4. Results

In the following section, the results of the present study are presented and discussed. The data analyzed came from two corpora constructed from the newspaper discourse present in two countries regarding the same topic ('drug-related violence') during October of 2011. Because the main ambition of the current study was to explore the feasibility of such research, the results presented here are only a selection of pertinent findings pulled from all of the data gathered.

The results are divided into two sections. These sections approach the corpus data on two levels. The first level of analysis focused on investigating the predominate discourse in both corpora, while the second concentrated on the linguistic similarities and differences encountered in examining the shared concepts found in both corpora.   The corpus data were examined and presented in this way in hopes of effectively addressing certain weaknesses within CDA-based research. This direction was taken because it was these very methodological weaknesses which served as the basis for designing and conducting the present study.

The first section of the results discusses findings related to the Semantic Prosody analysis of the most frequently occurring node words in each corpus. This was done in order to respond to the accusations which are quite commonly leveled against CDA (see Poole, 2010; Mautner, 2009) that researchers are often liberal in selecting the data to be analyzed in CDA investigations. Through a focus on the most commonly used linguistic types in the corpora, the predominant discourses in each corpus could be analyzed based

only on salient lexical features and not on preselected search terms (Salama, 2011; Baker et al., 2008).

The second section discusses the prosodic characteristics found while examining node words which were present in both corpora (these were called, for the purpose of this study, 'shared concepts'). This analysis was included in order to explore the similarities and differences in the presentation of certain types within both corpora. Additionally, this approach helped to test not only the possibility of carrying out a study using the methodology employed here, but also helped to determine the applicability of this sort of methodology in analyzing multi-lingual corpora.

Together, these two approaches to analysis provided a balanced perspective through which to examine the general characteristics of each corpus as well as to compare and contrast the discourse characteristics present in both. As a result of this approach, it was possible to analyze the general print media discourses present in both countries from inter- and intra-linguistic points of view. The findings obtained through these two approaches are presented in the following two sections.

4.1. Frequent Node Words

The examination of the most frequent lexical items (LIs) in each corpus was one of the least labor-intensive portions of the data interpretation as a whole. Despite this, it was also one of the most important parts of the entire data analysis process. This is because the analysis of frequent node words not only showed the presence of salient LIs within the discourse of each country's print media, but also selected the nodes to be analyzed (as a response to claims of selective data analysis in CDA) (see Poole, 2010; Mautner, 2009).

Because of this, the analysis here was expansive in its application of SP as an analysis tool.

That is, broad discourse trends in the corpora were examined more than were minute

individual differences or similarities (see Section 4.2 for discussion of these, p. 101). This

was done because the most frequent LIs in each corpus could be seen to be representative

of each country's print media discourse regarding 'drug-related violence.'   Because of this,

an overview of the prosodic characteristics of the most common nodes gave a balanced

overall impression of the discourses found in each corpus.

For this section, the top ten most frequently occurring LIs for each corpus were selected

and their collocates were analyzed. Table 10 shows the top ten most frequent LIs for both

corpora along with the actual lexical frequency and the normalized frequency for each

(normed frequency per 1,000 words according to corpus size).

Table 10. Top ten most frequent LIs in both corpora

	Node	Freq.	Freq./1,000 words		Node	Freq.	Freq./1,000 words
English Corpus	DRUG	101	7.02	**Spanish Corpus**	MÉXICO	86	7.18
	MEXICO	98	6.81		VIOLENCIA	58	4.84
	MEXICAN	61	4.24		DROGAS	55	4.59
	CARTEL	57	3.96		PAÍS	37	3.09
	BORDER	55	3.82		ESTADOS	33	2.75
	STATE	48	3.34		UNIDOS	33	2.75
	POLICE	43	2.99		SECUESTRO	29	2.42
	OFFICIALS	42	2.92		GRUPOS	28	2.34
	VERACRUZ	39	2.71		AÑOS	27	2.25
	VIOLENCE	38	2.64		MEXICANOS	25	2.09

As can be seen in Table 10, nearly all of the most frequent LIs from each corpus were

directly related to the topic of 'drug-related violence.' Even those LIs not obviously related

to the topic (e.g. *años* or *state*) were found to be tied to the topic through the context in

which they were found to be used in the corpora.   This was seen as a demonstration that the corpora constructed were in fact representative of the language-use being examined. This can also clearly be seen in that some of the search terms which were used in collecting data for the corpora were also found to be present in the top ten most frequent LIs for each corpus.

The first, most general, analysis of the data was carried out using each corpus' top ten most frequently occurring node words.   This portion of the study involved nothing more than an overview of the connotative characteristics that each corpus had, based on the understanding that individual words carry positive, negative or neutral connotations in their 'DNA' (see Morley & Partington, 2009). In order to examine the prosodic characteristics of each corpus, the prosodic characteristics of the most frequent LIs (see Table 10, p. 89) and their collocates were examined. In order to examine the broad prosodic characteristics of each collocate in relation to its node and the discourse itself, the 15 most frequently occurring collocates were selected for each node (as in the node selection, function words were not included in the analysis) and these collocates were analyzed according to their individual prosodic characteristics as well as their presence within the corpora (using concordance analysis). This is discussed below.

As was expected, the most frequent LIs in both countries' corpora were thematically related to the topic of 'drug-related violence.' However, it is important to note that in only examining the raw frequency of overtly positive, negative or neutral connotations of the nodes presented here, both corpora appeared to give relatively equal representation to the same nodes. Also, the corpora appeared to be balanced in terms of the use of certain prosodic characteristics. The US corpus contained three negative nodes, DRUG, CARTEL

and VIOLENCE. Similarly, the Mexican corpus contained VIOLENCIA, DROGAS and

SECUESTRO. Though any difference in this respect was slight, it is interesting to note

that the only difference between both of these sets of prosodically negative nodes was the

US's use of CARTEL and Mexico's use of SECUESTRO.

   As was pointed out above, the presence of VIOLENCE/VIOLENCIA and

DRUG/DROGAS is not in itself noteworthy in that these were search terms used to

compile the data used in the corpora. However, the difference in the other negative node in

each corpus is interesting since, in theory, both corpora are made up of texts regarding the

same topics (VIOLENCE and DRUGS). These frequent LIs function like a window into

the predominate discourse off each corpus (see above). Since both corpora share the

common theme of 'drug-related violence' it is not surprising that these concepts are well

represented in looking at frequent nodes. As such, there would seem to be a split between

the overriding discourse of each country's print media in that there is a difference of

representation regarding these nodes. This was seen in other frequent nodes as well (see

the discussion of BORDER/FRONTERA, p. 95). A few noteworthy examples of these

sorts of similarities and differences are discussed below, particularly the collocation with

the token *security* (see p. 96).

   In both corpora the most frequently occurring node words were, by and large, neutral

(many being place names). Nonetheless, most of these nodes frequently co-occurred with

negative collocates. MEXICO/MÉXICO, for instance is a place name and, thus, can carry

neither overtly positive nor negative connotations on the part of the author(s) who printed

it. Despite this, the nodes MEXICO/MÉXICO were found to co-occur with a number of

negative collocates in both corpora. Table 11 shows the 15 most frequently occurring

collocates of the node MEXICO in the English corpus along with the MI scores (see

Section 3.1.4.1.2, p. 82) and the raw frequency and joint frequency[7] for each. Table 12

(below) shows the same information for the node MÉXICO from the Spanish corpus.

Table 11. Collocates of MEXICO in the English corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
MEXICO	drug	108	14	4.24
	city	37	13	5.67
	violence	38	9	5.11
	northern	11	7	6.53
	cartel	60	7	4.08
	violent	15	5	5.60
	veracruz	39	5	4.22
	two	34	5	4.42
	states	35	5	4.38
	texas	29	4	4.33
	several	14	4	5.38
	american	23	4	4.66
	years	19	3	4.52
	war	15	3	4.86
	troops	10	3	5.45

---

[7] *Raw frequency* and *joint frequency* refer to the manner in which a given collocate is present in relation to the corpus as a whole as well as to the node with which it collocates. *Raw frequency* refers to the number of times that a LI appears in the entire corpus, while *joint frequency*, specifically refers to appearances as a collocate of the node being examined.

Table 12. Collocates of MÉXICO in the Spanish corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
MÉXICO	drogas	57	10	4.61
	violencia	59	8	4.24
	unidos	33	4	4.08
	tráfico	17	4	5.03
	nuevo	10	4	5.80
	grupos	28	4	4.31
	mayor	14	3	4.90
	líder	6	3	6.12
	cárteles	22	3	4.25
	contra	21	3	4.31
	ciudad	18	3	4.54
	unido	2	2	7.12
	texas	4	2	6.12
	tema	10	2	4.80
	sucede	2	2	7.12

As can be seen from looking at the collocates for each node, many of the LIs which co-occurred with MEXICO and MÉXICO had negative connotations. In solely looking at raw frequencies, the American corpus featured a much higher number of negative collocates than did the Mexican corpus. Nevertheless, frequently occurring collocates did not necessarily have high levels of joint occurrence. For example, a negative collocate such as *violencia* is, statistically, a collocate with the node word MÉXICO; even so, *violencia* only occurs as a collocate (within five tokens on either side) of MÉXICO eight times despite being present 59 times in the entire corpus.

In the interest of maintaining as balanced of an analysis as possible it was also important to view overtly positive items which co-occurred with the nodes being examined. In the case of the node word MÉXICO, two of the collocates which featured high levels of joint occurrence with the node word MÉXICO also had positive prosodic characteristics

(*líder* and *unido*). Despite this, both occurred in negative syntactic contexts within the Mexican corpus.

In the case of *líder*, the collocate co-occurred with the node MÉXICO in reference to either leaders of drug cartels or Mexico's place as the global leader in drug trafficking. Similarly, the LI *unido*—despite a positive prosody—was only featured (in the entire corpus) as part of the name of an organization, *México unido contra la delincuencia*; showing that even as a positive term, within the corpus being examined here, *unido* is a strong collocate of the negative LI *delincuencia*[8]. These collocates are important to the analysis of both corpora because they exhibit some interesting behaviors. What is remarkable about them is that they are present to begin with (the US corpus featured no positive collocates for MEXICO—see Table 11, p. 92); but it also is notable that even though they appear, they did not actually make the discourse surrounding the node MÉXICO any more positive (at least according to the analyses carried out here).

The frequency of individual nodes within each corpus was additionally important in that (aside from SP analyses) their occurrences alone offered insight into the general discourse of each corpus. This can be clearly seen in the case of the node word BORDER. BORDER was one of the top ten most frequent nodes in the English corpus. However, this was not the case for its Spanish equivalent FRONTERA. In fact, when looking at the normalized frequencies of each node word, BORDER occurred over four times more frequently than did FRONTERA (4.6 and 1 occurrence per 1,000 words, respectively). While this is a key indicator of how important the concept of the border between Mexico and the US was in

---

[8] In some respects, *unido* can be seen—in this example—as presenting positive prosodic characteristics. While debating this point is beyond the scope of the current project, it bears pointing out that even though *unido* is representative of a generally positive concept, the fact that it co-occurs as a sort of opposition to crime implies that it is negative within the data analyzed here.

the print media discourse examined here, it is also interesting to note the collocates which were found to frequently co-occur with the nodes BORDER and FRONTERA. Table 13 shows the significant collocates of the node BORDER in the English corpus along with the raw frequency, joint frequency and MI score for each.

Table 13. Collocates of BORDER in the English corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
BORDER	mexican	61	9	5.01
	security	30	8	5.86
	mexico	99	7	3.95
	patrol	8	6	7.35
	drug	108	5	3.34
	agent	12	5	6.51
	years	19	4	5.52
	one	40	4	4.45
	long	9	4	6.60
	governor	8	4	6.77
	threatening	4	3	7.35
	texas	29	3	4.50
	state	52	3	3.65
	shelters	3	3	7.77
	perry	33	3	4.31

Table 14 shows the significant collocates of the node FRONTERA in the Spanish corpus along with the raw frequency, joint frequency and MI score of each.

Table 14. Collocates of FRONTERA in the Spanish corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
FRONTERA	unidos	33	3	6.50419
	norte	9	3	8.37866
	estados	44	3	6.08915
	méxico	86	2	4.53735
	lado	7	2	8.15626
	ambos	4	2	8.96362

At first glance, the most conspicuous difference in the collocates found for each node is that the Mexican corpus did not even have 15 frequent collocates. This is partly the case because BORDER was so much more common in American media discourse than it was in Mexican media discourse. Still, it is important to note that the LIs which collocated with BORDER tended to be related to the discourse of 'drug-related violence,' whereas the node FRONTERA principally co-occurred with collocates that had neutral prosodies, most of which referred to the border's geographic position in reference to the United States and/or Mexico. The strongest difference in collocation that can be seen here is the presence of frames determined by the co-occurrence of collocations; for example, while the US media discourse featured BORDER as a sort of 'concept' (which collocated with political LIs and ones related to 'drug-related violence'), FRONTERA was treated like a physical entity within the Mexican corpus. Additionally, the US corpus' use of the node BORDER occurred with both positive and negative collocates (*security*, *shelters*, *drug* and *threatening*) in addition to neutral collocates (i.e. *Mexico*, *years*, *Texas*, etc.), while FRONTERA only collocated with LIs with neutral prosodies.

As in the case of MEXICO, the collocates which occurred with BORDER/FRONTERA also had salient prosodic characteristics which bear mentioning. The collocate *security*, for example, exhibited tendencies toward negative prosody when paired with BORDER, as in *border security*. This was an intriguing example because the pairing of the two LIs cannot be seen as overtly negative (with *border* having neutral prosody and *security* having positive prosody); but, of the five occurrences of 'border security' in the English corpus three occurred in negative contexts. The first use was in reference to the death of an American rancher, the second while discussing so-called 'spillover violence,' and the third occurred as part of a quote implying that a lack of border security is predictive of a lack of

national security in the United States. The concordances of 'border security' are presented in Figure 4, below.

Figure 4. Concordances of *security* with the node word BORDER in the English corpus

at the polls, spent $400 million on BORDER	**security**	and strongly opposed amnesty to people who enter
treating the county as a bellwether of BORDER	**security**	. Indeed, when a Cochise rancher named Robert
immigration by citing his expertise in BORDER	**security**	and spotlighting the potential threat of spillover
have national security until we have BORDER	**security**	," Perry said. The governor also struck that theme
committed "unprecedented resources" to BORDER	**security**	, including a beefed-up Border Patrol and a record

As can be seen in Figure 4, only two occurrences of the collocation of BORDER and *security* did not occur in negative prosodic contexts. Interestingly, both 'non-negative' occurrences still cannot be said to have occurred with overtly positive prosodic characteristics. This was due to the fact that, in the American print media discourse, BORDER *security* would seem to be similar in its prosodic characteristics to *unido* as a collocate of MÉXICO in the Spanish corpus (see Table 12 and discussion, p. 93). That is, security—even when occurring with positive prosodic characteristics—occurs as an opposition to something negative (i.e. the difference in the prosody between something like *security blanket* and *security guard*). Because of these findings, *security* (at least in the context of the corpora examined here) can be seen to have a combined negative prosody due to its co-occurrence with BORDER.

This sort of collocational behavior among seemingly neutral LIs was not only found in the English corpus. In examining the fifth most frequent node in the Spanish corpus PAÍS, a similar pattern was found in which a node which was more frequently used in the overall discourse had a markedly different prosody than did its counterpart in the other corpus.

Table 15. Collocates of PAÍS in the Spanish corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
PAÍS	vive	6	4	7.68
	violento	5	4	7.94
	violencia	59	4	4.38
	méxico	86	4	3.84
	asesinatos	20	4	5.94
	homicidios	19	3	5.60
	tasa	7	2	6.46
	meses	6	2	6.68
	grupos	28	2	4.46

Table 15 shows the significant collocates of the node PAÍS in the Spanish corpus along

with the raw frequency, joint frequency and MI score of each. Table 16 presents the same

information for the equivalent node COUNTRY in the English corpus.

Table 16. Collocates of COUNTRY in the English corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
COUNTRY	using	7	2	8.68
	uncomfortable	2	2	10.49
	tools	5	2	9.17
	officials	45	2	6.00

While almost half (4 out of 9) of the collocates for the node PAÍS were overtly negative

(*violento*, *violencia*, *asesinatos*, *homicidios*), the only overtly negative collocate of the node

COUNTRY in the English corpus was *uncomfortable*. Further, many of the apparently

positive or neutral collocates of PAÍS carry negative connotations when viewed in the

context of their concordances with the node. The collocate *vive*, for example, exclusively

occurred in overtly negative contexts within the corpus, with all of its appearances co-

occurring with the LI *violencia*.

Figure 5. Concordances of *vive* with the node PAÍS in the Spanish corpus

na dura batalla, pero aún así la violencia que se	**vive**	en muchas partes del PAÍS es enorme. Han salido a
legalizar drogas para erradicar la violencia que	**vive**	el PAÍS El PAN debe entrar a discutir temas noved
men organizado y la situación de violencia que	**vive**	el PAÍS, admitió Fernando Canales Clarion, ex gob
ijo que es necesario que ante la violencia que se	**vive**	en el PAÍS, es ineludible que el tema se discuta

Figure 5 shows the concordance of the LI *vive* within the Spanish corpus. As can be seen, when *vive* was present as a collocate of PAÍS, it exclusively occurred with the LI *violencia*, always as a part of a phrase which roughly translates as 'the violence which X experiences/is experiencing.' This overarching negative semantic prosody was not only found in the co-occurrence patterns of *vive*. The other positive and neutral collocates of PAÍS (*tasa*, *meses* and *grupos)* also acquired negative prosodic features from *homicidios*, *asesinatos* and *drogas* (there was also one occurrence in a context talking about 'cartels'), respectively (see Appendix B, p. 138).

In looking at the examples discussed here (all of which were drawn from the top ten most frequently-used nodes in at least one of the corpora), it becomes clear that there was a general 'pattern' present in both corpora and, by proxy, both countries' print media discourses. That is, in both corpora two general characteristics were seen through this part of the analysis. First, each corpus seemed to have a specific set of discourse characteristics based on the frequently occurring nodes present. Second, these frequent nodes were found to consistently take on negative prosodic features (oftentimes irrespective of the positive or neutral prosody of the individual node or collocate being examined)—see Chapter 5 (p. 115) for further discussion.

Although there were—obviously—instances in which this pattern of negative prosody was not found, many prosodically positive or neutral nodes occurred in overwhelmingly negative prosodic environments; at the same time, most prosodically negative LIs occurred in negative syntactic environments. What was additionally interesting to note in examining the top ten most frequent nodes in each corpus, was the perspective given by these LIs in relation to the overall discourse of each country's media environment and also the 'lived reality' of each country (Berger, 2009). This can be seen very clearly in the focus on the topic of drugs in the US corpus (as seen through the presence of the nodes DRUGS and CARTEL) as well as the presence of BORDER. In the case of the Mexican corpus there was a more marked emphasis on violence and crime. This was not only seen based on the presence of the nodes VIOLENCIA, DROGAS and SECUESTRO, but was also seen in neutral nodes such as GRUPOS and PAÍS which predominately co-occurred with negative prosodic features. As a response to this analysis, which focused mainly on the SP of both corpora insofar as it related to overarching concepts within them, the following section focused more concretely on the shared concepts between both corpora.

In order to accurately analyze the similarities and differences between both corpora's media discourses regarding 'drug-related violence,' it was necessary to focus on the concepts which existed in both corpora. All equivalent concepts were identified in both corpora and were analyzed for their individual prosodic features in much the same way as was done in the preceding section. This, in turn, focused less on the big picture and more on the presentations of concepts which were utilized in both corpora in order to discuss the same topic.

4.2. 'Shared Concept' Nodes

The following section is focused on examining and comparing the use of certain nodes which occurred in both corpora. Whereas the previous section aimed to provide an overview of the discourse characteristics present in the corpora as a whole, the present analysis was focused on nodes which occurred as 'shared concepts'[9] in both corpora. Obviously many of the LIs found in one corpus appeared in the other corpus simply due to the fact that both corpora were built around the shared theme of 'drug-related violence' in Mexico and the United States. Nonetheless, this common discourse was by no means the case in all instances of language use, even in instances where the language used in one corpus seemed logically related to the topic around which the common discourse was built.

All of the following analyses were carried out utilizing the most frequent LIs in both corpora. Within the corpora (115 tokens in the English list and 71 in the Spanish) only thirty tokens occurred as shared concepts across both corpora. This group of shared concepts was analyzed for collocation patterns and general semantic prosody characteristics. This was done (as in the previous section) through the use of the AntConc corpus analysis program (Anthony, 2011). Because of the importance placed on studying concepts and not necessarily individual tokens, the node words were searched here using wildcards (Salama, 2011). This was only done for shared concepts which had different morphological realizations in each corpus. Thus in cases where it was possible, instead of searching DRUG and DRUGS, DRUG* was used as the search term in AntConc and the collocation results brought back were applicable to all appearances of both tokens. This

---

[9] The term 'shared concept' is used here to refer to nodes in one corpus which had equivalent nodes in the other corpus. 'Shared concepts' is used to describe these nodes because in some cases a literal equivalent was not present and it was thus impossible to examine them as if they were translations of a single meaning.

was not the case in searching for many shared concepts (BORDER and FRONTERA, for example). Due to the fact that the previous section focused on a similar approach, the nodes included here have not already been discussed.

In order to carry out the analysis presented here, all nodes were first sorted in order to assure that only those nodes which were present as concepts in both corpora were examined. This was accomplished by seeking out literal translations whenever possible, but occasionally multiple LIs were included as the shared concept to a LI in the other corpus (this was only the case in the Mexican corpus). For instance, while the node word DRUG had a literal Spanish equivalent in the Mexican corpus (DROGA), a node such as KILLINGS did not have a literal equivalent in the Mexican corpus. In the case of KILLINGS two conceptually equivalent Spanish nodes were found and used as conceptual equivalents (ASESINATOS and HOMICIDIOS). This 'flexibility' in data selection was used because the analysis here was carried out on broad shared concepts and it was, as a result, important to focus on the underlying meanings of the nodes and not on surface similarities (e.g. Saussure's distinction between the signifier and the signified). Being flexible in this sense was very important in examples like that of ASESINATOS and HOMICIDIOS where they are rapidly seen to be two tokens of the same type.

In this way, this section was quite methodologically similar to the majority of SP studies which have been carried out to date. That is, a concept was chosen (here, concepts were 'chosen' based on their presence in both corpora) and the concept's prosody was examined according to its occurrences within the corpora. What sets this analysis apart from many previous SP studies is that prosodies were compared across multi-lingual corpora; while many SP studies have focused on describing the behavior of certain LIs'

prosodies within corpora, the present study sought to describe certain LIs' behavior in the corpus in comparison to another, parallel corpus.

As in the previous section, the first step taken was to look at the overall frequency of positive, negative and neutral nodes present as shared concepts in both corpora. This served to give an insight not only into the common discourse between both corpora but also the 'tone.' As in the previous section, the vast majority of these nodes were neutral. However, in looking only at shared concepts there appeared to be a more varied presence of nodes with positive and negative prosodies than in the previous analysis (Section 4.1, p. 88). This was especially true of nodes with overtly positive prosodies.

The list of shared concepts (see Appendix C, p. 139) contained far more positive nodes than did the list of the ten most frequent occurrences. Additionally, after analyzing the shared concepts it was found that nodes which were seen to be positive or neutral at first glance were not necessarily so depending on the syntactic environment in which they were found. These nodes (POLICE/POLICÍA, AUTHORITIES/AUTORIDADES, MILITARY/EJÉRCITO and NEW/NUEVO) were all deemed to be either positive or neutral. There was really nothing overtly positive or negative about them. That is, none of them immediately suggested a positive prosody like HAPPY would, for example; conversely, none appeared as obviously negative as a LI like WAR would have. Nonetheless, these shared concepts were judged to be more open to carrying a non-neutral connotation (likely a positive one) than would a LI like NORTH, for instance. With this in mind, the following section will first discuss the analysis of these shared concepts before moving on to other nodes which appeared in both corpora.

What was immediately interesting in examining these nodes and their collocates was the steep drop in the number of collocates as compared to the nodes looked at previously. The shared concepts, as a whole, occurred far less frequently than did the nodes examined in Section 4.1 (see p. 88) and, as a result, had a much smaller range of collocates to examine. Despite this, there were many interesting differences to be noted both in terms of collocation and prosodic characteristics. Indeed, in some ways the limited variety of collocates allowed for a more concentrated look at the presence of prosodic features.

In the example of the shared node POLICE/POLICÍA, for example, there was no notable tendency towards either positive or negative prosodic characteristics among the collocates. This was obviously different than what was found in the previous section with the node MEXICO, in which there was a marked presence of negative collocations. However, when comparing the node POLICE to the node POLICÍA, it did become obvious that there were more negative prosodic characteristics in the English corpus than in the Spanish corpus and that even neutral collocates occurred in negative contexts when examined through concordance analysis.

Table 17. Collocates of POLICE in the English corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
POLICE	mexican	61	9	5.59
	federal	33	8	6.31
	officers	22	7	6.70
	state	52	5	4.97
	city	37	5	5.47
	two	34	4	5.27
	municipal	4	4	8.35
	mexico	99	4	3.72
	detained	7	4	7.55
	chief	6	4	7.77
	thursday	13	3	6.24
	luis	10	3	6.62
	local	18	3	5.77
	corruption	4	3	7.94
	allegedly	8	3	6.94

Table 17 shows the most frequently occurring collocates of the node POLICE in the

English corpus along with the MI scores and rates of raw and joint frequency for each.

Table 18 (below) shows the same information for the node POLICÍA from the Spanish

corpus.

Table 18. Collocates of POLICÍA in the Spanish corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
POLICÍA	ministerial	3	3	9.96
	tránsito	3	2	9.38
	san	4	2	8.96
	presentar	2	2	9.96
	nicolás	4	2	8.96
	municipal	4	2	8.96
	federal	9	2	7.79
	división	2	2	9.96
	camioneta	3	2	9.38
	calle	7	2	8.16
	ayer	6	2	8.38
	antidrogas	5	2	8.64

As can be seen in Tables 17 and 18, the node POLICE occurs with one overtly negative collocate in the English corpus (*corruption*), whereas the Spanish node POLICÍA has none. Aside from this, both collocate lists are fairly neutral with both nodes generally collocating with LIs used to differentiate types of police as well as describe law enforcement-related activities. Despite these similarities, when looking at the individual collocates in each list using a concordance analysis tool many differences come to light.

In the case of the node POLICE, the collocates with the highest levels of joint occurrence (*officers*, *municipal*, *detained*, *chief* and *allegedly*) predominately were found in negative prosodic environments despite being (at first glance) LIs with positive or neutral prosodies (see Appendix D, p. 140). For instance, in the case of the collocate *officers*—a seemingly common LI to co-occur with the node POLICE—all but one of the examples found in the text were found to have negative prosodies. Of those, only one was dependent on the greater syntactic context in which it occurred. That is to say that, out of seven co-occurrences with POLICE in the English corpus, the LI *officers* occurred once as a collocate with positive or neutral prosody, once as a potentially neutral collocate within an extremely negative linguistic environment (talking about police officers who had failed background checks) and five times in blatantly negative prosodic environments (allowing violence, being caught with cocaine, committing crimes, etc.).

Figure 6. Concordances of *officers* with the node POLICE in the English corpus

for the Zetas, Domene said. Four POLICE	**officers**	in northern Mexico allowed a violent drug gang to
jail Monterrey, Mexico Several POLICE	**officers**	from Juarez, a suburb of the city of Monterrey,
to San Luis to pay for city POLICE	**officers**	to provide traffic control during periods of long
third of 63,436 low-ranking Mexican POLICE	**officers**	tested so far have failed background and security
percent of midlevel POLICE commanders and	**officers**	. On Thursday, the Defense Department said soldier
Luis Potosi detained two local POLICE	**officers**	from the city of Cardenas with 39 doses of cocaine
who allegedly gave orders to the POLICE	**officers**	to commit illegal acts; documents linking them

Figure 6 shows the concordances of *officers* with the node POLICE in the English corpus. Although the context of many of these occurrences can be seen in the above figure, a more expansive set of concordances for *police officers* can be seen in Appendix D (see p. 140).

This pattern of consistent negative prosody was additionally found when examining the collocate *municipal* (in which the only positive or neutral prosody came about when referencing the killing of six *officers*), *detained* (in which, out of four uses in the corpus, three refer to the *police officers* themselves being detained), *chief** (in which the only non-negative environment in which the collocate was found was in a story saying that a police chief would not lose his job despite having failed a background check[10]) and *allegedly* (which only referred to POLICE being accused of wrongdoing once out of three occurrences in the corpus).

---

[10] It should be noted here that this particular example is interesting in that it still shows negative prosodic characteristics (albeit not overtly). That is, even though the *chief* did not lose their job they still failed the background check.

As can be seen, the majority of the collocates of POLICE had negative prosodic characteristics in relation to the node. It is worth noting that the collocates which did not exhibit this behavior as strongly were descriptors of the node (*municipal* and *chief**). In both of these cases, there was not a negative prosodic relationship to the node; however, they still occurred in overtly negative syntactic environments in that these examples occurred in relation to the killings and investigations of POLICE. Additionally, the LIs which *did* exhibit negative prosody as related to the node word were LIs which would seem to be common collocates of POLICE in English news writing. However, in the corpus examined here, seemingly common collocates such as *detain** and *alleged** referred to the POLICE themselves and not to the POLICE's actions against criminals or suspected criminals.

Remarkably, this same general presence of negative prosody was not present in the Mexican corpus despite the fact that the POLICE being discussed in the English corpus are the same POLICÍA from the Mexican corpus. That is, in both corpora Mexican law enforcement officials were reported on, not American ones. The most obvious characteristic of the collocates of POLICÍA is that there was not a single overtly negative collocate. Though the English corpus only had one (*corruption*), the collocations found in searching the Mexican corpus were mainly the sort of collocations that one would expect to find in relation to POLICÍA: types of POLICÍA (*ministerial*, *tránsito*, *municipal*, *federal*), time and place vocabulary (*San*, *Nicolás*, *calle*, *ayer*, *camioneta*) and general descriptive vocabulary related to POLICÍA in terms of police actions and categories (*presentar*, *división*, *antidrogas*).

In the case of some of the most strongly collocating LIs—based on MI score (see Appendix D and Appendix E, pp. 140 & 141)—not a single negative prosodic environment was found. That is, while neutral collocates of the English node POLICE took on predominately negative prosodic characteristics due to their surrounding linguistic environments, similar collocates of the Spanish node POLICÍA exhibited no such characteristics. For instance, the conceptual equivalent of the English collocate *municipal*, when examined in the Spanish corpus, revealed positive or neutral connotations in relation to POLICÍA—something not present in the English corpus. Through examining the prosodic characteristics of the collocates of both nodes as well as the syntactic environments in which the nodes were present, it can be gathered that the American press would seem to present a negative image of Mexican POLICE (paradoxically, often portraying them as criminals), while the Mexican press presented Mexican POLICÍA either in a positive light or as victims.

Despite the characteristics detailed above, this sort of imbalance in the distribution of certain connotations was also found in the Mexican corpus when compared to the American corpus. For example, the nodes NEW and NUEVO featured extremely different sets of collocates.

Table 19. Collocates of NEW in the English corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
NEW	york	3	3	10.11
	times	3	2	9.53
	report	7	2	8.31

Table 19 shows the most frequently occurring collocates of the node NEW in the English corpus along with the MI scores and rates of raw and joint frequency for each. Table 20 (below) shows the same information for the node NUEVO in the Spanish corpus.

Table 20. Collocates of NUEVO in the Spanish corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
NUEVO	méxico	86	4	5.80
	león	4	4	10.23
	drogas	57	4	6.39
	tráfico	17	2	7.14
	texas	4	2	9.23
	líder	6	2	8.64
	grupo	12	2	7.64
	empresarios	12	2	7.64
	california	8	2	8.23
	arizona	2	2	10.23

As can be seen in the Tables 19 and 20, the majority of the collocates of NEW/NUEVO in both corpora were focused on place names (New York, Nuevo León, etc.). Nonetheless, in the Mexican corpus there were also two collocates with negative prosodies (*drogas* and *tráfico*) as well as one positive and one neutral collocation (*líder* and *grupo*, respectively) both of which occurred in overtly negative linguistic contexts within the corpus (see Appendix F, p. 142). Thus, as in many of the examples examined above, even positive and neutral collocates seem to acquire negative prosodic characteristics from the contexts in which they appear.

Interestingly, these same sorts of characteristics were found to exist in the shared concepts AUTHORITIES/AUTORIDADES. However, here the general semantic prosody characteristics of the collocates were positive.

Table 21. Collocates of AUTHORITIES in the English corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
AUTHORITIES	mexican	61	4	5.18
	two	34	3	5.61
	cartel	60	3	4.79
	records	6	2	7.53
	helped	8	2	7.11
	federal	33	2	5.07
	drug	108	2	3.36

Table 21 shows the most frequently occurring collocates of the node AUTHORITIES in the

English corpus along with the MI scores and rates of raw and joint frequency for each.

Table 22 (below) shows the same information for the node AUTORIDADES from the

Spanish corpus.

Table 22. Collocates of AUTORIDADES in the Spanish corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
AUTORIDADES	no	64	3	5.33
	mexicanas	4	2	8.74
	acuerdo	12	2	7.16

As can be seen in both Tables 21 and 22, there was a notable difference in the number of

collocates for each node. This was, however, most likely due to the frequency of

occurrence of the node itself (26 in the English corpus and 14 in the Mexican corpus).

What was noteworthy in examining these shared concepts side by side was that the

English collocates of AUTHORITIES generally featured positive prosodic characteristics

(as opposed to the prosodic behavior of POLICE). This was even true when looking at

overtly negative collocates such as *cartel*. In the case of *cartel*, the LI was found with

mostly positive prosodic characteristics (i.e. people associated with a cartel helping

AUTHORITIES). In looking at the Spanish corpus, any hard evidence of a marked positive

or negative trend was harder to come by. That is, although all but one collocate were

neutral (*not* being negative), the collocates' presence in the corpus was quite mixed.

The final shared concepts which were examined were the nodes MILITARY and

EJÉRCITO. In the case of the node MILITARY, nearly all of its occurrences in the

English corpus were as parts of quotes from one particular American politician. In the case

of EJÉRCITO, the collocates mainly occurred in reference to geographical location (i.e. the

Mexican and American militaries) and, likewise, most of the prosodic characteristics were

neutral—even in cases where this was not the case, there was by no means a general

tendency which could be analyzed and discussed here.

Table 23. Collocates of MILITARY in the English corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
MILITARY	government	33	3	6.55
	support	8	2	8.01
	require	2	2	10.01
	islas	2	2	10.01
	group	19	2	6.76

Table 23 shows the most frequently occurring collocates of the node MILITARY in the

English corpus along with the MI scores and rates of raw and joint frequency for each.

Table 24 (below) shows the same information for the node EJÉRCITO from the Spanish

corpus.

Table 24. Collocates of EJÉRCITO in the Spanish corpus

Node Word	Collocate	Freq.	Joint Freq.	MI
EJÉRCITO	zetas	6	2	8.79
	tecnológicamente	2	2	10.38
	privado	2	2	10.38
	norteamericano	3	2	9.79
	méxico	86	2	4.95
	mexicano	11	2	7.92

While this particular set of shared concepts offered little in the way of easily discernible similarities or differences, it did speak to the general discourse in each corpus with regard to the armed forces. The most obvious example of this is the context in which many of the collocates in Tables 23 and 24 appear. As was mentioned previously, the majority of the collocates in the English corpus came from one particular person whereas the collocates in the Spanish corpus examples were more varied in that they occurred as parts of text as well as parts of quotes. The most notable characteristic which was found in examining MILITARY and EJÉRCITO was based on the personal connotations which appeared to be behind the nodes' presence in both countries' discourses. However, a discussion of this is beyond the scope of the current study and, in many ways, flies in the face of what was attempted in proposing this methodological approach (see Section 5.2, p. 119).

Although the preceding section did not offer concrete examples of marked linguistic differences or similarities between both countries' print media discourses, it did serve as an exploration of the method which was proposed here. In this sense, it would seem that the study was successful in meeting its established goals. The study showed that it is indeed possible to employ a combination of SP and CL methodologies in order to carry out CDA-related research. Additionally, in two cases it was demonstrated that not only was it feasible to carry out research in this way, but that significant findings could come of it.

Part of the reason that the results of the current study are not as well-defined as in other, similar studies in both CDA and SP, is that the current project focused on eliminating the traditional role of the researcher in CDA investigations. That is to say that because the researcher did not explicitly select phenomena, lexical uses or political stances within the corpora from the beginning, it proved difficult to draw marked conclusions about specific phenomena. Despite this, the study presented here was able to show that the methodology

utilized can potentially be used in future research (see Section 5.3, p. 121); and, in fact,

individual lexical behaviors were found within the corpora (see the discussions of

MEXICO/MÉXICO, POLICE/POLICÍA and BORDER/FRONTERA). The primary

reason that this was not more marked, though, was due to various factors involving the

methodology and corpora themselves. This is discussed in more detail in the following

chapter.