




Josef Schmied (Herausgeber)  
Isabelle van der Bom (Herausgeber)

**Working with Media Texts**

Deconstructing and Constructing Crises in Europe



<https://cuvillier.de/de/shop/publications/7724>

Copyright:

Cuvillier Verlag, Inhaberin Annette Jentzsch-Cuvillier, Nonnenstieg 8, 37075 Göttingen,  
Germany

Telefon: +49 (0)551 54724-0, E-Mail: [info@cuvillier.de](mailto:info@cuvillier.de), Website: <https://cuvillier.de>



# **Digesting Crises in Europe (DICE): Deconstructing and Constructing Media Texts in Dialogue with Students**

*Josef Schmied*

## **Abstract**

This contribution introduces the project “Digesting Crises in Europe” (DICE) and gives its funding background and implications. It argues that a more thorough and systematic analysis of language and texts than in traditional content analyses and in literary or cultural studies allows students to see more than meets the eye. It reveals more precisely how writers create meaning to persuade their readers by applying a set of tools from critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics. As a theoretical background, it discusses critically different journalistic and linguistics perspectives that may be used as a starting point for discussion in a critical media project. As a practical exercise, it illustrates that the recent public dialogue in news world-wide can be followed and reconstructed by on-line resources like the NOW (News On the Web) Corpus, which is freely available on the web and allows us to investigate word combinations and phrases in context that reveal more about national and international discourse in English than students may think. Of course, it is necessary to critically observe output and input and remain aware of the well-developed traditions of politicians and journalists to construct the news in a persuasive attempt to influence their readers in their thinking and acting about Europe. Thus young readers from all parts of Europe, including the Balkans, must learn not to react only as passive consumers, but to act as conscientious citizens who deconstruct the news and develop this extra critical awareness necessary in our trying times of “crises in Europe”.

**Key words:** news, construction, deconstruction, corpus linguistics, critical discourse, crisis in Europe, fake news

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1. The Project Background**

This contribution introduces the project “Digesting Crises in Europe”. We chose the acronym DICE, since it alludes to the English phrase “the dice is/are cast”; originally, “The die is cast” is a translation of the Latin *iacta ālea est* exclaimed by Caesar in the decisive moment when he crossed the Rubicon to start the civil war (as quoted in Suetonius, *Vīta Dīvī Iūlī*, The Life of the deified Julius, 121 CE, par. 33). Today it is used metaphorically to refer to a decisive moment in



history, in our case the future development of Europe, which is said to tumble from crisis to crisis. Some media texts lead their readers and listeners to think that Europe, or rather the European Union, is in a constant flow of crises.

“Digesting the crises” emphasises of course that a crisis is a period of time that presents challenges to the development of the European Union, but if these challenges are met and mastered, they can contribute to an even stronger and more vibrant Europe than before. By emphasising deconstructing and constructing media texts, I mean that there is no text that cannot be deconstructed, in the sense that the intentions and sometimes even hidden agendas of the text producers are analysed and discussed openly, and that the news items are always constructed consciously or unconsciously, so that the persuasive elements lead the reader to think or even act according to the proposals or intentions of the writer and speaker. In linguistic terms, it would have been even more convincing to use a more technical expression, like *construing* a text in self-constructing, as in the functional grammar terminology proposed by Halliday (now most forcefully presented by Halliday and Matthiesen 2006).

By emphasising *in dialogue*, we mean that it is important for a democratic European society to discuss the crises in well-established partnership and communication channels. In particular the European discourse by teachers and students from Germany and the Balkan countries should be undertaken in such a way that in the end all contributors are happy with the results and think that the discourse may make some contribution, however small, at least to the mutual understanding of European crises texts in the media, as well as to the mutual understanding of the European citizens who deal with these texts. The terms *deconstruction* and *construction* make it clear that there is no such objective ideal as the *unconstructed, unintentional, unbiased, uncritical* view of media texts in general. Of course, in such discussions it is most important that the critical dialogue of European identities in crises is portrayed from all different perspectives of the peoples and groups involved.

If we apply these basic principles to our own project, we have to discuss openly and critically the funding conditions for such a “Dialogue with countries from the Western Balkans”, as the DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service) programme is called. For the project it is important to show that: a) there is a certain continuation of projects, i.e. that the project includes experienced collaborators; that b) the dialogue is not only academic but involves civil society as a whole to support the development of a democratic culture; that c) it helps to avoid ethnic conflicts in the region. By establishing such a dialogue, we have to be careful, because dialogue as such implies that both sides have an opportunity to make their voices heard on all modern channels of media discourse. The definition of media has to be seen in a modern digital perspective, so that the media include not only newspaper articles and related letters to the editor or comments online, but also social media in a wide sense, from Twitter and Facebook to the exchange of current news and images via smartphones and other much more immediate means of communication than were available only 20 years ago. One of

the advantages of such modern approaches is, of course, that students are more than willing to contribute in such a context to the discussions, since they see this as a welcome change to their usual philological university routine.

## 1.2. Combining Critical Thinking and Writing

The student participants in this project came from a variety of universities, but all had a philological background in the widest sense. Whether they came from traditional English departments or from teacher training, or even from tourism or journalism, all were used to working with texts and had previously been instructed to work with texts critically. The critical thinking paradigm underlies all modern philologies in this sense. Even if the texts may differ, the detached attitude to texts and the critical discourse of them should be a good starting point for open student discussions on media texts.

## 1.3. Local Context in Macedonia: the Fake News Wiki Website

For students from the Balkan and particularly from Macedonia, the year 2016 brought a special relationship to news texts, as the Wikipedia “fake news” entry featured Macedonia under “Prominent Sources” first (Figure 1). Thus it was not surprising that during our Dialogue, students from Skopje in particular were very keen on reporting their personal experiences of the “colourful revolution”, also called the 2016 Macedonian protests, which led to an overturn of the government and the speaker of the protests being moved into the Ministry of Information, demonstrating convincingly the awareness of the importance of “news” for political developments in the Balkans.




Figure 1: Screenshot of the Wikipedia page “Fake News Websites” (19/12/12).



## 2. Looking at Media from Journalistic and Linguistic Perspectives

### 2.1. Journalistic Perspectives

#### 2.1.1. *The Crisis of Journalism*

The crisis of journalism has been discussed again and again, but has become more pronounced than ever in the last few years, in the professional but also in the popular media. The following excerpt from Bennet (2016: 4-5) illustrates the debate:

The struggles of the legacy press system may not worry most people because there appear to be so many outlets for information that it is hard to keep up with them. One only need enter a topic in a search engine to find hundreds or thousands of sites with information about it. Yet many of the blogs, webzines, and online news organizations are *merely recycling the shrinking journalism content produced by increasingly threatened news organizations*. Consider a revealing study of one news microcosm: the “news ecosystem” of the city of Baltimore. The Pew Project for Excellence in Journalism conducted a study of where information about politics, government, and public life came from in that city. The study looked at various media, from newspaper, radio, and television to blogs and other online sites. Although this information system seemed rich and diverse, with some 53 different outlets for news, tracking the origins of actual news items showed that 95 percent of the stories containing original information ‘came from traditional media—most of them from the newspaper’ [(Pew Research Center for Excellence in Journalism 2010 quoted in Bennet 2016: 4-5). Even more distressing was a look back in time showing that the sole surviving paper, the *Baltimore Sun*, reported 32 percent fewer stories between 1999 and 2009, and 73 percent fewer than in 1991.

In his sweeping look at the creation (and demise) of the modern media, Paul Starr [(2009, quoted in Bennet 2016: 5) argued that if these trends continue, *the growing ignorance of the citizenry and the diminished public accountability of officials will surely be accompanied by a great wave of public corruption*. Indeed, many citizens already see corruption in government as a major problem. For example, a 2008 poll on the roots of the financial crisis showed that 62 percent strongly agreed with the statement that political corruption played a major role in the crisis, and another 19 percent agreed “somewhat” with that statement. By 2013, 76 percent of Americans felt that the political parties were the most corrupt institutions and that the problem was growing worse (Bennett 2016: 4-5, italics are my own).

Thus the crisis of journalism can be seen on three levels: The quantity of journalistic texts is decreasing (although the number of information sources on the web seem to be increasing); the quality of journalistic texts is debated; and “established” democratic institutions are questioned.

#### 2.1.2. *Definitions of News in the Context of the Expansion and Criticism of Journalistic Work*

In this sometimes heated political context, new definitions of news have become necessary, and again the classic handbook by Bennett (2016) provides a starting point for our dialogue:

How do the changing interactions among political actors, publics, and the press affect the way we define the news? As a starting point, it makes sense to adopt a simple definition





that expands political news beyond just what news organizations produce: *news consists of (a) the reporting of actions and events (b) over a growing variety of publicly accessible media (c) by journalism organizations and an expanding spectrum of other content producers, including ordinary citizens*. As the news process expands beyond the legacy media, standards for selecting, formatting, sourcing, and documenting reports become less shared and more open to challenges about accuracy and relevance. Yet as some properties of news change, others remain the same. Doris Graber suggested that news is not just any information, or even the most important information, about the world; rather, the news tends to contain information that is *timely*, often *sensational* (scandals, violence, and human drama frequently dominate the news), and *familiar* (stories often draw on familiar people or life experiences that give even distant events a close-to-home feeling). In this view, the news is constructed through the constantly changing interactions of journalists, politicians, and citizens often seeking different ends (Bennet 2016: 24-25, italics my own).

This argumentation includes again a constructionist perspective and the “expanding” spectrum and does not hide the possibly conflicting ends of journalists, politicians and citizens. These conflicting ends have brought about a discussion about gatekeepers in popular public discourse, in particular on social media, where today’s professional journalism is accused of not being sufficiently independent from political parties or governments to portray political events in an objective light. This has been criticised “extremely” by the new right movements in Europe, including in Germany, under slogans that suggest that the press “lies” (“Lügenpresse”) or also produces “fake news” (fake news is not only produced by “uncontrolled” social media, like Twitter, Facebook, etc., but also by the “traditional press”). Bennet (2016: 25) has the following to say about this:

At the height of the mass media era, journalists were often regarded as “gatekeepers” who screened information (ideally) according to its truth and importance. More recently, as the news habits change and the capacity for *direct news production and distribution by citizens grows*, gatekeeping by the legacy press is less effective and, in the view of some observers, less important. (Bennett 2016: 25, italics my own).

Despite all the changes outlined above, the legacy news reported by journalists remains important in the governing process, even as it may undermine the legitimacy of that same process for many citizens who consume it. The core question explored in this book is, *How well does the news, as the core of the national political information system, serve the needs of democracy?* (Bennett 2016: 25, italics in the original).

In public relations and politics, spin is a form of propaganda, achieved through providing a biased interpretation of an event or campaigning to persuade public opinion in favour or against some organization or public figure. While traditional public relations and advertising may also rely on altering the presentation of the facts, “spin” often implies the use of disingenuous, deceptive, and highly manipulative tactics. The Wikipedia entry on “Spin (propaganda)” states the following:

As such, a standard tactic used in "spinning" is to reframe, reposition, or otherwise modify the perception of an issue or event, to reduce any negative impact it might have on public opinion. For example, a company whose top-selling product is found to have a significant safety problem may "reframe" the issue by criticizing the safety of its main competitor's products or indeed by highlighting the risk associated with the entire product category. This might be done using a "catchy" slogan or sound bite that can help to persuade the public of the company's biased point of view. This tactic could enable the company to defocus the public's attention on the negative aspects of its product.



[One] theory suggests [that] the omnipresence of the Internet in some societies will inevitably lead to a reduction in the effectiveness of spin.

This attack is much more dramatic than what we have seen over the past 20 years, when politicians, in particular British politicians and New Labour led by Tony Benn, started discussing the political discourse under the new concept of spin, which is an interesting metaphor to convey the idea that the news has to be twisted according to the needs of the politicians.

### 2.1.3. *Post-Truth Politics and Fake News and Journalistic and Political Reactions*

In 2016, this mistrust of news and the general public has culminated in the debate of post-truth politics, which again resulted in a relatively recent new entry on Wikipedia:

*Post-truth politics* (also called *post-factual politics*) is a political culture in which debate is framed largely by appeals to emotion disconnected from the details of policy, and by the repeated assertion of talking points to which factual rebuttals are ignored. Post-truth differs from traditional contesting and falsifying of truth by rendering it of "secondary" importance.

In the 2016 American presidential campaign, which led to the election of President Trump, the discourses of post-truth politics have been joined by the discourses of fake news. Although the term “fake news” is relatively new (it is not prominent in the Standard English dictionaries), the attempts by certain industries (in the US usually tobacco, weapons, or pharmaceutical industries) and, of course, most war-time “propaganda”, to influence buyers or citizens, has been a problem of news agencies since their beginning. However, ‘fake news’ clearly goes beyond what has been called a “bias”, since it has absolutely no basis in fact, but is simply presented as being factually accurate. The relevance of fake news has increased in post-truth politics and modern (social) media, which allow not only the rapid dissemination of “news”, but also anonymously-hosted fake news websites that lack known, credited publishers, and make it difficult to prosecute sources of fake news for libel. The connection of the American presidential campaign and fake news websites can be explained through the possibility of click-bait, which used to allow website creators to earn money by luring their customers onto special websites. This opportunity was used extensively by Macedonian unemployed youths (see Section 1.3 above), and may even have had an influence on the American presidential election.

The two most important organisational forms of fact-checking take place in Europe. These are the newsroom model associated with existing news media, and the NGO model that operates independently. Both exist across different countries, but with more newsroom-based fact-checking in Western Europe and more NGO-based fact checking in Eastern Europe. The fact-checkers identify fake news in different and sometimes multiple ways. Many see themselves as reporters, but others identify themselves as activists or experts, and in some cases two or all three of these. Their relation is shaped in part by their perception of the ex-

isting political and media system in their country – the situation in Nordic countries with relatively robust news media and comparatively higher levels of trust in political institutions is different from that in the Balkans, with weaker and less independent news media and a more problematic political situation. Whatever their organisational form, research practices and funding models, all fact-checking outlets still rely in a large part on existing news media to publicise their work. All have a digital presence, ranging from their own websites, to various social media channels, but they also work, in a sometimes uneasy relationship, with the existing media that they aim to influence or provide an alternative to. Graves and Cherubini present the following example as a case study:

At the French news organisation *Le Monde*, the mission of Les Décodeurs (The Decoders) is to verify declarations, statements, and rumours, put information in context, and reply to readers' questions (Grave and Cherubini 2016: 31).

In the recent award ceremony on the occasion of the Marion-Dönhoff-Prize, the German President Steinmeier (2017) praised *The New York Times* (and its executive editor Dean Banquet) for asking the right critical questions, even though they were attacked frequently as the “East Coast establishment”, continuing to draw consequences from their questions. *The New York Times* promises clear institutional differentiation between reportage and comment, more resources into investigative research, strict criteria for source verification, more transparency in the Newsroom, and strict rules for social media use. The half a million new subscribers to *The New York Times* may be an indication that the independent critical press is felt to be needed in “Western” democracies more than ever before.

## 2.2. Applied Linguistic Perspectives

### 2.2.1. Detecting News Bias – Fake News

Due to the global concerns of news bias and fake news, the world-wide trend to include “fake news” in the teaching curriculum at every educational level, from school to university, is not surprising. In October 2017, even *The New York Times* reported on “Italian Schools, Reading, Writing and Recognizing Fake News” (Horowitz 2017) – and many other nations are thought to follow. Thus we witness an expansion of the traditional understanding of “literacy”, including new media and social media, and critical evaluation skills for all types of texts, i.e. an awareness of the deconstruction and construction of texts, as is the topic of our Dialogue programme. Most of the programmes currently in existence are however oriented towards the formal side of “detecting” fake news by looking at the situational and production context of texts (such as source, authors, dates and supporting sources) that are suspected of being fake, the linguistic means to recognise “outrageous” content, “jokes” and “biases” are not discussed in detail (see Figure 2).





Figure 2: International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions infographic based on FactCheck.org's 2016 article "How to Spot Fake News".

### 2.2.2. From Media Bias to Fake News through Language Analyses

Applied linguistic approaches to journalistic texts have been around for many years. Standard approaches to news (media) language are Bell (1999) and, even more practical, Ludwig and Gilmore (2005). Parts of newspapers, like headlines or editorials, have been analysed. The direct linguistic challenge to identify (maybe even automatically) clear news bias or fake news has not yet been taken up systematically, only logical argumentation is available.

Of course, there are grammatical approaches to fake news or biased news that use well-known features of language-specific parts-of-speech tagging, for instance. Such news stories contain more proper nouns, since they are focussed on celebrities and other well-known personalities, and they contain more adjectives and adverbs, since they are indicative of sentiment. They also have more comparatives and superlatives, since they want to attract the readers' attention by using, for instance *better*, *biggest*, *worst* etc. They also contain more question words (like *where*, *how*, *why*). Functional linguistic approaches show that the personalisation of such news stories can be seen by the use of pronouns like *we*, the specific stance can be seen by an overuse of boosters (e.g. *must*, *clearly*), compared to hedges (e.g. *may*, *possibly*). The use of affect words, especially negative words, which express anger, and little metadiscourse, which can be seen from the lack of conjunctions, and which would emphasise or clarify logical con-

nections. Artificial intelligence and computer-linguistic approaches could be used as well, since such news contain more exclamation marks, less sentence complexity (especially *semicolons, quotes, articles, apostrophes, commas*) – again, these stance markers are more headline-supporting and may provide conflicting evidence, but this does not, as of yet, lead to conclusive evidence.

### 2.2.3. Combining Critical Discourse and Corpus Linguistics

The central argument of this contribution is that two major fields of applied linguistics, critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics, can make a major contribution to raising awareness of the “constructedness” of news. When critical discourse analysis, as an established set of tools for critical linguistics, is complemented by corpus linguistics, a wider set of data can be included in the debate and the threat of the researcher’s own ideological bias influencing the analysis can be avoided. This type of approach has developed in applied linguistics and is exemplified in section 3 below.

As early as 2005, Baker and McEnery have used a corpus of newspaper texts (as well as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) website) to analyse collocations of *refugee(s)* and *asylum seeker(s)* to show that such a combined methodology can make an analysis more objective and verifiable. In this type of analysis there are of course still some qualitative and subjective elements involved, and hard critics will always be able to point out that the analysis is not completely balanced, or that it is necessary to study the individual production mechanisms directly, e.g. by interviewing the author or including all relevant information that may play a role in biased construction or deconstruction of texts. Thus some newspapers, like the German weekly *Die Zeit*, have started adding boxes to their larger stories in order to explain the background of the investigation, especially financial implications, access to information and collaboration with local informants, media, and/or institutions.

## 3. Exploring BYU Corpora for “crisis in Europe” and “fake news”

### 3.1. Quantitative Analyses of the NOW Corpus

The well-known BYU corpora (Davis and Fuchs 2015) can be used to show the NOW (News On the Web) Corpus, which collects news on the web overnight and allows us to see the standard collocates of our keywords “fake” and “crisis”, and which can be used to investigate current issues in the news over the last few years. In the first analysis, we searched for “crisis in Europe” in August and in October 2017 and can see at a first glance that the keywords in context (KWIC) were the same (Figure 3). Most frequent collocations were either *refugee, migrant or dead, political crisis* and *economic crisis*. As the two screenshots from the NOW Corpus in Figure 3 show, English speaking newspapers from all around the world seem to agree unanimously, as the national codes of the newspapers after the dates show (CA for Canada, IE for Eire, US, MY for Malaysia, etc.).



Figure 3: KWIC for “crisis in Europe” in the NOW corpus (04/07/17 and 12/12/17).

An analysis of the first 20 collocates after the notorious “Europe” shows the semantic group of *refugee*, *migrant*, *migration*, *humanitarian*, *Syria(n)*, and *immigration* are clearly prominent with the semantic field of *dead*, *economic*, *financial*, and *banking* a clear second (Figure 4).