The Role of *Ethos* in the Sceptical Discourse on Climate Change:
An investigation of authorial stance in the Drudge Report

By
Michael E. Volek

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree
Master of Arts

School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-40616-8
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-40616-8

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Abstract

This project examines 'authorial stance' in the representation of the discourse on climate change by a prominent online news outlet known as the Drudge Report. Climate-related headlines posted on the Drudge Report during the first six months of 2007 are brought together for examination according to a systemic-functional approach to discourse analysis known as appraisal theory. It is hypothesized that headlines offering apparent support for the global warming position actually undermine it by conveying a negative evaluation of the personal character or *ethos* of its proponents. A variety of analytical issues and challenges are discussed, and an analytical framework on the model of the Appraisal System is proposed. An analysis of the headlines according to the modified appraisal system supports the view that a consistent effort has been made to cast doubt on global warming claims by undermining the credibility of its advocates.

Acknowledgements

It is my pleasure to acknowledge the assistance and support I was fortunate to have received in the preparation of this thesis. Special thanks go out to my advisor, Dr. Lynne Young, who encouraged me to take on this project and always kept me pointed in the right direction. Thanks also to my second reader, Dr. Graham Smart, whose lessons on environmental discourse put me on this path; and to Dr. Rodney Williamson at the University of Ottawa, who kindly agreed to participate as an external reader.

I would also like to acknowledge the support of Dr. Natasha Artemeva, who was always willing to lend an encouraging and enthusiastic ear; and to my friend and classmate Suah Park, who seemed to find my nonsense genuinely amusing. Thanks also to Greg Albert, who agreed to read and comment on a draft of this manuscript despite his own impossible workload; and to all my other friends and acquaintances, who continue to go beyond the call of duty just by sticking around.

Finally, a word of deepest gratitude to my wife and partner, Mitsuko Volek, whose arms extend from horizon to horizon, and beyond whose embrace there is no other world.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Table of Figures.....	v
Table of Appendices.....	vi
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Review of the Literature.....	11
2.1 Informing Versus Influencing.....	13
2.2 Heteroglossic Constructions: the Bakhtinian Perspective	16
2.3 Modalized Constructions	20
2.4 Propositions about the future	23
2.5 Prosody and Condensation.....	26
2.5.1 Prosody	26
2.5.2 Prosodic Choices.....	33
2.5.3 Condensation and Nominalization.....	36
2.6 Reported Speech	38
2.7 Indirectly Evaluative Constructions.....	43
2.8 Ironic Constructions.....	49
2.9 Situation-Evaluation/Hypothetical-Real Constructions.....	55
2.10 Conclusion	60
3. The Analytical Framework	62
3.1 The Appraisal System.....	62
3.1.1 Heteroglossic Engagement.....	68
3.2 The Modified System.....	81
4. Analysis of the Drudge Report's Discourse on Climate Change	87
4.1 Methodology.....	87
4.1.1 Data Selection	87
4.1.2 Data Analysis	89
4.2 Analysis.....	92
4.3 Results.....	138
4.4 Discussion	140
5. Conclusion	146
References.....	172

Table of Figures

Figure 1. Lemke's seven semantic dimensions.....	21
Figure 2. Hunston's system of attribution.....	41
Figure 3. The system of evaluative targets.....	43
Figure 4. The Appraisal System.....	63
Figure 5. The system of Judgement.....	66
Figure 6. The system of Affect.....	67
Figure 7. The system of Appreciation.....	68
Figure 8. The system of Heteroglossic Engagement.....	70
Figure 9. The modified system of Heteroglossic Engagement.....	83
Figure 10. The modified system of Judgement.....	86

Table of Appendices

Appendix A: Headlines Selected for Analysis.....	149
Appendix B: Summary of Analysis	160
Appendix C: The Politics of Climate Change.....	163
Glossary	168

1. Introduction

This study is concerned with the rhetoric of climate change scepticism, an issue of particular relevance in light of the recent publication of the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4)¹ of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which was released in four stages over the course of 2007.

The first section of AR4, or “Working Group 1” (WG1), released on February 2, was concerned with “the human and natural drivers of climate change, observed climate change, climate processes and attribution, and estimates of projected future climate change” (IPCC, 2007b: 2).² It concludes that “Warming of the climate system is unequivocal” (4) and “*very likely* due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations” (8).³ The implications, spelled in WG2, released on April 6, are projected to be dire, and call for serious and concerted action. These conclusions characterize what is referred to throughout the following discussion as the ‘global warming position’.

The dialogic alternative, referred to as ‘climate change scepticism’ or ‘the sceptical position’, constitutes a range of opinion. Although the different voices fail to cohere into a unified response, they form what Maarten Hajer (1993) would call a ‘discourse coalition’ whose individual voices add rhetorical weight to the opposition to the global warming position, if only by undermining the claim that there is a consensus on global warming. The ‘strongest’ position rejects the conclusion that there has been any real warming of the climate system at all. Strong sceptics believe that ‘climate change’ is the

¹ AR1 was released in 1990 and supplemented in 1992, AR2 was released in 1995, and AR3 in 2001.

² The document, entitled, “The Physical Science Basis”, was officially released on February 2, 2007, though the “second-order draft” was widely available as far back as May 2006. [<http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2006/05/ipcc-draft-no-comment/>].

³ “Very likely” denotes an assessed likelihood of an outcome judged to be greater than 90% (IPCC, 3, footnote 6).

artefact of flawed methodologies and hidden agendas.⁴ The ‘median’ position accepts the IPCC’s first conclusion, that the climate system is warming, but rejects the second, that it is due to human activity. Median sceptics believe that climate change is natural and unavoidable.⁵ The ‘weak’ position is generally consistent with the two main conclusions of WG1, but rejects the implication that actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are either practical or desirable. Weak sceptics believe either that climate change can be adapted to or that technological solutions will be found as required.⁶

According to promotional materials disseminated by the IPCC, AR4 was the product of six years work by “2500+ scientific expert reviewers” in conjunction with “800+ contributing authors and 450+ lead authors from 130+ countries” (IPCC, 2007a). How climate change scepticism could remain in the face of such an authoritative voice is a question that drives this study.

It might be supposed that doubt about climate change reflects a simple lack of awareness, and that an effort to inform the public of the *facts* should be sufficient to move sceptical opinion in line with the scientific view.⁷ Such is the logic behind Al Gore’s speaking

⁴ The strong sceptical position is reflected in such headlines as: “Climatologist Calls Global Warming Fears ‘Greatest Deception in the History of Science’”, “President of Czech Republic Calls Global Warming a ‘Myth’ - Questions Gore’s Sanity”, “Danish scientist: Global warming is a myth”, “Climate expert says it’s ‘time to attack the myth of global warming’”, “Antarctic Temperatures Disagree with Climate Model Predictions”, “Researchers Question Validity Of A ‘Global Temperature’”, “‘Father’ of climatology dismisses global warming as ‘hooey’: ‘There is a lot of money to be made in this’”, and “Climate scientist says global warming stopped in 1998”.

⁵ The median sceptical position is expressed in such headlines as: “MIT Scientist: ‘Alarm over climate change is based on ignorance of what is normal for weather and climate’”, “Scientists find Earth’s climate ‘seesawing’ for last 10,000 years”, “Scientists Counter UN Report - Claim Global Warming Due to Solar Activity, Not Man”, “PAGLIA: ‘Man is too weak to permanently affect nature’”, “Mars Melt Hints at Solar, Not Human, Cause for Warming, Scientist Says”, “Cosmic rays blamed for global warming”, and “Ocean currents - not humans - to blame for warming: expert”.

⁶ The following headlines convey a weak sceptical position: “NASA chief unsure of need to tackle climate change” and “Americans: ‘Global Warming Real, Not Priority’”,

⁷ Of course, ‘facts’ can be construed in a number of ways: scientific facts, political facts, social facts, economic facts, etc. The ‘facts’ for global warming advocates are primarily scientific and spelled out in detail in AR4. For global warming advocates, the

tour, his film (*An Inconvenient Truth*), and the series of international concerts modeled on Live Aid. This is also the view taken by researchers at MIT, who concluded in 2005 that climate change was poorly understood in the United States and that education was critical. They suggested that an education campaign begin with the fundamental link between the burning of fossil fuels, the emission of greenhouse gases and the potential for global warming (Stauffer, 3/16/05). A survey by ACNielsen just before the official release of AR4 found that Americans continued to be among the least informed about climate change, and the least concerned (ACNielsen, 1/29/07). Again, there is the suggestion that such apathy could be corrected through education.⁸

But is this really the case? Are doubts about climate change—that it warrants immediate action, that it is the result of human activity, or that it is even occurring at all—simply a matter of ignorance? A closer look at the data does not support this view.⁹ Beliefs about climate change, at least in the United States, are correlated neither with formal education, nor with awareness of the issue, nor with the scientific consensus. In fact, on some measures, a correlation exists, but opposite the one that many global warming advocates suppose. Climate change scepticism, it appears, is primarily a political position; specifically, of the political right. In this regard, the evidence supports Peter Jacques'

implications of significant global climate change are so momentous that all other relevant facts are subordinate to, and develop from, the scientific conclusions.

⁸ Corbett & Durfee (2004) take this view. But their response to the survey data (discussed below), which shows a disconnect between education and the 'correct' opinion, is puzzlement. They write: "Obviously, having heard of climate change is not the same as understanding the phenomenon, possessing accurate knowledge about it, or being certain about it" (132). They make no mention at all of the potential relevance of political orientation. Demeritt (2001), on the other hand, situates the discourse squarely in the political realm, though he disagrees that it is necessarily a partisan issue. He cites Yearley (1996), Redclift & Sage (1998), Sachs (1999), among others on the political left, whose scepticism has more to do with the dangers of technocracy and scientific reductionism. This issue is taken up again when the discussion turns to the informing/influencing distinction.

⁹ See Appendix C for a discussion on the correlation between climate change scepticism and political orientation. See also Timothy Luke (2000), who argues that opposition to global environmental policy-making comes from a coalition of conservative groups; and McCright & Dunlap (2003), who argue that America's continued resistance to climate policy "is heavily influenced by the success of the conservative movement in challenging the legitimacy of global warming as a social problem" (367).

(2006) contention that scepticism of the science is “superficial, tangential even, to its more important arguments for limiting who and what citizens are responsible to and for” (77).¹⁰

Jacques’ distinction between the scientific and political underpinnings of climate change scepticism is a recognition that even scientific *truths* are subject to interpretation and ultimately to political appropriation.¹¹ In this sense, the issue of *truth* is a red herring. A more essential matter is *trust*.¹² As Demeritt (2001) observes: “In the particular case of climate change, heavy reliance upon diverse, highly specialized, and multidisciplinary bodies of scientific knowledge highlights the problem of trust in knowledge and the expert systems that produce it” (309).¹³ This is the message Frank Luntz conveys to his clients in a controversial 2003 policy memo. Luntz, a prominent U.S. pollster and political advisor to the Republican Party, argues that “A compelling story, even if factually inaccurate, can be more emotionally compelling than a dry recitation of the

¹⁰ Jacques (2006) adds: “More importantly, the struggle over the state of the planet is a struggle over society’s dominant core social values that institutionalize obligation and power” (77).

¹¹ Carvalho (2005) takes a similar perspective when she speaks of the “(discursive) manipulation of ‘reality’ by social actors” (3).

¹² McComas & Simone (2003) identify the issue of trust in science as a major concern, citing factors like research funding and relationships between scientists and industry as posing threats to public confidence in the integrity of science and scientific research. They cite Cohen (2001), on the one hand, as expressing concern that the publicizing of conflicts of interest controversies in the mass media could harm science (for instance, through its impact on scientific funding or public support); and Shuchman & Wilkes (1997), Angell (2001) and Moynihan et al. (2000), on the other, that potential biases and conflicts of interest do not receive enough media attention, and that the damage to the public’s trust is done when the conflicts are belatedly exposed. McComas & Simone are careful to distinguish a conflict of interest as “a state of affairs” rather than “a kind of behavior” (citing Cohen 2001: 210), explaining: “a conflict of interest does not necessarily mean [individuals] have engaged in improper behavior but simply that the conditions are ripe for improprieties to occur” (398). But as Cohen (2001) observes, whether people always recognize this distinction in meaning is unclear.

¹³ Demeritt later adds: “The proper response to public doubts is not to increase the public’s technical knowledge about and therefore belief in the scientific facts of global warming. Rather, it should be to increase public understanding of and therefore trust in the social process through which those facts are scientifically determined” (329).

truth” (132). He goes on to describe how Democrats applied this lesson to the contentious issue of arsenic in the public water supply:

The story was not that Bush was delaying a hastily imposed regulation, but rather that he was actively *putting in more* arsenic in the water. Republicans... pointed this out... and pointed this out again... but the facts didn't matter. The hit had been scored, the political damage done, and that was the first chink in President Bush's approval ratings. Again, let me emphasize: The facts were beside the point. *Facts only become relevant when the public is receptive and willing to listen to them* (Luntz, 133).

Luntz is emphasising here that the given facts are less important than the received impression. Later in the memo, he offers some crucial advice on how to make the public receptive to one's message. He explains: “*the burden of proof is on you to prove your good intentions and your sincerity*” (134, emphasis in the original). While simple and perhaps even a bit trite, Luntz's advice nevertheless strikes at the heart of what others have found to be an essential component of communication: the projection of a compelling personal character.

In a 1996 analysis of risk communication, Steven Katz and Carolyn Miller also emphasize the centrality of personal character in successful communication. Katz and Miller found that in communicating the risks of various proposals about where to store low-level radioactive waste, the authorities had resorted ineffectually to a top-down model of communication in which the ‘experts’ endeavoured to ‘correct’ the public's perception of risk in order to bring it in line with their own analyses (116).¹⁴ Katz and Miller argue instead for a rhetorical model based on something like the Aristotelian tradition that emphasizes *ethos*, which they feel better addresses the issues of trust that had hampered effective communication among the participants in their study.

¹⁴ Demeritt (2001) sees exactly the same thing happening in the discourse on climate change. As he explains: “This vision of the scientific advisor depends upon an absolute distinction between fact and value and an associated division of labor between scientists and policy makers” (308).

The following investigation is similarly concerned with the role of *ethos* in the communication of risk. However, it will extend, and in a sense, reverse, Katz and Miller's Aristotelian model by arguing that voices promoting climate change scepticism have made efforts not only to promote their own *ethos* but, more importantly, to undermine the public perception of their opponents' character. There is another important difference between the Aristotelian model and the one employed here. Normally, an *ethos* is identified with a particular individual, on the basis of his or her actual choices and actions over the course of a lifetime. One does not usually speak of the *ethos* of an abstract and diffuse group of participants in a debate. It seems reasonable, however, especially in light of the distributed nature of political leadership, to extend the Aristotelian notion to a broader coalition of individuals advocating for one policy or another. Whether it is strictly appropriate is a question perhaps for philosophy, but in terms of political rhetoric, it is hardly uncommon to characterize the motives and virtues of various groups and organizations. Consider, for instance, how environmental activists have characterized the '*ethos*' of ExxonMobile.¹⁵ It may even be that one has created a straw man, whose character corresponds to none of the actual participants, either individually or as a group. Even then, if the construct is perceived as a real voice in the debate, the characterization of its *ethos* could be expected to have an impact on opinion. The sole criterion of relevance is the persuasiveness of the characterization.

As Geoff Thompson & Susan Hunston (2000) observe, "Ideologies do not exist in silence, but neither are they usually expressed overtly" (8). This is particularly true of discourses in the news media, where principles of journalistic objectivity discourage the overt expression of authorial stance. Nevertheless, as Thompson & Hunston go on to explain, ideologies "are built up and transmitted through texts, and it is in texts that their nature is revealed" (8). And as they are essentially sets of values—about what is good or bad, right or wrong, what must be done or avoided—the ideologies underlying a given text may be laid bare by identifying the 'attitudinal meanings'¹⁶ expressed.

¹⁵ See, for instance, Livesey (2002).

¹⁶ to use Michael Halliday's term.

In order to identify the attitudinal meanings conveyed by voices sceptical of climate change, an analytical framework was first constructed on the model of Jim Martin's (2000, 2004) 'Appraisal System', a resource conceived specifically for the analysis of what Martin (2000) calls "the semantic resources used to negotiate emotions, judgements, and valuations, alongside resources for amplifying and engaging with these evaluations" (145). The term "evaluation" is used here to describe the attitude or stance conveyed by these 'semantic resources'.¹⁷

The resulting framework was put to use in examining the discourse on climate change as represented in the news media, which research has shown to be the source of much of the public's knowledge about science.¹⁸ As the central concern of this study was with climate change scepticism, and the presumption was that such scepticism is especially pronounced on the political right, a prominent, politically conservative news provider was sought for examination. An online outlet known as the Drudge Report¹⁹ was settled

¹⁷ Hunston & Thompson (2000) offer a clear definition of 'evaluation' as it is used in this context, describing it as "the broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about" (5). The term 'appraisal' is also frequently employed in this context.

¹⁸ Nelkin (1995) claims that the public's understanding of science comes "less through direct experience or past education than through the filter of journalistic language and imagery" (2). Trumbo (1996) echoes this view, arguing that because of its presumed influence, the media is the arena in which various social groups, institutions, and ideologies struggle over the construction of social reality (270). Corbett & Durfee (2004) agree: "For most citizens, knowledge about science comes largely through the mass media, not through scientific publications or direct involvement in science" (130). They add:

This is especially true for unobtrusive or "invisible" issues where a person lacks real-world experiential conditions that could help shape opinion and understanding, such as global climate change. Even if a person lives through the hottest summer on record, record drought, or severe forest fires (weather events that occurred in the United States in 1988 and 2002), it is the media that attempt to connect such events to scientific evidence (130).

¹⁹ The single page that comprises the Drudge Report is exceedingly plain. It contains a simple banner identifying the site as the 'Drudge Report' in a large black font. This banner sometimes links to a 'Special Report', if one is available, but more often simply enables one to refresh the page. In any event, the Special Reports are generally very brief, consisting of only a paragraph or two about an important developing story. Above the

on for a number of reasons. It would be of little interest to the current discussion if the source offered only a marginal voice on the climate. But the Drudge Report takes the issue very seriously. Between January 1 and July 1, 2007, Matt Drudge posted links to approximately 850 climate-related articles—an average of more than 4.5 items a day on a site that averages perhaps 30 headlines in total each day—about 15% of its output over the period. Though not all of these headlines addressed climate *change* (at least not directly), a great many did, and inferences could be drawn from many of the rest. The Drudge Report is in turn an important venue for the discourse on climate change. As Michael Malone of ABC News observes, Matt Drudge has enormous impact, not only on public opinion, but on the American leadership and other journalists as well (Malone, 3/01/07). The site draws something on the order of 10 to 15 million visits a day—a huge number for a largely political web log that produces almost no original content.²⁰ Though comparative data is hard to find, traffic to the Drudge Report in 2005 exceeded by nearly 250% the next 100 busiest web logs combined (Slowplay, 2/20/05). During the Senate and Congressional elections in November 2006, traffic on the Drudge Report set new records as more than 2.3 million unique visitors logged on a combined 25 million times

banner is the main headline and associated image, above which, to the left, can sometimes be found links to other closely related news items. Beneath the banner are three rows of smaller headlines of about 20 to 40 stories, interspersed with a half-dozen images and a few advertisements. The headlines generally appear in black, in sentence case, though a few key headings may appear in red or blue, or typed in uppercase, for added emphasis. Very occasionally, Drudge may include a flashing siren. Fresh headlines are added periodically throughout the day, with the newest and most important placed near the top of the page. At the bottom of the left-most column are links to about 100 newspapers; in the centre are links to approximately the same number of columnists and opinion-makers; and on the right are links to the world's news wires and Drudge's own archives, as well as a window for the submission of anonymous news tips. Although the number of images displayed on the Drudge Report has progressively increased (from only a single one above the banner prior to 2001, to about six in current offerings), the format has remained virtually unchanged since its inception. The simplicity and consistency of the format make the site amenable to a critical analysis. The relatively small number of headlines, the limited use of images, the strategic application of coloured fonts, and the unambiguous position of the top story all reveal something about the discourses that are engaged—the importance of the story, the emphasis, the tone and, ultimately, the broader message intended to be conveyed.

²⁰ As a 'news aggregator', the Drudge Report posts links to news articles from websites throughout the Internet.

over the course of a single day (Intermarkets, 1/12/07). And during the censorship controversy at the Weather Channel, Drudge posted a link that sent an estimated 30 to 50 thousand visitors an hour to the U.S. Senate website, which promptly collapsed under the pressure (The Hill, 1/23/07). Such is his reputation that when the Dow Jones saw its worst collapse since 9/11, James Pethokoukis of the U.S. News & World Report attributed the panic to the Drudge Report, where the headline, “Greenspan Warns of Likely U.S. Recession” had been posted the previous day (Pethokoukis, 2/27/07). In 2006, Time Magazine listed Drudge as one of the top 100 “people who shape our world” (Time, 4/30/06). The Guardian Unlimited observed that Drudge’s importance in the US media was “undisputed” and placed the Drudge Report among the top ten websites that have “changed the world” (Guardian, 8/13/06). And Forbes magazine recently ranked Matt Drudge fourth in its list of the top 25 ‘web celebrities’ (Forbes, 1/23/07). The Drudge Report is clearly not a marginal voice.

Moreover, the Drudge Report is not a lone voice. As a “news aggregator”, posting links to stories from a vast pool of sources, from the New York Times to the Hindustan Times, it ensures that voices from every conceivable position are well represented. This constructs it as implicitly—indeed, *radically*—‘heteroglossic’, and thus a portal on the broader discourse (or even ‘meta-discourse’) on climate change. Moreover, its stance is not obviously partisan. The clamour of voices is brought together without editorial commentary, leaving it for the reader to draw her own conclusions about the issues presented.

Of course, the sense of open and competing discourse is illusory. Matt Drudge exercises complete control over who is given a voice and the context in which that voice is heard. Al Gore and other global warming advocates have frequently expressed the opinion that the news media are culpable for giving too much weight to the sceptical position in a misguided effort to achieve a balanced presentation of the different views.²¹ But the

²¹ For instance, Boykoff (2005) argues: “While much focus of ire and frustration has focused on the Bush administration, another significant, yet often underconsidered point of resistance to international cooperation on climate change also revolves around the

Drudge Report offers a chance to test a different hypothesis: that in the very presentation of a dialogic alternative a negative evaluation may be conveyed that weakens the position being proposed. In other words, rather than offer overtly sceptical propositions, either on their own or in conjunction with global warming affirmations, a news provider may promote the sceptical position by presenting ostensibly *positive* support for the global warming position, but in such a way that the claims undermine themselves. This is the essence of irony. On such a view, the global warming propositions are not simply 'balanced' by the sceptical ones, but contribute *directly* (if covertly) to the sceptical position and reinforce any overtly sceptical propositions that may also appear. Far from merely balancing the opposing views, such a strategy serves to magnify the argument in favour of scepticism.

Among the issues investigated below is the question of how the Drudge Report engages with the discourse on climate change. Does he convey a sceptical stance? And if so, what resources are employed to achieve this end? It will be argued below that while the Drudge Report links to various news items without modification, each story is implicitly framed and evaluated by the choices made in the headline, and that such choices serve to promote the sceptical position by presenting consistently negative evaluations of global warming. It will be argued, moreover, that these evaluations are directed primarily at the character or '*ethos*' of the participants involved, and achieve their end by casting doubt on the credibility of global warming advocates.²²

media's ongoing adherence to the journalistic norm of balanced reporting" (86). See also Schneider (2001) and Boykoff & Boykoff (2004).

²² While Jacquelin Burgess (1990) rightly points out that "it is naïve reductionism to abstract a single 'message' from a single media text and then measure its apparent 'effect' on an individual's attitudes or behaviour" (143), it is assumed below that consistent and repeated expressions of authorial stance in the news media are as relevant to the shaping of public opinion as the more explicit semantic meanings conveyed by the text, and that these other semantic meanings themselves have a significant effect. Corbett & Durfee (2004) support this view, arguing that "It is logical to conclude that there must be some connection between media coverage of climate change and public misconceptions of it, particularly because this is an issue largely communicated to the public through the media" (133).

2. Review of the Literature

The following is an examination of the work being done in an evolving field of linguistic research known as appraisal theory. This is an area of study concerned with the ways and means of expressing inter-subjective (and ultimately ideological) positions within a text. More specifically, it is a field concerned with the expression of a speaker's attitude toward his or her own text, and how such an expression affects the meanings that are conveyed.²³ As Peter White (2006a) acknowledges, however, appraisal theory is still very much an on-going project with many issues yet to be addressed, and the analytical framework—the “Appraisal System”—which manifests the various elements of the

²³ Appraisal theory is an offshoot of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), a socio-linguistic grammar model developed in the 1960s by Michael Halliday. As a systemic-functional approach to discourse analysis, appraisal theory is organized according to a network or *system* of choices, each offering the potential to fulfil a particular linguistic *function*. As with SFL, it is the presumption that language is a system of choices that gives it a ‘critical’ edge: if language is all about choice, then the features of an utterance should reflect the choices made and an analysis of the features should reveal something about the language user’s personal intentions; in other words, it should reveal the function of the utterance or text. Among the various linguistic ‘strata’ recognized by SFL, is the ‘meta-functional’ or ‘semantic’ level at which the communicational aspect of language is realized; that is, where we consider the meanings that language is meant to convey (‘below’ it are the ‘lexico-grammatical’ and ‘phonological’ strata, and ‘above’ it is the ‘situational’ or ‘contextual’ stratum). Appraisal theory is concerned with the different semantic meanings on the meta-functional level. SFL distinguishes three types of semantic meaning: ‘ideational’, ‘interpersonal’ and ‘textual’. Ideational meanings address the underlying ‘content’ of a text in terms of the ‘processes’, ‘participants’ and ‘circumstances’ involved in any given utterance (usually referred to as the system of ‘transitivity’); textual meanings reflect the arrangement of these processes, participants and circumstances in terms of ‘theme’ and ‘cohesion’; while interpersonal meanings address the author’s presence in a text, primarily through ‘mood’ and ‘modalization/modulation’. Appraisal theory is concerned with the expression of authorial stance or “evaluation”—an aspect of interpersonal meaning. But it distances itself from traditional views of SFL by considering the expression of stance or evaluation to be inseparable from the expression of any of the semantic meanings. In other words, evaluation is not a matter that can be addressed by the interpersonal metafunction alone; ideational, textual, lexico-grammatical, and even phonological resources may all play a decisive role in the expression of interpersonal meaning. For a more detailed treatment of SFL, see Halliday & Matthiessen (2004); and Eggins (2004).

theory, remains subject to elaborations and extensions as it is applied to different registers and discourse domains.

The current project, exploring the Drudge Report's discourse on climate change, shows up some of the shortcomings of the Appraisal System, and calls for a broader look at the literature for insight into how the Appraisal System may be adjusted. To that end, a rather diverse body of work has been examined and divided up according to a number of themes that will inform the modifications made to the framework in chapter 3 and the analyses of the text in chapter 4.

In light of the hypothesis that *ethos* is the primary target of evaluation in the Drudge Report, this chapter begins with a brief look at the distinction between 'informing' and 'influencing'. Just as appraisal theory expresses a suspicion of the distinction between the interpersonal meanings and the other semantic meanings in a text, allowing for the simultaneous expression of both, the distinction between informing and influencing is called into question under the presumption that every communication may likewise contain elements of both information and influence. The discussion then turns to the Bakhtinian notion of 'heteroglossia', which is central to appraisal theory and grounds the entire project by framing 'discourse' as something inherently oriented toward (or against) the viewpoints of others in the community. This is followed by a look at the issue of modalization and its relationship to the Appraisal System. Modals are the traditional way to express authorial stance, and an understanding of the relevance and limitations of modals in this regard is important, especially as it relates to expectations about the future, which characterize many propositions in the discourse on climate change. The following section looks at the issue of prosody as an obstacle to any simple analysis of authorial stance. Prosody describes the distribution of evaluative resources throughout a text—or even a body of texts—and not, as one might expect, in discrete, easily delimited units of language. This is examined more closely in terms of prosodic choices, demonstrating how various configurations of the same lexical items (that is, thematic choices) may affect interpersonal meaning. In addition, a sort of 'inverse' of prosody is also examined in the related notions of condensation and nominalization, whereby prosodic meanings

are essentialized or submerged in nominal form. This is followed by a look at the issues surrounding reported speech, something especially relevant to the question of appraisal in the news media. Reported speech is looked at both as it relates to the evaluation of a proposition itself and as it relates to the possible evaluation of the cited source or speaker. The latter case is closely related to the issue of irony, which is also looked at in detail, particularly because it is employed so frequently in the Drudge report. The final section brings the discussion back to the questionable distinction between influencing and informing or between the expression of interpersonal meaning and the other semantic meanings in a text. Here the distinction is between two grammatical structures: a 'Situation-Evaluation' structure, where a separation between the interpersonal and other meanings is presupposed, and a 'Hypothetical-Real' structure, where the difference is seen as purely functional and subjective.

2.1 Informing Versus Influencing

Jay Lemke has observed that we use language not only to take a stance toward others but also toward the propositional content of our own texts. As Lemke (1998) explains, we not only speak *about* the world, but also about how we feel about the world, and we may do so in the very same utterance. Steven Katz and Carolyn Miller (1996) arrive at the same conclusion in their examination of risk communication. They find that most conceptions of risk communication presuppose or 'embed' a distinction between 'informing' and 'influencing'—and that, indeed, such a distinction has been institutionalized (for instance, at the U.S. National Research Council, the 'NRC'). According to this dualist view, informing is a "communicative function" that allows people to understand an issue and act "appropriately", while influencing goes beyond that, even to the level of deception (Katz & Miller, 132; citing NRC, 82).

But this 'informing versus influencing' approach reflects what Craig Wadell (1996) calls the 'one-way Jeffersonian model', which Katz and Miller (after Fiorino, 1989, 1990) identify with 'elitist democracy' and its emphasis on representation rather than participation, with "experts acting for citizens, maintaining stability, and applying

specialized knowledge” (133).²⁴ Taken to its extreme, the result is technocracy: a “closed rhetoric of authority, control, precision, associated with the power of science and technology” (134). Lemke (1990) also sees this issue of authority as a major feature of technocratic discourse, and links it with ‘the pervasive denigration of common sense’.²⁵ Lemke (1995a) points to “the transformation of discourses of expert knowledge into discourses of social policy”, calling it the dominant political strategy (58). The advantage, he explains, at least for those who practice it, is that it presents policy “as if it were directly dictated by matters of fact... and deflects consideration of *value* choices and the social, moral and political responsibility for such choices” (58).²⁶ Young and Fitzgerald (2006) concede that ‘technicalization’ lends an air of legitimacy to public policy, but warn that technicalized discursive choices keep a lay audience from fully comprehending the discourse, and thus from fully participating in it.²⁷ Lemke (1990) explains: “The opacity of *technical* discourse to the uninitiated permits *technocratic* discourse to use the prestige and mystique of science to win advantage in policy debate” (65). This advantage is maintained even when the technocrat is obliged to transform the technical discourse into something comprehensible to a wider audience (as when he is called on to inform the public of the facts). As Lemke (1990) goes on to explain: “This transformation frees elements of technical discourse from their canonical

²⁴ Former IPCC chairman Bert Bolin accepts this role, explaining that “only scientists can grasp the intricate interactions... of the global environment”, and that it is therefore their responsibility to “present available knowledge objectively” to those entrusted with the responsibility for making policy decisions “based on a combination of factual scientific information as provided by the IPCC and [the policy maker’s own] value judgments” (27).

²⁵ Lowe (2006) notes the growing body of literature addressing the error in assuming that an “ignorant public” needs to be provided with simple information, an approach that underestimates the depth of public thinking and fails to situate the issues in the broader social and cultural contexts. (See also Horlick-Jones et al., 2003).

²⁶ Technicalization is thus a monological form of engagement, in which there is no place for alternative voices.

²⁷ In a curious twist on this argument, Demeritt (2001) contends that reliance on computer modelling puts even the scientist in this position: “most scientists stand in a similar downstream relation to climate models as those of policy makers and the lay public: they are forced to put their faith in technical expertise that they do not fully understand” (309). Others, however, take pointed issue with Demeritt’s position. See, for instance, Schneider (2001), who responds to Demeritt’s argument in detail.

contextualization and redefines them in ways that better serve the technocratic values and interests” (65).²⁸ Demeritt (2001) draws the same conclusion: “Those who have addressed the politics of scientific knowledge have largely done so in an instrumental way, arguing that political interests of one sort or another have distorted the science to serve their own ends” (308). We will look at this in more detail when the discussion turns to the issue of condensation and nominalization. But for the moment, it is important to consider a possible alternative to the technocratic/informing approach to communication.

Katz and Miller suggest the possibility of ‘an entirely different philosophy of communication’, a ‘participatory’ model (to use the political analogy again) that “emphasizes process more than results, with participating citizens gaining not only results but satisfaction and investment from their engagement in decision making” (133-134). They describe their alternative as a ‘rhetorical model of risk communication’, whereby influencing—rather than informing—is seen as the ‘fundamental communicative relationship’. It is an acknowledgement that “information is never pure but always comes shaped, selected, and intended in some way” (132). They add, with echoes of Bakhtin and Volosinov that:

The rhetorical approach also assumes that the relationships among rhetor, audience, language, situation, history, and intentions are complex, themselves situated and historical, rather than discrete, objective, and measurable. It assumes that what is unsaid and what is implied are just as important as the overt “messages” in information transfer and can serve as indications to the values, relationships, attitudes, and historical trajectories of the parties to communication (132).

This leads Katz and Miller to suggest a re-evaluation of the Aristotelian notion of *ethos*—or the contribution to persuasion made by the ‘character’ of the communicator. They cite Aristotle’s contention that *ethos* may be the “the controlling factor in persuasion” (Katz

²⁸ Demeritt (2001) echoes this in terms of the discourse on climate change: “One consequence of this rather conventional view of science as hermetically sealed off from politics is that very little attention has been paid to the cultural politics of scientific practice and its consequential role in framing and, in that sense, constructing for us the problem of global warming” (308).

& Miller, 1996: 133, citing Aristotle, *On Rhetoric* 1.2.5).²⁹ On this view, there are three elements of character that make a speaker persuasive: one must demonstrate the *wisdom* to form opinions 'rightly', the *virtue* to be honest about those opinions, and the *goodwill* to offer the best advice in light of those opinions.³⁰ To the extent that such an insight is valid, the importance of evaluation or 'stance' in the representation of a proposition becomes all the more obvious. 'Character' is an inherently evaluative notion, and Aristotle's description of the most salient aspects of character (in terms of persuasiveness) simply emphasizes that fact. Wisdom, virtue and goodwill are exactly the sort of evaluations that an appraisal system should be designed to capture. This will be taken up again when the discussion turns to the issue of 'Judgement'.

2.2 Heteroglossic Constructions: the Bakhtinian Perspective

This discussion began with Lemke's observation that in saying something about the world, we can also, in the very same utterance, communicate the extent to which we

²⁹ According to the translation by W. Rhys Roberts, Aristotle writes that character constitutes one of the three modes of persuasion furnished by the 'spoken word' (as opposed to external factors):

Persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible. We believe good men more fully and more readily than others: this is true generally whatever the question is, and absolutely true where exact certainty is impossible and opinions are divided. ... It is not true, as some writers assume in their treatises on rhetoric, that the personal goodness revealed by the speaker contributes nothing to his power of persuasion; on the contrary, his character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion he possesses (Aristotle, 1.2.5).

³⁰ As Aristotle explains:

There are three things which inspire confidence in the orator's own character—the three, namely, that induce us to believe a thing apart from any proof of it: good sense, good moral character, and goodwill. False statements and bad advice are due to one or more of the following three causes. Men either form a false opinion through want of good sense; or they form a true opinion, but because of their moral badness do not say what they really think; or finally, they are both sensible and upright, but not well disposed to their hearers, and may fail in consequence to recommend what they know to be the best course. These are the only possible cases. It follows that any one who is thought to have all three of these good qualities will inspire trust in his audience (Aristotle, 2.1.5).

believe in the likelihood, importance, permissibility, unexpectedness, seriousness or comprehensibility of what we are saying; in other words, that we can simultaneously evaluate or appraise the propositions and proposals we articulate. Thompson & Zhou (2000) note something similar in their discussion on the structuring role of evaluative disjuncts. They reject the distinction between the textual and interpersonal metafunctions (as described in SFL) and argue instead that at least some words can act simultaneously in both metafunctions and that, moreover, whole classes of words (like the conjuncts and disjuncts they present) may not even be assignable to just a single metafunction. As the following discussion will demonstrate, the conflation of the textual and the interpersonal opens up an evaluative 'space' in which stance may be expressed implicitly, even surreptitiously, and therefore without overt need for justification or explanation. This is particularly relevant to the discourse in the news media, where the overt expression of authorial stance is generally inappropriate.

Lemke explains that in making evaluative utterances, we are really orienting our text among the broader social perspectives of our world and refining our identities as meaning-makers (Lemke 1.0). There is nothing new in this observation. Mikhail Bakhtin wrote in detail about the clamour of variously oriented discourses (which he dubbed "heteroglossia") as far back as 1935.³¹ But what is still being untangled are the different

³¹ Lemke (1992) speaks also of the related notion of "heteropraxia" or the different practices and ways of being that underlie the clamour of voices:

There are MULTIPLE social semiotic realities because all social communities are heterogeneous: there are multiple practices and systems of interrelated practices that do not agree. According to different semiotic codes of construal, there are always alternative ways to interpret what the 'present context' is, and there are different patterns of redundancies between contexts and the actions deemed appropriate or meaningful in those contexts" (83).

This notion of heteropraxia will be important when the discussion turns to the issue of informing versus influencing. Demeritt (1998, 2001) argues for a notion of "heterogeneous constructionism" as a sort of heteropraxia that draws in nature, science, and society:

Rather than taking these phenomena as given, this approach is concerned with how they are constructed through the specific and negotiated articulation of heterogeneous social actors. I call this variety of social constructionism "heterogeneous constructionism," to signal that the facts of nature are not given as such but emerge artifactually as the heterogeneously constructed result of

ways in which particular attitudinal meanings can be instantiated in language, and in this regard, the notion of heteroglossia turns out to be a central concept for many theorists.

Martin (2004) alludes to this shared function when he speaks of ‘Sense and Sensibility’, explaining, “it is the bonding of classification with feeling that shapes discourse and moves the world. And as the possibility of inviting appraisal shows, classification is intrinsically charged with evaluation” (299). He adds, “Sense and sensibility are the yin and yang of discourse; texts unfold logically as truth as [*sic*] the same time they develop as community. In every instance, Bakhtin’s ideological and axiological always already intertwine” (300).

Clift (1999) also turns to Bakhtin, this time for insight into the nature of irony, and finds inspiration in the following observation:

The speech of narrators... is always ANOTHER’S SPEECH (as regards the real or potential direct discourse of the author) and in ANOTHER’S LANGUAGE (i.e. insofar as it is a particular variant of the literary language that clashes with the language of the narrator). ... Thus we have in this case “nondirect speaking”—not IN language but THROUGH language, through the linguistic medium of another—and consequently through a refraction of authorial intentions (Bakhtin 1981, 313).

As Clift explains, “Irony may, on this view, be seen as one form of what is clearly a more general strategic use of language, depending on the recognition of a “voice” that is the speaker’s own—a sincere expression of belief—as distinct from one that threatens to undermine that belief” (530).

Drawing his own inspiration from the dialogical perspective of Mikhail Bakhtin and Valentin Volosinov, Peter White (2003) offers a framework for the analysis of intersubjective positioning in text. His guiding assumption is that the textual voice primarily acts to engage with positions outside the text. This is essentially the Bakhtinian view that all efforts to communicate do so by simultaneously taking up what has already

contingent social practices (Demeritt, 2001: 311).

been said (in the past) and what may be anticipated (in the future) from a real or imagined audience.³² He bases his analyses not on linguistic structures per se, but on their rhetorical effect, arguing that a focus on dialogistic functionality “leads compellingly to the conclusion that, in formulating categories for linguistic analyses of this type, we must look beyond commonalities in lexico-grammatical structuring or affordance and consider commonalities in rhetorical effect” (280). This focus on rhetorical effect entails an orientation to the ‘prosodic’ realizations of meaning.

As with Martin (2000, 2004), White is interested in the rhetorical strategies by which speakers/writers take a stance on the positions being referenced in their text. In particular, he is interested in an aspect of what Martin calls Engagement. In this regard, his approach is complementary to Martin’s (indeed, the two are frequent collaborators). In line with Thompson and Zhou (2000) he explicitly rejects the notion that the modalizing and hedging of claims is done solely with the aim of communicating the uncertainty or incomplete commitment of the speaker/writer to the truth-value of a proposition.³³ On the contrary, White (2003) shows us how the various socio-political relations (status, power, social contract, solidarity, etc) may be construed in a given text, and how both the ‘authorial persona’ and the readership are textually constructed.³⁴ He claims that by

³² Similarly, Volosinov argues, contra Saussure, that “verbal interaction is the basic reality of language” (139). Moreover, such interaction, i.e., dialogue, does not need to be face to face, but can be of any type whatsoever, including the written form (“a verbal performance in print”) and inevitably orients itself with respect to previous performances in the same sphere: “the printed verbal performance engages, as it were, in ideological colloquy of a large scale: it responds to something, affirms something, anticipates possible responses and objections, seeks support, and so on” (139).

³³ Take, for instance, the phrase, ‘I think’, whose rhetorical function depends on whether the proposition it modifies is evaluative or factual (what Clift distinguishes as ‘discourse’ rather than ‘world’ entities or ‘averrals’ rather than ‘facts’).

³⁴ Compare this with Lemke (1995b), who also argues that heteroglossia is a social as well as a linguistic phenomenon:

distinct social groups... often speak distinct discourses which they take metadiscursively, to be allied with or opposed to the discourses of other groups. Social identity, the relations among social positions and roles, and social alliances and conflicts are maintained and in part constituted by the relations construed between usual ways of speaking about various subjects. Discourses and, in particular, thematic formations do not have *intrinsic* heteroglossic relations of

applying the typology of modes of intersubjective positioning he sets out, it becomes possible to analyze a text's construction of its readership as "a set of micro-maneuvers by which different alignments or affiliations are envisaged with an array of different value positions" (275).³⁵ We will return to this notion of 'solidarity' and a constructed readership throughout the discussion.

2.3 Modalized Constructions

Frequent reference will be made throughout the following discussion to evaluations of 'Warrantability', 'Expectability', etc. These come from the analytical framework proposed by Jay Lemke (1998). He develops his ideas from an approach taken by Francis (1995), who found that propositions in the form, 'it is... that...' (where 'that' introduces an embedded noun clause and 'it is' precedes an adjective phrase) are invariably evaluative epithets, which, moreover, fall into a small number of semantic classes. Lemke concludes that "*the only semantic attributes that propositions and proposals can have are evaluative ones*" (Lemke, 3.0; italics in original). He identifies seven such 'semantic dimensions', which leads to something like the system illustrated on the following page.³⁶

Items like 'wonderful' and 'horrible' would be included in the first dimension, 'possible' and 'doubtful' the second, 'necessary' and 'appropriate', the third, 'often' and 'unlikely', the fourth, 'crucial' and 'trivial', the fifth, 'clear' and 'obscure', the sixth, and 'laughable' and 'grave', the seventh.

ALLIANCE, OPPOSITIONS, and so on, to one another. Those relations must be constructed metadiscursively, or implied discursively (97).

³⁵ As Macken-Horarik (2003) points out, the social subjective perspective means that the analyses must provide not only a "production-centric" account, but must build on the reader/listener's perspective of the evaluation.

³⁶ Lemke (1992) refers to these dimensions as 'Value Orientations' and argues that the ways in which such orientations are constructed in a text can be regarded as "central to the Social-constitutive function of language" (88). He does not explain why he has resorted to the use of a double heading, but this is taken here to convey different facets of the same semantic dimension.

Figure 1. Lemke's seven semantic dimensions

Attributes, in Lemke's schema, can be thought of as bi-polar, serving to situate a proposition in a multi-dimensional semantic space by assigning it a value that can either be positive or negative to some specified degree (Lemke, 4.0). In this way, every proposition can be positioned somewhere along a spectrum from the most positive to the most negative evaluation in any of a number of semantic dimensions. We note here something that will be seen again in the discussion on Graduation resources; namely, that evaluations are expressed in varying degrees of intensity. Martin (2000) observes this as well, noting that appraisal resources "all involve grading, which is to say that the meanings involved can be adjusted by degree to reflect the strength of the evaluation" (145; see also Martin, 1992).

Lemke is clearly in the tradition of SFL, adapting the notion of modality to a framework according to which the various linguistic resources can be seen to express an evaluation to a particular degree, in the same way that the predicator in SFL is afforded finer gradations of meaning by the use of modals.³⁷ Moreover, Lemke confirms the relevance of the traditional categories of modality in SFL, finding that over 90% of the evaluative

³⁷ Indeed, while adjectives seem to be the richest source of evaluative lexis, more typically 'modal' forms are also possible, including modal auxiliaries ('must', 'should'), modal adverbs ('definitely', 'potentially'), evaluative epithets ('it is certain that~', 'I am confident that~'), evaluative nominalizations (It is a possibility that~, 'It is known that~'), modal projections ('I believe that~', 'I doubt that~'), etc.

epithets in a corpus of newspaper editorials addressed matters of inclination, probability, obligation and usuality.³⁸ Crucially, however, he demonstrates that the grammatical realizations of such evaluations are *not* primarily (or even largely) modal.³⁹ Evaluations in the corpus he looked at were most frequently realized through unmodalized finite verbs (at a rate of 22%), followed by attributive adjectives of quality (16%), nominal groups and prepositional phrases (13%), abstract nouns (12%), nominalized processes (11%), and adverbs (9%). Modals came in at only 7% (Lemke, 5.0).

As with the Appraisal System (outlined in chapter 3), Lemke's framework bridges the different evaluative dimensions posited for the classification of interpersonal meaning in appraisal theory with the more traditional treatment of modality in SFL. At the same time, it exposes the limitations of the traditional SFL approach. According to the Hallidayan model (see, for instance, Halliday, 2004), there are a number of ways a language user can express her attitudes and judgements in a text. Among these are the use of 'modalization' and 'modulation', where modalization embraces claims of probability or usuality (Lemke's second and fourth semantic dimensions) and modulation deals with claims of obligation or inclination (Lemke's first and third semantic dimensions).⁴⁰ But modality does not address the possibility that evaluations of Importance, Comprehensibility or Seriousness might also be treated as categories of interpersonal meaning, and when the discussion turns to the Appraisal System, we will see that there are still other categories of interpersonal meaning that need to be addressed.

³⁸ 'Desirability', 'Warrantability', 'Normativity', and 'Usuality', respectively in Lemke's framework.

³⁹ White (2002) makes the same observation. In his discussion of Affect, he observes: "its values are sometimes construed as qualities (adjectives – 'I am happy about that'), sometimes as processes (verbs – 'This pleases me') and sometimes as comment adjuncts ('Happily...'). They may even be realized as virtual entities (nouns) via nominalization – 'happiness'" (6).

⁴⁰ Martin (2004) incorporates modality in a similar way, under the heading 'Judgement', addressing 'obligation' and 'probability' in terms of judgements of 'Social Sanction' (which he calls 'Propriety' and 'Veracity', respectively), and 'inclination' and 'usuality' (alongside 'ability', which falls outside Lemke's framework—We cannot say 'It is *capable* that...') in terms of judgements of 'Social Esteem' (which he calls 'Tenacity', 'Normality' and 'Capacity', respectively).

Before turning to the problem of propositions about the future, it would be good to revisit one of the first claims offered in this discussion: that we can simultaneously evaluate or appraise the propositions and proposals we articulate. As Lemke, Martin, and others argue, evaluations are not expressed exclusively through modals, and I would argue in turn that explicit modals do not necessarily impose a more subjective judgement on a proposition than the predicator does on its own. Consider, for instance: 'John missed class last semester' and 'John rarely missed class last semester.' According to the views of Halliday and Mathiessen (2004), the latter proposition includes an expression of the speaker's judgement while the former does not. But why must 'rarely' be seen as a judgement rather than a disinterested refinement of the predicator (i.e., as an ideational resource)? Or, from another perspective, why is the unmodalized proposition ('missed'/'not missed') any *less* a judgement?

Eggins (2004) says that modalization is the way the speaker gets into the text and that it always expresses an implicit judgement. But there may also be a (negative) evaluation in the unmodalized proposition, implicit in the fact that John's attendance is brought up in the first place. Contrary to the usual notion of modality, we may imagine a scenario in which the unmodalized claim is being made in an effort to suggest that John had poor attendance, while the modalized proposition presents a more objective account. Take another example: 'John never missed class' and 'John missed no classes'. Whether there is any real ideational difference between the two propositions is debatable, and even if there is a difference, it is not obvious that one of the propositions expresses an implicit judgement while the other does not. Yet only the first is modalized. This suggests that modality, or at least explicit modality, is not essential for the expression of evaluation. Indeed, Hunston & Thompson (2000) treat modality as a sub-category of evaluation. As we see below, this issue crops up again with propositions about the future.

2.4 Propositions about the future

Propositions about the future add a further element of complexity to the question of authorial stance. This is particularly relevant to propositions on climate change, which are

frequently about projected events. The consensus in the literature seems to be that propositions about the future are inevitably evaluative.⁴¹ And we can understand this, to some extent, by the fact that most propositions about the future are modalized. But this is scarcely obvious. Consider the following headlines:

1. "Global warming may spur wind shear, sap hurricanes"
2. "UN: TEMPS PROBABLY TO RISE OVER 7 DEGREES BY 2100"
3. "EU likely to miss global warming goal"
4. "Environmental Guru Predicts Climate Doom: 'Billions of us will die; few breeding pairs of people that survive will be in Arctic'"
5. "Climate death toll 'to double within 25 years'"
6. "REPORT WARNS OF COMING CHAOS "
7. "TOMORROW'S FORECAST: CHAOS"

The first three headlines express different propositions about climate change and its effects with progressively greater certainty. We can see in these examples the intersection of what Halliday normally treats as 'modality' (i.e., expressing the speaker's evaluation of the certainty of the proposition) and the signal that the proposition is about the future.⁴² Dunmire (1997) agrees that statements about the future are necessarily modalized.⁴³ She

⁴¹ See, for instance, Dunmire (1997), Fleischman (1982), and Givon (1994).

⁴² Similarly, White (2003) follows Stubbs (1996) in seeking to extend the notion of modality in SFL and consider it as something that includes "all wordings by which speakers/writers modulate their attachment to, or detachment from, the proposition" (260). In what seems to be a very pragmatic move, White also looks to organize 'wordings' (of whatever lexico-grammatical sort) into categories informed by their rhetorical function; that is, from a 'meta-discursive' perspective.

⁴³ In her own analysis, Dunmire (1997) refers to a "projected event"—by which she means "a state of affairs that an individual or group claims will occur at some point in the future" (221). Dunmire is interested in the way a future ("projected") event can be constructed in the news media as something discrete and autonomous, and how political interests are naturalized in such a construction through linguistic processes that frame politically situated assertions as unmediated and presupposed information. This may be

cites Givon's observation that "futurity by definition involves epistemic uncertainty" (Dunmire, 1997: 232, citing Givon, 1994: 275). And according to Fleischman (1982), "what purports to be a *statement* describing a future event is therefore, of necessity, a subjectively modalized utterance". As Fleischman explains, "The subjectivity factor is a crucial one, since the distinction drawn [between contingent and assumed events] depends not on any objective, ontological notion of 'future reality' but on the *speaker's conviction* that the predicated event will at some future moment constitute reality" (20).

Fleischman's comments make a lot of sense. But the examples above show that even if statements about the future are necessarily subjective, the modal may or may not have any direct or obvious relation to the evaluation. In the first three examples, the evaluation is conveyed by the modal: in the first, the author evaluates the probability of the claim rather weakly ("may"). It is given more certainty in the second ("probably"), and still more in the third ("likely"). In the fourth, however, the two related propositions are modalized with "will", which seems to express a very strong evaluation of likelihood, at least compared to the earlier headlines. But 'will' is not usually taken to express a strong evaluation about the future, and is often used in conjunction with another modal when the author wishes to signal a given level of certainty ('will possibly', 'will probably', 'will definitely', etc).

In the fifth headline the verb has been elided, and the futurity of the proposition is signalled only by 'to' (and to a lesser extent by the predicted time span, '25 years'). So while Fleischman may be correct that the proposition depends on the speaker's conviction and is thus inherently evaluative (indeed, offering an apparently strong evaluation of likelihood), none of this is realized through modalization.

compared with Graham's (2004) observation that "certain genres such as those associated with the production of news or policy or advertising shape and delimit future potentials for social change by consistently producing and reproducing expectations about future courses of action" (56). Dunmire seeks to uncover the rhetorical and linguistic devices that give events the appearance of pre-existing reality (beyond their textual rendering) and demonstrate, on the contrary, how they are emergent phenomena. She points to nominalization and sourcing/reported speech as among the primary resources for the evaluation of a projected event.

We see something similar in the sixth headline, which similarly elides the auxiliary verb and expresses the futurity of the proposition simply with the main verb, “coming”. Note also how the nominalization (“COMING CHAOS”) serves to construe the projected future as an existing thing. In the last headline there is no verb at all (unless we read the colon as a substitute for ‘is’). The futurity of the proposition is signalled only by ‘tomorrow’ and ‘forecast’. This begs the question of how we are to analyze the evaluation that Dunmire, Lemke and others insist is there.

My own impression is that there is a sort of ‘anti-modality’ at play in these latter headlines, where the marked absence of the expected modal serves to enhance the evaluation of Probability to the maximum extent. Compare the proposition ‘We leave tomorrow’ (or even ‘We’re leaving’) with a counterpart that incorporates one of the strongest explicit modals, ‘We definitely leave tomorrow’. The latter proposition is actually weakened by an implied doubt, which the speaker unintentionally signals through her emphasis on certainty.⁴⁴ The former proposition implies no such doubt—it acknowledges no dialogic alternatives; it is monoglossic.

2.5 Prosody and Condensation

2.5.1 Prosody

One of the most important issues with evaluation that must be addressed is the fact that interpersonal meanings are realized in less localized or ‘segmentable’ and more ‘prosodic’ forms than other semantic meanings (see Martin, 1992). That is to say, attitudinal (or ‘axiological’) meanings may be distributed through and across clausal and

⁴⁴ This is very much in accordance with the functional view of language discussed earlier, in which word choice is seen to be informed by a rhetorical purpose. In the example above, when we ask ourselves what function is being served by a modal like ‘definitely’ or ‘certainly’, the answer is, ‘to dispel doubt’, which implies that there is some doubt to dispel. This is an example of what is described in the Appraisal System as a dialogically contractive utterance.

sentence, and even textual, boundaries.⁴⁵ Lemke (1998) adds: “There are also much longer range cohesive propagations, as well as structural ones that depend on relations among elements of genre structure or rhetorical units and which can span very long distances in the text” (7.24).⁴⁶ He notes that evaluations may ‘propagate’ or ‘ramify’ through a text, following the grammatical and logical links that make the text a structured and cohesive unit rather than a mere sequence of unrelated words and clauses.⁴⁷ This latter point (that words and clauses are not to be understood in terms of an unrelated sequence) is central to Winter’s (1986) analysis of clausal relations, discussed below.

Macken-Horarik (2003) offers an analogy to music, observing that:

Future work... will move us beyond localized notions of ‘prosody’ and incorporate broader, more global text structures. These structures can be likened to the harmonic progressions in a piece of music, which have a distinctive quality in themselves but also enter in relationship with other ‘chord progressions’ in the piece and contribute to the interpersonal structure of the text as a whole (314).⁴⁸

This may be compared with what Thompson (1998) calls “resonance”, and Lemke (1988) calls “cohesive harmony”. Michael Halliday (1981) expresses this situation well:

⁴⁵ Lemke (1995b) argues:

meanings are made between texts and between parts of a text that are not made in words, clauses, or clause complexes taken in isolation. A complete account of textual meaning must describe how the sense we make of words depends, not just on grammatical and situational contexts, but on the inter-textual contexts in which we place them (85).

⁴⁶ Following Martin (2000) and Lemke (1998), Graham (2004) adopts the distinction between the ‘predication’ and ‘propagation’ of ‘axiological’ meanings. He notes that “Lexical resources deployed in evaluative *predication* inscribe or attribute an element of the text with particular attributes. From the perspective of evaluative *propagation*, axiologies can be seen to propagate across the whole course of a text and beyond” (57-58).

⁴⁷ Lemke (1992) identifies some of the variations in the way evaluations may propagate prosodically. These include ‘cumulative’, ‘climactic’ and ‘periodic’ patterns.

⁴⁸ Lemke (1992) makes a similar analogy, comparing the prosodic realizations to “‘chains’ or ‘strands’ appearing and reappearing, or rising and falling in prominence, through a text, in a non-connected fashion. Further structuration arises through the simultaneously [*sic*] interplay of these strands... rather as in musical theory” (93).

(The) interpersonal kind of meaning is a motif that runs throughout the clause, and this is represented by lexicogrammatical or phonological motifs that are likewise strung unboundedly throughout. The speaker's attitudes and assessments, his judgements of validity and probability; his choice of speech function, the mode of exchange in dialogue – such things are not discrete elements that belong at some particular juncture but semantic features that inform continuous stretches of discourse. It is natural that they should be realized not segmentally but prosodically, by structures (if that term is still appropriate) that are not particulate but field-like. (Halliday 1981: 37)

The key point here is that 'prosody' must be accounted for in explorations of appraisal.⁴⁹ One's approach must recognize the unboundedness or the ambiguous boundaries (or the "concatenations of interpersonal motifs" to use Macken-Horarik's phrase) among the evaluative resources that may be invested in a stretch of text, and, perhaps most importantly, must acknowledge the dynamism in the choices of language used to express the evaluations.

In her brief overview of appraisal issues, Macken-Horarik (2003) stresses the importance of recognizing that the values we assign to certain utterances are likely to be overturned or adjusted as we read on in a text. This is especially true when the author intentionally plays with the expectations brought to the text by the reader.

If a writer or speaker sets out to change our views on something, then our apparatus needs to enable us to pick up on these changes and to show their genesis in the analysis itself. This puts the emphasis on an instantial appraisal system rather than a system which establishes values for choices from the outset, which are extraneous to the text-instance (316).

This is another perspective on prosody. Only compact and segmentable units can have their values established at the outset. But where the author's intention is rhetorical, the

⁴⁹ Susan Huston and John Sinclair (2000) take a very different approach. They believe that a systematic and coherent account of evaluation may be achieved through the production of "local" or highly specified grammars for each of the various patterns of evaluative utterances. While fascinating, such an approach is still in its infancy and its feasibility uncertain.

evaluation may be inseparable from the utterance, and the analytical framework must be sensitive to this.⁵⁰

Gruber's (1993) framework for the analysis of 'Reported Evaluative Utterances' (REUs) goes in this direction. It does not account (or even seek to account) for the changes of opinion that an evaluative utterance may be intended to achieve, but it does pick up the values conveyed implicitly along a stretch of text, and therefore inseparably from the 'text-instance'. Moreover, by discriminating among the different utterances according to the degree of directness and degree of responsibility for the evaluation, it recognizes the different contributions to attitudinal meaning that are made by the reader. This will be looked at in more detail when the discussion turns to the issue of reported speech.

Prosody is nowhere better exemplified than in ironic or sarcastic utterances (see, for instance, Clift, 1999), where the appraisal is realized in wordings that may have no pre-established value one way or the other—or may consciously play on the reader's expectations for a particular value that will be overturned co-textually (or even within the same utterance). Macken-Horarik calls this a 'dynamic' or 'logogenetic' perspective on evaluation. But she observes that even this fails to account for meanings construed synoptically, and which require a global perspective on the text. She calls this a "vexed" issue, as it demands a decision on the size and type of the environment (context) admitted into the analysis. She recommends 'at least' four 'frames': the "local frame" surrounding the evaluative item; the "global frame" of the text itself; the "inter-textual frame" (including one's own reading of the text); and "the contra-textual frame" or a reframing of our reading of our own appraisal values 'against the grain'.⁵¹ Consider the following headline:⁵²

⁵⁰ Indeed, this is the first issue to be confronted, below, in the analysis of the Drudge Report, where the evaluative function of the word "now" must be understood.

⁵¹ The final ('contratextual') frame is especially useful in confirming the evaluations of ironic or implicitly speaker evaluating utterances. Take, for instance, "Travolta: Global warming solution in 'other planets and dome cities'". It would be going against the grain to read a positive evaluation of Seriousness in the claim that "other planets and dome cities" offer an adequate solution to global warming, as we immediately run up against all the different values that call such a reading into question. Indeed, a later headline

“China blames the west for global warming”.

On its own, it offers little indication of authorial stance. We could perhaps cite Gruber’s approach and identify it as a “sub-type 2 REU” (in which the paraphrased content of the speech evaluates a third person while the representation of the speech-act evaluates the source of the speech).⁵³ But this hinges on our interpretation of ‘blame’ as a negative affect or high volatility word, and on the basis of this one headline, it is hard to make such a case persuasively. But if we accept the possibility that evaluation propagates throughout a text, we can look for inter-textual clues as to the likely evaluation. We see, for instance, that while China ‘blames’ the west for global warming, elsewhere it ‘brags’ about its own effect on the environment: “China brags: One-child per couple policy has reduced global warming”. Still, is ‘brag’ meant to convey a negative evaluation? Or can we maintain that the headline simply reports a laudable achievement about which China has a right to brag? The latter interpretation (contratext) turns out to be unpersuasive, as elsewhere we find: “CHINA SET TO TOP U.S. AS TOP GREENHOUSE GASSER”, followed sometime later with “China overtakes US as world’s biggest CO2 emitter” and “China building two power plants per week”. Nowhere (in this discourse) is China evaluated as a Warrantable voice for global warming advocacy, though it is clearly identified as a major culprit. This points away from the possibility that the earlier headlines could be read as third-person evaluating utterances.⁵⁴

inscribes a powerfully negative evaluation of the speaker, thereby discrediting him as a source of opinion on global warming: “Travolta called ‘world’s least eco-friendly celebrity’ -- for owning 5 airplanes”.

⁵² Unless otherwise noted, all examples are taken from the discourse on climate change presented in the Drudge Report.

⁵³ This is discussed in more detail under the heading ‘Indirectly Evaluative Constructions’.

⁵⁴ We could also do an analysis of the use of ‘blame’ in the Drudge Report to see whether it collocates with positive or negative evaluations of the source or the content of the claim. Briefly, we find it used in two ways: in describing the causes of global warming, and in attributing an event to global warming. As for the latter, the term is frequently made for odd or trivial occurrences, investing it with a sense of petty finger-pointing: “Global warming blamed for ‘carnage’ at Masters golf tournament”, “Brothel Owners Blame Global Warming for Staff Shortages”, “France Invaded by Swarms of Giant Hornets - Global Warming Blamed”, “Global warming blamed for cockroach migration”,

It is important to emphasize that while (co-)textual evidence may *indicate* a more persuasive interpretation of 'China' in the above headline, such co-text need not be present to *establish* the values identified. As Lemke observes: "It is quite common that a reader needs inter-textual knowledge of the writer's probable assignment of value polarity to key well-known elements in order to trace out the evaluations in the text" (7.22). In other words, it is often the case that the interpretation of authorial stance requires certain ideological (or 'meta-communicative') knowledge on the part of the reader. Indeed, Gruber sees this as a basic requirement for the identification of what he calls 'implicitly speaker evaluating utterances'.⁵⁵

The issue of implied appraisal is one of the most challenging and important issues we face in addressing stance. It is worth quoting Peter White (2000) at length:

Clearly such 'implied' appraisal poses major theoretical and analytical problems. In moving from direct to indirect activation, we step here from what certain Anglo-American traditions would see as 'semantics' into what would be seen as 'pragmatics', from meanings seen to be inscribed in the text to meanings seen to be operating only in the context. Accordingly, those operating with analytical philosophical notions of 'semantics' might want to exclude such formulations from treatments of 'evaluative language', arguing that there is nothing about the actual 'language' here which is attitudinal. While this might be attractive in terms of avoiding complication and providing for more easily replicable analyses of texts, it would mean that much of the evaluative work being done by texts would simply be missed out. Analyses would not only be unable to attend to the role of implied evaluation generally, but they would also be unable to take account of the often rhetorically crucial interaction between direct and indirect assessment (3).

"'Warming' Blamed for Newfoundland House Plunge Into Gulf", When blame is used to indicate the avowed cause of global warming, there is a similar lack of gravity, with fingers pointing in every direction: "Too little, too late: Gore blames scientists for climate crisis", "Scientists blame Hollywood for increased fears over global warming", "Muslim cleric blames drought, climate change on lack of faith in Allah", "Ocean currents - not humans - to blame for warming: expert", "Sun Blamed for Warming of Earth -- and Other Worlds", and "Cosmic rays blamed for global warming".

⁵⁵ White (2002) observes the same issue: "More problematic are activations which rely on implication and inference, which rely on the reader/listener to interpret the depicted happening or state of affairs as positive or negative according to the value system they bring to the text" (3).

Lemke (1998) offers a fine example:

“Since 1980, the Republican platform has opposed abortion without exceptions and promoted an ammendment [sic] to ban the procedure.”

Here, the evaluation of the text hinges on an inter-textual (social-contextual?) interpretation of the value of being opposed to abortion. Other elements of the text are evaluated for Desirability only indirectly, once a value has been assigned to this “keystone”. This is also intimately connected to what White (2003) is expressing when he speaks of the textual construction of an authorial persona and construed readership.

Consider a similar headline from the Drudge Report:

“Belgium to impose tax on barbequing to fight global warming”

Here again the evaluation of the text hinges on the interpretation of an implicit ‘keystone’ value, in this case, of imposing a tax. Were this to be interpreted seriously, the headline could be read as a positive evaluation of the Desirability of Belgium’s efforts to conquer global warming. But were it to be interpreted negatively, the text must be read as offering a negative evaluation of the proposition. While in this case the author’s (libertarian) political affiliations are relatively well known, suggesting a negative evaluation of ‘impose tax’, we may also question the function of ‘barbequing’ in the headline. Is a ‘tax on barbequing’ to be read as a serious way to “fight global warming”? If this were the only text available, we would have little choice but to rely on our ideological knowledge to answer the question, and we would always be vulnerable to charges that we have ‘read too much’ into it, but the interpretation may be supported by co-textual or even inter-textual evidence (in this case of what we might call ‘irony’).

2.5.2 Prosodic Choices

A curious aspect of the prosodic realization of interpersonal meaning is that differences in evaluation may follow from differences in the structure of the utterance, even while lexical choices remain constant; that is to say, the evaluation may depend on the textual meaning (through choices of theme and mood). One example widely discussed in the literature is the rhetorical choice of agency and affectedness (see, for example, Fowler, 1987; Kress & Trew, 1978; Kress, 1983, 1985; Dunmire, 1997, 2005). Tony Trew's analysis of contrasting newspaper presentations of riots in London's Notting Hill (Trew, 1979a) is perhaps the most famous examination of its type. There is a second analysis (in the same volume) of news coverage of riots in (what was then) the Rhodesian town of Salisbury, from which Trew draws similar conclusions (Trew, 1979b). In both cases, Trew finds that one newspaper indirectly positions the reader to blame the crowd for the events by representing them as the 'agents'; while in another the police are represented as the agents and the crowd is depicted as having been 'acted upon' (or affected by the actions).⁵⁶ White (2006b) finds the same pattern of agency in his own analysis of a pair of more recent news articles (which bear an uncanny resemblance to the ones that Trew looked at 20 years earlier). In these analyses, agency is shown to be a way in which authorial stance may be expressed. Indeed, Kress & Trew (1978) reject the notion that the choice of agency can ever be understood as a simple expression of style.

But for both Kress and Trew, the choice of agency is only part of the story, as similar choices about the participants, processes and circumstances are made not only in the initial presentation, but over time whenever the story is revisited. The various selections, deletions and rewordings (what Kress and Trew call "ideological transformations in discourse") that occur in each instance may be seen to further the maintenance, reproduction or transformation of an underlying ideology.

⁵⁶ For instance, the *Guardian* offered the headline: "Police Shoot 11 Dead in Salisbury Riot", while the *Times* wrote: "Rioting Blacks Shot Dead By Police As ANC Leaders Meet". In the *Times*' lead, agency is further eroded as the connection between the deaths and the police is only made indirectly: "Eleven Africans were shot dead and 15 wounded when Rhodesian Police opened fire on a rioting crowd of about 2000".

This perspective on the progressive adjustments that can be made to a text fits well with the functional view of language. By taking such a view, we may assume that there is a reason for each choice, and that the reason may be inferred from the likely effect. The Drudge Report is an excellent candidate for such analysis as it makes available, with a time stamp, every headline and every modification of a headline that appears on the site. We are thus afforded a window onto the choices the author/editor makes in his presentation of the news.

Consider the following headlines:

1. "Rove engages in heated climate change exchange at White House dinner"
(5/22/07-19:31:54)
2. "Rove takes on the Warming Sisters" (5/22/07-23:31:47)
3. "Debates Climate With Sheryl Crow, Laurie David" (5/22/07-23:34:03)
4. "THE WARMING SISTERS TAKE ON ROVE!" (5/22/07-23:56:14)

In the first version of this story (1), Karl Rove, President Bush's (then) Deputy Chief of Staff, is presented as an agent, engaging in "heated" debate over climate change. A number of hours later, the same story is given a slightly different headline. In this version (2), Rove retains agency, but his interlocutors, those 'affected' by his agency, are identified, pejoratively, as "the Warming Sisters".⁵⁷ In a related article, under a different headline (3), the 'Warming Sisters' are identified by name, and although Rove's own name is elided, he retains agency. In the final version (4), however, Drudge has reversed the agent and the affected. In this headline, which has been given increased Force through the use of full caps and an exclamation point, the 'Warming Sisters' are represented as the agents, aggressively (and somewhat ridiculously, considering the soubriquet) 'taking on' Rove.

⁵⁷ It is possible that some might fail to see a negative appraisal in the phrase "Warming Sisters". As elsewhere, however, we may turn to other references in the Drudge Report and see how these particular individuals are evaluated.

As we can see in the following series of headlines, moreover, the linguistic choices need not have to do with questions of agency:

1. "Religious Leaders Urge Action On Warming" (05/21/07-21:28:30)
2. "SIN OR SUN? RELIGIOUS LEADERS URGE ACTION ON WARMING"
(05/21/07-21:50:42)
3. "SIN OR SUN? RELIGIOUS LEADERS URGE ACTION ON CLIMATE"
(05/22/07-15:04:53)

The original headline seems to be a sub-type 2 REU (first sub-set), offering a third-person evaluation (of climate change) by an inherently Warrantable source (a group of religious leaders). 'Urge' positively evaluates the Appropriateness or Desirability of action, and implicitly offers a positive evaluation of the Importance of action and the Significance of the issue.

It is perhaps difficult to discern the irony in the juxtaposition of a religious expert offering an opinion on an ostensibly scientific matter. But we can see that this was the author's intention as the headline was soon modified to include the rhetorical question, "Sin or Sun?" This presumably refers to our options in assigning a cause for global warming: either it is the result of sinful human behaviour or natural solar activity. Given the two choices, 'sin' or 'sun', to agree with the religious leaders (that action is needed) is to affirm that climate change is punishment for sin, and to dismiss it is to affirm the only alternative, that climate change is caused by the sun. As White would observe, the question opens up the dialogic alternatives while nevertheless positioning the reader to reject certain possibilities.⁵⁸ Of the two choices offered, to affirm that climate change is the result of 'Sin' is to be aligned with the superstitious;⁵⁹ to affirm that it is the result of solar activity is to take the sceptical position.

⁵⁸ Those, for instance, who say, 'science' are not given a voice.

⁵⁹ For instance: "Gore sees 'spiritual crisis' in warming", "Czech President Says 'Environmentalism is a Religion'", "Catholic Cardinal Ridicules 'Semi-Religious' Belief in Global Warming", "American Indians say 'Earth Mother getting angry' about global warming", "Muslim cleric blames drought, climate change on lack of faith in Allah",

In the final change to the headline, made the following afternoon, ‘warming’ is replaced with ‘climate’. The significance of such a move is looked at in more detail in the discussion on nominalization, but in brief, to keep ‘warming’ in the headline is to suggest that it is a fact, a presupposed truth about which only the question of action remains. In the modified headline, the author avoids making such a concession.

2.5.3 Condensation and Nominalization

A counterpart to prosody is the condensing of an earlier (or inter-textual) proposition *into* a participant later in the text. That is to say, not only are the various components of the evaluation potentially dispersed over long stretches of text (and even context), making it difficult to point to a particular textual feature as evidence of the author’s attitude toward the proposition, but in connected text, the evaluation of a proposition may not even be independent of the evaluation of the processes, participants and circumstances involved. This is frequently achieved through nominalization.⁶⁰ Fairclough (2001) characterizes it as a process where “reported happenings are generally represented as categorical truths—facts—without intermediate modalities”, and which, as a result, “support a view of the world as transparent—as if it signalled its own meaning to any observer, without need for interpretation or representation” (129). Dunmire (1997, 2005) also sees it as an objectifying and naturalizing device, as it constructs the discourse in such a way that the underlying interpretive processes are suppressed or omitted.⁶¹ In particular, it removes the temporal (as well as modal) coding that might otherwise situate the agents and processes of a given proposition in concrete places and times, turning an action (even a projected action) into an attribute of the agent’s character while at the same time

“William F. Buckley: Business of Global Warming Feels a Lot Like Inquisition”, etc.

⁶⁰ Lemke (1990) sees nominalization as “only the most obvious special case of a more general feature of technical discourse that I will call *condensation*” (60).

⁶¹ White (2006b) says something similar: “Implicitly evaluative mechanisms are of particular interest to those concerned with ideology in that they provide means by which particular points of view and value orientations can be made to seem to arise naturally from apparently ‘factual’ informational content” (66).

obviating the need to provide modal qualifications as to the certainty or warrantability of the underlying proposition.

This issue is pursued in a brief essay by Michael Hoey (2000), in which the author takes Noam Chomsky to task for submerging his evaluations (particularly his negative evaluations of anyone who might dispute his linguistic claims) in just such a condensed or embedded form. The technique, according to Hoey, makes it more difficult for the reader to challenge Chomsky's point of view.⁶² Young and Fitzgerald allude to the related issues of prosody and ideological or inter-textual knowledge with what they call (following Lemke) 'thematic formations' (262).⁶³ Like Hoey, they argue that without a proper understanding of the underlying formations, a listener cannot fully unpack the meanings that have been condensed.⁶⁴ Consider the following headline:

"Global warming blamed for 'carnage' at Masters golf tournament"

⁶² Lassen (2006) agrees: "No matter whether propositions are contested or established as symptoms of generally held beliefs, they share the characteristic features of being difficult to challenge, once they are backgrounded as presuppositions" (93). Lassen (2004) points to the connection between this and Halliday's (1994) notion of a 'Grammatical Metaphor', whereby a Process or a Classifier is mapped onto an Actor, resulting in a clause structure which may be developed into an extended nominal group and then be pre-modified by a Deictic (determiner), Epithet (adjective), and Classifier (noun or adjective). Lassen argues that when the nominal group is represented as Theme or Given, it becomes impossible to challenge its truth value or negotiate the elements of the implicit finite verbal group. Fairclough (2003) similarly argues that 'assumed meanings' have particular ideological significance, especially when presented as given information.

⁶³ This, of course, takes us back to the issue of prosody, for it is in the broader (prosodic) discourse formations that the condensed meanings are made intelligible. Indeed, Lemke (1995b) argues that "any word can be used to realize any meaning, provided only that a sufficient context is provided to establish its recurrent use in a discursive formation. It is the *formation* that tells us what the word used must mean, not the word's 'own' semantic features" (90).

⁶⁴ Lassen (2006) addresses this in terms of structures that rely on 'presuppositions', by means of which "the writer takes a part of the utterance for granted and presents it to the reader as shared knowledge" (92). See also: Grice, 1975; Levinson, 1983; Verschueren, 1999; and Simons, 2001.

Needless to say, the phrase “global warming” is itself a nominalization, though one for which the underlying thematic formations are relatively well known. More interesting is the use of the word “carnage”, which simultaneously nominalizes and evaluates the quality of golf at the Masters Tournament. One must bring a certain level of ideological knowledge to bear on this headline in order to know that “carnage” describes the golfers’ poor play and not something far more serious. In condensing the proposition in this way, the author limits the reader’s ability to challenge the evaluation.⁶⁵

2.6 Reported Speech

In many of the examples we see, the claims are expressed in terms of third-party propositions or proposals. That is, they make use of spokespersons as sources of information. Hunston (2000) sees a crucial difference between ‘sourced’ or ‘reported’ claims and directly stated propositions. She refers to the former as ‘attributions’ and the latter as ‘averrals’, and observes that the distinction is important to the study of evaluation because it helps the reader determine how much credence to attach to the various pieces of information in a given text.⁶⁶ As Dunmire (1997) explains in her discussion of ‘sourcing’, one of the purposes of attributing a claim to another is to tie the

⁶⁵ This particular example is especially complex, in that the evaluation appears to be ironic, as signalled by the combination of scare quotes and extreme negative affect lexis. The result is an overt evaluation of global warming that leads to a covert evaluation of the unidentified source of the claim. These sorts of structures will be examined in more detail when the discussion turns to indirectly evaluative utterances.

⁶⁶ White (2006b) treats this in terms of ‘evidential standing’: “where the social standing or authority of the source is such that it can act as a sign (a token) that the associated value position is well-founded, reasonable or otherwise credible” (59). Lemke (1998) offers the following example: “*Thomas Parker, a lecturer in education at Boston University, predicts a dramatic rise in self-learning...*” He notes that Warrantability (“the writer’s view of the probability of something someone else is saying” (7.23)) is what is at stake here: Warrantability is particularly important in this case because the proposition refers to a future event. This is looked at in more detail in the discussion about ‘projected events’, but in terms of credibility, which is central to what Gruber calls a sub-type 1 REU, Lemke’s observations are apposite: “Lexically *predicts* is a projecting process... that has relatively low Warrantability; we assume that predicting the future is at best an uncertain matter. But the reliability of predictions, and so the Warrantability of the proposition predicted, rises if we specify a credible Sayer for the process” (7.23).

credibility of the claim to the reliability of the speaker.⁶⁷ Attributing an opinion to a reliable source enhances its evaluation. Lemke (1998) treats this as a notable element of warrantability. On the other hand, as Gruber demonstrates, a source may be tied to a proposition, especially through the use of negative affect/high volatility structural markers and other devices, not as a means of enhancing the evaluation of the proposition, but as a means of denigrating either the source or the claim.

Moreover, as Hunston and Gruber both demonstrate, the distinction between averrals and attributions is important because it establishes the two poles of responsibility for the claims made in the text: where a proposition is averred, the author takes explicit responsibility for the claim; where it is attributed to another source, that responsibility is diminished.⁶⁸ This, however, is not always straightforward. Consider the following headline:⁶⁹

⁶⁷ The ideological implications of this have been examined in a vast number of studies: for instance, Bird & Dardenne (1988), Bruck (1989), Clayman (1990), Eldridge (1993), Ericson & Baranek (1991), Fairclough (1988, 1992, 1995), Fisk (1989), Fowler (1991), Fowler & Kress (1979), Hall (1978, 1982), Hartley (1982), Hermann & Chomsky (1988), Hodge (1979), Iedema et al (1994), Parenti (1993), Trew (1979), Tuchman (1978), Van Dijk (1988, 1989), White (1997, 2000), Zelizer (1989), etc. White (2006b) begins his discussion of evaluative semantics with the observation that:

contrary to any claims to 'objectivity' on the part of the media industry, news reporting is a mode of rhetoric in the broadest sense of the word—a value laden, ideologically determined discourse with a clear potential to influence the media audience's assumptions and beliefs about the way the world is and the way it ought to be. This rhetorical and ultimately ideological potential has now been so widely demonstrated in the literature that it hardly needs to be argued for (37).

⁶⁸ Macken-Horarik (2003) points to the danger of failing to recognize the implicit evaluations. She observes that "within texts, it is implicitly evaluative meanings that are most coercive of the reader simply because they appear to pass beneath the threshold of conscious awareness" (314). Hunston (2000) points out that the writer chooses the sources, and may select named people or construct groups, which together "constitute a constructed culture of knowledge and opinion, which the reader is expected to share and be convinced by" (181; see also, Hunston, 1993). The subtlety involved here can be appreciated if one considers the observation by Hunston (2000) that not only is every attribution, at bottom, an averral, but, moreover, may contain many layers of attribution and evaluation, only some of which may be explicitly identified. She offers, by way of example, the following: "George I regarded [Gibraltar] as an expensive symbol". The claim (that Gibraltar is an expensive symbol) has been attributed/sourced to George I. But as there is no reason to believe that the attributed claim is a verbatim report, the author

“ABC TV Meteorologist Claims He Does Not Know A Single Weatherman Who Believes ‘Man-Made Global Warming Hype’”

There are two obvious attributions in this headline and a third that is somewhat subtler. Each offers a particular evaluation of the content of the headline, and each is attached to a different source. The first presents a negative evaluation of global warming claims on the dimension of warrantability (signalled by “Hype”) by an ABC TV Meteorologist. The second presents a positive evaluation of the Meteorologist’s (implicit) position⁷⁰ on the dimension of Usuality, which is made by attributing the position to weathermen in general. Finally, if less obviously, there is an implicit attribution to an unnamed voice in response to whom the meteorologist and weathermen are compelled to express their doubt.

Characterizing this last voice as a manifestation of attribution is, I think, both valid and useful, and points to a difference in the approaches taken by Hunston and White. White sees attribution as a form of dialogic expansion, even when the author uses an explicitly distancing formulation to separate himself from the claim being expressed. But here the view of the unnamed voice is presented only in negation—that is, as a dialogic contraction—in what would seem to be best accounted for in the Appraisal System as a ‘Disclamation’ rather than an ‘Attribution’. Here we are faced with a blurring of the distinction between dialogic expansion and contraction that we touch on later, in the discussion on Engagement. It would seem that an attribution may contribute either to dialogic expansion or contraction, and should therefore be seen as a superordinate or even separate category rather than a mode of expansion.

has implicit responsibility for interpreting and summarizing the king’s opinion in the way she has. Of course, not only is the author responsible for choosing George I as a source, she has an even more basic responsibility for making the averral about how George I regarded Gibraltar in the first place. As White (2006b) observes: “Many analysts... have noted that the very act of selecting a source and a particular sub-selection of their words for inclusion in the report carries with it evaluative and ultimately ideological consequences” (58).

⁶⁹ See also Hunston’s example cited in footnote 129.

⁷⁰ While the ABC TV Meteorologist’s (sceptical) position is not explicitly stated, it can be inferred from the use of the word ‘hype’ and the reference to the other weathermen.

Figure 2. Hunston's system of Attribution

Hunston (2000) offers some other interesting distinctions among attributions not otherwise described in the Appraisal System. The most important is the distinction between the self and another as a possible source for a claim, which leads to the system illustrated above.

Consider the following examples:

1. "Robert Kennedy Jr. Says Bush Environmental Policies a 'Science-Fiction Nightmare'"
2. "Lloyd's of London: Climate change 'fact, not hypothesis'"
3. "I am convinced that we have reached the tipping point and Congress will act"
4. "Survey finds 71% of people believe global warming 'natural occurrence'"

Grammatically, each of the above is expressed as an attribution (to another person, to another group, to oneself, and to a text respectively), though only the first two are what we might normally call 'sourced' claims. Hunston draws a number of finer distinctions within the category of the self as a source: a proposition can be 'averred', 'emphasized' or 'hidden'. An 'averred' claim, moreover, can be 'sourced' (to an implicit voice against

which the textual voice is arguing, as in the example with the ABC meteorologist) or ‘non-sourced’ (as in the headline, “‘New world order’ to fight global warming”); an ‘emphasized’ claim would be explicitly sourced to the author (as in example 3, above); and a ‘hidden’ claim sourced either to the text (as in example 4, above) or to a general sentiment (e.g., ‘No one is claiming that...’).⁷¹ As Dunmire (1997) has demonstrated, the ‘others’ to whom one’s statements may be sourced comprise a broad range of more or less specific persons or groups (compare example 1 and 2, above). Hunston adds that responsibility may even be delegated to the speech act itself, which may or may not maintain the trace of an actual agent (e.g., ‘Rumour has it that...’).

The latter sub-categories, ‘Delegated’ and ‘Reclaimed’, are comparable to what Martin calls ‘Distancing’ and ‘Acknowledging’, respectively. Responsibility for claims attributed to others may be ‘reclaimed’ by the writer by means of linguistic choices (e.g., lexically by verbs like ‘prove’, ‘point out’ and ‘show’ or structurally through forms like, ‘as...’). Consider the following headlines:

1. “Scientist who alleged Bush administration muzzled him, admits to doing 1,400 media interviews”
2. Czech President Says ‘Environmentalism is a Religion’”

A crucial difference in the two claims is the use of ‘admits’ in the first and “says” in the second. By using ‘admits’, the author has reclaimed responsibility for the truth of the statement (which is represented as a fact that has simply been exposed). This, as Lemke would say, presents a very strong evaluation of its warrantability (or ‘Expectability’ of truth). By projecting the claim in the second sentence with “says”, the author takes no

⁷¹ White (2006b) makes a similar observation: “*reportedly* and *it is believed* potentially give rise to the inference that the source for these propositions is so diverse and widely spread that it does not need to be more narrowly specified” (65). He also notes how this can be used to distance the claim from the author: “These and similar formulations thus construe the proposition they frame as highly warrantable, even while nevertheless removing direct responsibility for the proposition from the writer” (65). Lemke (1990) is highly critical of hidden attributions, like those sourced to a text, which he sees as particularly symptomatic of highly technicalized (and implicitly politicized) discourse.

such responsibility for the Czech president's provocative opinion and, to some extent, 'distances' himself from it.⁷²

2.7 Indirectly Evaluative Constructions

Gruber (1993) also finds reported speech to be crucial for the expression of evaluative utterances. His focus, however, is on the degree of directness with which an utterance is made. But even when discussing the positive extreme of directness as manifested by Direct Evaluative Utterances (DEUs) (which, in any case, he finds to be relatively uncommon in the news media), his comments largely presuppose a heteroglossic discourse. His framework for the analysis of reported speech, moreover, complements the Appraisal System by elucidating the ways an attribution can be used not only to evaluate the expressed proposition, but, perhaps more importantly, to evaluate the source as well. His approach leads to the following system:

Figure 3. System of Evaluative Targets

Gruber distinguishes three 'subtypes' of Reported Evaluative Utterances (REUs), which we can see in the following headlines:

1. "MIT Scientist: 'Alarm over climate change is based on ignorance of what is normal for weather and climate'"
2. "Researchers Question Validity Of A 'Global Temperature'"
3. "Gore Launches Searing Attack on Bush, War"

⁷² 'Say' is a median formulation, expressing less distance than formulations that use projecting verbs like 'claim' or 'argue', but more than those employing verbs like 'show' or 'prove'.

4. "BOSTON GLOBE's Ellen Goodman: Global warming deniers are like Holocaust deniers"

The first is what he calls a '3rd person evaluating REU'.⁷³ It employs a Warrantable source and a 'positive affect' or 'low-volatility' structural marker, like 'say', 'report', or 'explain' to project the speech. The evaluation in such utterances is restricted to the quoted content and thus beyond the overt responsibility of the author (who is simply 'reporting the facts'). In headline (1) above, the credibility of the source has been enhanced by affiliation with a prominent scientific institution, and the projecting verb is represented by a simple colon, which offers very little volatility. The evaluative force is simply a combination of the evaluation itself and the credibility of the source. According to Gruber, exposing the systematic and directed use of such evaluative utterances requires a detailed, long-term study of the reporting.

The second subtype, which Gruber calls an 'Explicitly speaker evaluating REU', makes use of indirectly reported speech. Following Leech & Short (1981), Gruber identifies these as: Narrative Reports of an Action (NRA), Narrative Reports of a Speech Act (NRSA), Indirect Speech (IS) and Free Indirect Speech (FIS). He describes two subsets of this grouping. The first, a 'transitional category' differs from the first subtype (the 3rd person-evaluating REUs) only in its form, which embeds the quote into the clausal structure of the utterance.⁷⁴ The function of such forms is to put a certain distance between the author and the source of the evaluation. Headline (2) above expresses the researchers' position indirectly, by reporting the speech act rather than quoting it. As with headline (1), explicit responsibility for the proposition is limited to the source, the

⁷³ Gruber's study looks at the evaluation of an individual (specifically, Kurt Waldheim) in the news. Thus, when he speaks of a '3rd person-evaluating' utterance, he is referring to one in which the attributed comments relate to a particular individual. In our examples, it is not an individual that is being evaluated in the third person, but a posited state of affairs: global warming.

⁷⁴ It is not clear whether this is really a 'sub-set' of speaker-evaluating utterances. Gruber claims that aside from the structural differences, it is similar in "all other respects" to the first type of REU, which he describes as 'third-person evaluating'. But this is a small point. Gruber's expressed intention is to set this sub-set out as a "transitional category" (479).

researchers, and is not reclaimed by the author. The low volatility/low affect projecting verb signals the author's willingness to let the inherent credibility (or 'warrantability') of the source carry the evaluative force of the proposition.

In contrast, the second subset of this same grouping employs speech-act or action-describing words with negative affect or high volatility that negatively evaluate the source of the reported speech. A crucial difference between this sub-type and the first is the splitting of the target of the evaluation. The paraphrased content of the speech evaluates a third person while the speech-act or action-describing words evaluate the source. This can be seen in headline (3) above. The speech-act, reported as a 'Searing Attack' that was 'launched' at the president, is a high volatility, negative affect evaluation that reflects on the source (Al Gore), while the content of the reported speech negatively evaluates George Bush.⁷⁵ In this subtype, the content of the speech is typically presented only in paraphrase or in fragmented form (and in this example is absent altogether), forcing the reader to rely less on *what* was said (What did Gore actually say about Bush and the war?) and more on *how* it was said (He spoke aggressively, heatedly). The evaluative force arises primarily from the represented speech-act, and only secondarily from the implicit evaluation of the content.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ It may not be obvious that the author is using this headline as suggested above, and this is a problem that will be taken up later in the discussion. For the current example, however, we can turn to inter-textual support in the form of a headline that appears three weeks after the one in the above: "Rewind: Gore Blasts Bush Father for Ignoring Iraq Terror Ties". In this headline, a similar high affect verb ("Blasts") projects the reported speech, but here the criticism is of Bush Sr. and his failure to engage the Iraqis—precisely the opposite of Gore's criticism in the earlier headline. 'Rewind' invites the reader to see the connection between an earlier speech act and a later one. The implication is Gore is guilty not only of bombast, but of hypocrisy, and in both cases the negative evaluation of Bush and the war is meant to redound on Gore rather than on either president.

⁷⁶ White (2003) makes a similar point in his discussion of direct utterances in which "those who hold the derogated position are not evaluated by reference to some purported shortcoming in their behavior (i.e., as being misguided or uninformed or lacking sound reasoning skills) but by reference to the negative emotional effect they are said to have on the author". He argues that in doing so, "the author construes his own, individual emotional reactions as being of significance for the... mass audience" (264).

The third, and arguably most interesting, subtype, which Gruber calls ‘Implicitly speaker-evaluating REUs’, locates the entire force of the evaluation in the content of the reported speech. In this subtype, the target of the evaluation is split into an overt and covert target, the overt target being the one evaluated in the reported utterance, and the covert one the speaker of that utterance herself. Gruber observes that such utterances act like ‘dramatizing quotes’, indicating “the highmark of offensive behavior of a certain speaker” (482). Gruber bases his identification of this category on a pattern of use in the texts he analysed, concluding that “only those catch-words, phrases, or evaluating utterances were represented which violated official Austrian norms and values and which were formulated in a very impolite and offensive way” (482). He offers the following criteria for classifying this subtype:

1. “Structural properties of the utterance are markedly different from the usual way in which statements of members of a certain group are represented in the media” (482). This requires ‘ideological knowledge’ on the part of the reader; that is, knowledge about cultural and social values, norms and stereotypes.⁷⁷
2. “The content of the represented utterances has to violate the norms of at least one significant subgroup of readers of the newspaper where the REUs occur” (482). This

⁷⁷ This is exactly what Lemke (1995b) sees as necessary for an adequate description of the ‘meaning potential’ of a community’s semiotic resource systems:

In addition to the lexico-grammar of a community’s language, we need to know its recurrent forms of argument, rhetorical patterns, and ways of talking about specific subjects. In general, we need to know its recurrent ways of doing things, its recognizable activity types as well as the meaning potentials of its actional semiotic systems (86).

He adds later that the relations which constitute social identity “must be constructed metadiscursively, or implied discursively” (97).

Lassen (2006) echoes this view:

Our propositions and proposals build on assumptions about a knowledge basis that we expect the listener or reader to possess, we add new information to this knowledge basis, and interpretation follows a similar set of mutually agreed principles. We make—in other words—certain assumptions about the listener’s or reader’s conceptualization of the world, which we model on our own world views (97).

requires ‘meta-communicative knowledge’; that is, knowledge of institutional communicative practices.

We can see this in headline (4) above (“BOSTON GLOBE’s Ellen Goodman: Global warming deniers are like Holocaust deniers”). As with the first type of REU, we are presented with an ostensibly credible source and a simple low affect/low volatility colon in place of the projecting verb. But there is a difference. In the first headline, there is only one target of evaluation: the reported proposition. Here, however, the target is split, and the reported proposition is only of secondary interest. The primary, if implicit, target is the source herself. As Gruber suggests, the entire force of the evaluation is located in the content of the reported speech, in this case the phrase “holocaust deniers”, and it is this unusual and offensive epithet that signals the author’s covert intention to evaluate the source.⁷⁸

One reason for the difficulty in identifying this subtype is that the whole evaluative force of the utterance is established by the belief and value system of the reader. As Gruber explains, “readers who are aware of the intention of the journalist or who support the opinion of the source of evaluation may react in a different way, compared to those readers for whom none of these prerequisites hold” (482).⁷⁹ Failure to 1) recognize the social and ideological significance of holocaust denial or 2) appreciate the offence that is likely to be taken by those accused of its equivalent may lead to a reading that confuses this headline with a third person-evaluating utterance.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ It is interesting here to note the contrasting effect of Ellen Goodman’s association with the Boston Globe as compared to the anonymous scientist’s affiliation with MIT. In the latter case, the source is evaluated with greater Warrantability as a result of his relationship with the institution. But in the Ellen Goodman headline, rather than enhancing the credibility of the source, the association actually serves to provide a negative evaluation of the Boston Globe, which suffers by association with the intemperate comments of its employee.

⁷⁹ This issue is taken up in detail by Martin (2000, 2004) and White (2003, 2006) in their discussions of attitudinal tokens.

⁸⁰ We saw this earlier in the discussion on prosody, particularly with the example from Lemke (1998) about the Republican position on abortion. We will return to it again in the discussion on irony.

Gruber offers a framework to organize these different sorts of evaluative utterances on the basis of the directness of evaluation. He posits two parallel dimensions. The first organizes the evaluation along a scale from most to least direct. This correlates with a second dimension that assigns overt responsibility for the evaluation more and more to the reader as the evaluation becomes less and less direct. Responsibility for the evaluation sits first with the author (in the most direct evaluations (employing adjectives and predicative NPs in DEU structures), then with the source (in subtype 1 REUs), then partly with the author and partly with the reader (in the form of NRAs and NRSAs), and finally with the reader alone (in the most indirect evaluations, realized as subtype 3 REUs). At the same time, the subject of the evaluation shifts from the overt target of the evaluation (in the most direct utterances) to the source of the overt evaluation (in the most indirect utterances).

Gruber's framework is especially useful for managing the varying responsibilities for evaluation according to the different forms of evaluative utterance, a problem that is especially acute in the sorts of constructions that have their intended effect on readers of a particular political or ideological orientation (i.e., subtype 3 REUs). Take the following example:

“Gore says Media Too Balanced, Miss Climate Message”.

This is a typical instance of what Gruber calls an ‘Implicitly speaker-evaluating REU’. The entire force of the negative evaluation (of the speaker, Al Gore) depends on the reader's interpretation of the reported comments (that the media is too balanced). Those who agree with these sentiments are unlikely to interpret the evaluation of the source negatively. On the other hand, those who tend to believe that the media has a strong liberal bias, can be expected to respond to the overtly negative evaluation of the media in the reported utterance by reading a negative evaluation of the source (the implicit target of the evaluation). Again, if we were to miss the covert evaluation of Al Gore, we might read the headline as a Subtype 1 REU, which negatively evaluates the media on the authority of Al Gore's declaration. Of course, such a reading would require one to

overlook the irony in the phrase ‘too balanced’ or deny that it serves any rhetorical function other than to provide a straightforward assessment of the media’s faults.

Irony will be looked at in more detail in the following section, but in terms of indirect evaluations, this example demonstrates the importance of meta-textual/socio-ideological knowledge.⁸¹ One of the recurring themes in the literature is that certain presuppositions are anticipated (indeed, even cultivated) by the author and can often be inferred from features of the co-text and intertext. For instance, we may see a consistent pattern of utterances throughout the above discourse in which Al Gore is negatively evaluated for Warrantability. Such a pattern indicates a presupposition that must be accounted for, and which is inconsistent with a reading in which Gore is taken as a credible source for evaluative claims about climate change and the news media.

2.8 Ironic Constructions

One of the more sophisticated ways a speaker may distance himself from a proposition is through the use of irony. Consider the claim, “I SAW THE CLIMATE CHANGE”, attributed to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (identified by the accompanying image). To recognize the intrinsic (and intentional)⁸² irony of this proposition is to see the distance

⁸¹ That is, knowledge that the reader brings to the text. Martin (2000) makes a similar observation in his analysis of *Educating Rita*. He explains:

[W]hen Rita mentions Rita Mae Brown’s *Rubyfruit Jungle*... it is clearly the case that anyone naively apprenticed into mainstream literary sensibilities will value the book as insignificant, and will therefore judge Rita as ignorant. Mere mention of the book encodes these feelings, without any explicit appraisal having to be construed at all (161).

He echoes Gruber with his observation that the evocation only works for people who take the same (negative) position on the value of the book.

⁸² One of the challenges in the analysis of an ironic utterance is in establishing whether the author was really aware of the ironic reading, which, functionally speaking, is essential if the irony is to be indicative of authorial stance. In the above example, we are fortunate to have an archival record of the linguistic choices that were made (and subsequently rejected) before the author arrived at the expression we see above. We will examine this in more detail when we turn to the analysis of the climate change discourse on the Drudge Report, where we find that the choice of language is highly conscious and

the author is putting between himself and the source/claim—and not just distance, but footing.⁸³

The traditional view of verbal irony holds that the ironic utterance means the opposite of its literal form. But as Clift (1999) observes, that is to overlook the fact that two aspects of meaning must be perceived at the same time for sense to be made of the irony: “it is not that one dimension cancels the other, but that it is necessary to make sense of the other” (533). Clark & Gerrig (1984) and Sperber & Wilson (1992) offer radical alternatives to the traditional view, but Clift’s interpretation, informed by the sociological insights of Erving Goffman (1974), is especially compelling.

Clark & Gerrig (1984) observe that there is often something of a performance involved in ‘mentioning’—as when the speaker achieves the ironic effect by imitating someone else. This leads them to argue that it is the performance or “pretence”—that is, the ‘dramaturgical characteristics’ of irony—that are central.⁸⁴

Suppose S is speaking to A, the primary addressee, and to A’, who may be present or absent, real or imaginary. In speaking ironically, S is pretending to be S’ speaking to A’. What S’ is saying is, in one way or another, patently uninformed or injudicious... A’, in ignorance, is intended to miss this pretense, to take S as speaking sincerely. But A, as part of the “inner circle”... is intended to see everything—the pretense, S’s injudiciousness, A’s ignorance, and hence S’s attitude towards S’, A’, and what S’ said (Clark & Gerrig, 1984: 122).

There are a number of reversals or oppositions at play in this characterization. First, there are two planes of discourse, the ‘literal’ and the ‘ironic’. On the literal level, there is the ostensibly sincere speaker (S), while on the ironic level a different voice (S’) is called on.

points away from the possibility that the irony is inadvertent.

⁸³ Indeed, according to the Appraisal System, irony cannot simply be a distancing formula, since even distancing is a dialogically expansive posture while the ironic attribution has a contractive effect.

⁸⁴ Haiman (1990) also sees irony as dramaturgy, declaring: “I wish to propose very seriously that the best metaphor in terms of which to understand sarcasm and irony is that of the stage and screen” (26).

In addition, on the literal level, A is only the ostensible addressee, while A' is the actual addressee. This reverses on the ironic level, where A is realized as the actual addressee.

Clark and Gerrig's description seems to account for the elements involved, but it is rather cumbersome, and as Clift points out, there are many prototypical examples of irony that seem to have no apparent need for 'pretence'. Sperber & Wilson (1992) draw a simpler distinction between the straightforward 'use' and self-referential 'mention' of a word or utterance.⁸⁵ And they apply this to a characterization of irony as a form of "echoic mention", where the ironist is construed as simultaneously echoing a speech act and dissociating from that echo, the origin of which may or may not be obviously present or easily identified. However, even the notion of echoic mention fails to capture the essence of the ironic turn.

Consider the examples below:

1. "DiCaprio bites back over eco-hypocrisy charge: 'I try to travel commercial as much as I can'"
2. "Scientists call global warming debate 'completely irrational'"
3. "Killer cured, then executed"⁸⁶

One could argue that the first two headlines make use of echoic mention. Moreover, since the first represents the actual speech as opposed to the speech act or paraphrased content, the echo has a certain theatrical potential: one could imagine the speaker mimicking the actor. But neither pretence nor an obvious echo seems to be crucial to the irony here. And in the latter headline something else is clearly at work—some inherent inconsistency or

⁸⁵ This may be compared with a distinction Hunston (2000) proposes (following Thetala, 1997) between two classes of entities that may be evaluated in a text, 'world-entities' and 'discourse-entities', where the former are facts or claims that have an existence beyond the discourse, and the latter are part of the discourse itself. This is akin to Sinclair's (1981) distinction between the 'interactive' and 'autonomous' planes of discourse, which Hunston adopts.

⁸⁶ Quoted in Clift (1999)

instability among the constituent meanings. Irving Goffman (1974) offers the following interpretation:

In daily life the individual ordinarily speaks for himself, speaks, as it were, in his “own” character. However, . . . when a speaker employs conventional brackets to warn us that what he is saying is meant to be taken in jest, or as mere repeating of words by someone else, then it is clear that he means to stand in a relation of reduced personal responsibility for what he is saying. He splits himself off from the content of the words by expressing that their speaker is not he himself or not he himself in a serious way (Goffman, 1974, 512).

With Goffman we move from pretence to mention to something even more abstract: a ‘bracketing’ or ‘framing’ of speech.⁸⁷ Goffman, like Bakhtin, draws a distinction between the speaker’s own voice and the one he has chosen—what Goffman calls “framing”. Clift believes that this notion of framing is implicit in the echoic account of irony.⁸⁸ She argues, moreover, that irony may therefore be seen as a particular form of a more general “strategic” use of language—one that depends on the listener’s recognition of the distinct “voices” being expressed (530).

Goffman uses the word ‘footing’ to describe the participant’s relationship (and commitment) to the framed utterance. He distinguishes among the ‘author’ of a particular utterance, the ‘principal’ committed to the sentiments expressed and the ‘animator’ who represents them to an audience. A given participant may occupy any of these footings or all of them at the same time.⁸⁹ Martin’s Authorial Voice system makes a similar, though two-fold, distinction between the ‘Reporter’ voice and the ‘Writer’ voice, where the former, taking the posture of ‘animator’, limits itself to the resources of Graduation,

⁸⁷ Notice how this takes us back to the related issues of attribution and responsibility.

⁸⁸ The quotation mark is one of the most explicit framing devices. Bakhtin (1981) even uses the phrase “intonational quotation marks” to describe the distancing of the speaker from the utterance.

⁸⁹ This is the issue that concerns Dunmire (2005) when she discusses the objectivity of the media in its use of sourcing. She argues, in effect, that despite the framing of a text and the writer’s apparent footing as a mere ‘animator’ of a report, the media are inevitably committed ‘principals’ in the news they present.

while the latter indulges in Judgements of Social Esteem ('Correspondent') and even Social Sanction ('Commentator').

Clift argues that the journalist and the ironist both signal a lack of commitment to what they are saying in the act of saying it (i.e., through the framing) but while the journalist seeks to maintain the footing of a mere animator, the ironist does so only briefly. As she explains: "what makes the ironist different from the journalist or actor... is that the distinction between animator, author or principal is one that the ironist only lays claim to, while in reality he is all three" (532-533). The key to irony, she believes, is the shift from one footing to another: "a speaker's shift of footing into irony achieves that which...characterizes all irony: framing" (533).⁹⁰

One of the advantages of Clift's interpretation over Clark & Gerrig's model is that the various elements can be picked out with the Appraisal System. The 'footings' are represented by the system of 'Authorial voices', and the 'frames' can be understood in terms of the different evaluative meanings expressed by those voices. Clift's interpretation is also compatible with the perspectives on evaluation offered elsewhere in the literature. She claims, for instance that "The framing serves metaphorically to invite the observer/audience to share the ironist's perspective" (538). As we will see when the discussion turns to Heteroglossic Engagement, Martin and White similarly identify evaluation as a way in which various socio-political relations (status, power, social contract, solidarity, etc) are textually construed through the construction of an authorial persona and a readership.

This also echoes what Hunston & Thompson (2000) say of the relationship between listener and speaker, that: "the expression of attitude is not, as is often claimed, simply a personal matter—the speaker 'commenting' on the world—but a truly interpersonal matter, in that the basic reason for advancing an opinion is to elicit a response of

⁹⁰ Later she declares: "The double perspective brought into existence by framing is ultimately what lies at the heart of all irony, and provides the one characteristic common to all its forms" (535).

solidarity from the addressee” (143).⁹¹ The influence of Bakhtin is evident in both Clift and Hunston & Thompson, as each makes a point of describing how the speaker ‘invites’ a response from the listener in an act of solidarity.⁹² Macken-Horarik (2003) similarly explains: “In our consideration of intersubjective evaluation, we shift emphasis from studies of hierarchical relations based on power to studies of vertical relations based on solidarity” (315).

Clift claims that many examples of irony are recognizable because they rely on common understandings and assumptions and on accepted standards of behaviour to which the speaker makes appeal.⁹³ And this sounds very much like what we have heard from Gruber and others about the need for a certain level of “ideological” or meta-communicative” knowledge on the part of the reader in order for the subtlest sort of evaluative utterances to be effectively interpreted. Clift argues:

it is only by reference to the generally held norm—say that rain is bad and sunshine good—that *it’s a beautiful day* is ironic in a context where it is evident that it is pouring with rain. Such ironies are marked by their extremity, and indeed often make use of extreme formulations to emphasize the impossibility of what is being asserted (538).

Compare this with Gruber’s criteria for classifying the difficult third sub-type of Reported Evaluative Utterance, where the structural properties of the utterance and its content are “markedly different” and somehow “violate the norms of at least one subgroup of readers” (482). When Clift describes the use of irony as a particular form of

⁹¹ Dressen (2003) sees the expression of stance as a manifestation of the community’s normalizing process, as a way to preserve and maintain community standards and values (274).

⁹² This notion of “inviting” a response is taken up in the discussion on heteroglossic engagement.

⁹³ Winter (1986) makes the same observation in his analysis of a political cartoon: ‘Knowledge of the world’ is what enables us to see the humour; we match our knowledge [of the story alluded to] with this drawing and appreciate the incongruity of the two situations. Much cartoon humour can be defined as matching incongruous Situations, with only one Situation present in the cartoon, another in the mind of the reader (60).

a more general “strategic” use of language, she seems to be pointing to something like these implicitly speaker evaluating utterances.

Clift addresses the structural and content issues in terms of reader ‘expectations’:

the recognition of irony... may be seen to be not so much dependent on conventionalized paralinguistic cues, but rather on expectations as to what constitutes an appropriate next turn in a conversational sequence: expectations that appear to be subverted by an apparent mismatch between the next slot in a sequence and that which fills it. ... It is, then, this apparent mismatch of item and slot that serves consistently to perform one activity: evaluation (542).

This issue of the ‘appropriate next turn in a conversational sequence’ is touched on below in the discussion on Eugene Winter’s ‘clause-relational analysis’.

2.9 Situation-Evaluation/Hypothetical-Real Constructions

Winter’s (1986) ‘clause-relational analysis’, also taken up by Michael Hoey (2000), looks at the clause as “a device of co-relevance” in a text. This is tied to a number of observations about the nature of language, the most important of which is that ‘a speaker cannot say everything about anything at any time’, a simple observation that nevertheless has serious implications for clausal structure. Winter argues that because we cannot just say anything, the selected content in a text is necessarily constrained by previous sentences or by the history of the larger message structure, and that one of the assumptions we must make in decoding the message is that the relations between adjoining clauses and sentences cannot be random or haphazard, but that the meaning is a function of the adjoining sentences, particularly the preceding ones: “it must make sense as a second member within the scope of the semantics of lexical and grammatical choice of the first member” (Winter, 1986: 68).⁹⁴ As Winter explains:

⁹⁴ Lemke (1995b) speaks of this in terms of ‘selective contextualization’, arguing that: “All meaning making may be described as such selective contextualization... because it is only insofar as all possible combinations of signs and their contexts of use are *not* equally likely that meaning itself is possible” (86).

The moment you put together any two sentences for a purpose, your listener or reader looks for a sensible connection between their topics, and if they make sense to him/her, it will be because s/he can *relate the two sentences* in the same way as they relate the constituents of the clause in *expected ways* (49).

He illustrates this with an interesting test, asking the reader to decide which of the following sequences was actually observed on a *Harpenden Weekly News* poster:

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Enjoy it	Buy it	Read it	Enjoy it	Buy it	Read it
Buy it	Enjoy it	Enjoy it	Read it	Read it	Buy it
Read it	Read it	Buy it	Buy it	Enjoy it	Enjoy it

Clearly, for most readers, choice (e) can be expected, as it realizes a basic clausal relation; namely, logical sequencing.⁹⁵ Winter identifies a second basic relation as well: ‘matching’, which he describes as:

the larger semantic field which is characterized by a high degree of systematic repetition between its clauses, and by the semantics of compatibility and incompatibility. Within compatibility, we have comparisons, alternatives and the crucial unspecific-specific relation, which includes general and particular and appositions; within incompatibility, we have contrasts and contradictions which includes Denial and Contradiction (50).

These relations are expressed, according to Winter’s approach, in one of two basic text structures (or combinations thereof): ‘Situation-Evaluation’ and ‘Hypothetical-Real’. In the former, the speaker begins by saying what is known about something (the ‘situation’⁹⁶) and then offers an opinion about it (the ‘evaluation’).⁹⁷ Fortunately for the

⁹⁵ Presumably, anyone selecting an option other than (e) does so on the basis of a different logical sequence than the one assumed in the advertisement (which is that one makes a purchase, consumes it and thereby enjoys it). Winter claims that people in contemporary Britain and Japan would all choose the fifth sequence. But it is odd that he would choose Japan as a particular example. If there is a cultural exception anywhere, Japan might be the place to find it. It is still common there to practice *tachiyomi* [lit. ‘stand-read’], whereby a customer stands for hours at a bookshop, reading and enjoying and only subsequently, perhaps, buying the item.

⁹⁶ Winter characterizes situation in more detail elsewhere: “bearing in mind what our audience knows, we tell them what we want them to know, framing it in an acceptable

analysis of very short textual units, the linguistic requirements for the completion of the text structure can apparently be fulfilled with as little as one sentence per member of the structure; even a single word may suffice as, for instance, the road sign 'Danger' evaluates the Situation for the motorist (62). As this example also illustrates, some of the structure (the Situation) may remain implicit.⁹⁸

Of particular relevance to the current discussion is the second of the two types, 'Hypothetical-Real'. Unlike the first, which presents its proposition as though it existed uncontroversially within the knowledge of the speaker (and maybe the audience too) as signalled by the absence of modalizing language, the situation in this latter structure is explicitly marked as a mere supposition. Winter writes: "Basically, we can regard the hypothetical and real structure as the basic text structure which we use to report our response to the perceived truth of somebody else's or our own statements" (63). Although Winter does not use the term 'heteroglossic engagement', these text structures, especially the hypothetical-real, are inherently heteroglossic.

Winter lists some of the markers of the Hypothetical as: *assertion, assumption, belief, claim, conclusion, expect, feel, guess, illusion, imagine, proposition, rumour, speculation,*

linguistic or pictorial starting point called Situation" (61).

⁹⁷ In addition, a third term, expressing the reasoning behind the opinion (the 'basis') may be added to the structure, resulting in the form, Situation-Evaluation-Basis. Dunmire and others refer to this latter element in terms of 'evidentiality', and it is captured in the appraisal system under the heading 'Justification'.

⁹⁸ Winter writes:

In systematically settling for saying less than everything, we can cut down our 'message structure' to what is relevant in as little as a one-clause sentence per member. This does not mean that our sentence is trivial or the simple sum of its words, but more importantly that one sentence will do because we can count on our decoder's very much vaster knowledge of the subject-matter which s/he brings to grasping the significance of the selections we have made for our clause (67-68).

He adds:

It is the likelihood of such a linguistic context that makes it possible for us to select very small text structures of two sentences long, since our audience brings their knowledge of this larger context to 'fill in' what we might have otherwise selected from it. This is what ensures their understanding of the significance of our selections (68).

suggestion, suppose, theory, think, etc. To use Lemke's gloss, the Hypothetical is marked by negative evaluations of Warrantability. In contrast, the Real may be signalled by Denials (*contradict, challenge, correct, deny, dismiss, disagree, dispute, false, lie, mistake, object to, refute, rebut, repudiate, not true, wrong, etc.*) or Affirmations (*affirm, agree, confirm, concur, evidence, fact, know, real, right, true, etc.*) (See also Winter, 1982: 196-200). The Real is comparable to the dialogically contractive 'Disclamations' and 'Proclamations' described in the Appraisal System.

As we see, particularly from such markers as 'claim' and 'assertion', what is presented as a Hypothetical in the context of one speech act may be offered as a Situation in another (i.e., in the speech act reported). The Hypothetical is thus already an evaluation: what someone has reported as a Situation (i.e., presented as true) is being contradicted or reformulated as mere hypothesis (i.e. as a claim negatively evaluated for likelihood or 'Veracity'). On the other hand, while the Real always conveys an evaluation of the Hypothetical, and is construed as the Situation, it can, in turn, be constructed in another proposition as a mere hypothesis itself. As Winter puts it: "the ultimate linguistic function of the real member is to transmute the hypothetical Situation into a real Situation as discovered by the encoder" (63).

There is a recursiveness to both the Real and the Hypothetical. One is defined by its opposition to the other. Both are inherently evaluative. The Situation, on the other hand, is presented as something that exists uncontroversially from the speaker's point of view—a fact of some sort. But as we saw in the discussion on informing versus influencing, a simple separation of fact and evaluation is uncertain. Indeed, it is a failure to appreciate the inseparability of a proposition and its evaluation that undermines Michael Hoey's (2000) analysis of Noam Chomsky.⁹⁹ Situation-Evaluation may be a

⁹⁹ Hoey's (2000) critique of Chomsky could be made the subject of an interesting and deeply ironic discourse analysis; consider the first two sentences:

There can be little doubt that the most influential movement in post-war linguistics has been that associated with Noam Chomsky and largely initiated by him in his work *Syntactic Structure* (1957). Until recently it has been difficult to offer new ideas without using transformational-generative grammar as bearings;

fundamental rhetorical structure, but the explicit separation of the Evaluative member does not mean the expressed Situation is any less value-laden than the Hypothetical or Real.

Consider the following example:

“Forecaster sees active ‘07 hurricane season... Experts universally, and erroneously, predicted ‘06 would be busy year for storms”

This can be read according to either of Winter’s structures. We can interpret the first clause as presenting an objective Situation (that weather forecasters have made a prediction), which is subsequently given a negative evaluation for Warrantability (i.e., hurricane forecasters are unreliable). This evaluation is realized prosodically through a sophisticated structure in which the “expert” opinion is positively evaluated for Expectability (through its characterization as ‘universal’) while at the same time being negatively evaluated for Veracity (through its characterization as ‘erroneous’). But we

anyone who has tried to do so has been in danger of being dismissed as hopelessly out of the mainstream of linguistic thought (29).

This is presumably what Hoey would call the presentation of the ‘situation’, which he explicitly ‘evaluates’ in the next few paragraphs, and finally substantiates on the ‘basis’ of his linguistic analysis. Thus, unless Hoey were to admit that he too was violating ‘the normal practice in scientific argumentation’, his first paragraph must be an ostensible example of a value-free presentation of the situation. But consider a possible alternative. Perhaps Hoey intends for the second sentence to be an evaluation of the situation set out in the first. If we follow Hoey’s advice and try to interpose a question to elicit the evaluation, we arrive at something like, ‘Until recently, how would you evaluate the prospects of ideas that compete with Chomsky’s?’ (Answer: ‘It has been difficult, and anyone who tried was likely to be ignored’). We thus have the situation-evaluation structure that he endorses. However, we can do the same thing for the first sentence as well, asking ‘How would you evaluate Chomsky’s contribution to post-war linguistics?’ (Answer: ‘It has undoubtedly been the most influential movement’). The problem here is that there is nothing to distinguish one as an objective presentation of the situation and the other an explicit evaluation. Both seem to offer the pretence of objectivity (It is a ‘fact’ that transformational-generative grammar is the most influential movement; it is a ‘fact’ that there has been a resistance to new ideas). At the same time both are brimming with evaluative language. It is therefore difficult to know how Hoey intends his comments to be taken, but the notion that he presents a value-free Situation is doubtful.

can also read this in terms of a Hypothetical-Real structure, in which “see” is taken as a marker of the Hypothetical (i.e., the proposition that ‘there will be many hurricanes in 2007’), followed by the Real, in which the author implies that there will not be as many hurricanes as hypothesized.

2.10 Conclusion

As this survey of the literature shows, the issue of appraisal opens up a vast number of questions and problems. Even focussing on the issues of immediate relevance to the discourse on the Drudge Report quickly results in a tangled web of interrelated linguistic phenomena, only some of which have been accounted for by the Appraisal System thus far in its development. Heteroglossia is obviously a key notion, which comes up again and again, if only indirectly, even when the discussion has moved to the relatively peripheral issues of irony and clause relations. This, however, should come as no surprise, as the thread linking all these issues together is the communication one’s ideas, and as Bakhtin has rightly shown, communication entails a refining of our identities as meaning makers in a world of diverse perspectives.

Another thread that carries through the literature is the stubbornly prosodic nature of evaluation. Again, whether we are looking in general at clause relations, reported speech, propositions about the future, or ironic constructions, the evaluative resources are frequently seen to be spread throughout the text in question and beyond, often relying for full effect on the perspectives brought to the text by the reader. In other cases, the evaluations are not spread out at all, but buried in a condensed form, and although the evaluation may be present in a discrete package, a proper understanding of the basis of the evaluation similarly requires access to meanings spread through and beyond the immediate text. All this makes the analysis of authorial stance as much an art as a science.

Indeed, while the following chapter will present both the Appraisal System as it has been developed to this point and the modifications to the framework that are proposed in light of the literature examined in this chapter, even the modified framework cannot reflect all

the nuances of evaluation. Indirect and ironic constructions, condensations, and prosodic realizations of stance are typical of the obstacles facing those who hope to develop a framework. While they cannot be ignored, it is difficult to see how they could ever be exhaustively formalized. But perhaps that should not be expected. As Macken-Horarik (2003) explains well, appraisal analyses must build on the listener or reader's perspective of the evaluation and acknowledge the dynamism in the choices of language used to express the evaluations. These are (or at least *often* are) inseparable from the text-instance. In short, there is no easy formula for the undertaking of such analyses. Nevertheless, we can go some way in elucidating the broad strokes, and these are looked at below in the discussion of the Appraisal System.

3. The Analytical Framework

There is nothing in the Appraisal System, even in its modified form below, that will establish whether or not a proposition should be read as ironic or speaker evaluating, or whether certain co-textual, inter-textual or meta-discursive evaluations really do propagate in a way that justifies the claim that a particular evaluation is being made. Indeed, it is this very uncertainty that permits evaluation to persist in a text where a more overt expression of stance would be inappropriate. Nevertheless, even if evaluation is resistant to efforts at providing a definitive catalogue of appraisal resources, a framework like the Appraisal System offers a way to articulate and compare the evaluations that are recognized in each text-instance.

To this point, the discussion of the literature has provided insight into how an evaluation may be expressed, and this is essential for an understanding of the analyses presented in chapter 4. Before moving on to these analyses, however, some of the insights from the literature will be brought to bear on the framework itself, leading to a number of suggestions about how the framework might be modified. These include a rethinking of the system of Heteroglossic Engagement, and, crucially for the hypothesis to be tested in chapter 4, the system of Attitude where, among other changes, *ethos* has been added as a category of Judgement. This chapter begins with a presentation of the original Appraisal System followed a discussion of the proposed modifications.

3.1 The Appraisal System

Martin strikes new ground between what he calls 'Negotiation'¹⁰⁰ on the one hand, and 'Involvement'¹⁰¹ on the other. This is the evaluative space he calls 'Appraisal'. It comprises three systems: Engagement, Graduation, and Attitude.

¹⁰⁰ That is, what SFL traditionally looks at in terms of speech function and exchange structure.

¹⁰¹ That is, the 'solidarity function' of technical and specialized vocabulary.

Figure 4. The Appraisal System

Engagement addresses the dialogism or diversity of viewpoints in a discourse. A Monogloss Engagement makes no reference to sources or alternative positions. A Heterogloss Engagement, on the other hand, embraces more than one voice by projecting the views of other participants. This will be addressed more fully when the discussion turns to ‘Heteroglossic Engagement’.

Graduation, as Martin sets it out, addresses the ‘Force’ of gradable (interpersonal) meanings (along a scale from ‘Low’ to ‘High’) or the ‘Focus’ of experiential meanings (along a scale from ‘Soft’ to ‘Sharp’). It addresses the differences between verbs like ‘plead’ and ‘request’, which express different levels of force, or modifiers like ‘approximately’ and ‘precisely’, which express different levels of focus.¹⁰²

¹⁰² Graduation is looked at more detail in the discussion on attitudinal betokening.

Attitude is the broadest category, comprising Judgement, Affect, and Appreciation (or, alternatively, 'ethics', 'emotions' and 'aesthetics' respectively). Martin characterizes the three very concisely:

AFFECT is the embodied system we are born with, which we develop into culturally specific emotional repertoires. JUDGEMENT and APPRECIATION on the other hand might be viewed as uncommon sense feeling: JUDGEMENT as the institutionalization of feeling with a view to prescribing behaviour, APPRECIATION as the institutionalization of feeling with a view to assessing the value and social significance of things (Martin, 2004: 275).¹⁰³

Martin observes an important distinction between what he calls "Inscribed appraisal" (as an explicit evaluation) and "Evoked appraisal" (implicit evaluation), the latter drawing on ideational or textual meanings "to 'connote' evaluation, either by selecting meanings which invite a reaction or by deploying imagery to provoke a stance" (Martin, 2004: 289). The latter may be realized through metaphor or image, or through a combination that multiplies or 'amplifies' the appraisal. This will be addressed more fully when the discussion turns to Peter White's distinction between 'attitudinal inscription' and 'attitudinal betokening'.

In brief, the 'token' is applied to formulations where no single item carries a specific positive or negative value in and of itself (i.e., independently of the co-text). In such a form, the evaluation is triggered by a variety of mechanisms of association and implication. In other words, the evaluative position is "betokened" rather than "inscribed" (White 2006: 39). An appraisal may be 'invited' purely through experiential lexis (i.e., language without any explicit evaluative potential) by a process of attitudinal inference,

¹⁰³ White (2006b) describes attitude in the following terms:

Positive and negative evaluations can be divided into those which involve (a) emotional reactions (what the appraisal framework terms 'affect'), (b) assessments of human behaviour and character by reference to some system of conventionalized or institutionalized norms (what the appraisal framework terms 'judgement') and (c) assessments of artefacts, texts, natural objects, states of affairs and processes in terms of how they are assigned value socially, for example in terms of their aesthetic qualities, their potential for harm or benefit, their social significance, and so on (39).

or it may be 'provoked'. A provoked appraisal relies on evaluative lexis that nevertheless carries no positive or negative value in and of itself, instead making use of intensification, comparison, metaphor, counter-expectation, etc. to achieve effect.

Martin puts particular emphasis on 'Judgement', especially in the context of what he calls Voice Systems.¹⁰⁴ Martin (2004) speaks of the different "media keys" that are distinguished by the expression of Judgement. These are classified in the Appraisal System under the heading 'Authorial Voice'. A further distinction is drawn between 'Reporter Voice' and 'Writer Voice'. The Reporter Voice may use Graduation (to draw attention) but does not otherwise express explicit judgement unless attributing it to another. The Writer voice is sub-divided into a 'Correspondent Voice' and a 'Commentator Voice', where the former permits explicit judgements of Social Esteem, and the latter allows not only judgements of Social Esteem and Social Sanction, but also explicit judgments of causality and directives.¹⁰⁵ This may be compared with Gruber's arrangement of evaluative utterances, from those expressing no explicit judgement at all (i.e., ostensibly objective reporting¹⁰⁶) to what may amount to explicit judgements of sanction.

¹⁰⁴ Hunston & Thompson, however, in their introduction to Martin (2000), observe that the "main" sub-system of Appraisal is 'Affect', not Judgement and, indeed, Martin gives far more attention to Affect in that particular article than he does to Judgement. Moreover, he suggests that Affect can be taken as "the basic system" (Martin, 2000: 147), which is modified or, as he puts it, "institutionalized", as Judgement and Appreciation. Nevertheless, if Judgement is, as he claims, "an evaluation matrix for behaviour, with a view to controlling what people do" (through the institutionalization of feelings as proposals), and Appreciation is "an evaluation matrix for the products of behaviour... with a view to valuing what people achieve" (through the institutionalization of feelings as propositions) (Martin, 2000: 147), then both Judgement and appreciation are the more relevant aspects of Appraisal for the purposes of the present investigation into the use of evaluation in the media.

¹⁰⁵ Coffin (1997) offers a similar system of voices, distributed as 'Recorder', 'Interpreter', and 'Adjudicator' respectively. Goffman (1974) and Clift (1999) describe the participant's relationship (and commitment) to a framed utterance by distinguishing among the 'author' of a particular utterance, the 'principal' committed to the sentiments expressed and the 'animator' who represents them to an audience.

¹⁰⁶ Martin observes, however that "In mature writing, perhaps the closest we get to facelessness is reporter or recorder voice; even there, the objective stance tends to be just one phase, and in any case allows for engagement and graduation of various kinds"

Following Iedema et al (1994), the Appraisal System divides Judgement into evaluations of 'Social Esteem' and 'Social Sanction', the former addressing a subject's 'Normality', 'Capacity' and 'Tenacity', while the latter deals with 'Veracity' and 'Propriety'. Martin relates these to Halliday's categories of modality (i.e., 'Usuality', 'Ability', 'Inclination', 'Probability', and 'Obligation' respectively). It is tempting to compare them with Lemke's semantic dimensions as well, but despite the obvious overlaps, the fit is incomplete. On the one hand, Martin addresses judgements of Appreciation in a separate system and consequently excludes from the category of Judgement what Lemke calls 'Importance/Significance'. Affect, too, is treated elsewhere, thus excluding 'Humorlessness/Seriousness' and 'Comprehensibility/Obviousness'. On the other hand, Martin addresses under a single heading, like 'Capacity' (or 'Tenacity'), what Lemke would treat as a combination of semantic dimensions (for instance, Usuality combined with Desirability).

Figure 5. System of Judgement

Affect is well described in Martin's framework, covering a range of realizations, including 'quality' (by way of epithets, attributes, and circumstances), 'process' (both mental and behavioural), and 'comment' (through modal adjuncts). As with Lemke's approach (following Halliday), Martin's analyses distinguish between positive and negative affect, and also among grades of intensity.¹⁰⁷ He also distinguishes between

(Martin, 2004: 282).

¹⁰⁷ With regards to polarity, Martin relies on a general sense of how feelings are

‘surges’ of emotion and ongoing mental states (e.g., ‘laugh’ as opposed to ‘enjoy’), and between feelings that are directed to others and undirected moods (e.g., ‘like’ as opposed to ‘happy’), and also between realized and unrealized states (e.g., ‘rejoice’ as opposed to ‘want’).

Figure 6. System of Affect

If there is a weakness here, it is in the final variable of Martin’s typology of affect, which groups emotions into three broad categories: un/happiness, in/security, and dis/satisfaction. This leads to a rather forced and artificial categorization of evaluative expressions. For instance, ‘beauty’ and ‘nice’ are categorized under Happiness, which is certainly the best of the three choices, but still seems out of place. Both terms would be better classified under Appreciation or even in a separate category of Affect. The same is

“popularly construed by the culture” (Martin, 2000: 149), but the assignment of positive or negative polarity could be given a more ‘scientific’ rigour through the use of statistical analyses of lexical collocations (or concordance lines) in corpus data. See, for example, Channell (2000), Coffin & O’Halloran (2005, 2006), Conrad (2002), Stubbs (1996), etc.

true of 'I don't like', which Martin characterizes as Unhappiness when, again, it seems better categorized as an expression of (negative) Appreciation.

Appreciation embraces the linguistic resources that construe the value of things. In effect, it covers the aesthetic evaluations, while Affect and Judgement deal with emotions and ethics, respectively. But these are very general guidelines and perhaps a little misleading. One can express 'appreciation' for something on grounds that have little if anything to do with aesthetics: for instance, one can appreciate the gravity of a situation, the importance of an event or the danger of a course of action. These are all included in the notion of appreciation. As we can see in the diagram of the system below, Appreciation is subdivided into Reaction, Valuation and Composition, where Reaction is further distinguished in terms of Quality or Impact, and Composition in terms of Balance and Complexity. However, as aesthetic questions play only a small role in the discourse under consideration, the merits of this system will not be examined in greater detail.

Figure 7. System of Appreciation

3.1.1 Heteroglossic Engagement

In line with Martin's observations, White argues that the barest assertions present a proposition in absolute terms and thereby fail to acknowledge the possible alternatives that may be operational within a discourse. They are thus 'monoglossic' or 'undialogized' (see also Bakhtin, 427) and represent the extreme of 'contraction'. White (2003) offers an interesting observation about monoglossic utterances in terms of rhetorical or intersubjective positioning. He notes that they are usually associated with 'consensual knowledge'; that is, with propositions that are regarded as unproblematic or

generally accepted ‘fact’ (in the intended context).¹⁰⁸ He interprets this to mean that such utterances assume the existence of epistemic or ideological agreement (or “dialogical alignment”) between the textual voice and the audience.¹⁰⁹ And where such agreement cannot be genuinely presupposed (that is, where the proposition is controversial or in dispute, as it often is), the bare utterance either constructs the textual voice as having the status/moral authority to derogate or ignore the alternative positions or constructs a readership for whom the author speaks from a position of solidarity.¹¹⁰ We can take from this that even direct, ostensibly monoglossic utterances can be reduced to a sort of implicit heteroglossic manoeuvring. White describes such ‘highly charged’ rhetorical moves as ‘dialogic disengagement’. But even in the disengagement, he observes, these utterances are still ‘modal’, still representative of particular intersubjective stances. Gruber’s (1993) conclusions seem to support this interpretation. Gruber finds that the monoglossic utterances he examines (‘Direct Evaluative Utterances’) operate on a pragmatic level to arouse the interest of the reader while conveying the evaluative agenda of the writer.¹¹¹

Both White and Gruber devote most of their attention to explicitly heteroglossic utterances. White starts out by looking at the speaker’s commitment to the different voices that are present in every discourse, something appraisal theory calls Engagement (see also Martin 2004c). He divides the linguistic resources of authorial stance into two broad categories: those that are ‘Dialogically Expansive’ and those that are ‘Dialogically

¹⁰⁸ Myers (1990), for instance, observes that unhedged claims in a scientific discourse are much less likely to be statements of new knowledge than statements of established ‘fact’. Compare this with what Winter (1986) calls the ‘Situation’ member of the ‘Situation-Evaluation’ structure.

¹⁰⁹ However, if we take the Dunmire or Hunston’s observations about evidentials seriously (or even White’s own comments about ‘justification’), we may have to qualify the above claim by noting that the sourcing or evidentiality of an ostensibly bare utterance may actually be present in the accompanying text (or possibly even inter-textually).

¹¹⁰ Compare this with what Winter (1986) calls the ‘Real’ member of the ‘Hypothetical-Real’ structure.

¹¹¹ White (2006b) offers a similar interpretation. He argues that the few instances of ‘attitudinal inscription’ usually found in journalistic discourse serve to anchor the intended appraisal of the ‘attitudinal tokens’.

Contractive'. Whether an utterance fits one category rather than another depends on whether, and to what degree, the linguistic resources promote 'dialogically alternative' positions and voices (dialogic expansion), as opposed to restricting the scope of such alternatives (dialogic contraction).

Figure 8. System of Heteroglossic Engagement

We can see the distinction between dialogically expansive and contractive utterances by looking at a pair of contrasting rhetorical questions. White argues that such utterances are dialogic not only to the extent that they mimic the turn-taking that normally operates in spoken communication, but, more importantly, by introducing a proposition in such a way that it is presented as only one of a range of possible alternatives.¹¹²

Consider the two different sorts of rhetorical question exemplified below:

1. "The Last Temptation of Al Gore; Will He Run or Not?"¹¹³

¹¹² On the other hand, he observes, the proposition is presented only indirectly, as though it were so self-evident that the reader could supply the meaning on her own. The rhetorical form thus already conveys an implicit evaluation.

¹¹³ Other examples in the Drudge Report include: "ONE LAST BLAST? Cold & Snow for the East", "WINTER FINALLY TO COME 'WITH A VENGEANCE'?", "The Last Temptation of Al Gore; Will He Run or Not?", "Gore's Earth Concert, Live From the Capitol?", and "Gas at \$6 per gallon? Get ready".

2. “Rosie to Sheryl Crow: ‘Have You Seen My Ass?’”¹¹⁴

In the first example, the writer indicates his uncertainty about the former Vice President’s political ambitions. The notion that he might run for president is only one possibility, and thus other alternatives may be entertained. In short, the proposition is located in the context of heteroglossic diversity.¹¹⁵ The second example is somewhat different. It was uttered in response to Sheryl Crow’s suggestion that people could do their part for the environment by limiting themselves to a single square of toilet paper during trips to the restroom. The response, by Rosie O’Donnell, may be interpreted as ‘Do you really think a single square of toilet paper is adequate?’ To the extent that different opinions may be elicited by this question, it is similarly ‘heteroglossic’. But unlike the first example, this one does not invite a dialogue about the alternative positions. Instead, it encourages the reader to supply a particular response (a rejection of the proposition). In this way it opens up the possibility of different viewpoints while simultaneously seeking to head them off.¹¹⁶

The differences between these two examples point to the larger differences between the two broad categories that White proposes as part of the Appraisal framework. Utterances that work like the first rhetorical question, in which alternative positions are construed as

¹¹⁴ Other examples in the Drudge Report include: “WARMING ON HOLD? April’s temperatures were below average”, “SIN OR SUN? RELIGIOUS LEADERS URGE ACTION ON CLIMATE”, “Have scientists oversold global warming?” (next to an image of a couple walking in front of a snowy capitol), “President of Czech Republic: ‘Do you really ‘see’ any damage caused by current warming?’”, “Al Gore’s ‘Inconvenient Truth’? -- \$30,000 utility bill”, “Gore booed, heckled by students at Canadian University - Protesters shouted: ‘What about your swimming pools?’”, “Rosie to Sheryl Crow: ‘Have You Seen My Ass?’”, “FRAUD?: Carbon offset industry; ‘Serious credibility concerns’”.

¹¹⁵ This example is part of an ongoing narrative in the Drudge Report in which Al Gore’s disavowal of any presidential ambition is questioned. The opening up of dialogic alternatives in this case has the effect of casting doubt on Gore’s denials and constructing a possible ulterior motive for his prominence in the global warming movement.

¹¹⁶ A more straight-forward example is the headline: “Have scientists oversold global warming?”, which was accompanied by an image of a couple walking past a snowy capitol in Washington. Again, different positions are elicited (scientists may or may not have oversold global warming; they may even have undersold it). But the possibility that global warming has not been oversold is headed off by the (photographic) evidence of the extreme snow/cold.

possible, and even to some extent authorized by the speaker, are characterized as 'dialogically expansive'. This is in contrast to the 'dialogically contractive' utterance in which the engagement resources are deployed as part of an effort to counter or confront or somehow reduce the space for the acknowledgement of dialogic alternatives.

We have seen that White divides Heteroglossic Engagement into two categories, 'dialogic contraction' and 'dialogic expansion'. He further distinguishes dialogically contractive utterances as either 'proclamations' or 'disclamations'. In a proclamation the textual voice conveys a heightened personal investment in the claims being made, often against a particular alternative, and works to increase the interpersonal cost for anyone who would oppose it.¹¹⁷ In a disclamation, the textual voice presents an explicit rejection or countering of the opposing view.¹¹⁸ At a greater level of delicacy, a proclamation can be distinguished as either a 'concurrence', a 'pronouncement' or an 'endorsement'. Concurrence describes an utterance in which the speaker explicitly signals her alignment with the construed reader (for instance, through the use of such expressions as 'naturally', 'obviously' and 'of course').¹¹⁹ This seems to be very much in tune with what Hunston (2000) distinguishes as a 'hidden' attribution, which identifies a view with a supposed public sentiment or opinion.

A 'pronouncement' is likewise comparable to what Hunston calls an 'emphasized' attribution to the self. White (2006) describes these as 'intensifications', 'emphases' or 'explicit authorial interventions', which in some way express the subjective involvement of the Authorial voice (269).¹²⁰ Finally, by 'endorsement' White describes what Dunmire (1997) and others have referred to in general as 'sourced' claims, and which Hunston distinguishes in particular under the heading, 'attribution, responsibility reclaimed'

¹¹⁷ Consider, for instance: "I want the public to be very scared by what they see. I want them to see a very bleak future". The textual voice expresses a personal interest in seeing a certain outcome ("I want").

¹¹⁸ For instance: "'Global Warming Is Lies' Claims New Documentary".

¹¹⁹ For instance: "'We can make it work with only one square per restroom visit, except, of course, on those pesky occasions where 2 to 3 could be required'".

¹²⁰ For instance: "I am convinced that we have reached the tipping point and Congress will act".

(190).¹²¹ White (2003) characterizes the distinction nicely when he describes an endorsement as “‘I’ *plus* some authoritative or otherwise convincing external source” (270, my emphasis).¹²² Disclamation, a sort of negative proclamation, similarly resolves into finer categories: ‘denial’ and ‘countering’, where the former constitutes “negation in the broadest sense”¹²³ and the latter is characterized by “concessives, adversatives and counter-expectancies” of various sorts.¹²⁴

Dialogically expansive utterances are also subject to finer distinctions. In the Appraisal system, these are divided into two broad groupings: ‘entertaining’ and ‘attributing’. By ‘entertaining’ dialogic alternatives, the dialogically expansive textual voice opens the discussion up to other viewpoints. Consider the following example:

“Limbaugh Proposes Vegas-Style Global Warming Catastrophe Wagering Lines...”

Here the two opposing climate change positions are represented implicitly. Not only do we see a willingness to entertain the dialogic alternatives, but the proposition cannot even be made sense of without recognizing that there are such alternatives.¹²⁵

¹²¹ White (2006b) offers a compact definition of ‘authorial endorsement’, characterizing it as “where the reported value position is framed or projected by formulations which simultaneously align the authorial voice with that value position and, by implication, construe it as true or otherwise warrantable” (58).

¹²² Both Hunston and White consider the verb ‘show’ (e.g., ‘They show that...’) to be an instance of this sort of attribution. The Drudge Report yields the following example of an endorsement: “COUNTER: Two New Books Confirm Global Warming is Natural; Not Caused By Human Activity”.

¹²³ For example: “Greenhouse effect is a myth, say scientists”.

¹²⁴ For example: “CBSNEWSNYT POLL: PUBLIC SAYS WARMING IS A PROBLEM, BUT REMAINS SPLIT ON ACTIONS”.

¹²⁵ The above headline is linked to a segment of Rush Limbaugh’s radio show, where he invites global warming affirmers to demonstrate their commitment to their beliefs by wagering on their predictions:

Here’s how we can once and for all prove that global warming alarmists are full of BS. We create a betting line on any or all of their dire prognostications. Just go get Gore’s movie and say, ‘Ok, what are the odds that New York City will be underwater in 20 years? What are the odds that Greenland is gonna melt?’—whatever’s in there—and then let people bet. Now, I would bet against every one of those assertions. Every prediction that the global warming people are making I

The second grouping under dialogic expansion ('attribute') appears at first to be relatively straightforward. White (2006b) expresses the logic behind the distinction when he observes the "range of mechanisms by which the journalistic author can indirectly indicate alignment with or disalignment from the 'externalized' value position and by which the reader may be positioned to regard that position as more or less warrantable" (41). White (2003) draws a further distinction among these (dialogically expansive) attributions, which he terms 'acknowledging' and 'distancing',¹²⁶ where in the former, the textual voice signals that the reported position (in the attributed claim) is worthy of consideration, while in the latter, the authorial voice separates itself from the reported position (by means of a reporting/projecting verb that indicates a possible disalignment with the expressed viewpoint), and thereby signals that the dialogic alternative may be valid. It is not clear, however, that distancing is best seen as a form of dialogic expansion. Consider the following example:

"SPORTS ILLUSTRATED Goes Green! Claims Mankind Creating 'Environmental Crisis'"

White would grant that the reporting verb ("claims") is offering an implicitly weak evaluation of the position taken by Sports Illustrated by 'distancing' the textual voice from the expressed viewpoint.¹²⁷ But he argues that 'claim' is a form of endorsement, and

would bet against. And they won't. You know damn well that Laurie David would not put her divorce millions on the line. And you don't—you don't for a m—for a fact—that Gore won't—put his tobacco cash—that's where a lot of his money comes from—his book cash or his movie cash—you wont—you -they—they will not bet for their own prognostications [transcribed from <http://www.breitbart.tv/html/2150.html>].

¹²⁶ White (2006b) defines 'authorial distancing' as: "where the reported value position is framed or projected by formulations which overtly distance the authorial voice from the attributed material and provide a signal that alternative of [sic] contrary viewpoints may be valid" (59).

¹²⁷ He writes:

the textual voice employs the resources of attribution/reported speech to ground the viewpoint in the subjecthood of some external voice. ... By attributing the viewpoint to the external voice, the author thereby represents it as contingent and individual, since it is explicitly grounded in the individual subjecthood of but one

that “To attribute any given viewpoint in this way is to open up the dialogic space to alternative positions” (273). He later adds that by casting some doubt on the proposition, “such ‘distancing’ formulations even more thoroughly open up the dialogic space to alternatives” (274). Of course, it is true that the dialogic space in the above example is opened up to an alternative position. We are presented with the view that humans are creating an environmental crisis, which as a news item evaluates the proposition with high negative Usuality/Expectability,¹²⁸ and this in turn implies a contrasting viewpoint against which the item *is* news. This is one way to engage opposing voices and dialogic alternatives.¹²⁹ Moreover, the distancing formulation provided by the use of “claim” (as opposed to an endorsing formulation that employs something like “confirm”) could be seen to open up the dialogic space more thoroughly by reinforcing the sense of uncertainty or disagreement (though I am not sure I would always attach such a distancing function to ‘claim’).

But if this is the case, then the otherwise interesting distinction between dialogic expansion and contraction becomes blurred. Surely if the intention of the formulation is to inject doubt into the proposition then the author is acting to close down or head off the view to some extent. One of the fundamental problems with the appraisal system, as it

speaker. The viewpoint is therefore but one possible position, given the diversity of viewpoints which typically operate among different individual speakers (273).

¹²⁸ This is one of Lemke’s (1998) seven ‘semantic dimensions’ discussed in greater detail elsewhere.

¹²⁹ Hunston (2000) offers an excellent example of a claim in which at least five evaluations are made by four different voices, including a similarly nameless or implied voice: “Sir James may have caused apoplexy in the Tory party with his tirades against Eurodoctrine, but he has not so far moved enough voters for them to register on an opinion poll”. Not only can we pick out Sir James’s negative evaluation of Eurodoctrine (signalled by “against”), and the author’s negative evaluation of Sir James’s comments (signalled by “tirades”), and the Tory party’s negative evaluation of those comments (signalled by “apoplexy”), but we can discern another voice as well. Like the implicit alternative signalled in the earlier example about *Sports Illustrated*, Hunston’s example contains an attribution to an unnamed voice, manifested in the claim that the Tory party evaluated Sir James’s comments negatively, which is only signalled by the author’s response (i.e., his conceding the possible truth of the evaluation); moreover, the author’s own viewpoint is inherently tied to the claim made by the nameless voice, by being expressed in terms of an evaluation of that claim.

has been set out, is that attribution is presumed to have a dialogically expansive function. But this relies on a rather simple notion of attribution, which Gruber (1993), Dunmire (1997), and Hunston (2000) among others, have shown to be much more tangled. Later in the discussion, it will be suggested that dialogic expansion and contraction represent choices alongside—but not superordinate to—choices of attribution.

White (2003) proposes a final mode of heteroglossic engagement, which he calls ‘Justification’. This describes the linguistic formulations that construe a particular type of ‘consequentiality’: “those by which non-‘factual’ propositions (for example attitudinal evaluations, directives/recommendations, predictions and so on) are justified, substantiated or otherwise argued for” (274).¹³⁰ This is comparable to what Chafe (1986) treats as ‘evidentiality’.¹³¹ As we have already seen, Eugene Winter (1986) looks at this in some detail as well, in terms of clausal structures he distinguishes as ‘Situation-Evaluation’ and ‘Hypothetical-Real’. As White observes, these sorts of structures are inherently dialogic, as they presuppose a viewpoint against which the proposition must be defended or an ‘addressee’ to be convinced of the merit of the claim being made. Take the following example:

“PAGLIA: I am a skeptic about what is currently called global warming... ‘Man is too weak to permanently affect nature’”.

In this example, Camille Paglia expresses a negative evaluation of the warrantability of global warming claims. The implicit dialogism surrounding this proposition is

¹³⁰ The clausal relations may or may not be explicitly signalled, though they are typically encoded through connectives and conjunctions like ‘therefore’, ‘accordingly’, for this reason’, etc.

¹³¹ “Evidentiality” refers to expressions of “attitudes toward knowledge” (Chafe, 1986: 262). We must not be led by the terminology into thinking that an ‘evidential’ must somehow be tied to ‘evidence’. It signifies the much broader notion of *how* we know something (and by implication how much stock we can put into it). As a result, evidentiality is expressed in *degrees* of reliability, which, as we have repeatedly seen, is characteristic of expressions of evaluation. ‘Evidentiality’ is manifested through many of the same linguistic devices that Lemke (and Halliday) identify as sources of evaluation, including modal auxiliaries, adverbs, projecting predicators, etc.

emphasized by the author's decision to provide justification (in the form of an observation about man's capacity to affect nature). This is a paradigm example of what Winter (1986) calls the Hypothetical-Real structure. The first clause expresses a proposition that is construed as a mere hypothesis. It is explicitly signalled as such by "skeptical". The subsequent clause presents the Real, an evaluative proposition construed as the true situation.

3.1.1.1 Attitudinal Inscription

White (2003) expresses less interest in what is referred to as 'inscribed attitude' in appraisal theory; that is, overt expressions of affect, judgement or appreciation. As he points out, the overt inscription of attitudinal orientation is uncommon in journalistic discourse and, when it occurs, is generally sourced or attributed to others.¹³² Consider the following headlines:

1. "Actress Jennifer Garner Confesses Climate Change Makes her Cry"
2. "SUPREME COURT RULES: 'CLIMATE CHANGE IS SERIOUS'"
3. Lloyd's of London: Climate change 'fact, not hypothesis'"

Each of the above presents an inscribed appraisal of climate change. The first offers an expression of Affect (Insecurity/Unhappiness), the second an expression of Appreciation (Valuation), and the third of Judgement (Veracity).

¹³² White (2003) finds only two examples of attitudinal inscription in the texts he analyzes: 'extremist' and 'strong-arm tactics'. It is of interest to note that he made recourse to the Bank of English, with its 450 million-word corpus, to confirm the polarity of the assessments. Of the 432 instances of 'extremist' that he examined in the corpus, all were associated with negative meanings, as were all but 5 of the 95 examples of 'strong-arm tactics' (the others being sports related). This shows that the polarity of an assessment may be determined with some confidence by making reference to a lexical corpus, if only as a last resort, as a demonstration that a given word or phrase carries a particular evaluation.

White (2006b) points out that despite the relative infrequency of explicitly attitudinal inscriptions, their assessment may (to use Lemke's term) 'propagate' throughout the text. White concludes from his own study of the *Guardian*: "while there was only the one explicitly attitudinal inscription in the *Guardian* extract, it played a crucial role in establishing the terms by which the potentially more open attitudinal tokens were to be interpreted" (48). Gruber (1993) observes something similar in terms of the directness of evaluation. He finds that on the textual level, 'Direct Evaluative Utterances' (DEUs) often only appear in the lead sentence of a report, while the main body of the text employs Reported Evaluative Utterances offers (REUs), which serve to substantiate or legitimize the direct evaluation. Thus, on a textual level, such utterances constitute an implicit evaluative argument framed by the introductory sentence.

The latter point is important for cases where the language is less overtly evaluative, as is likely when the author strives to maintain a footing of objectivity. Rather than using purely attitudinal lexis (like 'disgraceful', 'menacing' and 'heroic'), she may employ language that simultaneously performs an experiential (i.e. ideational) and interpersonal function.¹³³ Hunston (2000) gives a good example of an ostensibly 'factual' presentation of events that is strongly evaluated for negative desirability by provocative lexis: "Energy World was recently *invaded* by police without warning at seven one morning. Exits were *sealed*, and all the computer files were *commandeered*; Mr. Barnett's private quarters were *ransacked*" (188; emphasis my own).¹³⁴ Consider also the following headline:

"Spy cams target 'envirocriminals'".

In less explicitly evaluative terms, this seems to be the equivalent of something like, 'Polluters to be monitored by camera' or 'Cameras to be used to monitor polluters'. But instead of 'camera', the author chose the phrase '*spy* cams', which carries an added sense

¹³³ 'Experiential' meaning, as it is applied in SFL, is a sub-category (along with 'logical' meaning) under the broader umbrella of ideational meanings.

¹³⁴ We find similarly provocative lexis in the following headline from the drudge Report: "'WARMING' PLAN IN DENVER: CRACKDOWN ON RESIDENTS".

of underhandedness and impropriety. The cameras, moreover, are represented not simply as ‘monitoring’ an activity but actively ‘targeting’ a certain group. Finally, the targeted group is not identified by any specific behaviours (for instance, ‘people who pollute our air and water’), but by the menacing, almost Orwellian, nominalization, ‘envirocriminal’. The scare quotes complete the evaluation by not only distancing the author from the characterization, but by actually highlighting its inappropriateness.¹³⁵

The implied assessment conveyed by these linguistic choices may be sufficiently discreet to avoid notice, though it is possible for the evaluative positioning to be demonstrated statistically through an analysis of the historical associations of the words chosen (as revealed in a corpus like the Bank of English).¹³⁶ However, even corpus-based analyses are unequipped to identify attitudinal effects that are carried not by the individual words themselves but by larger segments like phrases and syntagms; that is, prosodically, through co-text (or even inter-text). Here we have moved away from attitudinal inscription toward attitudinal betokening.

3.1.1.2 Attitudinal Betokening

The more overt of the two forms of attitudinal tokens are referred to in appraisal theory as ‘attitudinal provocations’. As White describes it: “the author’s subjective presence is clearly made salient in some way, with this subjectivity capable of being seen as directing

¹³⁵ Trask (1997) observes:

Scare quotes are quotation marks placed around a word or phrase from which you, the writer, wish to distance yourself because you consider that word or phrase to be odd or inappropriate for some reason. Possibly you regard it as too colloquial for formal writing; possibly you think it’s unfamiliar or mysterious; possibly you consider it to be inaccurate or misleading; possibly you believe it’s just plain wrong. Quite often scare quotes are used to express irony or sarcasm
[\[http://www.informatics.sussex.ac.uk/departments/docs/punctuation/node31.html\]](http://www.informatics.sussex.ac.uk/departments/docs/punctuation/node31.html).

¹³⁶ As Channell (2000) argues, some words carry a negative polarity that “does not appear to be open to conscious introspection” (45). But the evaluation exists nevertheless, and can be revealed statistically through a corpus-based analysis of how various terms collocate in actual use. In other words, it may not simply be the context of the proposition that carries along the negative evaluation, but also the much broader context of the socially established use of the word at its most basic level.

the reader towards a particular attitudinal assessment, but where, nevertheless, there are no terms which, of themselves, carry a positive or negative value" (48). The attitudinal positioning is therefore somewhat open, relying on socially and culturally informed associations. Where these are absent, an alternative reading may follow. As Martin observes, the metaphor is a characteristic example of an attitudinal token. In the text White looks at, there is the expression, "baying for the Prime Minister's blood" that gives a sense of how the author can 'provoke' an evaluative response from the reader, in this case by associating the protestors with hungry wolves. In the Drudge Report, we see a similar example: "DiCaprio bites back over eco-hypocrisy charge: 'I try to travel commercial as much as I can'". In this headline, Leonardo DiCaprio's speech act is construed, metaphorically, as 'biting back', a potentially menacing representation that contrasts, to ironic effect, with the represented content of his speech.¹³⁷ This is an example of what Gruber (1993) calls an 'Explicitly speaker-evaluating REU', the second of three sub-types he identifies.¹³⁸

Attitudinal provocation may also be realized through what the Appraisal System distinguishes as 'force' (under the heading, 'graduation'). White offers as an example the headline, "Mega-rich reap child benefit", where the terms 'mega-rich' and 'reap' (which do not carry any stable evaluative meanings on their own) nevertheless 'increase the volume' of the utterance. As White explains, "While the headline is no more overtly positive or negative than the lead sentence is [sic] precedes,¹³⁹ the heightened volume nonetheless clearly has the potential to signal that something attitudinal is at stake" (57). Consider the following example:

"TED TURNER: Global Warming is 'single greatest challenge that humanity has ever faced'"

¹³⁷ As the point of the example is to offer an instance of metaphor, I will not attempt to justify the interpretation of the content as ironic. Irony is discussed in detail elsewhere.

¹³⁸ In Gruber's own examples of sub-type 2 REUs, the speech acts are represented by the metaphors: "pounce upon" and "threw".

¹³⁹ The lead sentence declares: "Thirty-one millionaire families in Australia receive the government payment designed to give extra help to single-income families".

Here we see the claim, attributed to Ted Turner, that global warming presents an unprecedented challenge. Notice, however, how the force of the proposition is magnified by the use of ‘single’ and ‘ever’, which work prosodically to bolster the evaluation of ‘Importance’ or ‘Seriousness’.

In addition to the lexico-grammatical and prosodic realizations of Force, we can see, for instance in the Drudge Report, how different visual cues may be employed. One of the most common such techniques is the use of full caps. For example: “WASTE NOT! ‘08 Dem Candidates Private Jet to Debate: ‘No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions’”. In a later version of this headline, the volume is increased: “WASTE NOT! ALL DEMS TOOK PRIVATE JETS: ‘No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions’”. Another headline is almost entirely volume: “THE WARMING, THE CHAOS”. In a similar vein, the force of a headline may be increased by displaying it in an unexpected colour, for instance red.¹⁴⁰ In this way the reader’s attention is drawn to “Ex-Canadian defense minister: UFO science key to halting climate change” and “NY TIMES PLANS HIT ON GORE: CALL TO COOL THE HYPE”. As we see in the first example, “WASTE NOT!...”, force may also be expressed through the use of exclamation marks. And when none of the above convey sufficient force, one may turn to the use of visual images or even (as the Drudge Report has on rare occasion) a flashing siren, which actually accompanied the headline “U.S. WINTER TEMPS NEAR AVERAGE” and “Winter Warmest on Record Worldwide”.¹⁴¹

3.2 The Modified System

A number of changes were made to the Appraisal System in response to the insights offered in the literature. The main sub-systems affected were those of Engagement and

¹⁴⁰ Drudge has also displayed headlines in blue to highlight certain ‘cold’ events.

¹⁴¹ It is perhaps noteworthy that the headline declaring “Winter Warmest on Record Worldwide” was followed only two minutes later by the louder headline, “U.S. WINTER TEMPS NEAR AVERAGE”, which was posted above it, at the top of the page, with a flashing siren.

Attitude. Changes to the system of Engagement are described first, followed by a discussion of the changes to the system of Attitude.

As suggested earlier, it was found that White's interesting and useful distinction between dialogically expansive and contractive utterances in the Engagement system was being undermined by the assumption that Attributions were always dialogically expansive (or, on the contrary, that Proclamations and Disclamations were necessarily less expansive). In response, Attribution has been set out in the modified framework as a separate system of choices available for the expression of either dialogically expansive or contractive utterances. Moreover, the scope of the term 'Attribution' has been expanded and the system augmented significantly. Following Hunston (2000), 'attribution' has been distinguished from 'source' so that even ostensibly 'unattributed' claims now find a place.

The biggest difference is the designation of 'Self' as a major sub-category of Attribution. This follows directly from Hunston's example. What White (2003) sets out under Dialogic Contraction has been distributed under the broadened heading of Attribution. Proclamations and Disclamations are represented as a separate system of choices, while the sub-categories of Concurrence, Endorsement and Pronouncement have been absorbed into what, following Hunston, are called Hidden, Reclaimed and Emphasized Attributions respectively. Likewise, White's distinction between 'Acknowledging' and 'Distancing' has been absorbed into the modified framework as 'Reclaimed' and 'Delegated' attributions respectively. In addition, a sub-system has been added, following Gruber, to address the choice of 'target' in the evaluation, either the 3rd person or the Speaker. Speaker Evaluating utterances are further distinguished as either Explicit or Implicit. And though Gruber did not address it in his own framework, 3rd person Evaluating utterances are distinguished according to whether they are to be taken as Sincere or Ironic.

Figure 9. The Modified System of Heteroglossic Engagement

Within the system of Attitude, ‘Affect’ and ‘Appreciation’ were not modified.¹⁴²

‘Judgement’, however, was adapted in some crucial respects. Lemke’s semantic dimensions were preferred over Martin’s in a number of places. Normality was revised to ‘Expectability/Normality’ (to capture the sense of probability or likelihood)¹⁴³; Tenacity was replaced with ‘Desirability/Inclination’ (which better expresses the nature of the category); and ‘Importance/Significance’ was added outright (as the judgement signalled, for instance, by the use of Graduation).¹⁴⁴ ‘Comprehensibility/Obviousness’ and ‘Humorousness/Seriousness’, however, were not included, as they seemed to be less categories of ‘Judgement’ than of ‘Appreciation’, expressing, first instance, the ‘Quality’ of the proposition (though the case could also be made for interpreting them as expressions of ‘Affect’). In any event, even Lemke considers these latter dimensions (particularly ‘Humorousness/Seriousness’) marginal. Of the 416 distinct evaluations identified in his study, only six related to Comprehensibility (1.4%) and none to Seriousness, while nearly half—199 of the 418—addressed Desirability/Inclination (Lemke 5.0).

Lemke’s approach points to another issue considered worthy of addressing in the appraisal system. He writes: “*A single lexical item may also realize the conflation of two or more evaluations*” (Lemke, 4.0, emphasis in original). He offers ‘miraculous’ and ‘alarming’ as examples: ‘miraculous’ evaluates its carrier as both Unusual and Desirable, while ‘alarming’ evaluates it as Unusual and Undesirable. Here we return to the issue of *ethos* introduced early on in the discussion. We saw that Aristotle’s notion of rhetoric took account of the speaker’s character along three dimensions: wisdom, virtue and

¹⁴² Except for the explicit reclassification of Importance/Significance from Appreciation to Judgement.

¹⁴³ “Warrantability”, a co-heading, along with “Probability” in Lemke’s framework is included in this category as well, in the sense that a warrantable source or proposition is one for which there is an “Expectability” of Veracity.

¹⁴⁴ Martin treats this as a category of Appreciation, in the sense, perhaps, of one appreciating the significance or importance of a great work of art. But in a claim like, “SURPEME COURT RULES: ‘CLIMATE CHANGE IS SERIOUS’”, the evaluation seems to have more in common with Judgements of Veracity or even Propriety than it does with Quality. It is not about the qualities of something, or even its impact, but about how the impact is to be received. It is thus treated here as a Judgement.

goodwill. None of these, however, are explicitly addressed by Martin or Lemke or the others who have contributed to the Appraisal System. This is not because the Appraisal System has no place for them. Rather, they are like those lexical items that conflate the different categories of evaluation.

Wisdom is first and foremost a judgement of truth—of Veracity. This is its social sanction. But the judgement of wisdom carries something besides the mere likelihood that a speaker's claim may be true. There is also an issue of social esteem: wisdom is, perhaps equally, a judgement of Desirability or Inclination ('Wise decision'). It is, as well, a judgement of ability or Capacity ('Wise enough'). It is also arguably a (negative) judgement of Normality or expectability, in that the 'wise' decision is relatively unusual.¹⁴⁵ It is in this sense also something remarkable ("Importance/Significance"). In short, Wisdom conflates Social Esteem with Veracity. But note that Wisdom does not carry a judgement of propriety: one has no strict obligation to behave wisely.

Virtue, on the other hand, does carry a Judgement of Normativity or Appropriateness—Propriety—though it does not carry an evaluation of Veracity. Again, however, it is not simply an evaluation of one's obligations.¹⁴⁶ Like Wisdom, the Social Sanction is accompanied by judgements of Social Esteem, as Virtue is simultaneously a judgement of Desirability or Inclination (Tenacity) and also, again like Wisdom, of Capacity and (negative) Normality. And, again like the former, it is also something remarkable ("Importance/Significance").

Goodwill is the most difficult of the character judgements to define, for it conflates all the various categories of Judgement. For instance, it seems to contain both categories of Social Sanction. An individual who lacks Goodwill toward another is liable to deception.

¹⁴⁵ One is not deemed wise for having the sense to refrain from sticking a hand in a fire, though the same person would be judged unwise were he or she to stick a hand *in*.

¹⁴⁶ One may have an obligation to drive on the right side of the road in North America, but this is not desirable in and of itself—it is not a matter of virtue. In some cultures, by contrast, it is appropriate to refrain from the consumption of alcohol and this, furthermore, carries a judgement of one's Tenacity (here, Martin's term is exceptionally fitting) and other judgements along the dimension of Social Esteem.

This is why Aristotle believed a sense of Goodwill was important for one who hoped to be persuasive. A Judgement of Goodwill thus contains an evaluation of Veracity. It is true that someone with Goodwill may also have reason to engage in deception, hence the notion of a ‘white lie’: one may feel compelled to mislead out of a (possibly misplaced) sense of Propriety. Nevertheless such a deception is pursued as part of a ‘deeper truth’, and one is not considered unreliable or mendacious as result. The same cannot be said for one who lacks Goodwill. He must deceive because he cannot openly acknowledge his ill will: his actions carry a sense of Impropropriety. At the same time, like Wisdom and Virtue, Goodwill also carries judgements of Social Esteem. It carries an implicit evaluation of Desirability and Capacity. However, unlike Wisdom and Virtue, it is not considered Unusual (negative Normality) or Significant. On the contrary, for most people ill will is likely to be considered the more Unusual and more Significant Judgement.

Figure 10. The Modified System of Judgement

In the following section, the modified Appraisal System is brought to bear on a selection of headlines from the Drudge Report in order to identify the possible Judgements made in the presentation of the news about climate change.

4. Analysis of the Drudge Report's Discourse on Climate Change

4.1 Methodology

4.1.1 Data Selection

In light of the vast number of headlines addressing global warming during the period under examination (approx. 850 separate items), a selection was made for the appraisal analysis. As the results of the analysis were to be generalized for the discourse as a whole, the first requirement was that the method of selection yield a representative sample of the discourse. This condition could be met in principle by taking the headlines from the original (chronological) list at regular, predetermined intervals, for instance, by selecting every fifth or tenth headline.¹⁴⁷ But while such a method would provide a random, objective, sample, it could not ensure that the most interesting or telling examples from the discourse would be included.

A better method would combine a random selection within the constraints of a sub-discourse or text-type of particular relevance or interest. This could be met in part by sampling headlines from a limited number of discourse categories (as opposed to the original chronological list); for instance, headlines related to the averred causes and effects of climate change, or headlines in which claims are attributed to unidentified sources. But there is a risk here of introducing the very sort of bias that the random sampling was intended to avoid.

In the end, a method was settled on that exploited a fortuitous feature of the original data, which included not only the headlines for each news item, dated and time stamped, but every variation of a headline modified after its original posting.¹⁴⁸ As only a fraction of

¹⁴⁷ The assumption, of course, is that a 'random' selection would produce a 'representative' sample.

¹⁴⁸ It also included, less usefully, a repetition of the unaltered headline, dated and stamped for each update made to the story itself.

the headlines were ever modified in this way, they formed a relatively small subset that could be identified without risk of bias while nevertheless representing more than a mere random collection. It is a fundamental assumption of Systemic Functional linguistics that every language choice is made with a purpose, hence its designation as a 'functional' linguistics. Normally, we can only see the choices made, and must infer that certain other options were intentionally (if perhaps unconsciously) rejected. But the modified headlines open a window onto the choices that were made and then rejected, offering potentially valuable insight into the function of the language ultimately chosen. Moreover, we may take it, in general, that headlines 'tweaked' for particular rhetorical effect are likely to be more central to the author's discursive intentions than those for which no such efforts were deemed necessary.

With this as the rationale, the headlines were selected for analysis according to the following methodology. The original list was examined for headlines in which there was a repetition of the processes, participants or circumstances from another headline posted within 24 hours. These were highlighted in green and then copied and pasted, along with their date and time information, into a new list. Headlines that reappeared without any alteration were highlighted in yellow for probable deletion.¹⁴⁹

The field codes for the entire list were then toggled, revealing the internet address of the story linked to each headline.¹⁵⁰ Where two or more addresses highlighted in yellow were found to be identical, all but one were deleted (as confirmed repetitions). If the remaining yellow-highlighted address failed to match a green one, it was deleted as an unmodified headline. When two or more addresses highlighted in green were found to be identical, the items were grouped and numbered as a set of modified headlines. This selection process resulted in a set of 89 items, each containing between 2 and 5 variations of a single headline.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁹ This frequently occurred when only the story itself was updated.

¹⁵⁰ Each headline is hyperlinked to the news item it addresses.

¹⁵¹ See Appendix A for a chronological list of the sample items.

Due to the prosodic nature of many expressions of evaluation, it was not considered appropriate to pre-select a particular category of evaluative resources (say, Reclaimed Attributions or Attitudinal Inscriptions) as the focus of the analysis. Instead, each headline was examined for the features that could be discerned in light of the insights offered in the literature, and classified according to the options described in the modified framework. These features include evaluative inscriptions and tokens, nominalizations, graduation resources, clausal relations (including ironic constructions), choices of agency and affectedness, attribution, etc.¹⁵²

4.1.2 Data Analysis

Each headline was examined specifically for expressions of Judgement in up to four progressively broader frames: (1) the immediate context of the individual headline (in light of the various modifications); (2) the surrounding co-text (as represented by the accompanying items in the sample set); (3) the broader inter-text (as represented by the headlines excluded from the sample); and (4) the ideological/meta-communicative knowledge brought to the text by the reader. In addition, following Macken-Horarik's direction, a final frame was employed: (5) the 'contratext' of appraisal values that go "against the grain" of readings from the other frames.

The sample items were initially arranged and examined in chronological order. But when an evaluation was seen to be informed to a large extent by co-textual claims (i.e., by other items from the sample set) or when a number of co-textual items exhibited a markedly

¹⁵² The very first word of item #1 illustrates the challenges we face in identifying and classifying the evaluative function of different linguistic choices. The final version of the headline reads: "NOW... IT'S SNOW IN MALIBU!" While no dictionary or framework can tell us how "now" is being used here, if we are committed to the functional view of language, we must assume the word serves *some* function (if not necessarily an evaluative one). All we can do is tell a story about how the word appears to contribute to the interpersonal meanings conveyed. If our interpretation proves to be consistent with the rest of the proposition, and with its co-text and inter-text, and with our meta-textual knowledge of the topic and participants, then we have done the best we can, and it is up to anyone who disagrees to offer a more persuasive reading.

similar use of appraisal resources, the latter items were brought forward (and in some cases analysed simultaneously with the earlier set) in order to highlight the shared features and avoid unnecessary repetition.¹⁵³

Likewise when an evaluation was seen to be informed by, or to make markedly similar use of, evaluations left out of the sample set altogether; these ‘inter-textual’ items were identified and discussed alongside the headline being analysed. While they were not added to the sample set, their contributions to the semantic meanings conveyed by the sample items were acknowledged. Whenever possible, such ‘inter-textual’ clues were preferred over the (less certain) contributions made by the ideological/meta-textual knowledge of the reader.

The final ‘contra-textual’ frame was employed only when the evaluation depended on a crucial ‘keystone’ value. In such cases, it was hoped that going ‘against the grain’ of the initial analysis would help bring out the various inconsistencies of an alternative reading and thus support the interpretations offered in the analysis. However, where a particular reading depended on the ideological/meta-textual knowledge of the reader and was not otherwise signalled by the features of the item itself, it was rejected as insufficiently certain and not acknowledged.¹⁵⁴ The analyses are presented in section 4.2.

¹⁵³ Thus, for instance, item #2, which uses the phrase “global warming hype”, is followed by item #35, which evaluates Al Gore’s position as “hype”, and then item #50, which identifies Gore himself as a “gross alarmist”. Each item, however, was analysed individually. On the other hand, item #12, which deals with the controversy over sceptical climatologists, is followed by items #18 and #28, which were deemed so closely related that a shared analysis was preferable.

¹⁵⁴ Consider, for instance, item #88: “PREDICTION: Cities will sizzle, Mediterranean wilt from global warming”. The very notion of ‘forecasting’ or ‘predicting’ (emphasised in this item) is evaluated negatively in a number of other headlines. Moreover, the discourse is consistently sceptical of the sort of outcomes described here. So there is reason to read a very subtle irony in this headline, and thus a negative evaluation of the Expectability of the claims it makes. But while this is perhaps the correct reading, there is a danger that we have moved too far from the text itself for the analysis to be persuasive. And since such ambiguous cases are relatively uncommon, there is little need to force the interpretation. In this case, the evaluation of the Significance and negative Desirability of global warming were noted, but not the negative evaluation of Expectability.

The analyses were then summarized in terms of the 'main' or overarching Judgment (or Judgements) conveyed by the headline, each one noting the polarity of the evaluation (though not the degree of Force), the dimension of the Judgment (Desirability, Significance, etc), and the target of the evaluation (global warming, climate change scepticism, etc). The summary appears at the end of each analysis.

After tabulating the results by item # (see Appendix B, below), the data was resorted, first according to polarity, then according to the category of Judgment, and finally according to the target of the Judgment. Polarity was examined first. The positive evaluations were analysed, first for the relative frequency of the various categories of Judgment, then for the target of each type of Judgment; the negative evaluations were examined in the same way. Next, each category of Judgment was analysed, first for the relative frequency of the various targets of the Judgment and then for polarity. Finally, each category of target was analysed, first for the relative frequency of the various Judgments made, and then for the polarity. The results are presented in section 4.3 and discussed in section 4.4.

4.2 Analysis

#1-01/18

00:17:45 NOW IT IS SNOW IN MALIBU [main headline] [with image of snowy palm trees]

15:21:54 NOW... IT'S SNOW IN MALIBU!

“Now” is employed in item #1 as a Graduation resource, positioning the reported event as the latest in a series of unusual incidents—‘First X, Now Y’. Along with the uppercase font and (in the modified version) the exclamation mark, it increases the Force of the (negative) evaluation of the Normality of the event. The evaluation of Normality is echoed visually by the unusual image of palm trees covered with snow. The use of ellipses in the modified version adds a dramatic pause, reinforcing the role of ‘now’ as an amplifying device.

The earlier event in the implied series is presumably the cold snap that hit California that same week. The forecast was reported a few days earlier: “Record cold, snow forecast for Los Angeles area”, and then the aftermath: “Cold Ruins Nearly \$1B of Calif. Citrus; Schwarzenegger Seeks Disaster Aid”. The day of the report on the snow in Malibu, there was also a headline forcefully broadcasting congressional plans to convene a House panel on climate change, with the headline “PELOSI ANNOUNCES ‘GLOBAL WARMING’ PANEL” directly beneath an image of frozen citrus fruit. A few days later, more unusual weather was reported: “Rare Snow Storm Surprises Arizona”, prompting the dialogically contractive rhetorical question (keyed by an image of a couple walking in front of a snowy capitol), “Have scientists oversold global warming?” Item #1 is thus part of a series of headlines expressing a negative evaluation of the Veracity of global warming claims.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#2-01/19

03:34:17 ABC TV Meteorologist Claims He Does Not Know A Single Weatherman Who Believes ‘Man-Made Global Warming Hype’...

04:32:49 ABC-TV Meteorologist: I Don’t Know A Single Weatherman Who Believes ‘Man-Made Global Warming Hype’...

This headline presents three different voices or sources: the ‘Meteorologist’, the ‘Weathermen’, and the ‘nameless voice’ to which they are responding. The nameless voice is constructed as proposing ‘man-made global warming hype’. This is an explicit, Speaker Evaluating Attribution, which achieves its effect by inscribing a negative evaluation of the Veracity and Importance (“hype”) of global warming affirmations.¹⁵⁵ This is enhanced by attributing scepticism to the (inherently warrantable) Weathermen (who are in turn evaluated positively for their Capacity to resist the ‘hype’). ‘Single’ is used as a Graduation resource, increasing the Force of the evaluation of the Normality of the Weathermen’s sceptical stance. The modified version replaces ‘claims’ (a Delegated Attribution) and the awkward paraphrase of the main proposition with an attribution to the Meteorologist that expresses less distance. On one level, the attribution (to an inherently warrantable source) enhances the evaluation of Veracity (of the main proposition). But on another, the proposition itself offers Justification for the Meteorologist’s own implied position (sceptical). In combination, these voices convey a negative evaluation of the global warming position, and a positive evaluation of the sceptical Meteorologist and other Weathermen (and thus the sceptical position in general).

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#35-03/13

NY TIMES PLANS HIT ON GORE, NEWSROOM SOURCES TELL DRUDGE:

‘Scientists argue that Gore’s warnings are full of exaggerated claims and startling errors’... Reporter William Broad filing the story, ‘A CALL TO COOL THE HYPE’... Developing...

00:47:20 NY TIMES PLANS HIT ON GORE: CALL TO COOL THE HYPE’... [in red]

00:49:22 NY TIMES PLANS HIT ON GORE: ‘CALL TO COOL THE HYPE’... [in red]

04:41:25 NY TIMES HIT ON GORE: ‘A CALL TO COOL THE HYPE’... [in red]

In item #35, we again see a complicated tangle of voices and appraisals, and a characterization of global warming as “hype”. At bottom is a nominalization of global warming claims attributed to Al Gore (“Gore’s warnings”). The nominalized entity is evaluated negatively for Veracity and Propriety and even Affect (“startling”) through a

¹⁵⁵ This nominalization is reprised in item #35.

pair of Attitudinal Inscriptions (“Exaggerated claims”, “errors”) with enhanced Force (“full”). It is further condensed into “hype”, which inscribes a negative evaluation for both Veracity and Importance. The proposition in which this is expressed is an attribution to “scientists”, contributing a positive evaluation of its Warrantability. The Impact of the claim is evaluated negatively (“hit”) while its Warrantability and Significance are evaluated positively through association with the New York Times and “Reporter William Broad”. The use of full caps (and in later headlines, a red font) increases the Force of the evaluation of Significance. Finally, the Veracity of the bulletin (which is about a projected and therefore inherently uncertain event) is evaluated positively for Warrantability through its attribution to “newsroom sources”. In subsequent headlines, the overt, Attitudinal Inscriptions attributed to the scientists are removed, leaving “hype” to evaluate Gore and his position, “hit” to evaluate the Impact, attribution to the New York Times to evaluate the Warrantability (and Significance) of the report, and the graduation resources to amplify the evaluation of Significance.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming); negative evaluation of Goodwill (Al Gore)

#50-04/07

07:03:09 Forecaster Blasts Gore on Global Warming...

07:04:54 Top Forecaster Blasts Gore on Global Warming...

07:23:19 Top Forecaster Blasts Gore on Global Warming; ‘a gross alarmist’...

In item #50 “forecaster” is appropriated by the sceptical voice. “Blasts” is a negative affect attitudinal token, which provokes the impression of a loud, damaging attack. It is apparent from the first revision, made almost immediately after the original posting, that “forecaster” is evaluated positively, with “top” acting as a Graduation resource to enhance Warrantability. The final version adds a high affect attitudinal inscription in the form of the epithet, “gross alarmist”. In combination, these elements express a strongly negative evaluation of the Veracity of Al Gore’s claims and the Propriety of his actions.

Summary: negative evaluation of Goodwill (Al Gore); negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming)

#3-01/19

04:08:37 Weather forecasters do battle...

04:32:49 Forecasters do battle...

Item #2 (above) is part of a larger discourse presented in a series of headlines over three consecutive days. It began on January 18, with the headline: “WEATHER CHANNEL Climate Expert Calls for Decertifying Global Warming Skeptics”.¹⁵⁶ Item #2, posted the following day, was the first response to the controversy to be reported. Item #3 was the second, posted very shortly after. It represents the opposing voices as actively engaged in a contentious “battle”. This constructs both sides as organized forces and invites an evaluation of Weather Forecasters as having the Capacity (and tenacity) to fight. This conveys a negative evaluation of the Veracity of claims of scientific consensus on global warming. The subsequent elision of ‘weather’ from the headline suggests the battle is not among the meteorologists themselves but among climate “forecasters” in general.

Another headline, posted later that day, uses a non-sourced attribution in which the Weather Channel’s position is nominalized as a “con job” to inscribe a negative evaluation of both the Veracity of its claims and the Propriety of its actions (““Con job at The Weather Channel”). This invites the opposite appraisal of its dialogic opponents, the meteorologists. Day 3, January 19, brought a recap: “STORM: TV meteorologist disputes human role in global warming”. Here, “STORM” evaluates the Significance and Impact of the dispute. While no other evaluations are immediately evident, the participants have become part of discourse formations already evaluated in earlier reports on the dispute.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (climate change consensus).

#12-02/01

14:11:10 Storm Brews Over Climatologist’s Skeptical Global Warming Views...

23:30:13 Storm Brews Over Climatologist’s Skeptical Views...

Item #12 reprises the theme of a “storm” first introduced in item #3. This is a witty nominalization of the response taken to the climatologist’s sceptical position, expressing a negative Reaction (Impact). As a group, climatologists offer an inherently warrantable

¹⁵⁶ The “sceptics” in this case were certified meteorologists; hence the call for “decertification”.

voice on climate change. If the climatologist in this example is aligned with his peers,¹⁵⁷ then their collective opinions (nominalized as “sceptical global warming views”) are evaluated positively for Veracity, and the storm of opposition (i.e., from global warming proponents) are evaluated negatively. As in item #3, claims of consensus on climate change are implicitly evaluated as negative for Veracity. In addition, the phrase ‘global warming’ has been elided from the modified headline. This changes the emphasis from the particularity of the climatologist’s views to the broader fact that he is dissenting. As it is dissent itself that is being evaluated, the dispute is constructed as matter of liberty—the right to hold and express a contrary opinion.¹⁵⁸ The strong reaction to the climatologist’s position (“storm”) thus offers a negative evaluation of the Propriety of the opponent’s response. This theme is reprised in item #18 and item #28.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (climate change consensus); negative evaluation of Virtue (global warming advocates)

#18-02/07

04:49:26 Governor Planning To Fire Oregon Climatologist for Taking Skeptical View of Global Warming...

04:51:27 Governor Planning To Fire Oregon Climatologist for Taking Skeptical View of Warming... [top]

#28-02/24

03:49:39 Delaware Governor Rebukes State Climatologist Skeptical of Global Warming...

14:47:21 Delaware Governor Rebukes Skeptical State Climatologist...

Item #18 and item #28 return to the issues introduced in item #12. Here, however, the specific reactions to the climatologists’ scepticism are represented. In one, the climatologist is threatened with removal from his post, and in the other, he has been “rebuked”. As before, the emphasis is shifted away from ‘global warming’ in later revisions. In the latter headline, the climatologist’s position is condensed into an epithet modifying the individual himself. He is thus represented as being punished merely for

¹⁵⁷ And indeed, virtually every reference to ‘climatologist’ and ‘meteorologist’ in the discourse positions them as sceptical.

¹⁵⁸ We see something similar in the headline: “Climate change skeptics say it’s hard to get heard” and “BOSTON GLOBE’s Ellen Goodman: Global warming deniers are like Holocaust deniers”.

being sceptical, while the Oregon Climatologist is punished for having a sceptical opinion.¹⁵⁹ As in item #12, the dispute is thus construed as matter of freedom—of belief and expression.

Note also the pattern of agency and affectedness. The affected are official government scientists, and thus highly warrantable experts with a mandate to advise the State on climate policy. The agents are political figures (Democrats) with no obvious credentials in climate science. These headlines are thus deeply ironic. In each, a political figure is seen punishing a scientist for taking a position on a topic for which he, the scientist, is clearly the greater expert, and whose official role, moreover, is to offer his expert opinion. An earlier headline from the Weather Channel dispute presages the evaluations here: “WEATHER CHANNEL EXPERT LAMENTS ‘VERY POLITICAL CLIMATE’”.¹⁶⁰ Here, the ‘Weather channel expert’ is represented as acknowledging the political nature of the dispute. But items #18 and #28 appropriate this claim and turn it against global warming proponents. The result is a negative evaluation of the Propriety of the Governors’ actions and, by extension, a positive evaluation of the tenacity of the climatologists who jeopardise their careers by resisting the political pressure to conform.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁹ Item #28 is presaged in a headline posted as a top story on the day item #18 appeared: “Delaware scientist’s contrarian stand criticized”. Its significance is further emphasised by the use of a red font.

¹⁶⁰ The construal of global warming claims as a political issue is taken up in other headlines, too: “Climate scientist skeptical of global cooling fears in 1970’s, calls current warming scare ‘massively political’”. Notice here that while the overt evaluation (“massively political”) is attributed to the climate scientist, the scientist’s evaluation merely confirms the implicit evaluation already conveyed by the nominalization of global warming claims in a negative affect inscription (“scare”) that has not been delegated to the scientist, but remains the responsibility of the author.

¹⁶¹ A contratextual reading reinforces the view that the above are ironic, implicitly speaker evaluating propositions. To read item #28, for instance, as a positive evaluation of the Propriety of the Governor’s actions would construe the scientist as deserving of punishment. But the only apparent Justification for such an evaluation is the scientist’s scepticism, and this begs the question of whether climate change scepticism warrants punishment. No voices are represented as making such a case. But there are voices represented throughout the discourse that make the opposite case by negatively evaluating the Veracity and Propriety of global warming advocacy. The contratextual reading is therefore unpersuasive.

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue (global warming advocates).

#4-01/30

13:20:12 GLOBAL WARNING: 'BILLIONS TO GO WATERLESS' IN CLIMATE SHOCK [top]

14:59:05 'BILLIONS TO GO WATERLESS' IN CLIMATE SHOCK... [image of parched earth]

Item #4 presents one of many global warming 'predictions' or 'forecasts' represented in the discourse. The events are nominalized in a negative affect inscription, "shock", the Force of which is enhanced by the use of full caps and the word, "billions", and the accompanying image of a parched landscape.¹⁶² This use of Affect and Graduation, along with Attitudinal Inscriptions, provoke a strongly negative evaluation of the projected events (Desirability) and a strongly positive evaluation of Significance. As we see in many of the headlines, explicit reference to "global warming" is removed from the modified version, shifting the emphasis away from the cause of the projected events to the prediction itself.¹⁶³ While global warming 'predictions' elsewhere are evaluated negatively for Expectability, this headline exhibits no clear signals of ironic intent.

Summary: negative evaluation of Desirability; positive evaluation of Significance (global warming).

#37-03/17

23:03:50 Environmental Guru Predicts Climate Doom: 'Billions of us will die and the few breeding pairs of people that survive will be in the Arctic'...

23:05:42 Environmental Guru Predicts Climate Doom: 'Billions of us will die; few breeding pairs of people that survive will be in Arctic'...

Item #37 is similar to item #4 in its use of Graduation ("billions") and Attitudinal Inscriptions ("doom", "die"). There is also a remarkable use of Attitudinal Tokens ("breeding pairs"). This provokes a strongly negative evaluation of Desirability and a

¹⁶² We see a similar use of negative affect/high volume inscribed evaluations in other reports on the IPCC predictions: "U.N. climate panel to project wrenching change", U.N. climate report will 'shock the world'", and "REPORT TO UNDERSCORE DANGERS OF GLOBAL WARMING".

¹⁶³ We see here the first hint of a pattern that becomes clearer in later headlines as other global warming predictions are reported: claims are magnified to such an extent that they begin to express negative evaluations of Expectability.

strongly positive evaluation of Significance.¹⁶⁴ Unlike item #4, the claim is attributed to an “Environmental Guru”—with its connotations of a ‘spiritual advisor’—rather than to a ‘doctor’ or ‘scientist’, or even (in light of his prominence) by name, James Lovelock.¹⁶⁵ As these latter choices would convey greater Warrantability, their absence suggests that an evaluation of positive Warrantability was not desired, and that the extreme predictions are implicitly speaker evaluating, which in turn invite negative evaluations of those who are aligned with the speaker (i.e. global warming proponents) and their cause.

Summary: negative evaluation of Desirability; positive evaluation of Significance (global warming); negative evaluation of Wisdom (global warming advocates); negative evaluation of Expectability (global warming predictions).

#5-01/30

13:30:17 GROUP: 10 years to save the planet... [top]

14:44:59 ALL-STAR GROUP: 10 years to save the planet... [top]

#74-05/15~05/16

23:43:26 ‘5 YEARS LEFT TO SAVE THE PLANET’: WWF...

08:00:17 ‘5 YEARS LEFT TO SAVE THE PLANET’: GROUP...

11:30:18 ‘5 YEARS LEFT TO SAVE THE PLANET’...

Items #5 and #74 offer two more examples of extreme propositions.¹⁶⁶ Item #5 was the top story of the day, presenting the claim that there are only ten years left to save the planet. The attribution in the first version is confusing, in that the reader’s attention is drawn to the source of the claim, which is nevertheless represented only cryptically, as

¹⁶⁴ A similar headline was posted a number of weeks earlier: “Environmental Guru Says Global Warming More Devastating Than Nuclear War”.

¹⁶⁵ Consider the evaluation of ‘spiritual’ or ‘religious’ propositions in other headlines: “Gore sees ‘spiritual crisis’ in warming”, “Czech President Says ‘Environmentalism is a Religion’”, “Catholic Cardinal Ridicules ‘Semi-Religious’ Belief in Global Warming”, “American Indians say ‘Earth Mother getting angry’ about global warming”, and also item #34 and #81 below.

¹⁶⁶ There are many other examples of negative affect/high volume inscribed evaluations of the effects of global warming: “VIDEO: John Edwards On Global Warming: ‘It’ll make world war look like heaven’”, “Crisis threatens the survival of our civilization”, “STUDY: World’s climate zones will vanish entirely by 2100”, “GLOBAL SWARMING: In a warmer world, insect population explosion may be ‘Biblical in nature’”, “DiCaprio warns humans face extinction from global warming”, etc.

“group”.¹⁶⁷ In the modified version, however, we are given a hint as to the evaluation of the group through the epithet “all-star”, which suggests a celebrity rather than scientific organization. As with item #37, the combination of extreme claim and unwarrantable source works to evaluate the proposition negatively for Expectability.

Item #74 is remarkably similar to item #5. Again, the proposition is amplified to the point of diminished Expectability, suggesting an implicitly speaker evaluating utterance. In the earliest version, the attribution to the WWF works to express a negative evaluation of that source in particular. This is broadened in the first revision (again) to the cryptic “group”, and finally left non-sourced and thus attributable to global warming proponents in general.

Summary: negative evaluation of Desirability; positive evaluation of Significance (global warming); negative evaluation of Expectability (global warming predictions).

#6-01/30

15:01:06 TOMORROW'S FORECAST: THE WARMING, THE CHAOS [main headline]

15:05:08 TOMORROW'S FORECAST: CHAOS

Item #6 is much like item #4. Here, however, the projected events have been nominalized in the form of an inscribed evaluation (“chaos”) amplified by the use of full caps and by the headline’s position as the top news item. This expresses something extremely Significant and Undersirable. But there is a hint of ironic humour in the play on the word, “forecast”, which invites a comparison between the UN’s predictions and a generic weather forecast (inviting the sceptical observation that scientists are unable even to forecast the weather more than a few days in advance).¹⁶⁸ This association, combined

¹⁶⁷ It is possible that “group” is being used here and in item #74 in an effort to associate the extreme prediction with the broader global warming coalition, including the IPCC. “GROUP” is similarly ambiguous in the first version of item #14, before being changed to “UN GROUP”.

¹⁶⁸ Compare the evaluation of the predictions implicit in following pair of headlines (which appeared within a few hours of each other, on June 19: “Greenpeace: 200 million global warming refugees by 2040”, and “The world will end in 2060, according to Newton”.

with the ironic structure of the proposition itself, evokes a negative evaluation of Expectability.¹⁶⁹

Summary: negative evaluation of Desirability; positive evaluation of Significance (global warming); negative evaluation of Expectability (global warming predictions).

#88-06/22

00:11:50 PREDICTION: Paris sizzles, Mediterranean wilts from global warming...

00:32:01 PREDICTION: Cities will sizzle, Mediterranean wilt from global warming...

Item #88 reports on another global warming prediction. Here, the claim is explicitly introduced by the word “prediction”, emphasised through the use of full caps. While there are no clear signals of ironic intent in this headline, global warming ‘predictions’ elsewhere have been evaluated negatively for Expectability.

Summary: negative evaluation of Desirability; positive evaluation of Significance (global warming).

#49-03/21

20:39:25 Forecaster sees active hurricane season... Experts universally -- and erroneously -- predicted 2006 would be busy year for storms...

20:57:34 Forecaster sees active hurricane season... Experts universally, and erroneously, predicted '06 would be busy year for storms...

Like item #6, item #49 treats the notion of a forecast ironically, in this case through two separate propositions. The first parallels item #6 perfectly. But this is followed by an unexpected shift in footing in which the second proposition negates the first.

“Universally” enhances the Force of both the “experts” (Normality) and their predictions (Expectability), while the structure of the clause enhances the Force of the embedded proposition that the experts were wrong (Veracity). The combination magnifies the negative evaluation of the “experts” (Capacity), which redounds onto the Warrantability of the forecaster and, by implication, his prediction (Expectability). These evaluations are

¹⁶⁹ Another headline reinforces this evaluation: “New climate research reveals far less alarming predictions of global warming”. Note how this sceptical proposition is expressed as a Reclaimed Attribution (“reveals”) to “new” climate research, and expresses none of the irony we see in climate change affirming propositions.

echoed in a subsequent headline posted two days later: “Hurricane Expert Disputes Storms’ Link To Global Warming”.¹⁷⁰

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom (forecasters); negative evaluation of Expectability (global warming predictions)

#13-02/01

21:27:11 UN: TEMPS ‘PROBABLY’ TO RISE OVER 7 DEGREES BY 2100...

23:01:58 UN: TEMPS PROBABLY TO RISE OVER 7 DEGREES BY 2100...

#14-02/01

23:30:13 GROUP: Humans ‘Very Likely’ Making Earth Warmer...

23:56:26 UN GROUP: Humans ‘Very Likely’ Making Earth Warmer...

The evaluations in Item #13 and item #14 do not result directly from the use of modals (“probably”, “very likely”), which are attributed to the UN, but from the Graduation resources used to emphasize modals and, in a sense, ‘reclaim’ them.

We can read these headlines in terms of the Hypothetical-Real structure, albeit with an implicit Hypothetical. However, the polarity of the evaluation offered by the Real depends on the ‘keystone’ value attached to the issue of uncertainty. This results in two different possible Hypotheticals: 1) that climate change is *not* the result of human activity; i.e., that it remains an open question; and 2) that climate change *is* the result of human activity; i.e., that it is a demonstrated fact.¹⁷¹

¹⁷⁰ Note the different uses of forecast here (item #6 and item #49) and earlier (item #3, item #35 and item #50). In the earlier discourse, forecasters are identified with the sceptical voice, whereas here they represent the voice of global warming proponents. This is an excellent example of the prosodic nature of evaluation. “Forecaster” is given different values in different contexts and these values impinge on the evaluations of the various propositions. “Forecaster” in the earlier discourse refers to meteorologists, who acknowledge the limits of their capacity to predict climate events. Indeed, this incapacity is consistent with (and in many cases no doubt informs) their opposition to those who claim they can predict the course and effects of climate change. In the latter headlines, by contrast, “forecaster” designates those who believe they *can* make predictions about global warming.

¹⁷¹ The Hypotheticals for item #14 would follow the same pattern.

If we read these headlines in terms of the first Hypothetical, then the quotes work to emphasise a positive evaluation of Expectability; which is to say, contrary to the sceptics, the odds are in favour of a human cause of global warming, which is the interpretation intended by the UN. But if we read these headlines in terms of the second Hypothetical, then the emphasis on modality (and thus incomplete certainty) serves to express a negative evaluation of the Expectability of the implicit Hypothetical.

Co-textual items (e.g., #5, #6, #37, #49, #74, etc.) support this latter reading. Indeed, familiarity with the IPCC report helps shed some light on these headlines, for nowhere in the report are the projections qualified by the word “probably”. Instead, there is a technical discussion of statistical “probabilities” and “probabilistic” projections and models, for which the weak term, “probably”, is inappropriate and misleading. A more accurate report would describe temperatures as ‘projected’ to rise. The modified headline corrects the misquote, but not the attribution or the misleading modal.

Summary: negative evaluation of Expectability (global warming predictions).

#7-01/30

14:49:00 Scientists Counter UN Report - Claim Global Warming Due to Solar Activity, Not Man... [top]

15:03:07 COUNTER: Two New Books Confirm Global Warming is Natural, Moderate...

15:07:09 COUNTER: Two New Books Confirm Global Warming is Natural; Not Due To Human Activity...

15:09:10 COUNTER: Two New Books Confirm Global Warming is Natural; Not Caused By Human Activity...

Item #7 and item #8 (discussed below), posted the same day, both report on the recent publication of books related to climate change. But they express strikingly different evaluations.

Item #7 comprises two clauses. The first version of the headline is an inverted ‘situation-evaluation’ structure, in which the scientist’s claims are construed as a “counter”, positively evaluating the subsequent proposition for Veracity.¹⁷² In addition, the

¹⁷² It is frequently observed in the literature that ‘claim’ is a distancing resource, which by

ideationally redundant clause fragment (“not man”) is a Disclamation that negatively evaluates the dialogic alternative for Veracity. In the modified versions, the emphasis is shifted away from the participants through an amplified nominalization of the first clause, an explicit Disclamation: “COUNTER”. Authorial responsibility for the main proposition is Hidden in the attribution to “two new books”, though it is Reclaimed by the use of “confirm”, which expresses a strongly positive evaluation for Veracity. In the first revision, the emphasis shifts away from the causes of global warming to an Inscribed Appraisal of the situation as of little Significance (“natural”, “moderate”). Subsequent revisions replace “moderate” with variations of the earlier Disclamation (“not due to human activity”, “not caused by human activity”), which negatively evaluates the Significance of the human role in climate change.

Summary: positive evaluation of Veracity (climate change scepticism); negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming)

#8-01/30

17:40:31 GOLBAL ACTIVIST/CELEB WIFE, CHILD PUBLISHING POWERHOUSE AIM TO SET STUDENTS STRAIGHT...

17:42:30 ACTIVIST/CELEB WIFE, CHILD PUBLISHING POWERHOUSE AIM TO SET STUDENTS STRAIGHT...

18:04:44 ACTIVIST/CELEB WIFE, STUDENT PUBLISHING POWERHOUSE AIM TO SET KIDS STRAIGHT...

Compare the evaluations in item #7 with those in item #8. Here, the entire headline is amplified by the use of full caps. The agents are represented as “global activist/celeb wife” and “child publishing powerhouse”. “As with the choice of “environmental guru” (in item #37), the participants are represented in terms that invite a negative evaluation of Warrantability. We may compare this with item #59, in which the “celeb wife” (Laurie David) is represented, along with Sheryl Crow, as one of the “warming sisters”. The markedly informal expression, ‘set someone straight’ (“set students straight”, later revised to “set kids straight”), signals the ironic turn. The result is a negative evaluation

weakening the author’s responsibility for the expressed proposition presents as a negative evaluation of Warrantability. This headline, however, illustrates the important role of prosody in the designation of values. While “claim” acts as a distancing resource, it delegates responsibility to an inherently warrantable source—and away from the subjective opinion of the author. This results in a positive evaluation of Warrantability.

of Propriety. “Global” and “powerhouse” further increase the volume of the evaluation. The same tone is used in a later report: “Laurie David touts new kids global warming book: ‘We want you to grow up to be activists’”, where “touts” signals the negative evaluation of Propriety. We see this again in item #79 (discussed below, on p. 134).

Summary: negative evaluation of Propriety (global warming activism).

#80-05/20

20:57:56 High school student shown Gore’s film in four different classes: ‘I really don’t understand why they keep showing it’...

23:11:05 High school student shown ‘INCONVENIENT TRUTH’ in 4 different classes: ‘I really don’t understand why they keep showing it’...

As with item #8, item #80 and item #72 express a negative evaluation of the Propriety of global warming activism aimed at children.¹⁷³ Item #80 employs a ‘situation-evaluation’ structure in which the first clause presents the situation that students have been repeatedly shown the film, *An Inconvenient Truth*; and the second, attributed to a student, evaluates the situation negatively for Normality, Desirability (tenacity) and Propriety. Despite the formal ‘situation-evaluation’ structure, a negative evaluation of Normality and Propriety is already (implicitly) conveyed by the representation of the situation, though the attribution to the student acts to Delegate responsibility for the evaluation.

Summary: negative evaluation of Propriety (global warming activism).

#72-05/10

13:03:11 Fifth-graders investigate global warming...

13:53:37 Fifth-graders investigate climate change...

Item #72 uses an ironic conjunction “fifth-graders” (as agents) and “investigate” (as process) to convey an implicitly negative evaluation (Significance, Normality, Capacity, Desirability and Propriety). Compare this with another headline that makes similar use of irony: “Maine fourth-graders issue climate report: ‘Global warming is a huge pending global disaster’”. The marked sophistication of the quoted content in this latter headline

¹⁷³ This theme resurfaces in various headlines; for instance: “Parents question how global warming is taught in schools” and “Parents threaten legal action to stop schools from showing Gore movie”. Compare the above with: “THE SUN HEATS THE PLANET: Gore’s daughter co-writes new global warming film -- for kids”.

amplifies the disjunction between the agents and the process. The implicit evaluation is expressed overtly in still another headline: “Vermont parents upset at schools after 6th graders testify on global warming before state legislature”.

Summary: negative evaluation of Propriety (global warming activism).

#27-02/23

03:49:25 Report: Global Warming Worries Keeps Children Awake At Night...

04:21:42 ‘Global Warming Worries Keeps Children Awake At Night’...

Item #27 reports on the impact of global warming fears on children. The proposition is presented as a Delegated Attribution to an unspecified “report”, which offers a weak (though positive) evaluation of Warrantability, though the modified version drops the source altogether, further eroding this evaluation. If we interpret the children’s sleeplessness as a negative evaluation of Desirability, then its cause, “global warming worries”, is also evaluated negatively and (by implication) the origin of those worries, too. This conveys a negative evaluation of the Propriety of frightening children with warnings about climate change. This interpretation is reinforced by the evaluations of global warming activism expressed in item #8, item #72 and item #80. Moreover, item #28, which expresses a negative evaluation of global warming claims and actions, was posted almost simultaneously with item #27.¹⁷⁴

Summary: negative evaluation of Propriety (global warming activism).

#9-01/30

18:08:43 Eiffel Tower to Turn lights off for 5 minutes to help the cause...

18:10:45 Eiffel Tower lights off for 5 minutes to help the cause...

18:12:45 Eiffel Tower lights off for 5 minutes to help cause...

¹⁷⁴ On the other hand, there is a subtly negative evaluation of Seriousness or Significance to the proposition—brought out by the weak evaluation of Warrantability and by the tone of surrounding headlines. For instance, the ironic “Company Offers to Offset ‘Your Cat’s Flatulent Contribution to Global Warming’ for \$6” was posted that same day. And another claim about children appeared around the same time: “Study Predicts Global Warming Will Cause Children’s Fevers To Soar”. As we see in many other headlines (items #4, #5, #6, #37, #49, #74), “predicts” is evaluated negatively for Expectability. As in those other headlines, the projected outcome is amplified (“soar”) to convey an ostensibly strong, positive evaluation of Significance but which instead serves to weaken the Warrantability of the claim and the Expectability of the projected outcome.

21:52:42 Eiffel Tower to Go Dark Ahead of Report...

23:57:48 Eiffel Tower to Go Dark Ahead of Climate Report...

Item #9 reports on a gesture made in support for global warming advocacy.¹⁷⁵ Modified five times, the final two revisions are presented in a Reporter Voice, with no apparent expression of evaluation. The earlier versions, though, differ from the final rendering in two crucial respects: in the expression of duration (“five minutes”) and intention (“to help the cause”). The disjunction between the two invites a negative evaluation of Significance, as we are led to ask, ‘how does turning off the lights for five minutes help reduce global warming?’¹⁷⁶ As with “set kids straight” in item #8, “help the cause” is a markedly informal expression that helps signal the ironic turn.¹⁷⁷

This reading is reinforced by a subsequent headline, from February 1: “Eiffel Tower Stunt May Cause Blackout, Consume More Energy than It Conserves”. Here, the initiative has been nominalized as a “stunt”, provoking a negative evaluation of Propriety and Significance comparable to what is elsewhere conveyed by the term “hype”. The headline also expresses a pair of projected outcomes, both of which evaluate the effort negatively for Desirability.

Summary: negative evaluation of Significance (global warming activism).

#10-01/31~02/01

14:47:34 Trees take on greenhouse gases at Super Bowl...

14:49:30 ...NOW SUPER BOWL FIGHTS GLOBAL WARMING

03:49:40 ...NOW SUPER BOWL FIGHTS CLIMATE

Item #10 began as a play on words, comparing the Super Bowl organizers’ tree planting initiative with a football match up. This humorous treatment conveys a weak evaluation

¹⁷⁵ We see a similar headline on March 31: “Sydney Blacks Out for Global Warming”.

¹⁷⁶ We see the same pattern, leading to similar questions in other headlines as well; for instance: “Prince Charles cancels ski trip to help save planet”, New York City environmentalists eliminate toilet paper in effort to save the planet”, and “Our superjumbo will save the planet, AIRBUS says”. In all these examples we see a striking disjunction between the initiative and the goal, which leads to the irony.

¹⁷⁷ Consider the difference in tone that results when “to help the cause” is replaced, for instance, with “in a show of support” or “to draw attention to Global Warming”.

of its Significance (seriousness).¹⁷⁸ Note, however, that the headline was almost immediately revised. In the first revision, agency is given to the Super Bowl and the sports allusion is abandoned. Here, it bears a striking resemblance to the early versions of item #9. Indeed, the use of “now”, which (as in item #1) alludes to a series of unusual events, might be a reference to the Eiffel Tower’s contribution to “the cause”.¹⁷⁹ We can be confident that it is an ironic structure—and thus a negative evaluation of the initiative—by noting the final modification, which constructs the situation as a fight against the “climate” rather than “global warming”. Not only does this represent a disavowal of “global warming”, it renders the headline rather nonsensical. In fact, it reverses the meaning altogether (the Super Bowl organizers’ would no doubt construe their efforts as fighting *for* the climate). This negative evaluation of the Significance of carbon offsetting is also seen in item #62.

Summary: negative evaluation of Significance (global warming activism).

#11-02/01

03:49:40 GLOBAL WARMING TOOK AWAY HIS PRICKLES... [with image of balding hedgehog]

13:48:58 ‘GLOBAL WARMING’ TOOK AWAY HIS PRICKLES!

Item #11 is one of the many reports on the averred effects of global warming to present its claims in an ironic tone.¹⁸⁰ Here, as in item 10, we see agency invested in an inanimate (indeed, *abstract*) object and causation represented as a wilful act (“took away”). The

¹⁷⁸ Compare this with the final version of item #59.

¹⁷⁹ Very shortly before the original version of item #10 was posted, the following headline appeared: “Super Bowl produces super myths”. It is therefore possible that “now” references not the next in a series of unusual efforts against global warming (verb phrase), but the next in a series of unusual efforts by the Super Bowl (noun phrase). While I lean toward the earlier interpretation, this one is interesting in that it invites a comparison between planting trees to sequester CO₂ and propagating a myth.

¹⁸⁰ Compare the tone of the above with claims made in other headlines: “Brothel Owners Blame Global Warming for Staff Shortages”, “France Invaded by Swarms of Giant Hornets - Global Warming Blamed”, “Global warming blamed for cockroach migration”, “‘Warming’ Blamed for Newfoundland House Plunge Into Gulf”, “Global Warming Linked to ‘Enhanced Risk of Suicide’”, “UN SECRETARY GENERAL: CLIMATE CHANGE BEHIND DARFUR KILLING”, and “Climate Changes Are Making Poison Ivy More Potent”. See also item #27 and item #51.

affected is a hedgehog (as revealed in the accompanying image), anthropomorphized through the use of a possessive (“his”), which also constructs “prickles” as a personal possession. This construes the event as a sort of theft, with global warming implicated as the villain. The use of full caps and (in the later version) an exclamation mark increases the Force of the proposition, evaluating it as extremely Significant and Undesirable. The disjunction between the expressed Significance of the claim and its inherent triviality signals the irony and the consequent reversal of meaning. The addition of scare quotes around the term “global warming” in the modified version confirms the author’s lack of commitment to the Veracity of the proposition.

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom (global warming advocates).

#51-04/07

19:05:09 Global warming blamed for ‘carnage’ at Masters golf tournament...

19:25:59 EAR-MUFFS AT THE MASTERS... [in blue] [with image of bundled up fans]

19:59:51 EAR-MUFFS AT THE MASTERS...¹⁸¹

#52-04/07~08

19:03:22 SNOW ON THE CHERRY BLOSSOMS! [main headline] [with main image of snowy blossoms]¹⁸²

03:58:58 SNOW ON THE CHERRY BLOSSOMS!

04:31:14 SNOW ON THE CHERRY BLOSSOMS [main heading in blue] [with main image of snowy blossoms]

Item #51 attributes the unusual heat during the early rounds of the Masters golf tournament to global warming. The effect of the heat is construed as “Carnage”, which provokes a highly negative evaluation Desirability and a strong evaluation of Significance. The scare quotes, however, signal the author’s intention to distance himself from this appraisal, conveying a negative evaluation of its Warrantability. Compare this with item #52, which was posted almost simultaneously with item #51. The original version employs a variety of Graduation resources to emphasize the Significance of the report. In contrast to the original version of item #51, item #52 was positioned as the main headline at the top of the page all in full caps, with a large font, an exclamation mark, and a large image of snowy blossoms. And in a subsequent revision the font colour

¹⁸¹ This is technically not part of item #51, as the headline links to a different article.

¹⁸² This is technically not part of item #52, as the headline links to a different article.

becomes a distinctive and symbolic blue. The Force is reduced only slightly in the final revision, with the removal of the exclamation mark.

The contrast between the two treatments is made even more apparent by the author's response to the sudden cold snap that descended on Augusta National. Twenty minutes after the original posting, item #51 was completely revised. The headline is moved up to the top of the page next to the headline about the cherry blossoms. The cold snap is reported at nearly maximum volume. Full caps are employed, along with the symbolic blue font, and an image of bundled up spectators, all of which trumpets the Significance of the cold.¹⁸³

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming)

#61-04/23

05:11:00 GLOBAL WARMING FIGHT: CROW PROPOSES LIMITS ON TOILET PAPER

05:11:00 'We can make it work with only one square per restroom visit, except, of course, on those pesky occasions where 2 to 3 could be required'...

05:19:03 WIPE OUT GLOBAL WARMING: CROW PROPOSES LIMITS ON TOILET PAPER

Item #61 uses irony to express a negative evaluation of global warming activism. In the first version, two headlines were posted simultaneously in what may be seen as a type of Situation-Evaluation structure, where the evaluative member works (as in a subtype 3 REU) by inviting (rather than directly inscribing) a negative appraisal entirely on the basis of the reported speech.¹⁸⁴ The Situation is a proposal to combat global warming by limiting the use of toilet paper. Presenting the claim that "one square per restroom visit" would "make it work" invites a negative evaluation along a number of dimensions, including Humorousness/Seriousness, Significance, Desirability, Capacity and

¹⁸³ Whether it was intentional or in error, the first revision of item #51, "EAR-MUFFS AT THE MASTERS", remained linked to the original story about the "carnage" wrought by the heat, conveying a deeply ironic commentary on global warming affirmations. We see similarly explicit irony in such headlines as: "Global Warming: Record snow fall buries Anchorage", "Global warming hits Mars too: study", and "WARMING ON HOLD? April's temperatures were below average".

¹⁸⁴ We could read the first revision on its own as an implicitly speaker evaluating utterance, even though the speaker is only indirectly identified.

Veracity.¹⁸⁵ In the modified headline, the ironic turn is signalled by the play on words in the expression “wipe out”.

A related headline, posted the same day, reinforces these evaluations: “Rosie to Sheryl Crow: ‘Have You Seen My Ass?’” The rhetorical question effectively provokes a broadly negative evaluation, amplified by the attribution to the outspoken source and the direct quoting of her inappropriate language. Yet another headline posted that day conveys still another negative evaluation of Sheryl Crow: “Sheryl Crow Backstage wish list: 3 tractor trailers, 3 buses”. The combination of this “wish list” (presumably part of a contract rider for her musical performances) and her aggressive (item #59) and extreme (item #61) activism results in a negative evaluation of Propriety, Warrantability, and Tenacity (Virtue).

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom (global warming advocates).

#59-04/22

19:31:54 Rove engages in heated climate change exchange at White House dinner...

23:31:47 Rove takes on the Warming Sisters...

23:56:14 THE WARMING SISTERS TAKE ON ROVE!

#60-04/22

23:34:03 Debates Climate With Sheryl Crow, Laurie David...

23:56:14 Sheryl Crow, Laurie David Find Table #92...

Item #59 and item #60 report on an incident at the annual White House dinner. In the original version of item #59, “Heated” evaluates the exchange for Tenacity and Affect, which in the context of the White House dinner invites a negative evaluation of Propriety. The first revision, however, condenses the original verb phrase into the idiomatic expression “takes on”, which retains the evaluation of Tenacity but avoids the question of Propriety.¹⁸⁶ On the contrary, with the other participants in the exchange now identified by the ridiculous epithet, “Warming Sisters”, Rove’s actions become positively evaluated for both Tenacity and Propriety. In the final revision, agency is reversed, representing the “Warming Sisters” as aggressors who (according to item #60) actively sought out the

¹⁸⁵ ‘Humorousness/Seriousness’ is one of Lemke’s semantic dimensions that were set out in the modified framework under ‘Quality’.

¹⁸⁶ The condensation is unpackaged in the original version of item #60.

former Deputy Chief of Staff. While the Force of the proposition is amplified by the use of full caps and an exclamation mark, the ironic tone evaluates the proposition negatively for Normality, Desirability and Propriety.

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue (Sheryl Crow, Laurie David)

#65-05/06~05/07

15:39:39 Sheryl Crow: 'We have risen to great heights of arrogance in our refusal to acknowledge that the earth is changing'...

13:35:01 Sheryl Crow: 'We have risen to great heights of arrogance...'...

Item #65 is another report on Sheryl Crow. The subtle irony here requires some contextual/inter-textual knowledge to be discerned (e.g., item #59, #60, and #61). It is more evident in the modified headline (posted the following day) where the quoted speech has been truncated in a way that takes “arrogance” out of context and makes the (grammatical) subject of the proposition ambiguous: who is arrogant and in what way? The ironic effect is conveyed by attributing the inscribed appraisal of (negative) Virtue to a source that has been negatively evaluated for Virtue herself.

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue (global warming advocates)

#62-04/26

12:22:56 FRAUD?: Carbon offset industry found to suffer 'serious credibility concerns'...

12:24:58 FRAUD?: Carbon offset industry; 'Serious credibility concerns'...

Item #62 begins with an inscribed appraisal of carbon offsetting initiatives in a nominalized form: “fraud”. This overtly negative evaluation (of Veracity and Propriety) is amplified by the use of full caps—though the Expectability or Warrantability of the evaluation is simultaneously lowered through its expression as a question (albeit a dialogically contractive one). The remaining clause offers a Justification for the evaluation. This, however, is also highly evaluative. “Serious credibility concerns” is a Sourced Averal that employs a negative affect verb (“suffer”) and attitudinal inscriptions (“serious”, “concerns”) to negatively evaluate the initiative in terms of Warrantability (“credibility”). In addition, though less obvious, the use of “industry” suggests a profit

motive, inviting a negative evaluation of the Propriety of the (carbon offsetting) initiative and the Veracity of claims made on its behalf.

Summary: negative evaluation of Goodwill (global warming advocates)

#25-02/18

19:25:49 Al Gore May Get Honorary Doctorate in Climatology...

19:37:55 Al Gore May Get Honorary Doctorate for his Work in Climatology...

It is difficult to discern an evaluation in the original posting of Item #25 (besides the median Judgement of Expectability that Gore will receive an honorary degree). But the headline was quickly revised to include the phrase “for his work”. This is the ‘keystone’ to the evaluation. If his work is evaluated positively (for Significance, Veracity), then the entire proposition is evaluated positively for Propriety. But if it is evaluated negatively, the negative evaluation of the proposition (that Al Gore may become an honorary doctor of climatology) works to devalue the Warrantability of climatology. Co-textual and inter-textual propositions point to the latter interpretation.¹⁸⁷

Summary: negative evaluation of Propriety (global warming activism).

#29-02/26

04:35:59 GORE’S ‘TRUTH’ WINS...

14:29:04 ‘TRUTH’ WINS...

20:14:08 ‘TRUTH’ WINS... [image Al Gore’s face on medallion]

Item #29 reports on the Academy Award victory of ‘An Inconvenient Truth’. The focus on this particular film evaluates it as Significant. However, the headline is constructed in a way that expresses a sense of irony. The title has been shortened to “truth” and explicitly identified with Al Gore (“Gore’s ‘truth’”). With the scare quotes around “truth”, the nominal group can be read as “Gore’s version of the truth”, a proposition that negatively evaluates the Veracity of the claims made in the film. In subsequent revisions the explicit reference to Gore is absent. Instead, the headline is accompanied by an image of the Nobel Prize humorously altered to depict Al Gore’s face in profile. This alludes to

¹⁸⁷ Consider, for instance, the headline: “Ivy League Professor to Students: ‘Every single one of you knows more about this than Al Gore’”.

(and strongly evaluates the Expectability of) a future Nobel Prize victory. This was addressed in an earlier report, from February 1: “Gore Nominated for Nobel Peace Prize”. The lack of any discernable evaluation (Writer Voice) in this latter report is compensated for by an accompanying headline: “Ivy League Professor to Students: ‘Every single one of you knows more about this than Al Gore’”.¹⁸⁸ In this latter headline, “Ivy League” enhances the Warrantability of an already inherently warrantable source (“professor”), while “Every” and “single” enhance the negative evaluation expressed in the quoted speech. The result is a strongly negative evaluation of the Propriety of both the Nobel nomination and the Academy Award.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming); negative evaluation of Propriety (global warming activism).

#30-02/26

22:20:47 Last August alone, Gore burned through 22,619 kWh -- guzzling more than 2x electricity in one month than average family uses in year...

22:20:47 POWER: GORE MANSION USES 20X AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD; CONSUMPTION INCREASE AFTER ‘TRUTH’

#31-02/27

04:55:48 AP: Gore family paid an average monthly electric bill of \$1,200 last year for 10,000-square-foot home...

04:57:49 AP: Gore paid avg. monthly electric bill of \$1,200 for 10,000-square-foot home...

#32-02/27

06:00:23 AP: Gore paid avg. monthly electric bill of \$1,200 for 10,000-square-foot home...

15:47:24 WIRE: Gore paid avg. monthly electric bill of \$1,200 for 10,000-square-foot home... [image of Gore mansion]

Item #30, item #31 and item #32 all express a strongly negative evaluation of Al Gore’s personal behaviour. So far from the Writer Voice are these items that they resemble editorials more than headlines (and, indeed, item #30 links to a Drudge ‘Special Report’ rather than the usual external source). Item #30 was posted the day Gore’s film won an

¹⁸⁸ Compare this with: “Climatologist Calls Gore’s Oscar Nominated Film ‘Science Fiction’”.

Academy Award.¹⁸⁹ In it, “Last August alone” works as a Graduation resource to amplify the subsequent evaluations of excess (Impropriety), which are provoked by the phrases “Burned through” and “guzzling”. The accompanying headline was positioned as the main story at the top of the page, all in full caps, with a large font and a large image of the Gore mansion, amplifying the evaluation of Significance. It is not clear how “power” contributes to the meaning of the headline, but the excess implied by the phrase “20X average household” invites a negative evaluation of Propriety. Similarly, “Consumption increase after ‘truth’” evaluates Gore negatively for Propriety and even for Veracity, as his actions seem to contradict his words.¹⁹⁰ Item #31 and item #32 are similar. However, these latter headlines attribute the claims to a news wire service, evaluating them positively for Warrantability. In addition, Gore’s energy consumption is expressed in dollar terms, and the size of his mansion in terms of square footage, provoking an evaluation of the Significance of his consumption.

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue and Goodwill (Al Gore).

#39-03/19

14:42:10 Gore Challenged to International TV Debate on Global Warming...

14:54:32 Gore Challenged to International TV Debate...

16:45:26 Challenged to International TV Debate...

Item #39 reports on a call for a debate on global warming. Despite the fact that Al Gore is not the agent but the affected, the clause is given a passive construction in which Gore is the only participant identified. This gives a strong evaluation of his Significance in the discourse on climate change. However, “challenged” suggests that his claims are being called into question, which expresses a negative evaluation of their Veracity.

“International” works as a Graduation resource, amplifying the Significance of the challenge and the confidence (Expectability, Warrantability, Capacity) of the opposing voices. The term “global warming” is elided from the first revision and “Gore” from the

¹⁸⁹ Item #30 does not technically qualify as a set of modified headlines, as the two versions (both to the same ‘special report’) were posted and displayed simultaneously. Nevertheless, it is part of a larger set of related headlines that were modified and would in any case have to be addressed as relevant inter-textual information.

¹⁹⁰ Compare this with the evaluations implicit in a later headline: “GOP: GORE REFUSES TO TAKE PERSONAL ENERGY ETHICS PLEDGE”.

second. This revokes the evaluation of Significance conveyed by those terms in the original headline—first, that there is such a thing as ‘global warming’; and second, that it is about Al Gore in particular (rather than global warming proponents in general).

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom (Al Gore); positive evaluation of Wisdom (climate change sceptics).

#42-03/21

12:10:59 Skeptics of Global Warming Hope to Test the Former Vice President’s Mettle...

13:59:57 Skeptics of Global Warming Hope to Test Former Vice President’s Mettle...

Like item #39, item #42 reports on the challenges to Al Gore’s position. In this item, the Process (“hope”) conveys a positive evaluation of Desirability.¹⁹¹ What is at stake is a Judgement of Veracity, arrived at through questioning before the Senate Committee. Its Desirability expresses a positive evaluation of the Capacity of the sceptical voices, and the Expectability that the sceptical position will be vindicated. In short, the proposition expresses a positive evaluation of the sceptical position and a negative evaluation of Al Gore’s position.

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom (Al Gore); positive evaluation of Wisdom (climate change sceptics).

#15-02/03

00:19:11 Gore to Testify on Climate Change...

15:33:44 Gore to Testify...

Item #15 is the first in a long series of headlines on Al Gore’s appearance before congress. As with item #38 (which reports on substantially the same story), the projected event is constructed in a way that invites comparisons with a criminal trial, with the implication that there has been some sort of wrongdoing: rather than report that the former Vice President will ‘speak’ before the Senate, item #15 reports that Gore will “testify” on climate change. The evaluation of Impropriety is reinforced in the modified headline, where the topic of his testimony has been elided.

¹⁹¹ This could be expressed with more delicacy in the Appraisal framework as: ‘a Median to High degree Positive affect Disposition toward an Irrealis proposition’. This informs its Judgement as Desirable.

Summary: negative evaluation of Propriety (ambiguous).

#38-03/19

00:24:36 GORE FACES HILL GRILLING ON 'WARMING'; QUESTIONS AWAIT FORMER VP

15:42:55 GORE FACES HILL GRILLING ON 'WARMING'...

In item #38, Gore is constructed not only as a witness, but as the accused who faces a “grilling” by the authorities.¹⁹² This is emphasised in the original headline through elaboration: “questions await”. In the modified version, the repetition is discarded along with reference to the “former VP”, which had served to enhance the evaluation of Warrantability. Note the difference between the representation of “global warming”, which includes scare quotes, and “climate change” (in item #15), which does not. This conveys a suspicion of the former term and thus a negative evaluation of the Veracity of the underlying proposition.

Summary: negative evaluation of Propriety (Al Gore)

#41-03/21

00:48:34 Capitol Hill Boils Over: Senate GOP Accuses Gore of Violating Committee Rules By Demanding Special Treatment...

14:32:12 Senate GOP Accuses Gore of Violating Committee Rules...

Item #41 begins with a condensation of the diverse members of the Senate as “Capitol Hill”. Thus unified, the Senate is constructed as ‘boiling over’.¹⁹³ The subsequent proposition is constructed as an elaboration (clarification) of the initial claim. The GOP is represented as Judging Gore negatively for Propriety through high volume, provocative lexis (“violating”, “demanding”, “special treatment”).¹⁹⁴ In the revised headline, the (misleading) reference to Capitol Hill is abandoned, as is any clarification of the phrase “violating committee rules”. What remains is a negative evaluation of Propriety attributed to the (entire) GOP.

¹⁹² There is also a subtle play on words here as “grilling” can mean “to torment with heat”.

¹⁹³ This could be expressed with more delicacy in the Appraisal framework as: ‘a Median to High degree negative affect Realis Surge of Dissatisfaction’.

¹⁹⁴ Note that here the agent is not “Capitol Hill” but the GOP.

Summary: negative evaluation of Propriety (Al Gore)

#43-03/21

15:00:11 'Crisis threatens the survival of our civilization'...

16:02:45 GORE SWEARS: 'Crisis threatens the survival of our civilization'...

Item #43 presents a claim implicitly attributed to Al Gore. Global warming is re-nominalized as a “crisis”, which evaluates it negatively for Desirability and positively for Significance. This is reinforced by the process “threatens” and reinforced again by the provocative, high volume phrase “survival of our civilization”. It is reinforced yet again in the revised version, where full caps emphasize that Al Gore “swears” to the Veracity of his claims. Item #43 is much like items #4, #5, #6, and #37, in that it represents a ‘maximally’ negative evaluation of the projected events, and thereby invites a negative evaluation of Expectability. This combines with numerous co-textual and inter-textual propositions that evaluate him negatively for Veracity and Propriety (e.g., items #30, #31, #32, #38, #39, #41, and #42) to construct Gore as source without Warrantability. This points to an implicitly speaker evaluating utterance in which the expressed evaluations work ironically against the source.

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom (Al Gore).

#47-03/21

19:04:36 GORE SWEARS: 'Crisis threatens the survival of our civilization'...

20:17:00 'THE PLANET HAS A FEVER' [image of Gore holding his forehead]

Item #47 links to a different source, but initially retains the earlier headline (item #46). It is subsequently revised to express another of Al Gore’s claims, emphasized to Humorous effect by the accompanying image of Gore holding his forehead (as though checking the temperature). The irony is signalled by the emphasis on Gore’s words, conveyed by a combination of bracketing (through the use of quotes) and Graduation (full caps), which express a Significance the claim does not otherwise warrant.¹⁹⁵ As in item #43, this points

¹⁹⁵ We see similar metaphors in later headlines as well: “Sheryl Crow: ‘Mother Earth is a living organism and when she gets sick we get sick’”, and “American Indians say ‘Earth Mother getting angry’ about global warming”.

to an implicitly speaker evaluating utterance in which the expressed evaluations work ironically against the source.

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom (Al Gore).

#45-03/21

17:49:57 Congressman: Al Gore a 'prophet'...

19:14:29 Dem Rep.: 'You are a prophet'...

#46-03/21

19:04:36 GOP Rep: 'You're not just off a little, you're totally wrong'...

19:14:29 GOP Rep.: 'You're totally wrong'...

#48-03/21

20:26:50 BOXER: YOU HAVE GIVEN IS HOPE...

20:29:06 BOXER: YOU HAVE GIVEN US HOPE...

Items #45, item #46, and item #48 all offer explicit evaluations (inscriptions) of Al Gore. Item #45 cites a "Dem Rep", who describes Gore as a "prophet". This is paralleled perfectly by the revised version of item #46 (posted at the same time). It cites a "GOP Rep", who describes Gore as "totally wrong". The conscious symmetry of these forceful claims invites a negative evaluation of Goodwill on either side.¹⁹⁶

Item #48 reinforces the evaluation in item #45. Here, the Democratic Senator, Barbara Boxer, is cited. The Significance of her claim is emphasized by the use full caps. It is not bracketed by quotes, but the irony is unmistakable. The proposition takes the same form as the partisan evaluations in the surrounding text (item #46 and item #48) and was preceded by a negative evaluation of Boxer herself: "Senator Boxer criticized for 'ethically questionable' Gore e-mail". This latter headline, posted earlier in the day, inscribes a negative evaluation of the Propriety of the Senator's interaction with Al Gore. Al Gore was already evaluated negatively for Propriety that day (item #41), and another headline, "GOP: GORE REFUSES TO TAKE PERSONAL ENERGY ETHICS PLEDGE", recalled still another series of reports evaluating his Propriety (item #30, item #31, and item #32).

¹⁹⁶ This is expressed well in the headline: "WEATHER CHANNEL EXPERT LAMENTS 'VERY POLITICAL CLIMATE'".

Summary: negative evaluation of Goodwill (political participants).

#34-03/12

05:16:44 Muslim cleric blames drought, climate change on Australians' lack of faith in Allah...

21:27:39 Muslim cleric blames drought, climate change on lack of faith in Allah...

#81-05/21~22

21:28:30 Religious Leaders Urge Action On Warming

21:50:42 SIN OR SUN? RELIGIOUS LEADERS URGE ACTION ON WARMING

15:04:53 SIN OR SUN? RELIGIOUS LEADERS URGE ACTION ON CLIMATE...

Item #34 is presents the opinion of a “Muslim cleric” who avers a link between climate change and “faith in Allah”. This is perhaps less likely to be read as irony in an Islamic journal for a Muslim audience, but in the context of the Drudge Report it borders on sarcasm, evaluating the proposition as Humorous. It is inherently unwarrantable, and serves only to tie global warming to religious faith, and thereby negatively evaluate it for Veracity. Item #81 was discussed earlier. The global warming position is identified with religion and faith to ironic effect.¹⁹⁷ It results in a negative evaluation of the Veracity of global warming affirmations.

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom (global warming advocates).

#16-02/06

19:14:50 MANMADE SNOW STORM HITS NYC... [with image of people in parkas]

20:37:34 MANMADE SNOW STORM HITS FRIGID NYC...

Item #16 is difficult to make sense of outside the context of surrounding headlines. Initially posted along with an image of people wrapped in parkas as Central Park is sprayed with ‘artificial’ snow, it does not really seem to be news at all. But other headlines, that day and in the two days preceding, set item #16 in the context of global warming. That day, for instance, the main headline (amplified by full caps and a blue font) declared: “WINDCHILL 25 BELOW: CHICAGO”.¹⁹⁸ It is in this context of

¹⁹⁷ See also the discussion of item #37.

¹⁹⁸ This was down from two previous days, when the temperature was reported as 35 below and then 30 below, all with the same the same blue font and full caps and accompanying image of people out in the cold. Also posted in a blue font over this period were related headlines: “Harsh Cold Expected to Linger in Midwest”, “Cold Front Closes

unusual cold that we see (on February 4): “Against the grain: Some scientists deny global warming exists” and (on February 5) “Climatologist Calls Global Warming Fears ‘Greatest Deception in the History of Science’”, which combine to negatively evaluate claims of global warming for Veracity. On the other hand, we also see (on February 4): “Environmental Guru Says Global Warming More Devastating Than Nuclear War” and (on February 6) “China sweats in warmest temperatures on record” and “China blames the west for global warming”. The overt emphasis on the cold, combined with the sceptical claims attributed to scientists and climatologists, contributes a negative evaluation of the Veracity of claims that record temperatures (in China and elsewhere) are the result of global warming activities in the United States. Thus we can understand item #16: it affirms the opposite of global warming, something like ‘manmade freezing’.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#17-02/07

00:33:14 Gore says Bush administration paying scientists to dispute...

00:35:16 Gore says Bush admin paying scientists to dispute... [top]

Item #17 and item #40 address the issue of freedom of expression (taken up in item #18 and item #28).¹⁹⁹ Item #17 attributes to Al Gore the claim that the Bush administration is “paying scientists to dispute” global warming. This evaluates Bush and his allies negatively for Virtue and Goodwill, and the sceptical position negatively for Warrantability. But this is countered in the surrounding headlines (e.g. item #18), which negatively evaluate global warming advocates for Propriety and their position for Warrantability. This suggests the sort of political partisanship that plays out in item #2 and item #3, and again in the combination of items #45 and #46.

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue and Goodwill (George Bush).

#40-03/20

12:37:41 Scientist who alleged Bush administration muzzled him, admits to doing 1,400 media interviews...

Schools, Businesses”, “Bitter Cold Grips Northern States”, “Record Lows”, “Below-Zero Temps Close Schools” and “Chilly cold spell sweeping Hawaii”.

¹⁹⁹ Similar headlines elsewhere express this claim from both perspectives: “Scientists charge White House pressure” and “Climate change skeptics say it’s hard to get heard”.

14:12:47 Scientist who alleged Bush administration muzzled him -- did 1,400 media interviews...

14:14:41 Scientist who alleged Bush administration muzzled him -- did 1,400 on-the-job media interviews...

Item #40 offers a rebuttal to charges of impropriety in the Bush administration. Here, the original claim is expressed by the provocative term “muzzled”. But the strongly negative evaluation of Propriety that this conveys is turned against the accuser, whose ‘admission’ is amplified by explicit reference to the large number of interviews he gave. The evaluation is made more implicit in the revised headlines, which replace “admit” with “did” (and thus ‘Invite’ rather than ‘Provoke’ an evaluation of Impropriety). In the final revision, the addition of “on-the-job” serves to emphasize the fact that far from being “muzzled”, the scientist was permitted to address the media in his professional capacity. The sharp contrast between the Situation (claimed) and the Real (now acknowledged) invites a negative evaluation of the Warrantability of global warming advocates.

Summary: negative evaluation of Goodwill (global warming advocates).

#20-02/14

00:34:21 HOUSE HEARING ON ‘WARMING OF THE PLANET’ CANCELED AFTER SNOW/ICE STORM

01:22:50 HOUSE HEARING ON ‘WARMING OF PLANET’ CANCELED BECAUSE OF SNOWSTORM

01:32:51 HEARING ON ‘WARMING OF PLANET’ CANCELED BECAUSE OF SNOWSTORM [main headline]

04:30:21 HEARING ON ‘WARMING OF PLANET’ CANCELED BECAUSE OF ICE STORM [image of blustery capitol]

#36-03/16~03/17

23:24:43 Activists greeted by Northeast snowstorm as they start global warming awareness walk...

00:01:22 Activists greeted by snowstorm as they start global warming awareness walk...

Item #20 and item #36 present two examples of a recurring theme.²⁰⁰ In each case, the headline presents an ironic disjunction between a global warming initiative (rally, hearing, forum, march, etc.) and a weather event (extreme cold or snow). Item #20 makes the most of this irony, positioning the report as the main story of the day, amplified with full caps throughout and accompanied by a large image of a blustery capitol. The scare quotes around the phrase, “warming of the planet”, convey the author’s distance from the characterization and help to signal the ironic turn. The same day, though not as a link, the following bulletin was posted as well: “SAVE IT FOR A SUNNY DAY: Maryville Univ. in St. Louis area cancelling screening of Al Gore’s ‘Inconvenient Truth’ because of a snowstorm”. Here, in addition to the evaluation conveyed by the ironic global warming/snowstorm disjunction, there is also a reverse Situation-Evaluation structure. “Save it for a sunny day”, the evaluative member, is emphasized, amplifying the judgement that the film would be better suited to a warmer afternoon; that is to say, it offers a negative evaluation for Warrantability. Item #36 expresses the same basic irony, though with less force. In all these examples, the proposition invites a negative evaluation of the Veracity of global warming claims, and an evaluation of their initiatives as Humorous.

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom (global warming advocates); negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#53-04/09

22:03:07 Thursday night’s Red Sox game at Fenway may be snowed out with 6 inches of snow in Boston... [in blue] [with image of snowy baseball field]

22:29:21 Thursday night’s Red Sox game at Fenway may be snowed out with 6 inches of snow... [in blue]

Item #53 reports that a baseball game may be cancelled because of snow. The Significance of the claim is emphasised by the use of a blue font and the image of a

²⁰⁰ Compare the above with: “Minnesota Public Radio forum on global warming cancelled -- due to blizzard”, “Expedition highlighting global warming called off due to extreme cold”, “ICE, WIND, COLD... PARADE!”, “Global Warming Awareness Walk Braves Snow Storm”, “Snow won’t dampen global-warming rallies”, “Global warming rally in the snow”, “Cold, sleet cuts short global warming rally”, and “Global warming activists urged to focus on Earth Day rallies and ignore snow as it ‘piles up outside our windows’”.

snowy Fenway Park, and by the repetition of the same story in another headline: “Play Ball? Weather Wipes Out Games”. As the cancellation of an early April spring ballgame is not inherently Significant, the implicit evaluation must be of the weather. This is informed by the surrounding headlines: “Cold Snap Postpones Spring Festivities”, “Charlotte, NC breaks 1923 record, sees coldest April day in history”, “Alaska bitter cold freezes sea otters out of bay causing early deaths”. It is in this context of unusual cold weather that we see the following headline: “MIT Scientist: ‘Alarm over climate change is based on ignorance of what is normal for weather and climate’”. Combined with the inherently warrantable source (“MIT” scientist), the cold weather reports, including item #53, contribute to the Warrantability of the proposition that global warming claims are “based on ignorance”, and thus without Veracity.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#19-02/09

01:56:48 Climate change concerts ‘to dwarf Live Aid’...

14:41:30 Gore’s Climate change concerts ‘to dwarf Live Aid’... [with image of gore and a balloon globe]

#22-02/15

19:26:36 Gore Announces ‘Global Warming’ Concerts...

19:34:41 Gore Announces All-Star ‘Global Warming’ Concerts...

#54-04/10

12:50:28 Megastars to rock the world in giant Live Earth concerts...

21:09:02 Megastars to rock the world...

#85-06/19

12:52:35 ‘LIVE EARTH’ VOWS CLEAN CONCERTS...

12:54:35 PROMOTORS VOWS CLEAN CONCERTS...

Items #19, #22, #54 and #85 all express propositions about the Live Earth concerts.²⁰¹

Item #19 evaluates the event for Quality (size), inscribing (through a Sourced Averral) the opinion that it would “dwarf” Live Aid. The emphasis on size is apparent in the original posting of item #54, as well, where the event is projected to be “giant”.²⁰² In

²⁰¹ The Live Earth initiative was followed carefully on the Drudge report, where nearly two dozen headlines about it were posted.

²⁰² Similarly, on July 1, we see: “Gore show is set to be biggest on earth”.

other postings (revised item #54 and item #22), the emphasis on size is replaced with evaluations of the Quality of the performers (“megastars”, “All-star”). In addition, item #85 uses full caps and prominent positioning at the top of the page to amplify the claim that the concerts will be “clean”. These headlines, particularly item #85, are difficult to interpret. But in the context of the larger discourse, both on climate change in general and Live Earth in particular, the emphasis on size and “star” power may invite Judgements about the Propriety of such an (inherently wasteful) initiative. Such an interpretation is supported by negative inscriptions in other headlines (e.g.: “Geldof Criticizes Gore’s Live Earth”, “Roger Daltrey blasts forthcoming Live Earth event”, “Pet Shop Boy uneasy about LIVE EARTH concert: Opposes ‘rock stars lecturing people’”), which are not balanced by any overtly positive Judgements elsewhere.

Summary: negative evaluation of Goodwill (global warming advocates).

#23-02/16

01:05:37 McCain on global warming: ‘I am convinced that we have reached the tipping point and Congress will act’...

22:20:33 McCain: ‘I am convinced that we have reached the tipping point and Congress will act’...

#26-02/22

15:14:53 McCain Criticizes Bush On Global Warming, Iraq...

15:55:15 McCain Criticizes Bush On Climate, Iraq...

Item #23 and item #26 attribute to (Senator) John McCain the opinion that global warming is Significant and that action to stop it is Desirable. Item #23 makes ironic reference to a “tipping point”, which may refer either to a ‘tipping point’ in political will, or the oft-discussed tipping point toward climate catastrophe.²⁰³ Item #26 ties comments about global warming to negative evaluations of the war in Iraq, thereby constructing them as political positions.²⁰⁴ This is reinforced in a later headline, in which McCain seems to acknowledge taking politically expedient positions: “McCain Seeks San Fran Vote: ‘I have addressed many issues and have taken positions that I think people in the

²⁰³ Google yields over 400,000 hits to the keywords “tipping point” and “climate change”.

²⁰⁴ Note how the modified headline replaces “global warming” with “climate”, which fits a pattern of rejecting “global warming” as a nominalization.

Bay Area agree with, especially climate change’”. Still another headline employs the sort of irony expressed in item #20 to evaluate his position on global warming: “McCain Hires Snowplow to Reach NH Events”. These suggest that item #23 and item #26 are implicitly speaker evaluating, inviting a negative evaluation of Goodwill.

Summary: negative evaluation of Goodwill (John McCain).

#24-02/17

21:20:28 GORE: ‘I can’t imagine in any circumstance to run for office again’...

00:17:56 Gore rules out bid for US White House in 2008 [again]...

#76-05/17

13:47:13 The Last Temptation of Al Gore; Will He Run or Not?

22:53:42 Al Gore says he out of love with politics...

Item #24 and item #76 address the possibility that Al Gore will enter the race for the White House. This is one of the most common themes in relation to Al Gore. The comments attributed to Gore (like the above) evaluate the Expectability of a Presidential run to be low. But comments attributed to others evaluate the Expectability as relatively high.²⁰⁵ The modified version of Item #24 is curious, in that “again” is changed from a modifier of “running for office” (i.e., ‘running again’) to a modifier of “rules out” (i.e., ‘rules out again’). Moreover, the use of parentheses actually emphasises the repetitiveness of his denials, conveying the impression that a presidential run is plausible enough to warrant repeated denials. This, ironically, conveys a positive evaluation of the Expectability that he will run. Item #76 invites a comparison of Al Gore with Jesus Christ (‘The last temptation of Christ’).²⁰⁶ The suggestion is that Gore may use his prominence as a global warming activist to secure his place in the White House, and this is given an implicitly negative evaluation of Propriety. Moreover, in light of his previous denials, this dialogically expansive proposition works to convey a positive evaluation of the Expectability that he will ultimately announce his candidacy. The revised version

²⁰⁵ For instance: “CLINTON: Gore might run”, “PAPER: Gore campaign team assembles in secret”, “Gore backers hold on to cash”, “NY TIMES Mag on Gore: ‘Everywhere he goes, people urge him, almost beg him, to run for the presidency’”, Former President Clinton Predicts That Gore Will Enter Race If Another Candidate ‘Fizzles’”, and “Al Gore Wins New Hampshire Poll”.

²⁰⁶ Compare this with a similar allusion in another headline: “Katie Couric Fears ‘Secular Saint’ Gore May Suffer Backlash”.

attributes to Gore the claim that he is no longer interested in pursuing politics. However, as with the earlier headline, the disavowal itself points to a dialogic alternative that is credible enough to warrant a denial. Moreover, explicitly political headlines like item #81, posted only a few days later, serve to contribute a negative evaluation of the Warrantability of Gore's denials.

Summary: negative evaluation of Goodwill (Al Gore).

#33-03/12

02:29:17 Climate fears prompt EU to suggest speed limit for German autobahns.....

05:26:48 Climate fears prompt EU to seek speed limit for German autobahns...

In item #33 global warming concerns are nominalized as "climate fears". These fears are represented as driving policy, which results in a negative evaluation for Propriety. There is also a subtle irony in the disjunction between the fear (of catastrophic global warming) and the action taken (imposing a speed limit).²⁰⁷ This invites a broadly negative evaluation of global warming activism (for Capability, Desirability, and Propriety).

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue (global warming activism).

#44-03/21

16:16:54 Czech President tells Congress: Environmentalism has replaced Communism as threat to freedom...

19:18:13 Czech Prez: Environmentalism has replaced Communism as threat to freedom...

In Item #44 Global warming is condensed into "environmentalism" and equated communism, inviting a negative evaluation of its Desirability and of the Propriety of pursuing it. This evaluation is reinforced by the epithet "threat to freedom", which also provokes a Judgement of Significance. The president of a formerly communist nation represents an inherently warrantable source for evaluations about communism and freedom, and his comments are not delegated through the use of quotes.

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue (environmentalism).

#83-06/04

²⁰⁷ A similar irony is expressed in a subsequent headline: "Belgium to impose tax on barbecuing to fight global warming".

13:32:23 Former German Chancellor slams climate 'hysteria', calls governments attempts to alter temperatures 'idiotic'...

16:05:40 Former German Chancellor slams climate 'hysteria'...

Item #83 has the structure of an explicitly speaker evaluating utterance. The speech act is represented by a high volatility, negative affect verb, “slams”, and only brief ‘highlights’ of content bracketed in scare quotes. The effect is to evaluate the speaker negatively for Propriety and Warrantability. But this sits very awkwardly with other representations of global warming claims, which invite a positive evaluation of climate change scepticism, and a contra-textual reading that takes this as an explicit third person evaluating utterance better conforms with propositions expressed elsewhere in the discourse. According to such a reading, the “former chancellor” is an inherently warrantable source whose comments inscribe a negative evaluation of the Significance global warming (“hysteria”) and a negative evaluation of the Capacity and Desirability of initiatives to reverse it (“idiotic”). Moreover, in the modified version, the second clause is abandoned, which is consistent with an attempt to reduce the Force of the proposition and make it less likely to reflect negatively on the source.

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom and Virtue (global warming activism).

#55-04/11

04:08:19 PAGLIA: I am a skeptic about what is currently called global warming... [with image of massive water fall]

04:32:47 PAGLIA: I am a skeptic about what is currently called global warming... 'Man is too weak to permanently affect nature' [with image of massive water fall]

04:34:33 PAGLIA: 'Man is too weak to permanently affect nature' [with image of massive water fall]

04:36:52 PAGLIA: 'Man is too weak to permanently affect nature'... 'Cooling and warming will go on forever'... [as two separate headlines]

Item #55 attributes to a prominent liberal social critic an explicit negative evaluation of the Veracity of global warming claims.²⁰⁸ This is accompanied by an image of a massive

²⁰⁸ Attributing the sceptical view to a prominent ‘liberal’ enhances Warrantability by demonstrating that scepticism is not a partisan conservative issue. We see something similar in the following headlines: “Climate scientist skeptical of global cooling fears in 1970’s, calls current warming scare ‘massively political’” and “Prominent French Scientist Reverses Belief in Global Warming - Now a Skeptic”. In both, the Warrantability of the claim is enhanced by sourcing it to someone more likely to be (or

waterfall (perhaps conveying the greatness of nature). The first revision adds the Justification that humans lack the Capacity to cause climate change (“man is too weak to permanently affect nature”). In the subsequent revision, the original evaluation is abandoned, leaving only the evaluation of Incapacity. This is augmented in the final revision by the claim that climate change is natural (“will go on forever”), amplifying the evaluation that the human contribution is Insignificant.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#21-02/14

14:21:26 SNOW IS FOR LOVERS

14:41:36 VALENTINE’S DAY ON ICE [main headline] [with image of a couple kissing in snow]

Item #21 reports on a Valentine’s day snowstorm. Positioned as the main story, emphasised through the use of full caps and an image of a couple kissing in the snow, the storm is evaluated positively for Significance. This is explained by the surrounding headlines (for instance, item #20), which tie the event ironically to global warming. It thus contributes to a negative evaluation of the Warrantability of global warming claims.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#56-04/11

01:35:01 The Big Chill: New York Temps Rival Record for Coldest April

01:36:46 THE BIG CHILL: NY TEMPS RIVAL RECORD FOR COLDEST APRIL

04:06:20 THE BIG CHILL: NY TEMPS RIVAL RECORD FOR COLDEST APRIL...
[with image of cloudy sky]

Item #56 and item #57 report on an unusual cold snap. In item #57, the Significance of the claim is conveyed in the second revision, where the Force is enhanced through the change to full caps, and in the third revision, where an image of an ominous, cloudy sky is added. The dialogism in the report that the temperatures “rival record for coldest April” is apparent in the surrounding headlines. Item #55, for instance, was posted the same day. Together, they invite a negative evaluation of the Veracity of global warming claims.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

formerly) identified with the opposite position.

#57-04/12

12:38:43 Chicago snow breaks 1957 record, causes havoc -- and more is on the way...

12:39:57 North Dakota breaks 1945 snowfall record...

13:10:28 Chicago breaks 1957 record...

13:10:28 North Dakota breaks 1945 snowfall...

Item #57 continues to evaluate the cold weather as Significant and Unusual. Like item #56, the implicit dialogism invites a negative evaluation of the Veracity of global warming claims. Perhaps item #57 should be treated as two separate items, as it contains two separate claims linked to two separate articles. But the two are clearly being treated in parallel (as evidenced by their structures and virtually simultaneous times of posting). The first headline reports on record snowfall in Chicago and the second on record snowfall in North Dakota. The Significance is emphasized by reference to the longstanding nature of the records broken.²⁰⁹

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#84-06/11

15:14:49 7 of 10 warmest years for Denver occurred before 1955...

15:51:07 9 of 12 warmest years for Denver occurred before 1955...

Like item #56 and item #57, Item #84 conveys an implicit (negative) evaluation of global warming by making reference to record weather events. In item #84, however, it is not record cold or snow that is appealed to, but record heat. It presents the claim that the

²⁰⁹ The relationship between record cold/snow and global warming is made explicit in the ironic headline: "Global Warming: Record snow fall buries Anchorage". Such reports are frequent in the discourse: "CHILL: Pakistan sees coldest day since 1935; India sees record low", "Record cold, snow forecast for Los Angeles area", "RECORD COLD STRIKES NYC; 9 DEGREES AT DAWN", "Record snow falls for date in Chicago", "Chicago's 9th coldest February in 137 years; 4th snowiest since 1929", "Record cold of minus 35 degrees registered at Watertown NY Airport", "February was coldest in 28 years For Toronto", "Record Low Temps In New York City", "Coldest March day since 1950 in Massachusetts", "Strongest snowstorm in half century buries China", "Charlotte, NC breaks 1923 record, sees coldest April day in history", "April currently tracking as coldest April in 113 years in USA", "April sets European heat records", "The Big Chill: New York Temps Rival Record for Coldest April", "Colorado's Pikes Peak has snowiest spring in more than a decade", "Spring snow breaks 1911 Canadian record", "Canadian resort reports second snowiest winter on record", "Heavy snows in australia once in 20 year event", "Johannesburg Gets 4 Inches of Snow, First Since 1981", "Australian citrus farmers fear damage after coldest June day ever".

hottest days were not during the era of global warming, and thus conveys an implicitly negative evaluation of the Veracity of global warming claims. “7 of 10” works as a Graduation resource, amplifying the Force of the implicit evaluation. The revised version increases the Force even further by announcing that 75% (not just 70%) of the hottest days in Denver occurred before 1955.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#58-04/16

05:24:09 STORM BLAST: New York City received 6.41 inches of rain, the fourth wettest day of all time, and the heaviest rainfall in 30 years...

06:06:30 STORM BLAST: NYC’S HEAVIEST RAINFALL IN 30 YEARS...

Item #58 and item #89 report on record rainfall. Its Significance is conveyed by the high affect, “blast” and the use of full caps. The original posting of item #58 constructs the data in a way that also emphasises the negative Normality of the event. “Of all time” is a graduation resource that increases the Force of the claim (even though it is only the “fourth” wettest day).²¹⁰ Similarly, “heaviest rainfall” is proclaimed (and emphasised with full caps in the revised version), though it needs to be qualified by the term “in 30 years”. This conveys not only the rarity of the event, but also invites a negative evaluation of claims that global warming will lead to drought and water shortages.²¹¹

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#89-06/27

13:58:14 Parts of Central Texas get 15-18 inches of rain overnight...

14:10:21 Parts of Central TX get 15-18 inches overnight...

14:18:27 18-INCHES OF RAIN OVERNIGHT IN TEXAS

Like item #58, Item #89 reports on extreme rainfall (emphasised in the final posting by the use of full caps). Although references to a ‘record’ are not made here, the forecast of “18 inches” conveys the Significance of the event to similar effect. Moreover, a few days after this posting a record *is* found, and on June 30, the headline, “Record June Rainfall”,

²¹⁰ See footnote 209 (under the discussion of item #57) for other headlines in which the data is specifically selected to express a record.

²¹¹ For instance, as predicted in item #4 and item #88.

is posted. While any connection between the rain and global warming affirmations is left unstated,²¹² the Warrantability of any such claims is headed off by an accompanying headline: “New scientific research refutes many of Gore’s climate claims”.

Summary: negative evaluation of Veracity (global warming).

#66-05/08

19:16:30 RECORD HEAT BAKES SOUTHER CALIFORNIA...

19:18:16 RECORD HEAT BAKES ORANGE COUNTY...

19:22:18 HEAT WAVE BAKES ORANGE COUNTY...

#71-05/10

00:36:26 EXTREME WEATHER, FIRES BEFALL NATION

00:53:01 Extreme Weather, Fires Befall Nation...

Item #66 reports on record temperatures. Reference to a ‘record’ and the use of full caps evaluates the report for Significance. Surrounding headlines contribute to the evaluation of Significance: “Record-breaking heat seizes Bay Area” and “TEMPS TOP IN HALIFAX” were posted almost simultaneously with item #66. But so too was a reference to the unusual volume of rain: “Record rain to record heat in Central Calif”. This serves to head off an association of the high temperatures with global warming. Item #71 works to the same effect, nominalising the various record cold/snow, rain and heat events as “extreme weather” (and adding the fires reported on in items #67, #68, and #70). Putting equal weight on all these contradictory weather events (there are as many reports on record cold as there are on record heat, for instance) heads off the claim that they could be due to global warming.²¹³ Item #71, moreover, uses the term “befall”, which constructs the events as misfortune—both in the sense of a plight (i.e., a negative evaluation of Desirability) and matter of chance (i.e., a negative evaluation of the Significance of human agency).

Summary: positive evaluation of Significance; negative evaluation of Desirability (extreme weather).

²¹² Or, rather, stated elsewhere; for instance, in item #4 and item #88 (the latter of which was posted only 5 days earlier).

²¹³ This is reinforced by another headline posted that day: “New climate research reveals far less alarming predictions of global warming”.

#67-05/08

21:48:55 FIRE IN HOLLYWOOD HILLS

21:52:25 FIRE BURNS AT L.A.'S GRIFFITH PARK

22:08:17 FIRE BURNS AT GRIFFITH PARK

#68-5/09

01:26:43 Brush fires in Georgia send smoke to Miami...

01:40:52 Sends smoke to Miami...

#69-05/09

11:15:44 FIRE RAGES IN L.A....

12:33:59 FIRE RAGES IN L.A.

#70-05/09

14:49:27 THE FIRES RAGE

19:38:40 THE FIRES RAGE IN L.A....

19:58:22 FIRE RAGES

#73-05/10

23:29:03 Brush Fire Breaks Out on Catalina Island...

23:52:56 Fire breaks out on Southern California island...

Items #67, #68, #69, #70, and #73 are among the many reports on fires that swept the United States at that time.²¹⁴ While they evaluate the fires as Significant, they offer little other indication of authorial stance. However, 'inter-textually', there are a number of headlines that situate the fires in the climate change discourse. On May 16, as the fires continued to burn, the following was posted: "California history, culture haunted by wildfires". This constructs the fires as a longstanding reality in California, and invites a negative evaluation of the Veracity of claims that they were due to global warming. On June 30, the following headline was posted: "Illegal Campfire Sparked Tahoe Blaze", explicitly tying the disaster to an "illegal campfire" and heading off the proposition that climate change was responsible.

Summary: positive evaluation of Significance (fires).

#77-05/18

13:59:58 Drought Saps Fla. Growers, Golf Courses...

15:34:48 Drought Sapping Resources in Florida...

²¹⁴ The fires were reported in numerous other headlines.

Item #77 adds drought to the list of extreme weather. In the original posting those affected by the drought are represented as “growers” and “golf courses”. While the change to “resources” in the modified version serves to convey a broader evaluation of Significance, there is little other indication of authorial stance.

Summary: positive evaluation of Significance (drought).

#75-05/16

11:49:35 CLIMATE PANIC: ACTIVISTS BUILD NEW NOAH’S ARK!

12:59:56 CLIMATE PANIC: ACTIVISTS BUILD NEW NOAH’S ARK

13:42:47 ACTIVISTS BUILD NEW NOAH’S ARK...

Item #75 reports on a particular global warming initiative. The original posting makes its claim with the most force, to the extent of using an exclamation mark, but all three versions are in full caps. The nominalization, “climate panic”, with which the first two postings introduce the headline, provokes a negative evaluation of Propriety, much as in item #33, and the reference to “Noah’s ark” invites a comparison with other faith-based efforts and propositions (see, for instance, item #34, item #37, and item #81), resulting in a negative evaluation of the Warrantability of Global warming activists.²¹⁵ The final revision does away with the provocative nominalization and allows the religious allusion to carry the evaluation.

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom and Virtue (global warming activism).

#78-05/19

21:25:55 DiCaprio on ‘11TH HOUR’: ‘I want the public to be very scared by what they see. I want them to see a very bleak future’...

11:15:25 DiCaprio: ‘I want the public to be very scared by what they see. I want them to see a very bleak future’...

Item #78 reports a claim attributed to Leonardo DiCaprio regarding his global warming documentary. It represents him as hoping to spread fear and despair. In the revised headline, explicit reference to the film is dropped, and only the actor’s interest in creating

²¹⁵ Compare the above with the February 9 report, “‘Doomsday vault’ to resist global warming effects”, and the March 12 headline, “From Babylon of Gilgamesh to post-Eden of Noah, every age has viewed climate change cataclysmically, as retribution for human greed and sinfulness”.

fear is expressed. It is a subtle, implicitly speaker-evaluating utterance, in which the expressed desire to frighten the public redounds on the source. DiCaprio and his coalition are thus evaluated negatively for Propriety. This theme was introduced in an earlier headline, on April 19: “Scientists blame Hollywood for increased fears”.

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue (Leonardo DiCaprio).

#79-05/19~05/20

18:54:35 DiCaprio bites back over eco-hypocrisy charge: ‘I try to travel commercial as much as I can’...

23:53:28 DiCaprio bites back over eco ‘hypocrisy’...

Item #79 uses irony to convey a negative evaluation of the actor’s Propriety and Warrantability. The disjunction between the represented speech act (“bites back”) and the content of the speech only serves to confirm the charges he presented as answering (“eco-hypocrisy”). In the revised version, the Justification is elided and the evaluation is carried entirely by the represented speech act and the inscription in the sourced averral (“hypocrisy”).²¹⁶

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue, Goodwill (Leonardo DiCaprio).

#63-04/27

01:09:43 ‘08 Dem Candidates Private Jet to Debate: ‘No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions’...

01:53:53 WASTE NOT! ‘08 Dem Candidates Private Jet to Debate: ‘No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions’...

02:22:22 WASTE NOT! Dem Candidates Private Jet to Debate: ‘No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions’...

12:36:10 WASTE NOT! ALL DEMS TOOK PRIVATE JETS: ‘No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions’...

14:31:11 WASTE NOT! DEMS TOOK PRIVATE JETS: ‘No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions’...

Item #63 is much like item #30 and item #35 in presenting something more akin to an editorial than a headline. It takes the form of a Situation-Evaluation, beginning with the claim that the Democratic Presidential candidates had travelled to a recent election debate

²¹⁶ Compare the above with a March 30 headline: Enviro-Activist Prince Charles Called High-Flying Hypocrite” and an April 10 report on another celebrity activist: “Climate change concert star Madonna accused of hypocrisy”.

in private jets. This is followed (in every version of the headline) by a sourced averral in which the list of failures implicitly evaluates the candidates for Improprity (Goodwill, Virtue). In the first revision, the headline is introduced with the high volume injunction, “waste not”, which signals the irony of the proposition, and reinforces the evaluation of Improprity.

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue, Goodwill (Democrats).

#64-05/03

16:27:23 U.S. ‘biggest culprit’ of climate change: WWF...

16:33:25 U.S. ‘biggest culprit’ of climate change...

Item #64 attributes to the WWF the Judgement that Americans are not only responsible for global warming, but guilty (indeed, *guiltiest*) of Improprity.²¹⁷ In the modified headline, the specific source of the claim (the WWF) is elided, which serves to broaden the attribution to global warming advocates in general. This Judgement is echoed in headlines posted a few days later: “Environmentalism calls mankind a ‘virus’” and “Environmental group says Children ‘bad for the planet’”. However, the inscription, “Biggest culprit” (emphasised by the use of scare quotes) signals an implicit evaluation of the speaker. In each case, certain badly chosen comments are attributed to an ‘environmental’ group, which is consequently evaluated negatively for Propriety. Moreover, as items #86 and #87 make explicit, the claims are of uncertain Veracity as well, calling into question the speaker’s Goodwill.

Summary: negative evaluation of Virtue and Goodwill (global warming advocates).

#86-06/20

03:28:30 China building two power plants per week...

03:32:33 Building two power plants per week...

#87-06/20

06:19:34 Nissan studying possibility of launching \$3,000-class car in India...

07:11:59 Nissan studying possibility of selling \$3,000 car in India...

07:28:08 NISSAN WORKING ON \$3000 CAR FOR INDIA...

²¹⁷ A similar headline was posted on February 27: “Indian MAG: Americans Lifestyles Creating Climate ‘Holocaust’”. Here, the high volatility, negative affect term, ‘holocaust’ (emphasised by scare quotes) signals the implicit evaluation of the source.

Item #86 and item #87 address climate change only indirectly. Item #86, however, was posted almost simultaneously with another headline that makes the connection clear: “China overtakes US as world’s biggest CO2 emitter”. This co-textual inscription of China as Significant, emphasized by the phrase “world’s biggest”, informs the implicit evaluations in item #86 and item #87 that the world’s two most populous nations are (or will be) the most Significant source of CO₂ emissions. Item #64 avoids mention of China or India, but the headline was preceded by (and appeared on same page as): “China brags: One-child per couple policy has reduced global warming” and was followed by: “Temps soar to record highs in Beijing”. This informs the irony signalled by the use of scare quotes around the phrase “biggest culprit”, which delegates the evaluation (attributed explicitly to the WWF in the original posting) and conveys the author’s suspicion of the term. In the revised posting, the source is elided, and the claim itself is evaluated, implicitly, as Unwarrantable.

Summary: positive evaluation of Significance; negative evaluation Desirability (India, China).

#82-05/29

00:34:43 I SAW THE ICECAPS MELTING

00:48:50 I SAW THE CLIMATE CHANGE

In the first posting of item #82, the irony is indiscernible, though its Significance is implied by the full caps. The revision, however, makes the author’s intention unmistakable. Though it is unlikely that the speaker (Nancy Pelosi) actually ‘saw’ the icecaps melting, the claim is not inherently ridiculous. But the revision makes the claim absurd.²¹⁸ The disjunction between the assumed Seriousness of the proposition (and the Significance conveyed by the full caps) and its underlying absurdity results in an irony that negatively evaluates the speaker for Warrantability.²¹⁹

²¹⁸ As a later headline declares: “President of Czech Republic: ‘Do you really ‘see’ any damage caused by current warming?’”

²¹⁹ Compare the above with the main headline of January 18: “PELOSI ANNOUNCES ‘GLOBAL WARMING’ PANEL”, which was accompanied by a large image of frozen citrus fruit, alluding (ironically) to the damaging cold that had recently descended on California.

Summary: negative evaluation of Wisdom (Nancy Pelosi).

The results of this analysis are presented in the following section (4.3) without interpretation. They are discussed in detail in section 4.4.

4.3 Results

One of the most striking results of the analysis was the consistently negative polarity of the Judgements. Of the 125 evaluations recorded, only 18 had a positive polarity.²²⁰ And of these 18, all but 3 were evaluations of Significance. Most of these conveyed Judgements on the Significance of global warming (5), extreme weather (8), and the implicit impact of Indian and Chinese industrialization (2). The 3 exceptions judged the Wisdom (2) and Veracity (1) of climate change sceptics or their position. The rest, 107 evaluations (85.6%), were negative.

Judgements were expressed along eight dimensions: Desirability (15), Expectability (6), Goodwill (22), Propriety (9), Significance (17), Veracity (22), Virtue (17), and Wisdom (17). All 15 expressions of Desirability were negative and formed a counterpart to the 15 positive evaluations of Significance described above; that is, the same propositions expressed both Significance and (negative) Desirability. Desirability was not otherwise an issue in the discourse.²²¹ Evaluations of Expectability were limited to a small number of headlines addressing global warming predictions. Of the 22 evaluations of Goodwill, 15 addressed global warming advocates, including 7 that addressed Al Gore in particular. The remaining 7 addressed political participants, both proponents and sceptics of climate change. All but 1 of the 9 Judgements of Propriety evaluated global warming activism,

²²⁰ The discrepancy between the sample size (89) and the number of evaluations (125) is due to the plurality of evaluations conveyed by some of the items in the sample set.

²²¹ Many other items in the sample set (indeed, the majority) convey evaluations of Desirability. But where these were not the primary Judgments being made, they were not included in the total. For instance, in item #57, the heavy snow is reported to have caused a "havoc", an implicitly negative evaluation of Desirability. But the Desirability of the snowstorm is not the issue in this headline, and so the evaluation was not included in the total.

including 2 that addressed Al Gore in particular. The remaining 1, which also addressed Al Gore, was ambiguous. The 2 negative Judgements of Significance evaluated global warming activism. 19 of the 22 Judgements of Veracity addressed global warming, with 2 more addressing the consensus on global warming. The lone positive evaluation addressed climate change scepticism. 15 of the 17 Judgements of Virtue targeted global warming advocates or their actions, including 3 that addressed Al Gore in particular. The remaining 2 targeted politicians, one addressing George Bush and the Republican administration, and the other the Democratic Presidential candidates. 15 of the 17 Judgements of Wisdom targeted global warming advocates or their actions, including 4 that addressed Al Gore in particular. The remaining 2 addressed climate change sceptics.

The evaluations targeted the following issues and participants: climate change consensus (2); climate change sceptics and scepticism (3); extreme weather, including fire and drought (16); global warming (29); global warming activism (14); global warming advocates (24); global warming predictions and forecasters (7); Indian and Chinese industrialisation (4); Al Gore (16); and various political participants (9). In addition, there was an evaluation with an ambiguous target (1). The evaluations of the global warming consensus were both negative for Veracity. On the other hand, the 3 evaluations of climate change scepticism were positive, 1 for Veracity and 2 for Wisdom. Extreme weather events were judged positively for Significance (8) and Negatively for Desirability (8); other evaluations were uncertain. Global warming was similarly evaluated for Significance and Desirability; in addition, however, there were 19 evaluations of Veracity, all negative. Global warming activism was evaluated for Significance (2), Wisdom (2), Propriety (6), and Virtue (4), all negatively. Global warming activists themselves were evaluated for Wisdom (8), Virtue (8), and Goodwill (8), all negatively. Global Warming predictions were evaluated for Expectability (6) and the forecasters themselves for Wisdom (1), all negatively. Indian and Chinese industrialisation was judged positively for Significance (2) and Negatively for Desirability (2). Al Gore was judged for Goodwill (7), Virtue (3), and Wisdom (4), all negatively. Finally, the politicians were all negatively evaluated for Goodwill (7) and Virtue (2).

4.4 Discussion

It is difficult to say how significant the ‘polarity’ results are. After all, a negative evaluation of the global warming position *is* a positive evaluation of its opposite, the sceptical position. This is generally not an issue when the evaluation is inscribed. For instance, in a headline like “Former German Chancellor slams climate ‘hysteria’”, “hysteria” conveys a negative evaluation of global warming. But when the evaluation is only betokened, as it most often is on the Drudge Report, the situation is not as clear. For instance, is “PAGLIA: I am a skeptic about what is currently called global warming” a positive evaluation of the sceptical position or a negative evaluation of the global warming position? The question is most acute when the headline says nothing about global warming either way, and conveys its meaning only by implication (as, for instance, in “North Dakota breaks 1945 snowfall”).

The position taken in this investigation is that climate change scepticism is a response to global warming claims and not vice versa, and therefore in cases of ambiguity it was assumed that the proposition is evaluating the underlying global warming claim and not the scepticism. Such an assumption has a direct effect on the polarity of the evaluation. To take the above example once again, “North Dakota breaks 1945 snowfall” could be read as Justification for, and thus a positive evaluation of, the sceptical position. If every similarly ambiguous headline were read from this perspective, the polarity results would be quite different. Note, however, that polarity is not the central issue if it is tied to an ambiguity in the interpretation of the target (as it is in the above example), for it cashes out the same (in terms of promoting the sceptical position) either way. It simply opens up the question of whether the sceptical position is being promoted directly (through positive evaluations of sceptical claims) or indirectly (through negative evaluations of global warming). In any event, the majority of the headlines were not ambiguous in this way. Though there was frequently the issue of whether or not to take a headline ironically, once the meaning was established, the polarity was generally informed by the participants and processes described. The absence of all but a small handful of positive evaluations therefore seems to be indicative of authorial intention rather than interpretive bias.

As for the issue of irony, it was not the purpose of this study to focus on the resources through which the underlying evaluations are expressed, so the relative frequency in the use of ironic constructions was not examined. This is perhaps a question for future investigation. Nevertheless, it is clear that at least some of the evaluations are being conveyed through ironic propositions (headlines like “Global Warming: Record snow fall buries Anchorage” leave no room for doubt) and, indeed, a large number of headlines were in fact interpreted as ironic. Few instances, however, are as overt as the above example, and any uncertainty leads directly to questions not only about the polarity of the evaluation but, even more fundamentally, about the appraisal of the target.

As suggested earlier, with reference to the headline about North Dakota’s record snowfall, the question of polarity itself has no substantive effect on the basic appraisal. Construing it as expressing a positive evaluation of the sceptical position or a negative evaluation of the global warming position ultimately leads to the same conclusion. Similar uncertainty about whether or not to read a proposition as ironic is far more consequential. Take the headline, “Muslim cleric blames drought, climate change on lack of faith in Allah”. The polarity of the evaluation here depends in a very fundamental way on whether or not we recognize the irony. To ignore it is to read climate change as a given fact, and to interpret the headline as conveying a positive evaluation of the Veracity of the global warming position.²²² We could say it is a negative evaluation of the sceptical position, but that is to miss the larger point: regardless of whether we see it as addressing one position or the other, what matters most is how we take the notion of a religious leader attributing climate change to a lack of piety.

But while there is perhaps room for doubt at the level of the individual proposition, this is generally relieved by the broader context of the discourse. Interpreting headlines like “WIPE OUT GLOBAL WARMING: CROW PROPOSES LIMITS ON TOILET PAPER” as anything but ironic makes no sense even in light of the surrounding text, let alone within the broader co-textual and inter-textual frames. If these have been

²²² We will overlook the fact that attributing climate change to anything other than the release of anthropogenic greenhouse gases is technically *not* the global warming position.

interpreted correctly, then we have reason to accept the ironic reading and reason to see the negative polarity of the evaluations they contribute as a genuine expression of authorial stance.

The question then is what is being rejected by all these negative evaluations. We turn first to the Judgements that are being conveyed. Significance is not in question; aside from the negative evaluation of a few global warming initiatives, the Significance of the various propositions is treated positively. The Desirability of these same issues is rejected, but that would likely be the case whether one accepted the global warming premise or not. Global warming predictions are consistently rejected, but these negative evaluations of Expectability account for only a handful of headlines. Veracity is among the most frequent Judgments expressed, with global warming being consistently rejected, but it still accounts for a mere 1 in 5 evaluations. Judgements of *ethos*, on the other hand, constitute more than half of all evaluations made.

We turn at last to the target of these evaluations. It was perhaps a mistake to include the headlines about India and China into the original dataset, as their relevance to the discourse on climate change is extremely oblique, relying to a very large extent on meta-discursive knowledge.²²³ In any case, their contribution is minor. Interestingly, climate change scepticism is also a minor target, with only 3 evaluations made without ambiguity. The consensus on global warming, too, is infrequently addressed. Drought and other extreme weather events are not overlooked, but their relevance to climate change is not clearly evaluated. With 24 evaluations, Global warming is the single largest target; indeed, constituting nearly one-quarter of all evaluations, its relevance is undeniable. And

²²³ They are interesting, however, in that they contribute to a distinct strand of climate change scepticism not otherwise addressed in this study—a variation on the median or weak position, similar to the one which holds that people are not responsible for global warming, or that they are responsible but must accept it and adapt to it. According to this version, *American* people are not responsible for it, or have only relatively little responsibility and ultimately no power over it, when one considers the imminent industrialisation of the world's two most populous nations. While the evaluation was deemed too indirect to offer in the analyses, these headlines may be seen to express a negative Judgement of the Wisdom (or perhaps Goodwill) of those who seek to reduce the production of greenhouse gases in the United States while tolerating it elsewhere.

while the Significance and negative Desirability of global warming are often acknowledged, the overwhelming Judgement is a negative evaluation of Veracity, a conclusion magnified by the negative appraisal of global warming predictions and forecasters. But consider the other targets.

Of the remaining 63 evaluations—of global warming advocates and their initiatives, including Al Gore and various other political participants (Republicans among them)—only global warming activism does not specifically address a human participant. Moreover, the line between an action and its agent is a fine one, and it might be argued that the evaluation of an individual's behaviour conveys an indirect evaluation of the individual himself. Indeed, many of the evaluations of global warming activism were interpreted in the above analysis as Judgements of *ethos*, and thus as indirect evaluations of the participants involved. For instance, item #75 ("CLIMATE PANIC: ACTIVISTS BUILD NEW NOAH'S ARK!") conveys a negative Judgement of the Wisdom or Virtue of a particular global warming initiative. But the implied lack of Wisdom in this undertaking surely reflects the lack of Wisdom among those engaged in it. In any case, a majority of the evaluations address the human participants in the discourse on climate change (or their actions) and the overwhelming majority of these address the proponents of global warming. In other words, more than half of the Judgements expressed about climate change on the Drudge Report evaluate *not* global warming itself, but the Wisdom, Virtue or Goodwill of those involved. And of these, only 3 are positive.

There are two implications to consider here; first, that *ethos* is the primary category of Judgement made with regard to claims about climate change; and second, that these Judgements serve not to *enhance* the warrantability of those involved in the discourse—not even the sceptics who ultimately benefit from them—but, rather, in almost every case, to *diminish* their standing, to make them *less* persuasive. While these Judgements complement those that express a negative evaluation of the Veracity of global warming, it is not the Drudge Report's position on climate change that is of central concern here. In a sense, the rejection of global warming was a foregone conclusion, anticipated with some

confidence on the basis of its given political leanings.²²⁴ And although the results lend further support to the connection between views on climate change and political affiliation, they would be no less interesting if they had been drawn from a politically liberal voice in support of global warming advocacy. Indeed, the question of whether similar results can be discerned in other news outlets, conservative or liberal, is one for possible future investigation. What is of most interest to the current discussion is that *ethos* is being addressed in this way at all.

As Aristotle observed nearly 2400 years ago, it is a mistake to believe that personal character contributes nothing to one's powers of persuasion. On the contrary, it is arguably one of the most potent weapons in the speaker's arsenal, and becomes only more so when opinions are divided. It is the latter point that suggests a reason why even more headlines were not evaluated for *ethos*. As important as character is to the issue of persuasion, there must be a sense of uncertainty or lack of consensus on the issue at hand for it to provide maximum impact. There is little to be gained from a reputation for character if the issues are already seen to be settled. In this regard, the many negative evaluations of the Veracity and Expectability of global warming are important to establish the necessary division of opinion and the possibility that a rejection of the global warming is tenable.

And this leads directly to the second important outcome identified above, that the evaluations of *ethos* are almost uniformly negative. There are many possible explanations for this, the simplest being that it is easier to sow doubt about an opponent's character or views than it is to make a positive case for one's own position. But the negative approach has other advantages as well, particularly in a medium where there are certain expectations of balanced coverage. It was pointed out earlier in this discussion that global warming advocates felt there was "too much balance" in the media presentation of the dialogic alternatives, and that this provided a sort of imbalance by over-representing the voices of the minority. While this is perhaps true of the Drudge Report as well, the

²²⁴ See Appendix C for the relationship between political orientation and attitudes toward global warming.

pervasive expressions of Judgement demonstrate that there is more going on than that. The many negative judgements of *ethos* are a function of the superabundance of voices ostensibly *promoting* the global warming position. The Drudge Report can honestly claim to be fulfilling its 'journalistic duty' to provide comprehensive coverage. But it does so as part of a two-pronged strategy to undermine the global warming position. On the one hand, it gives voice to the sceptics and thereby conveys the sense that global warming remains uncertain; while on the other, it gives voice to the proponents, but only to undermine what is arguably their most effective means of persuasion—credibility.

It is not that the Judgements of *ethos* simply trump the other evaluations or overpower them by virtue of superior number. Indeed, they are complementary to the others, and with them provide an implicit argument for the sceptical position. As in any argument, a simple—even if frequent—reiteration of one's position is likely to be less persuasive than if the position is justified by certain relevant facts. The Judgements of Wisdom, Virtue and Goodwill constitute those facts in the Drudge Report's discourse on climate change. The Veracity of global warming is not simply rejected, but reason is offered in terms of the judged failure of the participants either to understand climate change even as they take a stand on it (Wisdom), to possess the moral qualities necessary to do the right thing (Virtue), or to be in solidarity with their audience (Goodwill).

5. Conclusion

This study was motivated by the question of how climate change scepticism was being promoted through the news media. In answering that question, it offered a variation on the Aristotelian claim that personal character, or '*ethos*', was one of the most important elements of a speaker's ability to persuade an audience of the truth of his or her position. Turning this around, it proposed that rhetorical advantage might be gained in a similar way by representing one's opponent as deficient in character. It also broadened the notion of *ethos*, from an attribute possessed by a particular individual to one that distinguished a broader movement or coalition of individuals.

It offered the hypothesis that doubt about climate change was being sustained, at least in part, by a strategy of depicting the global warming coalition as lacking the *ethos* to be trusted in its claims about what is happening to the climate system and what must be done to avoid catastrophe. While there is no reason to suppose that such a strategy is unique to climate change scepticism or, indeed, to the issue of climate change at all, the project was inspired by the resilience of climate change scepticism in the face of an international scientific consensus, and so the hypothesis was tested on the climate change discourse, in an arena where scepticism to climate change was likely to be promoted, the conservative news media, as represented by the online news outlet, the Drudge Report.

To facilitate this investigation, an analytical framework was required, one that would help identify and systematize the various expressions of authorial stance presented in the discourse being studied. To this end, the literature was explored for insight into the way language can be used to convey interpersonal meanings. The Bakhtinian notion of heteroglossia proved to be a fundamental concept, giving force to the idea that we can (and do) express our subjective positions on the propositions we make, without any need to inscribe them overtly. To quote Jim Martin (2004), "In every instance, Bakhtin's ideological and axiological always already intertwine" (300). Language is always a response to another, an orientation to another, an invitation for another to accept and share our perspectives. In short, language is about engagement.

Two conclusions follow from this and reaffirm it. One is that evaluation is not restricted to any given linguistic resource. It is interpersonal, but not limited to the modalizations that are often seen to characterize the interpersonal. Indeed, this points us toward the second, and perhaps most important conclusion about evaluation, that it may not be manifested in a discrete, segmentable element at all. Evaluation is prone to a prosodic realization that defies efforts to locate and capture it at a particular point in a text, to say ‘this here is where the author reveals her stance on the matter’. Evaluations propagate, ramify and overlap, often depending for their ‘expression’ on the co-text, the inter-text and even the implicit meta-discursive knowledge of the reader.

This makes the study of evaluation a fascinating and challenging endeavour, and one that is taken up by a relatively new approach to discourse analysis known as ‘appraisal theory’. Appraisal theorists offer a framework that addresses many of the issues involved, but it is an avowedly incomplete project. In light of the various conclusions from the literature and the particular needs for the investigation of the Drudge Report, some elements of the Appraisal System were modified, most notably by the addition of a system of Judgement to specifically address issues of personal character.

Applying this modified framework to the analysis of a selection of climate-related headlines from the Drudge Report yielded clear evidence not only of a consistently negative appraisal of global warming, but, even more notably, a consistent critique of the *ethos* of its proponents. These results are significant for a number of reasons. First, they offer insight into why an effort to inform the public about global warming does not necessarily lead to support for the global warming position. As long as the wisdom, virtue or goodwill of the educators and activists are in doubt, the message will be resisted. In this regard, the dispute over climate change recalls another controversy in which the overwhelming (indeed, all but *unanimous*) scientific consensus has failed to impress a significant constituency of sceptics: the issue of evolution versus creationism. In both cases, the scientific “facts” are tangential to the underlying issues of solidarity. In addition, the results confirm that even a ‘balanced’ presentation of the news may conceal an ideological agenda, as the various claims are simultaneously, and often implicitly,

evaluated along any number of possible semantic dimensions, potentially conveying an appraisal that not only undermines but even reverses the meanings expressed overtly. The Drudge Report offers an excellent case study for such a subversive use of irony.

There are a number of limitations to this study that may be addressed in future research. The most obvious is the focus on a single news source. It remains to be seen whether similar results can be discerned in other news outlets, conservative or liberal. It is possible that the emphasis on *ethos* is unique to the Drudge Report and may not be as pronounced elsewhere. Indeed, it is possible that the emphasis on *ethos* even in the Drudge Report is restricted to the discourse on climate change, which is all that was examined. It is also far from clear what impact the expression of authorial stance has on the reader's interpretation of the text. How important are such evaluations to the reader's position on climate change? Moreover, this analysis construed the reader as someone with access to evaluations made co-textually and inter-textually—and in some cases relied on knowledge that needed to be brought to the text *by* the reader; in other words, it construed the reader as someone familiar with the broader discourse on the Drudge Report. It is uncertain how the conclusions would change if the reader were construed as someone with access only to the evaluations expressed in the text that appeared over the duration of a single session of reading. There are also questions about the resources employed in conveying these evaluations. Irony, for instance, is evidently an important resource for the expression of stance on the Drudge Report, but its relative frequency was not examined, and other news sources may employ entirely different resources. A comparative study of how meanings are appraised in different media might yield important insights. But even within the constraints of this particular study, the importance of recognizing and accounting for authorial stance cannot be overstated.

Appendix A: Headlines Selected for Analysis

#1-01/18

00:17:45 NOW IT IS SNOW IN MALIBU [main headline] [with image of snowy palm trees]

15:21:54 NOW... IT'S SNOW IN MALIBU!

#2-01/19

03:34:17 ABC TV Meteorologist Claims He Does Not Know A Single Weatherman Who Believes 'Man-Made Global Warming Hype'...

04:32:49 ABC-TV Meteorologist: I Don't Know A Single Weatherman Who Believes 'Man-Made Global Warming Hype'...

#3-01/19

04:08:37 Weather forecasters do battle...

04:32:49 Forecasters do battle...

#4-01/30

13:20:12 GLOBAL WARNING: 'BILLIONS TO GO WATERLESS' IN CLIMATE SHOCK [top]

14:59:05 'BILLIONS TO GO WATERLESS' IN CLIMATE SHOCK... [image of parched earth]

#5-01/30

13:30:17 GROUP: 10 years to save the planet... [top]

14:44:59 ALL-STAR GROUP: 10 years to save the planet... [top]

#6-01/30

15:01:06 TOMORROW'S FORECAST: THE WARMING, THE CHAOS [main headline]

15:05:08 TOMORROW'S FORECAST: CHAOS

#7-01/30

14:49:00 Scientists Counter UN Report - Claim Global Warming Due to Solar Activity, Not Man... [top]

15:03:07 COUNTER: Two New Books Confirm Global Warming is Natural, Moderate...

15:07:09 COUNTER: Two New Books Confirm Global Warming is Natural; Not Due To Human Activity...

15:09:10 COUNTER: Two New Books Confirm Global Warming is Natural; Not Caused By Human Activity...

#8-01/30

17:40:31 GOLBAL ACTIVIST/CELEB WIFE, CHILD PUBLISHING POWERHOUSE AIM TO SET STUDENTS STRAIGHT...

17:42:30 ACTIVIST/CELEB WIFE, CHILD PUBLISHING POWERHOUSE AIM TO SET STUDENTS STRAIGHT...

18:04:44 ACTIVIST/CELEB WIFE, STUDENT PUBLISHING POWERHOUSE AIM TO SET KIDS STRAIGHT...

#9-01/30

18:08:43 Eiffel Tower to Turn lights off for 5 minutes to help the cause...

18:10:45 Eiffel Tower lights off for 5 minutes to help the cause...

18:12:45 Eiffel Tower lights off for 5 minutes to help cause...

21:52:42 Eiffel Tower to Go Dark Ahead of Report...

23:57:48 Eiffel Tower to Go Dark Ahead of Climate Report...

#10-01/31~02/01

14:47:34 Trees take on greenhouse gases at Super Bowl...

14:49:30 ...NOW SUPER BOWL FIGHTS GLOBAL WARMING

03:49:40 ...NOW SUPER BOWL FIGHTS CLIMATE

#11-02/01

03:49:40 GLOBAL WARMING TOOK AWAY HIS PRICKLES... [with image of balding hedgehog]

13:48:58 'GLOBAL WARMING' TOOK AWAY HIS PRICKLES!

#12-02/01

14:11:10 Storm Brews Over Climatologist's Skeptical Global Warming Views...

23:30:13 Storm Brews Over Climatologist's Skeptical Views...

#13-02/01

21:27:11 UN: TEMPS 'PROBABLY' TO RISE OVER 7 DEGREES BY 2100...

23:01:58 UN: TEMPS PROBABLY TO RISE OVER 7 DEGREES BY 2100...

#14-02/01

23:30:13 GROUP: Humans 'Very Likely' Making Earth Warmer...

23:56:26 UN GROUP: Humans 'Very Likely' Making Earth Warmer...

#15-02/03

00:19:11 Gore to Testify on Climate Change...

15:33:44 Gore to Testify...

#16-02/06

19:14:50 MANMADE SNOW STORM HITS NYC... [with image of people in parkas]

20:37:34 MANMADE SNOW STORM HITS FRIGID NYC...

#17-02/07

00:33:14 Gore says Bush administration paying scientists to dispute...

00:35:16 Gore says Bush admin paying scientists to dispute... [top]

#18-02/07

04:49:26 Governor Planning To Fire Oregon Climatologist for Taking Skeptical View of Global Warming...

04:51:27 Governor Planning To Fire Oregon Climatologist for Taking Skeptical View of Warming... [top]

#19-02/09

01:56:48 Climate change concerts 'to dwarf Live Aid'...

14:41:30 Gore's Climate change concerts 'to dwarf Live Aid'... [with image of gore and a balloon globe]

#20-02/14

00:34:21 HOUSE HEARING ON 'WARMING OF THE PLANET' CANCELED AFTER SNOW/ICE STORM

01:22:50 HOUSE HEARING ON 'WARMING OF PLANET' CANCELED BECAUSE OF SNOWSTORM

01:32:51 HEARING ON 'WARMING OF PLANET' CANCELED BECAUSE OF SNOWSTORM [main headline]

04:30:21 HEARING ON 'WARMING OF PLANET' CANCELED BECAUSE OF ICE STORM [with image of blustery capitol]

#21-02/14

14:21:26 SNOW IS FOR LOVERS

14:41:36 VALENTINE'S DAY ON ICE [main headline] [with image of a couple kissing in snow]

#22-02/15

19:26:36 Gore Announces 'Global Warming' Concerts...

19:34:41 Gore Announces All-Star 'Global Warming' Concerts...

#23-02/16

01:05:37 McCain on global warming: 'I am convinced that we have reached the tipping point and Congress will act'...

22:20:33 McCain: 'I am convinced that we have reached the tipping point and Congress will act'...

#24-02/17

21:20:28 GORE: 'I can't imagine in any circumstance to run for office again'...

00:17:56 Gore rules out bid for US White House in 2008 [again]...

#25-02/18

19:25:49 Al Gore May Get Honorary Doctorate in Climatology...

19:37:55 Al Gore May Get Honorary Doctorate for his Work in Climatology...

#26-02/22

15:14:53 McCain Criticizes Bush On Global Warming, Iraq...

15:55:15 McCain Criticizes Bush On Climate, Iraq...

#27-02/23

03:49:25 Report: Global Warming Worries Keeps Children Awake At Night...

04:21:42 'Global Warming Worries Keeps Children Awake At Night'...

#28-02/24

03:49:39 Delaware Governor Rebukes State Climatologist Skeptical of Global Warming...

14:47:21 Delaware Governor Rebukes Skeptical State Climatologist...

#29-02/26

04:35:59 GORE'S 'TRUTH' WINS...

14:29:04 'TRUTH' WINS...

20:14:08 'TRUTH' WINS... [with image of Al Gore's face on medallion]

#30-02/26

22:20:47 Last August alone, Gore burned through 22,619 kWh -- guzzling more than 2x electricity in one month than average family uses in year...

22:20:47 POWER: GORE MANSION USES 20X AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD; CONSUMPTION INCREASE AFTER 'TRUTH'

#31-02/27

04:55:48 AP: Gore family paid an average monthly electric bill of \$1,200 last year for 10,000-square-foot home...

04:57:49 AP: Gore paid avg. monthly electric bill of \$1,200 for 10,000-square-foot home...

#32-02/27

06:00:23 AP: Gore paid avg. monthly electric bill of \$1,200 for 10,000-square-foot home...

15:47:24 WIRE: Gore paid avg. monthly electric bill of \$1,200 for 10,000-square-foot home... [with image of Gore mansion]

#33-03/12

02:29:17 Climate fears prompt EU to suggest speed limit for German autobahns.....

05:26:48 Climate fears prompt EU to seek speed limit for German autobahns...

#34-03/12

05:16:44 Muslim cleric blames drought, climate change on Australians' lack of faith in Allah...

21:27:39 Muslim cleric blames drought, climate change on lack of faith in Allah...

#35-03/13

NY TIMES PLANS HIT ON GORE, NEWSROOM SOURCES TELL DRUDGE:
'Scientists argue that Gore's warnings are full of exaggerated claims and startling

errors'... Reporter William Broad filing the story, 'A CALL TO COOL THE HYPE'...
Developing...

00:47:20 NY TIMES PLANS HIT ON GORE: CALL TO COOL THE HYPE'... [in red]

00:49:22 NY TIMES PLANS HIT ON GORE: 'CALL TO COOL THE HYPE'...

04:41:25 NY TIMES HIT ON GORE: 'A CALL TO COOL THE HYPE'...

#36-03/16~03/17

23:24:43 Activists greeted by Northeast snowstorm as they start global warming awareness walk...

00:01:22 Activists greeted by snowstorm as they start global warming awareness walk...

#37-03/17

23:03:50 Environmental Guru Predicts Climate Doom: 'Billions of us will die and the few breeding pairs of people that survive will be in the Arctic'...

23:05:42 Environmental Guru Predicts Climate Doom: 'Billions of us will die; few breeding pairs of people that survive will be in Arctic'...

#38-03/19

00:24:36 GORE FACES HILL GRILLING ON 'WARMING'; QUESTIONS AWAIT FORMER VP

15:42:55 GORE FACES HILL GRILLING ON 'WARMING'...

#39-03/19

14:42:10 Gore Challenged to International TV Debate on Global Warming...

14:54:32 Gore Challenged to International TV Debate...

16:45:26 Challenged to International TV Debate...

#40-03/20

12:37:41 Scientist who alleged Bush administration muzzled him, admits to doing 1,400 media interviews...

14:12:47 Scientist who alleged Bush administration muzzled him -- did 1,400 media interviews...

14:14:41 Scientist who alleged Bush administration muzzled him -- did 1,400 on-the-job media interviews...

#41-03/21

00:48:34 Capitol Hill Boils Over: Senate GOP Accuses Gore of Violating Committee Rules By Demanding Special Treatment...

14:32:12 Senate GOP Accuses Gore of Violating Committee Rules...

#42-03/21

12:10:59 Skeptics of Global Warming Hope to Test the Former Vice President's Mettle...

13:59:57 Skeptics of Global Warming Hope to Test Former Vice President's Mettle...

#43-03/21

15:00:11 'Crisis threatens the survival of our civilization'...

16:02:45 GORE SWEARS: 'Crisis threatens the survival of our civilization'...

#44-03/21

16:16:54 Czech President tells Congress: Environmentalism has replaced Communism as threat to freedom...

19:18:13 Czech Prez: Environmentalism has replaced Communism as threat to freedom...

#45-03/21

17:49:57 Congressman: Al Gore a 'prophet'...

19:14:29 Dem Rep.: 'You are a prophet'...

#46-03/21

19:04:36 GOP Rep: 'You're not just off a little, you're totally wrong'...

19:14:29 GOP Rep.: 'You're totally wrong'...

#47-03/21

19:04:36 GORE SWEARS: 'Crisis threatens the survival of our civilization'...

20:17:00 'THE PLANET HAS A FEVER' [image of gore holding his forehead]

#48-03/21

20:26:50 BOXER: YOU HAVE GIVEN IS HOPE...

20:29:06 BOXER: YOU HAVE GIVEN US HOPE...

#49-03/21

20:39:25 Forecaster sees active hurricane season... Experts universally -- and erroneously -- predicted 2006 would be busy year for storms...

20:57:34 Forecaster sees active hurricane season... Experts universally, and erroneously, predicted '06 would be busy year for storms...

#50-04/07

07:03:09 Forecaster Blasts Gore on Global Warming...

07:04:54 Top Forecaster Blasts Gore on Global Warming...

07:23:19 Top Forecaster Blasts Gore on Global Warming; 'a gross alarmist'...

#51-04/07

19:05:09 Global warming blamed for 'carnage' at Masters golf tournament...

19:25:59 EAR-MUFFS AT THE MASTERS... [in blue] [with image of bundled up spectators]

19:59:51 EAR-MUFFS AT THE MASTERS...²²⁵

#52-04/07~08

19:03:22 SNOW ON THE CHERRY BLOSSOMS! [main headline] [with main image of snowy blossoms]²²⁶

03:58:58 SNOW ON THE CHERRY BLOSSOMS!

²²⁵ This is technically not part of item #51, as the headline links to a different article.

²²⁶ This is technically not part of item #52, as the headline links to a different article.

04:31:14 SNOW ON THE CHERRY BLOSSOMS [main heading in blue] [with main image of snowy blossoms]

#53-04/09

22:03:07 Thursday night's Red Sox game at Fenway may be snowed out with 6 inches of snow in Boston... [in blue] [with image of snowy baseball field]

22:29:21 Thursday night's Red Sox game at Fenway may be snowed out with 6 inches of snow... [in blue]

#54-04/10

12:50:28 Megastars to rock the world in giant Live Earth concerts...

21:09:02 Megastars to rock the world...

#55-04/11

04:08:19 PAGLIA: I am a skeptic about what is currently called global warming... [with image of massive water fall]

04:32:47 PAGLIA: I am a skeptic about what is currently called global warming... 'Man is too weak to permanently affect nature' [with image of massive water fall]

04:34:33 PAGLIA: 'Man is too weak to permanently affect nature' [with image of massive water fall]

04:36:52 PAGLIA: 'Man is too weak to permanently affect nature'... 'Cooling and warming will go on forever'... [as two separate headlines]

#56-04/11

01:35:01 The Big Chill: New York Temps Rival Record for Coldest April

01:36:46 THE BIG CHILL: NY TEMPS RIVAL RECORD FOR COLDEST APRIL

04:06:20 THE BIG CHILL: NY TEMPS RIVAL RECORD FOR COLDEST APRIL...

[with image of cloudy sky]

#57-04/12

12:38:43 Chicago snow breaks 1957 record, causes havoc -- and more is on the way...

12:39:57 North Dakota breaks 1945 snowfall record...

13:10:28 Chicago breaks 1957 record...

13:10:28 North Dakota breaks 1945 snowfall...

#58-04/16

05:24:09 STORM BLAST: New York City received 6.41 inches of rain, the fourth wettest day of all time, and the heaviest rainfall in 30 years...

06:06:30 STORM BLAST: NYC'S HEAVIEST RAINFALL IN 30 YEARS...

#59-04/22

19:31:54 Rove engages in heated climate change exchange at White House dinner...

23:31:47 Rove takes on the Warming Sisters...

23:56:14 THE WARMING SISTERS TAKE ON ROVE!

#60-04/22

23:34:03 Debates Climate With Sheryl Crow, Laurie David...

23:56:14 Sheryl Crow, Laurie David Find Table #92...

#61-04/23

05:11:00 GLOBAL WARMING FIGHT: CROW PROPOSES LIMITS ON TOILET PAPER

05:11:00 'We can make it work with only one square per restroom visit, except, of course, on those pesky occasions where 2 to 3 could be required'...

05:19:03 WIPE OUT GLOBAL WARMING: CROW PROPOSES LIMITS ON TOILET PAPER

#62-04/26

12:22:56 FRAUD?: Carbon offset industry found to suffer 'serious credibility concerns'...

12:24:58 FRAUD?: Carbon offset industry; 'Serious credibility concerns'...

#63-04/27

01:09:43 '08 Dem Candidates Private Jet to Debate: 'No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions'...

01:53:53 WASTE NOT! '08 Dem Candidates Private Jet to Debate: 'No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions'...

02:22:22 WASTE NOT! Dem Candidates Private Jet to Debate: 'No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions'...

12:36:10 WASTE NOT! ALL DEMS TOOK PRIVATE JETS: 'No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions'...

14:31:11 WASTE NOT! DEMS TOOK PRIVATE JETS: 'No one pooled, no one took commercial flights to save money, fuel or emissions'...

#64-05/03

16:27:23 U.S. 'biggest culprit' of climate change: WWF...

16:33:25 U.S. 'biggest culprit' of climate change...

#65-05/06~05/07

15:39:39 Sheryl Crow: 'We have risen to great heights of arrogance in our refusal to acknowledge that the earth is changing'...

13:35:01 Sheryl Crow: 'We have risen to great heights of arrogance...'...

#66-05/08

19:16:30 RECORD HEAT BAKES SOUTHER CALIFORNIA...

19:18:16 RECORD HEAT BAKES ORANGE COUNTY...

19:22:18 HEAT WAVE BAKES ORANGE COUNTY...

#67-05/08

21:48:55 FIRE IN HOLLYWOOD HILLS

21:52:25 FIRE BURNS AT L.A.'S GRIFFITH PARK

22:08:17 FIRE BURNS AT GRIFFITH PARK

#68-5/09

01:26:43 Brush fires in Georgia send smoke to Miami...

01:40:52 Sends smoke to Miami...

#69-05/09

11:15:44 FIRE RAGES IN L.A....

12:33:59 FIRE RAGES IN L.A.

#70-05/09

14:49:27 THE FIRES RAGE

19:38:40 THE FIRES RAGE IN L.A....

19:58:22 FIRE RAGES

#71-05/10

00:36:26 EXTREME WEATHER, FIRES BEFALL NATION

00:53:01 Extreme Weather, Fires Befall Nation...

#72-05/10

13:03:11 Fifth-graders investigate global warming...

13:53:37 Fifth-graders investigate climate change...

#73-05/10

23:29:03 Brush Fire Breaks Out on Catalina Island...

23:52:56 Fire breaks out on Southern California island...

#74-05/15~05/16

23:43:26 '5 YEARS LEFT TO SAVE THE PLANET': WWF...

08:00:17 '5 YEARS LEFT TO SAVE THE PLANET': GROUP...

11:30:18 '5 YEARS LEFT TO SAVE THE PLANET'...

#75-05/16

11:49:35 CLIMATE PANIC: ACTIVISTS BUILD NEW NOAH'S ARK!

12:59:56 CLIMATE PANIC: ACTIVISTS BUILD NEW NOAH'S ARK

13:42:47 ACTIVISTS BUILD NEW NOAH'S ARK...

#76-05/17

13:47:13 The Last Temptation of Al Gore; Will He Run or Not?

22:53:42 Al Gore says he out of love with politics...

#77-05/18

13:59:58 Drought Saps Fla. Growers, Golf Courses...

15:34:48 Drought Sapping Resources in Florida...

#78-05/19

21:25:55 DiCaprio on '11TH HOUR': 'I want the public to be very scared by what they see. I want them to see a very bleak future'...

11:15:25 DiCaprio: 'I want the public to be very scared by what they see. I want them to see a very bleak future'...

#79-05/19~05/20

18:54:35 DiCaprio bites back over eco-hypocrisy charge: 'I try to travel commercial as much as I can'...

23:53:28 DiCaprio bites back over eco 'hypocrisy'...

#80-05/20

20:57:56 High school student shown Gore's film in four different classes: 'I really don't understand why they keep showing it'...

23:11:05 High school student shown 'INCONVENIENT TRUTH' in 4 different classes: 'I really don't understand why they keep showing it'...

#81-05/21~22

21:28:30 Religious Leaders Urge Action On Warming

21:50:42 SIN OR SUN? RELIGIOUS LEADERS URGE ACTION ON WARMING

15:04:53 SIN OR SUN? RELIGIOUS LEADERS URGE ACTION ON CLIMATE...

#82-05/29

00:34:43 I SAW THE ICECAPS MELTING

00:48:50 I SAW THE CLIMATE CHANGE

#83-06/04

13:32:23 Former German Chancellor slams climate 'hysteria', calls governments attempts to alter temperatures 'idiotic'...

16:05:40 Former German Chancellor slams climate 'hysteria'...

#84-06/11

15:14:49 7 of 10 warmest years for Denver occurred before 1955...

15:51:07 9 of 12 warmest years for Denver occurred before 1955...

#85-06/19

12:52:35 'LIVE EARTH' VOWS CLEAN CONCERTS...

12:54:35 PROMOTORS VOWS CLEAN CONCERTS...

#86-06/20

03:28:30 China building two power plants per week...

03:32:33 Building two power plants per week...

#87-06/20

06:19:34 Nissan studying possibility of launching \$3,000-class car in India...

07:11:59 Nissan studying possibility of selling \$3,000 car in India...

07:28:08 NISSAN WORKING ON \$3000 CAR FOR INDIA...

#88-06/22

00:11:50 PREDICTION: Paris sizzles, Mediterranean wilts from global warming...

00:32:01 PREDICTION: Cities will sizzle, Mediterranean wilt from global warming...

#89-06/27

13:58:14 Parts of Central Texas get 15-18 inches of rain overnight...

14:10:21 Parts of Central TX get 15-18 inches overnight...

14:18:27 18-INCHES OF RAIN OVERNIGHT IN TEXAS

Appendix B: Summary of Analysis

Item #		Polarity	System	Dimension	Target
1		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
2		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
3		negative	Judgement	Veracity	climate change consensus
4		negative	Judgement	Desirability	global warming
4		positive	Judgement	Significance	global warming
5		negative	Judgement	Desirability	global warming
5		negative	Judgement	Expectability	global warming predictions
5		positive	Judgement	Significance	global warming
6		negative	Judgement	Desirability	global warming
6		negative	Judgement	Expectability	global warming predictions
6		positive	Judgement	Significance	global warming
7		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
7		positive	Judgement	Veracity	climate change scepticism
8		negative	Judgement	Propriety	global warming activism
9		negative	Judgement	Significance	global warming activism
10		negative	Judgement	Significance	global warming activism
11		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	global warming advocates
12		negative	Judgement	Veracity	climate change consensus
12		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming advocates
13		negative	Judgement	Expectability	global warming predictions
14		negative	Judgement	Expectability	global warming predictions
15		negative	Judgement	Propriety	(ambiguous)
16		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
17		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	George Bush
17		negative	Judgement	Virtue	George Bush
18		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming advocates
19		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	global warming advocates
20		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	global warming advocates
20		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
21		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
22		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	global warming advocates
23		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	politicians
24		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	Al Gore
25		negative	Judgement	Propriety	global warming activism
26		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	politicians
27		negative	Judgement	Propriety	global warming activism
28		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming advocates
29		negative	Judgement	Propriety	global warming activism
29		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming

30		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	Al Gore
30		negative	Judgement	Virtue	Al Gore
31		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	Al Gore
31		negative	Judgement	Virtue	Al Gore
32		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	Al Gore
32		negative	Judgement	Virtue	Al Gore
33		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming activism
34		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	global warming advocates
35		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
35		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	Al Gore
36		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	global warming advocates
36		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
37		negative	Judgement	Desirability	global warming
37		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	global warming advocates
37		negative	Judgement	Expectability	global warming predictions
37		positive	Judgement	Significance	global warming
38		negative	Judgement	Propriety	Al Gore
39		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	Al Gore
39		positive	Judgement	Wisdom	climate change sceptics
40		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	global warming advocates
41		negative	Judgement	Propriety	Al Gore
42		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	Al Gore
42		positive	Judgement	Wisdom	climate change sceptics
43		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	Al Gore
44		negative	Judgement	Virtue	environmentalism
45		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	politicians
46		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	politicians
47		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	Al Gore
48		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	politicians
49		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	forecasters
49		negative	Judgement	Expectability	global warming predictions
50		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	Al Gore
50		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
51		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
52		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
53		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
54		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	global warming advocates
55		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
56		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
57		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
58		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
59		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming advocates
60		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming advocates

61		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	global warming advocates
62		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	global warming advocates
63		negative	Judgement	Virtue	politicians
63		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	politicians
64		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming advocates
64		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	global warming advocates
65		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming advocates
66		positive	Judgement	Significance	extreme weather
67		negative	Judgement	Desirability	extreme weather
67		positive	Judgement	Significance	extreme weather
68		negative	Judgement	Desirability	extreme weather
68		positive	Judgement	Significance	extreme weather
69		negative	Judgement	Desirability	extreme weather
69		positive	Judgement	Significance	extreme weather
70		negative	Judgement	Desirability	extreme weather
70		positive	Judgement	Significance	extreme weather
71		negative	Judgement	Desirability	extreme weather
71		positive	Judgement	Significance	extreme weather
72		negative	Judgement	Propriety	global warming activism
73		negative	Judgement	Desirability	extreme weather
73		positive	Judgement	Significance	extreme weather
75		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	global warming activism
75		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming activism
76		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	Al Gore
77		negative	Judgement	Desirability	drought
77		positive	Judgement	Significance	drought
79		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming advocates
79		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	global warming advocates
80		negative	Judgement	Propriety	global warming activism
81		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	global warming advocates
82		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	global warming advocates
83		negative	Judgement	Wisdom	global warming activism
83		negative	Judgement	Virtue	global warming activism
84		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming
85		negative	Judgement	Goodwill	global warming advocates
86		negative	Judgement	Desirability	Indian, Chinese industry
86		positive	Judgement	Significance	Indian, Chinese industry
87		negative	Judgement	Desirability	Indian, Chinese industry
87		positive	Judgement	Significance	Indian, Chinese industry
88		negative	Judgement	Desirability	global warming
88		positive	Judgement	Significance	global warming
89		negative	Judgement	Veracity	global warming

Appendix C: The Politics of Climate Change

It is evident that conservative Americans—or perhaps conservative *North* Americans—constitute the largest constituency of global warming sceptics in the world. Peter Jacques’s survey of the sceptical literature found that the “overwhelming majority” written since the 1990s revealed overt ties to contemporary political conservatism (78). Similar conclusions could be drawn from a survey by the PEW Research Center for the People and the Press.

Polled on the eve of the official release of AR4, 92% of ‘liberal’ Democrats expressed the belief that the Earth is getting warmer, as compared with only 54% of ‘conservative’ Republicans, a huge difference, albeit a majority at both ends of the political spectrum (PEW, 1/24/07). This was little different from the results of a Zogby International poll from August 2006, which found that 87% of Democrats as opposed to 56% of Republicans expressed the belief that global warming was a reality (Zogby, 8/21/06).

Moreover, when the question was framed in terms of whether climate change was due to human agency (i.e., the median sceptical position), public opinion was even more in line with political affiliation (with political moderates split down the middle). According to Pew, only 20% on the far right expressed the opinion that humans were responsible for global warming; on the far left the number was 71%. In the middle, the numbers ranged from 46% for moderate Republicans to 54% for moderate Democrats.

Sharpest of all were the divisions of opinion about the seriousness of the issue (i.e., the weak sceptical position). According to Pew, only 18% on the far right thought climate change a very serious matter, with 35% of moderate Republicans in agreement, 46% of Independents and 52% of moderate Democrats. On the far left, in contrast, 73% thought global warming was a very serious issue. The same pattern held throughout the survey. Even those who acknowledged that global warming was a problem distinguished themselves according to political ideology when asked about what should be done—on

the question of whether the issue warranted immediate government action, only 22% of conservative Republicans agreed, compared with 81% of liberal Democrats.

In short, political leanings are a highly reliable indicator of attitudes toward climate change. Moreover, while Americans were surpassed only by the UAE in the proportion of the population still unaware of such a thing called global warming, fully 84% *had* heard of it at that point, yet only half considered it a very serious problem (ACNielsen, 1/29/07). Climate change scepticism, therefore, cannot simply be dismissed as a matter of being uninformed.

Nor is it a question of being poorly educated. In fact, one of the most striking results of the Pew survey was the relationship between views on global warming and levels of education. While college educated Democrats were found to be more likely than their less educated peers (by 75% versus 52%) to believe that global warming was due to human agency—college educated republicans were *less* likely than their less educated peers to believe that humans were the source of climate change (by 23% versus 32%). It seems that higher education leads to greater certainty among Democrats but greater scepticism among Republicans.

The same trend was reflected in the expressed opinions of America's elite. A poll of 110 members of Congress, from both the Senate and the House, found an even sharper division along ideological lines than did the Pew survey. Of the 72 members who responded to the poll, fully 95% of Democrats expressed the belief that the Earth was warming as a result of human activity, while only 2% disagreed. Among Republicans the numbers were practically reversed: only 13% agreed as compared to 84% who disagreed. Surprisingly, both sides showed a decline in confidence since April 2006, though the effect was considerably sharper on the political right. Among Democrats, agreement dipped from 98% (though the numbers expressing disagreement remained steady), while among the Republicans, agreement plummeted from 23% and disagreement rose from 77% (National Journal, 02/03/07). As the scientific consensus actually increased during this period, culminating in the final draft of the fourth IPCC report (which attributed

global warming to human agency with 90% certainty) the most obvious explanation for the politicians' change in opinion is a hardening of position along partisan lines.

This interpretation is supported by data showing similar changes in opinion among the broader public. A survey conducted for the National Science Foundation by researchers at Ohio State University in 1997 found that 79% of the respondents believed global temperatures had risen, while 75% expressed the belief that temperatures would continue to rise if remedial action were not taken. The survey did not ask specifically whether the respondents believed global warming was anthropogenic, but the idea was implicit in the responses; most strikingly, 79% expressed the view that global warming could be reduced by limiting air pollution. Moreover, 91% said the government should put limits on the amount of air pollution businesses were allowed to produce, and 80% said the government should demand reductions in air pollution from countries receiving American aid (Krosnick & Visser, 3). Move forward to 2007 and the proportion of Americans accepting the reality of global warming remains virtually unchanged at 77%, while the number attributing it to human activities has tumbled to 47%, and of those, only 55% expressed the view that immediate government action was warranted (Pew, 01/24/07).

Again, in line with recent surveys, the Ohio State University poll found that opinion moved differently depending on political affiliation. The OSU researchers took two separate surveys, one shortly before and the other some months after the White House Conference on Global Climate Change. The earlier poll showed only an 8% difference in opinion about the reality of global warming, with 75% of "strong" Democrats expressing a belief as compared with 67% of "strong" Republicans. After the White House initiative, however, the partisan gap had grown to 22%, with strong Democrats expressing increasing confidence that global warming was a reality (77%), and strong Republicans much more sceptical (55%). Moreover, when the question turned to the dangers of global warming, the earlier poll actually showed strong Democrats as less concerned than their political rivals, with 15% saying global warming would not cause serious problems as compared with only 11% of strong Republicans. But after the White House initiative and the spate of attention it drew to the issue, only 4% of strong Democrats continued to

express doubts about the dangers, while among strong Republicans the numbers soared to 27% (Krosnick & Visser, 4).

In short, U.S. public belief about climate change divides along political lines independently of variables such as education, familiarity with the issue, or the growing consensus among scientists. While similar surveys correlating Canadian environmental beliefs with political identification are difficult to find, some inferences may be drawn from the available data. According to a recent poll by Angus Reid, Canadians are even more sceptical of global warming than Americans; only 73% believe it to be real. In the most conservative provinces, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the numbers drop to 61%. Conversely, while only 20% of Canadians believe the threat has been overplayed, among those in the conservative western provinces the number rises to 33% (Angus Reid, 2/11/07a). The data is hardly conclusive, but it points to the same pattern of conservative doubt we see in the United States.

Moreover, as the recent leak of a newsletter by Prime Minister Stephen Harper reveals, this doubt extends to the conservative leadership. Written in 2002, after Harper had become leader of the official opposition, the letter exposes conservative scepticism about global warming even as the ruling Liberal party was pushing for ratification of the Kyoto Accord. Calling the effort “a ‘socialist scheme’ designed to suck money out of rich countries”, Harper described resistance to ratification as the biggest struggle his party had faced since entrusting him with the leadership. While the letter primarily focuses on opposition to the Kyoto Accord, it reveals a deeper scepticism about global warming in general, describing the scientific evidence about climate trends as “tentative and contradictory”, and rejecting the characterization of carbon dioxide as a pollutant when it is “essential to life” (Harper, 2002). In an address at the Ottawa Leader’s Dinner that same year, Harper characterized the Kyoto Accord as a response to the “so-called ‘greenhouse gas’ phenomenon”. In a subsequent radio interview, he reiterated his scepticism, explaining, “We can debate whether or not... CO₂ does or does not contribute to global warming. I think the jury is out” (Liberal Party, 1/31/07). Although as Prime Minister he has spoken in favour of action on the environment and has introduced a

number of initiatives, his comments show that conservative scepticism about global warming persisted, much as it did in the United States, long after the scientific consensus had been achieved. It would not therefore be a stretch to imagine that scepticism among the conservative leadership continues in Canada as it does in the United States.

Glossary

Affect	A category of Attitude denoting culturally specific “emotional repertoires”.
Appraisal	A speaker’s expression of stance toward a proposition or proposal.
Appreciation	A category of behaviour denoting “institutionalized feeling” directed toward aesthetic values.
Attitude	One of three subsystems of Appraisal, comprising Affect, Appreciation and Judgement.
Attribution	A mode of Heteroglossic Engagement in which the responsibility for a proposition is assigned to a source.
Authorial Voice	A “media key” distinguished by the expression of Judgement.
Averred claim	A proposition implicitly Attributed to the Self.
Capability/Capacity	A Judgement of Social Esteem in terms of what one is able to do.
Commentator	A Writer Voice that expresses Judgements of Social Esteem and Social Sanction.
Correspondent	A Writer Voice that expresses Judgements of Social Esteem.
Counter	A proposition that serves to head off or undermine a dialogic alternative.
Delegated Attribution	An attribution that expresses a distance between the author of a reported utterance and the source, thereby diminishing authorial responsibility for the claim.
Denial	A proposition that rejects a dialogic alternative in the broadest sense.
Desirability/Inclination	A Judgement of Social Esteem in terms of what is desirable.
Dialogic Contraction	A mode of Heteroglossic Engagement in which alternatives voices are suppressed.
Dialogic Expansion	A mode of Heteroglossic Engagement in which dialogic alternatives are invited.
Disclamation	A proposition that explicitly rejects a dialogic alternative.

Emphasized Attribution to Self	A Proposition that emphasizes the subjective involvement of the authorial voice.
Engagement	One of three subsystems of Appraisal, which addresses the dialogism of a discourse.
Ethos	The recognized character of a speaker, comprising Wisdom, Virtue and Goodwill.
Evoke	To 'connote' an evaluation, by Inviting or Provoking a response
Expectability/Normality	A Judgement of Social Esteem in terms of what can be expected.
Explicitly Speaker Evaluating Utterance	An attributed proposition in which the structure or content of the reported speech Provokes a negative evaluation of the source.
Focus	A Graduation resource that modulates the precision of a claim.
Force	A Graduation resource that modulates the strength of a claim.
General attribution	A Hidden Attribution to Self whereby a claim is sourced to a common sense or sentiment.
Goodwill	A Judgement of Ethos, conflating Social Esteem and Social Sanction.
Graduation	One of three subsystems of Appraisal, comprising Force and Focus.
Heterogloss	A plurality of voices.
Heteroglossic Engagement	The acknowledging of one or more alternative voices in a discourse.
Hidden attribution to self	An Averred Claim disguised as an Attribution to an inanimate source.
Impact	An Appreciation as a Reaction, in terms of influence or effect.
Implicitly Speaker Evaluating Utterance	An attributed proposition in which the structure or content of the reported speech evokes a negative evaluation of the source.
Importance/Significance	A Judgement of Social Esteem in terms of what is significant.

Inscribe	To employ language that contains an overt expression of Attitude.
Invite	To employ language that encourages the listener to share the speaker's perspective.
Judgement	A category of Attitude denoting "institutionalized feeling" directed toward prescribing behaviour.
Justification	A mode of Heteroglossic Engagement in which the linguistic construction serves to support or substantiate a non-factual (evaluative) proposition.
Monoglossic Engagement	A mode of Engagement in which no dialogic alternative is acknowledged.
Non-sourced Averal	A proposition implicitly attributed to the Self, without reference to any source.
Proclamation	A proposition conveying a heightened personal investment in the claim being made.
Propriety	A Judgement of Social Sanction in terms of what constitutes appropriate behaviour.
Provoke	To deploy imagery that rouses a response.
Quality	An Appreciation as a Reaction to (aesthetic) features.
Reaction	An Appreciation as an aesthetic response, in terms of Impact or Quality.
Reclaimed Attribution	An attribution in which the Authorial Voice maintains responsibility for the proposition.
Reporter Voice	An Authorial Voice in which Judgements are expressed only through the use of Graduation resources.
Social Esteem	A category of Judgements about how something is valued.
Social Sanction	A category of Judgements about what is right and proper.
Sourced Averal	A proposition attributed to an implicit voice in the discourse.
Speaker Evaluating	A proposition that evaluates the source of a reported claim.
Text (attribution to)	A Hidden Attribution to the Self, in which a proposition is explicitly sourced to a piece of text.
Third-person Evaluating	A proposition that evaluates the content of a reported claim.

Veracity	A Judgement of Social Sanction in terms of what constitutes the truth.
Virtue	A Judgement of Ethos, conflating Social Esteem and Propriety.
Wisdom	A Judgement of Ethos, conflating Social Esteem and Veracity.
Writer Voice	A category of Authorial Voice, in which explicit Judgements are expressed.

References

- ACNielsen (2007, January 29). Global Warming: A Self-Inflicted, Very Serious Problem, According to More Than Half the World's Online Population. Retrieved on February 14, 2007, from: <http://www2.acnielsen.com/news/20070129.shtml>
- Angell, M. (2001). Medicine in the noise age: What can we believe? *Accountability in Research*, 8, 189-195.
- Angus Reid (2007a). Federal Political Landscape: Harper and Dion: Who's the Greenest?. Retrieved on March 1, 2007, from: http://www.angus-reid.com/admin/collateral/pdfs/polls/AngusReidPoll_02-11-07.pdf
- Aristotle. (350 BC). *Rhetoric* (W. Rhys Roberts, Trans.). Retrieved September 1, 2007, from: <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.html>.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin* (M. Holquist, Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bird, S. E., & Dardenne R. W. (1988). Myth, chronicle and story: exploring the narrative qualities of news. In J. W. Carey, (Ed.). *Media, myths and narratives: Television and the press*. (pp. 67-86). New York: Sage.
- Bolin, B. (1994). Science and policy making. *Ambio*, 23, 25-29.
- Boykoff, J. & Boykoff, M. (November/December 2004). Journalistic Balance as Global Warming Bias: Creating controversy where science finds consensus. *Fairness & Accuracy in Reporting*. Retrieved on September 21, 2007, from: <http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=1978>
- Boykoff, M. (2005). The disconnect of News Reporting from Scientific Evidence. *Nieman Reports*, 59 (4), 86-87.
- Bruck, P.A. (1989). Strategies for peace, strategies for news research. *Journal of Communication* 39, 108-127.
- Burgess, J. (1990). The production and consumption of environmental meanings in the mass media: A research agenda for the 1990s. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 15, 139-161.
- Carvalho, A. (2005). Representing the politics of the greenhouse effect: Discursive strategies in the British media. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2, 1-29.
- Chafe, W. (1986). Evidentiality in English Conversation and academic writing. In W. Chafe and J. Nichols (Eds.). *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. (pp. 261-72). Norwood: Ablex.

Channell, J. (2000). Corpus-based analysis of evaluative lexis. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson, (Eds.). *Evaluation in Text*. (pp. 38–55). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clayman, S.E. (1990). From text to talk: Newspaper accounts of reporter-source interactions. *Media, Culture, and Society*, 12, 79-103.

Clift, R. (1999). Irony in conversation. *Language in Society*, 28 (4), 523–553.

Coffin, C. (1997). Constructing and Giving Value to the Past: an Investigation into Second School History. In F. Christie, F. & J.R. Martin, J.R. (Eds.). *Genre and Institutions - Social Processes in the Workplace and School*. (pp. 196-230). London, Cassell.

----- & O'Halloran, K.A. (2005). Finding the global groove: Theorising and analyzing dynamic reader positioning using APPRAISAL, corpus and a concordancer. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2 (2), 143-163.

----- (2006). The role of Appraisal and corpora in detecting covert evaluation. *Functions of Language*, 13 (1), 77- 110.

Cohen, J.J. (2001). Trust us to make a difference: Ensuring public confidence in the integrity of clinical research. *Academic Medicine*, 76, 209-214.

Conrad, S. (2002). Corpus Linguistic Approaches for Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 75-95.

Corbett, J.B. & Durfee, J.L. (2004). Testing Public (Un)Certainty of Science Media Representations of Global Warming. *Science Communication*, 26 (2), 129-151.

Demeritt, D. (1998). Science, social constructivism, and nature. In B. Braun and N. Castree (Eds.). *Remaking reality: Nature at the millennium*. (pp. 173-193). New York: Routledge.

----- (2001). The construction of global warming and the politics of science. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 91, 307-337.

Dressen, D. (2003). Geologists' implicit persuasive strategies and the construction of evaluative evidence. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2 (4), 273-290.

Dunmire, P. (1997). Naturalizing the future in factual discourse: A critical linguistic analysis of a projected event. *Written Communication*, 14, 221-264.

----- (2005). Preempting the Future: Rhetoric and Ideology of the Future in Political Discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 16, 481-513.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter Publishers Ltd.

Eldridge, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Getting the Message—News, Truth and Power*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1988). Discourse Representation in Media Discourse. *Sociolinguistics*, 17 (2), 125-139.

----- (1992). Discourse and Text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 3, 193-217.

----- (1995). *Media discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

----- (2001). *Language and Power*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

----- (2003). 'Political correctness': the politics of culture and language. *Discourse and Society*, 14, 17-28.

Fiorino, D.J. (1989). Technical and Democratic Values in Risk Analysis. *Risk Analysis*, 9 (3), 293-299.

----- (1990). Citizen Participation and Environmental Risk: A Survey of Institutional Mechanisms. *Science, Technology, and human Values*, 15 (2), 226-243.

Fisk, J. (1989). *Reading the Popular*. London: Routledge.

Fleischman, S. (1982). *The Future in Thought and Language: Diachronic Evidence from Romance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forbes (2007, January 23). The Web Celeb 25. Retrieved on February 15, 2007, from: http://www.forbes.com/2007/01/23/internet-fame-celebrity-tech-media-cx_de_06webceleb_0123land.html

Fowler, R.G. (1987). The intervention of the media in the reproduction of power. In I.M. Zavala, T. A. van Dijk, & D. M. Diazl (Eds.). *Approaches to discourse, poetics, and psychology*. (pp. 67-80). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

----- & Kress, G. (1979). *Language as Ideology*. London: routledge & Keegan Paul.

Francis, G. (1995). Corpus-driven grammar and its relevance to the learning of English in a cross-cultural situation. In A. Pakir (Ed.). *English in Education: Multicultural Perspectives*. Singapore: Unipress.

Givon, T. (1994). Irrealis and the subjunctive. *Studies in Language*, 18, 265-337.

- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Graham, P. (2004). Predication, propagation, and mediation: SFL, CDA, and the inculcation of evaluative meaning systems. In L. Young and C. Harrison (Eds.). *Systemic Functional Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis*. (pp. 53-67). London: Continuum.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.). *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Gruber, H. (1993). Evaluation devices in newspaper reports. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19 (5), 469-486.
- Guardian (2006, August 13). Websites that changed the world. Retrieved on February 15, 2007, from: <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/review/story/0,,1843263,00.html>
- Haiman, J. (1990). Sarcasm as theatre. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 1, 181-205.
- Hajer, M. (1993). Discourse coalitions and the institutionalization of practice: The case of acid rain in Great Britain. In F. Fischer & J. Forester (Eds.). *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning*. (pp. 198-218). Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Hall, S. (1978). The social production of news. In S. Hall, C. Critcher, T. Jefferson, J. Clarke & B. Roberts (Eds.). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state, and law and order*. (pp. 53-77). London: McMillan.
- (1982). The rediscovery of "ideology": Return of the repressed in media studies. In M. Gurevitch, T. Bennett, J. Curran & J. Woollacott (Eds.). *Culture, society, and the media*. (pp. 53-77). London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1981). Text semantics and clause grammar: Some patterns of realization. In J. E. Copeland & P. W. Davis (Eds.). *The Seventh LACUS Forum*. (pp. 31-59). Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.
- & Matthiessen, C. (2004) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 3rd edition. London: Edward Arnold.
- Harper, S. (2002). News letter. Retrieved on March 1, 2007, from: <http://www.liberal.ca/pdf/docs/HarperLetter.pdf>
- Hartley, J. (1982). *Understanding News*. London: Routledge.
- Hodge, R. (1979). Newspapers and communities. In R. Fowler et al. (Eds.). *Language and Control*. (pp. 157-174). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Hoey, M. (2000). Persuasive rhetoric in linguistics: a stylistic study of some features of the language of Noam Chomsky. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson, (Eds.). *Evaluation in Text*. (pp. 28–37). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horlick-Jones, T., Sime, J. & Pidgeon, N. (2003) "The Social Dynamics of Environmental Risk Perception: Implications for Risk Communication Research and Practice," in N. Pidgeon, R.E. Kasperson and P. Slovic (Eds.). *The Social Amplification of Risk*. (pp. 262-285). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunston, S. (1993). Professional Conflict — Disagreement in Academic Discourse. In M. Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.). *Text and Technology*. (pp. 115-136). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (2000). Evaluation and the planes of discourse: Status and value in persuasive texts. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.). *Evaluation in Text*. (pp. 176–207). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- & Sinclair, J. (2000). A Local Grammar of Evaluation. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson, (Eds.). *Evaluation in Text*. (pp. 75-101). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Iedema, R., Feez, S., & White, P. R. R. (1994). *Media Literacy*. Sydney: Disadvantaged Schools Program, NSW Department of School Education (extracts available to download from <http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal>).
- Intermarkets (2007, January 12). *Drudge Report Traffic Record Set*. Retrieved on January 31, 2007, from: <http://www.intermarkets.net/press-room.htm>
- IPCC. (2007a). [Promotional flyer]. Retrieved on July 1, 2007, from: http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/global_warming/IPCCflyer_lr.pdf
- IPCC. (2007b). Summary for Policymakers. In S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor & H.L. Miller (eds). *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved on July 1, 2007, from: <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg1/ar4-wg1-spm.pdf>
- Jacques, P. (2006). The Rearguard of Modernity: Environmental Skepticism as a Struggle of Citizenship. *Global Environmental Politics*, 6 (1), 76-101.
- Katz, S. & Miller, C. (1996). The low-level radioactive waste siting controversy in North Carolina. In C.G. Herndl, & S. C. Brown, (Eds.). *Green culture: Environmental rhetoric in contemporary America* (pp. 111-140). Madison: Wisconsin University Press.
- Kress, G. (1983). Linguistic processes and the mediation of reality: Newspaper language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 40, 43-57.

----- (1985). Ideological structures in discourse. In T.A. Van Dijk (Ed.). *Handbook of discourse analysis: Discourse analysis in society*. (pp. 27-42). New York: Academic Press.

----- & Trew. (1978). Ideological transformations in discourse. *Sociological Review*, 26, 755-776.

Krosnick, J.A. and Visser, P.S. (1998). The Impact of the Fall 1997 Debate About Global Warming On American Public Opinion. Retrieved on March 1, 2007, from:
<http://www.rff.org/rff/Documents/RFF-RPT-globlwarndeb-exec-sum.pdf>

Lassen, I. (2004). Ideological resources in biotechnology press releases: Patterns of Theme/Rheme and Given/New. In L. Young and C. Harrison, (Eds.). *Systemic Functional Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis*. (pp. 264-279). London: Continuum.

----- (2006). De-naturalizing ideology: presupposition and appraisal in biotechnology press releases. In I. Lassen, J.Strunck, & T. Vestergaard (Eds.). *Mediating Ideology in Text and Image: Ten Critical Studies*. (pp. 97-118). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Leech, G. & Short, M. (1981). *Style in fiction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Lemke, J. (1988). Genres, Semantics, and Classroom Education. *Linguistics and Education*, 1, 81-99.

----- (1990). Technical Discourse and Technocratic Ideology. In M.A.K. Halliday, J. Gibbons, & H. Nicholas (Eds.). *Learning, Keeping, and Using Language, Selected Papers from the 8th AILA World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Volume II*. (pp. 435—460). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

----- (1992). Interpersonal Meaning in Discourse: Value Orientations. In M. Davies and L. Ravelli (Eds.). *Advances in Systemic Linguistics: Recent Theory and Practice*. (pp. 82-104). London: Pinter.

----- (1995a). *Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics*. London: Taylor and Francis.

----- (1995b). Intertextuality and text semantics. In M. Gregory and P. Fries (Eds.). *Discourse in Society: Functional Perspectives*. (pp. 85-114). Norwood: Ablex.

----- (1998). Resources for Attitudinal Meaning: Evaluative Orientations in Text Semantics. *Functions of Language* 5 (1), 33-56. [Available online at:
<http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/education/jlemke/editorl.htm>]

Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liberal Party of Canada (2007). Stephen Harper in his own words. Retrieved on March 1, 2007, from: http://www.liberal.ca/news_e.aspx?type=news&id=12214

Livesey, S. (2002). Global Warming wars Rhetorical and discourse analytic approaches to Exxonmobil's corporate public discourse. *Journal of Business Communication*, 39 (1), 117-146.

Lowe, T., Brown, K., Dessai, S., França Doria, M, Haynes, K. & Vincent, K. (2006). Does Tomorrow ever come? Disaster narrative and public perception of climate change. *Public Understanding of Science*, 15, 435-457.

Luke, T.W. (2000). A Rough Road Out of Rio. In N. Low, B. Gleeson, I. Elander, & R. Lidskog (Eds.). *Consuming Cities*. (pp. 54-69). London: Routledge.

Luntz, F. (2003). The Environment: A cleaner, safer, healthier America. Retrieved on February 10, 2007, from: <http://www.luntzspeak.com/graphics/LuntzResearch.Memo.pdf>

Macken-Horarik, M. (2003). Envoi: intractable issues in appraisal analysis? *Text*, 23 (2), 313-319.

Malone, M. (2007, March 1). Surfing Upstream: The Drudge Report's Impact on America. Retrieved on March 2, 2007, from: <http://abcnews.go.com/Business/IndustryInfo/story?id=2915370&page=1>

Martin, J.R. (1992). *English Text*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

----- (2000). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (Eds.). *Evaluation in Text*. (pp. 142-175). London: Oxford University Press.

----- (2004). Sense and sensibility: texturing evaluation. In J. Foley (Ed.). *New Perspectives on Education and Discourse*. (pp. 270-304). London: Continuum.

McComas, K. & Simone, L. (2003). Media Coverage of conflicts of Interest in Science. *Science Communication*, 24 (4), 395-419.

McCright, A.M. and Dunlap, R.E. (2003). Defeating Kyoto: The conservative Movement's Impact on U.S. Climate Change Policy. *Social Problems*, 50 (3), 348-373.

Moynihan, R.; Bero, L. Ross-Degnan, D.; Henry, D.; Lee, K.; Watkins, J.; Mah, C. & Soumerai, S.B. (2000). Coverage by the news media of the benefits and risks of medications. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 342, 1645-1650.

Myers, G. (1990). *Writing Biology: Texts in the Social Construction of Scientific Knowledge*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

National Journal (2007, February 3). Congressional Insiders Poll. Retrieved on February 14, 2007, from:

http://syndication.nationaljournal.com/images/203Insiderspoll_NJlogo.pdf

Nelkin, D. (1995). *Selling science*. New York: Freeman.

Parenti, M. (1993). *Inventing Reality—the Politics of News Media* (2nd Ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Pethokoukis, J. (2007, February 27). Did the Drudge Report Help Tank the Stock Market? Retrieved on February 27, 2007, from:

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/biztech/capitalcommerce/070227/did_the_drudge_report_help_tan.htm

Pew Research Center for the People & the Press (2007, January 24). Global Warming: A Divide on Causes and Solutions. Retrieved on March 1, 2007, from:

<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/282/global-warming-a-divide-on-causes-and-solutions>

Redclift, M., & Sage, C. (1998). Global environmental change and global inequality: North/south perspectives *International Sociology*, 13, 499-516.

Sachs, W. (1999). *Planetary dialectics: Explorations in environment and development*. London: Zed Books.

Schneider, S.H. (2001). A Constructive Deconstruction of Deconstructionists: A Response to Demeritt. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 91 (2), 338-344.

Shuchman, M. & Wilkes, M.S. (1997). Medical scientists and health news reporting: A case of miscommunication. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 126, 976-82.

Simons, M. (2001). Why some Propositions are Conversational Implicatures. Paper presented at *Rutgers Center for Cognitive Science, Semantics Workshop*, September 2001.

Sinclair, J.M. (1981). Planes of discourse. In S.N.A. Rizvi (Ed.). *The Two-Fold Voice: Essays in Honour of Ramesh Mohan*. Salzburg: University of Salzburg, 70-89.

Slowplay (2005, February 20). Drudge vs. Bloggers - by the numbers. Retrieved on January 31, 2007, from: <http://www.slowplay.com/cramarchives/2005/02/20/drudge-vs-bloggers.php>

Stauffer, N. (2005, March 16). Climate Change Poorly Understood, MIT survey finds". Retrieved on January 31, from: <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2005/climate-0316.html>

Stubbs, M. (1996). Towards a modal grammar of English: A matter of prolonged fieldwork. In *Text and Corpus Analysis: Computer-Assisted Studies of Language and culture*. (pp. 196-228). Oxford: Blackwell.

The Hill (2007, January 23). Drudge, global warming shut down Senate site. Retrieved on January 31, 2007, from:
<http://thehill.com/thehill/export/TheHill/News/UndertheDome/012307.html>

Thetala, P. (1997). Evaluated entities and parameters of value in academic research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16 (2), 101-118.

Thompson, G. (1998). Resonance in text. In A. Sanchez-Macarro and R. Carter (Eds.). *Linguistic Choice Across Genres: Variation in Spoken and Written English*. (pp. 29-63). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

----- & Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation: an introduction. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson, (Eds.). *Evaluation in Text*. (pp. 1-27). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

----- & Zhou, J. (2000). Evaluation and Organization in Text: The Structuring Role of Evaluative Disjuncts. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (Eds.). *Evaluation in Text*. (pp. 142-175). London: Oxford University Press.

Time (2006, April 30). TIME 100: The People Who Shape Our World. Retrieved on February 15, 2007, from:
<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1189247,00.html>

Thompson, G. (1998). Resonance in text. In A. Sánchez-Macarro & R. Carter (Eds.). *Linguistic Choice across Genres*. (pp. 29-46). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Trask, L. (1997). Scare Quotes. *University of Sussex Guide to Punctuation*. University of Sussex. Retrieved on October 31, 2007 from
<http://www.informatics.sussex.ac.uk/departments/docs/punctuation/node31.html>

Trew, T. (1979a). What the papers say: linguistic variation and ideological difference. In R. Fowler et al (Eds.). *Language and Control*. (pp. 117- 156). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

----- (1979b). Theory and Ideology at Work. In R. Fowler et al. (Eds.). *Language and Control*. (pp. 94-116). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Trumbo, C. (1996). Constructing Climate Change: Claims and frames in US news coverage of an environmental issue. *Public Understanding of Science*, 5, 269-273

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making News: A study of the construction of reality*. New York: Free Press.

U.S. National Research Council (1989). *Improving Risk Communication*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Van Dijk, T. (1988). *News analysis: Case studies of international and national news in the press*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

----- (1989). Mediating racism: The role of the media in the reproduction of racism. In R. Wodak (Ed.). *Language, Power, and ideology*. (pp. 199-226). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.

Volosinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (L. Matjka & I. R. Titunik, Trans.). London: routledge.

White, P.R.R. (2002). Appraisal – the language of evaluation and stance. In J. Verschueren, J. Östman, J. Blommaert & C. Bulcaen (Eds.). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. (pp. 1-27). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

----- (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: a dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text*, 23, 259-284.

----- (2006a). An introductory tour through appraisal theory. Retrieved on September 12, 2007, from:
<http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalOutline/UnFramed/AppraisalOutline.htm>

----- (2006b). Evaluative semantics and ideological positioning in journalistic discourse: a new framework for analysis. In I. Lassen, J. Strunck & T. Vestergaard (Eds.). *Mediating Ideology in Text and Image: Ten Critical Studies*. (pp. 37-67). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Winter, E.O. (1982). *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English*, London: George Allen & Unwin.

----- (1986). Clause relations as information structure: Two basic text structures in English. In M. Coulthard (Ed.). (1996) *Advances in written text analysis*. (pp. 46-68). London: Routledge.

Yearley, S. (1996). *Sociology, environmentalism, globalization: Reinventing the globe*. London: Sage.

Young, L. & Fitzgerald, B. (2006). *The Power of Language: How Discourse Influences Society*. London: Equinox Publishers.

Zelizer, B. (1989). "Saying" as a collective practice: Quoting and differential address in the news. *Text*, 9, 369-387.

Zogby (2007, August 21). Americans Link Hurricane Katrina and Heat Wave to Global Warming. Retrieved on March 1, 2007, from:
<http://www.zogby.com/News/ReadNews.dbm?ID=1161>