A Multimodal Analysis of Negation in Princess Diana's *Panorama* Interview

Shatha Khuzaee and Gibreel Sadeq Alaghbary

Stylistic analyses of negation have traditionally and predominantly focused on linguistic texts due to lack of a well-defined tool for investigating negation in multimodal texts. To fill this methodological gap, the present study integrates the critical stylistics tool of negation in written texts with Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) framework of visual analysis to develop a tool for the analysis of negation in multimodal texts. This tool is named the *multimodal textual conceptual function of negation* (MTCFN) and is used to explore how multimodal meanings of negation are constructed in Princess Diana *Panorama* interview, broadcasted in 1995. The analysis revealed that the co-occurrence of language and images in the same text creates a co-text that regulates and determines the meanings of negation produced by both semiotic systems. The combination of the visual affordances of gaze direction, head tilts, and different shot types and angles helps reinforce and make coherent the meanings initiated through the verbal medium, thus creating a coherent and impactful multimodal narrative. The study concludes that stylistics holds significant potential for informing approaches to the analysis of multimodal texts and recommends that further research is carried out on other multimodal text types to test the explanatory adequacy of the proposed MTCFN tool.

Key words: Critical stylistics, visual analysis, negation, textual-conceptual functions

1. Introduction

Stylistics is a discipline that applies linguistic methods and tools to the analysis and interpretation of texts, where texts are understood as "a unit of language in use" (Jeffries & McIntyre, 2010; Halliday & Hasan, 1976), aiming to uncover how language choices shape meaning, structure, and effect. In recent years, different stylistic approaches have witnessed theoretical and methodological advances that have extended the scope of what stylistics can achieve as a discipline widening its primary concern to include non-literary texts. One recent development is *critical stylistics* (Jeffries, 2010), which brings together *critical discourse analysis* (Fairclough (1989, 1992, 2001) and stylistics, proposing a framework to account for meaning-making in different types of non-literary texts. An even more recent development is *multimodal stylistics*, which has expanded the circle of concern to include multimodal texts, including semiotic systems beyond language (McIntyre, 2008). It manifests a general tendency to develop methodologies that expand the stylistic tool kit with tools for the analysis of different text types (Nørgaard, 2014) e.g., films and children's books, and for different purposes, e.g., theoretical and pedagogical.

Multimodal stylistics adopts Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) framework as the social semiotic approach for the analysis of images, providing stylisticians with a consistent methodology and terminology for the analysis of language and images (Nørgaard, 2014, p. 471). However, the rise of multimodal stylistics highlights two concerns. The first is that the dominant focus in multimodal stylistics still remains on literary texts rather than non-literary texts (Khuzaee, 2019). To this point, Jeffries (2010) argues that even recent stylistic trends have focused on uncovering ideological meanings embedded in literary texts (p. 14). Despite the fact that Jeffries' (2010) approach introduces a new method to stylistically analyse non-literary texts, it has mostly been applied to the analysis of verbal (i.e. language-based) texts (e.g., Alaghbary, 2022, 2019; Ibrahim, 2018; Abeed, 2017). Thus, limiting the stylistic analysis to multimodal literary texts or verbal non-literary texts may produce an incomplete picture of what stylistics can achieve as a discipline and how multimodal analysis works stylistically (Khuzaee, 2019).

The second concern is that multimodal stylistic analysis, despite the development of methodologies that expand the stylistic toolkit, still lacks a comprehensive toolkit that can offer a systematic analysis of texts, literary or non-literary. This lack can be attributed to the idea that

while the linguistic analysis draws on a well-established toolkit that is "already well-described in very many semantico-grammatical theories and models" (Jeffries, 2010a, p. 14), visual stylistic analysis "still needs to develop, or systematically gather, its theoretical apparatus to start building a well-defined toolkit [of multimodal textual analysis]" (Khuzaee, 2019, p. 50). Another reason is that most of the available frameworks and methodologies are designed to analyse literary rather than non-literary texts, e.g., drama performance (McIntyre, 2008), films (Zurru, 2009), hybrid texts (Luke, 2013), and novels (Nørgaard, 2014). This, in turn, results in, a growing need to suggest frameworks that can handle the stylistic analysis of non-literary, multimodal texts.

In sum, research in multimodal stylistics needs to address two interrelated goals. First, it should extend the focus of stylistic analysis to include multimodal non-literary texts, in order to evaluate how well stylistic methods can be adapted or expanded for analysing a broader range of texts. Second, it should work toward integrating theoretical tools from visual analysis to build a more comprehensive multimodal toolkit—one that complements existing linguistic frameworks and can be applied consistently to both literary and non-literary texts. Towards achieving this goal, the present study adapts the critical stylistic textual-conceptual function of negation to the analysis of multimodal negation by introducing the *multimodal textual-conceptual function of negation* (MTCFN). This eventually aims to test the power of (critical) stylistics to account for negation in a non-literary multimodal text, viz., Princess Diana's *Panorama* interview in 1995. The introduction of MTCFN is a continuation of a research attempt to adapt the critical stylistic tools to the multimodal analysis of non-literary texts towards building a more comprehensive toolkit capable of performing systematic stylistic analyses of multimodal texts (e.g., Khuzaee, 2019).

The present study aims to fill this methodological gap and contribute to an already growing multimodal stylistic model for the analysis of multimodal texts. In these texts, language and image are treated as two distinct modes of representation, each operating within its own semiotic system—that is, an organized set of signs governed by rules specific to that mode (e.g., grammar in language, composition in image (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). Within each system, semiotic structures refer to the specific ways signs are arranged and function to produce meaning. By drawing on key principles from critical stylistics and visual analysis, the framework developed by Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) to analyse how visual elements like gaze and framing create meaning, semiotic systems and structures can be formally described to enable a more systematic and integrative analysis. Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

- How can critical stylistics and visual analysis synthesize to develop a multimodal textual-conceptual function of negation (MTCFN)?
- How efficient is MTCFN in investigating the construction of multimodal meanings of negation in Princess Diana *Panorama* interview broadcasted in 1995?

The structure of the remainder of the paper is as follows. The next section introduces the theoretical background to negation and surveys approaches to the multimodal analysis of negation in non-literary texts. This is followed by a description of the data, namely the 1995 Panorama interview with Princess Diana, and an outline of the analytical model, which examines the multimodal textual and conceptual functions of negation through both linguistic and visual resources. The subsequent section presents the analysis and results, and the paper concludes with a discussion of the main findings and their implications.

2. Theoretical background

The theoretical part of the current paper focuses on two points. The first is to present an overview of negation as a language phenomenon, outlining previous research on negation in non-literary texts. The second presents a discussion of the proposed method to the analysis of negation in non-literary multimodal texts composed of language and image.

2.1. Negation

Negation is a universal language phenomenon that has captured the attention of scholars in diverse fields including linguistics, logic, metaphysics, and the philosophy of language from Plato and Aristotle to date. It is used for various functions, including rejection, denial and conjuring up the non-existent (Tian, 2014). In light of this diversity of contexts, the definition of negation differs depending on the perspective from which it is viewed and the purpose of analysis (Nahajec, 2021). In linguistics, negation refers to the use of a negative element to reverse the truth value of a statement. For example, the affirmative sentence *He is coming* becomes negative as *He is not coming*. In philosophy, negation is often treated as a logical operation rather than an ontological claim—such as stating *Unicorns do not exist*, which logically negates the existence of something without asserting anything about its real-world presence (Heinemann, 1944). From a pragmatic perspective, negation is defined by its role in communication, particularly in denial or prohibition. For instance, a speaker might say *That's not what I meant* to deny an interpretation, or *Don't run!* to issue a prohibition (Nahajec, 2012). These different perspectives have given rise to multiple research approaches to negation as a general phenomenon.

Among these approaches to negation is *multimodality*: a recent approach to text analysis "drawn from social semiotics that understands communication and representation as more than language and attends systematically to the social interpretation of a range of forms of making meaning" (Jewitt, 2013, p. 1). It explores negation across different modes of meaning-making, such as spoken, visual and written modes, either simultaneously or in coordination. The present paper is concerned with the semiotic and semantic features of negation, rather than its pure grammatical, propositional or pragmatic features, and seeks to integrate these separate areas of research in proposing the MTCFN. To do this, Jeffries' (2010) approach to negation as a conceptual practice is adopted and integrated with Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) framework of visual analysis, drawing on van Leeuwen's (2005) concepts of *semiotic resources* and *affordances.* The former refer to the actions, materials and artefacts used for representational and communicative purposes (e.g., facial expressions) (Lyons, 2016, p. 1). *Semiotic affordance*, on the other hand, refers to the material and the cultural aspects of a semiotic resource: what can be expressed and represented easily with that particular semiotic resource (e.g., looking down) (Kress, 1993; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 123). Integrating these two concepts with the notion that images are texts, in the sense that they "display regularities that can be made the subject of relatively formal description" (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 20), enables considering these resources and affordances as those regularities that are "semiotically-charged organisations of material that can be employed for sign construction" (Bateman, 2011, p. 20).

Within this framework, the focus of the present study is on the semiotic resources of facial expressions and bodily expression selecting the affordances of *gaze* and *head movement* to build a two-stage model of visual negation. The first stage follows Barthes (1973) and Machin (2007) denotation-connotation model, focusing mainly on connotation. This stage is supported by Lewis' (2012) guide to interpreting bodily expression, specifically to explore the meanings behind various instances of gaze and head movement. The second stage adopts Kress (2007) and van Leeuwen's (2008) three-dimensional framework of *shot, gaze* and *angle* as depicted in images. This framework examines how different choices of shots and angles influence the interpretation of gaze and head movements. This interpretation is also supported by the co-occurrence of the instances of gaze and head movement with the accompanying verbal production of negation. A detailed account on this proposed model is presented in Section 3.2. This two-stage model puts the theoretical assumptions of semiotic resources and affordances into practical use exemplifying the principle of images as texts.

The analysis carried out in this paper focuses on how language and visuals produce meanings of negation, rather than on why they are producing them. In other words, the focus is on the descriptive features of negation, rather than their interpretation or explanation (Khuzaee, 2019). Given the critical stylistic dimensions, we focus on description to highlight two important

aims. The first aim is to draw attention, practically, to the interaction between semiotic resources, examining how language and images carry the required semiotic potential to make and produce negation, using specific affordances available in the underlying structure of the respective semiotic systems, thereby constructing a coherent portrayal of the speaker's identity. The second aim is to examine the capability of the theories of multimodality to develop and gather their underpinnings to account for making and producing meanings of negation using resources specific to the underlying structure of images. A detailed discussion on these aims is presented in Section 3.

2.2. Approaching the multimodal analysis of negation in non-literary texts

Research in stylistics has examined the concept of negation in literary and non-literary written texts from different theoretical and analytical perspectives. In literary texts, analyses of negation follow "traditional philosophical problems, such as the relation between negation and presupposition and the supposed ambiguity of negation" (Hidalgo-Downing, 2000, p. xix). Analyses of this kind use extracts from poetry, prose and drama, with the aim of exploring the presupposed positive expectations presented through negation. For example, Short (1996) offers an analysis of extracts from poetry, drama and prose where he designed a model that examines the discourse structure of these texts. His model distinguishes different levels on which negation is transmitted to the reader by the poet, narrator or character. Sweeter (2006), in a similar vein, examines the different ways in which negation can "foreshadow" future events at the narrative level.

Other studies introduce insightful methods to examine the use and effect of negation as a mental space. One such method is exemplified by Nørgaard (2007), which offers a qualitative analysis of negative polarity as a stylistic device in James Joyce's short story *Two Gallants* (1992 [1914]). Nørgaard provides evidence that this textual feature is a significant meaning-making resource, albeit not a salient feature in the text. Building on this method, Nahajec (2012) carried out a comprehensive study drawing on Jeffries' (2010) model of negation, aiming to explore the way the textual effects of negating can overlap with the textual practice of constructing opposition. Nahajec examined the textual and ideological effects of linguistic negation in literary and non-literary written texts, focusing on its semantic/propositional features and explaining syntax, logic and pragmatics in its interpretation. In a later study, Nahajec (2019) extended her analysis to cover the effect of multimodal context on the usual processes involved in making sense of utterances containing linguistic negation.

Research on negation in non-literary texts has, however, been considerably less prevalent, focusing on the effect of negation as a textual practice, in the construction and reproduction of ideological meanings. One notable example is the work of Hodge and Kress (1979), who introduced an approach, informed by *systemic functional linguistics*, to analyse ideology in news, drawing on non-linguistic insights. Another example is Jeffries' (2010) critical stylistic approach to negation, which presents it as "conceptual practice" that allows the speaker/writer to produce a hypothetical version of reality, thereby practicing a persuasive power on the reader/listener (2010, p. 106). Jeffries' approach represents a crucial development in the study of negation as textual practice, focusing on its propositional and semantic aspects rather than the narrow understanding of its grammatical qualities. Building on these studies, Nahajec (2012, 2021) presents a comprehensive analysis of different non-literary texts, including advertisements in the form of posters, political speeches, and newspaper reports and editorials exploring the various meanings constructed via negation. She focused on the potential of negation to create persuasive effects by projecting and reflecting expectations, as well as varying the pragmatic force of negation through form.

However, little research has been carried out on the visual analysis of negation. A few studies have proposed frameworks for the analysis of negation in images. One of these is that of Giora et. al. (2009), which introduces visual extra-diegetic negation markers to account for the way negation, suppression and retention are perceived visually in different images, elaborating

on their role in processing meanings of negation. Another attempt has incorporated insights from visual communication and cognitive science to explore the possibilities for visual expressions of negation. This study examined the applicability of the structural factors and the potential of these visual expressions to construct negation, demonstrating that "pictures can, in effect, say no" (Oversteegen & Schilperoord, 2014). Another attempt describes the kinesic ensembles that speakers perform when they express negation by analysing the coordination of hand and head gestures with grammatical negation in speech through ELAN annotation software (Harrison, 2014).

Despite the fact that these few attempts have elaborated on the potential of visuals to construct negation, their approaches are not applicable to deal with negation from a multimodal stylistic perspective. This is because the focus of the first two studies was only on the visual system, overlooking the significance of the co-occurrence of language and visuals in the same text and how they can jointly produce meanings of negation. While the study of Harrison (2014) accounts for multimodal negation, it does not qualitatively examine the way the underlying structures of language and image interact in constructing meanings of negation, as the present research does. Therefore, it is necessary to equip the multimodal stylistics framework with a toolkit that can handle the qualitative multimodal stylistic analysis of negation in texts where the underlying structures of language and image collectively produce the meanings of negation.

To help fill this gap, the present study draws on the analytical toolkits of critical stylistics and visual analysis. Both approaches are informed by Halliday's (1994, 2004) theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics that views language as a semiotic system, among many others, with semiotic resources shaped by social contexts. As a result, both approaches have shown integrative theoretical principles, making their cooperation to produce a multimodal tool of negation a possible outcome. These principles are related to the concepts of text, textual meaning, meaning-making, and co-text. Jeffries (2014) claims that "the tools of analysis that we need to perform all kinds of text analysis are the same" because all "texts make meaning in fundamentally the same way" (p. 408). On a similar vein, Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) propose that visual images can be read as texts because they "display regularities which can be made the subject of relatively formal description" (p. 20). These regularities suggest that "they have an underlying system that arranges them" (Khuzaee, 2019, p. 50) and that there is a "grammar of images" (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2006, 19). This suggests that the analysis of images as *texts* would be to explore how the visual semiotic resources and affordances are used to account for "what an image is doing in representing the world in a particular way" (Khuzaee, 2019, 50). Critical stylistics has this view as its central concern where analysis is performed to uncover "what the text is doing conceptually in representing the world in a particular way" (Jeffries, 2010, 2014, 2016) and "how resources of the linguistic system are…used to produce this conceptual meaning" (Jeffries, 2014). Therefore, both frameworks focus on demonstrating how the resources specific to the verbal and visual systems are used to make and produce meanings which construct a particular world view.

In addition, the notion of *co-text* is essential in arriving at a systematic stylistic analysis. According to Jeffries' (2014) this suggests that the meaning in the text is not made because of the underlying language itself but because of the use of that language in the overall text (p. 409). This notion is used here to suggest that the co-occurrence of language and image in the same text creates a sort of context, a multimodal co-text, that regulates and relatively determines the linguistic and visual choices of meaning in both forms. The "meaning in the multimodal text is not created because of the linguistic and visual features themselves but because of their co-occurrence and use in that text" (Khuzaee, 2019, p. 16). This notion also makes the meaning produced by language and image co-dependent on, and motivated by, each other in that the interpretation of the linguistic and visual meaning is regulated by the way it is used in the multimodal text. This view allows the analysis to limit the number of the possible interpretations suggested by the visual features an image might contain and introduces a more systematic method to address the issue of "infinite details" (Forceville, 2007, p. 1236).

As mentioned in Section 1, the present study explores the phenomenon of multimodal negation with the help of multimodal stylistics, contributing towards building a well-defined

toolkit capable of performing systematic stylistic analyses of multimodal texts. The *multimodal textual-conceptual function of negation* (MTCFN) tool is essential because of the ubiquity of negation as a semiotic phenomenon.

3. Methods

3.1. Data collection and analysis

The research data consisted of the Princess Diana famous *Panorama* interview from 1995, which lasts for 54:34 minutes (Archives Web, 2021). This was selected as the data for the study due to its frequent and varied occurrences of both linguistic and visual forms of negation, which provided a rich basis for applying the proposed analytical model across the two semiotic systems—language and image. Since the main aim of the study was to propose a tool for analysing multimodal negation in non-literary texts, the data must include a sufficient number of both linguistic and visual instances of negation to test the tool's practicality and adequacy. The chosen interview met this criterion, offering rich examples for analysis. The ubiquity of instances of negation allowed the proposed analytical model to operate on both modes of meaning making.

The interview transcript was arranged first as the linguistic component of the data, using the following three steps. First, the linguistic instances of negation were highlighted, numbered, and classified according to the three types of linguistic negation, explained in Section 3.2.1, and then analysed. Second, meaning patterns were discussed in relation to their recurrence and the underlying identity construction they represented. Finally, conclusions were drawn to present the textual meaning portrayed through the structures of linguistic negation.

Within the visual component, the interview was edited into distinct shots using *Monosnap* as the software tool to highlight the exact moments where instances of linguistic negation occurred. The visual shots, ranging from 3 to 9, that visualised each single linguistic instance of negation were analysed along with their linguistic counterparts. The patterns of meaning were classified and discussed in relation to the meaning initiated in the linguistic instances of negation. It is worth remarking that those shots were considered as visual texts, and that their interpretation depended on two essential criteria. First, every instance of possible visual negation was counted and interpreted on the basis of how all visual affordances, in that single instance, combined to present that particular meaning of negation. Second, the resulting interpretation was further understood according to its co-occurrence with its linguistic counterpart, adopting the notion of co-text to interpret the suggested meanings of negation constructed in the text-image. This step helped reduce the number of possible interpretations an image might suggest, leading to a more systematic analysis.

3.2. Analytical model: Multimodal textual conceptual function of negation

As mentioned in Section 2, this paper proposes the MTCFN to perform the multimodal textual analysis of negation. The adopted theoretical frameworks, critical stylistics and visual analysis, are employed in analysing the linguistic and the visual components of the interview, respectively, by examining the particular linguistic and visual semiotic resources used to produce meanings of negation and construct identity, as outlined below.

3.2.1. The linguistic resources of negation

We incorporated the textual conceptual tool of negation (Jeffries, 2010) to analyse the linguistic component of the interview. Negation in critical stylistics is a textual conceptual practice where interest is paid to the construction and interpretation of non-existent versions of the world created for a great many different reasons (ibid, p. 106). Three types of linguistic structures of negation were outlined: *syntactic, morphological* and *semantic negation*.

Within the first linguistic vehicle, negation is seen as a grammatical phenomenon and is realised by the well-identified range of negators (e.g., not, no, never, no one, nobody) (ibid, p. 108), as in examples (1-5), all taken from the data.

(1)   I'm *not* a destructive person
(2)   it caused *no* surprise
(3)   I would *never* let them down
(4)   *no one* sat me down with a piece of paper and said: This is what is expected
(5)   anything good I ever did *nobody* ever said a thing.

In the case of morphological negation, certain prefixes imply meanings of negation and are in a position to realise different negative meanings, as shown in (6-8).

(6)   Diana was *un*stable
(7)   I felt very *un*comfortable
(8)   I was *un*well

Within semantic negation, the semantic content of the words is responsible for expressing lexical meanings of negation. This structure type of negation depends on the notion that some words (e.g., depression, desperate) are inherently negative (Jeffries, 2010, p. 108), as illustrated in example (9). Here, the semantic content of the noun *pain*, the verb *hurt*, and the adjective *wrong* imply a non-existent world without pain, not being hurt and not asking for the wrong.

(9)   you have so much *pain* inside yourself that you try and *hurt* yourself on the outside because you want help, but it's the *wrong* help you're asking for.

One point worth noting is that while other studies have applied this critical stylistic tool to understand the various ideological or narrative reasons for creating non-existent versions of the world, its main focus, in this paper, was to present its power in constructing identity. This focus enabled us account for how the linguistic vehicles of negation create and produce these meanings and how they are reflected in the accompanying images.

3.2.2. The visual resources of negation

As mentioned in Section 2, we adopted Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) and van Leeuwen's (2005) account of semiotic resources and affordances, as well as the view of images as texts to develop a well-defined tool for visual negation. Due to space constraints, we limit the discussion to the basic, but essential, points regarding these semiotic features. Additional explanations are provided to expand on the definitions of semiotic resources and affordances from the theoretical section, clarifying what qualifies images as texts and how they are used to introduce the visual tool of negation.

As a result, the present research focuses on particular *visual affordances* available for the *semiotic resource* of *facial expressions* and *head movements* as the ones that participate and cooperate in the process of making and producing meanings of negation. The choice of these two affordances was based on two essential factors. The first was that they are the most ubiquitous affordances available in the data under analysis, as other affordances of gestures, torso and hand movements are almost not in operation. While previous body of research (Harrison, 2018, Streeck, 2013, Kedon 2004) stresses the importance of hand gestures in the analysis of verbal/nonverbal negation, we focused on other kinesics, especially facial expressions, to explore their role in making and producing meanings of visual negation. The second factor was that facial expressions have long been thought of as a hardwired human behaviour, supporting notions of a "universal language of emotion" (e.g., Izard, 1994; Matsumoto & Willingham, 2009). In contrast, Kress and

van Leeuwen (2006) suggest that facial expressions are more context-sensitive than so, and people become finely attuned to the reading of meanings conveyed by them (p. 129).

Putting these considerations together, a two-stage method was developed to account for visual negation. In the first stage, the basic denotation-connotation analytical steps of Barthes (1973) and Machin (2007) were adopted, with a focus on connotation where visual elements are used to express ideas and concepts. In the process of interpreting the connotative meanings of these visual features, Lewis's (2012) interpretation guide for "body language" was adopted to uncover the different meanings of facial expressions and head movements to arrive at the possible connotative meanings suggested by those visual affordances. In the second stage, we made use of Kress (2007) and van Leeuwen's (2008) three-dimensional framework of *shot*, *gaze* and *angle*, where each dimension, considered as affordances, functions as a semiotic resource that shapes how viewers relate to the represented participants and how meaning is constructed. *Shot size* conveys social distance: a close-up suggest intimacy; medium close-up emphasizes facial expressions while retaining some upper-body context to convey emotional content; medium shot suggests neutrality, while medium long shot balances focus between the subject and their surroundings, and a long shot shows the full body to convey objectivity and social distance. *Gaze*, on the other hand, indicates viewer's engagement: a direct gaze establishes as demand, while an indirect gaze functions as an offer. *Angle* reflects power relations: a high angle suggests subordination, while a low angle implies authority, and eye-level suggests equality. Together, these elements construct viewer-participant relationships and guide the interpretation of visual communication.

These semiotic affordances can be considered part of what Bateman (2011) described as the "paradigmatic systems of choice" together with the facial expressions and head movements as the "syntagmatic organisation for re-expressing paradigmatic choices in structural configurations" (p. 20). In this way, these affordances "allow making choices and combining them in expressions" in which "for each choice, there are several options from which to choose" (Hiippala 2013, p. 70). For instance, the use of a close-up (CU) shot, which shows the head and shoulders of the subject, captures facial expressions and head movement in a way that conveys strength or weakness of a character. This shot when used along with the facial expression of looking down and the head tilted downward suggests a negative identity construction that reinforces the verbal production of negation.

Consider the image shots shown in Figure 1. Here, the combination of close-up shots along with head tilted downwards, eyes closed (or half closed) directed downwards are the choices used by the visual system to account for weak and/or unconfident identity construction that coheres with verbal production of the utterance *Diana was unstable*. This head [tilt] gesture conveys an attitude of … submissiveness (Key, 1975, p.152). Looking down, although it might indicate cognitive processing or a momentary withdrawal to think, can also signal submission, defeat, guilt, deception all of which indicate a form of (semantic) negativity (Givens, 2002, p. 300). It is worth noting here that the frontal angle, with its meaning of involvement, used in the shots in Figure 1 was found redundant in making and producing meaning through negation.

Figure 1. Image shots showing features of "instability" and submissiveness, co-occurring with the verbal utterance *Diana was unstable*.

In comparison, the use of a medium shot (MS) along with gaze direction and the head tilt, as shown in Figure 2, result in another identity construction via negation when analysed in relation to their accompanying verbal counterpart of *I wasn't daunted, and am not daunted by the responsibilities.* These images connote different meanings due to the variations of gaze direction and head movement, combined with types of shots which are contextualised with the verbal production of negation, providing co-text that suggests a confident identity. This interpretation, in turn, provided the textual construction of the identity under analysis.

Figure 2. Image shots connoting different meanings, contextualised with the verbal expression of negation in the utterance *I wasn't daunted, and am not daunted by the responsibilities*

In the case of Figure 2, combining a medium shot with the eyes gazing straight leftward and the head in level position conveyed a sense of positive identity. In other words, medium shots and gaze direction and type along with head neutral tilt, being in level position, were treated as affordances used to account for the positive identity construction through negation. In general, it was not the presence of structures that underlie the linguistic and/or visual negation in the multimodal text itself that determined the overall meaning, but the way they were used and combined in the production of two different meanings of textual constructions through negation.

In sum, the focus in the linguistic analysis was on how different structures of negation in the data that resulted in two main identity constructions of positive/negative and/or strong/weak representation. The visual analysis concentrated on the way the accompanying shots react to the linguistic meaning and contribute to a unified visual construction through the underlying visual structures of negation, represented by the affordances of gaze and head tilt. In Section 4, the linguistic and visual analysis are presented separately.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Linguistic analysis of negation

Table 1 shows 127 instances of verbal negation across the three linguistic structures: syntactic, semantic and morphological. As can be seen, semantic negation was the most prevalent linguistic structure. Syntactic negation followed, while morphological negation was the least frequent appearing only 7 times. Independently of this, we categorized if each linguistic expression was used to construct the identity of Princess Diana in two primary ways: as positive or as negative, depending both on the underlying meanings of the structures, and their contextual usage.

Table 1. Frequencies and distributions of linguistic structures of negation – and how they correspond to positive or negative identity construction

Type of linguistic negation	Frequency	Positive identity construction	Negative identity construction
Syntactic	47	33	14
Semantic	72	14	59
Morphological	8	1	7
Total	127	48	79

As shown in Table 1, and motivated by the following analysis, we can see that the of syntactic choices (47 occurrences) of negation, the majority were used to construct Princess Diana positively as confident, strong and decisive (33). On the other hand, in the cases of semantic (72) and morphological (8) negation, most of the instances were major choices for constructing her negatively as weak, defeated and unstable (59 and 7, respectively). Based on the frequencies, it is evident that the negative identity pattern was more prevalent than the positive one in the transcript, above all in the semantic and morphological negation. Positive identity, however, was also constructed with the help of negation. We discuss each case in the following two subsections.

4.1.1. Negation in the construction of a negative identity

Semantic negation was reflected in the inherently negative meanings conveyed by the adjectives, nouns, and adverbs that contributed to the negative portrayal of a weak, defeated and unconfident identity (10-14). Considering the grammatical function of the adjectives in these examples, they

operated as subject complements, describing the princess as *confused*, *devastated*, *fat*, *chubby*, *tired*, *exhausted*, and *desperate*. When the implied meanings of these adjectives were taken into consideration, the identity was constructed as unconfident, weak, undesirable, and confused.

(10)   I was *confused*
(11)   I was absolutely *devastated*
(12)   I was a *fat*, *chubby* 20-year-old
(13)   I was constantly *tired*, *exhausted*
(14)   I was *desperate*.

Examples (15-17) illustrate the case of negative nouns. Focusing on the semantic implications of these nouns, they inherently suggest negative connotations associated with the princess, such as having *bulimia* and being described as a *problem* or an *embarrassment*. These nouns contributed to constructing a negative portrayal rather than a positive one. In the case of verbs, similar meanings emerged, as shown in examples (18-20). The particle verb *finished off* in (18) is usually used to refer to the act of destroying someone or something that has already been injured or damaged. In the context of the example, the use of this verb suggests that the princess was already facing significant difficulties and the royal duties (represented in the example by the pronoun *it*) ultimately contributed to "destroying" her.

(15)   I had *bulimia* for a number of years
(16)   I was a *problem*, I was liability
(17)   I was almost an *embarrassment*.
(18)   It practically *finished* me *off*
(19)   I *did inflict upon myself*
(20)   I was *crying out* for help

     In terms of morphological negation, observed seven times, the examples consist of adjectives serving as subject complements that frame her identity negatively. This is demonstrated in examples (21–23).

(21)   I was *unwell*
(22)   you felt *misunderstood*
(23)   I was again *unstable*

In these examples, it is the prefixes *un-* and *mis-* attached to the adjectives that conveyed the negative meaning and participated in constructing a weak and negative identity. The overall textual meaning of weakness and negativity accumulated through the repeated use of these prefixes in contexts where the Princess recounted her various experiences. As a result, these two linguistic features were consistently employed throughout the interview, portraying the princess in a negative way.

4.1.1. Negation in the construction of a positive identity

As seen in Table 1 there were 48 instances that constructed Princess Diana's identity as positive, strong and decisive. Of these, 33 instances used the syntactic structures, including the negative particles *not*, *no*, *never* and *no one*, to depict the Princess as positive, confident and decisive, as shown in examples (24–29). These examples show that the different syntactic items were used to represent the Princess as strong (24, 29), confident (25, 28), and decisive (26, 27).

(24)   I wasn't daunted, and *am not daunted* by the responsibilities
(25)   I *never had had depression* in my life
(26)   I was *never* going to hurt anyone; I was never going to let anyone down.

(27)   I *do not* want a divorce
(38)   I've *never* encouraged the media.
(39)   I'm *not* a destructive person

The remaining 15 instances involved semantic and morphological structures that contributed to constructing her positively. The use of these structures emerged in contexts concerning her royal position, mental health, friends, perspectives on divorce, ties to the media, and overall personality, as illustrated in examples (30–31). In these examples, meanings of strength and confidence were reflected in the semantic potential of the adjectives. For example, *confusing an enemy* implied a strong and undefeated character. Similarly, being *unaware* of particular content of a book suggested a confident identity that did not accept accusations.

(30)   you should always *confuse* the enemy.
(31)   I was totally *unaware* of the content of the book

4.2. Visual analysis of negation

Examination of the visuals that accompanied the verbal instances of negation led to the identification of 152 shot groups that were collected to visualise the exact moments when verbal instances of negation were produced, as shown in Table 2. Each shot group consisted of 3-9 shots to capture the exact moment that visualised one verbal negation. This variation in the number of shots was linked to the type of representation (negative, positive), which served as the primary source of analysing multimodal negation in our analysis.

Table 2. Frequencies of visual constructions of negation

Type of shot group	Frequency	Negative representation	Positive representation
Long Shot (LS)	1	Neutral	0
Medium Long Shot (MLS)	1	0	1
Medium Shot (MS)	25	9	16
Medium Close Up (MCU)	61	45	16
Close Up (CU)	64	52	12
Total	152	106	45

Almost all shot groups were interpreted as constructing either a negative or positive identity. The two patterns of identity construction depended on the interplay and overlap of the meaning suggested by each shot group, in relation to the visual affordances provided by facial expressions and head tilts. As can be seen in Table 2, the most frequent shot groups in the data were close-up (CU) and medium close-up (MCU) shots, with 64 instances for the former and 61 for the latter. This was followed by medium shots (MU), which appear 25 times. Long shots (LS) and medium long shot (MLS) are the least frequent, each appearing only once. The ultimate meaning of negation was determined by the combination of elements at the second level and their interpretation at the first. More details on their negative/positive meanings are provided in the following two sub-sections.

4.2.1. Negative visual identity construction

The negative visual identity was primarily constructed through the dominant use of close-up and medium-close up shot groups, with 52 occurrences for the former and 45 for the latter. To a lesser extent, this pattern was also constructed through the use of medium shot, with 9 occurrences. The negative meanings associated with these two shot types arose from the combination of these two shot groups with various facial expressions and head tilts, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Visual construction of negative identity

Angle	Frequency	Head tilt	Frequency	Gaze	Frequency
Frontal	86	Up	1	Up	3
Horizontal	22	Down	26	Down	44
Vertical	0	Right side	17	right	0
		Left side	77	Closed/Half	15

The frequent use of head tilts down (26 occurrences) and left side (77 occurrences), gaze down (44 occurrences), and eyes closed or half closed (15 occurrences each) played a significant role in constructing a negative identity. These visual clues were linked to the verbal construction of a weak, unconfident and defeated identity. For example, as stated earlier, the princess revealed that *I had bulimia for a number of years* (example 15 above). When this verbal statement was being made, it was represented visually as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Image shots of the Princess admitting having bulimia, contextualised with the verbal expression of a negative identity

The facial expressions in Figure 3 include looking down with the eyes almost closed in the last two shots, accompanied by the head tilted downward to the left side, align with the context where semantic negation suggests an inherently negative feature *bulimia*. Together, these elements represent the multimodal textual construction of negative identity. All of these visual affordances were depicted in close-up shot, which served as the ideal paradigmatic choice for the syntagmatic presentation of gaze and head movement.

In another instance, the use of morphological negation was also accompanied by the same visual features that appeared in the data with a negative verbal construction. As mentioned earlier, the princess stated that she *was unstable* (example 23).

Figure 4. Image shots of the Princess expressing instability, reinforcing negative identity

In the close-up shots in Figure 4, the head is tilted downward, accompanied by eyes half closed and then fully closed, along with an additional facial expression, i.e., pouting lips. These visual affordances co-occur in the context where the verbal production of morphological negation (negative adjective *unstable*) was made. Together, these verbal and visual resources worked in tandem in constructing the multimodal meaning of weak and defeated identity.

The use of medium close-up shots had also conveyed similar meanings due to their co-occurrence with verbal negation that constructed a weak or unconfident identity. For example, the verbal statement *I was a problem, I was liability* (example 16), is accompanied by the shots in Figure 5.

Figure 5. Image shots of the Princess stating that *I was a problem, I was a liability*

In Figure 5, the medium shots include the visual affordances of the head tilted left and downward, with eyes gazing downward, which accompanied a verbal production through semantic negation portraying a defeated identity. The analysis here does not aim to explain why these shots and visual affordances co-occur, as the focus is on how meanings of multimodal negation were constructed, rather than discussing the rationale behind their selection.

The analysis has shown how different visual affordances were combined and coordinated to produce meanings of negation that cohere with those conveyed by the verbal mode through its affordances of negation. This resulted in the construction of one dominant identity: a negative

one. The following section will explore how other affordances of the same semiotic resources cooperate with verbal production to construct a positive identity.

4.2.2. Positive visual identity construction

As in the case of the verbal constructions (see Section 4.1), positive visual identity had fewer instances than the negative one and was constructed via the use of close-up, medium close-up shot groups and medium shots, with 12 occurrences for the first and 16 occurrences for the second and third each. The positive meanings that arose from using these three shot group types were created through the combination of these shot groups with different gaze direction and head tilts, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Visual positive identity construction

angle	Freq.	head tilt	Freq.	gaze	Freq.
Frontal	22	up	2	up	5
horizontal	22	down	0	down	2
Vertical	0	Forward	2	right	0
oblique	0	backward	0	Left	16
Rear	3	Left side	14	closed	0
High/low	0	Right side	10	Half closed	0
Total	47		28		23

The noticeable absence of head tilts down (0 occurrences) and eye closed or half closed (0 occurrences) from the visual affordances that accompanied the verbal production of negation in the construction of a positive identity was textual evidence that these affordances were used in the construction of positive and strong identity. Instead, the visual affordances involved the head tilted upward and gaze directed upward and to the left, which accompanied verbal productions where a positive identity was presented. For example, it has been demonstrated that syntactic negation was a way of constructing a positive identity for the princess, as in *I wasn't daunted, and am not daunted by the responsibilities* (example 14).

In the shots shown in Figure 6, the use of a medium shot, combined with the visual affordances of gaze direction to the left side (rather than downward), a straight head tilt, and the pose, cooperated in constructing a positive identity. In another instance, it was the use of the syntactic feature *never* that helped construct a strong identity, as seen in the example *I never encouraged the media* (example 28). While this verbal negation was being produced, the shots shown in Figure 7 co-expressed this positive identity visually. Here, the medium close-up shot, frontal angle, head drawn back and tilted to left side, with the gaze directed in the same direction, constructed the meaning of disagreement and protest which in turn depicted a strong and confident personality.

Figure 6. Image shots depicting a positive identity through gaze, shot, pose and head tilt

Figure 7. Image shots connoting a strong identity through shot, angle and head tilt

Further, the use of close-up shots co-occurring with the verbal production of *I do not want a divorce* shown Figure 8 also supported such positive identity construction. The use of a close up shot, frontal angle, head tilted back, gazing to the left side, and the flattened lips created an indication of refusal

Figure 8. Image shots connoting a strong identity through refusal

.

Based on this analysis, it is evident that positive identity meanings were constructed through the two visual affordances of gaze direction and head tilts, in combination with their verbal counterparts. This co-occurrence provided a sort of co-text that allowed for a more thorough and precise interpretation. The next section presents the main concluding remarks of the paper.

5. Conclusions

The primary aim of this article has been to propose a tool for the analysis of negation in non-literary multimodal texts. In doing so, the study addressed two research questions. The first sought to ascertain if critical stylistics and visual analysis can be synthesized to develop a multimodal textual conceptual function of negation (MTCFN). The use of the proposed tool in analyzing Princess Diana's Panorama interview has shown how the semiotic resources available in both verbal and visual modes can work together to construct multimodal meanings of negation, depending on the semiotic affordances available for the underlying system in each mode. The analysis has revealed that the co-occurrence of language and images in the same text creates a co-text that regulates and determines the meanings of negation produced by both forms.

The second question sought to examine the efficiency of the MTCFN tool in investigating the construction of multimodal meanings of negation in the data. The findings revealed that in the analysed text, the three linguistic structures of negation – syntactic, semantic and morphological – construct two distinct identity patterns: positive and negative. These influenced by the underlying meaning of the linguistic structure, but notably, there was not a one-to-one relation between linguistic construction and type of identity construction, since it was the use of the linguistic markers in context that determined the type of identity. For example, semantic negation in statements like *I had bulimia* and morphological negation in *Diana was unstable* expressed a negative identity, but there were also cases of positive identity like *you should always confuse the enemy*. Conversely, syntactic negation, such as *I was not daunted* and *I never encouraged the media*, was most often used to construct a positive and confident identity, but there were also cases to the contrary.

The analysis has also highlighted the way images interact with these linguistically expressed identities. The combination of the visual affordances of gaze direction, head tilts, and different shot types and angles helped to reinforce and make coherent the meanings initiated through the verbal medium. Specifically, downward head tilts and half or fully closed eyes tend to accompany negative linguistic constructions, whereas a neutral head position and direct gaze trigger positive linguistic constructions.

The analysis and discussion presented in this paper demonstrate that the discipline of stylistics holds significant potential for informing and shaping approaches to the analysis of multimodal texts. By adopting the notions of image-as-text, textual meaning, and co-text, we have demonstrated how stylistics can enrich the toolkit for the analysis of multimodal negation. Furthermore, the analysis has revealed the capacity of the visual system to leverage a conceptual

framework that can refine and expand the theoretical apparatus of stylistics, thus enabling the introduction of new tools geared towards the analysis of negation in non-literary multimodal texts.

Additionally, by employing the concepts of semiotic resources and semiotic affordances, in combination with the afore-mentioned tools, this article has demonstrated that the integration of visual semiotics and multimodal stylistics can provide a systematic framework for analysing the interplay between language and image in non-literary texts. The proposed tool offers a theoretical foundation for scholars interested in offering deeper insights into the multi-layered meanings of negation produced by the combination of verbal and visual forms in multimodal texts.

There are several limitations to acknowledge, however. First, for purposes of relevance to the aims of the paper, the analysis has focused on a limited set of visual affordances, such as gaze direction, head tilts and shot composition. There are other visual affordances, such color saturation, lighting, space, etc., that were not explored in this study. Further research can expand the tool by incorporating additional visual features towards offering more nuanced and comprehensive multimodal analyses of negation. Another limitation concerns the analysis of a specific set of verbal examples. The choice was influenced by the concept of co-text, which necessarily limits the choice of examples to those that corroborate or contradict the visual meanings. Further research can test the tool on other forms of communication, from print media and advertisements to films and other visual-verbal compositions. Further research can also examine audience reception to meanings uncovered by multimodal analysis and whether different viewers from different cultural backgrounds than ours, and with varying ideological outlooks, would have have arrived at the same or different conclusions.

Acknowledgements

References

Abeed, M. (2017). *News representation in times of conflict: A corpus-based critical stylistic analysis of the Libyan revolution* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Huddersfield).

Archives Web. (2021, December 15). *Princess Diana and Martin Bashir HD version! Interview on Panorama* [Video]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/100064318891630/videos/458110482504341/

Alaghbary, G. S. (2019). Ideological positioning in conflict: The United States and Egypt's domestic political trajectory. In M. Evans, L. Jeffries, & J. O'Driscoll (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language in conflict* (pp. 83–102). Routledge.

Alaghbary, G. S. (2022). *Introducing stylistic analysis: Practicing the basics*. Edinburgh University Press.

Barthes, R. (1973). *Mythologies*. Paladin

Bateman, J. A. (2011). The decomposability of semiotic modes. In K. L. O'Halloran & B. A. Smith (Eds.), *Multimodal studies: Multiple approaches and domains* (pp. 17–38). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203828847

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power.* Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In R. M. Wodak, M. (Ed.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 452-487). Sage Publications Ltd.

Forceville, C. (2007). Multimodal metaphor in ten Dutch TV commercials. *Public Journal of Semiotics, 1*(1), 15–34. 10.37693/pjos.2007.1.8812

Giora, R., Heruti, V., Metuki, N., & Fein, O. (2009). "When we say no we mean no" (Decker, 2007) (emphasis added): Interpreting negation in vision and language. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(11), 2222–2234. 10.1016/j.pragma.2008.09.041

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Mathiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Arnold.

Harrison, S. (2014). The organisation of kinesic ensembles associated with negation. *Gesture, 14*(2), 117-140. https://doi.org/10.1075/gest.14.2.01har

Harrison, S. (2018). *The impulse of gesture*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108265065

Heinemann, F. H. (1944). The meaning of negation. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, 44*, 127–152. https://doi.org/10.1093/aristotelian/44.1.127

Hidalgo Downing, L. (2000). *Negation, text worlds and discourse: The pragmatics of fiction*. Ablex.

Hiippala, T. (2013). *Modelling the structure of a multimodal artefact* (PhD thesis). Department of Modern Languages, University of Helsinki. http://hdl.handle.net/10138/41736

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1979). *Language as ideology*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Izard, C. E. (1994). Innate and universal facial expressions: Evidence from developmental and cross-cultural research. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*(2), 288–299. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.115.2.288

Jeffries, L. (2007). *Textual construction of the female body: A critical discourse approach*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Jeffries, L. (2010). *Critical stylistics: The power of English*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Jeffries, L. (2014). Critical stylistics. In M. Burke (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of stylistics* (pp. 408-420). Routledge.

Jeffries, L. (2016). Critical stylistics. In V. Sotirova (Ed.), *The Bloomsbury companion to stylistics* (pp. 157–176). Bloomsbury.

Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture: Visible action as utterance*. Cambridge University Press.

Key, M. R. (1975). *Paralanguage and kinesics*. The Scarecrow Press.

Khuzaee, S. (2019). *A multimodal textual analysis of nonliterary texts: A critical stylistic approach*, Doctoral dissertation. University of Huddersfield.

Kress, G. (1993). Against arbitrariness: The social production of the sign as a foundational issue in critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 169–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002

Kress, G. (2007). *Multimodality: Exploring contemporary methods of communication*. Routledge.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. Routledge.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Lewis, H. (2012). *Body language: A guide for professionals*. SAGE Publications India.

Luke, J. A. (2013). *Writing the visible page: A multimodal approach to graphic devices in literary fiction*, PhD thesis, Queensland University of Technology.

Lyons, A. (2016). Multimodality. In Z. Hua (Ed.), *Research methods in intercultural communication: A practical guide* (pp. 268–280). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119166283.ch18

Machin, D. (2007). *Introduction to multimodal analysis*. Arnold.

Matsumoto, D., & Willingham, B. (2009). Spontaneous facial expressions of emotion of congenitally and noncongenitally blind individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014037

McIntyre, D. (2008). Integrating multimodal analysis and the stylistics of drama: A multimodal perspective on Ian McKellen's *Richard III*. *Language and Literature, 17*(4), 309–334. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947008095961

Monosnap software tool version 5.1.18 retrieved from https://monosnap.com/download/win

Nahajec, L. (2012). *Evoking the possibility of presence: Textual and ideological effects of linguistic negation in written discourse,* Doctoral dissertation. University of Huddersfield.

Nahajec, L. (2019). Song lyrics and the disruption of pragmatic processing: An analysis of linguistic negation in 10CC's *'I'm Not in Love'*. *Language and Literature, 28*(1), 23–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947019827072

Nahajec, L. (2021). *Negation, expectation and ideology in written texts: A textual and communicative perspective*. *Linguistic Approaches to Literature, 38*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lal.38

Nørgaard, N. (2007). Disordered collarettes and uncovered tables: Negative polarity as a stylistic device in Joyce's "Two Gallants." *Journal of Literary Semantics, 36*(1), 35–52. https://doi.org/10.1515/JLS.2007.002

Nørgaard, N. (2014). Multimodality and stylistics. In M. Burke (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of stylistics* (pp. 471–484). Routledge.

Oversteegen, E., & Schilperoord, J. (2014). Can pictures say no or not? Negation and denial in the visual mode. *Journal of Pragmatics, 67*, 89-106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.03.009

PBS. (n.d.). *Interview with Martin Bashir on Princess Diana: A BBC Panorama special*. PBS. https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/royals/interviews/bbc.html

Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the language of poems, plays, and prose*. Longman.

Streeck, J. (2013). Interaction and the living body. *Journal of Pragmatics, 46*(1), 69-90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.10.010

Sweetser, E. (2006). Negative spaces: Levels of negation and kinds of spaces. In S. Bonefille & S. Salbayre (Eds.), *Proceedings of the conference "Negation: Form, figure of speech, conceptualization"* (pp. 313-332). Publications universitaires François Rabelais. https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pufr.4851

Tian, Y. (2014). *Negation processing: A dynamic pragmatic account* (Doctoral dissertation). University College London (UCL).

Tottie, G. (1991). *Negation in English speech and writing: A study in variation*. Academic Press.

van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Zurru, E. (2009). A linguistic and multimodal analysis of the construction of the character of Anton Chigurh in *No Country for Old Men*. *Language & Literature Studies, 251*. https://doi.org/10.18485/bells.2010.2.13

About the authors

Shatha Khuzaee is a senior lecturer of Linguistics at the Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, Samawah, Al Muthanna University/Iraq. She holds a PhD in Linguistics from the University of Huddersfield, UK. She is also a member of the MA courses in the College of Education for women, Qadisiya, Al Qadisiya University/Iraq. Her research interests include multimodality, multimodal stylistics, critical stylistics, textual stylistics, textual analysis, visual grammar, social semiotics, and critical discourse analysis.

sthatha.salih@mu.edu.iq

Gibreel Sadeq Alaghbray is Associate Professor of English at the Department of English Language and Literature, Colleges of Languages and Humanities, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia. He is also Professor of English at the Centre for Languages and Translation, Taiz University, Yemen. He served as a Fulbright post-doctoral fellow and adjunct faculty at San Diego State University, USA, in 2013. His research covers multimodal stylistics and the analysis of textual ideology, with a focus on political discourse. He is author of "Ideological Positioning in Conflict" in the Routledge Handbook of Language in Conflict, 2019, and "Introducing Stylistic Analysis: Practising the Basics" by Edinburgh University Press, 2022.

g.alaghbary@qu.edu.sa