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Same time, same place

- Same issues
- Same labels
- Same context

**BUT NOT**

- Same worldview
- Same ideology
- Same discourse

“We are indeed so good at thinking spatially that converting non-spatial problems into spatial ones seems to be one of the fundamental tricks of human cognition.”

(Levinson 2003: 16)
From basic facts to social realities

Our neural organising schemata rely on the primacy of spatial cognition for orientation and navigation in the real and in the abstract worlds we imagine. (Levinson 2003: 16)

“How do we get from electrons to elections and from protons to presidents?” (Searle 2010: 3)
Space and Time

Function: The ground for making sense of our social situatedness

**STATIVE SPACE AND DYNAMIC TIME**

Ex. The nation state as a mandatory space for government agency.

Effect: Selective space and time frames (here and now)
Ex. “Holland is full ... ”

**POINT OF VIEW IN SPACE AND TIME**

But how can mental frames lead to intentions for action?
Ex. “Holland is full, so we must close the borders.” (Fortuyn 2002)
Agency requires deonticity

Facts require Attitude to gauge their importance (attention) relative to a point of view.

**Modality of Attitude**

*Function:*
Positioning objects and ideas relative to a deictic centre to regulate attention.

*Effect:* Regulates attention, immediacy, desirability
Worldview architecture

• Spatial frames of reference (stative)

• Temporality (dynamic)

• Point of View (Origo)

• Modality of deontic and epistemic attitude (force dynamics)
A Deictic Space Model

Adapted from Chilton (2004: 58)
Levels of meaning construction

1. Meaning-Form Mapping

*Linguistic elements and constructions* enable us to represent knowledge and experience.

*Text worlds*: enable us to represent relations and force dynamics in narrative structures.


*Discourse worlds*: Where language meets society. Verbal and conceptual constructions begin to make sense in the non-formal social context in which they function.
Discourse worlds and social worlds

1. Epistemic alignment (Epistemic communities, Van Dijk 2006)

2. A schematic system of
   - Time and Space FoRs in which to configure facts
   - Location of perspective (point of view)
   - Distribution of attention (modality)
   - Force dynamics (cf. Talmy 2001)
From protons to presidents

3. Deonticity
Underlying non-denotational, moral presumptions about epistemic facts relative to a subjective point of view (Chilton 2011; Searle 2010)
Social-empirical Worldview approach

“[…] a world view is a system of co-ordinates or a frame of reference in which everything presented to us by our diverse experiences can be placed.”

(Apostel in Aerts et al. 2007: 9)

- **Function:** to negotiate and establish common ground for social action
Worldview in Political reasoning: One world and many worlds

Scenario for ideologically motivated action

A. A perspective on the exiting order (here/past & present)
B. A vision of an ideal ‘good society’ (here/future)

C. Political action to get from (A) to (B)
   (cf. Heywood 2007: 11-12)

D. Public support. How does the public know who to vote for?
Vote Advice Applications: A new industry

Homer Simpson’s vote in the Alberta Election 2012

How You Fit in the Political Landscape

The grey dot is where your answers place you in the political landscape, but you could fall anywhere within the shaded area.

Calgary Herald 29-03-2012
Corpus-based discourse analysis for party positioning

**Procedure**
Select a corpus of like-data: Manifestos
Code book design
Test and structure for annotation reliability.

**Function**: Substantiates accountability of results and interpretive conclusions.

**Result**: Insights into lectal variation in parties’ spatial ground.
Deictic Discourse Space Model
(based on Chilton 2004)

Origo = point of view: S = Here; T = Now; A = Immanent, certain, necessary
A TSM Codebook

*Time and temporality*: historic events, recent developments, past, present, future (e.g. WWII, now, always), temporal verbs (*stimulate*). NOT tense.

*Space*: geographic and abstract references to relevant political space (citizens, Brussels, Western World, *Islamization*).

*Modality of Attitude*: modifiers/intensifiers of Time and Space relative to Origo (e.g., *must* has stronger urgency than *want*).
### Coding Attitude

Epistemic and deontic modal expressions (inspired by Chilton 2005; Werth 1999) + expressions of desirability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>is, must be, deserve</th>
<th>necessary, should be, wish, believe</th>
<th>probable, possible, might, may, prefer</th>
<th>uncertain, might not, perhaps</th>
<th>improbable, may not, unnecessary</th>
<th>impossible, is not can’t be unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Annotator: Kyoto Annotation Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>P.prep</td>
<td>Near Past &lt;10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>N.noun</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Near Past &lt;10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2009</td>
<td>D.num</td>
<td>-2009</td>
<td>Near Past &lt;10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getroffen</td>
<td>G.adj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>D.det</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ergste</td>
<td>G.adj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economisch</td>
<td>G.adj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crisis</td>
<td>N.noun</td>
<td>crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinds</td>
<td>P.prep</td>
<td>sinds</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>D.det</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tool: Kyoto Annotation Format**

**Space**

**Time**

**Attitude**
Christian Democrat scope

Green Left scope

Origo = point of view: S = Here; T = Now; A = Immanent, certain, necessary
“Globalization is putting our economic position under pressure. To prevent decline we will continue to invest in the infrastructure.” (CDA 2010)

“We are a world country. Our economy runs on energy from abroad. ... Our future depends on good neighbours and far friends.” (GL 2010)
Conclusion: Space and Ideology

Discursive constructions of Time, Space and Attitude relate to Progressive-Conservative, but not to the Left-Right dimension.

LEFT ↔ RIGHT

Social priorities ↔ Economic priorities

CONSERVATIVE ↔ PROGRESSIVE

Traditional, Authoritarian, Nationalistic – Green, Alternative, Libertarian
(related to past-present-future and attention space)
Conclusions

Discourse analysis for cognitive grounding in layered constructions of emergent meaning (Barsalou 2008):

Origin: the Primacy of Time- and Space FoRs (Levinson 2010)

Lectal variation in Scope and Figure-Ground for variation in attitudes to ‘Fit’ same space and time (Geeraerts 2005; Searle 2010)

Combining epistemic and deontic worldview analysis to explain how we get from selective basic facts to social facts.

Corpus analysis: Guides interpretations of the contextual function of ideologically motivated grounding of worldviews.
Looking outward

TSA: a cognitive schema for discourse analysis

Empowerment

“You need to understand the roots of identity to understand it and to challenge it.” (Harder ICLC12)

Functions

• Stimulates awareness of diversity
• Affords alternative imaginaries of identity, and
• Questions the scope of deliberative space

Applications

e.g., in End-of-life care; Policy making: points of view; Management, migration & diversity studies