# Agency Patterns Guidelines

version 1.2.0 · 17 December 2024

17 December 2024  15:52 · revision 1201

# Table of Contents

# Introduction

This document provides guidelines for the agency analysis of discourses. The purpose of agency analysis is to produce an agency model, that is, a representation of the beliefs, desires and intentions of each speaker in the text.

This document is designed as a pattern reference, that is, it describes what to do when a certain pattern is found during agency analysis. Guidelines are given in the form of situation/solution pairs, thus indicating what solution must be applied when a particular situation is found. Also, examples are used throughout.

This document includes a standard question set that is provided as part of the IAT/ML methodology. If the questions in this set are modified, or other questions are added, specific guidance would need to be developed.

Please see the *IAT/ML Analysis Process Guidelines* document for additional context and process-oriented guidance, and the *IAT/ML Technical Specification* document for specific details.

# Writing Questions

This section provides guidelines related to the design and wording of questions.

These guidelines are necessary only if you intend to add to or modify the questions in the IAT/ML standard question set.

## Phrasing

Questions must be clear, succinct and self-contained. Avoid direct references to other questions, and phrase them in such a way that each can be understood in isolation.

Questions must be formulated as interrogative sentences that require a short response. Use a question mark at the end.

Questions can be of different types depending on the kind of response that is expected:

- A short text, such as in "What is the figured world in the text?"
- A list of items, such as in "What parts exist in the text?"
- An element from a list, such as in "What is the genre of the text?"
- An agent from the associated context, such as in "What agents are mentioned in the text?"

See the following sections for details on each question type.

In addition, questions may require separate sub-responses for different scopes, such as in "Who are the friends of each agent according to each speaker?". Here, the expected response is a list of items for each previously identified agent. See *Scopes*, page 7, for additional details on questions having multiple scopes.

| Phrasing |
|---|
| **Situation** |
| A new question must be written, or an existing one modified. |
| **Solution** |
| Phrase the question in a clear, succinct and self-contained manner. Use an interrogative sentence. Write it so that the expected response is a short text, a list of items, an element from a list, or an agent. Consider that different sub-responses may be needed for different scopes. |

## Text Questions

Text questions, such as "What is the figured world in the text?", require a response in the form of a short text.

When writing a text question, apply the general advice related to phrasing (see *Phrasing*, page 5). In addition, make sure that the question can be reasonably responded by writing a few lines or one paragraph at most.

| Text Questions |
|---|
| **Situation** |
| A new text question must be written, or an existing one modified. |
| **Solution** |

Apply the general advice for phrasing questions. Make sure that the question can be answered by a few lines or a paragraph at most.

## Itemised Questions

Itemised questions, such as "What parts exist in the text?", require a response in the form of a list of items. The analyst responding the question must list as many items as necessary to respond the question.

When writing an itemised question, apply the general advice related to phrasing (see *Phrasing*, page 5). In addition, make sure that the question is phrased in plural, to convey the sense that multiple items are expected as a response.

| Itemised Questions |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| A new itemised question must be written, or an existing one modified. |
| **Solution** |
| Apply the general advice for phrasing questions. Phrase the question in plural to convey the fact that multiple items are expected as a response. |

## Option List Questions

Option list questions, such as "What is the genre of the text?", require a response in the form of one or more choices from an option list. The option list is provided together with the question, so that the analyst responding the question can see the available choices and select the best one.

When writing an option list question, apply the general advice related to phrasing (see *Phrasing*, page 5). In addition, create an option list from which the analyst responding the question will have to select the response. Decide whether the question must be responded with a single option from the list or whether it allows multiple options.

| Option List Questions |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| A new option list question must be written, or an existing one modified. |
| **Solution** |
| Apply the general advice for phrasing questions. Provide an option list together with the question, and decide whether responses will allow multiple simultaneous options. |

## Agent Questions

Agent questions, such as "Which agents are mentioned in the text?", require a response in the form of one or more agents from the associated context.

When writing an agent question, apply the general advice related to phrasing (see *Phrasing*, page 5). In addition, decide whether the question must be responded by selecting a single agent from the context or whether it allows multiple agents.

| Agent Questions |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| A new agent question must be written, or an existing one modified. |
| **Solution** |

Apply the general advice for phrasing questions. Decide whether responses will allow multiple simultaneous agents.

# Grouping

As described under *Organising Questions*, page 10, questions are likely to be grouped into a hierarchical structure depending on aspects such as their degree of interpretativeness and the issues they address.

When you write a new question, or modify an existing one, you must place it into the right group. To determine what group is the best, look at the following factors:

- Can the question be easily responded by reading the text? If this is so, it probably has a low degree of interpretativeness. If not, you may need to place it into a high degree of interpretativeness group.
- Are different analysts working on the same text likely to obtain the same response, or very similar responses, to the question? Again, if this is so, then the question probably has a low degree of interpretativeness. If not, you may need to place it into a high degree of interpretativeness group.
- What is the expected response to the question describing? This will indicate what group the question should be placed in.

If you cannot find a clear group for a question, you may need to create a new one or adapt an existing one. Please refer to *Organising Questions*, page 10, for guidance on how to do this.

| Grouping |
|---|
| **Situation** |
| A new question must be placed in the right group. |
| **Solution** |
| Find a group for the question according to its degree of interpretativeness and the issue it addresses. If no group can be found, create a new one or adapt an existing one. |

# Scopes

Some questions may require multiple responses, one for each speaker, agent, or element in a list. For example, "What is the main thesis of each speaker?" requires that you provide a separate response for each speaker in the text. The question "How is each place beneficial to each agent?" requires that you provide a response for each combination of an agent and a place. Each individual thing for which a response is required is called a *scope*. In the first example, each speaker in the text constitutes a scope; in the second example, each agent and place constitute a scope. The required scopes, if any, must be clearly stated in the question, usually through words such as "each".

There are four kinds of scopes:

- **Subject Speakers**. If your question must be responded by capturing the point of view of each speaker in the text, mark it as such. Questions like these usually include the words "according to each agent" or similar. The analyst responding the question will need to identify the speakers in the text and write a response according to each one.
- **Object Speakers**. If your question must be responded for each speaker in the text, mark it as such. Questions like these usually include the words "for each speaker" or similar. The analyst responding the question will need to identify the speaker in the associated context and write a response for each one.

- **Object Agents**. If your question must be responded for each agent in the text, mark it as such. Questions like these usually include the words "for each agent" or similar. The analyst responding the question will need to identify the agents in the associated context and write a response for each one.
- **Object other entities**. If you want your question to be responded for each of a list of entities, create an entity list and give it a meaningful name and description. Almost any kind of entity can be used as a scope, such as places or organisations. Questions like these usually include the words "for each X", where "X" is the kind of entity being referred to, or similar. The analyst responding the question will need to list the entities of that kind according to the text, and write a response for each one.

When you write a new question, determine whether it is unscoped (that is, it must be responded for the whole text) or scoped for subject speakers, object speakers, object agents, and/or object other entities. If scoped for entities, create the necessary entity list.

| Scoping Questions |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| A new question must be properly scoped. |
| **Solution** |
| Determine whether the question is scoped for subject speakers, object speakers, object agents, object other entities, or any combination of these, and mark it so. If scoped for entities, create the necessary entity list. Phrase the question so that its scopes are clearly visible. |

# Guidance

Questions are expected to be responded by an analyst working on a text. Then, responses to multiple questions are to be summarised in terms of beliefs, desires and intentions of the associated speakers. To aid in these tasks, you should provide some guidance on how to respond each question and how to use the produced responses. There are different kinds of guidance that you should provide:

- **Conceptual**. Conceptual guidance defines or explains concepts that appear in the question text and need to be understood in order to develop a proper response. For example, in "What are the final theses in the text", you should explain what a *final thesis* is.
- **Response**. Response guidance involves advice on how to respond the question. This includes the clues and markers in the text that the analyst should look for in order to write a response. For example, response guidance for the question "What is the main thesis in the text for each speaker?" could be "If you have done argumentation analysis of the text, this question can be responded by carrying out an argumentation structure analysis and selecting the final thesis of each speaker having the highest cogency".
- **Beliefs**. Beliefs guidance includes information on how to use the responses to the question in order to gain knowledge about the speaker's beliefs.
- **Desires**. Desires guidance includes information on how to use the responses to the question in order to gain knowledge about the speaker's desires.
- **Intentions**. Intentions guidance includes information on how to use the responses to the question in order to gain knowledge about the speaker's intentions.

Conceptual guidance is necessary only for those questions that involve technical concepts that should be explained. However, almost every question needs some response guidance. Also, only some questions contribute to the description of the beliefs, desires and intentions of speakers, and therefore only these need beliefs, desires and intentions guidance. Questions that need a

significant degree of interpretation and that are speaker-scoped are more likely to contribute towards these.

| Guidance |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| A new question must be provided with guidance for analysts. |
| **Solution** |
| Write some concept guidance if the question involves concepts that must be explained. |
| Write some response guidance on how to obtain the necessary information to respond the question. |
| If responses to the question may contribute to determining the beliefs, desires and intentions of the associated speaker, then write some specific guidance for beliefs, desires and/or intentions. |

# Organising Questions

This section provides guidelines related to the organisation of questions in hierarchical groups.

These guidelines are necessary only if you intend to modify the way in which questions are organised in IAT/ML, for example by adding questions to the standard question set.

## Degree of Interpretativeness

Some questions may be easy to respond by reading the text, such as "What terms are emphasised in the text?", whereas other questions may need a larger degree of interpretation by the analyst in order to obtain a response, such as "What are the interests of each agent within the figured world?".

Unless you have very few questions of the same degree of interpretativeness, it is recommended that questions are arranged from the least to the most interpretative, so that you tackle them in this order. To achieve this, it is good idea to organise questions into two large groups:

- **Direct questions**. This group includes questions that require no or little interpretation, and whose responses are usually objectively and straightforwardly available from the text.
- **Interpretative questions**. This group includes questions that require significant interpretation by the analyst, and whose responses are defined by the text but also by its environment, speakers, situation and other contextual aspects.

Bear in mind that responses to questions should always be clearly anchored on the text, no matter how highly interpretative the question is. It is acceptable to define questions that require the analyst to use their intuition to derive reasonable and traceable inferences from the text in order to write a response. However, it is not acceptable to define questions that can only be responded by relying too much on the analyst's beliefs, previous experiences or ideological stance.

You may add extra groups if you have many questions or if you want to establish a finer sequence of interpretativeness degree.

| Degree of Interpretativeness |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| Questions must be arranged according to their degree of interpretativeness. |
| **Solution** |
| Arrange questions in two or more groups, from the least to the most interpretative. |

## Addressing Different Aspects

Different questions address different aspects of the text, such as what agents appear, what situations are portrayed, what kind of rhetoric is used, etc.

It is recommended that questions are grouped by aspect by creating subgroups of the same degree of interpretativeness. To achieve this, you can use sub-groups such as the following:

- **Direct questions:**
  - **Form**. This subgroup includes questions related to the surface form of the text, such as emphasis or highlights.

- o **Themes**. This subgroup includes questions related to theses and themes dealt with by the text.
  - o **Rhetoric**. This subgroup includes questions related to the tone, lexical choices and metaphors used in the text.
- **Interpretative questions:**
  - o **Agents**. This subgroup includes questions related to the agents that appear in the text.
  - o **Situations**. This subgroup includes questions related to the situations in which agents are portrayed to be in the text.
  - o **Rhetoric**. This subgroup includes questions related to strategies, hypotheses and intentions of the speakers.

| Addressing Issues |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| Questions must be arranged according to the aspects that they address. |
| **Solution** |
| Arrange questions in groups and subgroups of similar degree of interpretativeness. |

# Responding Questions

This section provides guidelines related to the process of responding questions in general. For advice on how to respond the questions in the IAT/ML standard set, please see *Standard Question Set*, page 18.

Also, bear in mind that developing good responses to many of the questions is much easier if ontological and argumentation analyses of the text being analysed have been already carried out.

Responses must always be anchored to the text. This means that you should indicate, as part of your response, what elements in the text support it. If the text doesn't contain enough information to develop a clear response to a question, you should probably skip the question rather than trying to guess a response.

Also, responses must be directed to the issues outlined during project initiation. Please see the *IAT/ML Analysis Process Guidelines* document for details.

## Text Responses

Many questions require a response in the form of a short text, such as "What is the figured world in the text?".

Respond questions like this by writing a few lines at most, and never more than a paragraph. Ensure that your response addresses what the question is about and stays focused, avoiding digressions or unnecessary clarifications.

| Text Responses |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| A question must be responded with a short text. |
| **Solution** |
| Write the response as a few lines of text, never more than a paragraph. Make sure that you address the question and focus on what it requests. |

## Itemised Responses

Many questions require a response in the form of a list of items, such as "What parts exist in the text?".

Respond questions like this by writing a list of items. There may be one or more items, or even none. Each item must be a single phrase of a few words. Ensure that each item is an instance of what the question is asking for. For example, in the example above, make sure that each item is in fact a part in the text.

| Itemised Responses |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| A question must be responded with a list of items. |
| **Solution** |
| Write the response as a list of zero, one or more items, where each item is a brief phrase. Make sure that each item directly addresses what the question is asking for. |

# Option List Responses

Many questions require a response in the form of a choice from a particular option list, such as "What is the genre of the text?".

Respond questions like this by selecting the best option from the associated list. The question may allow for multiple options, so select more than one if allowed and appropriate.

| Option List Responses |
|---|
| **Situation** |
| A question must be responded with an option from a list. |
| **Solution** |
| Select the best option from the associated list. If the question allows it, you may be able to select multiple options. |

# Agent Responses

Many questions require a response in the form of one or more agents from the associated context, such as "What agents are mentioned in the text?".

Respond questions like this by selecting the best agents from the associated context. The question may allow for multiple agents, so select more than one if allowed and appropriate.

| Agent Responses |
|---|
| **Situation** |
| A question must be responded with an agent from the associated context. |
| **Solution** |
| Select the best agent from the associated context. If the question allows it, you may be able to select multiple agents. |

# Unscoped Responses

Many questions require a response that pertains to the whole text being analysed, such as "What are the major conflicts in the text?". These questions take the text as a whole, without any distinction between different speakers that may be part of it.

To tackle questions like this, start by reading the whole text to gain an impression of its overall content. If the text involves multiple speakers (such as in an interview or a debate), think of how each speaker is contributing to the whole. Then, sketch your response and make sure that it does not exclude any relevant points. In particular, make sure that your response integrates the contributions of all the speakers, if this is the case. Finally, re-read your response and ensure that it is addressing what the question asks for and that it constitutes a genuine and fair account of the text as a whole.

| Unscoped Responses |
|---|
| **Situation** |
| A question must be responded for the whole text. |
| **Solution** |
| Read the whole text and think of how different speakers (if this is the case) contribute to it. Sketch your response and make sure it integrates contributions by all the speakers. Check that your response addresses what the question is asking for and that it constitutes a genuine and fair account of the whole text. |

# Scoped Responses

Many questions require a response that focuses on a particular scope within the text being analysed, such as "What are the central entities according to each speaker?". These questions take one scope in turn, and aim to provide a distinct response that is independent of those of other scopes. For example, two participants in a debate may emphasise different concepts as central to their positions. When you attempt to respond questions like this, you must focus first on one scope, write your response, and then repeat for the next scope, and so on, thus obtaining different responses to the question, one per scope.

If you are using a question set containing subject or object speaker-scoped questions, you will need to identify and list the speakers in the text before you attempt to respond these questions. Similarly, if the question set contains agent-scoped questions, you will need to identify and list the agents mentioned in the text. Finally, if the question set contains questions scoped for other kinds of entities, you will need to identify and populate the associated entity lists. For example, if the question set contains a "Places" entity list, you will need to find and list the relevant places that are mentioned in the text.

The semantics of each type of scope are different:

- **Subject speaker**-scoped questions must be responded by looking at what each speaker says in the text, and capturing their views. For example, to respond to "What are the central entities according to each speaker?", find what each speaker says in the text and determine the central entities.
- **Object speaker**-scoped questions must be responded by looking at how each speaker is portrayed in the text. For example, to respond to "What terms are used to describe each speaker?", find words in the text (by any speaker) that describe each speaker, and list them.
- **Object agent**-scoped questions must be responded by looking at how each agent is portrayed in the text. For example, to respond to "What is forbidden for each agent?", find passages in the text (by any speaker) that describe what is forbidden for each agent, and summarise them.
- **Object entity**-scoped questions must be responded by looking at how each entity of the selected kind is described in the text. For example, to respond to "What adjectives are used to describe each historic period?", find adjectives in the text (by any speaker) that describe each historic period, and list them.

Some questions may have multiple scopes. For example, "What adjectives are used by each speaker to describe each historic period?" is both subject speaker- and object entity-scoped. You will need to develop a response for each historic period according to each speaker. For example, if there are 2 speakers in the text and 3 different historic periods, you will need to produce 6 different responses, one for each combination.

In particular, and to respond a scoped question, start by reading the whole text to gain an impression of its overall content. Then, look at what kinds of scopes the question refers to, such as speakers, agents, or other entities. Then, select one scope and highlight the associated text so that it clearly stands out. If possible, hide or dim out text that is unrelated to this scope. If the question has multiple scopes, select one individual combination. Read the text in focus once or twice. Then, sketch your response and make sure that it addresses what the question asks for, and that it constitutes a genuine and fair account of the text from the perspective of the selected scopes. Finally, repeat the whole process for the next scope (or combination of scopes) until you finish.

| Scoped Responses |
| --- |
| **Situation** |

A question must be responded for each scope in the text.

**Solution**

Make sure that you have listed the relevant speakers, agents and/or entities.

Read the whole text to get an overall understanding. Select a scope (or combination of scopes for multi-scoped questions) and highlight the associated text so that you can read it in isolation. Sketch your response and make sure it addresses what the question is asking for, and that it constitutes a genuine and fair account of the text in relation to the selected scopes. Repeat for the next scope or combination until you finish.

# Summarising Results

This section provides guidelines related to the process of summarising responses to questions in order to describe the beliefs, desires and intentions of speakers.

## Describing Speaker Beliefs

The responses to many subject speaker-scoped questions can contribute towards characterising the beliefs of the associated speaker. For example, responses to the question "How is each agent portrayed by each speaker?" are likely to provide information on what each speaker believes about each agent, in terms of how they see them and expect them to behave. Questions that are expected to contribute towards belief characterisation provide specific guidance in this regard.

To describe speaker beliefs, carry out the following process for each speaker in the text. Find the responses to all the questions labelled as contributing towards belief characterisation and for the target speaker. Read them carefully and draft a summary that describes the overall beliefs of the speaker. Revise the text and ensure it is concise and complete. Then move to the next speaker and repeat the process until all the speakers have been dealt with.

| Describing Speaker Beliefs |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| The beliefs of each speaker in the text must be described. |
| **Solution** |
| For each speaker, find responses to questions that contribute to belief characterisation for that speaker, and summarise them into a concise and complete text. |

## Describing Speaker Desires

The responses to many subject speaker-scoped questions can contribute towards characterising the desires of the associated speaker. For example, responses to the question "What actual or hypothetical situations are compatible with the main thesis according to each speaker?" are likely to provide information on what each speaker desires, in terms of what situations are enabled or fostered by their discourse. Questions that are expected to contribute towards desire characterisation provide specific guidance in this regard.

To describe speaker desires, carry out the following process for each speaker in the text. Find the responses to all the questions labelled as contributing towards desire characterisation and for the target speaker. Read them carefully and draft a summary that describes the overall desires of the speaker. Revise the text and ensure it is concise and complete. Then move to the next speaker and repeat the process until all the speakers have been dealt with.

| Describing Speaker Desires |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| The desires of each speaker in the text must be described. |
| **Solution** |
| For each speaker, find responses to questions that contribute to desire characterisation for that speaker, and summarise them into a concise and complete text. |

# Describing Speaker Intentions

The responses to many subject speaker-scoped questions can contribute towards characterising the intentions of the associated speaker. For example, responses to the question "What is the intention of each speaker in producing the text?" are likely to provide information on what each speaker aims to achieve, in terms of what actions they propose or what scenarios they facilitate. Questions that are expected to contribute towards intention characterisation provide specific guidance in this regard.

To describe speaker beliefs, carry out the following process for each speaker in the text. Find the responses to all the questions labelled as contributing towards intention characterisation and for the target speaker. Read them carefully and draft a summary that describes the overall intentions of the speaker. Revise the text and ensure it is concise and complete. Then move to the next speaker and repeat the process until all the speakers have been dealt with.

| Describing Speaker Intentions |
| --- |
| **Situation** |
| The intentions of each speaker in the text must be described. |
| **Solution** |
| For each speaker, find responses to questions that contribute to intentions characterisation for that speaker, and summarise them into a concise and complete text. |

# Standard Question Set

This IAT/ML Standard Question Set is now provided as a LogosLink 2 question site file on www.iatml.org.

# Standard Question Set

# Rhetorical Strategies

Rhetorical strategies are discursive approaches aimed at persuading the reader or listener, and are often recognisable through specific markers. In this section, strategies elaborated from [6], [7] are presented in groups and described through the markers that usually make them visible. Note that some markers are common to multiple strategies.

## Justification and Relativisation

These strategies aim to justify ideas or actions that are considered positive or soften ideas that are considered negative.

### Transfer of responsibility

These strategies assign responsibility that pertains to an agent to another.

Markers include:

- Terms that express difference or uniqueness, e.g. "unique", "special", "exclusive", "distinct", etc.
- Naturalising metaphors, e.g. exaggerated scientism, supremacy of a group for biological reasons, etc.
- Insinuations, e.g. implicit consequences of what is said
- Weakened assertions, e.g. "it seems that the president…"
- Allusion to ignorance, e.g. "we don't know how this is going to affect it"
- Reference to a pre-existing conflict, e.g. "we are at war"
- Reference to abstract ideas that seem to be determinant, e.g. "the homeland"
- Allusion to inevitable forces outside of our control, e.g. "we are left with no option but…"

### Trivialisation

These strategies aim to downplay an undesirable problem or situation.

Markers include:

- Expressions of balancing co-responsibility, e.g. "but everybody does it"
- Expressions of the "yes, but…" type
- Comparatively reduced attention, e.g. one speaker is presented with much detail of her CV, and another speaker with very little, thus trivializing him
- Presentation of fictional scenarios where the situation is actually trivial
- Comparative minimisation, i.e., introducing a bigger problem so that, in comparison, the situation seems smaller, e.g. "more people die from traffic accidents"
- Premature generalisation or far-fetched examples, e.g. "women in the Middle Ages were very empowered because some left large inheritances"
- Absolute quantifiers such as "all" or "none"
- Indefinite articles such as "one" or "some"
- Euphemisms that downplay the issue, e.g. "negative growth" to describe an economic crisis
- Concealment by indirect allusion, e.g. "the person you are talking about" to minimize one's relationship with them

## Legitimation

These strategies magnify the relevance of one's ideas.

Markers include:

- Quotes, especially self-quotes, e.g. "as I said the other day..."

## Self-victimisation

These strategies portray oneself as a victim or as someone who has received an unfair treatment.

Markers include:

- Literal references to victimhood status, e.g. "in fact, we are the victims here"
- Application of terms related to suffering or unfair treatment to oneself, e.g. "we have endured oppression for decades"

## Disrepute

These strategies minimise the relevance of one's opposed ideas.

Markers include:

- Citing a third-party opposing agent, e.g. "but your customers dislike your product"

# Construction

These strategies aim to define or create a new situation, very often a group identity.

## Integration

These strategies determine who is part of a group through assimilation, inclusion, and continuation.

Markers include:

- Etymological interpretations
- Definitions
- Visibility of shared traits, e.g. "we", "we are all the same"
- Use of the second person plural, e.g. "all of you are welcome here"
- References to common spaces and places
- Metonymy, taking the whole for the part, to give a sense of union
- Personification of entities that unite, e.g. "the nation unites us"
- Allusion to temporal continuity, e.g. "our forebears"
- Boat ("we are all in the same boat") or house ("this is our house") metaphors
- Explicit or implicit comparisons (i.e. presenting two cases and letting the reader compare), e.g. "trans women are women"
- Analogies with desirable situations
- Passionate and evocative rhetoric

## Singling out

These strategies magnify the importance of a situation or agent by appealing to its singular or unique quality.

Markers include:

- Expressions of uniqueness, e.g. "unique", "extraordinary", etc.

- Hyperboles with positive connotations
- Analogies to special situations
- Metonymy of part for the whole, singling out the part, e.g. "Putin has invaded Ukraine".

## Autonomisation

These strategies present an agent or situation in a positive light through allusions to its autonomy.

Markers include:

- Words referring to autonomy, e.g. "able"", "independent", "is capable of"

## Cohesion

These strategies establish the ideas that unite a group.

Markers include:

- Words that allude to union, e.g. "everyone", "community", etc.
- Appeal for cooperation and solidarity
- Use of slogans or phrases that signal belonging to a group
- Description of utopian or dystopian scenarios

## Disintegration

These strategies establish distance and differences between two agents or situations.

Markers include:

- Use of words that signal difference, e.g. "different", "distinct", "opponent", etc.
- Emphasis of the differences between past and present
- Allusion to catastrophic or dystopian scenarios
- Explicit or implicit comparisons (i.e. presenting two cases and letting the reader compare), e.g. "Scotland is not Britain"
- Negative attributions, e.g. "they are criminals"

## Avoidance

These strategies hide similarities of an agent with opposite ones, or differences with related ones.

Markers include:

- Focus on concepts in the abstract, omitting the differences of each agent in relation to them, e.g. "we are all European" (ignoring the big differences that exist between European countries)

# Perpetuation

These strategies aim to perpetuate an existing situation.

## Positive presentation

These strategies present the existing situation in a positive light.

Markers include:

- Positive attributes of the current situation, e.g. "beneficial" or "reliable"
- Exaltation of the situation, e.g. "America is great"

- Reinterpretation of the situation in a positive manner, e.g. "the economic downturn is a huge opportunity"

## Portrait in black & white

These strategies present the existing situation in absolute terms, with no room for intermediate degrees, in order to magnify the differences between the existing position and any possible alternative.

Markers include:

- Tending bridges towards similar situations, e.g. "Finland is doing the same"
- Burning bridges towards opposing situations, e.g. "we are not like them"
- Antonyms, e.g. "if we are rabbits, they are the wolves"
- Hyperbole, e.g. "that would annihilate all hope"

## Continuity

These strategies attempt to maintain the existing situation in the future.

Markers include:

- Positive references to the past, e.g. "our parents and grandparents started something beautiful"
- Positive references to the future, e.g. "our children will inherit unpolluted air and water"
- "We are all in the same boat" metaphors, e.g. "all of us face the same challenges, so let's stick together"
- Time adverbs indicating continuity or repetition, e.g. "always", "forever", "regularly", etc.

## Defence

These strategies aim to disqualify or criticise any alternative situation.

Markers include:

- Negative attributes, e.g. "that would be devastating" or "that option would lead to chaos"
- Denial of the need to change, e.g. "we are fine as we are" or "there are no practical reasons to change a system that has worked well for many years"

## Omission of problems

These strategies hide the problems of the existing situation to make it look better than it is.

Markers include:

- Rejection to deal with problems, e.g. "we will talk about that later on"
- Vague language to avoid being explicit, e.g. "diverse economies" to avoid recognition that there are many poor people

# Transformation

These strategies aim to transform an existing situation into another one that has already been conceived.

## Language manipulation

These strategies aim to establish new uses of language to make change more appealing.

Markers include:

- Metaphors, e.g. "we're social justice warriors"
- Euphemisms, e.g. "austerity" instead of "poverty"

## Reassurance in the face of change

These strategies aim to minimise the fear or negative consequences of undertaking change.

Markers include:

- Procatalepsy, e.g. "although some may argue that raising taxes will stifle economic growth, it is crucial to recognise that it will benefit the country in the long run"

## Advantages of transformation

These strategies aim to show the advantages of undertaking change.

Markers include:

- Deontic and normative modals, e.g. "we should", "it is imperative that", etc.
- Suggestive rhetorical questions, e.g. "wouldn't we love an economy where everyone can afford a large and comfortable home?"
- Allusion to history as a source of knowledge, e.g. "our ancestors did it, so we can do it too"

## Devaluation of the existing situation

These strategies aim to present the existing situation in a poor light.

Markers include:

- Metaphors with a negative connotation, e.g. "the current tax situation is theft"

## Appreciation of the alternative situation

These strategies aim to present the alternative situation in a positive light.

Markers include:

- Positive attributes of the alternative situation, e.g. "beneficial" or "reliable"
- Exaltation of the alternative situation, e.g. "make America great again"

# Destruction

These strategies aim to dismantle an existing situation without providing an alternative.

## Discrediting

These strategies aim to attack or demean agents that support the existing situation.

Markers include:

- Negative attributions, e.g. "they are liars"
- Negative metaphors, e.g. "the current board is a bunch of crooks"
- *Ad hominem* attacks, e.g. "you wouldn't trust a president that cheats on his wife"

## Negative presentation

These strategies aim to portray the agent to be dismantled in a poor light.

Markers include:

- Negative attributions, e.g. "most migrants are criminals"
- Neutral attributions to build a negative connotation, e.g. "women are emotional and sensitive" to construct the idea that women are weak or unreliable

## Unauthorised disclosure

These strategies reveal negative properties and mistakes made by the agent to be dismantled without their knowledge or authorisation.

Markers include:

- Confrontation with facts, e.g. "but you said in an email to your team that you'd never do that"

## Misleading assimilation

These strategies hide properties of the agent to be dismantled by assimilating it to a more advantageous ideal.

Markers include:

- Assimilation constructions, e.g. "we are all middle class" to avoid recognising that many poor people cannot afford decent living

## Dissimilation

These strategies emphasise differences of the agent to be dismantled in relation to one's own.

Markers include:

- Dissimilation constructions, e.g. "gay marriage is not real marriage because real marriage is between a man and a woman"

## Discontinuation

These strategies aim to show that the existing situation is no longer valid because it is old or obsolete.

Markers include:

- Metaphors of obsolescence, e.g. "the company works under a nineteenth-century management culture"

## Pronouncing somebody dead

These strategies aim to disqualify an agent as being metaphorically dead.

Markers include:

- Metaphors of death, e.g. "she is politically dead"

# References

[1]     T. A. Van Dijk, "Critical Discourse Analysis," in *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, and H. Hamilton, Eds. Blackwell, 2001, pp. 352–371.

[2]     J. P. Gee, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. Routledge, 2014.

[3]     J. P. Gee, *Language and Learning in the Digital Age*. Routledge, 2011.

[4]     D. Holland, W. S. Lachicotte, and D. Skinner, *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds*. Harvard University Press, 2001.

[5]     G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*. The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

[6]     J. M. Sabucedo Cameselle, M. Rodríguez Casal, and C. Fernández Fernández, "Construcción del discurso legitimador del terrorismo," *Psicothema*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 72–77, 2002.

[7]     R. Wodak *et al.*, *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh University Press, 2009.