

# Ethos Guidelines:

## Ethos supports and attacks (2nd iteration)

(For the *EthosHansard2* corpus)

Rory Duthie

## 1 Context

Ethos is defined as the character of the speaker, in its original form this meant building one's own ethos through speeches made at the beginning of public address. To modernise this, ethos is considered as the character of a speaker which can be attacked or supported by other people or organisations. Within the UK parliament a prior ethos is already established due to the process in which a politician is elected to parliament. Annotation is conducted on Hansard UK parliamentary records.

## 2 Guidelines

- Ethotic statements should be annotated on a sentence level. This is to provide the relevant context for any support of or attack on ethos. All annotation must be split into sentences.
- An ethotic statement must contain the following:
  - A **TARGET ENTITY** in which the statement refers to. This can be a person or an identifiable group. For Hansard annotation the people identified must be a known political entity within the parliament. For example “Prime Minister”, “hon. Member for Bedford” or “hon. Lady” NOT “the president of France”, while this is a person it is outwith the context of the UK Parliament. The groups identified must also be political entities. For example “the Labour Party”, “Conservative Members” or “the Government” NOT “hon. Members”, “British Gas” or “the German Government”. While referring to “Conservative Members” is a generalisation this is on a small, identifiable scale, “hon. Members” is on large scale where it is impossible to determine which members. Companies and other countries again fall out of the remit of the UK parliament and while they have influence are not the subject of this annotation.
  - A **SOURCE SPEAKER** from which the statement has come from. This must be a person or an identifiable group. This must have the same restrictions as the TARGET.
  - **SUPPORT** of another entities character but not self referential. It puts in a positive frame the target's character or achievements, or supports their credibility explicitly. For example, “the hon. Member is right”, “the hon. Member is correct” NOT “I congratulate the hon. Member on their appointment”. While congratulations can show support in some cases, in this context it is merely politeness which is expected in the UK parliament. All supports must be explicitly stated on the linguistic surface of a statement.

OR

- **ATTACK** of another entities character but not self referential. It puts in a negative frame the target's character, attacking their credibility or associating them with events of a negative connotation explicitly. For example, “the hon. Member is wrong”, “that was a terrible speech by the hon. Member” NOT “the Scottish area of British Rail is one of the least reliable and punctual of all the areas in the British Rail federation”. Although this is an issue for parliament to discuss British Rail

is not a political entity and therefore should not be considered. All attacks must be explicitly stated on the linguistic surface of a statement.

- all statements not tagged as ethotic must be considered as Non-ethotic sentiment expressions (**n-ESEs**)

### 3 Examples

#### 3.1 Example 1 - ESE vs n-ESE

This example makes the distinction between ethotic statements and non ethotic statements while applying the tags from the guidelines.

Speaker positions:

Mr. Atkins Secretary of State for Northern Ireland.

Mr. Bradford Member of Parliament for Belfast South.

- (1) a. Mr. Bradford: *Will the Secretary of State accept that extradition is consequential on firm evidence being provided to the Eire courts and that the Act to which he has referred does not allow policemen to go in person to the courts to provide that evidence?*
- b. Mr. Bradford: *Will he demand that the RUC should be admitted to the Eire courts and that the criminals who are indicted there should be extradited to Northern Ireland?*
- c. Mr. Bradford: *If he does not agree to press for those measures, we shall have no alternative but to ask the Prime Minister to assume responsibility for security.*
- d. Mr. Atkins: *I am not sure that the hon. Gentleman is right in stating that witnesses, whether police officers or anyone else, are not allowed to attend courts in the Republic.*

- (1-a) **n-ESE**. Although here a point is asserted through the question it is not an attack on the minister rather a clarification that “the Act to which he has referred does not allow policemen to go in person to the courts to provide that evidence”

- (1-b) **n-ESE**. This is a direct question looking for further information from the minister.

- (1-c) **ESE**

– **SOURCE**: Mr. Bradford

– **TARGET**: Mr. Atkins

– **Ethotic Attack**. The source here is attempting to undermine the Ministers position by saying that the Prime Minister should have responsibility for his job.

- (1-d) **ESE**

– **SOURCE**: Mr. Atkins

– **TARGET**: Mr. Bradford

– **Ethotic Attack**. While not a convincing attack on ethos the Minister informs the target in this case that they are not right.

#### 3.2 Example 2 - ESE vs n-ESE

This example makes the distinction between ethotic statements and non ethotic statements while applying the tags from the guidelines.

Speaker positions:

Mr. King Secretary of State for Defence.

Sir Peter Emery Member of Parliament for East Devon.

- (2) a. Sir Peter Emery: *‘In view of my right hon. Friend’s answer to the hon. Member for Woolwich (Mr. Cartwright) on question No. 3, and the relationship that Germany must have to that, in the review that is being carried forward will he press the Americans to set a level for the troop requirements in Europe in conjunction with General Galvin and ourselves, as it is essential that we should be able to give a lead to the rest of NATO on what we believe is necessary for the proper defence of Europe even after the conventional force reduction treaties?’*
- b. Mr. King: *I am grateful to my hon. Friend.*
- c. Mr. King: *He is exactly right.*
- (2-a) **n-ESE**. While containing multiple entity references none of these entities are being attacked or supported, in reality they are used as reference points for multiple points of reasoning.
  - (2-b) **n-ESE**. While containing a positive sentiment and an entity, the positive sentiment is from politeness rather than support of character. In essence “I am grateful” could be replaced with “Thank you”.
  - (2-c) **ESE**.
    - **SOURCE**: Mr. King
    - **TARGET**: Sir Emery
    - **Ethotic Support**. Here Mr. King states that the prior statement by Sir Emery is right. This is a feature of ethotic language. See ethotic key words.

### 3.3 Example 3 - Ethos vs Logos

This example makes the distinction between ethotic statements and reasoning (logos) while applying the tags from the guidelines. When annotating ethos only and not taking into account the logotic context, we annotate **logos** as **n-ESE**.

- (3) a. Mr. John: *Since the major obstacle to extradition is the ability of those against whom extradition is sought to raise a political defence, does not the answer lie in the ratification by the Irish Republic Government of the European convention on terrorism?’*
- b. Mr. Atkins: *The hon. Gentleman is right on the latter point.*
- (3-a) **n-ESE**. Here there is reference to entities which are not relevant for the UK parliament. What we also see is logos where the conclusion is that “the answer lies in the ratification by the Irish Republic Government of the European convention on terrorism” which is supported by “the major obstacle to extradition is the ability of those against whom extradition is sought to raise a political defence”. What this reasoning allows is the use of supporting or attacking ethos in a particular context.
  - (3-b) **ESE**.
    - **SOURCE**: Mr. Atkins
    - **TARGET**: Mr. John
    - **Ethotic Support**. Mr. Atkins again supports Mr. John’s ethos by declaring he is right. We see the relation between ethos and logos where Mr. Atkins supports Mr. John’s ethos on the conclusion Mr. John has made.

### 3.4 Example 4 - Ethos vs Logos

This example makes the distinction between ethotic statements and reasoning (logos) while applying the tags from the guidelines. When annotating ethos only and not taking into account the logotic context, we annotate **logos** as **n-ESE**.

- (4) a. Mr. Kaufman: *Is the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Heseltine) further aware that the director-general of the National Federation of Building Trades Employers said that this was a further body blow to the building industry, which is accelerating into decline and has in prospect the worst recession since the war?’*
- b. Mr. Kaufman: *The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Heseltine) is a disaster to housing and is bringing about a disaster to the housing industry and he should resign.*
- (4-a) **n-ESE**. Although we have entity mentions again here there are not directly relating to ethos, rather the question is directed towards Mr. Heseltine but in a more assertive fashion. The whole question is rather a premise or using expert opinion to support the final conclusion.

- (4-b) **ESE**. Although this can be considered a conclusion in the reasoning. It also plays the roll of an ethotic attack on Mr. Heseltine. Mr. Heseltine is said to be a disaster and is told as a further point he should resign. Despite the clear relation between the logos and ethos here there is also a clear distinction in what each hope to achieve.
  - **SOURCE**: Mr. Kaufman
  - **TARGET**: Mr. Heseltine
  - **Ethotic Attack**.

## 4 Ethotic Keywords

Below is a set of ethotic keywords, character traits and situations which typically indicate ethos. While this set is indicative of ethotic support the opposite of any of the set can be applied for ethotic attack. E.g. the opposite of calm would be irate. The list is compiled from the following publications: ????

- Good moral character
- Know the right information and provide it
- Unselfish
- Graceful
- Calm
- Just
- Courageous (not rash)
- Noble
- Show moral excellence
- Contribute effectively
- Say what they think
- Have an ability for doing good
- Show self control
- Liberality (do good with money)
- Magnanimity (give benefits for others)
- Magnificence (produce something great in expenditure)
- Will always have the right response
- Sound knowledge of the subject
- Have knowledge sufficient for the purpose at hand
- Draw the right conclusions from their knowledge
- Sensible
- Have practical experience
- Have the right decision
- Concerned with doing or action
- Act with regard to human goods
- Able to deliberate well about moral goods not for one's own benefit
- In deliberation they command action
- Balance the moral good and bad

- Know what is good for man
- Use knowledge quickly and reliably
- Treat the audience the way they want to be treated.
- Show goodwill towards others
- Do not deceive
- Inclusive
- Care about who they represent and give good advice
- Consider what needs to be known
- Supply necessary information but do not repeat it
- Say what benefits something will achieve
- Self sacrifice
- Align with the audience
- Give good advice when it is known