

Authors: Ana Belén Cabrejas Peñuelas and Mercedes Díez Prados

Title of the paper: Positive self-evaluation versus negative other-evaluation in the political genre of pre-election debates

Professional affiliation for Ana Belén Cabrejas Peñuelas:

Profesora Ayudante de Universidad
Universidad de Valencia
ana.belen.cabrejas@uv.es

Institutional address:

University of Valencia
Department of English and German Philology
Facultad de Filología, Traducción y Comunicación
Blasco Ibáñez 32
46010 Valencia (Spain)
Tel. : +34 963543589
Fax: +34 963543550

Biographical note:

Ana Belén Cabrejas Peñuelas is an Assistant Lecturer at the University of Valencia (Spain). She investigates the cognitive processes involved in second or foreign language writing, in particular the revision process and the use of the mother tongue, although she is also concerned with Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics and Systemic Functional Linguistics. Her most important publications deal with L2 writing processes and evaluation in political language from a contrastive perspective.

Professional affiliation for Mercedes Díez Prados:

Profesora Titular de Universidad
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
mercedes.diez@uah.es

Institutional address:

University of Alcalá de Henares (Madrid)
Department of Modern Philology
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras - Edificio Caracciolos
Universidad de Alcalá
c/ Trinidad, 3. 28801 - Alcalá de Henares (Madrid), España
Tel.: +34 91885 5333
Fax: +34 91885 4445

Biographical note:

Mercedes Díez Prados is Senior Lecturer at the University of Alcalá (Spain). Both her teaching and research are mainly concerned with Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics and Systemic Functional Linguistics. Her most significant publications tackle the issues of cohesion, evidentiality and evaluation in written English by native and non-native writers, both expert and novice, occasionally from a gender perspective. Of late, she is conducting contrastive research (English-Spanish) on evaluation devices used in political language. Her most recent publications on this issue are two works co-authored with Ana Belén Cabrejas Peñuelas: *Cohesion devices of three political texts: The*

Gettysburg Address, I Have a Dream and Obama's Inaugural Address and The evaluative function of cohesive devices in three political texts (in press).

Address for proofs and offprints:

University of Valencia
Department of English and German Philology
Facultad de Filología, Traducción y Comunicación
Blasco Ibáñez 32
46010 Valencia (Spain)
Tel. : +34 963543589
Fax: +34 963543550

Short title: Positive self-evaluation versus negative other-evaluation in the political genre of pre-election debates

Size: 10,265 words, 339 KB

Positive self-evaluation versus negative other-evaluation in the political genre of pre-election debates

Ana Belén Cabrejas Peñuelas, University of Valencia

Mercedes Díez Prados, University of Alcalá

Abstract

The present study explores the language of evaluation in a sub-genre of political discourse, pre-electoral debates, and its potential persuasive function for gaining voters via a contraposition of positive self-evaluation and negative evaluation of the other candidate. A further aim of this research is to check whether the candidate's ideology has a bearing on the entities that get evaluated. After a brief examination of the characteristics of the sub-genre at hand, specifically in the Spanish context, we present the results of an evaluation analysis carried out in a corpus of 19,849 words, which is the extension of the most recent pre-electoral debate held in Spain between the candidates of the two main political parties. Taking into account Van Dijk's CDA framework (2005) for parliamentary debates as global semantic strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, Martin and White's (2005) method was adopted as an analytical tool. The results showed that, although each candidate had different preferences in the choice of evaluative devices, they both used them as a strategy to win electoral votes while deprecating the opposing party and, therefore, minimizing their chances of winning the elections. On the other hand, and despite their opposing ideology, they both seem to defend those policies that are more widely accepted in order not to risk losing voters: public services and egalitarian social policies.

Keywords: political discourse, political rhetoric, persuasion, evaluation, Critical Discourse Analysis, pre-electoral debates.

1. Introduction

For decades discourse analysts (Eggins and Slade, 1997; Hood, 2004; Hunston, 2000; Martin, 2000; Martin and White, 2005) have attempted to explore the language of evaluation to find out how writers/speakers adopt attitudes towards their readers/listeners and the content they want to communicate. To do so, they have analysed oral (Grimes, 1975; Labov, 1972; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975) and written discourses (Hoey, 1983; Hunston and Thompson, 2000; Martin and White, 2005) in an

attempt to provide further insights integrating both perspectives into the evaluative uses of language. Current studies of evaluation have used Appraisal theory in the academic, journalistic, legal and political discourses (Cabrejas-Peñuelas and Díez-Prados, 2013; González-Rodríguez, 2011; Hood, 2004; Martin, 2000, 2003; Martin and White, 2005; Miller, 2004; White, 2002, 2003) to find out how evaluative items may change depending on the genre, register or individual styles.

Both political discourse and political language seem well-suited to express evaluation, as politicians need to sketch a positive image of themselves so as to persuade people to vote for them, while at the same time they portray the opponent in a negative light by reacting against his/her comments and by being ironic, in such a way that they discredit him/her (and the opposing party that the opponent represents). They also depict themselves and others subjectively and evaluate events (e.g. health care system, budgetary limits, housing bubble) “to appeal not so much to reason but to the recipient’s expectations and emotions” (Sornig, 1989: 109). Therefore, the purpose of political language “is not so much to inform as to make people believe, and in the end to act upon their beliefs, he/she who sounds like one of us is the one we most easily trust” (1989: 109).

The evaluative uses of political language have been studied by a number of researchers (Becker, 2011; Harris, 1991; Simon-Vandenberg, 1997, 2009; Wang, 2010) who, by analyzing the politicians’ use of evaluation markers, have attempted to find out how politicians use them to show lack of commitment in response to face-threatening questions while, at the same time, they present an image of absolute certainty and intellectual power that serves to persuade their audience. Indeed, it seems that the public’s perception that politicians are evasive and indirect is based on linguistic facts, since less than 40% of their answers are direct (Harris, 1991: 92). However, since politicians should also aim at gaining or retaining intellectual power, they are persuasive by stating “the essential rightness of their claims” (Simon-Vandenberg, 1996: 408), which is often the case in political interviews, i.e. politicians often claim the reliability and truth of their statements and they do so by using a wide range of lexical and grammatical devices indicating certainty. Such devices are treated within the notion of *modality* (Simon-Vandenberg, 1996; Becker, 2011). These are expressions that emphasize cognitive certainty (e.g. *we had very detailed scientific evidence, I have no evidence at all*) and emotional and social commitment. Emotional commitment indicates that the politician has knowledge of and is personally involved in

the issues s/he presents (e.g. *I certainly think, I do believe*). However, s/he is also socially committed, since s/he takes into account the principle of the majority of opinion (e.g. *which commands the strong enthusiasm of the overwhelming majority*) (Simon-Vandenberg, 1996: 392-408). In this way, s/he “creates the image of a knowledgeable person who ‘knows what he or she is talking about’ and who therefore deserves public trust and political power” (Simon-Vandenberg, 1996: 408).

In political speeches politicians also make use of evaluative devices: positive attitude markers (e.g. *hope*), negative ones for criticizing their adversaries (e.g. *desperation, tears*), judgement (e.g. *ineffective programs, slashing programs*) and appreciation markers (e.g. *innovative, highly successful*) for praising or criticizing a person’s capacity and property, although there may be elements that are characteristic of a particular culture, such as references to historical figures, anecdotes and American history in American political speeches. Other differences between political speeches account for the politicians’ individual styles of speaking even when they belong to the same party (Simon-Vandenberg, 2009).

One type of political discourse where political language is implemented is in pre-election debates. These are face-to-face confrontations in front of an audience - television viewers, but on occasions also a stage audience -, in which two political candidates spar in a dialogical duel. They are a subclass of political discourse included within the domain of agonal or conflict discourse (Vion, 1992: 92). Extrapolating Van Dijk’s definition of parliamentary debates, pre-election debates can be considered “a specific genre of political discourse” (Van Dijk, 2005: 67). If, according to Van Dijk (2005: 67), parliamentary debates are “local manifestations of the global political acts of legislation, governing, and control of government”, pre-election debates can be defined as local manifestations of *wanting to do* - or continue doing in case the same party gets re-elected - those political acts of legislating, governing and controlling the government. Thus, pre-election debates are a political *arena* where prospect candidates present themselves in a positive light (Van Dijk, 2005: 76) and the opposing party in a negative one. While political discourse such as political interviews, electoral meetings and speeches have been object of wide research (Bull & Fetzer, 2006; Nuolijärvi & Tiittula, 2011; Proctor & I-Wen Su, 2011; Simon-Vandenberg, 1996, 1997, 2008), electoral television debates have been much less so, which is especially the case of Spanish electoral television debates, the exceptions being Blas-Arroyo (1999, 2000, 2003, 2009), Cantavella et al. (2008) and Téllez et al. (2010). However, to our knowledge,

none has attempted to study how evaluation is used with a persuasive function, when it is essential that politicians appeal to the public and convince them, while simultaneously criticizing the opponent and criticizing implies expressing a negative evaluation of the opponent, while, at the same time, the speaker presents a positive self-image via positive evaluation. Thus, in the context of the genre of pre-election debates, the one we are focusing on in the present paper, politicians' speech triggers a load of *political implicatures* (Van Dijk, 2005: 66) that the audience should infer as positive or negative depending on the type of evaluation used. Following Van Dijk (2005: 66), *political implicature* is defined as specific political inferences that participants taking part in a political communicative situation may make based on the speech and context.

In this study we attempt to fill that apparent gap of the persuasive function of evaluation by analyzing how this is expressed in the Rajoy-Rubalcaba pre-election debate, which took place on the 7th November 2011 in the period building up to the General Elections on the 20th of November 2011. The following research questions will be analyzed:

1. Which type(s) of evaluation device(s) found in Martin and White's categorization of Affect are used in the Rubalcaba-Rajoy debate and which is/are the preferred type(s) by each politician as measured by frequency of occurrence? What is the function of the evaluative devices used?
2. To what extent do the evaluation devices used reveal each candidate's ideology?

The next section describes the context of the communicative event. Section 3 presents an overview of the concepts and relevant theoretical issues following Martin and White's (2005) Appraisal Theory. Section 4 includes the methodology for data collection and coding process. Section 5 addresses the results of the study and the last section presents the main conclusions from the study.

2. Pre-election political debates

The pre-election political debate is a type of communicative event that is relatively recent in Spain, unlike in other countries such as France, the United States and the United Kingdom, where there is a long tradition of electoral debates. In eleven general elections, only three have been preceded by televised debates between the candidates to the Spanish Presidency¹, since political parties preferred to participate in mass meetings, where the candidates' political agendas were made public. Therefore,

Spanish citizens did not have direct access to the ideas put forward by the different political parties before the elections took place. The Spanish model of presidential debate is described as “eclectic” (Marín, 2003: 233-4), since it combines elements of the American, French and German models. According to Cantavella et al. (2008: 84), these are:

- a. Spectacularization of debates by using music to induce a duel, interviews with analysts, calculated arrival of the candidates so as not to coincide, cameras following their steps in the corridors, among others. This is typical of American debates.
- b. Face-to-face confrontation between politicians, as in French debates. The moderator suggests topics for discussion rather than posing questions.
- c. Lack of a public audience, which eases concentration. This can also be found in French and German debates.

The contextual properties of this political genre are unique (Van Dijk, 2005: 68) and do not always coincide with those in the American, French and German models: there is pre-allocation of turns, with a strict limit of time per turn, a moderator whose function is to assure there is not free turn-taking or violent interruptions and to present pre-established topics to deal with. In that sense, each participant’s intervention is rather like a monologue which may or may not be subsequently relevant to the previous speaker’s interventions. In fact, the speakers plan in advance what they are going to say and seldom respond to their interlocutors, not necessarily fulfilling their expectations. In that sense, Spanish debates are only marginally dialogical. Apart from the direct participants in the debate, there is an overhearing audience (television viewers), who is not present in the situational context of the event and, thus, has no possibility of visibly reacting or intervening in the communicative event. The audience’s reactions are subsequently measured through polls and the illocutionary effect of the speech acts realized in the event is potentially reflected in the electoral results. The image, then, that each candidate presents of himself and his party can be decisive, since through evaluation they make themselves legitimate and devalue the others.

The Rajoy-Rubalcaba debate has been used in the present paper as an example of the sub-genre of pre-election debates in order to examine the use of evaluative devices in these communicative events. The debate between Rubalcaba and Rajoy was held after a tough election campaign and followed the increasing feeling that the majority of the Spaniards wanted a major political change. The context of the General

Elections was one of profound economic crisis, which was activated by the US subprime mortgage crisis, although its causes can also be found in problems not always dealt with properly in Spain: a housing bubble, a decrease in demand of touristic products and cars worldwide, loss of productivity, inadequate energy and water policies, problems with the financial system, high rates of unemployment among the youth, expenditure policies that contributed to rise the budget deficit and the lack of a solid education system.

After an almost eight-year period that had been governed by the Socialists, their leader Jose Luis Rodríguez Zapatero set the date of the General Elections for November 20th, 2011. Different opinion polls had predicted the victory of the Partido Popular (from now on PP), although the gap between the Partido Socialista Obrero Español (from now on PSOE) was getting smaller, as the date for the General Elections got closer (7.1 points in July 2011 vs. 10 points in April 2011, according to the barometer of the Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas²). In this context, both parties discussed whether or not to hold a televised debate. Both parties had their own reasons for taking part in the debate: the Socialists could see an opportunity to persuade a good number of undecided voters, whom they believed were not convinced by the policies carried out by their former leader Jose Luis Rodríguez Zapatero and were then more inclined toward other left-wing political parties. In the PP camp, Rajoy's advisors wanted to offer an image of a moderate and responsible candidate.

In the end, both parties agreed to hold a single debate before November 20th on public television and radio channels: La 1, Canal 24 horas, Canal Internacional and RNE and on the Internet site RTVE.es. The debate took place at the Palacio Municipal de Congresos in Madrid. It lasted for 90 minutes and was divided into three sections moderated by Manuel Campo Vidal: a 40-minute section dealing with economy and employment, a 30-minute section about social policy and a 20-minute section about foreign policy and other topics. The debate started with Mariano Rajoy and closed with Alfredo Pérez Rubalcaba (most widely addressed as 'Rubalcaba'). Also, there was a single 12-minute pause, when the candidates for the Presidency could talk with their advisors. The debate sections were further structured into interventions by the two candidates:

Debate sections	Number of interventions by each participant
Introduction	1
Economy & employment	5
Social policy	4
Miscellanea of topics	3
Conclusion	1

The structure of the debate is important for the object of this study, since one might think that the choice of evaluation markers may vary from the introduction and concluding parts of the debate to the central interventions. For example, it would be logical to think that in those parts where there is more dialogic battle between the candidates, there would be more affect, judgement and appreciation markers.

3. Martin and White’s Appraisal Theory and its application to the political text

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the theoretical framework used for the analysis of evaluation in the present study, Martin and White’s (2005) Appraisal Theory. This theory seems particularly suitable when applied to the political context, since it is concerned with the linguistic resources that a language makes available for its users when expressing and negotiating their subjective positions (García Gómez, 2010), which are ultimately ideological.

The on-going interest in the 90s in how language is used to evaluate and how attitudes, judgements and emotions are expressed in text resulted in the development of Martin and White’s (2005) Appraisal Theory, which is used to analyze how the speaker/writer values the entities (people and things) within their texts. It distinguishes between *Graduation* (evaluation related to intensification), *Engagement* (evaluation related to the use of different voices) and *Attitude* (evaluation that is “concerned with our feelings, including emotional reactions, judgements of behaviour and evaluation of things”, Martin and White, 2005: 35). In the present article, we concentrate on the major category, *Attitude*, since our interest is focused on the expression of evaluation itself, rather than on the source (i.e. Engagement) or the intensification of the expression of evaluation (i.e. Graduation). The explanation that follows is devoted to explaining exclusively how this type of evaluation is implemented in texts.

Attitude is subdivided into three categories dealing with judgement and emotional responses: Affect, which covers the field of emotions; Judgement, which covers ethics; and Appreciation, which is associated to the field of aesthetics. Affect “deals with resources for construing emotional reactions” (2005: 35) and is “concerned with registering positive and negative feelings” (2005: 42). It may be expressed through verbs of emotion (e.g. *hate/love, interest/bore, please/displease*), adverbs (e.g. *happily/unhappily, sadly, poorly*), adjectives of emotion (e.g. *happy, sad, worried, pleased*) and certain nominalisations (e.g. *joy, despair, fear*). Thus, in order to analyse the Rajoy-Rubalcaba debate, Martin and White’s Appraisal framework has been used and includes the following categories³:

- I. Affect: Evaluates an entity, process or state emotionally (e.g. *That makes me happy, This building is boring*):
 - a. Authorial evaluation: The author is the one ascribing affect.
 - b. Non-authorial: A participant is the one evaluating the affect.
 - c. Un/happiness:
 - i. Misery/cheer (e.g. *down, sad, miserable*, versus *jubilant, laugh, rejoice*).
 - ii. Antipathy/affection (e.g. *dislike, hate, abuse* versus *fond, loving, embrace*).
 - d. Dis/satisfaction:
 - i. Ennui/interest (*flat, fidget, yawn, tuned out* versus *involved, absorbed, attentive*).
 - ii. Dis/pleasure (*cross, angry, furious, scold, castigate* versus *satisfied, compliment, reward*).
 - e. In/security:
 - i. Dis/quiet (*uneasy, anxious, shaking* versus *confident, assured, poised*).
 - ii. Dis/trust (*astonished, suspicious* versus *commit, entrust*).
 - f. Dis/inclination (*keen, long for, wish to* versus *wary, disinclined, unwanted*).
- II. Judgement: Evaluates human behaviour ethically (morally or legally); it consists of language which criticizes or praises, which condemns or applauds the behaviour (actions, deeds, sayings, beliefs, motivations, etc.) of human individuals and groups. It is subdivided into:

- a. Normality: assessments of how special or (un)usual the behaviour or the person's state is (*natural, familiar, fashionable* versus *peculiar, eccentric, odd*)
 - b. Capacity: assessment of competence or ability (*skilled, genius, brilliant* versus *stupid, ignorant, clumsy*).
 - c. Tenacity: assessment of psychological disposition or determination (*brave, plucky, resolute, reliable, hard-working* versus *cowardly, reckless, hasty, impatient*).
 - d. Propriety: assessment of ethical or moral standing, i.e. how far beyond reproach the behaviour or person's state is (*good, fair, just, generous, charitable, kind* versus *immoral, corrupt, arrogant, greedy*).
 - e. Veracity: assessments regarding the person's truthfulness or honesty, dependent on social contextual values (*credible, candid, direct, sincere* versus *deceitful, liar, manipulative, devious*).
 - f. Unclear: assessment of behaviour or persona where none of the subtypes of judgement may apply (in our text, only 14 cases have been labelled as unclear, e.g. "nos jugamos mucho" [there is a lot at stake], "(para que España) levante cabeza" [so that Spain can get back on its feet –literally lifts/raises its head]. We tried to resort to this category only in extreme cases, where we felt that the utterance was loaded with evaluation but could not fit into the other categories.
- III. Appreciation: Evaluates things, processes and states of affairs aesthetically or with the social value accorded to the object. It is subdivided into:
- a. Reaction: values which make reference to, or are derived from, values of Affect but where the emotional reaction has been detached from any human experiencing the emotion and has been attached to the evaluated entity as if it were an intrinsic propriety (e.g. *a boring building*). Two subtypes:
 - i. Impact (i.e. how does it strike me?).
 - ii. Quality (i.e. do I like it?).
 - b. Composition: how well the parts of the entity fit together (*harmonious, well-formed, balanced, unified* versus *ill-formed, convoluted, confused, unbalanced*). Two subtypes:
 - i. Balance (i.e. did it hang together?).
 - ii. Complexity (i.e. was it hard or easy to follow?).

- c. Social Valuation: whether something is socially valued for its usefulness, worthiness, efficaciousness, or health-giving proprieties (related to Judgement: Propriety).

IV. Explicitness:

- a. Inscribed: The text contains a word or phrase which explicitly evaluates the behaviour (*immoral, virtuous, just, sinful, lascivious*).
- b. Invoked: The judgement is not explicit in a word or phrase, but is rather implied by the information given. E.g. *Bush delivered his inaugural speech as the United States President who collected 537,000 fewer votes than his opponent*.

V. Polarity:

- a. Positive attitude.
- b. Negative attitude.
- c. Ambiguous (when it is not clear whether the attitude is positive and negative).

The expression of evaluation in pre-election debates is a means to an end, in the sense that, by evaluating the opponent in that speech battlefield, each candidate can win or lose the votes that will allow him/her to come into power or remain there. The one who wins will be able to realize the political functions of legislating, governing and controlling the government (Van Dijk, 2005: 67) for the following four years, and, therefore, there is a lot at stake. Furthermore, to fully interpret the force of evaluation in this type of verbal battle, the political implications derived from the use of evaluative devices should be taken into account. Following Van Dijk's (2005: 68) Critical Discourse Analysis framework for parliamentary debates, evaluation may be interpreted as a "global semantic strategy of positive presentation of *Us* and a negative other-presentation of *Them*". Evaluation is thus a rhetorical device to depict a given political party as the best or the worst option.

4. Methodology

The transcription for analysis of the Rajoy-Rubalcaba debate (19,849 words, including the moderator's interventions) was taken from the Spanish national radio and television broadcast (Radio y Televisión Española or RTVE) web page⁴, where the whole debate can be watched and the debate transcription followed while listening to the actual words of the participants. The transcription was copied and pasted in text format to be

uploaded into a freeware program called UAM Corpus Tool, developed by Mick O'Donnell⁵. This software is, in fact, a set of tools to annotate the text(s), make searches in the corpus, and run descriptive and inferential statistics. In order to analyze the text, the researcher can either take one of the coding schemes already developed in the program or create his/her own scheme. In the case of the present study, we used the scheme for Appraisal Theory included in the program, whose categories have been explained above.

We decided to analyze Attitude in this study because we were interested in “mapping feelings” (Martin and White, 2005: 42) as they were construed in the debate by both participants. We thought this Appraisal category could shed some light into the way the debaters condemn or praise, attack or defend and negatively or positively describe the policies of the opponent's party (Van Dijk, 2005: 68). With that aim, we carried out a content analysis of the text, assigning labels corresponding to the Appraisal schemes. In most cases, labels were attached to individual words (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs), but in some cases, the unit of evaluation spanned over phrases or even clauses or sentences. An example of the latter would be the following utterance by Rubalcaba:

(1) *Segundo, hay que hacer una ley para impedir que los conciertos sanitarios acaben en eso que está pasando en algunas de las comunidades autónomas que usted gestiona. 'Secondly, a law must be enacted to impede that sanitary accords end up like what is happening in some of the regions where you rule'* [Appraisal: Attitude: Judgement: Propriety: Invoked: Negative Attitude].

In order to guarantee consistency in the analysis, only one of the two researchers analyzed the whole debate; notwithstanding, to ensure inter-rater reliability, the other researcher analyzed 30% of the debate. Both researchers coincided in 82.65% of the cases of the Attitude analysis. In those cases where there were discrepancies, the researchers discussed them until consensus was reached.

In the study we also made two other methodological decisions: the first one concerns the use of percentages of any of the Attitude, Judgement and Appreciation types relative to the variable “overall number of evaluation devices” to calculate relative frequencies, since it seemed the most enlightening to interpret data meaningfully. Thus, the different types of evaluative devices are weighed against the total amount of evaluation in the text. We also calculated the frequencies of stance markers per number of words of text in each participant's intervention to draw comparisons. However, it was felt that calculating proportions of attitude markers per 1,000 words of text would not

make much sense, since many of the attitude markers did not correspond to individual words, but to larger units: phrases, clauses and even sentences.

The second methodological decision refers to the use of the chi-square test to examine whether the number of attitude, judgement and appreciation markers used by each political speaker is due to a 'real' difference between the speakers or to sheer chance. Following the statistician's advice (personal communication), the chi-square test was selected because the statistical data met certain requirements: (1) quantitative data, (2) one or more categories in the analysis, (3) the data evaluated represented a random sample comprising n independent observations (i.e. the Attitude devices were classified per types – Appreciation, Affect and Judgement – in each politician's speech, which were independent of each other), (4) adequate sample size, (5) simple random sample (i.e. each Attitude type had the same probability of being chosen), (6) data in frequency form (not percentages, proportions or means), and (7) all observations could be used (i.e. each candidate's use of attitude markers could be compared to the other).

5. Results

This section has been subdivided into two parts in order to address each of the research questions posed in the introduction. We first present and discuss the quantitative results for evaluation in the Spanish debate and then explore the influence that ideology may have on the use of evaluation devices by each of the Spanish candidates.

5.1. Results from the analysis of evaluation

In this section we present and discuss the main findings regarding the frequency of evaluation devices used by each participant in the debate, with the final aim of answering the first research question: which type(s) of evaluation device(s) is/are most highly used by each politician and what function they fulfil. Of all the features analyzed within the category of Attitude seen in Section 3, we will only deal with those features that showed significant differences in the use by the two debaters. First, we examine the results obtained from the debate as a whole (Table 1⁶) and then focus on the different debate sections (Tables 2-6).

When contrasting the three types of Attitude, Appreciation⁷ (i.e. evaluation of things, processes or states of affairs aesthetically or with the social value the object is accorded to) is the most frequently used by both politicians and Affect (i.e. evaluation

of an entity, process, or state emotionally) the least used; Judgement (i.e. evaluation of human behaviour from an ethical standpoint, criticizing or praising actions, deeds, sayings, beliefs, motivations, and so on) falls within the other two. Political debates are used to assess things, processes and human behaviour and less to express emotions, all of which explain such differences. However, significant differences are revealed when focusing on each Attitude type (see Table 1): Rajoy uses a total of 1,025 instances of attitude devices, while Rubalcaba uses 821 instances. This is the result of Rajoy using more attitudinal meaning than Rubalcaba in the same time allocated for their interventions. Further examination shows that Rajoy uses Affect and Judgement ($X^2 = 10.59$, $p < .02$) more frequently than Rubalcaba, who prefers Appreciation over the other two devices ($X^2 = 15.67$, $p < .02$), despite having a lower raw number of appreciation markers than his opposing candidate. This is explained by the different totals of attitude markers. The possibility remains, however, for listeners to feel that Rajoy uses more Appreciation than Rubalcaba in terms of raw numbers ($n=571$ vs. $n=532$) and relative frequencies calculated per total number of words produced (6.35% for Rajoy and 5.90% for Rubalcaba). The listeners' feeling that Rajoy is indeed using more appreciation (and also more judgement) may explain the reactions found in the aftermath of the debate: "Rajoy tenía una enorme ventaja: podía acudir a los desastrosos datos de la economía. Y lo hizo en todo momento, lanzándose contra el Gobierno" (Cué 2011) [Rajoy had an enormous advantage: he could resort to the disastrous data of the economy. And he did so at all times, pouncing on the Government].

When focusing on Judgement, Rajoy mainly judges the capacity (i.e. assessment of the competence and/or ability of the appraised element) and normality (i.e. how special/unusual the person's behaviour or state is) of the Appraised elements ($X^2 = 6.22$, $p < .02$), while Rubalcaba emphasizes propriety (i.e. assessment of ethical or moral standing, or, in other words, how far beyond reproach somebody's behaviour or state is) of the Appraised entities ($X^2 = 9.48$, $p < .02$). Despite these results, the raw numbers ($n=149$ vs. $n=129$) and relative frequencies calculated per total number of words produced (1.7% vs. 1.4%) prove that Rajoy was really the one that favoured Property. This result may also lead the listener to feel that Rajoy assessed the opposing party's moral standing more than Rubalcaba, which is also proven by the AdQAT report *Análisis del discurso del debate Rajoy-Rubalcaba*⁸: Rajoy used more "juicios de valor" (assessment) – 6% for Rajoy and 4.3% for Rubalcaba. The report also affirms that Rajoy "navega entre la opinión, el dato, el ataque y eventualmente la sorna" [combines

opinions, data, attacks and occasionally sarcasm]. It should be pointed out, however, that, although Propriety is the most extensively used by both speakers throughout the debate (Rajoy, 36.7% and Rubalcaba, 48.7%), Rajoy makes a more balanced use of the different Judgement types than Rubalcaba, who clearly prefers Propriety over the rest of Judgement types.

Within Appreciation, only the Reaction subtype (i.e. what strikes or makes you react somehow) shows significant differences and, specifically, between Impact (i.e. perceptual reaction) and Quality (i.e. emotional reaction), the former being appreciated by Rajoy and the latter by Rubalcaba. Nevertheless, the significance of both devices is weak ($X^2 = 3.23$, $p < .10$). It should be taken into account that, to fully interpret the meaning of the frequency of such linguistic devices, we need to have a look at how those devices are used in order to present a positive image of oneself and a negative one of the other. With that aim in mind, we will examine each debate section at a time.

Table 1. Attitude devices in whole debate: Rajoy vs. Rubalcaba

WHOLE DEBATE	Rajoy		Rubalcaba		Rajoy					Rubalcaba
	Percent	N	Percent	N	T Stat	Signif	ChiSqu	Signif.	[Attitude markers /number of words] x 100	
Total number of words	8,991		9,013							
ATTITUDE-TYPE	N=1025		N=821							
affect	4.7%	48	2.9%	24	1.94	+	3.77	+	0.5%	0.3%
judgement	39.6%	406	32.3%	265	3.26	+++	10.59	+++	4.5%	2.9%
appreciation	55.7%	571	64.8%	532	3.97	+++	15.67	+++	6.3%	5.9%
JUDGEMENT TYPE	N=406		N=265							
normality	11.8%	48	6.0%	16	2.50	+++	6.22	+++	0.5%	0.2%
capacity	24.4%	99	18.5%	49	1.80	+	3.24	+	1.1%	0.5%
propriety	36.7%	149	48.7%	129	3.10	+++	9.48	+++	1.7%	1.4%
unclear	3.0%	12	0.8%	2	1.95	+	3.80	+	0.1%	0.02%
APPRECIATION: REACTION TYPE	N=8		N=7							
impact	75.0%	6	28.6%	2	1.89	+	3.23	+	0.07%	0.02%
quality	25.0%	2	71.4%	5	1.89	+	3.23	+	0.02%	0.06%

+ Weak significance (90%) ++ Medium significance (95%) +++ High significance (98%)

In the introduction to the debate, whose function - as announced by the moderator - is to make a general statement about the situation in Spain, each candidate sets the principles that are going to conduct their interventions in the debate. Rajoy first

mentions the need to anticipate the call for a general election, due to the Government's incapacity to mend the situation and then highlights the need for a change; thus, making the present Government's incompetence obvious and the change he represents are his main communicative goals. On the other hand, Rubalcaba – whose party was in power, although Rodriguez Zapatero was the president at the time - cannot attack his own party and does not represent change, since the same party would govern if he wins; therefore, he needs to convince the audience of his candidacy by brandishing other intentions. He offers a solution to overcome the crisis based on three compromises: agreements with the different political parties to solve unemployment (the most prevalent concern among Spaniards nowadays), control of public expenses and guarantee of basic social rights, such as healthcare, education, and pensions. These values are represented by a 77.5% of Appreciation ($X^2 = 11.54$, $p < .02$), particularly the subtype of Social Valuation with a 96.8% ($X^2 = 4.48$, $p < .05$) both of which are significant (see Table 2 below). The Appraisal results also reveal that Rajoy focuses on the negative policies (63% of Negative Attitude, $X^2 = 12.63$, $p < .02$) adopted by the government (50% Judgement, $X^2 = 9.79$, $p < .02$) and the critical situation in Spain (40.9%, $X^2 = 11.54$, $p < .02$), while Rubalcaba tries to give a positive image of how he would solve the crisis in case his party were re-elected (72.5% of Positive Attitude, $X^2 = 11.00$, $p < .02$). All those differences are also significant.

All in all, it seems that both political candidates rely on different uses of the attitude devices to build rather different public images: Rajoy negatively evaluates human behaviour (the current government's behaviour) from an ethical point of view and evaluates issues and processes by making reference to a system of aesthetics that are socially valued. Also, Rajoy contrasts evaluative devices in disjunctive syllogisms⁹ that offer stark choices and, by doing this, he implies that they are the *only* choices and are mutually exclusive. This no doubt contributes to persuasion. In contrast, Rubalcaba cannot judge his party's responsibility in the current situation of Spain and, thus, he mostly evaluates things and processes by referring to socially valued aesthetics and does so using a positive attitude. See the examples below:

(2) RAJOY: Lo que vamos a debatir aquí esta noche es muy simple [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Positive], no si gobierna un candidato u otro, no si gana [Judgement: Capacity: Positive] las elecciones un partido u otro, lo que está en juego [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Negative] y lo que se vota el próximo 20 de noviembre es si queremos continuar por la misma senda [Judgement: Normality: Negative] o cambiar de rumbo [Judgement: Normality: Positive], si queremos seguir como hasta ahora [Judgement: Normality: Negative]

o comenzar a ver la luz al final del túnel [Judgement: Normality: Positive]. [*What we'll be debating here tonight is very simple, not whether one candidate or another governs, not whether one party or another wins the elections. What is at stake and what is voted next November 20th is whether we want to continue on the same path or to change the course, whether we want to continue as at present or to start to see the light at the end of the tunnel].*

(3) RUBALCABA: Me quiero comprometer ante ustedes a tres cosas: primero, buscar un acuerdo para el empleo, que es una gran causa [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Positive] nacional. Un acuerdo con los partidos, los sindicatos y las fuerzas políticas y, por supuesto, con las instituciones. En segundo lugar, a reorientar nuestra economía, a buscar un equilibrio entre el control del gasto público y los incentivos para crear empleo [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Positive]. Y en tercer lugar, garantizar la seguridad de los españoles, las garantías básicas como la sanidad, las pensiones, la educación y la protección al desempleo [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Positive]. Estos son mis compromisos, acuerdos, protección social y crecimiento económico y creación de empleo [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Positive]. [*I would like to commit myself to three issues: first, to find an agreement for employment, which is a great national motive, an agreement with the parties, the unions and the political forces and, of course, with the institutions. Second, to redirect our economy, to find a balance between the monitoring of public expenses and the incentives to create jobs. And third to guarantee Spaniards' safety, basic guarantees such as health care, pensions, education and protection to unemployment. These are my commitments, agreements, social protection and economic growth and job creation].*

Table 2. Differences in Attitude devices in the Introduction section

INTRODUCTION	Rajoy		Rubalcaba					
Total number of words	307		273					
Feature	Percent	N	Percent	N	T Stat	Signif.	ChiSqu	Signif.
ATTITUDE TYPE	N=44		N=40					
judgement	50.0%	22	17.5%	7	3.29	+++	9.79	+++
appreciation	40.9%	18	77.5%	31	3.61	+++	11.54	+++
JUDGEMENT TYPE	N=22		N=7					
propriety	18.2%	4	57.1%	4	2.09	++	4.04	++
APPRECIATION TYPE	N=18		N=31					
reaction	16.7%	3	0.0%	0	0.00		5.50	+++
social valuation	77.8%	14	96.8%	30	2.18	++	4.48	++
ATTITUDE-POLARITY	N=44		N=40					
positive attitude	36.4%	16	72.5%	29	3.52	+++	11.00	+++
negative attitude	63.6%	28	25.0%	10	3.81	+++	12.63	+++

The Economy and Employment section of the debate is the longest of all (40 minutes) and deals with the topics that opinion surveys show as the most prevailing concerns of the Spanish population nowadays; therefore, this was likely to be a sensitive issue that the candidates for Presidency had to treat accordingly. Examination of the candidates' interventions reveal that, as they pursue their rhetorical goal of persuading the audience, both Rajoy and Rubalcaba build their personae by using different evaluative devices that vary depending on their position in the government: since Rajoy belongs to the main opposing party, he judges the current government's incapacity to mend the critical situation of the Spanish economy and employment and offers a capable government if he wins ($X^2 = 6.18$, $p < .02$, see Table 3) (e.g. "no se ha sabido gestionar bien la economía" *the economy has not been well managed*, "un cambio político ... con ministros que sepan de lo que hablan, que se conozcan bien los temas, se los estudien" *a political change ... with ministers that know what they are talking about, that know the topics well, that study them*). Also, Rajoy expresses emotions by using Affect (e.g. 'what *matters* to me') four times, which adds a powerful final emphasis, and to defend himself from Rubalcaba's accusations that he does not care about social rights such as public health and education. In contrast, Rubalcaba, who belongs to the governing party, and therefore, cannot accuse them, uses negative property more often to blame the banks' indebtedness, lack of credit, unemployment and economic stagnation (e.g. 'los bancos no prestan' *banks don't give loans*, 'los bancos se endeudaron' *banks got indebted*) and positive property to highlight his party's adequate

policies and proposals. Curiously enough, this is the only debate section where there are no significant differences in the use of Judgement or Appreciation on the part of the speakers, but Affect does ($X^2 = 5.41$, $p < .05$) (see Table 3), despite being part of the Economy and Employment section of the debate and each candidate endorsing an opposite ideology.

Table 3. Differences in Attitude devices in the Economy & Employment section

ECONOMY & EMPLOYMENT	Rajoy		Rubalcaba					
Total number of words	3,718		3,731					
Feature	Percent	N	Percent	N	T Stat	Signif.	ChiSqu	Signif.
ATTITUDE TYPE	N=404		N=338					
affect	4.0%	16	1.2%	4	2.33	++	5.41	++
JUDGEMENT TYPE	N=183		N=145					
capacity	25.7%	47	14.5%	21	2.50	+++	6.18	+++
propriety	24.6%	45	41.4%	60	3.28	+++	10.48	+++

The Social Policies section deals with hard-won social rights (i.e. healthcare, education and pensions) that are considered assets for the Spanish society; therefore, regardless of the political party the candidates belong to, they should show their commitment to protect and favour these social rights. This, together with the candidates' position in the government – member of the opposing party or member of the government – determines the candidates' evaluative orientation: Judgement for Rajoy (33.9%, $X^2 = 10.10$, $p < .02$) and Appreciation for Rubalcaba (74.6%, $X^2 = 15.26$, $p < .02$). These are both positive and negative (see Table 4) and are used with the aim of deprecating the opposing candidates' social policies and, therefore, damaging their social image, and praising their own. These results are in accordance with those of previous studies (Van Dijk, 2005), who mentions that politicians present themselves positively and the other negatively. This idea is also pointed out by Atkinson (2011: 134), as a very frequent strategy in political discourse: “positive self-presentation of ‘us’ and the negative other-presentation of ‘them’”.

What is most interesting in this debate section is that both politicians resort to the expression of emotion, despite the fact that affect is only slightly present in debates (candidates do not talk much about their personal feelings or emotions): Rajoy focuses on Un/happiness (38.1%, $X^2 = 4.21$, $p < .05$) mostly to positively depict himself by claiming that his intention is to maintain social rights if he wins and thus capture the audience's sympathy, while Rubalcaba evaluates In/security to express his negative

surprise at Rajoy's silence about how to finance public healthcare in his agenda (12.5%, $X^2 = 2.72$, $p < .10$) and, therefore, raise doubts about his real intentions.

Table 4. Differences in Appraisal devices in Social Policies (healthcare, education) section

SOCIAL POLICIES	Rajoy		Rubalcaba					
Total number of words	2,768		2,648					
Feature	Percent	N	Percent	N	T Stat	Signif.	ChiSqu	Signif.
ATTITUDE TYPE	N=381		N=280					
affect	6.0%	23	2.9%	8	1.91	+	3.65	+
judgement	33.9%	129	22.5%	63	3.20	+++	10.10	+++
appreciation	60.1%	229	74.6%	209	3.95	+++	15.26	+++
AFFECT TYPE	N=21		N=8					
un/happiness	38.1%	8	0.0%	0	0.00		4.21	++
in/security	0.0%	0	12.5%	1	0.00		2.72	+
JUDGEMENT TYPE	N=129		N=63					
normality	11.6%	15	0.0%	0	0.00		7.95	+++
REACTION-TYPE	N=3		N=4					
impact	100.0%	3	25.0%	1	2.54	++	3.94	++
quality	0.0%	0	75.0%	3	0.00		3.94	++

In the last section of the debate the speakers discussed miscellanea of topics; each debater was allowed to choose what issue(s) to deal with. Despite the fact that a difference in the use of evaluation devices could be anticipated due to variety, the only significant difference found was in the realm of Affect ($X^2 = 6.19$, $p < .02$) (see Table 5). As seen so far, this device was not prominent throughout the debate and, where slightly significant differences were found between the speakers, it was Rajoy who used it more frequently. In contrast, in this case, it is Rubalcaba who shows higher statistically significant frequencies (9.7% versus 2.3%). There is an exchange of Affect between the speakers that is worth mentioning here, since it is the only emotional reaction that can be considered personal: Rajoy expresses how a comment made by Rubalcaba hurt him and this latter mitigates the threat by using two downtoners:

- (4) RAJOY: *Señor Pérez Rubalcaba, ha hablado de seguridad, pero claro, ha hablado de seguridad para darme un estacazo.*
 RUBALCABA. *Pequeñito, cariñoso [Affect]*
 RAJOY. *Pequeñito, pero, oiga, es que usted lo da, al que le duele es a mí [Affect].*

‘RAJOY: Mr. Pérez Rubalcaba, you’ve talked about security, but of course, you’ve talked about security to give me a blow.

RUBALCABA. Tiny, affectionate [Affect].

RAJOY. Tiny, but, listen, the thing is that you give it (but) it hurts ME (equivalent to the emphatic ‘a mí’) [Affect].’

Table 5. Differences in Appraisal devices in Other Topics section

OTHER TOPICS		Rajoy		Rubalcaba					
Total number of words		1,839		1,915					
Feature	Percent	N	Percent	N	T Stat	Signif.	ChiSqu	Signif.	
ATTITUDE-TYPE		N=133		N=103					
affect	2.3%	3	9.7%	10	2.51	+++	6.19	+++	

Although the concluding section is short (only one intervention per participant), it is very relevant, since it contains the final message each candidate wants the audience to leave with. In fact, the moderator points out that they can gaze at the camera if they want to, instead of looking at the opposing candidate as they do during the whole debate. In this part of the debate, the candidates brandish their main weapons against their opponents. Both of them do so through Judgement, although focusing on different evaluative devices: Normality for Rajoy (23.3%, $X^2 = 5.43$, $p < .02$) and Propriety for Rubalcaba (45%, $X^2 = 4.78$, $p < .05$) (see Table 6 below). Normality evaluative devices presented in disjunctive syllogisms serve Rajoy the purpose of presenting the dilemma voters will face in the upcoming elections: continuing with the same policies or giving change a chance. Thus, continuing with the present party in power is considered as ‘the usual thing now’, while change represents ‘something special’. It may be inferred that ‘*continuar igual*’ to *continue in the same way* is negative, while change is positive: ‘*si vamos a gestionar las cosas de otra manera*’ if *we are going to manage things in a different way*, ‘*España necesita un cambio y lo necesita con urgencia*’ *Spain needs a change and needs it urgently*. Therefore, Rajoy finishes the debate as he started it: offering a change; this is a common strategy used by politicians in political campaigns when they are not in power and the current government is facing problems.

Table 6. Differences in Attitude devices in the Conclusion section

CONCLUSION		Rajoy		Rubalcaba					
Total number of words		359		446					
Feature	Percent	N	Percent	N	T Stat	Signif.	ChiSqu	Signif.	
JUDGEMENT TYPE		N=30		N=20					

normality	23.3%	7	0.0%	0	0.00		5.43	+++
propriety	16.7%	5	45.0%	9	2.25	++	4.78	++

On the other hand, Rubalcaba evaluates the propriety (ethical or moral standing) of Spain to acknowledge the current difficulties and evaluates his own behaviour to present himself as a good candidate to solve them: “no soy pasivo” *I’m not passive*. However, his main weapon is reminding Spaniards that, if the opposing party wins, they may lose most of the benefits they have obtained throughout the years of socialist rule, although this is sometimes tacitly implied.

For the variables inscribed/invoked evaluative devices and positive/negative attitude of such devices, initial analyses reveal that they were not statistically significant. However, closer examination reveals that, when combining them, there are indeed some interesting significant differences between both political candidates (see Tables 7 and 8 below): Rajoy shows a higher ratio of inscribed positive attitude markers indicating capacity (53.2% versus a 33.3% in Rubalcaba), which are mostly to claim his party’s capability to improve the current situation of the country (e.g. mejorar (la sanidad, la calidad de la educación) [*improve (health care, the quality of education)*]). Rubalcaba, however, has a higher ratio of attitude markers indicating veracity (11.6% versus 2.5% in Rajoy), which are used to question the PP camp’s honesty (e.g. aclarar, compromisos [*make it clear, compromises*]). For inscribed negative attitude markers the opposite results are found: while Rubalcaba negatively evaluates his opponent’s inability to explain his real agenda (“no ha sido capaz de aclarármelas” [*you haven’t been able to clarify them to me*]), Rajoy negatively evaluates the lack of honesty of the opposite party (“usted miente, engañaron a la gente” [*you lie, you deceived people*]).

Table 7. Differences in inscribed/positive attitude devices

Feature	Rajoy		Rubalcaba		T Stat	Signif.	ChiSqu	Signif.
	Percent	N	Percent	N				
JUDGEMENT TYPE	N=79		N=69					
capacity	53.2%	42	33.3%	23	2.46	+++	5.88	+++
veracity	2.5%	2	11.6%	8	2.21	++	4.80	++

Table 8. Differences in inscribed/negative attitude devices

Feature	Rajoy		Rubalcaba		T Stat	Signif.	ChiSqu	Signif.
	Percent	N	Percent	N				
JUDGEMENT TYPE	N=86		N=50					
capacity	15.1%	13	34.0%	17	2.61	+++	6.56	+++

veracity	29.1%	25	12.0%	6	2.32	++	5.23	++
----------	-------	----	-------	---	------	----	------	----

For the variable invoked/positive and invoked/negative, there are also significant differences between Rajoy and Rubalcaba (see Tables 9 and 10). For the variable invoked/positive attitude, Rubalcaba uses a higher ratio of invoked attitude devices (60.7% versus 43.9%) referring to the current government’s ethical behaviour when implementing specific measures aimed at solving the country’s financial crisis: “financiar la sanidad, crear empleo, nos hemos preocupado” [*finance healthcare, create jobs, we have worried*]. Despite the ratio, the audience may indeed feel that Rajoy was the one that really judged positively some specific proposals against the crisis, since he made a higher raw number of property markers: “hemos de participar, crear empleo, cumplir la ley, aumentar las pensiones” [*we have to participate, create jobs, enforce the law, raise pensions*]. However, this may not be but a strategy for someone who thinks of himself as a president¹⁰. For the variable invoked/negative, this serves again Rajoy to judge the government’s incapacity to mend the current economic situation and Rubalcaba to judge the lack of moral standing of the right wing party.

Table 9. Differences in invoked/positive attitude markers

Feature	Rajoy		Rubalcaba		T Stat	Signif.	ChiSqu	Signif.
	Percent	N	Percent	N				
JUDGEMENT TYPE	N= 98		N= 56					
property	43.9%	43	60.7%	34	2.02	++	4.04	+++

Table 10. Differences in invoked/negative attitude markers

Feature	Rajoy		Rubalcaba		T Stat	Signif.	ChiSqu	Signif.
	Percent	N	Percent	N				
JUDGEMENT TYPE	N=140		N=87					
capacity	20.7%	29	4.6%	4	3.42	+++	11.22	+++
property	29.3%	41	46.0%	40	2.58	+++	6.51	+++

When discussing the results, we have mentioned who or what was positively or negatively evaluated; however, an exhaustive and systematic analysis of targets may have been missed. The UAM Corpus Tool does not provide a scheme for the analysis of targets, and, therefore, such analysis was initially not carried out. However, when discussing the results for appraisal, the need to take into account the appraised items (i.e. targets) seemed obvious. Thus, the whole discussion of results is accompanied by a

qualitative description of the evaluation targets focused on in each section of the debate. A quantitative account of targets, although desirable, falls outside the scope of the present paper, since it attempts to categorize all targets used, elaborate a new scheme for the UAM tool and tag the 19,849-word corpus with the corresponding labels, not to mention the considerable increase of results that would have to be dealt with. All of these reasons prevented us from accomplishing this task in the present study.

In the next section of the results, we will try to interpret the data in light of the second research question: *to what extent does evaluation reflect each of the candidates' ideology.*

5.2. Evaluation as a reflection of ideology

In order to answer the question as to whether the evaluation devices used by each candidate reveals his ideological traits, we examine which entities and behaviours get evaluated and how. The notion of ideology is present throughout the entire debate, since both political parties have different ideological positions: while the Socialists are progressive and liberal, the PP party is known to be conservative. Indeed, Rubalcaba starts off the debate by announcing that he and his opponent have very different ideas and implies that ideology is the most important factor to take into account when voting, since the way the country will be governed depends on which ideological principles rule. By stating that his and his opponent's ideas are "different", he is insinuating that his opponent would not take care of basic social needs that he proclaims himself to respect (see Appraisal analysis above); he also blames the world crisis for being the root of the present problem in Spain, thus dodging in part his party's responsibility for the Spanish crisis.

The last section of the debate is the part where the expression of ideology is more clearly distinguished, since each candidate can choose what issue to deal with. Rubalcaba selected as topics of discussion democracy and some laws that were enacted by PSOE with the opposition of PP, which show the PSOE's liberal ideology, such as homosexual marriage, abortion, post-coital pill and euthanasia. Thus, Rubalcaba positively evaluates those laws: "las leyes que han extendido los derechos en España" [*the laws that have spread rights in Spain*], "la ley que permite morir dignamente" [*the law that enables one to die with dignity*]. In fact, this strategy of Rubalcaba's highlighting the opponent's conservative ideology, with the potential threat of people losing these social rights if his party wins, is used on several occasions throughout the

debate. Rajoy, however, remains in the economic arena stressing the need to come out with policies to increase employment (a topic which, in fact, belongs to the Economy and Employment section) and the need to reduce our deficit with austere policies and reforms.

In the last section we also have the only examples in which both candidates seem to agree. The first one is the need to advance the equality of men's and women's conciliation of work and family (women "conciliate more than men", says Rubalcaba to which Rajoy fully agrees) and the second one is to collaborate on terrorism issues. Not to show agreement on these issues would lead to loss of voters. In the analysis of Appraisal, fundamental social rights, which may vary depending on the ideological stand of the political party in power, such as the right to healthcare ('sanidad') and education, are considered as assets and, thus, they are positively evaluated by both speakers: they present themselves and their parties as defenders of these rights:

(5) RUBALCABA: Lo más importante para los ciudadanos, creo en este momento, es su sanidad y su educación. Y le diría, fíjese, le diría más, yo creo que es más importante la sanidad. La sanidad pública que es, sin duda, una magnífica sanidad que hemos construido entre todos. Es una sanidad barata [...] pero es una sanidad fantástica [...]. *'What is most important for citizens, I think, at this moment is healthcare and education. And I'd tell you, look, I'd tell you more, I think healthcare is more important. Public healthcare, which is, no doubt, a wonderful healthcare that we all have created. It is a cheap healthcare [...] but is a great healthcare [...]'.*

(6) RAJOY: A mí también me preocupan las pensiones y mucho. Y me preocupa la dependencia, y me preocupa la desigualdad entre españoles, que cada vez es mayor. *'I am also worried about pensions and very much. And I am worried about the dependents and I am worried about the inequality between the Spaniards, which is every time bigger'.*

In other potential contexts, such basic human rights may not be loaded with an evaluative function, but in a political debate, in which each candidate is trying to persuade the audience of how appropriate and valuable their ideologies and manifestos are, these terms are used in an evaluative fashion. Also, since the positive or negative weight of these terms is derived from the contextual characteristics of the exchange (i.e. the self-image each candidate presents to win voters), it seems that we are dealing with *political implications* rather than with semantic implications (Van Dijk, 2005: 69). For example, (i) the candidates care about the citizens' rights and, therefore, (ii) they are good candidates for Presidency, (iii) the opposing party's critiques against them are

wrong and possibly biased, (iv) unlike the opposing party, they will do all they can to preserve and improve social policies. It is also true that the candidates attack how the other and the political party each represents deal with fundamental social rights and they do so using negative evaluation in an attempt to discredit each other. For example, the candidate for the Socialist party frequently accuses the PP camp of holding hidden antisocial policies, since the PP ideological position favours the reduction of social policies:

(7) RUBALCABA: [...] Lo he leído, señor Rajoy, no hay ninguna mención a la financiación de la sanidad pública. [...] Cuando hay que quitar ambulancias, camas, entonces sí, no tienen ningún problema. Cuando hay que privatizar, ningún problema. '[...] I have read, Mr. Rajoy, there is no mention of the financing of public healthcare [...] When ambulances should be cut out, then of course, you have no problem. When it is necessary to privatise, no problem'.

In the same vein, words such 'public' or 'private', which are again linked to the candidates' ideological positions (i.e. the Socialist party favours public institutions, while the PP camp advocates for privatization), could be both considered as positively or negatively valued, depending on what they are making reference to. In the present context, 'privado' [private] is tinged with negative appraisal, because it is considered unfair, unsupportive and unequal, while 'público' [public] is seen as positive, because it implies solidarity for its universal character. On several occasions, Rubalcaba accuses Rajoy's party of defending private institutions (private health and education) instead of public ones:

(8) *Es evidente que los hospitales privados [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Negative] seguirán ganando [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Negative] dinero, pero el sistema público [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Positive] de sanidad [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Positive] entonces quebrará [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Negative]. 'It is obvious that private hospitals will keep on making money, but the public health system will then go bankrupt' (Rubalcaba)*

He is even sarcastic in tone:

(9) *Y realmente me gustaría saber si usted tiene alguna propuesta para financiar la sanidad pública más allá de esos principios generales [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Negative] que ha anunciado usted en una clase de primero de economía [Appreciation: Social Valuation: Negative] que le agradecemos todos los españoles [Affect: Satisfaction (ironical)], *estoy seguro*. 'And I would really like to know if you have any proposal to finance public healthcare further than those general principles you have announced in a first-year economy lesson [you gave] that all of us Spaniards appreciate, I'm sure'.*

All in all, regarding the expression of ideology, it seems that both debaters say what the audience wants to hear, although Rubalcaba shows off his liberal and social ideas and Rajoy counterattacks Rubalcaba whenever he accuses him of having an anti-social hidden agenda. Therefore, if we are to decide whether ideology has a direct bearing on the way evaluative devices are used (i.e. which entities get positively or negatively evaluated), one may conclude that both candidates (seem to) defend what is acknowledged as a left-wing ideology: public services and egalitarian social policies. Whether this praising of the same social rights responds to their political ideas or to their wish to gain voters is there for anyone to decide. Thus, evaluation, rather than as an expression of ideology, is used as a loaded weapon for self-praise and the belittlement of the other.

6. Conclusion

The present study has contributed to understanding the role of the evaluative devices used by two ideologically-different politicians in a pre-electoral debate that raised a lot of expectation and interest among the Spanish people at the time. In this section we recall the research questions addressed and provide our conclusions drawn from the analysis in order to answer them:

(I) *Which type(s) of evaluation device(s) is/are most highly used by each politician and what is their function?*

The Appraisal analysis reveals that Rajoy and Rubalcaba used the evaluative devices differently in the 20th November debate: while Rajoy expressed emotions and judged human behaviour from an ethical viewpoint, Rubalcaba evaluated things and processes aesthetically and expressed social value. They also judged differently: Rajoy focuses on the incapacity (Judgement: (In)capacity) of the present government and the need to change (Judgement: Normality) the party in power, while Rubalcaba focused on his and the opponent's ethical behaviours. Regarding Appreciation, Rajoy's evaluations highlighted perceptual reaction (mainly the impact of the opponent's policies) and Rubalcaba emotional ones (the positive ones to praise Spain and the negative ones to accuse Rajoy of elitist policies). The variable inscribed/invoked and negative/positive were also used differently as a political strategy to win votes: both regarded their own party as capable of bringing stability to the country and the opposing party as incapable; also, they both praised or set into question each other's party's honesty. Although each

section of the debate presents some peculiarities regarding the use of evaluation devices, these preferences are observed throughout the debate.

(II) *To what extent do the evaluation devices used reveal the ideology of each candidate?*

Although it is certainly difficult to answer this question in an unbiased way, trying not to depict one of the two ideologies (right-winged or left-winged) as the preferred option, our aim is to observe from an outsider's perspective whether ideology influenced the way each candidate was evaluated in the debate. Rubalcaba's main line of argument was his own ideological principles, sustained by two pillars: public services (specifically health and education) and a liberal mentality (i.e. no prejudices regarding sexual preferences and the personal right to decide on abortion or euthanasia). Of these two, Rajoy only pronounced his opinions regarding the need for public services, mainly to defend himself from Rubalcaba's accusations of elitism. He also openly agreed with Rubalcaba in gender equality regarding work and family conciliation and terrorism, as if they were universally acknowledged truths. Rajoy, rather than brandishing his own ideology, preferred to undermine Rubalcaba's credibility. However, there were no ideological differences shown on the entities praised or criticized (i.e. both mainly praised public services and criticized privatization) by the candidates in the interest of not losing voters by publicly announcing unpopular policies. They both preferred to discredit their opponent by criticizing each other's ideas or deeds.

The press of the day following the debate presented Rajoy as the winner in the debate; this result may be due to the negative evaluation he portrayed of the Government, reproaching them for their incorrect policies and blaming them for the present crisis. However, it could also be the case that the debate was lost beforehand, since the audience was ready for change and listened to Rubalcaba's accusation of Rajoy for having a hidden agenda with scepticism, as an electoral manoeuvre. Thus, Rajoy's negative evaluation of his opponent may have been more convincing than Rubalcaba's because it was based on facts, while that of the latter was based on speculations, warning the audience of the danger if the PP won the elections.

Future studies may carry out a quantitative study of who/what was being positively or negatively evaluated using affect, who was being judged and who/what was being appreciated. This prospect analysis of the evaluation targets (i.e. appraised entities) may show interesting results as to the political speakers' attitudinal orientations and which entities were being more frequently evaluated.

Notes

¹ The first electoral debate was held between Jose M^a Aznar and Felipe González in 1993 before the 1993 general election. Although the audience share reached 60%, which showed the Spanish citizens' interest in this type of events, the newspaper *El Mundo* points out that the political parties did not interpret it as such and the next debates in 2008 were “only an excuse to look for trouble between the political parties; the accusations of “allergy” to the democratic debate left society without debates”. It is thought, however, that the debate between Alfredo Pérez Rubalcaba and Mariano Rajoy “may mean a tendency change” (our translations). *El Mundo* “La breve historia de los debates electorales en España”.

² Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (CIS). Barómetro de julio. Avance resultados. Estudio nº 2.909 Julio 2011.

<http://imagenes.publico.es/resources/archivos/2011/7/27/1311762708748Barometro%20julio%202011.pdf>

³ The categories, definitions and examples reproduced here correspond to the scheme developed by Mick O'Donnell as part of the software program UAM Corpus Tool which has been used for the analysis (see Methodology section).

⁴ The debate and transcription can be consulted on the web page <http://www.rtve.es/noticias/elecciones/generales/debate/>.

⁵ The program can be downloaded for free from the web page: <http://www.wagsoft.com/CorpusTool/>.

⁶ The tables presented here have been exported from the software used for the analysis, UAM Corpus Tools, which also counts with a tool to carry out both descriptive and inferential statistics. This tool provides the total number of occurrences (N), its representation in percentages and the levels of significance, both in terms of Students T-test and Chi-Squared. The + sign indicates how statistically significant the difference between a given feature is: one + sign means the significant level is 90% (i.e. a 10% chance of error), two signs mean 95% (5% chance of error) and three signs 98% (2% error due to chance alone). According to Dörnyei (2007: 210), a result is considered significant in social sciences if $p < 0.05$, that is, a significant level of 95%. Thus, significance levels lower than that need to be taken with caution.

⁷ The definitions are recalled here so that the reader may interpret the type of evaluation used by the speakers. They are based on the glosses provided by the UAM corpus Tools used to tag the text.

⁸ AdQAT is a software tool for the analysis of political discourse to assess it scientifically. It evaluates five structural elements: (1) main argument, (2) logic of the argumentation, (3) emotional tone, (4) support to the argumentation, and (5) closure. The variables of the analytical tool have good internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha between .88 and .89) and validity indicator “good” (Dunnett test) <<http://estepais.com/site/?p=35099>>.

⁹ The name “disjunctive syllogism” is used because there is a syllogism, that is, a three-step argument, and a disjunction, which is an “or” statement. For example, the statement “Either you or me” is a disjunction. Disjunctive syllogisms may be inclusive or exclusive. The *inclusive* disjunction takes the form “and/or” and at least one of the premises is true or maybe both; however, the *exclusive* disjunction takes the form “or” and only one of the premises is true, but the two of them cannot be true (http://www.princeton.edu/~achaney/tmve/wiki100k/docs/Disjunctive_syllogism.html).

¹⁰ The newspaper *La Vanguardia* reports about the debate: “Rubalcaba ha preguntado más que ha respondido, con la intención de hacer olvidar que gobernó hasta ahora. Rajoy ha respondido más que preguntado, ya se sabe presidente” [Rubalcaba has asked more than answered, with the aim of making (the audience) forget that he has governed until now. Rajoy has answered more than questioned, he already recognizes himself a president] (P. Rahola et al., “Ventaja de Rajoy”, 8th November 2011).

References

- Atkinson, D. (2011) ‘Political implicature in parliamentary discourse: an analysis of Mariano Rajoy’s speech on the 2006 Catalan Statute of Autonomy’, in N. Lorenzo-Dus (ed.) *Spanish at Work: Analysing Institutional Discourse across the Spanish-Speaking World*, pp. 130-145. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Becker, A. (2011) ‘Modality and engagement in British and German TV interviews’, in

- K. Aijmer (ed) *Contrastive Pragmatics: Special Volume of Benjamins Current Topics*, pp. 5-22. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Benoit, W. L. and Sheaffer, T. (2006) 'Functional theory and political discourse: televised debates in Israel and the United States', *J & MC Quarterly* 83: 281-297.
- Besnier, N. (1993) 'Reported speech and affect on Nukulaelae Atoll', in J. H. Hill and J. T. Irvine (eds) *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*, pp. 161-181. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blas-Arroyo, J. L. (1999) 'Diga por qué, Diga por qué ...' La repetición en el debate político-electoral', *Revista de Investigación Lingüística* 2: 5-42.
- Blas-Arroyo, J. L. (2000) 'Mire usted Sr. González ... Personal deixis in Spanish political-electoral debate', *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1-27.
- Blas-Arroyo, J. L. (2003) 'Perdóneme que se lo diga, pero vuelve usted a faltar a la verdad, señor González': form and function of politic verbal behaviour in face-to-face Spanish political debates', *Discourse and Society* 14: 395-423.
- Blas-Arroyo, J. L. (2009) '¿Pero qué pregunta es esa?': sobre la naturaleza variable de preguntas y respuestas en el debate político-electoral', *Oralia* 12: 153-192.
- Bull, P. and Fetzer, A. (2006) 'Who are *we* and who are *you*? The strategic use of forms of address in political interviews', *Text and Talk* 26: 3-37.
- Cantavella Blasco, J., Bullough, R., Curiel Calleja, L. A., Morales Blanco-Sieger, B., Mejía Chiang, C. and Pittaro, E. (2008) 'Algunos aspectos lingüísticos de los debates electorales Zapatero-Rajoy 2008', *Estudios sobre el Lenguaje Periodístico* 14: 79-98.
- Conrad, S. & Douglas B. (2003) 'Adverbial marking of evaluation in speech and writing', in S. Hunston & G. Thompson (eds) *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*, pp. 56-73. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cué, C. (2011) 'Un interminable juego del gato y el ratón'. *El País*. 7th November 2011. Available at: <http://politica.elpais.com/> (accessed 7 May 2013).
- Díez Prados, M. and Cabrejas Peñuelas, A. B. (2012) 'Cohesion in American political rhetoric: The Gettysburg Address, I have a dream and Obama's Inaugural Address', *Revista de Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid*, 20: 37-60.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2007) *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eggins, S. and Slade, D. (1997) *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.
- García Gómez, A. (2010) 'Lexical Encoding of Gender Relations and Identities', in R. M. Jiménez Catalán (ed.) *Gender Perspectives on Vocabulary in Foreign and Second Languages*, pp. 238-263. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Halliday, M. (1994) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd edition). London: Edward Arnolds.
- Harris, S. (1991) 'Evasive action: how politicians respond to questions in political Interviews', in P. Scannell (ed.) *Broadcast Talk*, pp. 76-99. London: SAGE Publications.
- Hunston, S. (2000) 'Evaluation and the Planes of Discourse: Status and Value in persuasive texts', in S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds) *Evaluation in Text*, pp. 176-207. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marín, B. (2003) 'Debates electorales por televisión. In Salomé Berrocal (ed.). *Comunicación Política en Televisión y Nuevos Medios*, 207-243. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Martin, J. R. (2003) 'Beyond Exchange: APPRAISAL systems in English', in S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, pp. 34-55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. R. and White, P. R. R. (2005) *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nuolijärvi, P. and Tiittula, L. (2011) Irony in political television debates. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 572-587.
- Proctor, K. and I-Wen Su, L. (2011) 'The 1st person plural in political discourse – American politicians in interviews and in a debate', *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 3251-3266.
- Rahola, P., Ónega, F., Zorzalejos, J.A., Aguilar, M.A., Nadal, R., Puig, V., Rexach, A. and López-Burniol, J.J. (2011) 'Ventaja de Rajoy'. *La Vanguardia*. 8th November 2011. Available at: <http://www.lavanguardia.com/> (accessed 7 May 2013).
- Rospir, J. I. (1999) 'La globalización de las campañas electorales', in A. Muñoz-

- Alonso and J. I. Rospir (eds) *Democracia Mediática y Campañas Electorales*, pp. 55-88. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Simon-Vandenberg, A. (1996) 'Image-building through modality: the case of political interviews', *Discourse and Society* 7: 389-415.
- Simon-Vandenberg, A. (1997) 'Modal (un)certainly in political discourse: A functional account', *Language Sciences* 19: 341-356.
- Simon-Vandenberg, A. (2008) *Hillary Clinton vs. Barack Obama: A linguistic study of appraisal in political speeches*. Master Dissertation. University of Ghent. English Linguistics.
- Sinclair, J. McH. (1981) 'Planes of discourse'. *The Two-fold Voice: Essays in Honour of Ramesh Mohan*, pp. 70-89. Salzburg: University of Salzburg.
- Sinclair, J. McH. (2004) *Trust the Text*. London: Routledge.
- Sornig, K. (1989) 'Some remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion', in R. Wodak (ed) *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*, pp. 95-114. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Téllez, N, Muñiz, C. and Ramírez, J. (2010) 'Función discursiva de los debates televisados. Un estudio transcultural de los debates políticos en México, España y Estados Unidos', *Palabra Clave* 13: 251-270.
- Thompson, G. and Hunston, S. (2003) 'Evaluation: An introduction' in S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, pp. 1-27. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2005) 'War rhetoric of a little ally: Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimatization of the war in Iraq', *Journal of Language and Politics* 4 (1): 65-91.
- Vion, R. (1992) *La communication verbale: Analyse des interactions*. Paris: Hachette Supérieur.
- Wang, J. (2010) 'A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches', *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1: 254-261.
- White, P. R. R. and Verbosity Enterprises, E. (2005) *The Appraisal Website: Homepage*. Available at: www.grammatics.com/appraisal/index.html (accessed 10 October 2012).

Zafra, M. (2011) 'Análisis del discurso del debate Rajoy-Rubalcaba'. *El País*. 7 November 2011. Available at: <http://www.elpais.com/graficos/> (accessed 7 May 2013).