COVID-19: The World and the Words

Linguistic means and discursive constructions

Michael Kranert, Paola Attolino,
Martina Berrocal, Júlio Antonio Bonatti Santos,
Sara Garcia Santamaria, Nancy Henaku,
Aimée-Danielle Lezou Koffi, Camilla Marziani,
Viktorija Mažeikienė, Dasniel Olivera Pérez,
Kumaran Rajandran & Aleksandra Salamurović

Main contact

Michael Kranert (University of Southampton).

Contact: M.Kranert@soton.ac.uk

About the authors

Short biographies and contacts of all authors can be found on page 8.

About the CWPS

The DiscourseNet Collaborative Working Paper Series (CWPS) reflects ongoing research activity at the intersection of language and society in an interdisciplinary field of discourse studies. Prolonging the activities and publications of DiscourseNet, it welcomes contributions which actively engage in a dialogue across different theories of discourse, disciplines, topics, methods and methodologies.

All contributions to the CWPS are work in progress. The CWPS offers an environment for an open discussion of the drafts, reports or presentations. Authors are provided with two expert commentaries for their paper and more extensive discussions of their ideas in the context of Discourse-Net Conferences.

The CWPS seeks to provide support for the advancement and publication of the presented works. It does not inhibit further publication of the revised contribution.

For further information on the CWPS visit:

https://discourseanalysis.net/dncwps

About the Special Issue: Discourse Studies Essays on the Corona Crisis

Edited by Jens Maeße, David Adler & Elena Psyllakou

This special issue seeks to collect ideas, reflections and discussions on the multiple aspects of the ongoing corona crisis from a discourse analytical and discourse theoretical point of view. We publish short work-in-progress papers (approx. 1000—3000 words) that take empirical, ethical, psychoanalytical, economic, political and everyday aspects as starting point for developing discourse analytical research ideas and reflections which can be further developed into full research papers at a later time.

Citation

COVID-19: The World and the Words

Linguistic means and discursive constructions

Michael Kranert, Paola Attolino, Martina Berrocal,

Júlio Antonio Bonatti Santos, Sara Garcia Santamaria, Nancy Henaku,

Aimée-Danielle Lezou Koffi, Camilla Marziani, Viktorija Mažeikienė,

Dasniel Olivera Pérez, Kumaran Rajandran & Aleksandra Salamurović

The present paper aims to explore by which discursive and linguistic means the COVID-19-pandemic as a macro event has been translated into local micro events and to point to similarities and differences by comparing the initial statements by leading political actors from 29 countries across four continents. The comparative analysis is based on the theoretical and methodological framework of the socio-cognitive approach within Critical Discourse Analysis, which focuses on exploring the construction of in-, affiliated and out-groups. In addition, our analysis is informed by argumentation theory and nationalism studies. The results of our analysis suggest that the major consensus has been found in constructing the out-group. In most countries, the virus is conceptualized as the main proponent of the out-group. In contrast, the linguistic and discursive construction of in-groups and the affiliated ones displays greater variation, depending on the prevalent discursive practices and the social context in different countries.

Keywords: *socio-cognitive approach, social actor representation, comparative analysis, political speech, COVID-19-pandemic*

The COVID-19 pandemic seems to be a truly global phenomenon, and probably the first of its kind, since the lockdown as an emergency measure against the spread of the virus affected nearly everybody and led to a "unique shared experience" (Bieber 2020, 1). This distinguishes it from other seemingly 'global' phenomena, such as the financial crisis or previous epidemics that were confined to one or more regions (e. g. SARS). Given this experiential uniformity, the question arises of how such general social phenomenon has been localized by discourse-linguistic means.

We therefore gathered an international group of linguistic scholars to explore this question in more detail by performing a comparative analysis of the first statements of main political actors in 29 countries across four continents, including developed and developing countries.

Background and Aims of the Project

The national-oriented reactions (closing borders, restrictions of medical and social aid within state borders etc.) were one of the most salient features in the very first phase of the outbreak of the pandemic, challenging the concept of solidarity. These circumstances have brought to the fore the concept of nationalism as opposed to global solidarity. Some scholars have argued that global solidarity is generally being questioned (Ozkirimli 2020). In contrast, Malešević (2013, 14) argues that solidarity is one of the key principles of nationhood, and "for an overwhelming majority of inhabitants of this planet, nationhood is understood to be the principal form of human soli-

darity." Others, although not so exclusive in their observations, see the potential for proliferation of nationalism worldwide (Bieber 2020). Although almost all political actors from our corpus invoke solidarity in one or another form, the comprehensive analysis of our corpus will demonstrate that there are differences in degree of solidarity and groups benefiting from it (for example, the case of Italy and the lack of EUropean solidarity at the beginning of the pandemic).

Nationalism as a nation-based ideology, draws on inclusion and exclusion, which are two main principles in constituting any group (van Dijk 1998, 72), and therefore also a nation (Bieber 2018, 521). In line with Anderson (1983), nations need to be understood as a social construction, mental model and cognitive structure that make up the core of "imagined communities". Within the discourse of COVID-19, a crisis has not only provoked the need to mobilize the "image of communion" between all members who do not know each other, but it has initiated the processes of discursive (re-)identification and of building in- and out-groups. We have considered initial observations from political and social sciences mentioned above in order to explore the discursive and linguistic construction of in- and out- groups. However, we would like to underline the fact that this paper we present is based on the corpus consisting of only one speech per country delivered in March 2020. Further analysis incorporating more speeches will follow.

However unique the experience with COVID-19 pandemic might be, from the discourse point of view, it builds on already existing discursive and linguistic elements, as we will show in our analysis. Bieber (2020) argues that the pandemic started at a moment when in many countries of Europe and North America an ideology he calls "exclusionary nationalism" was gaining hegemony, in terms of both discursive and social practice (2020, 4). Many aspects of the exclusionary nationalism were adopted when the pandemic started (e. g. appeal to the need to protect the nation, linguistically conceptualized through metonymy "country name for people" or particular metaphors). Furthermore, the pandemic provoked "emergency politics" (White 2015) and crisis communication, which in public discourse often relies on "representation[s] of nation[s'] mood and sense of identity" (Matus-Mendoza and De Rycker 2013, 426).

A further discursive element that plays a part in crisis discourse is the (re-)evaluation of citizenship as a national/ethnic category: Bieber (2020, 8) mentions the case of the Austrian chancellor Kurz in "his statements to the public on the crisis, consistently addressed all Austrians, while ignoring the substantial number of permanent residents who are not Austrian citizens." The scholar warns that the "risk is that citizens from the Global South will be particularly affected by continuous border restrictions. The result could be a reinforcement of global inequalities of citizenship, especially as citizenship and migratory policies are likely to remain more rigid."

Bieber's analysis focuses on politicians and discourse supporting exclusionary nationalism, but what about less exclusive, more 'banal' forms of nationalism (Billig 1995)? Ozkirimli (2020) observes a general tendency towards national reactions to the crisis, which he attributes to public health being a national competency of the individual states and the fact that "the nation-state – the institution – is the gravitational constant that determines politics".

An important limitation of the analyses of national reactions to the COVID-19 crisis is their focus on developed nations, while the crisis discourses in developing countries might also include elements of a critique of the unequal economic and geopolitical situation (cf. critique on power structures, inequalities in global health system and symbolic colonialism and racism within Europe-Africa nexus, The Lancet 2020). There was, for instance, a widespread view in many Global Southern contexts, such as Mexico, Nigeria and India, that COVID-19 is a "a rich man's disease" as in many of these contexts, the disease was imported by people returning from their travels to China and Europe especially (Bengali, Linthicum and Kim, 2020). Also, unlike the COVID-19 Crisis, many recent epidemics, such as Ebola, affected only Global Southern countries – a situation that may be an important context for some of the crisis communication in such contexts.

Developing Asian countries were the first to experience COVID-19, and the virus was first considered a crisis in Asia before it spread to Europe and North America. Unlike previous health crises that were centered on particular continents or regions (e. g. Ebola in Africa, SARS in Asia), COVID-19 became a global crisis within three months. This inspires a study of national reactions to COVID-19 from countries with diverse geographic and developmental levels.

This paper starts from the assumption that 'emergency politics' is discursively constructed and examines it from a contrastive perspective. Bieber (2020) and other scholars observed that the global COVID-19 discourse is mainly based on nationalist discourses. On the basis of our extremely diverse multilingual and international corpus, we are exploring whether these observations can be confirmed empirically and if they also extend to centrist and left-wing politicians. The analysis has therefore the following aims:

1) To understand how the pandemic is discursively constructed by political leaders;

2) to carve out the most important discursive and linguistic elements in the early statements of officials from different countries by applying the bottom-up approach;

3) to point to commonalities and differences in discursive and linguistic features in analysed countries worldwide;

4) to monitor communicative interdiscursivity and intertextuality during the pandemic timeline.

Our project performs a comparative analysis of the first statements of leading political actors in 29 countries in four continents from developed and developing countries (see the list below). To achieve a comparable data set, we decided to collect speeches or announcements that were given shortly after 11th March 2020, the day the World Health Organization declared a pandemic. This was of course not without problems – different political systems will favour different roles in Government to make such announcements: While in presidential systems such as the US and France this might be the president, semi-presidential and parliamentary systems might have a different speaker with different restrictions on who she speaks on behalf of etc. In Switzerland, for example, the government always speaks as a collective, presenting the point of view of their department – the president there is really only a chair of this collective decision maker. These political institutions might therefore also have chosen different genres that might influence the discursive features.

The polities and languages studied so far:

- *Europe (17):*
  Germany (German), Austria (German), Switzerland (German, Italian, French, Romansh), United Kingdom (English), Spain (Spanish), Netherlands (Dutch), Belgium (Dutch, French), Italy (Italian), Croatia (Croatian), Bosnia (Bosnian), Montenegro (Montenegrin), Serbia (Serbian), North Macedonia (Macedonian), Czechia (Czech), Slovakia (Slovak), Russia (Russian), Lithuania (Lithuanian)

- *Americas (6):*
  North: United States (English), Mexico (Spanish), Cuba (Spanish)
  South: Brazil (Portuguese), Argentina (Spanish), Chile (Spanish)

- *Asia (4):*
  Brunei (Malay), Indonesia (Malay), Malaysia (Malay), Singapore (English, Malay, Mandarin)

- *Africa (2):*
  Ghana (English), Côte d'Ivoire (French)

Theoretical and methodological considerations

The project is based on two main ideas around political discourse: Politics is understood as collective decision making (Klein 2000, 2019; Fairclough and Fairclough 2012). A course of action needs to be legitimized on the basis of common values and an agreed understanding of the situation and the issue in question (Chilton 2004). But not only the course of action is socially and discursively legitimised – the question of who can act on whose behalf and what defines political entities such as states, nations, governments, and institutions are discursively constructed and contested socio-cognitive representations.

Two analytical heuristics therefore guide our analysis: The social construction of political identities provided by the crisis communication reacting to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the argumentative legitimation of political actions. When analysing textual data of political discourse, we need to understand them in context. Here, we are guided by the three-dimensional model suggested by Fairclough (2010, 131–34) and adapted for the socio-cognitive approach by Koller (2012, 2014):

- *Macro-Level*: social context, i. e. it points to social factors influencing text and discourse practice.

- *Meso-Level*: context of discourse practice and the participants involved in these practices, participant role as well as the genre of the text

- *Micro-Level*: linguistic and semiotic analysis of the texts, construction of identities and political action

The research on social categorization as one of the basic processes of social cognition and the linguistic means which express them is elaborated within the socio-cognitive approach to discourse analysis (van Dijk 2008; Koller 2014, 2019). The distinctive feature of the socio-cognitive outlook lies in inferring the socio-cognitive representations (SCR) from texts produced in a particular social context. Socio-cognitive representations (SCR) are conceptual structures defined as "organized, coherent, and socially shared sets of knowledge about an object or domain" Thus, collective identities are seen as socio-cognitive representations "comprising beliefs and knowledge, norms and values, attitudes and expectations as well as emotions" (Koller 2012, 20).

This knowledge can come from different sources, such as media, the norms and values of the community on which basis expectations are built and evaluations of groups are performed. Such categorization leads to the construction of group identities in discourse (Koller 2019, 71) and the discourse space occupied by them (Chilton 2014, 2017; Cap 2017). SCRs are dynamic and flexible, also because they are not necessarily internally consistent but can show contradictory elements that lead to their change over time (Augoustinos et al. 2006: 99, as quoted in Koller 2012, 20).

The basis for the distinction between the individual groups, mainly *in-groups* and *out-groups* is a construction of difference, also known as bounding – construction of limits and boundaries (Koller 2019, 71). The in-group construction is based on self-categorization, being expressed by self-attribution, assignment of action, motivation and shared values.

Besides in- and out-groups, Koller introduces another group named *affiliated group* which is different from the in-group, however, it is "sympathetic" or at least neutral towards the in-group and shares some of its goals, norms and values. "Members of the in-group and affiliated group are likely to have a positive attitude towards each other. The phenomenon of affiliated groups can be found in a

range of social, including institutional contexts, including coalition partners in politics or *allied nations*" (Koller 2019, 72, emphasis by authors of this paper).

First Insights from the Data: National and international identity and group construction

The in-groups

A first step in the analysis was a content analysis that identified the textual construction of in-groups, out-groups and affiliated groups. The categorizations we found were relative to the macro level context of the country analyzed. The central in-group in the addresses are, of course, the listeners, which are addressed to coordinate and legitimize action. However, there is wide variation in the addresses that already constructs local differences. As Bieber (2020) already observed, the Austrian Chancellor Kurz construed quite an exclusive in-group by addressing his audience as "dear Austrians" (similar to, amongst others, the American President, the Lithuanian Prime Minister, the Malaysian Prime Minister, the Ghanaian President, the Spanish Prime Minister and the Chilean President), quite in contrast to the German Chancellor who either talks to "Ladies and Gentleman" (similar to the Swiss government representatives) in the press conference, or addresses the audience in her video message as "dear fellow citizens" and talks about the "population" instead of "the people" (similar address can be observed in the speeches in Czech Republic, Slovakia and Russia). The same holds for all Western Balkan countries in the corpus, which however reflects more the tendency to rhetorically conform with the notion of an "inclusive" state-nation concept while reinforcing nationalism by other discursive and linguistic means.

Generally, there is also a widespread entextualization of enablers during the crisis, mostly health experts/researchers, volunteers in Lithuania, army in Switzerland, Spain, Mexico, Lithuania and Serbia, civil servants in Malaysia and Lithuania. These have different functions: While health experts are used to close and depoliticize the discourse about political options ("We are following the science" – this can be found in Germany, the UK, Mexico and Spain. "The government … uses WHO protocols, and consults with health experts in the community …" in Indonesia), the army is called upon as helpers mainly to support local communities and health care. Health care professionals, teachers and shop assistants are often thanked (Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Czech Republic, Slovakia) and even construed as heroes (UK 'our amazing NHS' – "national emergency … stay at home, protect the NHS and save lives'; in Spain, Sánchez calls health professionals "our shield against the virus", in the Czech republic, the Prime Minister Babiš says that the health professionals "risk their lives in the field", President Putin in Russia states that they "are now at the forefront of defending the

country"). Even in Ghana, where it is not common for heroes to be made out of workers and where a sense of skepticism that tends to scrutinize public workers based on a general postcolonial cynicism is popular and where, like many African contexts, as Houeland (2000) indicates, the work of health professionals during the crisis is significantly impacted by a weak health delivery system, health workers are construed as heroes in some instances. However, this happens outside the corpus analyzed here, as the pandemic peaked slightly later in Ghana.

There are also cases, where the government (exclusive/ambiguous exclusive 'we') is central to the in-group and defends its actions. Boris Johnson repeatedly claims credit for Government actions (we have …), while Angela Merkel uses her TV address to "explain what we do to protect the community". In Serbia, President Vučić adopts even the role of the National Assembly ("Under these circumstances, we, as the National Assembly, will inform you that we have decided …"), although the parliament has been suspended shortly before he gave his speech. The Czech Prime Minister Andrej Babiš switches repeatedly from exclusive "I am aware that we make life complicated for the people [by imposing the protective measures], to inclusive "nobody was ready for this. We are doing very well". In Singapore, Prime Minister Lee says "We keep up our guard" which spans the Government and citizens, indicating a conflation between the two. In Chile and Cuba the presidents appeal to the international recognition of their health systems/measures in order to legitimize their concrete anti-COVID-19 actions.

Affiliated Groups

As expected, affiliated groups are generally other countries cooperating to deal with the crisis, mostly neighboring countries. With this, neighbors are reassured that even if borders are closed, they are seen as partners in this crisis. Sometimes, countries further afield are construed this way, either because an affected area becomes an affiliated group as it is a place with a significant expat population (Ghana), or because their knowledge or expertise can ensure the survival of the in-group (for instance, references to South Korea by the Chilean President).

However, it is actually the differences between the speeches that were particularly pertinent in terms of the categorization of affiliated groups and out-groups and therefore the transnational positioning of the different countries in the crisis discourse.

A good example is the European Union: It was rendered as an affiliated group in Austria and Germany, while being an out-group in the USA and Serbia. The relationship between the EU and the US has always been complex and challenging, but at the same time it has persevered and prospered. The EU would have hardly been an out-group without President Trump, who has questioned the US-EU relationship since the beginning of his mandate with his open criticism towards the European project. In Serbia, the construction

of the EU as an out-group (and China as an affiliated group instead) must be seen, first, in the context of the authoritarian ruling style by the President Vučić, who decides on political friends and foes, depending on what corresponds with his political goals. Second, this is in line with the Serbian discursive myth on being on the eternal crossroad between West and East (although the overall relations with the EU has been intricate since 2000 for several reasons, such as Kosovo independence, migration crisis, delay of EU accession etc.). In Germany, Chancellor Merkel actually reported directly from the EU summit when making her statement on COVID-19 being declared a pandemic, naming the other heads of governments as "Colleagues" and stressing the necessity of EU wide coordination in both the immediate medical, administrative and the macro-economic reaction. This is very much in line with Germany's strong pro-European but also hegemonic agenda.

In Chile, the EU equivalent would be Prosur, which integrates most South American countries. A further example can be found in the Indonesian President's speech, where he emphasizes communication with the WHO. In the Ghanaian President's speech   it is transnational organizations such as the WHO, WORLD BANK, IMF and "friends of Ghana" that are thanked for their "assistance", their "pledges … in support of our fight" and to whom the President indicates the government "will continue to work with to defeat the virus". These cases provide a counterexample to the emphasis on nationalism in some Western countries. This example introduces two crucial questions: Is there a tension between deglobalization and globalization and what influence does a country's geopolitical positioning have on this transnational interpellation?

Out-groups

The major subcategory in the out-groups is the personified virus (e. g. in the Netherlands, the USA, Cuba, Brunei, Indonesia, Lithuania, Serbia, Czech Republic). The personified virus is first and foremost seen as an enemy to fight against. This is evident in the lexical choice of military vocabulary and metaphorical language (front-line, fight, deaths, destroy, defeat, stop, hit, foreign/invisible enemy, those who offend us/those who attack us). In Serbia, the virus is directly named the enemy: "... as of today Serbia has been at war against an invisible enemy, a dangerous and vicious enemy that our country must defeat." However, the enemy may be indirectly implied: for instance, in the Ghanaian president's speech, there is no direct use of the word "enemy", but such lexical choices like "fight", "defeat", or "a possible hit on our borders" implicitly constructs the virus or disease as an enemy, and the pandemic is said to be "wreaking havoc on the global economy". This is also seen in speeches from Malaysia and Singapore.

Particular aspects that have emerged regarding out-groups are the following: they stand in contrast to in-groups; in some cases, outgroups are historical adversaries (the his-

torical adversary is the US, who "has imposed" "all sorts of wars on Cuba – a country at war"; or in Mexico: "We have also faced our adversaries, who always seek to harm us, although in that purpose, they harm the people"); out-groups disturb the solidarity, and may worsen the situation (or they are defined as showing lack of solidarity); out-groups need to be warned; they may or may not be citizens; physical borders do not correspond to out-groups.

Certain foreign countries may be indicated as adversaries. For instance, Donald Trump sees both the EU and China as being responsible for the outbreak in the US: "The European Union failed to take the same precautions and restrict travel from China and other hotspots. As a result, a large number of new clusters in the United States were seeded by travelers from Europe" and "We made a life-saving move with early action on China."

In some cases, particular groups are identified – e. g. traders in Brunei – who are warned about repercussions if they continue their behaviour ("Traders are warned not to take the opportunity to raise prices, and if this happens, my Government will not hesitate to take legal action"). Also, in some countries (Cuba, Mexico), media are regarded as adversaries ("We have been able to face the yellowing of some media. The spread of lies to frighten, false news", Mexico).

Importantly, compliance (or lack of it) with certain values can constitute an out-group (rather than it being predetermined). For instance, there can be no out-group a priori, but it will be constructed as people/groups start developing or resisting certain values: being unsupportive, not complying with regulations. For instance, quarantine violators receive negative evaluations that may be implicit (Spain) or explicit ("Those who violate the established quarantine will face criminal charges", Argentina, "the deliberate violations of the measures is no fun or heroism", Czech Republic).

Conclusions – next steps of the project: Links between Macro, Meso and Micro Levels

The overall goal of our project was to indicate by which discursive and linguistic means the pandemic as a macro event has been translated into local micro events and to point to similarities and differences by comparing material from 29 countries. As regards the text type, we have focused on the first statements by the political actors given after 11th March. The comparative analysis is based on the theoretical and methodological framework of socio-cognitive approach within Critical Discourse Analysis, which focuses on exploring the construction of in-, affiliated and out-groups. In addition, our analysis is informed by argumentation theory and studies in nationalism.

The major consensus has been found in constructing the out-group. In most countries the virus is conceptualised as

the main proponent of the out-group, which in our view reflects the meso level of our analysis, that is, the context of the discourse practice. We have observed only one of the first statements after the pandemic was declared, so that the focus of the speakers was more on strengthening the "imagined community" as the in-group.

The central in-group in the addresses are the recipients, who are addressed to coordinate and legitimize action. However, there is wide variation in the addresses that already constructs local differences: in some countries the national orientation is emphasized by using generic noun phrases such as "people" or ethnonyms, in others the nomination is more inclusive by using "citizens" or personal pronoun "we". The function of those nominations has to be observed against the background of the general discourse features in particular countries, that is, to be linked to macro and meso level of discourse (e. g. not the same discursive function in Germany and in the Western Balkans). This is to be an issue of further analysis within our project.

The affiliated groups are generally other countries cooperating to deal with the crisis, mostly neighbouring countries. There are also substantial differences which reflect the transnational positioning of the different countries (e. g. EU as both affiliated and out-group). Furthermore, there are cases in our corpus providing a counterexample to the emphasis on nationalism as observed in Western countries. Ghana is heavily dependent on transnational aid so that transnational organisations like WHO or World Bank are conceptualized as some of the main members of the affiliated group.

Further steps in our analysis include a more detailed linguistic analysis of the corpus on the micro level and linking those results to meso and macro level of analysis. This will particularly contribute to accentuating commonalities and differences in discursive features in analyzed countries worldwide. Moreover, we plan to include more speeches from the analyzed countries in order to monitor communicative interdiscursivity and intertextuality during the pandemic timeline.

References

Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. 1983. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. Revised edition. London, New York: Verso.

Bengali, Shashank, Linthicum, Kate and Kim, Victoria. (2020). How coronavirus – a 'rich man's disease' — infected the poor. Los Angeles Times. https://www.latimes.com/world-nation/story/2020-05-08/how-the-coronavirus-began-as-a-disease-of-the-rich. Accessed June 25, 2020.

Bieber, Florian. 2018. "Is Nationalism on the Rise? Assessing Global Trends." Ethnopolitics 17 (5): 519–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2018.1532633.

Bieber, Florian. 2020. "Global Nationalism in Times of the COVID-19 Pandemic." Nationalities Papers, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2020.35.

Billig, Michael. 1995. Banal Nationalism. London, Thousand Oaks, Calif. Sage.

Cap, Piotr. 2017. The Language of Fear: Communicating Threat in Public Discourse. Palgrave pivot. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chilton, Paul. 2004. Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice. London, New York: Routledge.

Chilton, Paul. 2014. Language, Space and Mind: The Conceptual Geometry of Linguistic Meaning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chilton, Paul. 2017. "Toward a Neuro-Cognitive Model of Socio-Political Discourse, and an Application to the Populist Discourse of Donald Trump." Langage et société 160–161 (2): 237. https://doi.org/10.3917/ls.160.0237.

Fairclough, Isabela, and Norman Fairclough. 2012. Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students. Abingdon, Oxon, New York: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman. 2010. Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. 2nd ed. Harlow: Longman.

Houeland, Camilla.2020. "'We Are Workers, Not Heroes.'" africaasacountry.com. https://africasacountry.com/2020/05/we-are-workers-not-heroes. Accessed July 2, 2020.

Klein, Josef. 2000. "Komplexe topische Muster: Vom Einzeltopos zur diskurstyp-spezifischen Topos-Konfiguration." In Topik und Rhetorik: Ein interdisziplinäres Symposium, edited by Thomas Schirren and Gert Ueding, 623–49. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Klein, Josef. 2019. Politik Und Rhetorik: Eine Einführung: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Koller, Veronika. 2012. "How to Analyse Collective Identity in Discourse-Textual and Contextual Parameters." Critical approaches to discourse analysis across disciplines 5 (2).

Koller, Veronika. 2014. "Applying Social Cognition Research to Critical Discourse Studies." In Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies, edited by Christopher Hart and Piotr Cap, 147–66. London, New York: Bloomsbury.

Koller, Veronika. 2019. "Gay Rights as a Symbol of Ideological Struggles Between Russia and the West: A Socio-Cognitive Discourse Analysis." In Political Discourse in Central, Eastern and Balkan Europe, edited by Martina Berrocal and Aleksandra Salamurović, 69–92 84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Malešević, Siniša. 2013. Nation-States and Nationalisms: Organization, Ideology and Solidarity. Polity political sociology series. Cambridge: Polity.

Matus-Mendoza, Mariadelaluz, and Antoon de Rycker. 2013. "Mexico City and the H1N1 Health Crisis: The Discursive Interconnectedness of Viruses, Kidnappings, Policy Fiascos and Tumbling Pesos." In Discourse and Crisis: Critical Perspectives, edited by Antoon de Rycker and Zuraidah M. Don, 395–433. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ozkirimli, Umut. 2020. "Coronationalism? Even Though Coronavirus Knows No Borders, Our Solidarity Often Does.". https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/can-europe-make-it/coronationalism/. Accessed June 25, 2020.

The Lancet. 2020. "Editorial: Decolonising COVID-19." The Lancet 8. https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/langlo/PIIS2214-109X(20)30134-0.pdf. Accessed June 30, 2020.

van Dijk, Teun Adrianus. 1998. Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach. London: Sage.

van Dijk, Teun Adrianus. 2008. Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Leeuwen, Theo. 2007. "Legitimation in Discourse and Communication." Discourse & Communication 1(1): 91–112.

White, Jonathan. 2015. "Emergency Europe." Political Studies 63 (2): 300–318. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12072.

About the authors

Paola Attolino is an Associate Professor at the University of Salerno. Her main research interests include evaluation in language, discourse analysis and pragmatics.

https://docenti.unisa.it/005823/en/home

Contact: pattolino@unisa.it

Martina Berrocal is a Research Associate at the Friedrich Schiller University Jena. Her research interests include discourse analysis, pragmatics and corpus linguistics.

https://www.gw.uni-jena.de/fakult%C3%A4t/institut+f%C3%BCr+slawistik+und+kaukasusstudien/mitarbeiterinnen/berrocal+martina

Contact: martina.berrocal@uni-jena.de

Júlio Antonio Bonatti Santos has a PhD in Linguistics (Federal University of São Carlos, UFSCAR, São Paulo, Brazil). He is member of the research group Laboratory of Epistemological Studies and Multi-modal Discursivities – LEEDIM – UFSCAR/CNPQ. He is currently interested in the sociological discourse of violence and is dedicated to research in Discourse Analysis field.

http://lattes.cnpq.br/8833166697244816

Contact: juliobonatt@gmail.com

Sara Garcia Santamaria is an Associate Professor at Blanquerna - Universitat Ramon Llull (Spain). Her research lays at the intersections of populist online communication, authenticity and the intimisation of politics.

Contact: garcias.sara@gmail.com.

Nancy Henaku holds a doctoral degree from Michigan Technological University. Her research focuses on the intersection between discourse, politics and culture in Global Southern context-more specifically postcolonial African contexts and their intersections with transnational processes and discourses.

Contact: nhenaku@mtu.edu.

Michael Kranert is Lecturer in Sociolinguistics at the University of Southampton. His research interests involve sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, political discourse, workplace discourse, and corpus linguistics.

https://www.southampton.ac.uk/ml/about/staff/mk10g18.page

Contact: M.Kranert@soton.ac.uk.

Aimée Danielle Lezou Koffi is a full professor at Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny (Ivory Coast). Her research interests include discourse analysis and development, didactics of French as a foreign language and gender issues.

https://fhb.academia.edu/Aim%C3%A9eDanielleLEZOUKOFFI

Contact: aimee.koffi@univ-fhb.edu.ci.

Camilla Marziani is a graduate student at the University of Bologna. Her research interests include discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, and pragmatics.

https://www.linkedin.com/in/camillamarziani

Contact: camilla.marziani@gmail.com.

Viktorija Mažeikienė is a researcher and lecturer at the Institute of Humanities, Faculty of Human and Social Studies, Mykolas Romeris University in Vilnius. Her research interests include media literacy, discourse studies, systemic functional linguistics, the language of evaluation.

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7682-5525

Contact: vmazeikiene@mruni.eu

Dasniel Olivera Pérez holds a PhD in Political and Social Sciences and is Assistant professor at the University of Havana in Cuba, at the Department for Communication and Media Studies. His research interests include communication theory, media studies and quantitative and qualitative social research.

Contact: dasnieloliveraperez@gmail.com.

Kumaran Rajandran is a Senior Lecturer in Linguistics at the School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia. His research involves the multimodal study of corporate, historical, political and religious discourses. He also explores the articulation of identity and ideology in contemporary societies.

https://humanities.usm.my/index.php/english-language-studies/dr-kumaran-rajandran

Contact: kumaranr@tuta.io.

Aleksandra Salamurović is a Research Associate at the Friedrich Schiller University Jena. Her research interests include discourse analysis, pragmatics and sociolinguistics of script.

http://diskurswestbalkan.uni-jena.de

Contact: aleksandra.salamurovic@uni-jena.de.