

Applying Appraisal Theory for the Interpretation of Experienced Researchers' Interviews on Open Access

La aplicación de la Teoría de la Apreciación para la interpretación de entrevistas a investigadores experimentados sobre el Acceso Abierto

Inmaculada Fortanet-Gómez

UNIVERSITAT JAUME I

ESPAÑA

fortanet@uji.es

Recibido: 08-X-2020 / **Aceptado:** 17-XI-2021

DOI: 10.4067/S0718-09342022000200481

Abstract

Interviews are a recognized and valued method for obtaining research data. Usually, these data are drawn from the content of interviews. However, words and prosodic elements that accompany them may reveal complementary, and even contradictory information, that substantially alters the researcher's first impression. After the publication in September of 2018 of the document *COAlition Plan S* which announced that research results funded by European institutions would have to be published in Open Access from 1 January 2020 (later postponed to 2021), 10 experienced researchers were interviewed on this topic. It is these interviews that will be the focus of this paper: the interviewees' discourse and its meaning. To develop this research, the Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005) was selected. Even though it was originally designed to study the English language, the Appraisal Theory framework proved to be very useful for analysing the researchers' attitudes towards Open Access (OA) through several Spanish and Catalan language strategies. In addition, as interviews were audio recorded, it was decided to complement the linguistic analysis by paying attention to paralinguistic resources. The multimodal analysis of Appraisal in these researchers' opinions reveals the dilemma they are faced with, either to publish in a limited number of less prestigious journals using Open Access, or to pay very high fees to use Gold Open Access.

Key Words: Appraisal Theory, Spoken Discourse Analysis in Spanish and Catalan, Interviews, Open Access.

Resumen

Las entrevistas son un método reconocido y valorado para la obtención de datos para la investigación. Normalmente, esos datos se extraen del contenido de esas entrevistas. Sin embargo, las palabras y los elementos prosódicos que las acompañan pueden desvelar información complementaria, o incluso contradictoria, que puede modificar sustancialmente la primera impresión obtenida por el investigador. Tras la publicación en septiembre de 2018 del documento COAlition Plan S que anunciaba que los resultados de la investigación financiada por organismos europeos deberían publicarse en acceso abierto a partir del 1 de enero de 2020, más tarde postergado a 2021, se realizó una entrevista sobre este tema a 10 investigadores experimentados. Estas entrevistas serán el centro de atención de este artículo, concretamente, el discurso empleado por los entrevistados y su significado. Para realizar esta investigación, se seleccionó la Teoría de la Apreciación (Appraisal Theory) (Martin & White, 2005). Aunque esta teoría se diseñó en un principio para analizar la lengua inglesa, resultó ser muy útil para analizar las actitudes de los investigadores hacia el Acceso Abierto a través de diferentes estrategias lingüísticas en español y en catalán. Además, dado que las entrevistas se grabaron en audio, se decidió prestar atención también a los recursos paralingüísticos. El análisis multimodal de la apreciación de las opiniones de estos investigadores descubre el dilema con el que se encuentran: publicar en acceso abierto en un número limitado de revistas poco reconocidas en las clasificaciones internacionales, o pagar altas cuotas en el acceso abierto Gold.

Palabras Clave: Teoría de la Apreciación, Análisis del Discurso oral en español y catalán, Entrevistas, Acceso Abierto.

INTRODUCTION

Research interviews have been commonly used in the last 50 years to obtain data in fields such as economics, psychology, or medicine (Brinkman & Kvale, 2014). The interpretation of these interviews can be based on the content, that is, direct information, or may go further by following a discourse analysis of the words and how they are uttered. This type of analysis is especially relevant when the interviews aim for elaboration by the respondent through open-ended questions (Roulston, 2006), as is the case in the present research.

There are few studies on the discourse of research interviews. One of the most interesting publications on this topic is that by O'Rourke and Pitt (2007), who classify research on interviews into various types. Interview material can be analysed as interview discourse, as is the case in the current study. However, it can also be considered that this interview material is analysed as stimulated discourse of interest, since participants are asked about their opinion on a very specific controversial topic. O'Rourke and Pitt (2007) also highlight the relationship established between interviewer and interviewee regarding identity creation or hierarchy. Brinkmann and Kvale (2014), who published a general study on how to carry out research interviews, also pointed out the relevance of knowing the relationships of power between

interviewer and interviewee for a better interpretation of the discourse. This relationship of power is not only related to the social or professional position of both parts. As Roulston (2017) highlights, interviewees in research interviews are assumed to have greater knowledge about the topic under research, while interviewers are eager to know about interviewees' experiences and opinions. Moreover, the communicative structure of the interview may also have an impact on the discourse produced. O'Rourke and Pitt (2007) introduce an example of a discourse analysis of a research interview. However, this analysis is merely based on the content and some terms used and it does not account for other relevant morphosyntactic elements such as pronouns or paralanguage; for example, high pitch or intonation. As far as we know, no previous research has focused on these elements.

The objective of this research is to find out the opinion of researchers about the European Open Access policy, through the interpretation of their answers in an interview. The discourse of the researchers interviewed was analysed following the Appraisal framework. By means of this research the author intends to answer three research questions.

- RQ1- How do the appraisal resources used in the answers to interviews contribute to the interpretation of the researchers' opinions on Open Access?
- RQ2- What are the multimodal resources mainly used by researchers to show Appraisal in interviews about Open Access?
- RQ3- What is the real opinion of researchers after analysing their interviews?

The hypothesis is that only by looking deeply into the interviewees' discourse and how it is expressed can their true opinion on this topic can be determined. This paper starts with a brief introduction of the Appraisal Theory and a justification of its use for the discourse analysis of the research interviews. This theory has been widely used for the interpretation of written texts in English, but very scarcely for spoken discourse. Moreover, English is the language which has mostly been analysed, and there are few studies regarding Spanish and, to our knowledge, none on Valencian, a language spoken in the Valencian Community with many similarities and the same origin as Catalan. Following this introduction, the reader will find an explanation on the use of paralanguage in discourse analysis, one of the modes in Multimodal Discourse Analysis. Thirdly, as it was the topic of the research interview, Open Access will be explained, as the reader will need to learn about the context to understand the participants' responses. The rest of the paper will consist of the methodology used, the results and discussion, and the conclusions.

1. Theoretical framework

1.1. *Appraisal Theory*

One of the approaches that has been used to conduct discourse analysis is the Appraisal Theory. This framework is part of the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday, 1985), and it tries to explain “how evaluation is established, amplified, targeted and sourced” (Martin & White, 2005: 9). The Appraisal Theory focuses on the interpersonal dimension of discourse to interpret “the subjective presence of writers/speakers in texts as they adopt stances towards both the material they present and those with whom they communicate” (Martin & White, 2005: 1). This research focuses on the interpersonal dimension, and will analyse Attitude, Graduation and Engagement. Attitude refers to the subsystem of evaluative meaning by which speakers take a positive or negative stance. Attitudinal meanings can be divided into three subtypes (White, 2015):

- Positive/negative assessment as emotional reactions (affect)
- Positive/negative assessment of human behaviour by reference to ethics (judgement)
- Assessment of objects, artefacts, etc. in terms of how they are assigned social value (appreciation)

Moreover, attitude can be explicit or ‘inscribed’, or implicit or ‘invoked’. The present research will focus on those individual words or phrases that can ‘invoke’ a heavy positive or negative attitude in the context of the interviews about Open Access.

On the other hand, Graduation, that is, the degree of the “personal investment” of the speaker (White, 2015: 4), can be observed through force (intensification or mitigation of propositions) or focus (sharpening or blurring of semantic boundaries). Graduation is most expressed by means of adjectives and adverbs, and these are what the research will look into.

Finally, Engagement determines how the speakers or writers position themselves, that is, whether their opinions are open to negotiation or not. White (2015: 5) describes it as the involvement the speaker wants to show with the propositions expressed, “their knowledge or commitment to the ‘truth value’ of the proposition”. Hyland (2005) develops the concept of Engagement and lists a number of resources to convey it: directives, questions, personal asides and pronouns. One of the most relevant ways to show engagement in Spanish and Valencian¹ is by means of the explicit use of the personal pronoun in front of verb forms, since as a general rule, the verbal affix expresses the subject implicitly. Personal pronouns, either as subjects or

objects, are not very common, especially when they are tonic, and they are often considered as an emphatic version of the affixal unstressed personal markers (García Salido, 2008). Among the most important reasons for using tonic personal pronouns, there are two that deserve to be mentioned: to indicate contrast with what has been said previously, or when the speaker purposely repeats the topic of his/her speech. As pointed out by Hyland (2005), the use of personal pronouns, especially 'I' and 'we' in the interviews is related to engagement, although other parallel reasons may also co-occur. Moreover, the use of impersonal 'you' may also shed some light on the willingness to avoid engagement by the speaker, especially in the context of research interviews (Myers & Lampropoulou, 2012).

A second device identified by White (2015) to convey engagement is the use of certain expressions, such as 'obviously', 'it's probable', and the use of modal verbs. Most of these examples would be classified by Hyland (2005) as 'hedges'. The present study will also pay attention to these devices, as well as to the use of questions and non-clausal material.

Up to now, the Appraisal framework has been used to analyse written discourse in scientific research articles (Chek-Kim, Miin-Hwa & Warton, 2016; Moyano, 2019; Cárcamo Morales, 2020), political discourse (Aloy Mayo & Taboada 2017; Ross & Caldwell, 2020) and some other written documents such as wine tasting sheets (Breit, 2014) and suicide notes (Grundlingh, 2018). However, research following this framework on spoken discourse is very scarce, even more so when the languages under study are Spanish and Valencian. Only Moyano (2019) and Breit (2014), as cited above, analyse the Spanish language in written discourse, research articles and wine sheets, respectively. No study has been found for Catalan.

1.2. Multimodal Discourse Analysis

Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MDA) is based on Halliday's (1985) Systemic Functional Grammar, like the Appraisal Theory. O'Halloran (2011: 120) describes MDA as "an emerging paradigm in discourse studies which extends the study of language per se to the study of language in combination with other resources, such as images, scientific symbolism, gesture, action, music and sound". The focus of this approach is on studying the sets of semiotic resources available and the choice writers and speakers make from them. Several authors have analysed the use of semiotic resources in spoken discourse, mainly in academic lectures (Crawford Camiciottoli, 2007; Bernad-Mechó & Fortanet-Gómez, 2019). These studies indicate that the modes of spoken discourse are speech, gesture, gaze, head movement, posture, facial expression, proxemics, and paralanguage. The present research will be limited to

speech and paralanguage, as the interviews were audio recorded. Moreover, among the paralinguistic elements it will focus on prosody (Roach, Stibbard, Osborne, Arnfield & Setter, 1998) and the contribution of silence, speed, loudness, and syllabic duration to convey hesitation or to intensify verbal messages (Querol-Julián, 2011; Crawford-Camiciottoli, 2015; Bernad-Mechó, 2018).

As indicated above, most multimodal discourse analyses have been carried out on academic lectures and academic discourse. However, little attention has been paid to other spoken genres such as interviews. In this paper, interviews are part of the methodology used to discover the researchers' opinions on Open Access, but at the same time they are the object of discourse analysis in order to interpret the attitudes behind these speech activities. Given that interviews were audio recorded, the semiotic resources that will be considered in the analysis will be verbal discourse, silence, syllable elongation, and pitch.

1.3. Open Access

Open Access is defined by Science Europe as 'the principle and practice of providing free online access to scholarly publications'². According to the members of Science Europe, Open Access grants access to publications to everyone without any restrictions. It guarantees more efficiency to research and improves the authors' visibility and the impact of their research results.

Open Access has two main varieties: Gold and Green Open Access, as established by the Budapest Initiative (2002). The aim of Gold Open Access is that most journals become freely available to the readers, provided the authors pay a high fee for the review and editing (Article Processing Charges). In contrast, Green Open Access advocates free article archiving in repositories (Abadal, 2014). In principle, they have been considered as complementary by the Open Access movement, though both have supporters and detractors. In Spain, Green Open Access has been widely supported. Since 2011 (BOE, 2011), universities and research centres are committed to depositing the results of state-funded research in Open Access repositories, though there are no incentives or special funding for this. In February 2019, the Spanish Confederation of Rectors (CRUE, 2019) published a document outlining their commitment to Open Access. One of the proposals in this document was to change the criteria for research recognition and to offer incentives for using Open Access. It would not be difficult to do so as in Spain Open Access journals account for 35% of the total, much higher than the 14% worldwide average (Abadal, 2014) and most of these journals are funded by public higher education institutions and research centres. Government support would help them to reach top positions in the world rankings, which most of them do not have yet. However, in November of 2019, updated criteria were published for the assessment of research results (BOE, 2019) and, contrary to what would be expected,

there is no mention of Open Access in the whole document and the main criteria used for the recognition of research publications are the Journal Citation Reports (JCR) and, in some disciplines, the Scimago Journal Rank (SJR).

In September of 2018, a group of national research funding organizations published Plan S (COAlition 2018), with the support of the European Commission and the European Research Council (ERC). The main aim of the Plan is the following:

“With effect from 2021, all scholarly publications on the results from research funded by public or private grants provided by national, regional and international research councils and funding bodies must be published in Open Access Journals, on Open Access Platforms, or made immediately available through Open Access Repositories without embargo” (COAlition, 2018).

The first date set to accomplish their aim was 1 January 2020, though a new document issued in September of 2019 (COAlition, 2019) postponed the date to 2021. Immediately after the publication of the first Plan S, a group of nine European researchers published a document expressing their concerns about the limitations they would have to face due to this policy (Researchers, 2018). They listed 4 main problems:

- 1) affordability (not all researchers can afford Gold Open Access for all their publications),
- 2) quality and sustainability (as there are not so many affordable journals available, research results may end up being published in lower quality journals, or in exchange for a fee, i.e. ‘pay and publish’),
- 3) exclusion (this policy may impede international collaboration between researchers, including PhD students, in countries where OA is compulsory and those where it is not),
- 4) violating academic freedom (the researcher cannot choose where to publish, Plan S makes it compulsory to publish in OA).

Although the document published in September of 2019 tries to solve some of these problems, especially by means of a transition period, researchers still show much concern over this policy as the results presented in this paper will reveal. This concern is not exclusive to Europe; OA policies have been expanding to other countries. For example, in a study about the perceptions of Colombian researchers concerning OA, several researchers claimed that sharing research results may infringe copyright (Pinto-Santos, Villanueva-Valadez & Cortés-Peña, 2019), which indicates the lack of knowledge many researchers have about OA policies and their repercussion. The

present study will try to check if the insecurity and doubts regarding OA exhibited by the researchers in previous research are also present in the participants' interviews.

2. Methodology

2.1. Participants

With the purpose of obtaining the answers to the research questions, 10 researchers with a long and successful trajectory in publication were interviewed. Table 2 summarizes the sample of subjects for the interviews.

Table 2. Sample of subjects for the interview.

CODE	DISCIPLINE	GENDER	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	LANGUAGE IN THE INTERVIEW
1HS	Health Science	Woman	31	Spanish
2HS	Health Science	Man	29	Valencian
3L	Law	Woman	28	Spanish
4L	Law	Man	25	Valencian
5BE	Business & Economics	Woman	26	Spanish
6BE	Business & Economics	Man	26	Valencian
7S	Science	Woman	28	Spanish
8S	Science	Man	30	Valencian
9H	Humanities	Woman	21	Spanish
10H	Humanities	Man	26	Valencian

All the interviewees are professors (*catedráticos*) at Universitat Jaume I (Castelló, Spain) who publish internationally and their experience as university scholars ranges from 21 to 31 years. Half of them answered the interview in Spanish and the other half in Valencian. They were offered to choose the language they felt more comfortable with, and it was only by chance that all women answered in Spanish and all men in Valencian. All respondents granted their permission to carry out this research and reproduce their words.

2.1. Research design

Interviews were semi-structured and face to face and all subjects were asked the same open questions:

- 1) Do you know COAlition Plan S? What is your opinion?
- 2) What is your opinion about the reaction by some researchers to Plan S?

It must be noted that these interviews took place in the researchers' office at the university and the interviewer, who is also a researcher and professor at the same

university, was the author of this article. In this case, in principle, there was a balanced power relationship which would lead to mutual trust and a friendly atmosphere. With the previous consent of the interviewees, the interviews were audio-recorded and only the interviewees' contributions were transcribed and analysed. Moreover, as only audio recordings were collected, it was not possible to analyse the body language of interviewees, but paralanguage resources such as silence, elongation of syllables, and speed to convey hesitation or to intensify verbal messages were considered, following the example of other previous multimodal studies (Querol-Julián, 2011; Crawford-Camiciottoli, 2015; Bernad-Mechó, 2018; Fortanet-Gómez & Bernad-Mechó, 2019).

As for the Appraisal analysis, it took into consideration the combination of occurrences of attitude markers (affect, judgement and appreciation, both inscribed and invoked), graduation (adjectives and adverbs used to indicate force and focus), and engagement (use of expressed personal pronouns, rather than affixed personal markers and hedging), which were complemented by the use of inserts: discourse markers ('well', 'right'), response elicitors ('right?', 'okay?'), response forms ('yeah', 'yes') and hesitators ('uh', 'um', 'erm') (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad & Finegan, 1999), which may also convey appraisal.

3. Results and discussion

As the focus of this research is the interpretation of the use of appraisal resources by researchers when expressing their opinion about Open Access, this qualitative analysis will analyse the answers of researchers to the two questions posed, and the expressions of attitude, graduation, and engagement in these answers. In general terms, and prior to the analysis of the answers to the two questions, there is a need to point out that interviewees position themselves either in favour or against the proposition. Nonetheless, there are also frequent doubts, expressed as '*tú estás abí en una disyuntiva*' [you are in a dilemma]³ (4L-Q1); '*No sé si pronunciarme. No lo he pensado suficientemente*' [I don't know if I should give an opinion. I have not thought about it enough] (5BE-Q2); '*Tendría que meditar el tema porque.... no... no lo sé.*' [I would have to think it over because... I don't... I don't know] (7S-Q2); '*És un dilemma molt fort*' [It is a very strong dilemma] (10H-Q2). In addition to these proclamations of doubts, other expressions of hesitation are found, as will be shown in the analyses.

1 Do you know COALition Plan S? What is your opinion?

Most researchers did not know about Plan S, although they had heard about the policies to make the use of Open Access the norm in research publication. In general, researchers agree with Plan S –only two researchers, one in Law and one in Science, are openly against it. This position is expressed by strong negative judgements: ‘*a mí me parece una barbaridad*’ (3L) [it seems outrageous to me] ‘*això és una catàstrofe molt gran*’ (8S) [that is an absolute catastrophe]. The rest seem to be in favour, although most of them question the relationship between the cost and the expense of OA and the date of implementation (1 January 2020 in the first document). These are two examples, one in agreement and one in disagreement with Plan S.

- (1) *Em pareix molt bé. Això em pareix magnífic, però això ens obliga a tots a canviar els nostres hàbits, perquè vol dir que... que hem d'adreçar la nostra investigació cap a les revistes Open Access, encara que tinguen menys prestigi que altres. A partir de 2020, jo vull veure que faran les editorials comercials, les revistes de John Benjamins, de Elsevier, de Routledge, que faran.* (10H)

[It seems very good to me. It seems magnificent, but that obliges all of us to change our habits, because it means that... that we must direct our research towards Open Access journals, even when they are less prestigious than other. From 2020 on, I want to see what commercial publishing houses will do, what the journals at John Benjamins, Elsevier, Routledge will do.]

In this example, the respondent agrees with Plan S using a strong positive judgement, ‘*molt bé*’, which is repeated by means of a single lexical item which carries its intensification in the pitch of the tone used, ‘*magnífic*’. The verbal construction is also repeated, to emphasize the strength of the opinion. However, there is some sarcasm in the words of this respondent: the idea is very good, but it involves important changes not only for researchers but also for publishing houses. He explains it using an inclusive first-person plural, we as researchers, and an obligation form ‘*hem d'adreçar*’. There is also a presupposition, which is an ‘invoked’ negative judgement shared by most respondents: OA journals have less prestige than non-OA ones. The last sentence starts with the date of implementation of the OA policy, as a reminder, then it starts with a first-person singular pronoun, which he stresses in his speech indicating direct engagement, then he repeats ‘*què faran*’ here and at the end of the sentence. This is the most important part of his contribution. We researchers must change the way we publish research, but we also want to see how publishing houses change their way of publishing. There is again an ‘invoked’ negative judgement behind the mention of publishing houses: publishing houses unfairly try to take advantage of researchers’ work, who need to pay to have their research results published.

(2) *Volen posar Open Access i això és una catàstrofe molt gran perquè van a alterar tot el sistema, com et deia, de prestigi, o siga, eeh, no podré publicar en cap de les revistes on publique ara, i tot el sistema que coneixem el van a eliminar. Aleshores van a deixar la ciència desestructurada... totalment. I és un problema molt gran perquè este sistema de prestigi és molt important, determina les contractacions, els projectes.... Tot es basa en el tipus de publicacions que tu fas. Així és com s'avalua tot.* (8S)

[They want to implement Open Access and that is an enormous catastrophe because they are going to change the whole system, as I told you, of prestige, that is, I will not be able to publish in any of the journals where I am now publishing, and the whole system we know is going to be removed. Then, science will be left unstructured... totally. And that is a very serious problem because this system of prestige is very important, it determines employment, projects (funding).... Everything is based on the kind of publications you make. That is the way everything is assessed.]

This researcher is radically against Open Access, and he foresees great changes the current system is not ready to take on. He starts by using a third person plural in the verb affix without specifying the subject. Then, he identifies Open Access with '*catàstrofe*', a very emphatic negative word expressed with a high pitch, and goes on explaining three reasons: '*van a alterar tot el sistema*', '*no podré publicar en cap de les revistes on publique ara*', '*tot el sistema que coneixem el van a eliminar*'. The first and last reasons again contain third person plural verbal affixes and no subject, while the second one has more personal engagement as he uses first person singular and a negative statement, and the third one also includes a first-person plural affix that identifies the respondent with other researchers including the interviewer. Moreover, in the first and third reasons he uses two verbs that indicate a negative assessment: '*alterar*' and '*eliminar*'.

Then, he makes another statement in the third person plural and a negative appraisal '*ciència desestructurada*' and an intensifier which gets even stronger after a short pause increasing its negativity, '*totalment*', in addition to a slower pace in his speech. He again repeats the same syntactic and semantic structure, introducing another stronger negative statement. '*és un problema molt gran*', and more reasons: '*sistema molt important*', '*determina les contractacions, els projectes*', '*tot es basa en el tipus de publicacions que tu fas*'. He expresses his appreciation of the system and justifies this attitude by explaining that publications may determine whether researchers are employed or not by a university, or whether they get funding for their research projects, as they need to provide their CV, and the quality and number of their publications are the main criteria for success. Although it is the third person that is mainly used, the third reason includes the use of

the second person with an explicit use of the pronoun 'tu', which indicates an impersonal use of the verb, but also involves the interviewer in some way. The last sentence is a summary of his contribution, reinforcing his argument.

2. What is your opinion about the reaction by some researchers on Plan S?

In their answers to this second question, as indicated above, most researchers seem to be in favour of OA when they are presented with arguments against Plan S. However, they also unveil their reluctance to comply with these policy requirements.

- (3) *Tal como está el panorama internacional, es que, uff, todo abre barreras porque al final publicar debería ser publicar en las revistas de tu área en las que sabes que te va a leer gente que trabaja en lo tuyo y que vas a poder seguir discutiendo y ampliando el conocimiento. Si ya tienes que ir imponiéndote criterios de estos tipos al final, se te reduce el área. Está claro que se va reduciendo un poco dónde puedes publicar y al final se ponen por encima criterios formales o criterios de financiación o criterios más estratégicos por encima del conocimiento [...] Y no puedes obligar al...No, no puedes obligar al grupo, a los grupos gordos a que cambien sus políticas de publicación porque en Europa hayamos decidido hacerlo diferente. Que me parece bien, ¿eh?, publicar en Open Access, pero claro, sin obligar. (9H)*

[The way the international scene is at the moment, it is, ugh . . . everything imposes barriers because in the end publishing should be publishing in the journals of your speciality which you know are going to be read by people who work in your field and that you will be able to go on discussing and expanding knowledge. If you have to comply with criteria of this kind, in the end your field is reduced. It is clear that the places where you can publish are somewhat reduced and finally formal criteria or funding criteria or more strategic criteria are given greater importance than knowledge [...] And you cannot oblige the group, the big groups to change their publishing policies because in Europe we have decided to do things differently. And I agree, eh? With publishing Open Access, but it is clear, without making it obligatory.]

This contribution is like a complaint by the respondent. The first sentence is in the third person with an undetermined subject in its first part, then the respondent moves to the use of the second person, which is made explicit with the possessive adjective 'tu área' and direct object 'te va a leer', in addition to the verbs. She also uses an insert, the interjection 'uff', which in Spanish indicates some degree of annoyance or displeasure, which precedes her complaint. In the next sentences, she continues using the second person singular with the double intention of making her comments more impersonal while at the same time involving the listener, in this case, the interviewer, and she starts using expressions to make negative judgements, 'reduce', 'se va reduciendo', mitigated by 'un poco'. It is as if the respondent is gaining self-confidence as she speaks,

and she eventually gives her real opinion. Still using the second person singular, she rejects Plan S by indicating they cannot oblige researchers, especially important groups, to change their publishing policies to follow European rules. In this sentence, the speaker uses the first-person plural in the verb affix, it is an inclusive pronoun meaning ‘we Europeans’ excluding researchers and policy makers in other continents.

To conclude her argument, she begins by using a subordinate clause with the first-person pronoun to emphasize the object: *‘que me parece bien’*, followed by a response elicitor (Biber et al., 1999), *‘¿eh?’*, which has a speaker-centred role and whose only purpose is to elicit a sign that the hearer has understood, and finally the subject the direct object is subordinate to. This argument seems to be contradictory with what she has expressed so far, and she limits her statement, after a short pause, by means of a coordination conjunction, *‘pero’* and a comment word *‘claro’*, reinforcing her position, and a modal adverbial *‘sin obligar’*. It is the obligation to publish everything using Open Access she does not agree with.

Only two researchers maintain their argument in favor of Open Access when presented with the reasoning of some European researchers against this policy. Here is one of their answers.

- (4) Hombre, el argumento no parece descabellado, pero parece como un poco (pause 3”) como cuando uno es rígido y le traen algo nuevo y le cuesta cambiar su mentalidad y... Yo estoy acostumbrada a esto, no me, no me lo cambies, ¿no? Mmmh, puede ser que haya efectos de este tipo, pero no debería ser suficiente causa para no probar. Si después no funciona, siempre se puede volver y reconocer el error. (5BE)

[Well, the argument does not seem to be unreasonable, but it seems a little like (pause 3”), when you’re being inflexible, and are brought something new and it takes time to change your mind and ... [you say] “I am used to this. Don’t, don’t change it” ... don’t you? Mmmh, there may be this kind of effect, but it should not be sufficient not to try it. If eventually it does not work, they can go back and acknowledge their error.]

This researcher starts with a popular vocative expression in Spanish: *‘hombre’*, using it quite like a discourse marker, which somehow mitigates the following statement, presented with a double negative, *‘no’* and the negative adjective *‘descabellado’*, which conveys less strength than the corresponding affirmative statement (‘it seems reasonable’), also due to the use of the mitigating verb *‘parece’*. This double negative statement is followed by the coordinating conjunction *‘pero’* indicating restriction and

three mitigators: *'parece'*, *'como'*, *'un poco'* and a 3-second pause, during which the speaker seems to be thinking how to express her thoughts.

Then, she provides an example introduced by *'como cuando'*. This example consists of three parts: *'uno es rígido'*, *'le traen algo nuevo'*, *'le cuesta cambiar su mentalidad'*, which are linked by addition coordinating conjunctions. All three clauses have an impersonal third person subject or object. She refers to researchers, but it is also a general judgement about a certain type of personality. She tries to add another coordinated clause, but after a short pause, she uses reported speech. We know it is reported speech because of the sudden change to first person singular, the short pause before it and the question tag or response elicitor at the end followed by the hesitator *'mmmh'*. Through using reported speech in the first person, she adds more realism to her previous words; she narrates how a rigid researcher might react to Plan S, including the repetition of *'no me'* which is almost like begging to stop changes. The response elicitor *'¿no?'* is used again to find an agreement sign from the interlocutor.

The next sentence is a summary of her idea, *'puede que haya efectos de este tipo'*, in which an impersonal clause is used again, expanded by coordination with *'pero'* to indicate a consequence that should be avoided *'no debería ser suficiente causa para no probar'*, again mitigated by a double negative. Her final statement expresses the possible negative effect of introducing the policy, and the action that may accompany it, by means of a conditional clause with an elliptic subject, Open Access policy, and impersonal verbs in the second part: *'Si después no funciona, siempre se puede volver y reconocer el error'*.

This qualitative analysis provides the answer to RQ1 and RQ2. Answering RQ1, researchers make use of a wide range of resources to show appraisal in their responses in the interviews. They express positive and negative assessment with clauses rather than with single terms. Almost all assessment found is judgement (White, 2015), as it is addressed to human ethical behaviour. In addition, there are several examples of 'attitudinal invocation', as for example, the negative appraisal of *'empresa privada'* when referring to publishing houses, which seems to be implied.

Regarding graduation, there is a frequent use of mitigators and intensifiers, most of them referring to the 'strength' of words rather than to their 'focus'. As for the expression of graduation, the use of certain words (*'un poco'*) is complemented by inserts such as *'bueno'*, *'uff'*, *'mmb'*, as well as rhetorical question tags, with the intention of receiving some sign of agreement from the interlocutor.

Finally, the main linguistic resource used for engagement seems to be the choice of a personal pronoun either as a verb affix, or explicitly. The range goes from a wide use of impersonal forms (*'puede que haya efectos'*, *'uno es rígido'*, *'todo abre barreras'*) to the

explicit use of tonic pronouns in contrast to the verbal affix (Garcia Salido, 2008). The first person singular '*yo*' (*yo no soy partidaria*) seems to indicate personal opinion, and inclusive first-person plural '*nosotros*' adds the meaning 'we researchers'. '*Tú*', second person singular, is also frequently used, as a way to avoid personal engagement (as noticed by Myers & Lampropoulou, 2012), sharing the impersonal meaning with the involvement of the interviewer. There is also some use of hedging (Hyland, 2005), expressed with certain verbs, mainly '*parece*' or modal forms (*no debería ser suficiente causa*).

All in all, it is the linguistic and paralinguistic combination of attitude, graduation and engagement markers that provides the real meaning to the researchers' responses, as an answer to RQ1. In addition to linguistic resources, paralanguage in the form of pauses, repetition, slower speed, higher pitch, and elongation of syllables has contributed to the effect speakers meant to produce (RQ2).

Regarding RQ3, first, most respondents do not have a firm opinion about Open Access. They agree with the general idea but use graduation and engagement to mitigate their answers when they are invited to elaborate about their personal commitment, or just acknowledge their doubts. Only the two researchers who disagree with Open Access seem to provide solid arguments and to be more coherent in their reasoning, though they make it clear it is their opinion, which may not be shared by other researchers.

CONCLUSIONS

The objective of the research presented in this paper was to find out the resources used by researchers when giving their opinion about the new European Open Access policy by means of a qualitative study. The Appraisal verbal and non-verbal analysis of the interview responses in Spanish and Valencian by 10 researchers from a Spanish university shed some light on the hesitations and incoherent answers obtained.

Although the Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005) was primarily applied to the English language, this study has proved it is also valid for other languages such as Spanish and Valencian, provided specific aspects such as the use of pronouns instead of verbal affixes receive special attention. Moreover, the Appraisal framework also appears to be an appropriate tool to analyse not only written but also spoken discourse, such as that of interviews, when complemented with multimodal resources, like elongation of syllables, pitch and pauses.

The qualitative analysis provided by applying the Appraisal framework gives the answer to RQ1. The interviews seem to indicate that the researchers mainly assess human behaviour, namely judgement. Most relate Open Access with an ethical attitude, consequently assess it positively, and make use of personal engagement and mitigators when they must introduce negative assessment about the new European policy. Although the limited number of respondents does not make it possible to generalize, there seems to be a rejection of Open Access in the discipline of Law, as well as among the most experienced science researchers, who are used to high Article Processing Charges when publishing in top ranked journals and Gold Open Access. However, further research will be needed to confirm this first impression.

All in all, the analysis shows many doubts and much hesitation in the researchers' opinions expressed by appraisal verbal and non-verbal resources in their answers to RQ2. There are 'invoked' assumptions against publishing houses, presumably benefitting from researchers' work. It is surprising that, even though 35% of Spanish journals are Open Access (Abadal, 2014), no researcher in the study mentions them. It may be due to their low-ranking positions, though if pushed up ranking scales, they could be a good alternative to Gold Open Access, as most of them do not charge any fee.

Many of the researchers' interviews refer to the changes they may be faced with and their uncertain future if Plan S is implemented. On the one hand, they acknowledge there is no evident alignment between the criteria used by the Spanish national agency for research assessment (ANECA) and the COALition Plan S. On the other hand, it is not clear whether this Plan is in favour of Green or Gold Open Access and, if it is the latter, who is going to pay for it. It seems researchers believe it to be necessary that all policy and decision makers at different levels make an effort, first to reach a firm general agreement to use Open Access, secondly to align all policies to this agreement, and thirdly, to clearly explain its objectives and implementation procedures to researchers and stakeholders.

Despite the evidence encountered, this research has limitations, as only 10 Spanish researchers were interviewed. Further research would be necessary to corroborate these findings with a larger pool of participants and a deeper analysis of their opinions, if possible, with video recorded interviews, which would allow a more complete multimodal analysis including gestures, gaze, and face expression.

REFERENCES

- Abadal, E. (2014). Gold and Green: The debate on Open Access policies. *Contributions to Science*, 10(1), 89-93 [on line]. Retrieved from: <https://www.raco.cat/index.php/Contributions/article/view/88359> (last accessed 31 August 2021).
- Aloy Mayo, M. & Taboada, M. (2017). Evaluation in Political Discourse Addressed to Women: Appraisal Analysis of Cosmopolitan's Online Coverage of the 2014 US Midterm Elections. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 18, 40-48.
- Berlin Declaration (2003). [on line]. Retrieved from: <https://openaccess.mpg.de/Berlin-Declaration> (last accessed 31 August 2021).
- Bernad-Mechó, E. (2018). *A multimodal approach to metadiscourse as an organizational tool in lectures*. Castelló, Spain: Universitat Jaume I PhD Dissertation.
- Bernad-Mechó, E. & Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2019). Organizational metadiscourse across lecturing styles: Metadiscourse beyond language. In C. Sancho-Guinda (Ed.), *Engagement in professional Genres: Deference and Disclosure* (pp. 321-340). Pragmatics & Beyond Series. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Ltd.
- BOE (2011). Ley 14/2011, de 1 de junio, de la Ciencia, la Tecnología y la Innovación. BOE 131, 2nd June 2011 [on line]. Retrieved from: <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2011/06/02/pdfs/BOE-A-2011-9617.pdf> (last accessed 31 August 2021).
- BOE (2019). Resolución de 12 de noviembre de 2019, de la Comisión Nacional Evaluadora de la Actividad Investigadora, por la que se publican los criterios específicos aprobados para cada uno de los campos de evaluación. BOE 284, 16th November 2019 [on line]. Retrieved from: <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2019/11/26/pdfs/BOEA-2019-17008.pdf> (last accessed 31 August 2021).
- Breit, B. W. (2014). Appraisal theory applied to the wine tasting sheet in English and in Spanish. *Ibérica*, 27, 97-120.

- Brinkmann, S. & Kvale, S. (2014). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Budapest Initiative (2002). [on line]. Retrieved from: <https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/> (last accessed 31 August 2021).
- Cárcamo Morales, B. (2020). La variación en los resúmenes de medicina y lingüística: Un análisis desde la organización retórica y la teoría de la valoración. *Onomazein*, 47,1-26.
- Chek-Kim, L., Miin-Hwa, J. & Wharton, S. (2016). Expressing an evaluative stance in English and Malay research article conclusions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 21,1-16.
- COAlition (2018). Plan S. [on line]. Retrieved from: <https://www.coalition-s.org/about/> (last accessed 31 August 2021).
- COAlition (2019). *Plan S Principles and Implementation Guidance* [on line]. Retrieved from: <https://www.coalition-s.org/addendum-to-the-coalition-s-guidance-on-the-implementation-of-plan-s/principles-and-implementation/> (last accessed 31 August 2021).
- Crawford-Camicciottoli, B. (2007). *The Language of Business Studies Lectures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Crawford-Camicciottoli, B. (2015). Elaborating explanations During OpenCourseWare Humanities Lectures: The Interplay of Verbal and Nonverbal Strategies. In B. Crawford-Camicciottoli & I. Fortanet-Gómez (Eds.), *Multimodal Analysis in Academic Settings. From Research to Teaching* (pp.144-170). New York: Routledge.
- CRUE (2019). *Compromisos de las universidades españolas ante la Open Science* [on line]. Retrieved from: <https://www.crue.org/?s=Open+Access> (last accessed 31 August 2021).
- Fortanet-Gómez, I. & Bernad-Mechó, E. (2019). Análisis multimodales del discurso específico. Special issue. *Ibérica*, 37, 9-15.
- García Salido, M. (2008). La influencia de la accesibilidad referencial en el empleo de pronombres personales sujeto y objeto en español conversacional. *Boletín de Filología*, Tomo XLIII, 83-108.
- Grundlingh, L. (2018). Exploring the possibility of using Appraisal Theory to determine the legitimacy of suicide notes. *Lingua*, 214, 1-10.

- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to Functional Grammar* [4th ed, 2014]. London: Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192.
- Martin, J. R. & White, P. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moyano, E. (2019). Knowledge construction in discussions of research articles in two disciplines in Spanish: The role of resources of Appraisal. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 139, 231-246.
- Myers, G. & Lampropoulou, S. (2012). Impersonal you and stance-taking in social research interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 1206-1218.
- O'Halloran, K. (2011). Multimodal discourse analysis. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.), *Companion to Discourse* (pp.120-137). London: Continuum.
- O'Rourke, B. K. & Pitt, M. (2007). Using the technology of the confessional as an analytical resource: Four analytical stances towards research interviews in discourse analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(2), art. 3.
- Pinto-Santos, A. R., Villanueva-Valadez C. & Cortés-Peña, O. (2019). Percepciones del docente universitario sobre la comunicación científica de libre acceso. *Revista Española de Documentación Científica*, 42(2), e233.
- Querol-Julián, M. (2011). *Evaluation in discussion sessions of conference paper presentations: a multimodal approach*. Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing GmbH & Co. KG.
- Researchers (2018). A response to Plan-S from Academic Researchers: Unethical, Too Risky! [on line]. Retrieved from: https://forbetterscience.com/2018/09/11/response-to-plan-s-from-academic-researchers-unethical-too-risky/amp/?__twitter_impression=true (last accessed 31 August 2021).
- Roach, P., Stibbard, R., Osborne, J., Arnfield, S. & Setter, J. (1998). Transcription of prosodic and paralinguistic features of emotional Speech. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*, 28(1), 83-94.
- Ross, A. S. & Caldwell, D. (2020). Going negative: An Appraisal analysis of the rhetoric of Donald Trump on Twitter. *Language and Communication*, 70, 13-27.

Roulston, K. (2006). Close encounters of the ‘CA’ kind: A review of literature analyzing talk in research interviews. *Qualitative research*, 6(4), 515-534 [on line]. Retrieved from: <https://www.scienceurope.org/our-priorities/> (last accessed 31 August 2021).

White, P. R. R. (2015). Appraisal Theory. In K.Tracy (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction* (pp. 1-7). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

NOTES

¹ Valencian, the language used by some of the interviewees in this research, is very similar to Catalan. I will use Valencian when referring to the language used in the interviews in this study and Catalan as the general language.

² See Science Europe website <https://www.scienceurope.org/our-priorities/open-access/> (last accessed 31 August 2021).

³ All translations have been made by the author.