CERLIS Series

Series Editor: Stefania M. Maci

Each volume of the series is subjected to a double peer-reviewing process.

CERLIS Series
Volume 8

Stefania M. Maci & Michele Sala (eds.)

Representing and Redefining Specialised Knowledge: Variety in LSP

2019
Università degli Studi di Bergamo

6

Contents

8

MICHELE SALA

Representing and Redefining Specialised Knowledge. Managing Discourse Appropriateness and Adequacy in LSP*

Specialised knowledge is the epistemological outcome of a process of selection, organisation (perspectivisation, framing, structuring, etc.) or even construal of information meant to make sense of segments or reality for very specific pragmatic purposes, either professional and task-oriented or speculative and cognition-based. It is a way of organising experience so as to favour its understanding and comprehension, of finding solid explanations and justifications to given phenomena so as to control them (for instance, minimising what is critical and problematic, maximising what is beneficial and allowing its replicability), of testing hypotheses in order to corroborate, refine or even discard given views with respect to others. In other words, analysing, discussing and understanding specialised contents is a way of making reality readily manageable in cognitive terms, potentially useful in operative terms, and factively usable in practical terms, so as to facilitate activities, solve problems and bypass obstacles, not just in specialised domains but also in everyday life. For this reason, the codification and transfer of this type of knowledge is an instance of strategic communication:

> As 'strategic' it is deliberately goal-oriented, that goal being the mediation of understanding across knowledge asymmetries. As 'communication' it is participative (interactive) and the communicative 'positions' converge on the co-construction of (specialized) knowledge. (Kastberg 2007: 8)

As a consequence, both knowledge and the knowledge-making practices reflect and corroborate specific epistemologies and understandings of the world, in that "knowledge is made and given shape in representation [and] the process of representation is identical to the shaping of knowledge. Makers of representations are shapers of knowledge" (Kress 2010: 27).

For these reasons, the mechanisms of knowledge construction and dissemination have been under scrutiny for several decades and from a variety of perspectives, ranging from Discourse and Genre Analysis (Widdowson 1979, Bazerman 1988, Swales 1990, 2004, Myers 1992, 2010, Gotti 2003, Hyland 2004), to Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 1992, 2001, 2003), Critical Genre Analysis (Bathia 2010, 2017), Social Semiotics and Multimodality approaches (Kress / van Leeuwen 2001, Lemke 2002, Bateman 2008, 2009, Kress 2010), which have focussed upon and identified the main commonalities between the different realisation of specialised communication and the most relevant trends of variation (both diachronically and synchronically) due to changing audiences and purposes, the changing medium or communicative practices (channel), the complexification or, even, the popularisation of specific disciplinary domains.

All these approaches, and their interplay, have provided insights to the understanding of specialised communication.

Discourse analytical approaches (Gotti 2003, Hyland 2004, Myers 2010) have pointed out how specialised communication resorts to features which are already inherent in everyday language – i.e. accuracy and perlocutionary effectiveness (Shannon/Weaver 1949) – and makes them stylistically and rhetorically noticeable. In particular, in these settings, effectiveness is attained through a language that is concise, precise and appropriate, by which:

> the amount and type of cognitive effort involved in a speech act […] influences the presuppositions that can be made about prior knowledge […] and the assumptions that can be made about the correct interpretation of the intention of text forms. (Sager *et al.* 1980: 323)

On purely linguistic grounds, expert and professional communication, even in very different disciplinary domains, is shown to share some core characteristics (Gotti 2003) at various levels, namely: the pragmatic level, where the set of possible communicative functions is restricted to a limited range which typically includes the informative, the argumentative, the pedagogical, the normative and the instructional one; the textual level, where both verbal and non-verbal or multisemiotic codes – formulae, flow-charts, tables, etc. (Widdowson 1979) – coexist to enhance clarity and comprehensibility; the syntactic and lexical level, which provide a technical and domain-specific vocabulary and, in general, a language that displays emotive detachment, lack of bias and impersonality, on the one hand, and informative density, brevity and unambiguity, on the other, and which – in cognitive terms – is characterised by generalisation, systematisation, schematisation and abstraction (Hoffman 1984).

Genre Analysis (Swales 1990, Bhatia 1993, 2004) has evidenced the conventions behind the structuring of specialised texts, pointing to the relationship between information and pragmatic purposes, and showing how the latter influences the organisation of the former in recognisable moves and steps for given contents to be easily codified and, at the same time, to facilitate their recognition, understanding and assimilation. Critical Genre Analysis (Bhatia 2010, 2012, 2017) goes even further in this direction by shifting the focus from genre as textual product – i.e. the result of rhetorical and discursive choices – to genre as textual action – i.e. as a critical site of engagement and interaction (Scollon 2001) – carried out by means of intertextual and interdiscursive contamination, and forms of hybridisation and blending between different genres meant to effectively achieve professional objectives and perform relevant disciplinary practices.

Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 1992, 2001, 2003) has offered parameters to understand how, within a discipline, knowledge is established and controlled, how asymmetries (either cognitive, disciplinary or relational) are represented and justified – for instance, as the necessary basis for knowledge advancement – how given epistemological frames of reference are reinforced, and how certain meanings are represented as accepted and shared while others as marginal or deviant. CDA explains why (specialised) disciplines are perceived the way they are, or, more specifically, why given ideologies

or forms of bias are recognised as normal or conventional rather than arbitrary, and why specific roles and functions are accepted and taken for granted rather than questioned, countered or dismissed.

Social Semiotics, combining concerns (such as perlocutionary effectiveness) and foci (such as interdiscursivity and intertextuality) which are in common with (Critical) Discourse Analysis and (Critical) Genre Theories, evidences how the communication of specialised contents can be made more impactful and convincing not only by establishing frameworks, attributing rhetorical roles or presupposing shared assumptions and understandings, but also by strategically resorting to the full range of semiotic codes of communication – notably the visual ones (i.e. numerical, graphical, figurative, cf. Rowley-Jolivet 2000, 2002, Bateman 2008, 2009) besides the verbal/scriptural one – which are available to expert writers, but also accessible to non-expert users, in order to codify and understand disciplinary meanings. Especially in the digital era, where social media and networking have transformed the mechanisms of knowledge construction and negotiation, the focus on multimodality (Kress / van Leeuwen 2001, Kress 2010) and hypermodality (Lemke 2002) has provided tools to measure how specialised communication is gradually accepting among its practices forms of meaning representations which are openly meant to facilitate comprehension, maximise inclusion and minimise gate-keeping. This phenomenon is generally referred to as 'popularisation', and has been a major focus of academic research in the past decades (Calsamiglia 2003, Gotti 2013, Salvi / Bowker 2015). In the context of digital networking and Web-mediated communication, and in consideration of the mass of information in any domain which can be easily available through the affordances of these channels (Tognini-Bonelli / Del Lungo Camiciotti 2005, Hyland 2009, Campagna *et al.* 2012), "knowledge can no longer be hemmed in by neatly-packed and restricted communicative products [since] today's globalized and digital environment has increasingly destructed the élitarian fence of knowledge communication" (Bondi 2015: 7). The main consequence of this is the expansion of the reading public, consisting of both experts and lay users, or competent and simply curious readers. Popularisation is a form of knowledge dissemination which is meant to facilitate the transmission of specialised contents by making them both comprehensible and appealing to lay audiences

(through re-contextualisation, explanation, exemplification, etc.), and easily manageable, effective and to the point, for expert readers. In fact, the literature on this phenomenon has shown that popularisation is not necessarily a top-down process of simplification (Bondi 2015), but may also be meant for the scientific community (Shinn / Whitley 1985, Abbott 1995), for expert writers "to reach a vast number of colleagues rapidly by sending them 'coded messages' without having to conform to the times and constraints of specialist communication" (Bucchi 1998: 12).

All these approaches and their different methodological perspectives provide the theoretical ground for the present volume, which discusses the representation and redefinition of specialised knowledge.

As a matter of fact, the codification of specialised contents has as its main goal the transfer, the dissemination, the sharing of this body of knowledge to/with the community or reference – that is a discourse community or a community of practice whose members know exactly 'what to do with it'. Specialised communication is thus,

> the intentional and decision-based communication of specialised knowledge in professional settings (among experts as well as between experts and non-experts) with a focus upon the interplay between knowledge and expertise of individuals, on the one hand, and knowledge as a social phenomenon, on the other, as well as the coping with knowledge asymmetries, i.e., the communicative consequences of differences between individual knowledge in depth as well as breadth. (Engberg 2016: 37)

For these reasons, readability, comprehensibility, clarity and, ultimately, perlocutionary effectiveness are the main concerns of expert knowledge dissemination. However, these concerns need to be interpreted in relation to different factors, the most prominent of which is the purpose of this type of communication. As a matter of fact, specialised communication may be intended for, at least, four distinctively different settings and (sets of) purposes. Firstly, it may be designed for professional settings and transactional purposes (Gunnarsson 2009), in that it is "aimed at getting things done and achieving outcomes" (Schnurr 2013: 9). The goal-oriented and practical nature of this form of communication is distinctive of workplace interactions and operative contexts, typically between peers or users

with the same (or comparable) level of domain-related competence, who are expected to unambiguously decode and understand meanings, and turn linguistic acts into actions and activities.

Secondly, specialised communication may have a speculative purpose, when it is intended to broaden, deepen or even revise knowledge within a specific domain. This is the case of academic and scientific research settings, which are primarily meant for the understanding (i.e. definition, explanation, classification, comparison, measuring, etc.) of disciplinary relevant knowledge objects for them to become useful cognitive tools or give access to epistemological parameters for interpreting and comprehending reality. Since this is an inter-subjective, collegial and participative activity, it requires to be based on shared, accepted codes and discursive practices for representing and negotiating meanings.

The third purpose of specialised communication is educational (Gotti 2003, Pérez-Llantada 2020), when it is meant to introduce (rather than extend or expand) disciplinary meanings to novices as future experts, in order for them to understand and assimilate not only contents and notions, but also codes and conventions which are typical of specific disciplinary discourses. This enables both experts and learners to effectively deal with such contents and learners to ultimately become experts in their turn.

The fourth level is represented by institutional settings, where meanings are exchanged "between an expert representing some authority and a layman" (Gunnarsson *et al.* 1997: 7) with the aim of pursuing practical goals in professional and organisational contexts which presuppose specific roles, identities and constraints to be respected and core goal tasks and procedures to be carried out (as in job interviews, medical consultation, meetings, etc., Drew/Heritage 1992).

In all these settings, for all said purposes, the position (or imposition) of new meanings establishes asymmetries, either in cognitive, relational or interpersonal terms (i.e. those who have access to new, advanced and updated knowledge vs. those who share established and standard knowledge; those who are discursively more competent vs. those who are less competent; experts vs. non-experts, etc.), and such asymmetries may be face-threatening, hence potentially hindering or interfering with the correct interpretation of new information.

The effectiveness of specialised communication can be guaranteed by using resources strategically at the three levels of discourse, namely, the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual (Halliday 1985). At the ideational level, for example, specialised knowledge dissemination benefits from resorting to conceptualisations, cognitive categories and structures by which phenomena and notions are framed through paradigms which are clearly established and, as such, function as recognisable epistemological bases and interpretive models within a given domain. Through such lenses, referential representations acquire intelligibility, meanings become understandable and their comprehension is assured.

The interpersonal level is the one at which asymmetries acquire justification and where rhetorical or relational roles are made acceptable. Users in a disciplinary community attribute to both themselves and readers identities and functions which correspond to those inherent in – even necessary for – the disciplinary epistemology (i.e. expert, novice, researcher, peer, scholar, lay reader, etc.) and such a relational framing, far from being an expression of gate-keeping, constitutes a facilitator for the process of meaning construction and negotiation.

The textual level accounts for all the discursive resources – terminology, registers, styles, genres, formats, semiotic codes, etc. – by which domain-specific contents find their way and place within a domain. Through such discourse-based affordances, which are usually highly normalised, standardised and conventionalised, meanings are made clear, coherent and unambiguous, their presentation or discussion appealing and compelling, and, as a consequence, their interpretation unproblematic.

By using resources made available to them at these three levels, experts/knowers manage to "galvanise support, express collegiality, resolve difficulties and avoid disagreement in ways which most closely correspond to the community's assumption, theories, methods and bodies of knowledge" (Hyland 2004: 13). Effective ways of attaining these purposes are by accounting for reader's needs and expectations and the writer's trustworthiness – at the relational level – and, at the same time, for the clarity and appropriateness of the text – at the ideational and textual level. These concerns correspond to what Hyland

(2004) labels as, respectively, the acceptability and adequacy conditions.

The first principle stems from the fact that, in order to be effective, (the content of) a text needs to sound authoritative and reliable, and this impression can be reflected in and corroborated by the idea of themselves that writers construct in the act of writing. The type of identity that they attribute to their persona, in fact, is not just (or necessarily) for self-promotion, but for such identity to be easily associated to a specific rhetorical role or pragmatic function, thus contributing to boosting the perceived worth of the author's text. Self-representation can be performed explicitly, through the narrative of self that we may find in 'personal' genres (Giannoni 2006) like acknowledgements, bionotes, authorial profiles, etc. Given the mass of texts readers can pick from, being able to identify an author and recognise his/her relationship with a domain, institution, school of thought, organisation, etc. can influence text selection. Since knowledge dissemination is indeed a form of social interaction, knowing whom we are dealing with, in personal, disciplinary and institutional terms, is not only useful, but in some context even necessary. As some of the chapters in this volume will point out, bios, CVs, notes on contributors have become a common feature in most platforms and are often used to accompany (anticipate or follow) knowledge-producing texts. Forms of self-presentation are also a requirement when submitting book or paper proposal,[1] and they serve as a guarantee of the author's scientific worth not only for knowledge brokers (editors, publishing organisations, etc.), but also for prospect readers.

Besides these personal genres, writers can establish their authorial identity also in crafting their knowledge-producing texts, by creating their textual persona as an 'acceptable' member of the community of reference, that is someone who knows how to appropriately deal with contents and, notably, with the intended audience. In other words,

---

[1]   In many cases, the type and amount of personal and institutional information to be provided by authors is specifically prescribed by editors, publishers or organisations.

> this means representing one's self in a text in a way that demonstrates one's flawless disciplinary credentials; showing yourself as a reasonable, intelligent, co-player in the community's efforts to construct knowledge and well versed in its tribal lore. (Hyland 2004: 13)

This can be attained by resorting to conventional discursive practices which can be used to combine confidence and caution, to balance modesty, self-assurance and assertiveness in ways which are contextually appropriate and accepted by the disciplinary community.

The adequacy condition, instead, concerns authorial trustworthiness and authoritativeness as an inherent linguistic property, that is, as implicit in the way authors use language to present contents and craft their text, which stems from how they conceptualise reality, in ideational terms, and represent it, in textual terms. New meanings may acquire disciplinary legitimation on the basis of the competence shown by writers in mastering and handling the discursive tools, the practices and processes by which information can be turned into science or disciplinary knowledge. By resorting to linguistic, stylistic and generic standards, or argumentative, expository and even normative models which are highly conventionalised, most recognisable and hence contextually salient, expert writers can – unlike lay writers – depict reality and, at the same time, make it cognitively manageable and easily measurable with respect to the *doxa*. In this way they are in a position to posit meanings, control interpretation and prove their expertise. As we will see in some of the chapters in this volume, adequacy and meaning construction are particularly relevant in asymmetrical popularising contexts, where meanings are to be transmitted to audiences lacking specialised competences (i.e. students in pedagogical contexts, young pupils in educational or infotainment settings, children as the intended audience of forms of institutional communication, etc.) without them losing any of their characteristic referential precision and specificity. In such scenarios, experts should be able to re-work the adequacy condition, that is, re-contextualise meanings and adjust the language so as to make it suit the content, the linguistic/stylistic etiquette of the domain of reference, and the discursive and cognitive competence of the reading public. It is precisely by how they handle adequacy that writers prove they are expert in both understanding reality phenomena, on the one hand, and

in skilfully managing the language needed to construe and foster such understandings.

The chapters in this volume will be distinguished into two main sections which are intended to reflect the two conditions illustrated above and the parameters which are strictly related to them. Therefore, the first section will deal with the notions of appropriateness, meaning negotiation and self-representation, while the second will discuss the principles of adequacy, meaning construction and discursive conventions.

Appropriateness, meaning negotiation and self-representation

The first section of this volume opens with a chapter, co-authored by GIUSEPPE BALIRANO and MARGARET RASULO, which discusses the notion of personal branding and aims to asses its impact on the processes of disciplinary knowledge dissemination, on the one hand, and the social construction of an academic online identity, on the other. On the basis of the fact that involvement in networking practices and the construction of a social presence are conditions which cannot be neglected in the context of Web-mediated communication, and also of the fact scholars are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of personal branding tools for both individual advancement and knowledge dissemination, the study explores a corpus of online academic bionotes written by scholars in the Humanities and Science, and selected from the *Academia.edu* platform. Combining both quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis – namely, the qualitative framework provided by Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis and the principles of Genre Theory – the investigation evidences how language in these sites is devised and packaged by academics to intensify scholars' visibility and enhance their academic identity, hence corroborating their reliability and ultimately facilitating knowledge dissemination.

The second chapter points out how acceptability may be a concern not just for scholars but also for publishing groups or journals, which may need disciplinary legitimation to established their role within a domain and be recognised as reliable sources for knowledge dissemination. This most notably applies to newly-established publications, for obvious reasons, but also to those publications conflating interests and discourses stemming from different domains, for their scientific identity to acquire epistemological grounding and disciplinary relevance. This is the case of the military academic journals examined by ROXANNE BARBARA DOERR, where military and scientific discourses, purposes, audiences and roles, overlap. By first outlining the main differences between military and civilian cultures in the USA so as to identify the core features of the former, the investigation examines a selection of online military journals – covering different branches of the military domain, for the sake of completeness, and for the most part affiliated with military colleges and universities – and identifies specific acceptability-enhancing practices which are realised in term of genre-related features, textual and multimodal content, and very specific stylistic requirements (which are often clearly prescribed in regulatory stylistic guidelines).

The next chapter points out how identity building and self-representation can indeed be strategic interpersonal resources in view to facilitating the transmission of problematic or openly negative meanings. More specifically the analyses carried out by WALTER GIORDANO, investigates how, within the context of the 2015 scandal concerning Volkswagen diesel engine emissions, the company managed to control and (re)build its image through its main institutional communication tool, that is, the 2015 and 2016 Letter to Shareholders, written by Volkswagen CEO Mathias Müller. Scanning the text of the two letters through the lenses of three different models for crisis management discourse – namely, the Image Restoration, Trust-repair and Impression Management model – this study outlines the discursive strategies used by the CEO to concede the existence of a problem and express the intention to repair it, thus controlling the company's identity and managing the reconstruction and consolidation of its broken image, as a result of which the company was perceived, only one year after the scandal burst off, as a serious and honest organisation, and a reliable competitor in the car market.

Along the same lines, the next chapter examines how an impression of reliability or, even more drastically, forms of persuasion and manipulation can be instantiated and enforced upon the reading public by the way contents are presented, and how their textualisation is designed. In fact, propaganda can be made to appear as knowledge on the basis of the discursive competence shown by writers in the process of meaning construal and, as a consequence, of the degree of authoritativeness that can be associated to the source of information. The investigation carried out by MARGARET RASULO provides evidence as to how mechanisms of identity-making, identity attribution and, in general, elements of popular media culture are exploited by organisations such as Al-Qaeda and ISIS in writing online magazines with the aim of indoctrinating – rather than informing – and recruiting young men in their war against infidels and the Western world. Based on a corpus of visual and verbal resources from two popular digital magazines, the analysis shows how mediatised radicalisation discourse is persuasively construed the competent handling of narrative frames, design features and popularising strategies (i.e. tactics of relevance, frequency and accessibility) which are typical of Western-like reporting style.

The last chapter of this section deals with the way organisations, in general, find ways to express their institutional identity and engage with users even in the act of codifying and representing participative policies, as is for instance the case of the handling and expression of language policies in UK higher education websites. As a matter of fact, communicating with prospective undergraduates in a range of languages can assist students in navigating academia more effectively – in fact, the degree of sensitivity shown to the needs of non-Anglophone students plays a key role in their choice of course – and, at the same time, may help universities and colleges establish themselves as both internationalised institutions and interculturally welcoming sites. The study by DAVIDE SIMONE GIANNONI looks at efforts made by the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) to engage with international undergraduate applicants in their home language by analysing data collected from institutional websites (covering the time span 2008-2018), mainly consisting of a range of 'International guides' offered in major international languages as well

as small national ones (e.g. Lithuanian and Norwegian) – a choice that reflects evolving students' demographics, as well as and their needs.

Adequacy, meaning construction and discursive conventions

The second section of this volume investigates how phenomena are conferred cognitive shape and meaning and are made disciplinarily, epistemologically and culturally relevant through discursive practices which are very often highly domain-specific and – within specific settings – totally transparent. This is the focus of the first chapter, by STEFANIA CONSONNI, which discusses the way Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) has acquired scientific profile and credit through language. More specifically, the analysis evidences that the awareness of such a condition and the related dangers developed not only as a consequence of medical and scientific research (and, notably, the introduction of the Evidence Based Medicine paradigm) but also on the basis of specific linguistic resources made available to represent it. Within a discourse-analytical framework, the study analyses the key syntactical and textual coordinates in a corpus of digital research articles titles, with a view to investigating the ideological and communicative impact of the EBM innovative methodology on specialised medical language. The discursive evolution of HIV research is reconstructed across competing specialties, representing different steps forward in the clinical history of this pathology, such as public/environmental health, biochemistry, molecular biology, immunology and infectious diseases.

The following pair of chapters assess the communication of specialised contents to lay audiences and, more specifically, to young readers, notably children, considering popularisation strategies employed to make given meanings accessible to them by avoiding banalising references or disposing such contents of their discursive domain-specificity. The chapter by GIULIANA DIANI and ANNALISA SEZZI examines the communication of institutional information about

the European Union focussing on how said information is organised and re-contextualised in order for it to be both comprehensible and precise and/or appealing to readers with little or no competence in the matter (given their stage of cognitive development and their limited background knowledge). In the light of the impact that knowledge re-contextualisation has on several aspects of communication, which range from lexico-syntactic patterns to different discourse strategies, this chapter aims to disclose the discursive resources employed to disseminate the concept of the EU in two official websites, Kids' Corner and Euro Kids' Corner, both launched by the Commission in 2011 as part of their educational communication expressly addressed to children.

The focus of the next chapter, by DANILA CESIRI, is on children-oriented forms of popularisation in educational settings, where they do not have the mere function of entertaining the reader, but are indeed instances of scientific knowledge dissemination. Given that paleontology is a very popular subject among laypeople, especially children (as demonstrated by the quantity and range of merchandise, publications, and media products of all sorts), while at the same time being a fully-fledged academic domain, this study analyses how scientific knowledge regarding dinosaurs is disseminated to pre-school children. To do so, a sample episode of the animated series *Dinosaur Train* is investigated. This series typically contains animated sequences and live action segments in which a real paleontologist describes the main features, the behaviour and the natural habitat of the dinosaurs seen in each episode. By using the framework of Discourse Analysis for the study of linguistic materials and the tools of Multimedia Analysis for the investigation of visual materials, the chapter identifies the main and typical verbal and visual strategies that are used to transmit scientific contents to young children.

The following chapter, by SOLE ALBA ZOLLO, discusses the notion of discourse adequacy as a tool for teaching/learning in pedagogical settings, and observes how the tracing of the discursive and semiotic features which make specialised communication effective (in this case media and advertising discourse) may be very useful for learners, and could conveniently be integrated among possible class activities for students to acquire awareness of such resources, of their function and contextual use, and also for them to be able to exploit such

strategies in communicative situations in order to corroborate meanings, make their representation appealing and facilitate interpretation. Based on a four-month experiment with undergraduate students at the University of Naples "L'Orientale" (Italy), the study indicates that the use of popular social platforms, in this case Instagram, does indeed affect students' learning processes and improve their critical skills concerning both specialised knowledge and discourse. The study shows that, most noticeably, this happens because, being authentic, engaging, and public channels, the social media allow real-time feedback from users, thus proving effective pedagogical tools in order to understand and apply the theoretical concepts discussed in class.

The last chapter, which is written in Spanish, closes this section on discourse adequacy and meaning construction by discussing a very peculiar and impactful form of meaning representation. Metaphors are linguistic phenomena by which two different items are conceptually connected and one of them is understood in terms of the other: through these phraseological forms, the actual (target) referent is conferred parts of the meaning and the relevant connotations associated to the (vehicle) term used to represent it. VIRGINIA SCIUTTO studies the set of floristic phraseological units (where the vehicle term relates to plants, fruits, vegetables, etc.) found in Argentinean Spanish. Given their peculiarity – since they display exclusive semantic and formal features which distinguish and connote them, generating a particular man-nature anthropocentric relationship based on senses (physical and sensory) – this analysis sets out to see what is their place and function in Argentinian Spanish by first identifying and collecting them as they are listed in the *Diccionario fraseológico del habla argentina,* and, then, by checking their use in speech through the *Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual* (CREA) and through web-searches via Google.

References

Abbott Andrew 1995. Things of Boundaries. *Social Research* 62/4, 857-82.

Bateman, John 2008. *Multimodality and Genre. A Foundation for the Systematic Analysis of Multimodal Documents*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bateman, John. 2009. Discourse across Semiotic Modes. In Jan Renkema (ed.) *Discourse, of course. An Overview of Research in Discourse Studies*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 55-67.

Bazerman, Charles 1988. *Shaping Written Knowledge. The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bhatia, Vijay K. 1993. *Analysing Genre. Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman

Bhatia, Vijay K. 2004. W*orlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-based View.* London: Continuum International.

Bhatia, Vijay K. 2010. Interdiscursivity in Professional Discourse. *Discourse and Communication* 4 /1, 32-50.

Bhatia, Vijay K. 2012. Critical Reflections on Genre Analysis. *Ibérica* 24, 17-28.

Bhatia, Vijay K. 2017. *Critical Genre Analysis. Interdiscursive Performance in Professional Practice*. London: Routledge.

Bondi, Marina 2015. Preface. In Salvi, Rita / Bowker, Janet (eds.) *The Dissemination of Contemporary Knowledge in English. Genres, Discourse Strategies and Professional Practices*. Bern: Peter Lang, 7-9.

Bucchi, Massimiano 1998, *Science and the Media: Alternative Routes in Scientific Communication*. New York: Routledge.

Calsamiglia. Helena 2003. Popularization Discourse. *Discourse Studies* 5/2, 139-146.

Campagna, Sandra / Garzone, Giuliana / Ilie, Cornelia / Rowley-Jolivet, Elizabeth (eds.) 2012. *Evolving Genres in Web-mediated Communication*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Drew, Paul / Heritage, John (eds) 1992. *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Engberg, Jan. 2016. Conceptualising Corporate Criminal Liability: Legal Linguistics and the Combination of Descriptive Lenses. In Tessuto, Girolamo / Bhatia, Vijay / Garzone, Giuliana / Salvi, Rita / Williams, Christopher (eds) *Constructing Legal Discourses and Social Practices: Issues and Perspectives*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 28-56.

Fairclough, Norman 1992. *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, Norman 2001. *Language and Power.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman 2003. *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* London: Routledge.

Giannoni, Davide S. 2006. *The Linguistics of Academic Worth.* Bergamo: CELSB

Gotti, Maurizio 2003. *Specialized Discourse: Linguistic Features and Changing Conventions*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Gotti Maurizio 2013. The Analysis of Popularization Discourse: Conceptual Changes and Methodological Evolutions. In Kermas, Susan / Christiansen, Thomas (eds) *The Popularization of Specialized Discourse and Knowledge across Communities and Cultures*. Bari: Edipuglia, 9-13.

Gotti, Maurizio 2014. Reformulation and Recontextualization in Popularization Discourse. *Ibérica* 27, 15-34.

Gunnarsson, Brit L. 2009. *Professional Discourse.* London: Continuum

Gunnarsson, Brit L. / Linell, Per / Nordberg, Bengt 1997. Introduction. In Gunnarsson, Brit L. / Linell, Per / Nordberg, Bengt (eds) *The Construction of Professional Discourse*. London: Longman, 1-12

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold

Hoffman, Lothar 1984. Seven Roads to LSP. *Special Language / Fachsprache* 6/1-2, 28-38.

Hyland, Ken 2004. *Disciplinary Discourses. Social Interaction in Academic Writing*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press

Hyland K. 2009, *Academic Discourse: English in a Global Context*, Continuum, London.

Kastberg, Peter 2007. Knowledge Communication: The Emergence of a Third Order Discipline. In Villiger, Claudia / Gerzymisch-Arbogast, Heidrun (eds) *Kommunikation in Bewegung:*

Multimedialer und multilingualer Wissenstransfer in der Experten-Laien-Kommunikation Festschrift für Annely Rothkegel. Bern: Peter Lang, 7-24.

Kress, Gunther 2010. *Multimodality. A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication.* London: Routledge.

Kress, Gunther / van Leeuwen, Theo 2001. *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Arnold Publishers.

Lemke, Jay L. 2002. Travels in Hypermodality. *Visual Communication* 1/3, 299-325.

Myers, Gregory 1992. Textbooks and the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge. *English for Specific Purposes* 11/1, 3-17.

Myers, Greg 2010. *The Discourse of Blogs and Wikis*. London: Continuum.

Pérez-Llantada, Carmen 2020. Preface. In Maurizio Gotti / Stefania Maci / Michele Sala (eds) *Scholarly Pathways: Knowledge Transfer and Knowledge Exchange in Academia.* Bern: Peter Lang, 5-9.

Rowley-Jolivet, Elizabeth 2000. Image as Text: Aspects of the Shared Visual Language of Scientific Conference Participants. *Asp* 27-30, 133-154.

Rowley-Jolivet, Elizabeth 2002. Visual Discourse in Scientific Conference Papers: A Genre-Based Study. *English for Specific Purposes* 21/1, 19-40.

Sager, Juan / Dungworth, David / McDonald, Peter 1980. *English Special Languages*. Wiesbaden: Oscar Brandstetter.

Salvi, Rita / Bowker, Janet (eds.) 2015. *The Dissemination of Contemporary Knowledge in English. Genres, Discourse Strategies and Professional Practices*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Scollon, Ron 2001. *Mediated Discourse. The Nexus of Practice.* London: Routledge.

Schnurr, Stephanie 2013. *Exploring Professional Communication. Language in Action.* London: Routledge.

Shannon, Claude / Weaver, Warren 1949. *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press.

Shinn, Terry / Whitley, Richard 1985. *Expository Science: Forms and Functions of Popularisation*. Dordrecht / Boston / Lancaster: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Swales, John 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, John 2004. *Research Genres. Explorations and Applications.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tognini-Bonelli, Elena / Del Lungo Camiciotti, Gabriella 2005. *Strategies in Academic Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Widdowson, Henry 1979. *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press