CONSTRUCTING THE CONSENT OF ANIMAL PRODUCTION

The representation of pigs in a smallholding magazine

Pauliina Nevala

Maisterintutkielma

Englannin kieli

Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden laitos

Humanistinen tiedekunta

Jyväskylän yliopisto

Kevät 2020

Tiedekunta – Faculty	Laitos – Department
Humanistinen tiedekunta	Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden laitos
Tekijä – Author Pauliina Nevala	
Työn nimi – Title Constructing the consent of animal production – The discursive representation of pigs in a smallholding magazine	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli	Työn laji – Level Maisterintutkielma
Aika – Month and year 5/2020	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 102

Kasvava kritiikki tehotuotannon ympäristövaikutuksia kohtaan yhdistettynä eläinten hyvinvointiin liittyviin kysymyksiin on lisännyt kiinnostusta vaihtoehtoisesti tuotettuihin eläinperäisiin tuotteisiin, kuten luomulihaan. Tätä taustaa vasten käsillä oleva tutkimus pyrkii selvittämään, heijastavatko pientilallisille suunnatun brittiläisen *Country Smallholding* -aikakauslehden diskurssit vaihtoehtoisen eläintuotannon pyrkimyksiä eettisempään lihantuotantoon. Tutkimus pohjaa kriittisen diskurssintutkimuksen perinteeseen sekä ekolingvistiikkaan, joka on nouseva tutkimusala ja kiinnostunut ihmisen ja luonnon välisten suhteiden kielellisestä rakentumisesta. Tutkimus selvittää, millaisin kielellisin keinoin sikoja kuvataan aikakauslehden artikkeleissa, minkälaisia diskursseja niistä rakentuu ja kuinka nämä diskurssit luovat ja ylläpitävät yhteiskunnan ideologisia rakenteita ihmisen ja tuotantoeläimen välisistä suhteista.

Tulokset osoittavat, että aineistossa vallitsi kaksi samanaikaista diskurssia. Hallitsevampi diskurssi tuki vallitsevaa käsitystä sioista tuotantoeläiminä esittämällä ne ”elottomina”, tavarankaltaisina objekteina. Tässä diskurssissa eläimiä esimerkiksi arvotettiin tehokkuuden ja tuottavuuden näkökulmasta. Toinen diskurssi esitti siat subjektiivisina olentoina muun muassa kuvaamalla ne toimijoina lihantuotantoprosessissa.

Näennäisestä ristiriidastaan huolimatta kumpikin diskurssi tuki lihantuotannon päämäärää. Vaikka siat esitettiin toisessa diskurssissa subjekteina, myös sen päämäärä on oikeuttaa sikojen riisto. Tähän diskurssiin niveltyi ajatus siitä, että eläimen voi tappaa, mikäli se on elänyt hyvän elämän. Tämän vuoksi kyseisessä diskurssissa myös korostettiin eläinten hyvinvoinnista huolehtimista. Tutkimuksen tulokset heijastavat laajempia yhteiskunnallisia muutoksia ihmisten ja eläinten välisessä suhteessa. Enää lihantuotantoa ei oikeuteta ihmisen moraalisella ylemmyydellä ja oikeudella valjastaa luonto omaan tarkoitukseensa, vaan se tehdään eläinten hyvinvointia korostavilla diskursseilla.

Asiasanat – Keywords
Critical Discourse Analysis, CDA, Ecolinguistics, production animals, pigs, animal agriculture, magazines
Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX
Muita tietoja – Additional information

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

Animals are assimilated into human societies in many different areas; some we share our homes with and treat as close members of the family, others become products that can be found on our dinner tables or worn as clothing items or accessories, while still others spend their lives in laboratories as research animals. While all these animals exist independently, their existence is determined by humans to a large extent. Thus, there is nothing inherent to a cow which defines it "food" or, similarly, no characteristic about a dog that makes eating the animal deplorable while keeping it as companion justifiable – the process through which animals are incorporated into human world or socially constructed has concrete implications for the animals and affects how they are seen and treated by people (DeMello, 2012: 10). The basis for placing animals in certain categories (food, companion, wildlife…) is dependent on their perceived use and, therefore, the categories reveal less about the nature of a species and more about how the animals relate to humans (Glenn, 2004: 66). This results in a situation where different codes of conduct are applied to different categories accordingly: "Violence to cats and dogs would result on criminal prosecution but not defined as so in farms." (DeMello 2012: 143).

Although animals are constructed differently in society, the commonality between all the animal species is how they figure in relation to humans. When the history of humans and animals is examined, it becomes evident that it is characterised with notions of dualism, separation and human exceptionalism. Indeed, humans have always been occupied with questions about animals, and how they have been perceived has developed throughout centuries and continues to do so to this day. The divide between humans and animals has been enforced by biblical and classical Greek accounts as well as western philosophy (DeMello, 2012: 37–39). For instance, Descartes (1596–1650) regarded animals as having no soul, thus operating mechanically akin to machines (Aaltola, 2013: 17). However, throughout history, there have been alternative voices, too: these have emphasised the shared experience of life between humans and non-human animals. For instance, the Greek philosopher Plutarkhos criticised the violence towards animals and considered it a grave obstacle for moral progress in humans, while Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832), the founder of utilitarianism, emphasised the importance of sentience in the moral treatment of animals (Aaltola, 2013: 9–10). Dualism was fundamentally questioned by developments in evolutionary biology and the works of Darwin (1809–1882) who acknowledged the impossibility of inherent separation between humans and animals and emphasised continuity and connection (DeMello, 2012: 41–41).

Regardless of the biological reality of continuity between species, including humans, the demand for philosophical justification of the human-centred world view persists and is broadly based on two main arguments. The first claiming that humanity, the human condition in itself, provides adequate justification for moral superiority, while the second argument ties together cognitive abilities and moral worth, pointing to the supposedly unprecedented ability of humans in possessing language and self-consciousness. (Aaltola, 2013: 17–18).

Thus, the pervasive presence of animals in human societies is characterised by notions of dualism and separation which has rendered them invisible in much of scholarly enquiry (DeMello, 2012: 5). In other words, animals occupy a place in society which positions them as subordinate beings, oftentimes serving a specific purpose (e.g. food, research, companion), in accordance with the notions of dualism that position humans at the top. Therefore, while animals have been used as tools for research in the past, mostly for vivisections and other experiments, the study of non-human animals in their own right is a relatively new enterprise. As an interdisciplinary field Human-Animal Studies, also known as HAS, has made extensive progress in combining research conducted in humanities, social sciences and natural sciences to create an understanding of the multidimensional ways human lives intersect with animals (DeMello, 2012: 4). Indeed, Human-Animal Studies has taken considerable strides in bringing animals into the attention of researchers in order to re-examine the historical trajectory that separates "us" from "them".

The field of linguistics, however, lags behind, and especially discourse studies has been relatively slow to acknowledge the role of language in representing animals and, ultimately, contributing to constructing the society's shared understanding. Indeed, while the socially constructed nature of animals is culturally contingent and the result of historical trajectories, it is, nevertheless, carried out linguistically. Simply put, the way we talk about certain animals can either reaffirm or contest society's perception and understanding of them. Therefore, language provides an influential tool to communicate our social values, and norms, including those related to the uses of animals (Glenn, 2004; Smith-Harris, 2004). The emerging field of Ecolinguistics has, however, taken up the challenge of uncovering the discursive representation of animals (Cook, 2015: 588). Adapting many of the conventions of Critical Discourse Analysis, Ecolinguistics is committed to an ecological framework against which it evaluates certain linguistic practices and worldviews and how those amount to either preserving or undermining the natural world (Stibbe, 2014: 118).

As mentioned before, the linguistic study of animal discourse is still in its infancy and many scholars have noted the lack of comprehensive knowledge on the topic (Cook and Sealey, 2017: 311). Although not extensive, studies have been conducted especially on discourses within

intensive animal farming industries, i.e. the production model aiming at maximizing production while minimizing expenses, or discourses communicated to potential consumers of animal-based products. The focus on discourses produced in factory farm conditions is understandable, since most people in industrialised countries encounter animals on a daily basis as "products" of the food industry. When animals appear on the shelves of supermarkets as an extensive selection of products, they are packaged in ways that bear little resemblance to their living counterparts. Indeed, when the process through which a cow becomes beef is removed from sight, people have limited experience or knowledge on where their food comes from. The invisibility of production animals can be seen as contributing to the high level of exploitation in many farms (Carter and Nickie, 2011: 113). Generally, research conducted on factory farm discourse concludes that animals are consistently represented as objects producing products. Therefore, the language used to describe them ensues this incentive; animals are denied individuality and objectified through a variety of linguistic means. For instance, deploying the metaphor of machinery discards sentience and reduces animals into inanimate objects and defines their worth based on profitability (Croney and Reynnells, 2008).

Linguistic research on animal discourses in the context of intensive farming is valuable in creating an understanding on how these practises are sustained on the level of language. However, increasing interest in the ecological impact of animal farming, responsible for 14,5% of global greenhouse gas emissions in 2015 (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), coupled with concerns for the wellbeing of the approximately 80 billion animals slaughtered each year (Ritchie and Rocher, 2020) have increased the demand for alternatively produced animal products, for instance organic eggs and grass-fed beef. The present study attempts to respond to these current trends, while simultaneously drawing from previous research in Ecolinguistics. In other words, by taking on the perspective of small-scale animal farming, the aim of this study is to add to the growing pool of knowledge on the discursive representation of farmed animals. More specifically, my aim is to determine whether or not discourse produced by alternative models of food production less committed to producing massive quantities of products with minimum resources, differ in how they represent animals from representations discussed in previous research, and whether the available discourses promote or hinder the wellbeing of the animals.

The study of discourses that surround farmed animals can contribute to creating critical language awareness which enables individuals to perceive how established ways of speaking construct certain realities (Stibbe, 2014: 119). This knowledge is especially important for those directly responsible for creating and distributing discourses, and they provide a useful tool for

reassessing whether the message sent out is accurate in depicting the reality of animal production. Indeed, the language used to represent animals plays a role in how they are perceived and valued by those who interact with them, and although the present study focuses on a restricted area of human animal interaction, creating awareness is an important step towards establishing discourses on animals that challenge harmful perceptions and give way alternatives that promote wellbeing. Since research has shown that industry-specific ways of speaking about farmed animals tend to gloss over the sentience and suffering of animals, a focus on an alternative farming model potentially reveals representation that are in concurrence with its practices. This could mean, for instance, encouraging the construction of animals as individuals, rather than referring to them as groups, or promoting subjectivity and agency by describing animals as 'doing' instead of merely 'being'.

I will begin the next section by introducing the theoretical perspective of Human-Animal Studies, after which the discussion will turn to Ecolinguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis which provide the linguistic background for the present study. I will close off section 2 by positioning my study in relation to previously conducted research. Section 3 will lay out my aims and research questions as well as the method for analysing my data. Following, sections 4 and 5 provide a detailed linguistic analysis of the uncovered discourses on pigs with examples from data to illustrate my findings. In section 6, I will discuss and evaluate the results in relation to my research aims and previously conducted studies and, lastly, section 7 will conclude the present study by examining the implications of my findings and suggesting aims for future research.

2 BACKGROUND

This section locates the present study within the fields of research that are relevant to its approach and aims. Firstly, I will describe the theoretical perspectives that provide my analytic framework and, secondly, discuss previous research on farmed animals in sociology and linguistics in order to position my work in relation to the current pool of knowledge.

2.1 Theoretical perspectives

The theoretical framework for the present study draws on the work conducted in the rather broad field of Human-Animal Studies, in order to understand the socially constructed role of animals in today's society. Human-Animal Studies has gone to great lengths in order to map out the contradictions that govern the relationship between humans and other non-human animals which allow for simultaneously perceiving animals as sentient creatures and objects and tools of use. In addition, HAS attempts to uncover how these contradictions have become so embedded in culture that they remain largely uncontested by most people (Arluke and Sanders, 1996: 5). Ecolinguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis complement the ideas of Human-Animal Studies by offering a specifically linguistics perspective for analysing the construction of production animals and the discourses that are central to humans' understanding of them. Animal discourses can be considered an area of interest in Ecolinguistics which utilizes many of the same concepts of traditional CDA, especially related to the idea of power and dominance carried out through language use. Together the perspectives provide both the baseline understanding for the present study which rejects the socially constructed role of farmed animals as inevitable or natural, and also enables the critical examination of discourse in order to uncover the role of language in constructing and maintaining the society's shared perception.

2.1.1 Human-Animal Studies

The theoretical perspective of the present study is influenced by and draws on those fields of study that have placed the interactions of humans with animals in the foreground of academic enquiry. Human-Animal Studies (HAS) is an interdisciplinary field which has combined insights from humanities, social sciences and natural sciences to map out the ways in which human lives intersect with animals' and identify those spaces (mental and physical) that animals occupy in human

societies (DeMello, 2012: 4). HAS provides an extensive account on the historical aspects of human-animal interaction, for example, discussing the trajectories that have been influential in establishing the current understanding that people share about the different animal categories and the values assigned to them. In addition to providing descriptive accounts, the critical branch of Human-Animal Studies attempts to deconstruct the social meanings imposed on animals as the result of various historical and cultural processes. Thus, HAS aims at actively engaging in political decision making to shape human-animal relations in the future (DeMello, 2012: 16, 28). Despite its commitment to animal welfare and to improving the positions animals occupy in human societies, theoretical positions that take a more critical and ideological stance have also emerged within the field. Animal Studies, in particular, places the concept of human exceptionalism at the centre of its inquiry by outlining its pervasiveness in the way humans think and relate to animals (Waldau, 2013: 2). This line of thinking is strongly committed to opposing the exploitation of animals that arises from the ideology of humans at the top of the natural world (Carter and Nickie, 2011: 2–3). Although not specifically focused on the linguistic aspect of human-animal relations, research fields that are concerned with animal related issues routinely comment on how language use can be employed to mask exploitation and enable animal suffering (Carter and Nickie, 2011: 129).

This study adheres to the idea that animals are socially constructed, meaning that although existing in nature, once animals are incorporated into human societies, they are assigned meaning and value as well as placed in categories that define their existence. The socially constructed nature of animals has little to do with their physical reality, therefore, it is entirely a human concept and often the result of an animal's use to humans. (DeMello, 2012: 10). More specifically, when humans assign meaning to animals, they tend to place them in categories which represent their constructed reality; pets, farm animals, research animals and wildlife are all examples of categories that in many ways determine how animals are seen by people. In general, both HAS and Ecolinguistics recognise animals as socially constructed and attempt to get to the core of this phenomena and understand what affects representations have on the lived reality of animals. It is often emphasised that Western consumers make a strong divide between animals categorised as companions and as food (DeMello, 2012: 49). The former is given a subjectivity and high degree of cultural visibility, while the latter is approached as an object and has low cultural visibility (Stewart and Cole, 2009: 460–461).

While there are classification systems that characterise animals based on their biological reality in natural sciences by grouping together those who share the most resemblance physically, the social categorisation of animals that is widely accepted in society is not necessarily

based on the biological similarity. According to Arluke and Sanders (1996: 169), the main motivation of categorising animals is based on how well the animal performs their expected social role. This way of categorising animals is called the sociozoological scale. Based on this idea, animals can be classified as "good" or "bad". "Good" animals consist of those species who surrender to the domination of humans and comply with this position. This category includes animals regarded as "tools" such as laboratory animals and farmed animals, which are routinely constructed as lesser beings with reference to capacity for emotions and experiencing pain. (Arluke and Sanders, 1996: 169–173). Of course, it is important to understand that when animals are seen as accepting their subordinate position, it reflects human perception of the animals' behaviour since the reality is, they have non-existent possibility for contesting this position (Arluke and Sanders, 1996: 170). "Bad" animals, on the other hand, include pests whose position as a subordinate is ambiguous and they do not remain distant from people, in other words, they break the boundaries between human and non-human set by people (Arluke and Sanders, 1996: 175–178).

The sociozoological scale has remained influential in determining the value and the moral worth attached to animal, and ultimately their accepted treatment. De Jonge and van den Bos (2005: 135) applied the sociozoological scale in their discussion regarding the killing of different animals and concluded that the position of each animal on the scale reflects the perceived acceptability to kill them. Pets are placed high on the scale and, thus killing them is deemed morally reprehensible, while the instrumental role of livestock animals result in almost a unanimous acceptance for their routine slaughter (De Jonge and van den Bos, 2005: 136). However, this idea is not always as straightforward since the acceptability is strongly associated with the perceived role of the animals; killing a stray dog is not as morally condemned as that of pet dog, and slaughtering livestock as a preventative measure for the spreading of disease is not as justified as slaughtering for food (De Jonge and van den Bos, 2005: 138). This provides an interesting perspective for the present study: pigs as livestock animals fall under the category of "good" animals on the sociozoological scale, and in order to fulfil their role, livestock animals are assigned tool-like status. However, the peculiar nature of small-scale farming, discussed more thoroughly is section 2.2.2., allows for a personal connection with animals and potential for diverging from the traditional category of livestock, thus assimilating the positions of production animals and companion animals

Although humans are scientifically classified as belonging to the Kingdom of Animalia and are, therefore, biologically animals, the everyday use of the term excludes humans from this category (Cook, 2012: 591). Therefore, the term animal is used to refer to all other living beings, except people to whom the term human is reserved exclusively. This can be understood a

way to maintain the divide between humans and animals created by notions of human exceptionalism. Research that takes a critical stance in examining the role of animals in society abandon this notion that humans are somehow separate from the rest of the animal kingdom and reintroduce the biological reality that connects humans to other animals (Waldau, 2013: 19–20). Therefore, the term 'non-human animal' recognises the fact that humans are not categorically separate but rather in continuum with other species. The present research acknowledges the potential that the terms 'human' and 'animal' have in increasing the separation by establishing a binary distinction between the two. However, I will employ the terms regardless in a conscious manner to make apparent the widely accepted usage in order to aptly criticise it.

2.1.2 Ecolinguistics

The field of Ecolinguistics can roughly be divided into two areas based on the specific definition of the ecology of language(s). More specifically, the term 'ecology', the eco- part of Ecolinguistics, can be understood as a metaphor according to which languages are considered equivalent to species. The object of study in this approach is the interaction between different languages, with specific reference to, for example, how certain languages become extinct and how endangered languages can be protected (Alexander and Stibbe, 2014: 107). Thus, the idea of biological diversity translated into linguistic terms is at the centre of this strand of Ecolinguistics. However, these topics are also studied under the term 'ecology of languages' (Fill and Stephensen, 2014: 8). In contrast with the metaphorical or symbolic understanding of ecology, the second strand of research takes on the literal meaning of the term, thus concentrating on the natural and biological ecology, the flora and fauna (Alexander and Stibbe, 2014: 107). More specifically, as Alexander and Stibbe (2014: 107) put it, ecology is seen "as the life-sustaining relationships between humans, other organisms and the physical environment".

Regardless of the different understandings of the term ecology and the rather different topics of research, there have been arguments in favour of combining the two strands of Ecolinguistics into a consolidated field. It has been suggested that Ecolinguistics could be seen as a unified platform where language phenomenon could be studies from a shared point of view as submerged in immense interconnected network. (Do Couto, 2014: 127). According to Do Couto (2014: 126), one of the most prevailing interests of research in this field relates the criticism of industry discourse and the use of unecological language (e.g. vocabulary and grammar), which subscribe to the above mentioned definition of ecology as the relationship between humans and the natural environment. These topics of research are also closely related to the object of the present

study. Thus, my understanding of Ecolinguistics relates exclusively to the study of language in relation to the natural environment, thus disregarding the strand of Ecolinguistics which was referred to above as the ecology of languages. Despite this position taken in this study, I do not reject the idea of Ecolinguistics as a field combining these two strands, but note that, according to my knowledge, a comprehensive framework for such a field is yet to be agreed upon (Do Couto, 2014: 126). Therefore, due to the close similarity of my research topic with one of the two strands of Ecolinguistics and a lack of a unified field combining both strands, it is justified to draw on insights from one understanding of ecology of linguistic research, while simultaneously acknowledging the diversity of the field.

Having made the distinction between the metaphorical and literal meaning of ecology in linguistics research, it is worth discussing the field of Ecolinguistics in more detail. Research in the field is grounded on the idea that language is not passive in reflecting reality but contributes to shaping it. According to Halliday (2001: 179), the combined impact of both grammar and vocabulary is what "shapes experience and transforms our perception into meaning." In other words, language, as a combination of different elements, makes meaning possible but also restricts the potential for creating meaning to its terms (Halliday, 2001: 179). This understanding of language is a prerequisite for Ecolinguistics. Such a view is central in Fill and Penz's (2017: 3) definition of the field as the analysis of the role of language concerning the environment with a specific focus on the impact of language and discourse in describing and creating environmental problems, but also the potential in alleviating these problems. Stibbe (2014: 118) provided another detailed definition which builds on out the two "parts" of Ecolinguistics, the first of which is comprised of linguistic analysis of varying devices and mechanisms which create a specific worldview, while the second part reflects this analysis with an ecological framework by analysing how the worldview mediated by language contributes to preserving or undermine the conditions that support the ecosystem. Along the lines suggested by these researchers, taking an Ecolinguistic approach to linguistic research involves the analysis of current uses of language and discourse in relation to the natural environment. As mentioned previously, linguistic analysis of discourse is made meaningful by reflecting it with an ecological framework, also referred to as an 'ecosophy'. In general, the ecosophy of Ecolinguistics rejects the idea of humans at the centre of nature and attempts to emphasise the interrelatedness of human life with animals, plants and the physical environment (Stibbe, 2012: 139). However, it is the task of each researcher to define their understanding of the ecological framework against which they reflect the world.

The emergence of Ecolinguistics is connected with a wider ecological turn in social sciences where ecological aspects are included as part of social research in order to understand the interconnectedness of environmental aspects with social issues (Stibbe, 2014: 2). Halliday's speech 'New Ways of Meaning: The Challenge of Applied Linguistics' at the AILA congress in 1990 (2001), can be considered an impetus for interest in the ecological aspect in linguistics. Halliday introduced the historical trajectory through which English has moved towards favouring an increasingly abstract and objectified reconstruction of experience (Halliday, 2001: 182). More specifically, he concluded that the lexicogrammar (grammar and vocabulary combined) of contemporary English constructs a view of the world that is no longer sustainable; our demand for the planet's resources has extended the supply (Halliday, 2001 :191). Thus, different features of English combined construct experience in a way that we as humans think that we can continue to expand indefinitely and exploit other living beings and the physical environment.

Thus, the unsustainable nature of contemporary English is the result of combining different features of the language, and not only of making specific word choices or grammar patterns. As an example of such features, Halliday introduced 'growthism' as deeply encoded into English: growth is considered positive and desirable (Halliday, 2001: 192). The idea of growth as positive allows for constructing a worldview, alongside other lexicogrammatical features, where expanding indefinitely is perceived inevitable. At the same time, this process is achieved at the expense of the natural world. According to Goatley (2001: 204), ordinary language use is incongruous with scientific insight into the biological universe and humans' relatedness with the rest of the natural world, meaning that the way in which we speak about the world is marked by a lack of representing matter as active and human life as inseparable from it. More specifically, Shultz (2001: 110) discussed three main linguistic devices which enable the commercial use of the environment by labelling it a resource and, as a result, encouraging exploitation. One of the devices is the use neutral words to describe exploitation that diverges from the reality of actions; 'development' is one such example where the process through which development occurs lacks any recognition of the potential harm caused on the environment which ultimately enables development. Closely related to Shultz's ideas is the concept of anthropocentrism which can be defined as a philosophical view that construes nature mainly or exclusively through human terms; the value of nature is defined by its usefulness to humans (Heuberger, 2017: 343). An example of anthropocentric language in English is countable and uncountable nouns and especially the use of uncountable nouns in reference to animals and plants, thus representing them as renewable resources that can be exploited indefinitely (Heuberger, 2017: 343).

The examples discussed above represent some of the key findings in Ecolinguistic and provide a starting point for mapping out the different ways grammar and vocabulary construct a worldview where humans are placed at the centre of the biological universe and where exploitation of nature is justified. In addition to revealing patterns that are harmful for the continuity of life on earth, Ecolinguistics is also committed to transforming these established discourses by introducing alternative ways of relating to the world outside us. According Goatley (2001: 212), considering the increasing effects of global warning, it is of utmost importance and urgency to identify the damaging impact of environmentally harmful discourses that are continually circulated by text and language. Stibbe (2014: 119) also addressed the role of Ecolinguistics in not only uncovering linguistic patterns but in creating critical language awareness. Critical language awareness refers to the practical application of information of the correlation between language and ecological destruction. This information can be used to influence policies in, for instance, educational context and provide ideas for redesigning or producing alternative texts in the future. (Stibbe, 2014: 119). Indeed, detecting the patterns of language that are harmful to the environment needs to be combined with practical alternatives to the status quo in order to create change.

Therefore, Ecolinguistics can be considered a field of research focusing on the role of language in representing and constructing our understanding of the natural world and humans' place in it. One area of interest that has emerged from the field is specifically focused on language concerning animals and, more specifically, farmed animals. Indeed, since Ecolinguistics takes as its central focus the impact of language use on other living beings, farmed animals can be considered as an area that is greatly impacted by human actions. Stibbe (2012: 15) concluded that as intensive animal farming is damaging the wellbeing of these animals as well as the environment at a such a large scale, there needs to be a constitutive shift in our understanding on how we perceive these animals. Therefore, the way we construct animals through language has a significant effect on how we treat these animals and, as a result, on their wellbeing.

The Ecolinguistic study on farmed animals draws a great deal on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and on the areas of interest within it that have included research on the role language in maintaining power and dominance of oppressed groups. Ecolinguistics points to the similarities between "traditional" power imbalances and the relationship between humans and other non-human animals by rejecting the idea that dominance can only be impactful between different groups of people (Stibbe, 2012: 21). This exclusion of animals from linguistic research has been argued to relate to their inability resist power imbalances constructed in discourse by engaging in activism. However, CDA is committed to taking the side of the least powerful who are inevitably

those who lack ability to defend themselves, the animals (Stibbe, 2012: 21). It is important to bear in mind that most if not all, interactions between humans and non-human animals include varying degrees of dominance since, as mentioned above, there is a strong tendency for humans to categorize and define nature and other creatures based on their perceived usefulness. However, the dominance of humans over those animals who are categorised as food provides the most striking example of power and exploitation, since it demands the confinement and routine slaughter of vast numbers of animals worldwide.

The Ecolinguistic research into farmed animal discourses has revealed persistent ways of representing animals that allow for continuing their intensive use that is characteristic of the current state of affairs especially in the context of factory farming. Trampe (2001) has discussed the representation of living beings as resources and the tendency to value these animals based on economic principles and, thus, to overlook ethical concerns. In such representations living beings are reduced to objects who can be produced and utilized. A similar discourse has also been noted by Stibbe (2012: 28) who argued that the discursive construction of animals as resources disregards the inherent suffering involved in especially intensive farming practices; as a resource an animal is awarded a status of an inanimate object and is, therefore, considered unable to suffer. Objectifying animals and representing them as resources that can be utilized appears as one of the overarching tendencies in discourses that address these animals. The specific linguistic devices through which this representation is mediated are discussed in more detail in section 2.2.3.

Discourses about farmed animals are influential in creating and maintaining a shared understanding on the value and worth of the lives of non-human animals. Ecolinguistics combined with Critical Discourse analysis provides a theoretical framework for the detailed linguistic analysis of the texts under investigation in this thesis. With such an approach it is possible to reveal the underlying tendencies in socially constructing those animals that are destined to end up on our plates. More specifically, Ecolinguistics sees the power imbalance between humans and animals as inherently problematic to the animals themselves and to the environment. The present study also subscribes to this position by questioning the justification of commodifying and slaughtering sentient beings.

2.1.3 Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis is based on the perception that language is not merely a neutral tool for describing and reflecting reality but influential in shaping the world around us. More specifically,

social norms and conventions as well as contextual factors influence and restrict language use, while language simultaneously shapes the organisation of knowledge, collective and individual identities (Pietikäinen, 2008: 197). Thus, the relationship between language and society is a dialectic one and language is an inherent aspect of social practices (Wodak, 1997: 17; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999). The dialectic relationship between society and language and the consequential nature of language use constitutes the particular interest of CDA, with regards to its societal impact.

Discourses contribute to shaping how we see the world as well as how we act in it, and their influence is realised both on the individual and collective level (Lynn, 2010: 84). However, the interest of CDA is not merely descriptive: rather than modelling the semiotic features that constitute certain discourses, it attempts to disclose the effects and meanings behind the availability of discourses. This interpretive and explanatory aspect of CDA both sets it apart from descriptive linguistic research and constitutes the "critical" aspect of discourse analysis. Essentially, CDA can be understood as drawing together aspects from linguistic theories due to its distinct focus on language and texts (both spoken and written) as well as from social sciences, especially related to the understanding of discourse as socially constructive and constraining (Pietikäinen, 2008: 192).

Due to its inherently critical point of view of language as a social practice, CDA is particularly interested in the interconnectedness of power, ideologies and discourse (Meyer and Wodak, 2001: 2). Discourses as an element of social practice have the potential to maintain established power relations in society. At the same time, due to the dialectic relationship between language and society, discourses can also challenge routine practices of power and dominance and, as a result, contribute to social change (Wodak, 1997: 9). Discourses can be regarded as embedded with some elements of power, since specific ways of perceiving aspects of reality always represents it from a specific point of view, while also concealing others. However, the most influential way through which power is manifested in discourse is via concealment. More specifically, certain discourses, or ways of perceiving the world become naturalised so that they are regarded as reflecting reality rather than constructing it (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999). In other words, some discourses gain the position of 'common sense', and as a result, the power and dominance embedded in them is concealed. Rather than regarding them as manifestation of power in the first place, they are seen as "just the way things are" (Fairclough, 1995: 43). However, issues of power and dominance in discourse are never neutral, although their position as common sense might denote this, since there are always some who gain from the hegemony, and others who are

disadvantaged by it. In other words, there are those who inflict dominance and those who submit to it as a result (Fairclough, 1995: 82).

According to Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999), the ability of language to mystify unequal relations of power constitutes the ideological nature of discourses. Ideologies are sets of practices that structure our perception of reality and the arrangement of norms and conventions (Groling, 2016: 119). According to Fairclough (1995: 73), "[l]anguage is a material form of ideology, and language is invested by ideology". In other words, the ideologies that are established in a society are realized through language and discursive practices. It is important to note that CDA subscribes to a critical understanding of ideology as obscuring from perceiving reality, and therefore, ideologies are a vessel of power and dominance (Pietikäinen, 2008: 202). Thus, discourses sustain power relations by concealing them as natural, however, the participants of social practices maintain the perception that their actions as guided by their own free will (Groling, 2016: 120). From the point of view of the present research, the aspects of power and dominance in discourse are central. The discursive construction of farmed animals as objects enables the production of meat by discarding concerns for suffering since inanimate objects do not feel pain (Stibbe, 2012: 28). As discussed earlier, the exploitation of non-human animals is widely accepted in many societies, thus it can be considered as a prevailing ideology and thus contributes to the discursive hegemony of many western societies of human exceptionalism.

However, it is important to note that discourses are not constant but rather could be regarded to be in a state of constant flux, meaning that alternative discourses compete with each other in order to gain the position dominance. This is reflective of the wider process of change taking place in society, thus denoting the dialectic nature of language as social practice (Pietikäinen, 2008: 199). According to Wodak (2011: 11), discourses do not appear individually or separately, but rather as a part of a larger network of discourses which comprises of alternative, contradicting and competing ways of perceiving the same phenomena. Considering the focus of the present study, it could be argued that the current perception on production animals is moving away from the discourse that constructs them as machine-like resources by being confronted with alternative discourses that represent the issue from the point of view of ecological impact or animal ethics. Acknowledging the concept of discourse itself makes possible to identify the beliefs and perceptions about reality that constitute any certain discourses (Lynn, 2010: 85). The ability to perceive discourses from an outside perspective and regard them as constructions rather than reflections of reality, opens the possibility of changing them and as a result providing new social realities (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999).

Closely related to the notion of power and ideology in discourse is the concept of representations. Representation refers to the language used to assign meaning to and present different aspects of social reality (Fairclough, 2001). Therefore, representations can be understood as the instrument through which reality is constructed, meaning that when we perceive the world the process is always mediated through representations. In other words, discourses are comprised of representations that construct and define aspects of reality in specific and consistent ways. Furthermore, verbal representations of certain phenomena consist of concrete linguistic choices that contribute to constructing a certain image of reality. (Mäkilä, 2007: 140). Although, discourses are comprised of clusters of representations, the linguistic choices that contribute to different representations are simultaneously controlled by the available discourses. More specifically, the prevailing discourses provide the frames within which different representational choices can be made. What this means is that, for example, when production animals are represented in text, the prevailing discourse which denotes them as resources, ultimately determines which aspects are emphasised and which are neglected when describing them.

The aim of CDA, then, is to uncover ideologies manifested in discourse that may help to create and maintain unequal power relations between individuals and groups in a given society. More specifically, Critical Discourse Analysis is interested in the role of semiosis (including language) in the changes that are taking place in society and how language contributes to the changes (Wodak, 2011). The traditional interests of CDA have been to side with those who suffer most from dominance and inequality forwarded in discourse and bring about change in the condition of different oppressed groups including women, ethical and sexual minorities (van Dijk, 2003: 253). The present study can be understood as following this convention, however, as mentioned previously, CDA has been rather slow in acknowledging the role of language in maintaining and constructing discourses that put forward the ideology of human dominance over non-human animals as natural and inevitable. Therefore, in addition to providing descriptive and explanatory accounts of language use in society, CDA aims to critically analyse it in order to bring about “enlightenment and emancipation” (Wodak, 2011: 52)

2.2 Previous research on farmed animals

This section discusses previous research conducted in the broad field of social sciences regarding animals, as well as linguistic research on farmed animals. Both fields of research are significant in foregrounding an understanding on farmed animals for the present study; studies in the field of

social sciences examine attitudes and perceptions that people hold on farmed animals with an attempt to theorise their origins, while linguistic research reveals how perceptions are encoded in language and, thus maintain and construct societal representation.

2.2.1 Sociological research on farmed animals

This section provides a brief overview of research conducted in the field of sociology regarding the relationship between humans and other animals. More specifically, the focus here is on research regarding the attitudes, beliefs and perception people hold about farmed animals. Although the work conducted in this field extends to animals in other social categories, including companion animals and wildlife for instance, the scope of my discussion is here limited to research on farmed animals, as based on the specific interest of the present study. In addition, studying the relationship between farmed animals and humans, it is important to distinguish between the perceptions of citizen/consumers, and those people working with the animals. The research examined in this section reflects some of the perceptions people hold towards farmed animal which are potentially reflected in the findings of the present study as representations of pigs and provide tools for understanding where certain discourses in the present data, *Country Smallholding,* arise from. I will begin this section by giving an overview of research conducted with reference to consumers of animal products and citizens at large, after which the focus will shift to examining the relationship between farmers and their animals.

As mentioned previously, animal production is a highly naturalized aspect of society and the socially constructed role of certain animals as food is widely accepted and has only relatively recently been under critical examination due to environmental issues and wellbeing concerns. According to Bastian et al. (2012: 247), analysing how people view meat eating can provide insight into the different strategies employed to maintain its cultural significance regardless of its morally debatable aspects. In other words, the attitudes and perceptions people hold about farmed animals contribute to maintaining the status quo, while recognising the reasons behind perceptions is key to transforming them. In general, it has been noted that mentally disengaging from the link between living animals and meat reduces the dissonance between consuming these products, while it simultaneously gives rise to feelings of discomfort with the realities of animal farming (Bastian et al., 2012: 247).

Studying attitudes regarding any aspect of the world can prove challenging and the factors governing them are myriad and difficult to detect. It appears that people often hold

contradictory attitudes towards farmed animals, as indicated by their desire to consume them while simultaneously objecting to harming them (Knight et al., 2004) Echoing similar ideas, Bergstra et al. (2017) considered the issue of boar taint as an example of the contradicting attitudes people hold towards production animals. Attitudes towards castration of piglets were negative, however, people were simultaneously unwilling to risk the taste of meat (Bergstra et al. 2017: 402). Regardless, people seem have positive attitudes to the welfare of production animals: for example, the 2016 Eurobarometer revealed that 94% of the respondents believed that it is important to protect the welfare of animals, and 82% believed that farmed animals should be better protected than they now are (Special Eurobarometer 442 online, 2016). Therefore, it can be stated that in general the public supports the welfare of animals and rejects causing suffering, but these attitudes are not necessarily reflected in their behaviour. More specifically, it appears that, while most people hold positive attitudes towards animal wellbeing, other factors come into play and allow for continuing use despite of the conflicting perceptions.

A recent study by Kupsala (2019) attempted to map out Finns' attitudes regarding animals in food production. The results revealed that the independent variables of having a farming background, gender and valuing social equality were the factors that most strongly connected with attitudes (Kupsala, 2019: 58). More specifically, women who valued equality without a background in farming held the most positive and least instrumental attitudes towards animals (Kupsala, 2019: 58). In addition, age was considered a significant variable with regards to negatively evaluating the current state of farming and having less trust in the current model of animal production, which potentially reflected deeper changes in attitudes due to knowledge on today's intensive methods of production, as opposed to previous small-scale farming (Kupsala, 2019: 85). Focusing specifically on attitudes of young people in Norway, Kubberod et al. (2002: 53–62) noticed the importance of gender with regards to attitudes towards meat and meat-eating. Male participants held negative attitudes exclusively for the distaste of meat, while women showed more emotional engagement and negatively evaluated the slaughtering of animals and did not want to associate living beings with meat (Kubberød et al. 2002: 60). In addition to gender, a regular contact with animals resulted in approving attitudes towards animal production, a result which was echoed by Kupsala (2019: 6) regarding participants having a farming background (Kubberød et al. 2002: 60). According to Kupsala (2019: 6), "those who live or grew up on a farm with agricultural animals tend to express less concern for farm animal wellbeing than those without a farming background". Similar results were also established by McKendree et al. (2014; 3161–3172) who studied the perceptions of US citizens regarding the welfare of farmed animals. Those who had more concern for welfare of

animals where most frequently women and younger respondents, signalling the importance of gender and age (McKendree et al., 2014: 3170). In addition, those who reportedly were committed to the Democratic Party also reported similar levels of concern. Lastly, respondents from the Midwest expressed less concern, which was hypothesised to be a result of high proportion of livestock production in the area, thus, relating to the idea of proximity to production as a factor in attitude formation. (McKendree et al., 2014: 3169–3171).

Besides the variables discussed above, the belief in animal mind (BAM) has been noted to strongly correlate with concern for animal wellbeing and less instrumental attitudes towards farmed animals (Kupsala, 2019: 71). The belief in animal mind can be defined as a state where people are influenced by a belief that animals have mental experiences and abilities, which can be further categorised as a belief in cognition and/or sentience (Knight, 2009: 466). This belief is usually influenced by biological similarity to humans (mammals versus vertebrates) as well as the social categorisation of different animals. According to Kupsala (2019: 6), Finns assign the most mental capacities to dogs, followed by cows, pigs, wolves, elks, chickens, salmon and shrimp. Therefore, the social categorisation of the dog as a companion animal results in a stronger belief in animals' mental capacity, as compared to farmed mammals. Similar results have also been acquired by Bastian et al. (2011: 250) who concluded that those animals that are deemed as appropriate for consumption where considered to possess "less mind" than those whose consumption is socially unacceptable. Thus, a weaker belief in animal mind can potentially provide a psychological defence mechanism towards the challenging dilemma of animal consumption and support for animal use, since animals with fewer mental abilities are considered more akin to mechanical objects, rather than living beings, and are less affected by use (Knight et al. 2004: 54)

To conclude, it appears that in general most people hold conflicting attitudes to and perceptions of farm animals and different variables are considered central in determining them, with gender, age and proximity to farm animals reappearing throughout different studies. BAM, however, is a considered a highly influential factor with its levels closely related to the social construction of animals. With reference to the present study, the proximity to animals and the belief in animal mind are potentially influential factors in evaluating and understanding animal discourses. More specifically, my initial assumption is that discourses in *Country Smallholding* may simultaneously illustrate high levels of BAM due to close contact between farmer and animals, thus displaying fewer instrumental attitudes towards them, while also being less bothered with animal use due to the proximity to animals created by personal engagement.

2.2.2 Farmer-animal relationship

As noted in the previous section, a background in farming and proximity to farmed animals are considered important variables in forming attitudes (Kupsala, 2019; Kubberod et al, 2002; McKendree et al., 2014). Indeed, the relationship between those who work in a close proximity to farmed animals negotiate a different relationship and perception of these animals, compared to those who merely consume them. Wilkie (2010) studied the connection between farmers and farmed animals and noted that the relationship is built on a number of paradoxes. First of all, farmed animals are considered legal property, however, the relationship on the level of individuals is more ambiguous (Wilkie, 2010: 123). Therefore, farmers have to balance between the inevitable connection that forms between them and the animals, while still regarding them as a source of profit (Wilkie, 2010: 124–125). More specifically, the scope of affinity is mediated by contextual factors, such as the number of animals and the specific purpose of each animals. A smaller herd size allows for more contact and breeding animals are encountered individually and for longer than those raised solely for meat (Wilkie, 2010: 133–134). The significance of gender is also noted in farmer-animal relationships with female workers expressing a connection and identification with cattle and finding it harder to except the inevitable slaughter of farmed animals (Kupsala, 2019: 80). In generally, dealing with the slaughter of animals was characterised as an "uneasy acceptance" especially by those who keep a smaller number of animals, therefore work in close contact with them (Wilkie, 2010: 149–150).

As noted above, different contextual factors mediate the contradictory relationship, and closeness can be enabled by smaller numbers of animals. There is a growing number of farmers who reject the traditions of conventional farming and aim for an alternative way of raising livestock. Wilkie (2010: 89) regarded them as 'hobby farmers' whereas Holloway (2000: 307) used the terms 'smallholders'. Regardless, this group can be defined as: "people who espouse a less commercialised attitudes towards farm animals" and "claim to practice more traditional, natural and welfare-friendly methods of farm-animal production than their farming counterparts in the commercial section." (Wilkie, 2010: 89). Holloway (2000: 307) extends this definition by going beyond the act of farming and regarding smallholding as a lifestyle choice which includes the consumption of the countryside more generally. A central aspect of 'hobby farmers' and 'smallholders' is the desire to reject and differentiate from commercialized farming practices that can be characterized as an intensive production model with a strong focus on maximising profit. Bergstra et al. (2017: 401) conducted a study on attitudes of different stakeholders on pig farming, and their results revealed that those who commit to organic farming practices possessed negative

attitudes towards aspects of harm on individuals, animals and the environment, while those in the commercialised category only exhibited negative attitudes towards harm on humans. Similarly, Bock and van Huit (2007: 939) divided farmers into two categories based on their perception of farmed animal welfare. The first group consisted of farmers who viewed welfare important for productivity reasons, thus, connecting it with economic interests, while the second group included welfare and organic farmers to whom welfare relates to animal's freedom and comfort.

Besides emphasis on welfare, small-scale farmers diverge themselves from commercialised animal production with a less distinct focus on profit. More specifically, hobby farmers' income in usually minimally linked to their animals, usually only supplementing income or aiming at self- sufficiency, despite the tendency of some farmers to treat smallholding as a steppingstone towards professional pursuit (Wilkie, 2010: 91–92). This can be regarded as an important reason for why smaller producers can afford to focus more on the wellbeing of individual animals and possess more positive attitudes towards them. However, it was noted that products with a more welfare-friendly or organic focus cater to a niche audience who justify the extra payment usually associated with these sorts of products (Brock and Van Huit, 2007: 940). Therefore, the concept of small-scale farming can work in favour of the producer in economic terms. Lastly, it is worth noting that although 'hobby-farmers' have a seemingly strong commitment to farmed animal welfare, they often lack the skills, experience and time commercialised producers have which can cause harm to the animals due to neglect or ignorance (Wilkie, 2010: 105).

Research on farmers' attitudes towards their animals and the human-animal relationship reveals contradictory and somewhat ambiguous ways animals are perceived. Thus, assuming that the people who choose to work in animal production consider animals as commodities and objects for use appears overly simplistic. On the contrary, many claim to like animals and enjoy working with them (Wilkie, 2010: 90). Thus, small-scale farmers display an interesting balance between feelings of affection and the realities of animal farming including the commodity status of animals and their inevitable destination, the slaughterhouse. Farmers who keep a smaller number of animals and thus work closely with them on an individual level, establish a close connection with their animals. Therefore, they also experience increased emotional distress. However, it could be assumed that providing the best possible care for one's animals simultaneously alleviates the distress and emotional conflict caused by killing the animals. What is particularly fruitful for the present study is the perceived commitment of small-scale farmers to the wellbeing of their animals. This is because my data are collected from a magazine with specific focus on smallholding. Therefore, the attitudes and perceptions of those producing representations

in *Country Smallholding* can be assumed to reflect results from research concerning smallholders and hobby farmers more generally. In other words, the desire of small-scale farmers to diverge from intensive models of food production is hypothesised to be reflect in data as representation of animals that reject perceiving them as commodities.

2.2.3 Linguistic research on farmed animal discourses

Moving forward, this section focuses on linguistic research on animal representation and discourses. Although there exists a body of research within animal studies that takes as its primary target the interconnectedness of humans and non-human animal, occasionally commenting on linguistic features that are connected with the social construction of animals, the focus here is specifically on research conducted within the field of linguistics. My discussion in this section is divided into two parts, the first of which looks at specific linguistic devices and features that are currently employed and significant when representing non-human animals, with an emphasis on production animals. The second section moves closer to the topic of the present research by focusing exclusively on the discursive representation of farmed animals by identifying distinct discourses that are currently circulating in society and the effects they have for the animals.

First of all, it has been noted that the tendency in English to use the pronoun "it" in reference to animals even when the biological sex is known contributes to and encourages the separation between humans and non-human animals. More specifically, Dunayer (2003: 61) claims that by referring to animals as 'something' instead of 'someone' diminishes a sense of animacy and sentience of the animal and, thus grants them object-like status and enables humans to continue using animals for different purposes. Gupta (2006: 107–128) conducted research on a similar topic, exploring the instances of the use of the words 'who' and which' when referring to animals. 'Which' appeared more frequently, therefore suggesting inanimate and ungendered perspective when representing animals. However, 'who' was used occasionally when the context suggested a more intimate relationship between a human and a specific animal such as a pet (Gupta, 2006: 108–109). Gilquin and Jacobs (2006: 9–105) have similarly noted the significance of contextual factors when choosing between 'who' and 'which'. 'Who' was most frequently used in instances where the context suggests a closeness to animals, or when they are represented in a way that gives them an increased human-like status, for instance, with reference to companion animals or animals who are helpful to humans (Gilquin and Jacobs, 2006: 93–94). However, it was also noted that the use of 'who' does not always align with these principles, with some examples

suggesting even explicitly negative attitudes towards the animals referred to with ‘who’ (Gilquin and Jacobs, 2006: 96). Therefore, the choice between ‘who’ and ‘which’ is not a straightforward one but highly dependent on contextual factors, regardless of claims that reject the importance of the issue. A different lexicon about humans and animals was said to promote separation therefore treating animals linguistically like humans could contribute to bettering their wellbeing and placing them closer to people. (Gupta, 2006: 109).

Sealey and Charles (2013: 486) discussed the importance of labelling animals as a way to indicate humans’ perception and understanding of them. Especially interesting for the present study is the idea that mass noun patterns in English encourage the construction of animals as commodities and objects of human consumption. More specifically, the consumable product of animal production, the slaughtered counterpart of the living animal, illustrate this point: ‘meat’, ‘pork’, ‘bacon’ and ‘beef’ are examples of mass nouns where the plural form of the word does not exist in common use. ‘Lamb’ provides a more ambiguous instance since it can refer to both the living animal and the product, however, the frequency of use points towards a tendency of ‘lamb’ as a referent of the product. (Sealey and Charles, 2013: 498). In addition, the results revealed that animals that belong to the social category of pets are more commonly referred in the singular when compared to those animals in vermin or livestock category, thus, representing the former as individuals while latter as groups. Lastly, labels for animals that are categorized as suitable for consumption and/or hunting, are used as modifiers in instances such as ‘salmon fishing’ and ‘pig farming’, which according to Sealey and Charles (2013: 501) provides insight into how attitudes towards animals are encoded in language.

Research on animal metaphors has provided another interesting perspective on language use that tends to influence our perception of animals by encoding in language the attitudes humans hold about non-human animals. Goatly (2006) stated that metaphor patterns in English contribute to a negative perception of animals by regarding the way they behave as something undesirable for humans. According to him, its effect encourages the idea of human superiority by framing animal behaviour in a negative light, thus, hindering sympathy and identification with animals (Goatly, 2006: 28). Some of the examples he provided includes commonly used metaphors regarding the pig, which take the form ‘HUMAN IS ANIMAL’ by associating perceived negative characteristics of pigs with humans. Thus, calling somebody a pig can be “a greedy, fat or unpleasant person”. (Goatly, 2006: 27). Especially fields that advocate for the use of animals for human purposes, including science, hunting and farming, tend to disregard suffering inflected on these animals with the way language is used to discuss them (Smith-Harris,

2004: 14). Idioms, metaphors and euphemisms are pervasive ways of representing animals in a negative light since their widespread use indicates an approval of cruelty towards non-human animals (Smith-Harris, 2004: 12).

Previous research which examines linguistic devices commonly used to discuss animals provides a useful reference point for the present study by mapping out some of the key features which are potentially reflected in my data. Especially interesting are those linguistic tools, discussed above, that encourage a separation between humans and non-human animals and, as a result, allow for understanding animals as resources for use, for instance the widespread conventions of pronoun use, as well as, labelling production animals in ways that hide individuality and denote them as groups.

In addition to specific linguistic devices that are more or less conventional ways of referring to and representing animals, research has focused on examining the wider discourses available on farmed animals. According to Cook and Sealey (2017: 311), "[r]esearch into the discursive representation of animals is a relatively new enterprise, and the existing literature is not extensive". Nevertheless, notable advances have been made especially in the context of farm animal discourses and representations. This focal point is well justified considering the invasive impact of animal agriculture on the environment as a source of greenhouse gasses, but also in the light of ethical and welfare concerns put forward by animal rights advocates. Therefore, farm animal discourses constitute a research topic where dominance and power struggles are noticeable with potentially dire consequences for both human and non-human animals. My discussion here is divided between discourses that are produced within the animal agriculture industry and those communicated to the general public due to the noticeable differences in the representation of animals.

The first category consists of discourses produced within animal agriculture industries, meaning publications that are mainly targeted at those who work directly with the animals, including production manuals. Language produced for such purposes is characterized as highly scientific and technical, therefore, using industry-specific jargon that might not be available for those who are not specialists in the field (Stibbe, 2003: 37). While such language might appear neutral at first, it has been argued that it can convey negative discourses about the animals. Stibbe (2003: 41) argues that these discourses represent animals as objects and reduce their existence to mere profitability, and thus it overlooks potential suffering and the inhumane treatment that is promoted by practices within the animal agriculture industry. Croney and Reynnells (2008: 387) also come to similar conclusion by stating that: "industry discourse characterizes animals in ways

that objectify them and obscure morally relevant characteristics such as animal sentience". Importantly, though, it has been emphasized that negative discourses about animals that circulate in animal agriculture industry are not explicit, rather, they're forwarded in indirect language and come together in combining a variety linguistic features, vocabulary, grammar and syntax (Stibbe, 2003: 42). More specifically, industry practices are framed as based on science and biological factors, thus, creating a representation where animal production is regarded as "inevitable", or as a natural aspect of reality (Croney and Reynnells, 2008: 388). This makes pointing out disruptive language use more difficult, however, it has been argued that ideologies are manifested more effectively by being implicit (Stibbe, 2001: 148).

Glenn (2004: 64) has also pointed out the indirect nature of discourses surrounding farmed animals that tend to encourage exploitation and discard the negative consequences modern farming practices have on the wellbeing of the animals. The term 'doublespeak' was coined to describe the discourse style of factory farm practices that Glenn perceives as "intentionally misleading by being ambiguous and disingenuous" (2004: 64–65). More specifically, this refers to situations where, for example, animals are handled in factories which are inevitably painful or unconformable for the animal, such as debeaking chickens or stunting horns, and describing these actions as somehow natural, accommodating or necessary Glenn (2004: 70). Thus, previous research on discourse produced within an industry that is based on the domination of human over animals in order to create profit, encourages discourses that allow for business to continue as usual. Industry practices are concealed through language use by framing them unproblematic, and the concerns for problems raised by environmental issues or animal advocate groups are consequently diverted.

The idea of doublespeak put forward by Glenn (2004: 64) relates to a general discursive representation of farmed animals which tends to gloss over the inherent violence and death in the industry. 'Happy meat' discourse aimed at the potential consumers of animal products achieves similar effects. This discourse communicates the idea that exploiting and killing animals can be conducted in a way that removes the ethical problems associated with the industry (Cole, 2011: 84). Cole (2011: 84) sees this discourse as a response to the afore mentioned animals-as-objects discourse which can seem unsettling when communicated to the consumers and, thus hinder the incentive to make profit. Linne (2016: 724) conducted a study on the social media pages of dairy industries and concluded that the representation of the industry and the animals exemplified the 'happy meat' discourse: cows are willing producers of the milk that is taken from them and the farmers are loving and compassionate towards their animals. Thus, discourses of animal welfare are

juxtaposed with those surrounding production and these discourses emerge together and become inseparable thus forming the idea of 'happy meat' which is communicated to the ethically aware consumer. By emphasizing the welfare aspect of production, such discourses work to re-moralise the exploitation of animals by adding ethical value to the products for the consumers in order to "permit business as usual" with little concern for actual change in practices. Cole (2011: 84). According to Linne (2016: 722) this discourse attempts to frame the problematic aspects of animal production as issues of industrialisation of the industry and disconnectedness of consumers, and by removing those obstacles the moral conflict is simultaneously lifted.

Cole's (2011) idea of the 'happy meat' discourse connects to a more general discussion amongst scholars who examine the discursive representation of farmed animals. More specifically, when farmed animals are represented in discourse, their lives and wellbeing in particular are almost exclusive described from the point of view of productivity, meaning that the way in which the wellbeing of a cow in conceptualised cannot escape the narrow boundaries set by the animal agriculture industry (Glenn, 2004; Cook, 2015). In practice, this means that people associated with animal husbandry make claims about committing to practices that reduce suffering and increase the wellbeing and comfort for the animals. However, these terms are defined by the desired end result of their actions, in this case meat production (Cook, 2015: 595). Therefore, the wellbeing of an animal in the food production is not conceptualized by the same terms as the wellbeing of a pet animal, since the purpose they have for humans is completely different: one is understood as food while the other as a companion. According to Cole (2011: 94), associating meat with happiness further enforces and legitimizes this difference by sending out the message that farmed animals exist only for the purpose of providing for humans and are even happy to do so.

Resorting to euphemistic language when addressing killing and suffering of non-human animals is yet another feature that has been identified by scholars as a way of diverging from the morally conspicuous aspects of animal farming. According to Trampe (2017: 237), euphemisation occurs "when taboo expressions are replaced by other words or circumscriptions. Rhetorically, this often occurs through the use of figures of speech such as metaphor, litotes or hyperbole." This process conceals the meaning of the taboo word since the euphemism does not carry the same negative emotional response as the original expression. Several words that are used when talking about killing animals, such as 'euthanize', 'put to sleep' and 'destroy', can be consider as euphemistic since they conceal and obscure important aspects about the act of killing, including the agent's motivation and the reality of the death resulting from the act (Jepson, 2008: 143). Interestingly, when applied to humans, some words for killing carry different connotation.

‘Slaughter’ is an example of such a word which is commonly used to refer to killing animals in a neutral way, but when humans are slaughtered the word invokes images of a particularly brutal and senseless form of killing (Jepson, 2008: 135). Euphemistic language and expressions that conceal aspects about killing non-human animals can be seen as contributing to how humans are allowed to appropriate nature and other living beings for anthropocentric purposes (Trampe, 2017: 328). More specifically, Jepson (2008: 144) stated that “by obscuring the actual motivations for killing animals, blurring the reality of the animals’ deaths and placing animals in the category of “object,” human beings avoid confronting the fact that they regularly kill living beings for the convenience and benefit of humans”. The language about killing and suffering of other humans evokes an emotional response which condemns these actions as unethical, whereas euphemistic expressions about animals work in a way that prohibit a similar response.

The discursive representation of animal slaughter was similarly the interest of Gillespie (2011) who analysed the websites of ‘alternative farms’, referring to those producers who commit to more ethical form of farming. A tendency to linguistically obscure or ignore discussion of slaughter or a complete lack of representation was discovered (Gillespie, 2011: 116). It was concluded that the representation of slaughter contributes to a sense of disconnectedness between the consumer and the animal and allows for continuing meat consumption, thus, benefitting the farmer, respectively (Gillespie, 2011: 121). Therefore, revious research has pointed to a dissonance between the inevitability of slaughter of meat production in practice and the reluctance to represent the process in discourse by employing linguistic devices to conceal it or neglect entirely. I will draw on these results in order to analyse the representation of slaughter in my data and discuss how that contributes to constructing the discourses on pigs.

While a noticeable proportion of research on animal representation to the public has focused on restricted cases of language use or emphasised the prevalence of certain discourses, Packwood Freeman (2009) conducted a study where she examined news media’s construction of animals in agriculture by determining the types of news stories about these animals that enter the public sphere through media. Her findings reveal that most news stories represent animals in a way that reinforces the human dominance over animals by objectifying them through various linguistic means, such as using labels and words that define animals as bodies rather than beings (Packwood Freeman, 2009: 89–91). However, while most stories enforce the idea that farmed animals are mainly conceptualized as resources in media, alternative frames also appear, albeit a lot less frequently. Included in her data were stories that urged for a more compassionate treatment of animals, such as rescuing them from cruel treatment and questioning the justification to kill animals

for food in the first place (Packwood Freeman, 2009: 95). Regardless of these alternative discourses, frames that promote the objectification of farm animals greatly outnumbered divergent voices which, according to Packwood Freeman (2009: 99), is representative of the society's status quo where animals are conceptualized as resources. Thus, media representation cannot escape the ideological makeup of the society in which it operates, therefore, making it harder for alternative ideas to gain ground and improvements in animal welfare to be established. (Packwood Freeman, 2009: 84, 99).

This section discussed wider discourses related to farm animals that are pervasive ways of understanding the society's perception of animals. The present research will draw on insights provided by the work examined in this section, since analysing pig discourses in *Country Smallholding* are assumedly connected with and relate to the discursive construction of farmed animals laid out in this section. In other words, discourses produced in *Country Smallholding* are interconnected with the society at large, by simultaneously they are recirculating shared perceptions and repurposing them for a context specific way of representing pigs. Moreover, the present research provides an interesting in-between point of view by focusing on smallholding which diverges from intensive farming and discourses produced within the industry by exhibiting some characteristics of ethically aware consumers (see 2.2.2.).

3 THE PRESENT STUDY

This section introduces the design of the present study. Firstly, I will spell out the aims of my study by placing it in context with previously conducted research and illustrate on its contemporary significance and present my research questions. Secondly, I will discuss my data, and rationalise its selection and collection process and, thirdly, provide a concrete method for analysing the data and extracting answer to my research questions.

3.1 Aims and research questions

The aim of the present study is to critically examine instances of text about farmed animals produced in the magazine *Country Smallholding*. The imperative is to discover discourses that arise from data and are central in the representation of farmed animals through careful linguistic analysis. In other words, the present study seeks out to, firstly, determine those discourses that circulate in data and, secondly, analyse the use of different linguistic features in creating the discourses, meaning determine how language is used in order to forward prevalent perceptions of production animals. More specifically, the interest of my analysis will be on the representation of pigs, which were chosen as the focal point for three reasons. First of all, pigs are generally constructed in contradictory ways: they are simultaneously regarded as clever animals who resemble humans physically and represented in discourse with negative idioms and metaphors which, are, in turn, argued to be a significant factor in facilitating the shared consent for their consumption (Kupsala, 2019: 78). Secondly, pigs are one of the few animals reared solely for their meat, thus, providing a stark contrast with other traditional production animals such as cows or sheep who are exploited for other commodities, too, and who do not end up in slaughterhouses imminently, albeit they do so eventually. And thirdly, the pig industry has been facing growing criticism from consumers on an international level, mainly due to the issue related to the industry's negative environmental impact, the animals' living conditions and their role in the potential spreading of diseases (Porscher, 2011: 3). For example, in Finland, the pork industry has been put under heat after multiple photos were released by undercover animal rights activist in 2007, 2009 and 2011 that revealed the appalling living conditions in multiple farms (Lappalainen, 2013: 169–170). For these reasons, the representation of pigs is considered a fruitful focal point for the present study, potentially manifesting the aforementioned peculiarities regarding the animals' cultural construction and the realities of the pork industry.

It is important to note that the present study is fundamentally critical of the current state of affairs where humans consistently impose their dominance over non-human animals on different areas of society which, to a large extent, is the result of the ideas of dualism between humans and animals and human exceptionalism. Although not exclusively applied to production animals, since dominance is inherent in most, if not all, human-animal interactions, the level of confinement, exploitation and slaughter of animals in food production illustrates the most crude example of dominance. Thus, I argue that the critical examination and revision of the language which maintains and forwards an understanding permitting such treatment of animals is of the utmost importance and urgency. The demand for problematizing the exploitation of production animals places sentience at the foreground of the argument and replaces the perceived exceptionalism of humans as the benchmark for moral value. Experiencing conscious states and ability for intentional behaviour have been accepted as aspects of sentience that extent to non-human animals such as mammals and birds among many others (The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness, 2012). Thus, the ability of animals in food production to be negatively affected by their treatment, to feel pain, provides adequate reasoning to problematise the current state of affairs.

In addition to adapting a critical stance towards human dominance over non-human animals exemplified by the treatment of animals in food production, the present study adheres to the idea that language is not a neutral tool for describing reality but rather influential in maintaining and forwarding ideologies that construct reality in specific ways while simultaneously marginalising or concealing alternative ways of perceiving the world (Halliday, 2001: 179). Therefore, language and the discourses circulating in language have concrete consequences. More specifically, regarding the interest of the present study, the tangible effects discourses amount to influencing the perceptions of pigs available in society, which ultimately determines their worth in practice, how they ought to be treated and what kinds of lives they ought to live. Critically examining the available discourses in *Country Smallholding* thus provides insight into the way language is used in order to construct a representation of pigs in a specific context, however, the discourses that arise are not exclusive to the magazine. In other words, discourses produced in certain contexts are understood to reflect the hegemony of a given society at large. Thus, analysing the language of representations and discourses of pigs in *Country Smallholding* provides a tangible approach to uncovering and specifying the ideological construction of pigs in society.

The present study relates to previous research conducted within the field of Ecolinguistics and is heavily influenced by the work in Human-Animal studies. However, the present study aims at providing a new perspective to the discursive study of animals in linguistics

by focusing specifically on discourses produced in small-scale agriculture magazine, *Country Smallholding*. In practice, people working in small-scale animal agriculture tend to engage in from a need to diverge from intensive farming practices that characterise much of contemporary food production. Holloway (2001: 313) noted that smallholders exhibit a desire to reject aspects of farming that characterise "modern" production, while embracing an ethical stance towards production. However, smallholders nevertheless invest varying amounts of time and money in animal production; thus the incentive to create a profit or at the very least, break even, is central for them, too. As a result, smallholding activities exemplify at least some of the central features of any other business model, however, with potentially decreased intensity.

Therefore, the aim of the present study is to provide new information by analysing production animal discourses in a context that is hypothesised to include both the incentives for animal wellbeing as well as productivity and efficiency inherent in most business pursuit. This could suggest that discourses regarding pigs produced in *Country Smallholding* are representative of a way of regarding animals in agriculture reflecting both initiatives in varying degrees. The smaller number of animals characteristic of small-scale farms as opposed to factory farms potentially suggests a subjective and intimate representation of animals, however, the objectives of production are similarly established in smallholdings. Thus, discourses representative of previous studies, including objectifying animals and marginalising suffering, might also be drawn on and recirculated in the magazine.

The research questions of this study are as the following:

1. What discourses arise from the representation of pigs in *Country Smallholding*?
2. What linguistic devices are employed to construct these representations?

3.2 Data Selection and Collection

According to Bock and Van huik (2007: 941), the current state of affairs for pig farmers in the UK is characterised as involving pressure from both social and economic directions; the country has well developed and prominent animal welfare legislation as well as top quality schemes for domestic pig meat coming from retailers. It was assumed that farmers in the UK are, therefore, more less optimistic about the profitability of products that regarded as animal friendly (Bock and van Huik, 2007;94). Therefore, pig farming in the UK was selected as the focal point of the present study. In addition, the interest in a small-scale farming particularly arose from the fact that intensive animal farming is characteristic of the majority of meat production, there are nearly 800 livestock

mega farms in the UK (Wasley and Davies, 2017), and thus smallholding provides an alternative to the dominant model, therefore, potentially embedded with similarly alternative discourses regarding the animals.

The data for the present study were collected from *Country Smallholding*, a UK-based magazine targeted at those engaged in or interest in different aspects of small-scale farming, including livestock care and home-crop growing. The magazine is published monthly and is available in both digital and print form. With a circulation of 20 000 per issue *Country Smallholding* is Britain's bestselling smallholding magazine, sold at hundreds of locations across the country (https://www.countrysmallholding.com/magazine/advertise). According to their website, "the magazine has a very strong focus on livestock, with regular feature series on sheep, pigs, goats and alpacas.", thus, providing useful data regarding the focus of the present study on the representation of pigs.

The data consists of articles from *Country Smallholding* collected from a time period of six months, from October 2018 to March 2019. This was done to ensure reflectivity of current themes and issues regarding pigs but also avoid a specific focus of individual issues, for example Christmas Edition (December, 2018) or Horse Special (October 2018) from skewing the data due to overrepresentation of certain topics. In other words, the time frame of data collection allows for a variety of topics to be included in the analysis, while the proximity of each issue ensures comparability between articles. The data were collected from the digital version *of Country Smallholding.* Articles for analysis where chosen based on two main criteria. Firstly, the topic of each article needed to focus on specifically and exclusively pigs, thus, articles which focused on production animals generally representing them as a group or commenting on pigs occasionally rather than consistently were excluded. This was done in order to ensure that the data selected reflected the research questions focused on discourses surrounding pigs, rather than a combining representations of different production animals. Secondly, only full-length articles were selected, and shorter news stories as well as articles from the question and answer column were discarded. The restricted length of such articles was regarded to affect the depth and diversity of representation.

Based on the selection criteria laid out above, a total of ten articles were collected from *Country Smallholding*. Six out of the ten articles were published in a column dedicated to topics regarding pigs, consequently titled *Pig's,* indicating a consistent demand and interest for covering issues related to pigs. More specifically, the data can generally be divided into two categories based on their content. The first category included two articles that can be characterised

as narratives representing the voice and personal experience of individual farmers, their "story". Furthermore, these articles described pigs that were representative of real-life animals, meaning they were known individuals. The majority, eight articles (including all six from *Pig's)* described pigs generally, thus representing 'hypothetical' animals. In addition, the articles where specifically aimed to disseminate information by focusing on restricted topics and give readers advice on how to perform different husbandry tasks or related issues. Furthermore, the articles utilized information boxes where or lists in order to convey information in a simplified and restricted form.

3.3 Method of Analysis

My method of data analysis is heavily influenced by the conventions of Critical Discourse Analysis regarding the role of discourses in creating and maintaining the dominance and oppression of production animals. In addition, I will apply the concepts and methods laid out by Mäkilä (2007), especially regarding the process of analysing the data in practice.

Generally, critical discourse analysis (CDA) provides insight into how language is used in order to create meaning and construct reality. In CDA, language is considered to be in a dialectic relationship with society and culture by simultaneously maintaining certain ways of understanding but also contributing to transforming them (Groling, 2017: 112). Therefore, in order to facilitate change in the social construction of production animals, the discourses that maintain a social order which promotes their use and exploitation must be anatomised. Indeed, for the purposes of this study, Critical Discourse Analysis provides the tools to examine the way language is used to create and maintain the society's shared consent regarding the oppression of non-human animals in variety of contexts (Stibbe, 2012: 21).

Therefore, any discussion of the discourses that are central in the representation of animals must refer to the wider social context in which they appear in order to address issues of power and dominance accordingly. Within Ecolinguistics, the analysis of discourse is combined with the idea of 'ecosophy', meaning an ideal social order which goes beyond the narrow focus on human-human interactions, and instead takes into consideration the interconnectedness of all life including animals, plants and the physical environment (Stibbe, 2012: 139). The particular ecosophy for the present study questions the moral justification for the exploitation and dominance of non-human animals by humans, especially regarding, but not restricted to, production animals and the overt manifestations of power and dominance. Rejecting the idea of exceptionalism that

governs understanding of non-human animals and promoting shared experience of sentience, would result in considerable changes in how humans perceive animals and ultimately treat them.

However, in order to promote any tangible changes that are in accordance with the aforementioned ecosophy of the present study, how discourses are encoded in the level of text must be analysed. Indeed, the clusters of linguistics features that construct discourses are the focus of the present study and examining them is the method for extracting discourses from any given text. According to Pietikäinen (2008: 205–206), critical discourse analysis has generally been applied to two types of research pursuits, the first of which aims at providing a comprehensive image of the research topic by gathering extensive data and employing computer technology to analyse it. The second research model, on the other hand, focuses on examining how specific social phenomena are constructed in discourse, and the linguistic features that figure in the process. Thus, the research aim is comparably more concise, and the data consists of a limited number of texts Pietikäinen (2008: 207). The present research follows the conventions of the latter research model by examining pig discourses produced in *Country Smallholding*.

My method of analysis follows the three-stage analysis of representation which provides detailed and practical guidelines for extracting discourses from texts laid out by Mäkilä (2007) which draws a great deal from previously conducted research in CDA especially in the works of Fairclough and Wodak (Mäkilä, 2007: 136,144–148). Mäkilä's research focused on nuclear weapon discourses in *Helsingin Sanomat* and *The New York Times*, but the resemblance of data between his (2007) research and the present study as well as the similarities in the overall research design and aims were the main factors that influenced the decision to refer to his method of analysis. More specifically, Mäkilä (2007) focused on newspaper texts while my data consists of magazine articles, and the imperative for both studies is to examine multiple representations of one phenomena (nuclear weapons and pigs) in order to extract the less overt discourses that govern these representations.

As mentioned above, the method of analysis consists of choices on three interconnected levels, from the most concise one to the most general one. The first stage regards the representational choices or the linguistic features that figure on the level of individual texts. The second level comprises the textual choices from the first level into representation, meaning the way the phenomenon in question is portrayed in individual pieces of texts. The third level regards the discourses that combine the single text representation. In practice, the analysis moves from the second level to the first, after which the discourses on the third level can be grasped. (Mäkilä, 2007: 146)

After collecting my data, I will firstly focus on carefully reading each individual article, after which I will refer to the second level in Mäkilä's analysis method (2007) and reread the article in order to scrutinize in more detail how pigs are represented in each of them. In this initial stage of analysis, I present each article the following questions: what kind of image of pigs was created? Are there any changes in representation throughout the article? What characteristics and properties were associated with pigs? These questions are employed to construct a general understanding on the available representations on pigs in each article. According to Mäkelä (2007: 145), it is important to understand that individual articles combine multiple and often contradictory representations of the same phenomenon, therefore, the discourses controlling them are not readily detectible at this point of analysis.

After outlining how pigs are represented in each individual article, I will be able to begin to map out the specific linguistic choices that encode these representations. This means analysing how the impressions created and the available descriptions of pigs are realised through language use. Thus, the idea is to detect the ways of using language that are central in constructing representation, meaning that rather than following an exhaustive list of linguistic elements, the focus is on those features that are significance. Four linguistic features emerged as central in constructing the representation of pigs. Firstly, words of reference, including the use of personal and reference pronouns as well as other nouns, reveal the connotations attached to the animals when addressing them. Secondly, analysing pigs as targets and subjects of different processes central to depicting the animals as animate or inanimate. Thirdly, how pigs are evaluated in articles arose as a central linguistic feature in depicting the opinions and values attached to them. Lastly, association with other entities is significant in assigning pigs with varying features and qualities. These four representational choices were the interest of the first stage of analysis and are the linguistic manifestation of the representation of pigs detected on the second level.

The last level of analysis includes detecting the discourses available in *Country Smallholding* on pigs and the analysis of the first and second stage enables extracting them. In practice, discourses are difficult to detect on the level of individual articles, however, reoccurring representations on between different articles, are expected to reveal consistent patterns which are then then assumed to be manifestations of a specific discourse (Mäkilä, 2007: 147). More specifically, discourses shape the ways in which the object of interest, pigs, are depicted, thus representations on pigs in individual articles will be compared and corresponding ones grouped together to form the discourses. Additionally, individual texts shape discourses, therefore, those discourses uncovered in the present study will simultaneously reflect the wider societal perceptions

on pigs while also being particular to my specific data. More specifically, discourses are comprised of a plethora of individual texts all of which contribute different elements to their construction. I will label the uncovered discourses according to their pervasiveness and prevalence in data as the primary and secondary discourse.

Thus, following Mäkilä's (2007) method of analysis I will be able to extract the discourses on pigs in *Country Smallholding* as well as those linguistic features that are central in constructing them. In effect, the analysis moves from the second stage, representation on the level of individual articles, to the first stage which includes analysis of linguistic features (words of reference, process regarding pigs, evaluation and association) that encode representation, finally, to the third level of discourse, which influences and restricts the representational choices in the first and second level. Following Ecolinguistics, these discourses are then reflected to the ecosophy of the present study by discussing how the relate to facilitating the consent for animal exploitation in food production.

4 PRIMARY DISCOURSE: PIGS AS COMMODITIES

Representing pigs as resources for food production and objects of use was the most salient discourse circulating in *Country Smallholding,* thus, it is here regarded as the primary discourse mobilized in the magazine. Its salience can be interpreted as an apparent reflection of data; the magazine is specifically targeted at those working or interested in working in the field of small-scale agriculture where pigs are regarded as objects for food production and as a potential source of profit. This discourse is also circulated in society at large, with the majority of people accepting the construction of pigs as food without much contemplation. However, the variety of linguistic choices employed to construct the representation of pigs was ample and uncovering them is a significant step forward in the pursuit of reconstructing the discourse of pigs as food. The linguistic choices that were regarded as central were words of reference, pigs as the target of action, association and evaluation, each of which will be analysed in more detail and examples are given that illustrate their use. This discourse is mobilized in all of the ten articles under investigation. It is worth noting, however, that the centrality of the discourse varied noticeable between different articles, with some focusing explicitly on the business aspect of farming, thus framing pigs (almost) exclusively as objects and resources (‘What Price Prime Pork?’*)*, while in others the discourse was more difficult to detect, as it was often competing with alternative representations, for example in ‘And They Call it Puppy Love’.

These findings are closely related to previous research in the field, further emphasising the centrality of the discourse. It has been concluded that different linguistic devices, including metaphors, pronouns and definitions, are routinely employed to represent production animals as objects while simultaneously diminishing their individuality (Croney and Reynnells, 2008). However, according to Stibbe (2003: 43), the representation of animals as objects is hardly ever carried out explicitly by stating their worthlessness and inferiority in order to justify their treatment. More specifically, the words chosen to represent these animals carry the message implicitly (Stibbe, 2003: 43). This holds true for the present study as well, and the analysis demonstrates how constructing the discourse of pigs as objects and resources is accomplished, for example, referring to them in ways that disregard individuality and evaluating behaviour and actions from the point of view of efficiency and profitability.

4.1 Referring to pigs

This section analyses ways of referring to pigs that are central in constructing the representation of the animals as objects and products for consumption. The analysis in divided into two parts. The first section examines the use of personal and relative pronouns by connecting examples from data with generalised conventions, and discusses the effects of choosing one pronoun over another on the representation of animals. The second part focuses nouns used to refer to production animals and animal farming by considering commonly employed examples within the industry as well as examples peculiar to my specific data. In effect, the analysis attempts to uncover the conventionalised ways of referring to farmed animals as well as those that arise from the data and point out how they contribute to representing the animals as objects.

4.1.1 Pronouns referring to pigs

My first point of interest is pronouns, specifically personal and relative pronouns. According to Gupta (2006: 2), when referring to non-human animals, the English language presents the speaker (or writer) with a choice between using personal pronouns *he/she/it* and relative pronouns *who/which*. *He/she/who* are regarded as gendered terms referring to humans, while *it/which* are inanimate and ungendered terms. Referring to animals in human terms can serve as a way to bridge the gap between humans and non-humans. This is confirmed in my data: there is a strong tendency to refer to pigs with the personal pronoun *he/she* when the sex of the animal was known or readily deductible.

1. Even if *he* has never shown any aggressive tendencies […], you should always be cautious when you are around *him* and never, ever become complacent when in *his* presence. [italics added] (‘The Boar Necessities’, 2019: 1)
2. This amount will increase significantly at certain times of the year, briefly when you are getting *her* ready for mating and for longer when *she* is feeding a litter. For instance, when *she* is at peak lactation, *she* may need as much as 7kg a day. [italics added] (‘Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls’, 2019: 3)

Examples 1 and 2 demonstrate instances where the sex of the animal is known, and the corresponding personal pronoun is used. This pattern is apparent throughout the data suggesting that referring to pigs favours representing them as gendered beings and the pronouns are chosen accordingly. In addition, in Examples 1 and 2 the animal’s sex is central for the topic matter; Example 1 discusses boars, meaning the animals who are used to impregnate female pigs, and in Example 2 “she” refers to pigs in gestation. However, when the animal’s sex is not important for the topic, *he/she* is chosen in reference to distinguished individuals:

3. “She’ll live out her days with us as she’s a gorgeous champion and because we’re soft farmers and she’s our friend,” smiles Suzi. (‘Back to Black’, 2019: 1)

“She” in Example 3 refers to a represented real-life pig, thus the sex of the animal is known, and the corresponding pronoun is chosen. In contrast with Examples 1 and 2, the topic here does not place significance on the animal’s sex, but the use of pronouns is instead based on principles similar to those with humans and represents the animal as a gendered individual. However, one instance from data does not correspond with this pattern for choosing personal pronouns:

4. Quite simply, androstenone and skatole, which are the compounds that the male pig naturally produces when *it* is intact […] [italics added] (‘Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty’, 2018: 11)

In Example 4, the sex of the animal is explicitly mentioned, “male pig”, and the context relates to representing the physiology of a male pig, however, the animal is referred to as “it”*,* thus, suggesting an inconsistency in determining between *he* and *it* when compared to the majority of instances from the data. More specifically, Example 4 discusses the pig’s hormonal production, a topic which potentially favours representing the animal as the object of biological processes rather than individuals, hence the use of “it” rather than *he.*

The use of *it,* however, appears consistent, when the animals’ sex is not known or cannot be inferred from the context:

5. [..] when you run your hand firmly along *its* back. If the spine can be felt really easily […] the pig is too thin, but if you can’t feel the spine, even when you apply firm pressure, *it* is obese. [italics added] (‘Don’t let your pigs get porky’, 2018: 12)
6. *It* runs the risk of getting squashed or trodden on […], and *it* also has to fight with siblings to get the teat *it* wants. [italics added] (‘Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls’, 2019: 3)

In Examples 5 and 6 “it” is used to refer to a pig whose sex is not addressed nor important for the topic at hand. In addition, the animal in both examples is ‘hypothetical’, meaning that “it” does not represent any real-life animal but rather can refer to any pig. There were no instances where sex was assigned/assumed or the neutral term *they* was used, thus, emphasising the importance of availability of the animal’s sex for selecting the pronoun.

Therefore, it appears that gendered pronouns are employed in various ways, and consistent patterns of use are elusive. However, whether the animal’s sex can be inferred from the context is a strong indicator of choice between *he/she* and *it*. In Example 3, it was noted that even though the animal’s sex is not central for the topic, i.e. when discussing reproduction, it tends to be represented, however, context suggested a personal connection with the represented animals. This

could be taken to indicate a desire to represent animals in human terms, due to intimacy between the farmer and animals. This strategy would, in turn, reflect the context of data from a small-scale focused magazine. However, due to the inconsistencies in pronoun use and the preference for *it* rather than *they* indicated a commitment to conventional ways of using personal pronouns in reference to animals, rather than a consistent attempt to represent the animals as animate and gendered beings.

Similarly, the use of relative pronouns *which* and *who* is rather ambiguous. *Which* is used a total nine times, while there are five instances of *who* in the data. Therefore, it appears that *which* is more frequent compared to *who*. Again, however, the context appears important for choosing one over the other:

7. MY FIRST pigs were a couple of weaners *who* I raised to meat weight and who went on to grace our freezer and our plates. [italics added] ('A Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)
8. For most smallholders raising a few pigs for meat and therefore keeping boars *which* haven't been castrated isn't a big deal […] [italics added] ('Cutting out the Pain', 2018: 10)

Referring to pigs in Examples 7 and 8 appears motivated by whether there has been a personal connection with the animals. More specifically, Example 7 refers to a pig which is oriented to a real-life individual, thus, "who" is the preferred pronoun. The author is referring to her "first pigs", therefore, "who" contributes to constructing a sense of closeness between the farmer and the pig as well as representing the animal as animate. On the other hand, in Example 8 "which" is used to refer to pigs that are 'hypothetical', reminiscent of Examples 5 and 6 where personal pronoun "it" was used. Therefore, "which" can refer to any "few pigs" since these animals are not representative of any real-life pigs. While the majority of instances of *who/which* follow similar principles analysed above, the following example provides an exception:

9. Central to his research is his long-held belief (backed by scientific studies) that entire boars produce better, leaner carcasses and better value for money than those *who* have been physically castrated. [italics added] ('Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty', 2018: 11)

In Example 9 the animate "who" refers to an unidentifiable group of pigs, regardless of generally used for humans or animals with elevated status, such as companion animals. In addition, when considering the context, the pigs are discussed in terms of production and profitability which would suggest using linguistics tools to objectify animals, rather than terms that suggest subjectivity and animacy. It has been argued by Gilquin and Jacobs (2006: 96) that using *who* could be an unconscious attempt to conceal the questionable treatment of animals. This is aimed at by

representing them as more animate. Taking the extremely production-focused topic of Example 9, this idea could potentially explain the chosen pronoun in it.

Analysing the use of *who/which* appears motivated by represented intimacy and an established relationship between the farmer and the animal; *who* is used to refer to pigs that represent real-life animals, while *which* is chosen when pigs are discussed 'hypothetically'. However, Example 7 presents an exception to this pattern, pointing to the fact that choosing reference pronouns is not entirely consistent and motivated by additional factors.

4.1.2 Nouns referring to pigs and pig farming

This section focuses on reference words on pigs and pig farming. My analysis will begin by examining terms of reference that are commonly used within the animal production industry and that are, thus, considered generalised conventions. These 'neutral terms', based on the standards of animal agriculture, are most commonly used when referring to pigs. In addition, I will focus on different ways of referring to groups of pigs that are specific to the magazine under investigation. Rather than being categorised according to the industry conventions, in other words generally used terms to refer to commercial pigs, these examples highlight particular tendencies to refer to pigs in the magazine which are less restricted by conventions of animal production and allow for more creative and expressive language use. The last part of my analysis here examines how the process of farming pigs is referred to and the implications it has on the representation of the animals. Generally, it was noted that plural forms are used more frequently than singular ones, meaning that the most common way of representing pigs is as a group, rather than discussing individual animals. In my data, when there are references to a single animal, *pig* is used every time, whereas there are no instances of the alternative terms *swine* or *hog*.

A common tendency in animal agriculture is to refer to animals based on their role in the production line, meaning that pigs are categorized according to the purpose they serve for humans. Although this is considered standard practice within the industry, referring to pigs as their human defined roles render the animals as objects. The following examples illustrate the different terminology used:

10. Erysipelas can cause abortion or fertility issues in *sows* [italics added] ('Purple Peril for Pigs', 2019: 1)
11. Suzi [….] bought two pedigree *gilts* for her husband. [italics added] ('Back to Black', 2019: 1)
12. Groups of entire *boars* [italics added] ('Cutting out the Pain', 2018: 10)

The animal's biological sex determines the appropriate terminology; Examples 10 and 11 refer to female pigs, "sow" and "gilt", and in Example 12 male pigs are referred to as "boars". Furthermore, with female pigs, "sow" is a general term, while "gilt" refers specifically to a young pig who is nearing the age of sexual maturity. Therefore, using different terms in reference to female pigs is based on their perceived profitability, in other words a gilt is an animal deemed ready to start giving birth to piglets, and this continuous reproduction is essential for animal farming to continue operating.

13. What should you be looking for when choosing your very first *weaners*? [added emphasis] ('Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)

Lastly, in Example 13 the term "weaner" is used, meaning a young pig (or other production animal) that has recently been weaned from their mother. Although not tied to biological sex, "weaner" categorises pigs from the point of view of production, similarly with "gilt". More specifically, once animals are weaned and become "weaners", they are constructed as commodity that can be sold or raised for meat, in other words, they become profitable.

In addition to using different terminology based on the animals' perceived purpose, groups of production animals are categorised and referred to with specific terms. Again, these examples demonstrate words that are commonly used in reference to production animals and in the data correspondingly. By appearing neutral, they contribute to the overall objectifying discourse:

14. In *herds* at particularly high risk, *youngstock* can also be vaccinated. Chat with your vet to devise a vaccine protocol that fits with your *livestock*. [italics added] ('Purple Peril for Pigs', 2019: 1)
15. We have never had *stock* suffer like this […] [italics added] ('And they Call it Puppy Love', 2018: 11)

The above examples refer to pigs as an indefinite and uncountable mass, denoting them as a group. In Example 14 a group of pigs is referred to as a "herd". The term is commonly used to refer to an undefined number of animals that are grouped together under the ownership of human/s (Merriam-Webster online, 2020). Therefore, "herd" conceals the individuality of pigs while representing the human dominance over the animals. The use of "stock", and the extended "livestock" and "youngstock", conveys similar functions in rendering animals into a faceless mass but it also carries additional meaning which emphasizes the construction of animals as object. More specifically, stock can refer to both things ready for supply and to a group of domesticated animals (Merriam-Webster online, 2020). Due to the interchangeably of meaning, using the term in reference to animals objectifies them both by equation with things. Although in Example 14 qualifiers "live" and "young" connect "stock" specifically with production animals, referring to a group of pigs as

"livestock", literally meaning the living supply of something, nonetheless, represents the animals as commodities.

The following examples similarly illustrate instances where pigs are referred to as groups, however, rather than being conventionally used in animal agriculture, they represent tendencies specific to *Country Smallholding.* In effect, pigs are grouped based on their perceived purpose for humans which ultimately renders the animals as a mass.

16. […] detailed trials with numerous *batches of pigs* […] [italics added] ('Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty', 2018: 10)
17. […] the same nutritional requirements *as larger commercial types*. [italics added] ('Don't let your pigs get porky', 2018: 12)
18. However, the majority of breeders will have an admirable *set up* […] [italics added] ('Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)

As noted previously, there is a reoccurring tendency to represent pigs as a group rather than depicting them as individuals. This results in neglecting their subjectivity which, in turn could allow for considering the animals as resources rather than sentient beings. In Example 16 groups of pigs are referred to as "batches" which encourages perceiving them as indefinite resources suggesting their disposability. More specifically, "batches of pigs" represent the animals as material for "detailed trials", thus, framing their value as related to a specific purpose. Similarly, Example17 refers to pigs as "larger commercial types" which defines the animals in terms of not only their size but more significantly, their human constructed purpose as commodities to be exploited. Lastly, example 18 refers to pigs as "set up" which both hides individuality by lacking indication of plural and, similarly with "types" and "batches", the term makes do indication to animacy of the animals. Although, the context reveals that "set up" refers to pigs, using ambitious terms contributes to representing animals akin to objects. In other words, Examples 16-18 illustrate how groups of pigs are labelled and referred to with terms that encourage perceiving them as inanimate material without distinguishing the subjectivity of those included.

Lastly, Examples 19 and 20 illustrate instances where farming pigs is referred to in commercial terms and, as a result, represent the animals as objects for business and profit.

19. Today, having slimmed down their *pig operation* […] [italics added] ('Back to Black', 2019: 1)
20. […] your *pig keeping venture* […] [italics added] ('What price prime pork?', 2019: 2)

Both Examples 19 and 20 define farming pigs as a business pursuit, thus, connecting it with potential profit. In addition, both "operation" and "venture" connote a specific type of business. More specifically, "operation" can be defined as 'a usually small business or establishment'

(Merriam-Webster online, 2020), therefore, reflecting the source of the data. “Venture”, on the other hand, has connotations of risk and uncertainty (Merriam-Webster online, 2020), therefore, framing the farming of pigs as an attempt at something which has no guarantee of (long-term) success. Therefore, “operation” and “venture” are ways of referring to pig farming that reflect the idiosyncrasy of these small-scale activities. Although potentially provoking positive connotations and diverging from large industrialised animal production, the terms, nonetheless, associate farming pigs with a business.

Thus, Examples 19 and 20 demonstrated how pig farming is referred to in order to connote it with aspects that dissociate it with intensive farming. However, Example 21 provides a contrasting instance:

21. […] starting your *business* running at a loss. [italics added] (‘What price prime pork?’, 2019: 2)

Referring to pig farming as a “business” represents it as functioning on the same logic of trade and profit comparable with any other business, thus, lacking the positive connotations of “operation” and “venture”. Pig farming as a “business” ultimately frames the animals as objects producing economic value and as resources that can be utilised. It is worth noting that Examples 17 and 18 are from the same article ‘What price prime pork?’, thus, suggesting that the terms “venture” and “business” are considered interchangeable, rather than as an attempt to differentiate from the conventional meaning of business through word choices. In other words, there appears to be a consistent tendency to frame pig farming as a business, regardless of the less commercial method of production compared to intensive farming.

Analysing the terms used to refer to pigs and pig farming revealed that generalised terms such as “gilt” and “weaner” categories animals based on their perceived role in production while words chosen to represent groups of animals concealed the individuality of animals and encouraged perceiving them as limitless resources. In addition, when referring to the process of farming pigs, terms chosen suggested a commercial commitment to varying degrees, thus, failing to reflect the supposed idiosyncrasy of the data.

4.2 Processes targeting pigs

This section analyses instances of discourse where pigs are depicted as the target of different actions. More specifically, the aim is to demonstrate that placing pigs as the target of certain actions contributes the primary discourse which represents them as objects by emphasising their status as commodities as well as accounting for their subordinate position and human dominance. Of course, representing the pigs as targets is not necessarily reminiscent of the primary discourse, since their significance lies in the types of actions depicted. The analysis in this section is divided into three parts, the first of which includes an analysis of different actions related to the production animal status of pigs, while the second part examines specifically actions of "handling", and the last part analyses how the action of killing pigs is represented.

4.2.1 Farming practices

The first section consists of examples where pigs are represented as the target of actions closely related to their social construction as objects for profit. The first examples are associated with money, and as a result represent pigs of target of trade by representing them as commodities and means for financial gain.

22. You can *buy* cheap as chips pigs from livestock markets […] [italics added] ('Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)
23. So are you aiming to turn all your piglets into meat for sale, would you *sell* them as weaners […] [italics added] ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)
24. My partner Chris and I have been *selling* our rare breed, home-grown British Lop pork at Shropshire's Ludlow Market on a regular basis this past year. [italics added] ('And they call it puppy love', 2018: 11)

In Examples 22, 23 and 24 pigs are the target of "buy" and "sell" representing them as objects of transactions. In effect, depicting pigs as the target of transaction not only indicates the possession of humans over the animals but also associates them with profit since these actions typically involve the exchange of money. Additional linguistic devices are employed simultaneously to establish this representation. In Example 22 "cheap as chips", meaning extremely cheap or a bargain, describes pigs in terms of their monetary worth and frames this aspect as a qualifying feature of the animal. Additionally, representing pigs as "cheap as chips" minimises their worth even when measured by these narrow metrics. Secondly, "livestock market" equates the selling of sentient beings to that of (other) commodities that occurs at markets, since "livestock" refers to a living supply of things. "Sell" can be extended to both living animals "would you sell them as weaners" in Example 23, as well as to the product "have been selling our rare breed, home-grown British Lop pork" in Example

24, thus, pigs are associated with money and profit throughout different stages of their lives. It must be pointed out that pigs were represented as the target of selling less frequently than buying, which could indicate that the aspect of selling pigs is less central in the context of *Country Smallholding* due to its specific interest in independent small-scale farming as opposed to commercial farming where the main purpose of production is profit. Thus selling constituting a less important aspect in small-scale farming where the focus is on self-sustenance or supplementing income. On the other hand, the infrequency of representing pigs as the target of selling is also be presupposed in some cases, thus, lacking explicit representation. The following example from 'What Price Prime Pork?' illustrates the presupposed continuum between pigs and profit, which is already established in the title:

25. Don't just buy some pigs without knowing who your potential customers are and how much you will charge them. ('What Price Prime Pork', 2019: 2)

In Example 25 pigs are not explicitly represented as the target of *sell* in order to be depict them as commodities and associate them with money, however, "customer" and "charge" link pigs to the process of transaction regardless.

Examples 26 and 27 from 'The Boar Necessities' depict additional transactions that are less frequently associated with pigs compared to *buy* and *sell*, however, similarly construct the animal as an object of trade:

26. Whether you decide to buy your own boar or *hire* one in when you start breeding […] [italics added] ('The boar necessities', 2019: 1)
27. Some smallholders will never take the step of *investing* in a boar. [italics added] ('The Boar necessities', 2019: 1)

"Hire" and "invest" both involve the transaction of money, thus, linking the animals to it. "Hire" can refer to both payment of labour or service or to temporary use of something, the former being generally used in reference to humans (to hire a cook/maid etc., also *employ*) while the latter is more commonly used with objects (to hire a car). Therefore, hiring a boar can appear rather ambiguous but I argue that the use of the phrase in Example 26 renders the animal an object for two reasons. Firstly, the animal has no agency or control over the processes as opposed to humans who can act as self-directive subjects and, secondly the context is reveals that boars are simultaneously represented as the target of "hire" and "buy", thus, resulting in a similar effect as in Example 22.

In addition to linking pigs with processes of transaction, my data demonstrates the varying verbs indicating the process of farming animals. Generally, the use of a specific verb reflects the

animal's role in production and the effect on representations also vary accordingly. The first examples demonstrate the use of "raise" in reference to pigs that are destined to become meat:

28. For most smallholders *raising* a few pigs for meat […] [italics added] ('Cutting out the pain', 2018: 10)

"Raise" was the most common verb used for those pigs that are slaughtered for pork, and Example 28 expresses this connection explicitly: "a few pigs for meat". Raise does not appear in reference to pigs used for breeding, therefore, is exclusive to meat animals. It puts emphasis on the aspect of growth, which is inherent to animal production; the ability to continuously grow new animals for slaughter, is a prerequisite for operation. In addition to emphasising the aspect of growth, *raise* involves the farmer as the actor in the process while pigs are the object of it. Comparing the difference between the verbs *raise* and *grow*, further clarifies the notion. Although both verbs express (physical) change, *grow* is an intransitive verb meaning it does not require an object while the transitive verb *raise* does. As a result, expressing the physical change of a pig with *grow* places the animal as the subject, "pigs grow", while *raise* renders them as objects, "I raise pigs". Therefore, *to raise* animals indicates the authority and dominance of the subject over the object.

On the other hand, "keep" is used more ambiguously than "raise" which only appears in association with meat pigs. Firstly, "keep" is used when representing pigs that are not used specifically for meat but for other purposes:

29. […] and if you decide to *keep* a boar, or hire one in […] [italics added] ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)
30. Last year we had four litters of piglets and we haven't *kept* one for showing […] [italics added] ('Back to Black', 2019: 1)

In Example 29, the object of "keep" is a breeding animal while in example 30 the object is an animal for pigs shows. Therefore, the pigs in neither case are directly associated with meat production. In addition, "keep" is used when representing a group of pigs whose purpose is ambiguous, thus, not defined or varying.

31. If you plan to *keep* a large number of pigs […] [italics added] (What price prime pork?)

In example 31 the object of "keep" is "a large number of pigs" and the context does not specify their purpose as, for instance, meat or breeding animals, thus, "keep" is extended to discuss the owning of pigs with a variety of potential uses. However, Example 32 demonstrates an instance of "keep" used in reference to pig whose purpose is meat production.

32. […] unlike just buying in animals and *keeping* them until they are ready for slaughter. [italics added] (‘Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls’, 2019: 3)

Example 32 places pigs as the object of the verb “until they are ready for slaughter”, thus, referring to animals used for meat production. Therefore, the use of “keep” is a rather ambiguous and multifaceted way of representing farming and owning animals. However, it is used more frequently in reference to pigs who are not exclusively ‘meat pigs’, for example breeding animals, but with some exceptions, such as example 32. Regardless, “keep” animals has certain implications which contributes to the representation of pigs. Similarly “raise”, it is a transitive verb requiring a subject and an object, thus, the phrase “to keep pigs” inherently represents the animal as the object of human action. More specifically, considering the definition of the verb, “to retain in one’s possession or power” (Merriam-Webster online, 2020) reveals an aspect of domination embedded in the action. Thus, “to keep pigs” emphasises both the representation of animals as possession as well as the unequal relationship between humans and non-human animals. On the other hand, comparing with “to raise” with “to keep” indicates a more passive action since the latter does not represent (physical) change in the animals. Thus, the use of “keep” could imply a desire to represent the farmer as less active in the process that represent the killing of animals. Similar instances are further explored in section 4.2.3.

The last example in this section, Example 33, aptly illustrates the use of different verbs in reference to owning pig and the varying implications they have with respect to how the animals are represented:

33. Overfeeding can happen whether you are raising weaners for meat, keeping breeding stock, or simply have a few pigs as pets. (‘Don’t let your pig get porky’, 2018: 12)

“Raising” implies the physical change of pigs, which is a central quality for animals in meat production, while “keeping”, in reference to breeding animals, represents the domination and possession of pigs. However, with pigs defined as pets, “have” is used. Although, the verb represents belonging, it lacks the connotation of domination and is also frequently used regarding humans, for instance “I have a friend”. Therefore, the use of different verbs to signal the owning of farmed animal constructs varying representation by emphasising their human defined purposes and subordination.

The last group of examples in this section relates to the control of the biology of production animals, a central feature of the industry. However, controlling biology extends to

animals categorised as 'companion' and 'wildlife', thus, demonstrating its salience in most human-animal encounters. The first example illustrates how the process of eating is depicted in a way that represents the animal as the object:

34. […] the manufacturer's recommendation is to *feed* pet pigs according to weight. [italics added] ('Don't let your pigs get porky', 2018: 12)

In effect, in Example 34 pigs are the object of their own physiological process of eating, thus, emphasising the control of humans over animals: humans eat but pigs are fed. Moreover, representing pigs as the subject of *eat* was noticeably less frequent than depicting the animal as the object of *feed.* By placing pigs as the object of *feed,* they appear passive, rather than representing the animal as the subject of the action. Compare the difference in representation when replacing *to feed* with *to eat*: "the manufacturer's recommendation is that pigs should eat according to weight." Depicting pigs as the subject of eating represents them as animate and self-directive and removes the aspect of human domination.

In addition to eating, the reproduction of production pigs in a highly controlled aspect of animal farming. Virtually, controlling reproduction is a fundamental prerequisite since new animals need to be bred in order to have a continuous supply of meat. The following examples illustrate a reoccurring tendency of placing animals as the objects of reproduction.

35. The Westrons average 10 piglets per litter and they farrow them twice a year. ('Back to Black', 2019: 1)
36. […] if you plan to breed pedigree […] ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)

Examples 35 and 36 represent the authority of humans over the reproduction of production animals. The meaning of *farrow* is "to give birth to a litter of piglets" (Merriam-Webster online, 2020). However, Example 35 represents humans as the agent of the process, thus, assigning "them" the responsibility and control of "farrow". A similar structure occurs in Example 36 where "breed" takes on the meaning "to propagate (plants or animals) sexually and usually under controlled conditions" (Merriam-Webster online, 2020), thus, emphasising the controlled nature of reproduction. *Breed* can also be defined as "to produce (offspring) by hatching or gestation" (Merriam-Webster online, 2020), and this sentence structure would represent the animal as subject. However, no instances of the aforesaid use of the verb occurred in data. Furthermore, no use of the structure "pigs farrow" appeared either, therefore, suggesting that the preferred way of representing animals' reproduction is through human agency. Moreover, the following examples illustrate the

use of *farrow* and *breed* where the pig is absent from the process, therefore, implying the highly naturalised construction of these processes as controlled by humans:

37. If you plan to *farrow* outside […] [italics added] ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)
38. […] or don't plan to *breed* all year round. [italics added] ('The Boar necessities', 2019: 1)

The analysis in this section focused on instances where pigs are associated with different actions and processes that constitute part of the operating logic of animal agriculture and food production. More specifically, pigs were frequently represented in association with transactions and money, as well as verbs related to farming and physiological processes that objectified the animals by emphasising human dominance and control. Although, depicting pigs as the objects of such processes is seemingly neutral due to conventionalised use, they, nonetheless, represent the animals as objects of human actions following the characteristics of the primary discourse.

4.2.2 Handling procedures

This section analyses instances of data where neutral, technical and medical language is employed specifically when representing pigs as the target of procedures that are routinely performed in animal agriculture, also referred to as 'handling'. The effects are twofold; firstly, it encourages seeing the animals as objects by marginalising suffering and representing them as similar to machines and, secondly, it tends to remove the responsibility of those performing the action. The first example from 'Cutting out the Pain' provides a detailed description the process of castrating piglets

39. The piglet is held by both hind legs, with its head down, and the handler pushes both testes up into the scrotum. An incision is made through the skin of the scrotum, over each of the testes, and then each testes is popped out, with the spermatic cord cut. ('Cutting out the Pain', 2018: 10)

Example 39 demonstrates the use of different linguistic tools contributing to the register of neutral, technical and medical language when representing castration of piglets. The use of passive voice is a notable feature, and in Example 39 passive verb phrases include "is held", "is made", "is popped" and "cut", with one active verb phrase "pushes". The use of the passive obfuscates who the subject is, i.e. the person performing the action, and, by placing the target at the beginning of the sentence, simultaneously puts emphasis on the object, the one experiencing the action and being affected by it. In addition to the passive voice, word choices are significant in depicting the process of castrating piglets. First of all, neutral terms referring to animals are employed; personal pronoun "it" is used to refer to the animal, thus representing them as inanimate (see section 4.1.1), specific terminology is used for describing the animal's physique, "hind legs", as well as "handler" referring

to a person in physical charge of the animals (Merriam-Webster online, 2020). Animal specific terms are combined with medical terminology to precisely depict the animal's body: "testes", "scrotum" and "spermatic cord". Moreover, Example 39 describes the process performed on the animal in a detailed yet concise way, employing a neutral register which lacks excess description or evaluation of the action. The following example from 'The boar necessities' describes the process of snaring a pig and cutting the animal's tusks:

40. The key to restraining is successfully placing the noose in the mouth and over the top half of the snout. The noose is pulled tight and held, or tied to a gate. Once the loop is tightened, the pig quickly works out that pulling will achieve nothing and gives up. Sawing through the tusk need only take a few minutes, using a piece of cheese wire with handles at both ends. Sawing is more effective than clipping, as it leaves a cleaner surface. ('The boar necessities', 2019: 1)

In the same way as with example 35, Example 40 employs the passive voice to describe processes performed on pigs. More specifically, the only active verbs refer to the pig, "works out" and "gives up", while all actions performed on the animal by humans are in passive, including "is pulled" and "is tightened". Representing the pig as an active subject makes the animal visible, however, what is represented is them submitting to the actions of humans. In addition to the passive voice, nominalisation is also apparent in Example 40, and it has a similar effect in alluding human agency by placing the action, rather than the subject, at the foreground. More specifically, "sawing" is used in place of a transitive verb *to saw,* which would require both the subject and object. The derived nominalised form refers to a process, thus, resulting in the absence of an agent performing the action.

The final example illustrates a handling procedure which does not necessarily inflict considerable pain on the animal, but which, however, is about the controversial procedure of chemically castrating piglets. Essentially, the process prevents the animals from entering puberty thereby minimising the risk of unpleasant taste, thus, securing profit. Similarly to Examples 39 and 40, neutral, medical and technical language is used to depict the action:

41. The second dose then eliminates the compounds that cause boar taint. Two separate doses of 2ml need to be given at least four weeks apart, the first at eight weeks old. Manufacturers recommend that the second is given four to six weeks before slaughter. However, if the planned slaughter date is more than 10 weeks after the second dose, an additional dose may have to be given. Each dose is given by subcutaneous injection in the neck. ('Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty', 2018: 11)

Again, the passive voice is frequently employed in Example 41, thus, resulting in the absence of a subject performing the actions, and in an emphasis on the object of action. Consider the difference between "Two separate doses of 2ml need to be given" and "You need to give two separate doses"

in the visibility for the subject. However, "manufacturers recommend*"* utilises an active verb in order to represent the voice of an authority, therefore, validating the legitimacy of action. Furthermore, Example 41 employs a medical register by describing in detail the process performed on the animal, especially regarding specific timing of action and correct dosage, and using terminology such as "injection" and "subcutaneous" (meaning that it is administered under the skin) to further depict the action in a precise manner. In addition, the nouns "slaughter" and "slaughter date" are used in place of representing the action with *to slaughter.* Depicting the killing of animals is discussed in the next section 4.2.3.

The examples discussed in this chapter represent painful and morally questionable actions that are routinely performed on pigs and considered as necessary within the industry. However, the way these actions are represented resembles what Glenn (2004) referred to as doublespeak, in other words, as the neutral representation of inhumane actions performed on pigs. The passive voice, nominalisation and word choices were some of the central linguistic choices used to construct a neutral and medical representation of castration and cutting a boar's tusks. In effect, such language use marginalises the issue of pain and suffering of the animal by reducing the actions of handling to things that performed by an undefined agent to part of the animals' bodies, which ultimately makes it difficult to perceive the animal as an animate being capable of experiencing the pain resulting from these actions.

4.2.3 Slaughtering pigs

This section analyses the process of killing that targets pigs and the effects it has on their representation. On the whole, the way killing animals is represented in my data has the effect of obscuring the reality by omitting the act of killing and by utilizing different linguistic devices to allude to it. The fact that pigs are killed for meat is a presupposition of animal farming underlying the descriptions of slaughter and those consuming the discourses in *Country Smallholding* subscribe to this collective reality where pigs are constructed as production animals. Therefore, the lack of explicitly in representing slaughter does not compromise intelligibility. However, the implicit nature of the presuppositions of slaughter makes it a powerful vehicle of discourse: it is actually difficult to detect and contest it.

Representing pigs as the target of killing is a central aspect of the discursive construction of production animals. As mentioned previously, the relationship between pigs and humans is defined by human control over these animals, and the ability to inflict pain and specially

to kill another living creature is the ultimate manifestation of power and control. The way in which killing animals for consumption is discussed is an integral part of the overall discourse which represents pigs as object by diminishing subjectivity and framing them as object. The following analysis is divided into three parts: the first analyses instances where killing animals is alluded to by reference to time, place or as a quality of the animal. The second part consist of examples where killing animals is omitted altogether and, however, the underlying presupposition allows for intelligibility. The last part includes an analysis of references to killing that can be characterised as euphemistic, due to replacing the action of killing with an expression that does not evoke the same negative connotation.

A common tendency in discussing killing pigs is to frame it as an integral and natural extension of their existence, or more specifically, a stable quality of the animals. The following examples illustrate this.

42. You may be used to feeding pigs up to pork or bacon weight for a relatively short time (six to 10 months) […]" ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)
43. MY FIRST pigs were a couple of weaners who I raised to meat weight […] ('Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)

In Examples 42 and 43, a physical quality of a pig, "weight", is qualified by "pork", "bacon" or "meat", referring to the product commercial pigs ultimately become. As a result, "pork weight" appears as a natural attribute of a pig; once they reach this weight the animal becomes the product, changing from an animate being to an inanimate object. Thus, the process which targets the animals and represents the change from living to dead, slaughtering, is omitted, making "meat weight" synonymous with killing. Compare the effect when worded differently: "You may be used to feeding pigs up to a weight when they are slaughtered for meat". Thus, rather than being inherent to the animal, these are arbitrary categories created by humans to refer to a weight when an animal is perceived suitable for killing in terms optimal cost-benefit ration.

The process of killing animals is also represented by reference to time which similarly hides the action of killing as well as establishes the idea that there is a pre-determined and fixed point in time when animals are slaughtered.

44. However, if the planned slaughter date is more than 10 weeks after the second dose, an additional dose may have to be given. ('Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty', 2018: 11)
45. With meat pigs, you will see the result of your generosity in a disappointingly fat carcass at slaughter time […] ('Don't let your pigs get porky', 2018: 12)

In example 44 the term “planned slaughter date” was used to indicate when an animal is destined to be slaughtered. Despite the fact that “planned” suggests fluidity of the date in terms of potential to choose, “slaughter date” appears as a fixed concept. Similarly to example 45, “slaughter time” refers to the time when animals are killed, however, without addressing the ability to influence it. Therefore, the idea of “slaughter time” and “slaughter data” as stable concepts appear as pre-determined aspect and outside of control, rather than as a human defined point in time, alluding to the time animals are slaughtered.

Reference to the place where animals are slaughtered is also used to represent the action. The following examples illustrate the use *abattoir*:

46. […] and making the abattoir trip of youngsters less stressful, we acquired a pair of gilts […] (‘Pig in a Poke?’, 2018: 10)
47. Sending your first pigs to the abattoir can be tough (‘Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls’, 2019: 3)

In Examples 46 and 47 “abattoir”, a physical place where animals are killed, implies the action of killing. More specifically, in Example 46 “the abattoir trip” is used. The connotations of “trip” imply potential return for the animals which diverges the reality of the death that occurs in slaughterhouses. Therefore, the reference to a place as synonymous with the act of killing conceals the potentially uncomfortable reality. This is further emphasised by referring to pigs as “youngsters”, meaning ‘young people’ (Merriam-Webster online, 2020) in Example 46, as well as accounting for experienced emotional distress in both examples; “less stressful” and “tough”. In addition, no responsibility for butchering animals is assigned since there is no action being taken. By masking the action behind killing animals and rendering it synonymous to a location conceals the reality; animals do not merely take a trip to the abattoir but are taken there to be slaughtered. Lastly, it is worth noticing the fact that throughout the article, “abattoir” appears frequently as the most often used term to refer to the place animals are killed, while the alternative term *slaughterhouse* is not used. The consistent preference of *abattoir* throughout different articles suggests it is the magazine’s stylistic preference, rather than the choice of individual journalists. One possible reason for preferring *abattoir* over *slaughterhouse* could be the fact that the latter is more literal in meaning while the former carries a more implicit meaning due to being a word borrowed from French (Merriam-Webster online, 2020).

The next group of examples include instances where a link between an animate pig and the product, pork is indirectly created, thus, establishing an inevitable and inseparable connection

between the two. The first examples illustrate the different verbs that are used to represent the process through which pigs become pork:

48. When finished, the pigs' carcasses are leaner […] ('Injecting to the delay the onslaught of puberty', 2018: 11)
49. At seven or eight months of age you will reap 45–50 kg of meat per pig. ('Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)
50. So are you aiming to turn all your piglets into meat for sale, would you sell them as weaners […] ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)

These examples omit the use of verbs that explicitly signify killing, by replacing it with alternatives that are more vague in expressing the action. In Example 48 "finished" is used instead of *killed* or *slaughtered* and is the most explicit out of the three examples due to a more conventionalised association with killing, also used regarding killing humans (usually with preposition *off*). Additionally, "carcass" refers to the dead body of a production animal, thus, creating a more explicit connection with dying compared to reference to the product. "Reap" in Example 49, on the other hand, obscured the action of killing by employing a verb also associated with plants, synonymous to *harvest.* Thus, the process through which pigs become meat is referred to with a term associated with insentient plants and has little connotations with death or violence. Lastly, Example 50 provides the most implicit expression of killing pigs for meat: "turn into" does not evoke an image of death, but rather suggests change or development. Due to the unspecific and vague description of the action, the process through which pigs are represented as becoming meat appears neutral.

The following examples represent the pig-pork continuum by omitting the representation of action through which this link is established altogether.

51. […] as lots of people who want the good life take two or three [pigs], enjoy them through the spring and summer months, feeding them from allotments and orchards, and then they pop them in the freezer for the best meat they say they've ever tasted ('Back to black', 2019: 1)
52. They are a long pig, so the bacon is a better size ('Back to Black', 2019: 1)

The same idea applies to Example 51 where living pigs become meat without having been slaughtered. More specifically, they are fed, thus represented as living, after which popped into the freezer through which they are suddenly "the best meat they say they've ever tasted". This example demonstrates a complete omission of the act of killing pigs, however, it is presupposed and the understanding is assumed to be shared by those who are reading the article. Similarly in Example 52, the continuum from a living pig to the product of bacon is presupposed and the adverb "so" connects the two without lacking intelligibility. The trajectory of a pig's life living beings to

becoming products for consumption is naturalized to the point n that the actual process through which pig becomes pork does not require mention for the sentence the remain meaningful and coherent. Killing or slaughtering is presupposed and inseparable with the animals, however, not addressing it renders the act invisible.

What is noticeable from analysing the instances of text where killing pigs for their meat is addressed, is what is absent. Namely, there is only one example where killing is associated with the farmer:

> 53. Slaughter younger. Killing at five to six months can minimise the risk of taint because the pig is less likely to be sexually mature. ('Cutting out the Pain', 2018: 10)

This can be understood as a command, thus propagating the message that the reader ought to do something. As mentioned above, this appears to be the only instances where the responsibility of killing is on the farmer. Furthermore, as Trampe (2017: 237) noted, there appears to be a tendency to avoid words which are considered taboo such 'death' and 'killing'. With only one instances of the word 'killing' and no use of the word death this notion is represents the analysis in the present study.

The examples above do not overtly mention the act of killing and, thus, distance the role of the farmer as an active participant responsible for ending the lives of pigs. They indirectly create a link between a pig and meat, and thus the motivation for killing animals, meat production, is explicit even though the act of doing it might not be. For example, "raising pigs to meat weight" juxtaposes the words "pig" and "meat" thus they are inherently linked and relate to one another. However, the use of euphemisms, meaning replacing the action of killing pigs with an expression where the literal meaning does not correlate to what is meant, is discussed in 5.3. as an expression of the secondary discourse on pigs.

4.3 Evaluation: profit, efficiency and risk

This section analyses instances of evaluation from the data. In general, evaluation refers to the value assigned to situations and entities, it reveals the judgements and dispositions embedded in text which ultimately construct discourses. In other words, evaluation regards the appraisals and opinions, approval or disapproval encoded in discourse. (Thompson and Hunston, 2000: 5). It is important to note that evaluation consists of a variety of linguistic means and evaluation can only be understood and analysed in reference to the context in which it occurs (Bednarek, 2006: 8).

Therefore, the below examples illustrate the use of different linguistic features in order to evaluate the phenomena under investigation. In general, the use of evaluation in the present study appears to frame phenomena from the point of view of profitability and efficiency. In other words, when assigning value to pigs, this assessment is based on the narrow definition of either decreasing or increasing the profitability and efficiency of the animal. Thus, what is emphasised is the animal's role in food production while simultaneously neglecting their wellbeing and subjectivity. Positive evaluation of increased profitability and efficiency are, of course, central values in most businesses aiming to create a profit, and the analysis in this section strongly associated pig farming to conventional business models.

Arguably the most apparent tendency to evaluate pigs and pig farming is based on the metrics of increasing profitability and efficiency is by discussing money. Several instances were discovered where aspects of animal farming were evaluated against the probability of either saving or losing money. In effect, evaluating animals based on economic motives decreases their value to monetary terms and, ultimately, represents them as commodities rather than sentient beings.

54. I thought feeding up a pig in a stable would be cheaper than buying pork from a butcher. ('Back to black', 2019: 1)
55. Be strict about feeding: Giving pigs more because they tell you they want more is throwing money down the drain. ('What price prime pork?', 2019: 2)

Both examples make a distinct connection with pigs and money, thus representing it as a central aspect of farming animals. More specifically, Example 54 describes the reasoning behind starting to farm pigs for their meat; it "would be cheaper", thus evaluating it based on the probability of saving money which considered a positive outcome. In Example 55, on the other hand, feeding animals is presented as negative, based on it resulting in loss of money. More specifically, excess feeding is deemed the same as "throwing money down the drain", meaning literally wasting money on nothing. In addition, pigs are represented as responsible for economic loss as the subjects of "they tell you they want more", thus framing the action of "giving pigs more", the reason for money loss, as the result of the animals' behaviour. In effect, this represents pigs negatively as greedy animals, demanding more food at the risk of economic loss. Example 56 frames the value of boars from the point of view of profitability which ultimately results in increased profit:

56. […] entire boars produce better, leaner carcasses and better value for money than those who have been physically castrated. ('Cutting out the pain', 2018: 10)

"Better value for money" evaluates the animals based on the probability of increasing profit, in other words the animal's worth is defined by the logic of maximum profit for minimum costs, thus, associating living animals with the production of any other commodities following a similar logic. However, Example 57 provides an alternative representation where evaluating animals based on money is explicitly rejected:

57. Despite the massively increased food bill for these newborn piglets (puppy milk is not cheap), we dutifully fed them five times a day. ('And they call it puppy love', 2018: 11)

In effect, "despite the massively increased food bill" acknowledges the logic of animal farming based on the motive to increase profit, while simultaneously rejecting it and representing the subject, "we", acting in the opposite manner. This is emphasised even further by highlighting the loss of money, "not cheap", and positively evaluating behaviour, "dutifully". Similar instances where pigs and pig farming are represented as meaningful beyond industry perspective are analysed in more detail under the secondary discourse.

Examples 54–57 illustrate the prevalence of the motive to increase profit and decrease losses either by evaluating aspect of farming against this logic or by explicitly rejecting it for an alternative approach. Nonetheless, associating pigs with money and evaluating aspects of farming based on this narrow perception ultimately represents the animals as objects whose worth is determined by profitability.

Profitability and efficiency are also central values when evaluating pigs' appearance and describing the animals. Generally, the data includes a relatively limited amount of description of pigs' appearance, however, the following Examples 58 and 59 demonstrate how the animals are evaluated in terms of what they ought to look like:

58. With Large Blacks, measuring up means that not one white hair is allowed, they should boast 14 to 16 even working teats, no inverted nipples, a good, straight back, strong, straight legs, ears to the nose and in proportion, with good round bottoms (hams). ('Back to Black', 2019: 1)
59. Their bottoms should be clean with no signs of scouring (diarrhoea) and there should be no lice or other crawling things running around on their skin under the bristles. You want them to be cough-free and a good pig shape, with nice chunky hams and no signs of lameness ('Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)

Examples 58 and 59 describe the animals' appearance from the point of view of their human determined purpose which, in context of production animals, relates to increasing efficiency of production and, as a result, maximising profit. In Example 58, the focus is on depicting the animal based on the standards for showing and breeding pigs, while the topic of Example 59 is "Selection criteria", referring to the standards for meat pigs. Therefore, in both examples, evaluation is

motivated by the animal's assigned purpose, thus, the focus is exclusively on aspects from that perspective, i.e. what constitutes a good show or meat pig. What is noticeable is the use of the adjective "good" to evaluate the animals' appearance. For instance, in Example 59 "good" appears rather ambiguously, however, regarding it from the perspective of animal production industry, the evaluation as "good" more distinct, therefore, "a good pig-shape" employs a specific interpretation of "good" which follows the metrics of the industry and is ultimately based on desired performance to increase profit. Similarly to Example 58, the meaning of "good round bottoms" is only intelligible from the point of view of the pig's purpose as a show animal, meaning the criteria determined by that narrow context. The human defined perspective of evaluation is highlight it further: "is allowed", "should" and "you want them to be" represent it as an outside demand rather than based on the animals' perspective. In addition, the phrase "no signs" in Example 59 puts forward the importance of outside evaluation thus, the central aspects relate specifically to what can be visually observed.

Evaluating the appearance of pigs is based on the industry's point of view which highlights profitability and efficacy of animals, therefore, exclusively accounting for aspects deemed important from that perspective. This evaluation perspective for pigs becomes increasingly distinct when in contrast with description of sheep:

60. […] but those extreme curly locks mean that once seen, never forgotten. Those locks can be more than 30cm long and, to top it all off, they boast a Shirley Temple mop top. As if they needed any more distinctive features, their heads and ears are blue, although somewhat muted in tone when compared to a Smurf. They are regal, imposing (the largest of the UK's native breeds) and true head-turners. ('Long-haired lovelies from Liverpool', 2019: 2)

Comparing Example 60 to Examples 58 and 59 it becomes apparent that the evaluation of the appearance of sheep and pigs is based on different values. Describing the animals' fleece as akin to a human's hair and employing adjectives like "regal" and "imposing" are in stark contrast with "good straight back" and "strong legs". The overall difference is evident: pigs are evaluated from the point of view of efficiency of use, while sheep are portrayed in positive terms that go beyond their immediate purpose for humans. Importantly, there is no comparable example on pigs, thus, the representation of pigs' appearance contributes the discourse of production and objectification.

61. Breeds vary in the speeds at which they grow and the ratio of meat to bone they produce. ('What price prime pork?', 2019: 2)

In example 61, the evaluation similarly reflects the ideals of efficiency and profitability and evaluates the animal as a whole. Example 61 constructs a representation of pigs as mechanical

objects: “Speed at which they grow” and “meat to bone ratio” are the features against which different breeds are evaluated, and the desirability of these features is based on increasing the animal’s profitability. More specifically, the term *ratio* is defined as “the relationship in quantity, amount, or size between two or more things: proportion” (Merriam-Webster online, 2020). Therefore, in example 61 “the ratio of meat to bone” refers to the proportion between the quantity of bone to meat. In other words, this ratio is used to evaluate the efficiency of a pig: the higher the ratio the better.

Lastly, evaluation of risk is apparent in two articles ‘Cutting out the Pain and ‘Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty’. These articles discuss boar taint which is defined as “an unpleasant taste and/or smell found in the meat of some uncastrated boars when the meat is heated.” (‘Cutting out the Pain’, 2018: 10). Boar taint is framed as a risk, thus, evaluating it negatively. Given the definition “the possibility of something bad happening” (Merriam-Webster online, 2020) evaluating something as a risk, it is assigns it with negative connotations. Examples from these two articles demonstrate the use of “risk” to refer to boar taint:

62. But the main reason boars are castrated is to prevent any risk of what is commonly known as ‘boar taint’ […] (‘Cutting out the pain’, 2018: 10)
63. According to studies carried out, while the main reason for using immunocastration is to delay puberty and reduce the risk of boar taint […] (‘Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty’, 2018: 11)

Evaluating boar taint as a risk, however, only makes sense from the point of view of business profit, since there is no actual danger for the animal. In other words, boar taint is not a medical condition that could endanger the life of an animal or have any serious consequences on their health, in fact taint is only detectible once the animal is already dead and ready to be consumed. Therefore, boar taint is only risky for the producer since it can potentially reduce the profit of meat sales. Regardless, by evaluating taint as a risk lends justification for actions that attempt to reduce or eliminate the risk. Example 62 discusses the issue of castration which is framed as the main reason of preventing the risk of taint. Castrating boars is, thus, justified by, first of all, framing taint as a “risk” and castration as a means to “prevent” this risk. However, castrating boars inflicts pain on the animal and subjects them to medical risks in order to prevent potential risks to profit. Therefore, the value of the animal is defined by their ability to make a profit and, thus, detriments to their wellbeing come second. Evaluating potential customer dissatisfaction as a risk justifies to conduction of such actions as castration.

Although the opposing argument is accounted for in 'Cutting out the pain' and 'Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty', it is given noticeably little space. Examples 64 and 65 illustrate how the opposing argument is framed:

64. With the European Union still aiming to end the painful practice of physically castrating boars by the end of 2018, Liz Shankland looks at the issues involved and the implications for the future. ('Cutting out the pain', 2018: 10)
65. Welfare campaigners have long argued that this type of castration — carried out in the first week of life to guard against any risk of boar taint (See box, right) — is painful, inhumane and medically risky ('Injecting to delay to onslaught of puberty', 2018: 11)

In these Examples, castration is evaluated negatively. However, in Example 64 to whom castration is "painful" is only presupposed rather than explicitly stated. More specifically, what is evaluated as "painful" is the "practice of physically castrating boars", therefore the action which is performed by humans is emphasised over the effects which are related to the animals. In addition, the appeal to authority "the European Union" assigns responsibility to the institute, thus, framing the practice as "painful" representing the voice of the EU rather than the author. Example 65 illustrates a similar situation where the painful effects of castration are not explicitly associated with the animal but the noun "type of castration" and the responsibility is assigned to "Welfare campaigners" who frame the issue as "painful, inhumane and medically risky", thus, not representing the author's voice. This is emphasised by the use dash to represent the author's voice commenting in between welfare campaigners' statements. Additionally, the verb choice here is revealing; "guard" implies that is castration is protective and similarly with evaluating it as "painful", whose interests are protected, the farmer's or the animal's, remains ambiguous.

This section analysed a reoccurring tendency in my data to evaluate pigs and pig farming from the point of view of profitability and efficiency which were framed as positive values. The effects of such evaluation contribute to the construction of the primary discourse by framing the animals' existence from the restricted perspective of business. In addition, evaluating boar taint as a risk was considered to amount to similar effects due to neglecting the wellbeing of animals in order to secure their productivity.

4.4 Association of pigs with objects

The focus of analysis in this section is on examples where pigs are objectified, and the subjectivity of the animals marginalised through association. What is meant by association is establishing a connection between two or more seemingly unrelated things. These things are represented as

sharing similar qualities and assuming these similarities is the process through which association is made meaningful. I argue that associating pigs and pig farming with inanimate things is an effective tool in constructing the primary discourse in which pigs are represented as objects. The following examples further illustrate this point by providing instances of text where association is used:

66. If you had a bit of experience as an amateur carpenter, it wouldn't make any sense to start making lots of chairs if you weren't confident you would be able to sell them, would it? The same logic applies to breeding ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)

In Example 66 pigs are juxtaposed with chairs and, as a result, represented as sharing some essential qualities. However, unlike pigs, chairs are not sentient or animate, thus, the associations renders the animals as akin to objects. In other words, it overlooks the crucial aspect which sets animals, and working with them, apart from crafting and selling chairs. Instead, the association emphasises the fact that both are, firstly, produced by humans, "making lot of chairs" and secondly objects for sale, "sell them". The association is, thus, created based on the ideas of business and the similarities between pigs and chairs are represented from this perspective, while simultaneously neglecting the subjectivity of sentient beings. Although the similarities between pigs and chairs are assumed in order to create meaning, the connection between animal farming and making of chairs is made explicit: "The same logic applies to breeding.", therefore, further highlighting the perceived similarities. The next example illustrates a similar case; however, the association is constructed less explicitly:

67. Breed type or seed variety, space and animal husbandry, feed and ultimately the location of where an animal is slaughtered are all factors affecting the flavour of produce […] ('And they call it puppy love', 2018: 11)

Example 67 juxtaposes "breed type" and "seed variety" by using the conjunction "or", therefore, representing them as equivalent, as well as labelling both as "factors". Similarly to Example 54 the association is based on the perceived similarities from the point of view of production and are both regarded as "factors" of similar importance in determining the flavour of produce. Therefore, the connection only makes sense when determined from this narrow perspective. Since seeds and breeds are constructed as serving a similar purpose of becoming produce, the association is intelligible, however, simultaneously objectifying the animals by connecting their worth with the flavour of a product. Example 68 is another instance of associating pigs with inanimate objects:

68. "I'm a lady who likes the finer things in life. Ask Stu," confesses Suzi Westron of Choller Farm Pigs. The Arundel, West Sussex resident is discussing how she first became a pig owner ('Back to Black', 2019: 1)

The association in Example 68 is rather difficult to point out, due to being carried out by the consequential use of conjunctions. Nonetheless, the connection between being someone “who like the finer things” and being “a pig owner” is created in order for Example 68 to be intelligible. More specifically, intelligibility is established through cohesion which presupposes a logical connection between the different elements of text. Although, the association does not reflect the perspective of production like in Examples 66 and 67, it nonetheless associates the animals with objects that can be consumed. In addition, Example 68 represents pigs in a seemingly positive light by describing them as akin to “finer”, however, the association still reduces their existence to that of “things”. In general, the phrase “finer things in life” is used to refer to items that are regarded as expensive or luxurious. By establishing this association, and even though pigs are equated with luxury, it places central the fact that the value of an animal is defined in relation to humans rather than as subjects of their own life.

The above examples illustrate the way in which pigs are represented as inanimate objects through the process of association. Juxtaposing an animal with an objects both dismisses the central aspect of sentience which sets pigs apart from the inanimate “chairs”, “seed variety” or “finer thing”, and as a result, emphasises as significant those shared qualities that render them akin to commodities, in other words the dominance of humans to produce and sell them, their role in food and the social construction that regards pigs as ‘something’ rather than ‘someone’.

5 SECONDARY DISCOURSE: SUBJECTS OF SUBORDINATION

The secondary discourse on pigs that can be identified in *Country Smallholding* constructs the animals as animate beings and accounts for their subjectivity. Thus, it provides an alternative representation to the primary discourse where the animals were represented mainly as objects of production and commodities. This discourse is characterised as secondary due to its relative infrequency in the data. More specifically, in only one of the articles 'And they call it puppy love', it was the predominant discourse, while in other articles it was subordinate to the primary discourse. Its presence can be explained by the magazine's focus on the peculiarities of small-scale farming, or smallholding which is characterized by smaller herd sizes resulting in increased subjectivity of animals and less invasive farming methods when compared to intensive animal production.

The secondary discourse is constructed of representations of pigs that specifically depict them as individuals and subjective beings as well as of descriptions of the farmer-animal relationship as meaningful beyond the immediate incentive of production. In this chapter I report on my analysis of the linguistic devices drawn in the construction of the secondary discourse: these include ways of referring to pigs, pigs as the target and subject of processes, the association of pigs with companion animals and humans, as well as evaluation related to the suffering/death of the animals' and their character. Each linguistic device is analysed individually with examples illustrating their effect of the representation of pigs and how they relate to the overall secondary discourse.

5.1 Referring to pigs

Words of reference are significant in the representation of pigs in *Country Smallholding*. In section 4.1. I discussed different ways of referring to the animals central to the primary discourse on pigs in which they are regarded mainly as means for profit and objects of production. However, this section demonstrates references that contribute to an alternative representation. This section consists of examples where pigs are referred to with terms that represent them as individuals, and of examples where referring emphasises human affect for and distinct status of specific pigs.

The first examples in this section demonstrate the use of reference words which signal family relationships between pigs, as well as ways of naming the animals in order to emphasise their individuality. It is worth noting that these instances were not very frequent in data: they were

limited to some instances in a few articles, thus, suggesting the preference of discussing pigs as either a group or referring to 'hypothetical' individuals, rather than naming specific animals. Despite this, they provide an interesting contrast with the more generally used reference words such as *it* or *sow*.

69. They [the Large Blacks] are milky mummies, so the piglets are chunky within days of being born. […] ('Back to Black', 2019: 1)
70. She will spend the rest of her days at Middle Farm, hopefully becoming a mother to her own litter […] ('And they call it puppy love', 2018: 11)
71. Charlotte's sister, Rosie ('And they call it puppy love', 2018: 11)

In Example 69 pigs are referred to with the informal word for mother, "mummy", a term generally used for humans, thus humanising the animal by extending the use of "mummy" to pigs. However, this effect is debatable due to the use of "milky" to qualify "mummies". More specifically, "milky" regards the pig's ability to produce a large quantity of milk for her offspring. Therefore, referring to pigs as "milky mummies" suggests productivity rather than associating the animals with aspects traditionally linked to motherhood. In other words, being a "mummy" is defined by industry objectives of productivity and the ability to produce "chunky piglets". In Examples 70 and 71, on the other hand, the effect of representing family relationships is different. Both examples are from 'And they call it puppy love' discussing one farmer's specific pigs, thus, "mother" and "sister" referrer to known individuals as opposed to a breed of pigs more generally like in Example 69. In general, acknowledging the animals' kinship constructs a representation of pigs as more than objects for food production; referring to them as "mothers" or "sisters" takes on some of the same connotations as in reference to humans, thus, bridging the gap between human and animal. However, it is worth noting that when referring to male pigs, boars, no kinship terms appeared, thus suggesting that acknowledging kinship is limited to female pigs. It could be argued that the role of boars in the industry does not reflect human definition of "father" and, therefore, they are represented as "workers" rather than family (the use of *hire* was analysed in section 4.2.1). In general, it has been noted that the constructions of female production animals tend to be concordant with traditional notions of femininity, including motherhood (Wilkie, 2010: 62).

In addition to representing kinship, referring to pigs with given names contributes to representing them as individual animals. In effect, naming an animal grants them special status by providing separation from the mass.

72. […] we acquired a pair of gilts, Dorothea and Persephone, known forever as Dot and Percy. […] In the end, Dot and Percy became pets and never had litters. ('Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)

73. With a litter of eight boars and one gilt, we have decided to keep the latter. Already tamed and named Dotty […]. She will spend the rest of her days at Middle Farm […] (‘And they Call it puppy love’. 2018: 11)
74. Not every pig has long floppy ears on this farm, however. There is one interloper in the form of Larretta. (‘Back to Black’, 2019: 1)

The above Examples are from the only three articles where pigs were named. However, these instances demonstrate how naming an animal represents them as an individual and displays a sense of intimacy between the farmer and the animal. In essence, these animals are special. Naming pets has been considered a significant way of incorporating them within human societies and of establishing emotional connectedness (DeMello, 2012: 149). Thus, referring to animals by names blurs the boundaries of social construction between pets and food animals. In addition, the minority of production animals that are named are known for their individuality and character and being distinct from the rest (Cook and Sealey, 2017: 317). Considering the context of data from a small-holding magazine, naming could be considered as a reflection of the intimacy created by small herd sizes, a characteristic of hobby farming.

Examples 75 and 76 demonstrate the use of reference words that similarly indicate that certain animals have a special status. In other words, they are revealing of how humans position themselves to their animals. Related to the examples of naming, these reference words grant a pig a distinct status, in comparison with the rest, by setting them apart and representing them as having value beyond their role in production:

75. The Middle Whites were always Amber’s choice. (‘Back to Black’, 2019: 1)
76. […] your very first weaners […] (‘Pig in a poke?’, 2018: 10)

In Example 75 a breed of pigs is referred to as “Amber’s choice” which represents them as special and distinct from the point of view of a human. Although, seemingly constructing a positive representation by depicting them as someone’s choice, i.e. special, the animals are ultimately referred to from a human’s perspective as the object choice, thus, highlighting the inherent dominance of humans over pigs. In addition, “the Middle Whites” refers specific breed of pigs and by referring to a breed similarly sets the pigs apart from the rest and assigns them a level of status and prestige. However, being a human-defined category, assigning animals into breeds emphasises the control of humans. Similarly, Example 76 describes pigs as “your very first weaners” which represent these pigs as having special status by being “the first” and setting them apart from the rest who follow. However, once more, referring to pigs as “your very first weaners” constructs them

from the point of view of humans and emphasises the significance the animals have for the farmer rather than in their own right.

77. “She’ll live out her days with us as she’s a gorgeous champion and because we’re soft farmers and she’s our friend,” smiles Suzi. (‘Back to black’, 2019: 1)

Lastly, in Example 77 the pig is referred to as “our friend” which grants the animal special status as well as suggests a strong emotional bond between the farmer and the animal. In contrast with Examples 75 and 76 where animals are regarded in terms that represent them as special in comparison with other pigs while simultaneously acknowledging dominance, referring to a production animal as a “friend” constructs the animal as akin to companion animals. Example 77, illustrates the only instance which suggests mutuality of affection rather than human dominance. It provides contrast with the majority of instances, however, coming across as rather exaggerative. The exaggerative tone is further emphasised by describing the animal as “a gorgeous champion”. More specifically, “our friend” does not represent a production animal as suggested by “She’ll live out her days with us” which potentially justifies exaggeration of description and reference that construct the pig as a companion animal.

The analysis of the ways of referring to pigs that included naming, kinship and words that signal status revealed that they were either used in reference to pigs that represented real-life individuals or only amounted to representing individuality of animals ostensibly by alluding to human perspective and dominance. Reference patterns that were consistently applied to pigs more generally to signal individuality and subjectivity were not discovered in data, thus, the overall way of referring to pigs is dominated by the conventions laid out in in section 4.1. excluding a limited number of instances as illustrated in this section.

5.2 Pigs as the target and subject of action

My analysis of the primary discourse on pigs included examples where the animals where represented as the target of a variety of processes, relating to different aspects of animal farming including the handling and killing pigs which represented the animals as inanimate commodities and objects of production. However, depicting pigs as the target of action does not inherently render them as commodities. In this section I analyse instances of data where pigs are the target of action, but which, however, contribute to the construction of the secondary discourse by representing individuality of the animals and depicting them as meaningful beyond industry incentives. The

second part focuses on examples where pigs are the subject of processes, thus, they are represented as actors, rather than the ones affected, and how this contributes to the overall representation of the animals.

5.2.1 Pigs as the target of action

The first instances place pigs are the target of human affection depicting an emotional connection with animals. In other words, these processes represent the feelings and emotions of humans towards their animals. Depicting the affection of humans towards pigs provides an interesting contrast to their social construction as production animals and represents them as more than objects that are utilised for different purposes.

Although the Examples 78–80 suggest an emotional connection between humans and pigs, the degree and depth of this connection varies according to verbs chosen to depict this process:

78. He fell in love with them and they were followed by a Middle White as Amber had taken a shine to them. (‘Back to Black’, 2019: 1)

Example 78 illustrates two instances of affection towards pigs: “fell in love” and “take a shine”, the first of which represents a deeper degree of emotional attachment than the latter. More specifically, the expression “take a shine to SB” means “to begin to like (someone or something).” (Merriam-Webster online, 2020). Example 79 demonstrates a similar instance where different degrees of affection are described:

79. You may get attached to the weaners you rear, but when you start up a breeding herd you will become even more infatuated with your pigs. (‘Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls’, 2019: 3)

The two examples of affection “get attached” and “become infatuated” similarly represent varying degrees of affection since the former implies feelings of strong connection to someone while the latter refers to a state of “being filled with or marked by a foolish or extravagant love or admiration” (Merriam-Webster online, 2020). Importantly, the different degrees of affection are represented as dependent on the animals’ role in production. “The weaners you rear” refers to the animals in the production chain who are slaughtered for meat and, therefore, spend less time on the farm. The represented emotional connection between the animal and farmer is “attachment” signalling the temporary purpose of weaners. On the hand, the pigs in “a breeding herd” are evidently kept for breeding purposes and, thus, live for longer, allowing for a deeper degree of affection towards the animals, which shows here in the choice of the expression “become infatuated”. In addition, a

varying degree of probability is represented; "may" indicates possibility while "will" is more affirmative, suggesting inevitability. This notion is also echoed by Wilkie (2010: 133) who noted that increased emotional affect is correlated with long term contact with animals, for example in the case of breeding animals.

Example 80, on the other hand, illustrates positive affection towards pigs, while simultaneously representing the animals as objects:

80. […] lots of people who want the good life take two or three [pigs], enjoy them through the spring and summer months […] ('Back to Black', 2019: 1)

"Enjoy" in Example 81 describes affection towards pigs representing a lower degree of emotion when compared to "fall in love" or "get attached", for instance. More specifically, "enjoy them [pigs]" depicts the animals as a source of (human) pleasure, therefore, rendering them as means to an end. However, the animals are associated with positive emotions, thus, alluding the fact that they are meaningful beyond the products they produce.

Examples 78–80 illustrate how pigs as represented as the target positive human perception, in other words, instances where affection and emotional responses towards the animals is expressed. As a result, the animals appear meaningful beyond their immediate role as production animals since the target of affection is precisely the animals and not the produced products. However, it is worth discussing whether the represented affection is exaggerated; "fell in love with' and "become infatuated with", especially, suggest a sense of strong emotional involvement. Indeed, it is meaningful to pose the question of whether these phrases accurately portray the experience of those working with animals who are eventually slaughtered for meat, or whether, indicating an overtly positive relationship serves as a way to disregard the suffering caused to animals as an inherent part of production.

A similar effect is additionally created when farming is constructed as beneficial for the animals and the farmers are depicted as helping pigs. In other words, pigs are depicted as the target of actions that can be regarded as benefiting them:

81. […] you can encourage them to take a bit more exercise. ('Don't let your pigs get porky', 2018: 12)
82. […] for the Large Black, not many people in the south are breeding them, so we felt we needed to support them. ('Back to Black', 2019: 1)
83. Charlotte Mouland explains how to keep your herd safe. ('Purple Peril for pigs', 2019: 1)

In Example 81 pigs are the target of encouraging in order to increase their physical activity, which can be understood as a positive pursuit benefiting the animals' health. Therefore, the depicted

actions of the farmer are seen as having a positive impact on the target, the pigs. Example 82 illustrates a similar instance where actions by the farmer, "we", are represented as supporting pigs which implies that the process of farming a breed is helping the animals. Although, farming a certain breed is supporting their existence on a collectively level, however, when considering the impact on an individual animal, "support" obscures the reality of animals in food production. Example 84 pigs are the target of "keep safe", therefore, representing human actions as protecting the animal. However, the context of Example 83 reveals that the imperative is to protect pigs from a disease, thus, simultaneously protecting profit due to infected animals being useless for the industry.

Examples 84 and 85 demonstrate additional instances where pigs are the target of action that contribute to creating a representation of the animals as meaningful beings.

84. Do you have someone who can step into your shoes, or, rather, your wellies, and who can be trusted to care for your pigs as well as you would? ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)
85. […] we had no desire to host a full-time boar […] ('Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)

Example 84 illustrates the use of a phrase "care for", implying that the process of farming goes beyond merely producing a product. In effect, it implies "to do the things that are needed to help and protect (a person or animal) (Merriam-Webster online, 2020), therefore, suggesting that farmers do more than what is necessary from the point of view of production, thus, representing the process of farming as meaningful for those who engage in it. Lastly, in Example 85 "host" refers to owning a boar. Comparing "host" with other phrases such as *keep* or *raise* denoting the ownership of production animals (see section 4.2.1.) it seems to construct a different relationship since "to host someone" is generally used in reference to guests. In other words, it depicts the target of "host" as more self-directive when compared with alternative examples.

This section illustrated instances of text where pigs are the target of a variety of actions which all had a similar effect on the representation of the animal. Firstly, pigs were represented as evoking positive emotions in humans ranging from "fall in love" to "enjoy". Secondly, different processes towards pigs were represented as benefitting the animals, and, thirdly, the act of farming was constructed as going beyond profit by representing care for and subjectivity of the pigs. These contribute to a discourse on pigs where the animal is meaningful beyond their imminent role as production animals. However, the accuracy of these actions need to be questioned due the potentially diverging from the reality of animal farming by exaggerating the represented affection and the benefit of farming for the animals.

5.2.2 Pigs as the subject of action

This section focuses on analysing instances where pigs are represented as the subjects engaging in different processes of doing, in other words, as active participants. Although, this representation of pigs is rather limited compared to depicting them as the target, it is meaningful to analyse its occurrence and the impact it has on the overall representation of the animals. This section focuses on, firstly, instances where the actions of pigs are considered to directly relate to aspects of the industry, in other words pigs are represented as helping the industry. And secondly, pigs as the subject appears to contribute to two distinct representations; one that bridges the gap between humans and non-human animals and one that furthers it.

A tendency to represent pigs as actively engaging in processes that are in concurrence with the objective of animal farming was visible in some articles of the magazine. In general, this depiction contributes to creating a representation where pigs not only comply with their role as production animals but also participate in fulfilling it. The below examples illustrate the most frequent yet perhaps least noticeable example, due to its highly conventionalised use:

86. As already discussed, not all boars will produce tainted meat […] (‘Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty’, 2018: 11)
87. Breeds vary in the speeds at which they grow and the ratio of meat to bone they produce. (‘What price prime pork?’, 2019: 2)

The animal is the subject of “produce meat”, suggesting an active engagement in this process (Examples 86 and 87). Regardless of being conventionalised expression, employing the phrase “pigs/cows/sheep produce meat” conveys a faulty image of the process through which an animal becomes meat. In other words, the animal is equivalent to the product, and the process of production is inseparable from death: when a pig becomes meat, the animal ceases to exist.

The following examples illustrate similar instances. These are, however, less established compared to *produce* and represent specifically the magazine’s choice to depict pigs as subjects:

88. […] stunting the growth of gilts which later go on to join the breeding herd. (‘Cutting out the pain’, 2018: 10)
89. […] keeping them [pigs] until they are ready for slaughter […] (‘Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls’, 2019: 3)

Both examples represent pigs as actively participating in different processes regarding food production in animal farming. Example 88 represents pigs as participating in their deemed role in production, more specifically “join” suggests self-directive action by the animals themselves.

Example 89, on the other hand, is quite ambiguous, since "are ready" can either suggest readiness in terms of size or mental readiness. With production animals "to be ready for slaughter" is determined by solely external factors, however, representing pigs as the subject in Example 89 depicts the animal as responsible and, as a result, as having a choice on the matter.

Pigs are also the subject of a variety of other actions that are not directly related to production processes, but which still contribute to constructing a discourse where animals benefit from their position and are represented as self-directive.

90. While your chosen pigs may have arrived at the auction in tip top health […] ('Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)
91. Pigs came into the Westrons' lives many years ago […] ('Back to Black'. 2019: 1)

Examples 90 and 91 both convey a similar representation of pigs which constructs a problematic image of the animals' role in food production, more specifically, pigs "arrive" at auctions where they are sold to different farmers and are active in coming in contact with farmers; they "came" rather than being found.

Pigs as the subject of action is utilised to suggest different images, the first of which depicts them as engaging in their own demise, was analysed above. Alternatively, the animals' represented subjectivity can either construct them negatively, thus, justifying their treatment, or positively by provoking sympathy and depicting individuality. Two types of processes are analysed regarding these representations: mental processes and action verbs. Depicting mental processes, or more specifically, what pigs feel and think, is not a unique feature of *Country Smallholding*, since there is a common tendency to assign animals with mental capacities based on human perception of their behaviour. This can be problematic, since it is impossible to actually know how animals feel or think and assigning mental processes to them is always a reflection of how humans suppose non-human animals ought to react. Representing animals' mental activity is a way to humanise them and functions to translate animal behaviour into human terms, thus, making it comprehensible, also known as anthropomorphism. In additions, actions verbs regard those instances of text where pigs are depicted as performing physical actions. These verbs provide an interesting contrast with the dominant discourse of pigs as inanimate objects; representing the animals as dynamic beings who are performing physical actions contributes to constructing their animacy.

The representation of pigs as the subject of "want" and "decide" are mental processes that contribute to their negative construction. "Want" is the most frequently used verb to describe the animals' mental activity and Examples 92 and 93 illustrate its use.

92. Giving pigs more because they tell you they want more is throwing money down the drain. (‘What Price Prime Pork?’, 2019: 2)
93. […] it was the only thing left on the list of reasons we could think of for Rosie not wanting to get up for a hearty meal. (‘And they call it puppy love’, 2018: 11)

Generally, the effect of pigs as the subject of “want” is negative: in Example 93 it results in farmers losing money (for details, see 4. 4.) and, in Example 93, the pig hurting herself by refusing to eat. More specifically, in Example 92 pigs want more food, which is the result of animal’s inner motivation, thus, they are responsible for the action. In other words, the effect of representing what the animal wants both places animals as responsible and also translates their behaviour into human terms; animals act a certain way because they want more. Similarly, in Example 93 the pig’s behaviour is made understandable by accounting for their mental processes; “Rosie not wanting to get up” where the animal, “Rosie”, is responsible for the represented behaviour.

In addition to “want”, pigs are also depicted as possessing more complicated mental abilities. For example, these seem even to require higher cognitive functions, such as the ability to “decide”.

94. It runs the risk of getting squashed or trodden on if the sow gets up for a reshuffle between births, or decides to re-make her nest […] (‘Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls’, 2019: 3)
95. If a mature sow or a boar decided to attack a human, it could kill. (‘The boar necessities’, 2019: 1)

“Decide” refers to the ability to think about one’s options and to choose between them, a process which requires complex mental capacities. The result of pigs as being able to “decide” represents the animals negatively in both Examples 94 and 95; in the former it results in piglets being hurt and, in the latter, in the potential death of a human. By deciding to “re-make her nest” or to “attack a human” the animals are depicted as responsible for these actions. Therefore, assigning pigs with the complex mental ability of deciding results in a rather negative representation of the animal. However, as mentioned above, representing the mental processes behind animal behaviour reflects the human perception of the animals, rather than the reality of experience.

The next examples illustrate instances where pigs are performing actions that contribute to their negative representation. The result of pigs as the subject of such actions inhibits identifying with the animal and potentially justifies continuing to treat them as objects for food production. The following examples demonstrate this:

96. Worse still is seeing an angry and agitated sow killing her piglets, either by tossing them away to die of injury or hypothermia, or actively savaging them. (‘Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls’, 2019: 3)

97. Although domestic pigs […] are equipped with teeth which allow them to pierce and tear flesh […] (‘The boar necessities’, 2019: 1)

Both Examples 96 and 97 represent pigs as performing violent actions. In Example 96 a sow is depicted as “killing”, “tossing” and “actively savaging” her piglets. In addition to being inherently violent actions, the target of action is the animal’s offspring which increases the negative effect due to new-borns generally being regarded as innocent. Also, “actively” further emphasises the animal’s responsibility for action and the word choice of “savaging” refers to a particularly brutal way of killing. “Pierce and tear” flesh, in Example 97, also represents the animal as dangerous by depicting violent acts in detail. Indeed, when pigs are represented as the agent performing these violent acts, they are assigned responsibility for them and blame for their actions.

However, pigs as the subject of mental processes and action verbs can also have the opposite effect on representation. The next two examples illustrate instances of “suffer” which emphasises the animal’s experience and potentially enables humans to emphasise with them.

98. […] breeding animals can suffer fertility and farrowing problems; but pet pigs are likely to suffer more than most, and for longer. (‘Don’t let your pigs get porky’, 2018: 18)
99. With sow Rosie possibly suffering from post-natal depression […] (‘And they Call it puppy love’, 2018: 11)

Representing pigs as suffering is not used exclusively in all the instances describing animals experiencing pain. Thus, it is reserved for specific instances. In Example 98 “suffer” describes the experience of breeding animals and pet pigs, meaning those animals who spend more time with humans compared to meat pigs, thus, enabling a deeper human-animal connection to form. In the same way as in Example 99, “suffer” is in reference to a breeding animal who is experiencing depression after birth. Therefore, describing the animals’ experienced discomfort with “suffer” appears in instances where the animals are constructed to possess a distinct status, when compared to “the mass”. Especially when comparing Examples 98 and 99 with the representation of discomfort of to pigs who have a lower status, namely boars in meat production, the difference is evident:

100. Other problems, such as haemorrhage and hernias, can occur and there can also be additional problems, such as prolonged pain causing depression and leading to a reluctance to suckle. (‘Cutting out the Pain’, 2018: 10)

The passive voice is used to describe discomfort from an outside perspective, rather than accounting for the experience of the animal. Therefore, representing pigs’ subjective experience with “suffer” has the effect of constructing them as sentient subjects. However, due to its rarity, this type of

representation is marginal. Lastly, it is important to note that the pain caused by regular practices in animal farming is not represented as suffering, which thus, is a way of overlooking the inherent violence of the industry. Therefore, representing the animals' suffering acknowledges their subjective experience, while also glossing over the everyday, routine suffering of the industry by failing to represent it in similar terms.

In addition, pigs as the subject of different actions depict them as animate individuals engaging in different dynamic processes

101. […] the piglet wobbles around, trailing an umbilical cord that can be more than 30 cm long, desperately trying to find the udder. ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3
102. […] they were at our feet bouncing around with over-exaggerated excitement; they were so enthusiastic to guzzle as much as possible. ('And they Call it Puppy love', 2018: 11)

In Example 101 the piglet is depicted as engaging in three actions "wobbling", "trailing" and "trying to find", thus, the pig is represented as an animate being moving around. "Wobbling" refers to a specific type of movement, thus, further contributing to depicting an active and animate agent, and evaluating the animal's behaviour "desperately" increases sympathy for the animal by depicting them as helpless. In Example 102 pigs are the subject of "bouncing" and "guzzle", the first of which represents them as engaging in dynamic movement while the second describes pigs as the subject of drinking. In general, representing animals active diverges from the dominant discourse and allows for regarding them as living beings. Examples 101 and 102 represents pigs as lively and dynamic beings, however, it is important to note that such depictions of pigs as active agents is exclusive to piglets, while representing adult pigs is demonstrated in Examples 96 and 97 where the animals' actions have the opposite effect resulting in negative description. This distinction is meaningful, since the representation of piglets reflects their role in animal production; they have yet to enter their role as productive parts of animal farming. Therefore, piglets occupy status of something between a production animal and a pet. Thus, depicting adult animals as active agents in ways that would reveal their animacy and subjectivity could be harmful to the industry by questioning the justification for exploiting animals that are so clearly animate.

Comparing instanced where pigs are depicted subjects of mental processes as well as engaging in physical actions, two varying representations are achieved. More specifically, pigs as the subject of "want" and "decide" assigns the animals' responsibility of such actions that result in negative outcomes, while "suffer", on the other hand, appears to have the opposite effect by representing the animal's experience of discomfort and potentially enabling humans to empathise

with them, however, represented only when the suffering is not directly associated with operating logic of the industry. Representing pigs as engaging in dynamic actions and process achieved similar effects by either depicting violent behaviour, thus, widening the gap between humans and animals or by representing lively and sympathetic piglets.

5.3 Evaluation of pigs' suffering and character

This section analyses the use of evaluation in two different contexts regarding the representation of pigs. The first focuses on instances from data where pain, discomfort and the death of pigs is represented, and demonstrates how situations are evaluated differently based on the type of suffering depicted. The second part is dedicated to analysing the evaluation of pigs and their behaviour in instances that I regard as exaggeration, and the effect this has on the animals' representation.

5.3.1 Pain, suffering and death

There are roughly three categories of suffering depicted in the magazine: (i) suffering that occurs outside the industry's norm whether caused by humans or not, (ii) suffering that can be considered "routine", and (iii) suffering caused by pigs to other pigs or humans. All these different types are evaluated accordingly, and as a result, contribute to the construction of the secondary discourse on pigs.

The first type of suffering refers to pain and death of pigs from reasons that are not inherent to animal farming. Thus they represent situations that are unusual and not inevitable:

103. Sadly, the first sow, Charlotte, didn't make it through the excessive heatwave of the early summer. We lost her and her litter. ('And they call it puppy love', 2018: 11)

Example 103 describes a situation where a pig, "Charlotte", died of an outside cause, "the excessive heatwave". The adverb "sadly" evaluates the situation, thus, highlighting a negative emotional response and suggesting disapproval. "Sadly" is an explicit representation of emotion, however, it is combined with additional linguistic features to construct the evaluation: euphemistic expressions of death, "we lost her" and "didn't make it through" and referring to the animal by name, "Charlotte" (see 5.1. for details). Thus, the evaluation of death from an outside cause represents the animal as meaningful and her death as a source of sadness.

104. Any of the above conditions are pretty horrible for any pig to go through, but thankfully there are effective vaccines widely available in the UK. (‘Purple peril for pigs’, 2019: 1)
105. If you suspect erysipelas, prompt treatment is essential, so veterinary assistance should be sought quickly. (‘Purple peril for pigs’, 2019: 1)

The context of Examples 104 and 105 is an infection called erysipelas in pigs. Example 105 evaluates the animal’s experience as “pretty horrible”, therefore, pain caused by something outside the routine practises of the industry is evaluated negative which simultaneously constructs pigs as meaningful as well as sentient by accounting for their experience of pain. In other words, evaluating the pig’s experience creates a sense of empathy for the animal. Additionally, “thankfully” regarding the availability of vaccines, adds to the effect by evaluating the aid to the disease positively. Evaluation in Example 105, on the other hand, constructs a feeling of urgency; “prompt treatment is essential” and “quickly”. Especially, the adjective “essential” frames treatment as the utmost of importance, thus, placing the animal’s health as a priority. Although, it can be argued that the sense of priority stems from maintaining profitability by avoiding illness, however, the use of evaluation in Examples 104 and 105 combined constructs a representation that places value specifically on the health and wellbeing of pigs.

Examples 103–105 demonstrated how pain and death that occur outside the norm of animal agriculture and are not directly caused by human behaviour are evaluated. The following Example 106 provides an interesting instance where suffering due to overweight is similarly not considered “routine” or reoccurring, however, is the result of human actions due to excessively feeding animals.

106. If you aren’t careful, you could be unwittingly giving them more food than is good for them (‘Don’t let your pigs get porky’, 2018: 12)

The people feeding animals are responsible for discomfort caused by overweight, however, Example 106 demonstrates how evaluation diverges that responsibility. “If you aren’t careful” evaluates the farmer’s behaviour as a lack of concern related to specific moments or instances, rather than a continuous neglect or malicious attempt. Furthermore, “unwittingly” emphasises the lack of consciousness of action that results in harming the animals. Therefore, the use of evaluation in relation to pain caused by humans removes responsibility by denying conscious behaviour and, ultimately, erases moral concern. Thus, Example 106 provides an interesting evaluation of pain and suffering that falls between something unrelated to humans and something considered routine within the industry.

The following examples demonstrate how the second type of suffering regarded as "necessary pain" is evaluated in data. "Necessary pain" regards practices that are performed routinely and are, thus, inherently linked to animal agriculture. In other words, in order for the industry to continue operating different levels of pain are inflicted on the animals, and this holds true regarding factory as well as smalls-scale farms. "Necessary pain" is additionally discussed in 4.2.2. and 4.2.3. where the representation of handling procedures and slaughtering pigs contributes to the construction of the primary discourse. However, the below Examples 107–110 evaluate two aspects of necessary pain, cutting tusks and killing pigs, which contribute to the secondary discourse by representing the animals as meaningful.

107. You should never: Restrain a pig longer than necessary. (The boar necessities)

In Example 107 "necessary" is used to evaluate the time pigs should be restrained. In effect, Example 107 seemingly accounts for the animal's wellbeing, emphasised by the strong negation "you should never" regarding the painful procedure of restraining a pig (carried out by snaring the animal by placing a metal loop in the mouth and over the snout). However, this is rendered meaningless by the evaluation "no longer than necessary" which is bound by the industry's incentive which initially requires restricting the animal in order to conduct the procedure of cutting his tusks which inflicts a noticeable degree of pain on the animal. The following examples, on the other hand, demonstrate evaluation in context of slaughtering pigs which is the most salient and profound form of suffering in animal agriculture.

108. Even experienced breeders who have seen hundreds or thousands of pigs come and go will have their favourites and will still feel sad when the end arrives. ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019:3)
109. MY FIRST pigs were a couple of weaners […]. It was unexpectedly difficult to take them to the abattoir due to the emotional turmoil. ('Pig in a poke?', 2018: 10)

In effect, Examples 108 and 109 evaluate the slaughtering of animals as distinctly negative from the human perspective: "sad" and "unexpectedly difficult". Thus, the Examples suggest farmers care for their animals, and representing the human-animal relationship as meaningful. These Examples illustrate the rare instances in data where any evaluation is attached to slaughter of animals and represent it as a source of negative emotions providing a clear distinction from the primary discourse where animals are constructed inanimate objects. In other words, their death as a source of sadness and "emotional turmoil", the pigs are depicted as having value beyond their objective status as food. However, in the majority of instances where slaughtering is addressed, the process is obscured (see. 4.2.3.). Similarly in Example 108, the expressions "come and go" and "when the end

arrives" are instances of euphemistic language use which do not carry associations of dying or killing, therefore, conceal the meaning and motivation inherent to animal slaughter, meat production. It is important to note that in both examples the represented emotions concern specific pigs and, therefore, are not extended to all animals that are slaughtered. More specifically, in example 108 "their favourites" refer to pigs with a special status, and in example 109 "them" refers to "my first pigs" from the preceding sentence. Thus, the animals whose death is negatively evaluated are specific individuals with significant status compared to pigs in general and the representation of death differs significantly from the examples in section 4.2.3. It can be argued that elevated status justifies feelings of sadness over the animal's death but extending it to pigs in general would considerably contradict with the logic of animal agriculture.

Finally, it is interesting to compare how the third type of suffering, i.e. death and pain caused by pigs to other pigs, is evaluated. This is specifically revealing, because evaluation appears to emphasise the severity of suffering and, as a result, to represent the animals in an increasingly negative way.

> 110. With farrowings you have to expect there to be occasional stillborns for a wide variety of reasons. However, there are few things more disappointing than returning to what was a healthy litter of piglets, only to find some dead because the sow has clumsily injured them. Worse still is seeing an angry and agitated sow killing her piglets […] ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)

Example 110 demonstrates the difference in evaluation regarding death in varying situations. Firstly, the first sentence represents a situation where death of piglets is not attached to any specific actor and the possible cause is left unsaid: "for a variety of reasons". Here death is not evaluated as either negative or positive, but it is instead framed as neutral or natural: "you have to expect", and this effect in further emphasized by the use of a euphemistic term 'stillborn', thus, not explicitly referencing death. However, when the pig is represented as the actor responsible for the death of piglets, evaluation is used to reveal negative opinions towards the animal's actions. "Few things more disappointing" is associated with a situation where death is caused by accident*,* "clumsily", nonetheless, as the animal's responsibility. Comparing with example 106 where accidental harm caused by humans is deemed unconscious, "unwittingly", thus void of moral responsibility, "clumsily" refers to the pig's innate character and, as a result, assigns blame to the animal. "Worse still", on the other hand, represents an increasingly negative evaluation of a situation where the animal is depicted as responsible for her actions which are the result of her inner state; "angry" and "agitated". In effect, assigning the animal responsibility of action, which is evaluated negatively, constructs a representation of pigs as knowingly engaging in morally reprehensible behaviour.

Three types of suffering and death are represented in *Country Smallholding* and the evaluation of each contributes to the secondary discourse: when occurring from an outside cause it is evaluated negatively and the animal's wellbeing is prioritised, the negative evaluation of "necessary pain" is seemingly sympathetic to the animals, however, restricted by industry incentives or aimed at animals with distinct status and euphemised. The relationship between the farmer and the animals is constructed as meaningful and the human's responsibility for suffering minimised, thus, representing humans positively. Contrastingly, the evaluation of suffering caused by pigs emphasises the severity of situation and the responsibility and subjectivity of the animal resulting in negative representation of the pigs.

5.3.2 Exaggeration of pig's character and behaviour

Evaluation is also utilised when describing pigs and their behaviour, meaning that instances from data were discovered where opinions were attached to varying aspects of the animals. A common feature in such evaluations is a tendency to exaggerate the features and behaviour of pigs in order to represent them in an overtly positive manner. Examples 111 and 112 demonstrate this point by illustrating how the behaviour of pigs is evaluated from the human perspective:

111. The piglets come out in the freezing weather and somehow latch on to the milk bar and just get warm and grow and cope. It's an incredible thing to see. ('Back to black', 2019: 1)
112. […] they [piglets] squeal at the slightest thing and mum turns into a ballet dancer. It's all very clever. ('Back to black', 2019: 1)

Example 111 described the perceived behaviour of newly born piglets and evaluates it as "an incredible thing to see", thus, assigning the situation with a very positive evaluation signalling approval, "incredible", while simultaneously emphasising the outside perspective of the human, "to see". Example 112 evaluates the actions of pigs as "very clever", similarly suggesting approval of animal behaviour by evaluating it positively. In addition to behaviour, the inner characteristics of pigs are also subjected to extremely positive appraisal in data:

113. Pigs are hugely intelligent creatures and can be trained to do many things dogs can do. ('Don't let your pigs get porky', 2018: 12)
114. […] so the pigs have to use their amazing sense of smell. ('Don't let your pigs get porky', 2018: 12)
115. A pigs' charisma is extremely powerful […] ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)

Example 113 evaluates animals as "hugely intelligent", depicting their mental abilities, while example 114 regards their sense of smell as "amazing" and, lastly, example 115 regards pigs as having "charisma", generally used to describe humans, which is evaluated as "extremely powerful".

In effect, the adjectives used to describe these represented attributes appear overtly positive and, thus, appear hyperbolic.

The effect created by the exaggerative evaluation of the pigs' behaviour and their other attributes is quite ambiguous, in spite of the way it conveys a distinctly positive appraisal of the animals. However, exaggerative evaluations appear to be motivated by similar factors as the representation of pigs as the target of affection and emotional responses (see 5.2.1). In both instances, the positive perception of pigs from the human perspective is so overtly expressed it appears disingenuous. More specifically, evaluating pigs as "hugely intelligent" or the behaviour of piglets as "an incredible thing to see", while continuing the practice which leads to the slaughter of these animals that are evaluated with such positive words, seems contradictory. Thus, emphasising positive perceptions of pigs by overtly expressing it potentially serves as an unconscious attempt to hide and diverge from the less "incredible" aspects of meat production. Exaggerative positive evaluation of pigs' character and abilities also provides an interesting contrast with Example 110 where the actions of animals are evaluated in overtly negative terms "worse still" and "few things more disappointing". It can be argued that negative evaluation stems from contexts where behaviour compromises production i.e. killing piglets while positive exaggeration attempts to conceal

5.4 Association of pigs with pets and humans

This section analyses the use of association of pigs with pets, especially with dogs, as well as two examples where pigs are associated with humans. Generally, it appears that association achieves two main purposes for the representation of pigs. Firstly, association grants pigs with a special status, one that creates a contrast with the traditional construction of production animals by representing them as a kin to companion animals who traditionally are assigned a higher value. Secondly, and in contrast with the first purpose, this kind of association can work in order to justify the morally questionable treatment of pigs by representing the animals as deserving of it.

The first examples demonstrate how pigs are associated and compared with pet animals in order to elevate their status and, as a result, represent them as distinct and special individuals:

116. When the time comes to say goodbye to a favourite sow or boar which is incurably lame, or which has come to the end of its breeding life, it can be as heartbreaking as having a much-loved pet put to sleep. ('Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls', 2019: 3)

Example 116 represents the killing of production animals "as heartbreaking as having a much-loved pet put to sleep", thus, equating the emotional distress of a companion animal's death to that of a production animal's slaughter. As a result, this association represents the relationship between humans and companion animals as inherently similar to the human-production animal one by juxtaposing the experienced grief: "as heart-breaking as". However, the social construction of companion animals and production animals differs drastically; the former are often treated as cherished members of the family, while the latter are destined to end up in the slaughterhouse. Thus, this association elevates pigs' status to that of companion animals, and ultimately overlooks the different purposes behind killing pets and pigs. This effect it emphasised further by the use of euphemism to describe killing; "to say goodbye to" and "put to sleep". These expressions conceal the act of killing, and "put to sleep" refers specifically to euthanizing animals and, thus, can be considered as morally justifiable (wanting to end suffering). However, "to say goodbye" does not reveal motivation and the expression is also very vague about the act of killing. Therefore, by juxtaposing these euphemisms, it can be argued that the ambiguous "to say goodbye to" is associated with the meaning behind "put to sleep" and, thus, represent the slaughtering of pigs as a moral choice. In addition, Example 116 resembles analysis on Examples 108 and 109 in the previous section where animal slaughter was negatively evaluated regarding pigs with distinct status, similar to that of companion animals (see section 5.3.1. for more detail).

117. In the end, Dot and Percy became pets and never had litters. ('Pig in a Poke?', 2018: 10)

Example 117 demonstrates similarly the change in a production animal's status when associated with companion animals. More specifically, the pigs, "Dot and Percy", are described as "becoming pets" which distinctly represents the elusive and fluid social construction of animals; the role of pigs as production animals is not an internal characteristic but, rather based on human perception. Therefore, pigs can "become" pets based on their perceived purpose. In addition, becoming a pet results in the relief of those obligations of production animals, in the above Example 117 breeding animals become pets and no longer have to produce piglets for the industry. My last example (118) showing how pigs are associated with pets in order to grant them the social status of companion animals is the title of one the articles 'And they call it puppy love'. The expression "puppy love" refers to: "romantic love that a young person feels for someone else, which usually disappears as the young person becomes older" (Cambridge Dictionary online, 2020), and derives from the excitement and affection puppies display towards their owners. The title employs the literal

meaning of puppy love in order to describe the relationship between the farmer and piglets. The following example from the article confirms this:

> 118. Nevertheless, our relationship with them has developed very differently to that of other litters. Spending so much time with them and being treated as their primary milk feeder meant that they would climb all over us at playtime and enjoy as many back and tummy tickles as we had time to give. ('And they call it puppy love', 2018: 11)

Thus, "puppy love" describes the loving relationship between humans and companion animals. By associating it with production animals, too, similar feelings of love are extended to them. However, Example 118 reveals the rarity of this kind of rapport: "our relationship with them has developed very differently to that of other litters", thus, suggesting that "puppy love" does not represent human-production relationship in general. Nonetheless, the above Examples 116–118 demonstrate the how pigs are likened with companion animals in order to assign increased emotional value to them. I argue that although this kind of association might allow for humans to sympathise with pigs, it simultaneously disregards the realities of their role as production animals. More specifically, in Example 116 feeling "heart-broken" about the death of pigs when they are slaughtered would result in having to question the justification of such actions, however, when associated with pets, the grief is acceptable. In addition, the association of pigs with pets reveals the ambiguity behind the social constructions of animals. By doing so, it also represents the elusiveness of the status of pigs that varies between that of a commercial pig to a companion animal.

Interestingly, the association of pigs with pets also appears to work the other way round, meaning that the similarity is denied in order to emphasise certain negative aspects of pigs:

> 119. The truth is, a boar should not be treated as a pet. ('The boar necessities', 2019: 1)
> 120. Some agricultural suppliers sell purpose-made snares — similar to the kind used for immobilising dangerous dogs […] ('The Boar necessities', 2019: 1)

Both examples deny the similarities between pigs and pets which is in contrast with the association discussed in examples 116–118 where the achieved effect is reverse. More specifically, the topic of examples 119 and 120 is boars, therefore, associating the negative representation to male pigs specifically. Together with other linguistic devices in the article, association contributes to a construction of boars as highly unpredictable and dangerous animals. In example 119, the similarities between boars with pets are explicitly denied, thus, representing the animal as opposite to the assumed positive qualities of pet animals. Example 120, however, associates pigs, or more specifically, tools used to restrain pigs with those used for dangerous dogs. Although dogs are commonly regarded as companion animals, in Example 120 they are qualified as "dangerous", thus,

violating the conventional role of a companion animal. Indeed, it has been argued by (Arluke and Sanders, 1996: 170) that those animals that fail to execute their human defined role, i.e. stray dogs, are placed at the bottom of the non-human animal hierarchy. By equating the tools used to handle both animals, it can be argued that qualities related to dangerous dogs are extended to boars as well. I argue that the effect of both Examples 119 and 120 is in fact to justify the morally questionable and painful treatment of boars, namely the cutting of their tusks and the use of snitches to perform it. This is stated explicitly in Example 119: "should not be treated as pets", thus, allowing for treatment which in the context of companion animals would be morally deemed but denying the association elevates moral concern.

Lastly, it is worth analysing two instances from the magazine where pigs are associated with humans. In these cases, the effect of these descriptions are similar to the examples in which pigs were likened to pets. The first example employs association in order justify a specific treatment of pigs:

> 121. It [chemical castration] makes the body shut the process off, just as your immune system reacts when you vaccinate for something, such as, in the pig industry, mycoplasma or circovirus. It just uses the body's natural immune system to turn things off. ('Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty', 2018: 11)

Example 121 is from article 'Injecting to delay the onslaught of puberty' which discusses the issue of vaccinating piglets to prevent boar taint, an unpleasant taste in cooked meat. Framing boar taint as a risk was analysed in primary discourse in section 4.3. where it was argued that risk framing is used in order to rationalize castration. The effect in example 121 is similar, however, comparing chemical castration to vaccinating humans (or pig) against disease contributes to the idea that production animals benefit from farming and the human-animal relationship is defined by care rather that profit. However, the reason for chemical castration is based on an attempt to guarantee profit by eliminating unpleasant taste in meat, rather than concern for health and wellbeing of the animals. In effect, the problematic aspect of castrating boars for the sake of taste is marginalised by associating it with something potentially beneficial. This is additionally emphasised by evaluation "just uses", thus, framing the procedure as insignificant.

The final Example 122 likens pigs with humans and constructs a contradictory representation:

> 122. Overweight pigs can suffer from health problems similar to those in humans, including premature arthritis, diabetes and heart and liver disease. As the extra weight puts additional pressure on limbs and joints, causing pain and loss of mobility, pigs can become depressed, uncomfortable and even aggressive. ('Don't let your pigs get porky', 2018: 12)

Example 122 juxtaposes the health problems of pigs and humans caused by overweight and regards them as similar. The effect of association here is to concretise the discomfort felt by overweight pigs by comparing it to pain experienced by humans, making it as relatable for the reader. In addition to associating human and animal pain, the verb "suffer" is used, thus, referring specifically to feelings of pain, and pigs are represented as the subjects experiencing the pain rather than, for example, using passive voice. Of course, it must be noted that the pain caused by excessive weight is not the result of conscious behaviour (see section 5.3.1), therefore, sympathising through association can be considered 'appropriate'. In other words, the context of association is dependent on whether it relates to inevitable aspects of the industry.

This section analysed the tendency in *Country Smallholding* to associate pigs with companion animals as well as humans and this was considered to amount to varying effects for the representation of pigs. Firstly, association with companion animals contributed to elevating pigs' status by extending the perceived qualities of pets to the production animals. Secondly, and in contrast with the first effect, association with pets was also employed to deny similarities and justify cruel treatment of pigs. Association with humans was similarly employed for to purposes; it justified questionable treatment of pigs by framing it beneficial or contributed to bridging the gap between humans and pigs by emphasising shared experience of suffering.

6 DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to uncover discourses circulating in *Country Smallholding*, a lifestyle magazine targeted at those working in or interested in the alternative method of food production, different from the intensive farming methods brought about by an increasing demand for affordable animal-based products. Considering the simultaneous attention to the environmentally disruptive and ethically questionable nature of such practices, the present study sought out to uncover discourses on production animals circulated in a context specifically aimed at people consciously diverging from the current model of food production. More specifically, the focus was to determine whether animal discourses, specifically on pigs, would reflect the commitments of those associated with small-scale farming. Indeed, it was hypothesised that the data which consisted of ten articles on different topics regarding pig husbandry, would reflect the peculiarities of small-scale farming, including the increased contact between farmers and animals brought about by smaller animal numbers.

The analysis was conducted by following the method laid out by Mäkilä (2007: 144–148) by firstly scrutinising each article individually in order to extract the varying representations of pigs, after which the specific linguistic features constructing these representations were detected. These were words of reference, process targeting pigs (primary and secondary discourse), pigs as the subject of processes (secondary discourse), evaluation and association of pigs. Finally, consecutive patterns of representations on the level of individual articles were grouped together under the primary or secondary discourse. By following this method of analysis, I was able to detect the two discourses on pigs that circulate in *Country Smallholding*, how they interact with and relate to each other as well as how they are encoded on the textual level.

The primary, i.e. more dominant, discourse mobilized in the magazine is strongly associated with the economic aspect of any farming pursuit of, at minimum, achieving self-sufficiency or potentially making a profit, thus the representation of the animals was in concordance with this initiative. The secondary – less prominent – discourse, on the other hand, allowed for perceiving the animals as more than commodities and object of production by representing the pigs as individuals who are regarded meaningful beyond their immediate use. Therefore, the findings of the present study illustrate how the magazine depicts a balancing between animal farming as tied to the conventions of being a business and the peculiar positions of small-scale farming as a passion or a hobby with the incentive to dissociate from these very conventions.

As mentioned above, the primary discourse consisted of representations of pigs that objectify their existence by defining from the narrow perspective of production. This discourse was characterised as the primary discourse on pigs in *Country Smallholding* due to its prevalence throughout data, meaning that the majority of representation were categorised as contributing to this discourse. In general, it illustrates the inseparability of regarding animals as objects from animal agriculture, since animals constitute the concrete material resources that are produced into products for consumption. Generally, the results regarding the primary discourse can be categorised as representing pigs as inanimate objects, thus, failing to account for their subjectivity and depicting pig farming as a business and the animals as resources. In effect, these categories are inseparable from each other and frequently overlapping since regarding animals as production resources requires perceiving them inanimate. In other words, acknowledging their full subjectivity and sentience would potentially put an industry that continuously exploits and slaughters them under serious threat.

The analysis of reference words revealed that the use of ungendered and inanimate pronouns “it” and “which” as well as denoting the animals a faceless group, i.e. “herd” and “livestock”, were frequently employed and contributed to the primary discourse. In addition, referring to pigs as “gilts” or “weaners” placed emphasis on their deemed role in production, and the process of farming pigs was recurrently framed as a business pursuit. The significance of reference words has similarly been noted by previous research as a way to either signal closeness or maintain separation between humans and non-human animals (Gilquin and Jacobs, 2006; Dunayer, 2003). Placing pigs as targets of different process related to animal farming emphasised the human dominance over production animals. More specifically, the owning of pigs was depicted with verbs such as “raise” and “keep” which displayed varying levels of dominance, in addition to which the biology of production animals was subject to human control by placing the animals as targets of, for example, “feed” and “breed”. The conventional role of production animals was also represented in the tendency to depict pigs as object of transactions, meaning they were “sold”, “bought”, and “invested in”. The effectiveness of these linguistic features lies in their conventional use, therefore often going unnoticed. In other words, referring to a group of pigs as “livestock” or describing them as the target of “feeding” are naturalised aspects of language use regarding production animals, thus seldomly brought to user’s attention and the discourses they contribute to remain unquestioned.

What was also discovered was the tendency to evaluate the animals and aspects related to farming based on the metrics of profitability and efficiency. More specifically, several instances of text were analysed where the perceived increase of money was assigned a positive

value while the opposite circumstances were regarded negatively. In addition, animals were evaluated from the point of view of efficiency. Especially revealing was the analysis of boar taint evaluated as a risk based on its potentially detrimental effects on profit. However, the ambiguity of the term simultaneously carried welfare implications which falsely represented the basis evaluation as grounded in concern for the animals. Indeed, the evaluation of animals revealed that the overarching bottom line of increasing profit and efficiency is inherently linked to animal production in *Country Smallholding*, regardless of the magazine's commitment to an alternative and more humane production model. Association of pigs with objects also had similar effects on their representation. In effect, the sentience and subjectivity of production animals was neglected by emphasising the similarities between pigs and objects, more specifically, as objects of production and consumption brought about by human dominance.

The representation of violent and painful processes performed on pigs revealed interesting tendencies in language use when discussing these potentially uncomfortable and immoral aspects of animals farming. Firstly, it was noted that when describing handling procedures that inflict pain or are other ways questionable, neutral and medical language was employed. The argument here is that it tends to both objectify the animals as well as gloss over unpleasant or controversial issues. In other words, the use of neutral and medical language with reference to production animals is employed to conceal sentience, thus, enabling business as usual. These findings are echoed in previous research. For example, Stibbe (2003: 37) concluded that the discourse within pork production industry can be characterised as scientific and technical and, regardless of being seemingly neutral, language use can carry assumptions and representation of pigs that construct them in negative ways. In fact, Glenn (2004: 64–65) coined the term 'doublespeak' to refer to the language of animal production discourse which tends to describe inhumane and cruel processes in neutral terms. When describing varying handling procedures performed on pigs, the use of the passive voice and specific word choices constituted a representation of processes occurring to their body parts, rather than to the animals as subjects experiencing pain.

Similarly, depicting pigs as the target of killing included the use of different linguistics devices in order to describe the action in ways that tended to diverge reality. Therefore, the findings are contiguous with Trampe's (2017: 335) who noted a tendency to avoid certain words that are considered taboo, including the verbs 'kill' or 'slaughter' when discussing killing of animals. Instead of using taboo words, my results concluded that implicit representations were favoured when discussing the killing of pigs for meat. First of all, there was a common tendency to

treat the location where animals are slaughtered, “abattoir”, or reference to the time when the process occurs, “slaughter time”, as synonymous with the action of killing. The ‘natural’ and inevitable connection between pigs as living beings and pork as a product was established and, similarly, lacked reference to the actual action of killing. More specifically, when the product is represented as a quality of the living animal, “meat pigs”, or meat is discussed in conjunction with its living equivalent, the continuum is naturalised. These linguistic tools representing the process of killing pigs contribute to marginalising it by rendering it unimportant, invisible or inevitable. Commercial pigs are raised for the purpose of meat, thus understanding pig and pork and parts of the same trajectory seems natural, “the way things are”. However, it can be argued that the way things are is not necessarily the way they ought to be. Although the ways of representing slaughtering pigs for meat makes it invisible and difficult to contest, I argue that it also serves the purpose of alleviating moral discomfort. More specifically, small-scale farmers interact closely with a relative limited number of animals, therefore, emotional connection are undoubtedly established. However, the purpose of these animals is to be killed, thus, establishing the contradiction between simultaneously caring for the animals while ultimately having to kill them. Diverging from representing this action that was evident from my data can be understood as a way to negotiate these contradicting realities.

Generally, it can be concluded that by objectifying animals and routinely representing them as commodities and resources through language use, the primary discourse deepens the socially constructed divide between humans and non-human animals by naturalizing their use for human purpose. However, it is inherently problematic, since it prohibits seeing the value of pigs, or any production animals, extending beyond their restricted construction as means of production. Ultimately, the prevalence of the primary discourse of pigs as objects for business created and maintained as the status quo by obscuring the morally relevant feature of the animals, their sentience, to be represented in discourse (Crowney and Reynnells, 2008). Indeed, it has been argued that by representing animals according to the narrow definitions of profitability “provides a blueprint for a system of farming that is both inhumane and environmentally destructive. (Stibbe, 2003: 41).

Thus, the representation of pigs as objects for meat production that contributes to a discourse and the construction of the social consent for their continued exploitation was the central finding of the present study. However, this discourse did not circulate exclusively but rather alongside with an alternative discourse. This secondary discourse consisted of two closely related representation of pigs. Firstly, the animals were depicted as animate beings whose subjectivity and

individuality were acknowledged. Therefore, this discourse provided a distinct contrast with the object-like and inanimate pigs constructed in the primary discourse. Secondly, and as a result of the animacy of pigs, the farmer-animals relationship was depicted as meaningful, meaning it extended beyond the animal's usefulness in meat production by including affection and care towards pigs. The representation of this intimate farmer-animals connection is inseparable from depicting the animals as more than objects, since it allows for a closer relationship when compared to one determined by efficiency and profit. However, when these representations were analysed in more detail, it became evident that they did not necessarily result in an increased interest for the animals' wellbeing or in more humane treatment. Indeed, the effects of representing pigs as animate and assigning them subjectivity were surprisingly flexible, meaning that representation was often in concordance with a predetermined industry objective, or effective only when examined from the surface level or in restricted contexts. Thus, the effects of the secondary discourse on pigs were rather conflicting: on one hand the animals are represented as animate beings providing a contrast with the primary discourse, but on the other hand, simultaneously appears to forward and construct consent for their exploitation.

Analysing words of reference, especially those signalling kinship between animals and naming individuals, were central to depicting the animal's subjectivity. It was argued that referring to pigs with terms such as "mother" or "Charlotte", bridges the gap between humans and non-human animals by assigning them distinctive identities. Thus, specific words of reference depict pigs with an elevated status and emphasise their distinctiveness from 'the mass', the rest of production animals. However, it was concluded that these reference words were only applied in restricted instances, rather than depicting consistent tendencies in *Country Smallholding*. Additionally, it was noted that while the analysis of the primary discourse revealed the tendency to place animals as the target of actions that emphasise human dominance, pigs as the target of action also had the opposite impact on representation. The secondary discourse represented pigs as the target of various forms of affection and emotional attachment, i.e. "fall in love with" and "get attached to" as well as processes that were considered to benefit the animals. Although seemingly emphasising the wellbeing of animals, I argue that placing pigs as the target of such processes amounts to two less favourable results for the animals. Firstly, the pigs as the target of love and care from the farmer justifies their exploitation since treating the animals well supposedly removes the moral conflict of killing and, secondly, represents the animals as dependent of the care provided by humans which similarly gives consent to their confinement. In addition to depicting pigs as benefitting from farming process to construct the consent for exploitation, they were represented as

the subjects engaging in it, thus, actively furthering their role as production animals which ultimately leading to their death. More specifically, pigs were reoccurring depicted as the subjects of "producing" meat, creating an idea that the product is separate from the living animal. Similar findings have been suggested in previous research, especially related to what is regarded as the 'happy-meat' discourse coined by Cole (2011: 83–101) where the consumer's perceived welfare of animals removes the morally questionable aspect of consuming meat. Therefore, by representing animals as the subjects rather than objects of farming, constructs the idea that they wilfully engage in this process, and as a result, consuming their flesh is in concordance with what the animals wants and creates the idea that consumers are in fact doing the animals a favour by consuming the end products of their self-directive actions (Cole, 2011; Linne, 2016).

In addition to representing pigs as self-directive subjects of production, representations comparable to Cole's (2011) 'happy-meat' discourse are central in creating the secondary discourse of the present study. Analysing patterns of evaluation revealed that the death of animals was valued negative as a source of sadness and despair, especially when occurring outside 'normal' death in the industry or to specific individuals and euphemised. Closely related was the positive exaggeration of the behaviour and characteristics of pigs, for example, depicting them as "hugely intelligent", which was concluded to have comparable effect to depicting love and care for the animals as a way to diverge the moral conflict resulting from killing the animals appraised so positively. In addition, a reoccurring tendency to associate pigs with pets and humans was discovered from data in order to elevate their status. More specifically, extending the qualities of companion animals to pigs can be understood as a way to place them higher on the sociozoological scale (Arluke and Sanders, 1996: 169).

Essentially, the presence of the secondary discourse illustrates a need to balance between the economic incentives of efficiency and profitability and the commitment to animal welfare particularly central in small-scale farming. These contradictory incentives are not unprecedented; Bergstra et al. (2017: 294) noted that the consumers' demands for welfare were incoherent with the pig farmers' concern for economic liability. However, in the context of the present study, it could be argued that both of these contradictory demands arise from the same source, namely the farmer. Therefore, diverging from the findings of Bergstra et al. (2017) or Cole (2011) where the incentive for welfare concerns was voiced by consumer, either constructed for them in the form of 'happy meat' discourse, or directly demanded by the consumers, the peculiar position of small-scale farmers appears to simultaneously engage with the motifs of both the producer and consumer of meat. When considering the reason for engaging in smallholding to begin

with, this finding becomes increasingly intelligible; smallholders are precisely those consumers concerned with animal welfare who have felt the need to discover alternatives for the problematic practices of intensive animal farming (Wilkie, 2010). Previous research has revealed that welfare discourse of production animals is regarded as the interest of consumers (Cole, 2011; Bergstra et al., 2017) and, thus, incompatible with reality or deliberately deceitful. However, the findings of the present study reveal the coexistence of two seemingly contradictory discourses that simultaneously circulate the widely accepted idea of production animals as objects for exploitation and a pressing concern for their wellbeing. These findings are in concordance with the aim of the present study to uncover discourses on pigs in *Country Smallholding* and reveal both the peculiarity of data, as reflected by the presence of the secondary discourse, as well as a connection with previous studies on production animal discourses in the form of the primary discourse.

The effect of the primary discourse is to represent pigs as inanimate and object-like beings in order to justify their treatment and exploitation for human consumptions. It could be argued that the primary discourse depicts "the animals in ways that objectify them and obscure morally relevant characteristics such as animal sentience" (Crowney and Reynnells, 2008). In other words, regarding living beings as objects allows for treating them in ways that would otherwise be considered cruel and inhume, however, this concern is not extended to production animals since inanimate objects cannot suffer. In effect, it prohibits seeing the animal behind the product and the aspect of death that is inseparable from meat production. The effects of the secondary discourse are less distinct; on one hand, it provides a contrasting representation of animate and subjective animals, thus, distinctly diverging from the primary discourse, on the other hand this representation is not extensively applied to pigs and, as a result, appears to serve the benefits of the industry. The secondary discourse is, therefore, reminiscent of how Cook's (2015: 602) research revealed hunters perceive their relationship with animals and how the killing of sentient beings is negotiated: hunting is constructed as an attempt to preserve a marginalised relationship with animals which regardless of being intimate is based on the view that animals are inherently different from humans in ways that makes killing them morally unproblematic. I argue that the secondary discourse similarly illustrates a commitment to an animal production model which allows for a more intimate farmer-animal relationship without a need to question the fundamental justification for killing sentient beings based on want rather than necessity. Indeed, it is precisely the intimacy of a farmer's connection with their animals which was overtly expressed and constructed in my analysis that alleviates the moral concern for the justification of killing, the idea that as long as animals are treated humanely and with care there is no ethical obstacle for their exploitation. However, this

logic fails to escape human exceptionalism as the idea that non-human animals are inherently different from humans. In other words, extending the idea of a happy life justifying killing to humans does not provide any moral relief of action.

Although the secondary discourse provides an alternative way of representing production animals, when compared to the inanimate and objectifying primary discourse as well as the finding of previously conducted research, its effectiveness in bringing about tangible changes in the wellbeing of animals is debatable. My analysis pointed out a tendency to employ subjectivity in order to assign pigs responsibility for unpleasant behaviour, for example when they are represented as "deciding" to attack humans, which potentially results in regarding the them as inherently bad, thus, unworthy of ethical treatment. Furthermore, the animals were depicted as actively engaging in and benefitting from their role in production, as well as constructing the human-animal relationship as founded on mutual affection rather than human benefit. Therefore, the magazine was advancing the idea that the wellbeing of animals is a priority, however, this was restricted by the limitations established by the end goal of animal agriculture, meat production. Indeed, it has been noted that sincere concern for the wellbeing of animals is often obscured by notions of productivity without having a real intent to question the fundamental treatment of production animals (Porcher, 2011: 12). Thus, it seemingly corresponds to the concerns for ethical treatment of animals without having to address the core issue behind animal exploitation, the routine slaughter of sentient beings. However, it is important to note that the representations of pigs that constructed the secondary discourse are not knowingly deceitful. For instance, when the farmer-animal relationship is explicitly represented as loving and mutually beneficially, this representation undoubtedly reflects the experience of those engaging is animal farming, rather than serving as deliberate to hide reality.

The presence of the secondary discourse could be understood as a reflection of wider changes in hegemony on a societal level. More specifically, evolving knowledge of both the mental abilities of non-human animals through advanced research in animal cognition as well as changes in increased understanding of the interconnectedness of human activities with the environment and its life-preserving systems have put the domination of humans over the rest of the natural world under serious questioning. Thus, the primary discourse can be regarded as manifesting the traditional notions of human exceptionalism and dualism between us and them, while the secondary discourse responds to the current changes in society by reinventing domination as grounded in the wellbeing of animals. Thus, I see the results of the present research as a reflection of the ideological struggle taking place in society the hegemonic construction of human dominance is making way to discourses that emphasise connectedness rather than separation.

7 CONCLUSION

The present study sought out to uncover and analyse production animal discourses available in a UK based magazine *Country Smallholding,* aimed at those engaging in small-scale agriculture. The specific focus was on the representation of pigs due to their prevalence in previous research as well as the animal's purpose being exclusively meat production. The aim of the study was to analyse how the widespread social constructions connecting living pigs with products were combined with the idea of smallholding providing a more humane alternative to intensive farming methods. The findings of the study revealed a coexistence of two seemingly conflicting discourses on pigs. These were labelled as the primary and secondary discourse based on their prevalence in data. The primary discourse included the use of different linguistic devices to construct pigs as object-like beings by obscuring their sentience and emphasising the human domination over them. These findings closely relate to previously conducted research, for example to Stibbe's (2003) research on the language of pig industry manuals, and to Glenn's (2004) perception of 'doublespeak' as a way to cover the uncomfortable aspects of animal farming, as well as to Jepson's (2008) findings on the tendency to render the killing of animals invisible. In fact, the primary discourse can be understood as the reflection of more general societal perception of production animals as food, and as a way to maintain this consent. On the other hand, the secondary discourse appeared to represent pigs in contradictory ways, constructing them as meaningful beyond their role in production by referring to their animacy and subjectivity. However, it was concluded that these representations were applied in a restricted way. This meant that only some animals were granted subjectivity, thus, setting them apart from the "mass" and often working in favour of an industry objective. Therefore, the secondary discourse related to the idea of 'happy meat' (Cole, 2011) according to which the animals' perceived welfare justifies meat production, as well as to hunters' perception of the animals they kill (Cook 2015). In essence, the secondary discourse is a response to the demand for animal welfare, often voiced by the consumers (Bergstra et al. 2017), and by those who engage with smallholding spaces as an attempt to diverge from mainstream meat production (Wilkie, 2010). However, the secondary discourse was understood preventive in how it addressed the ethical dilemma inherent in meat production due to its seeming association with wellbeing. Thus, ultimately protecting the ideology of human exclusivity justifies dominance of other non-human animals.

The results from the present study will add to the relatively small pool of knowledge within the field of discursive studies of animals within linguistics. Indeed, the lack of

comprehensive research regarding the importance of language in creating and maintaining society's understanding of animals has received little attention from scholars occupied in the field (Cook, 2015; Cook and Sealey, 2017). Thus, the ability of new research to broaden the understanding within the field by introducing information is valuable, and the present study attempts to achieve exactly that. More specifically, the findings will add a contemporary viewpoint by taking into consideration the growing concern for the ethical treatment of animals brought about by the increasingly intensive methods of animal farming. This was achieved through analysing the discourses produced in a context which exemplifies the potentially conflicting interests of productivity and animal wellbeing. The insights of the present study can thus be utilised to revise and specify the academic understanding to respond more accurately to the changing perception of production animals in society. Indeed, the changing societal perceptions of production animals are reflected in language which simultaneously circulates and maintains them. I argue that the present study illustrates how the discursive construction of production animals as lifeless resources is moving towards alternative ways of representation. In addition, I posit that this is due to increasing information on the cognitive abilities of non-human animals and the disturbing reality of treating sentient beings as akin to machines for production. Therefore, discourses that place animal wellbeing at the foreground potentially illustrate the contemporary way dominance of humans over other non-human animals is established in society. The field of linguistic study on animal discourses needs to respond to the changing social construction of production animals accordingly.

In general, the critical study of language can contribute to raising awareness on how discourses are exercised to forward certain ideologies while concealing alternative ways of thinking, and how social cognition, or shared knowledge, is created on the level of language. For instance, Glenn (2004: 65), has argued that factory farm industry discourses help to persuade how people think about animals in ways that ultimately justify cruel treatment, despite the harm they cause to the animals and the environment. The powerful discourses that are regarded as common sense determine whether farmed animals are seen and treated as subjects in their own right or in as commodities that can be exploited continuously. Taking into consideration the extensive impact discourses can have on those whom they address, critical linguistic study is crucial. Language awareness is especially beneficial for those who are directly responsible for creating the discourses. The individuals who write about farmed animals and thus produce discourses that contribute to their conceptualisation need to be aware of the impact their activities have, even though, the issues raised by linguistics might seem irrelevant or out of reach. Croney and Reynnells (2008) regarded the awareness on the impact of language as a matter of professional ethics and viability when dealing

with animal representations. More specifically, what is needed is revision of text in order to determine whether the messages sent out are accurate and convey the type of information that was intended without obscuring aspects of reality (Croney and Reynnells, 2008). I regard this to be the most direct and effective implication of the current study's results, since it targets the source of discourse and can thus result in practical change if deemed necessary. Although, it is possible that the results from my study either do not reach the source of discursive practices or are not taken up by those responsible for creating them, and more often than not, the connection between academic study and real-life implication are not as straight forward. However, comprising the main arguments into a popular article and suggested for publication in suitable magazine, provides another potential opportunity for presenting the results from the present study to a wider audience.

Nonetheless, my results can be applied on a more general level together with other research that addresses similar topics. Thus, my findings can provide examples of those linguistic features that are central in constructing production animals in ways that allow for the continuity of their exploitation and, thus, require critical examination and potential alteration. Of course, this can only be done in conjunction with other research in order to build a comprehensive understanding of the way disruptive discourses about animals are constructed, determining viable replacement and demanding change. While such a process is undeniably complicated and the implications of a single study can have in the larger scheme of things seem miniscule, it can nonetheless be argued that "What is needed is a larger shift of consciousness, a change in dominant models of reality and the discourses that encode them" (Stibbe, 2004: 15). Therefore, I am hopeful that the findings of the present study can contribute to changing the current state of affairs for production animals by illustrating how language can hinder tangible improvement for their wellbeing. However, exposing disruptive discourses needs to be coupled with suggesting alternative ones which can be used for replacement. Discourse analysis that aims at providing alternative ways of language use to establish different realities than those we are currently used to, is referred to as positive discourse analysis (Stibbe, 2001: 170). In other words, it is equally important to focus on the positive impact that certain discourses can have on the way animals are seen and treated as it is to point out potential areas of improvement. The current study can also have some significance to offer in this context, since the data is extracted from a farming magazine that subscribes to an alternative way of animal production and lifestyle in general, thus, it is likely that alternative discourses regarding animals are also employed. Identifying ways of representing animals that promote a more positive way of relating to them is an important step in the process of creating more sustainable communities and better establishing the ethical treatment of farmed animals.

Either as communications directly to those who are responsible for creating certain discourses to encourage practical change, or as a part of a more general attempt to alter society's perceptions through language awareness, research on animal discourses can have a tangible effect. In order for the human perceptions of animals to change, the language used to represent them must change respectively and discourse analysis can prove significant in encouraging this (Smith-Harris 2004: 14). Critical analysis of discourse is a first step in the process, since by revealing the way language is used to encode reality on textual level can contribute to revealing the discourses that are disruptive and beneficial can have an important impact on what kind of practices people adapt in relation to other living being in the future.

Due to the fairly limited scope of the present research, the results cannot be extended to comprehensively describe those discourses that currently circulate in society on pigs, nor are they directly applicable to comment on the discursive construction of production animals in general. Therefore, future research could engage further with determining the peculiarities in the discursive construction of different animals in different areas of production. Indeed, it has been previously noted that people tend to assign different production animals with noticeably different amount of mental and cognitive abilities (Kupsala, 2019: 59) and these varying perceptions are likely reflected in discourse respectively. The present study also pointed to some degree of variation in representation regarding pigs that serve different functions in the production chain, assigning increased individuality to those animals that whose existence endures longer. In addition, the present study pointed to a tendency to represent animacy and subjectivity of either female pigs or piglets, thus, excluding comparable depiction of male pigs, however, the data was too limited to provide comprehensive results on potential differences between these categories of pigs. Thus, future research could tackle the question of whether the differences in the social construction of animals go beyond the level of species and extends to perceptions on male/female animals. Due to the emerging status of Ecolinguistics, the field is ripe with topics for future research, and mapping out a comprehensive understanding of discursive construction of production animals is still a working process.

The exploitation and slaughter of production animals on a massive scale is dependent on the consent of society for such action, and the ideologies that govern such a system are embedded in and transmitted through discourse (Stibbe, 2001: 145). Therefore, in order to achieve meaningful change in the lives of animals currently defined by their purpose in production, close attention must be paid to the language used to construct these animals. Although language use is not directly responsible for the violence and exploitation of animals in food production and other areas,

it contributes to maintaining and circulating the discourses that construct this shared consent on the societal level (Smith-Harris, 2004: 12). However, language use and discursive constructions on production animals can also achieve the opposite and through extensive and diverse research on the topic of animal discourses, dismantling the ideologies that govern separation and exceptionalism and thus make way for new ways of perceiving animals valuing our shared experience of life.

BIBLIOGARPHY

Primary sources

Gray, S. (2018). And they call it puppy love. *Country Smallholding* [online] November 2018, 44–45.

Kingsley, D. (2018). A pig in a poke? *Country Smallholding* [online] October 2018, 49.

Kingsley, D. (2019). Back to black. *Country Smallholding* [online] January 2019, 29–30.

Kingsley, D. (2019). Long-haired lovelies from Liverpool. *Country Smallholding* [online] February 2019, 28–30.

Mouland, C. (2019). Purple peril for pigs. *Country Smallholding* [online] January 2019, 41.

Shankland, L. (2018). Cutting out the pain. *Country Smallholding* [online] October 2018, 28–29.

Schankland, L. (2018). Injecting to delay to onslaught of puberty. *Country Smallholding* [online] November 2018, 34–35.

Schankland, L. (2018). Don't let your pigs get porky. *Country Smallholding* [online] December 2018, 50–51.

Schankland, L. (2019). The boar necessities. *County Smallholding* [online] January 2019, 32–33.

Schankland, L. (2019). What price prime pork? *Country Smallholding* [online] February 2019, 32–33.

Schankland, L. (2019). Avoiding pig breeding pitfalls. *Country Smallholding* [online] March 2019, 34–35.

Secondary sources

Aaltola, E. (2013). *Johdatus eläinfilosofiaan*. Tallinna: Gaudeamus Helsinki University Press.

Alexander, R. and Stibbe, A. (2014). From the analysis of ecological discourse to the ecological analysis of discourse. *Language Sciences* 41(A), 104–110.

Arluke, A. and Sanders, C. (1996). *Regarding animals*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bastian, B., Loughnan, S., Haslam, N. and Radke, H. (2012). Don't Mind Meat? The Denial of Mind to Animals Used for Human Consumption. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 38(2), 247–56.

Bednarek, B. (2006). *Evaluation in Media Discourse: Analysis of a Newspaper Corpus*. London: Continuum.

Bergstra, T., Hogeveen, H. and Stassen, E. (2017). Attitudes of different stakeholders toward pig

husbandry: a study to determine conflicting and matching attitudes toward animals, humans and the environment. *Agriculture and human values* 34, 393–405.

Bock, B. and van Huik, M. (2007). Animal welfare: the attitudes and behaviour of European pig farmers. *British Food Journal* 109(11), 931–944.

The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness 2012. Cambridge: Cambridge University [online] http://fcmconference.org/img/CambridgeDeclarationOnConsciousness.pdf. (15 May, 2020)

Cambridge Dictionary [online]. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/. (15 May, 2020)

Carter, B. and Nickie, C. (2011). *Human and other animals: critical perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan. 2011.

Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University press.

Cole, M. (2011). From "Animal Machines" to "Happy Meat"? Foucault's Ideas of Disciplinary and Pastoral Power Applied to 'Animal-Centred' Welfare Discourse. *Animals* 1(1), 83–101.

Cook, G. (2015). 'A pig is a person' or 'You can love a fox and hunt it': Innovation and tradition in the discursive representation of animals. *Discourse & Society* 26(5), 587–607.

Cook, G. and Sealey, A. (2017). The Discursive representation of Animals. In A. Fill and H. Penz (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Ecolinguistics*. New York: Routledge.

Croney, C. and Reynnells, R. (2008). The Ethics of Semantics: Do We Clarify or Obfuscate Reality to Influence Perceptions of Farm Animal Production. *Poultry Science* 87(2), 387–91.

DeMello M. (2012). *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*. New York: Columbia University Press.

van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society* 4(2), 249–283.

Do Couto, H. (2014). Ecological approaches in linguistics: a historical overview. *Language Sciences* 41, 122–128.

Dunayer, J. (2003). English and speciesism. *English Today* 19(1), 61–62.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power* (2nd edition). London: Longman.

Fill, A. and Penz, H. (2017). The Routledge Handbook of Ecolinguistics. New York: Routledge 2017.

Fill, A. and Steffensen, S. (2014). Ecolinguistics: the state of the art and future horizons. *Language Sciences* 41, 6–25.

Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations: *Key Facts and Findings* (2015). http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/197623/icode/. (15 May, 2020).

Gilquin, G. and Jacobs, GM. (2006). Elephants who marry mice are very unusual: The use of the relative pronoun who with nonhuman animals. *Society & Animals* 14(1), 79–105.

Glenn, C. (2004). Constructing Consumables and Consent: A Critical Analysis of Factory Farm Industry. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 28:1, 63–81.

Goatley, A. (2001). Green Grammar and Grammatical Metaphor, or Language and Myth of Power, or Metaphor we Die By. In A. Fill and P. Mühlhäusler (eds.), *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment*. London: Continuum.

Groling, J. (2016). *Hounding the urban fox: a Critical Discourse Analysis of a moral panic with an animal folk devil*. Studies in Sociology. University of Exeter.

Gupta, A. (2006). Foxes, hounds, and horses: Who or which? *Society & Animals* 14(1), 107–128.

Halliday, M. (2001). New ways of meaning: the challenge of applied linguistics. In A. Fill and P. Mühlhäusler (eds.), *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment.* London: Continuum.

Heuberger, R. (2017). Overcoming Anthropocentrism With Anthropomorphic and Physiocentric Uses of Language? In Fill, A. and Penz H. (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Ecolinguistics.* New York: Routledge.

Hunston, S. and Thompson, G. (2000). *Evaluation in Text : Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holloway, L. (2000). 'Hell on earth and paradise all at the same time': the production of smallholding space in the British countryside. *Area* 32(3), 307–315.

Jepson, J. (2008). A linguistic analysis of discourse on the killing of nonhuman animals. *Society & Animals* 16,127– 148.

de Jonge, F. and van den Bos, R. (2005) *The Human-animal Relationship: Forever and a Day*. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.

Knight, S., Vrij, A., Cherryman, J. and Nunkoosis, K. (2004). Attitudes Towards Animal Use and Belief in Animal Mind. *Anthrozoös* 17(1), 43–62.

Kubberød, E. Ueland, Ø., Tronstad, Å. and Risvik, E. (2002). Attitudes towards meat and meat-

eating among adolescents in Norway: a qualitative study. *Apettite* 38(1), 53–62.

Kupsala, S. (2019). *A sociological study of Finnish attitudes, perceptions and meanings regarding animals in food production*. Studies in Social Sciences and Business Studies. University of Eastern Finland.

Lappalainen, E. (2012). *Syötäväksi kasvatetut*. Jyväskylä: Atena Kustannus Oy.

Linne, T. (2016). Cows on Facebook and Instagram: Interspecies Intimacy in the Social Media Spaces of the Swedish Dairy Industry. *Television & New Media* 17(8), 719–733.

Lynn, W. (2010), 'Discourse and wolves: Science, society, and ethics'. *Society and Animals* 18(1), 75–92.

McKendree, M., Croney, C. and Wildmar, N. (2014). Effects of demographic factors and information sources on United States consumer perceptions of animal welfare. *Journal of animal science* 92(7), 3161–3172.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary [online]. https://www.merriam-webster.com/. (15 May, 2020).

Mäkilä, K. (2007). *Tuhoa, tehoa ja tuhlausta. Helsingin Sanomien ja New York Timesin ydinaseuutisoinnin tarkastelua diskurssianalyyttisesta näkökulmasta 1945–1998.* Studies in humanities. University of Jyväskylä.

Packwood Freeman, C. (2009) This Little Piggy Went to Press: The American News Media's Construction of Animals in Agriculture. *The Communication Review* 12(1), 78–103.

Pietikäinen, S. (2008). Kriittinen diskurssintutkimus. In K. Sajavaara and A. Piirainen-Marsh (eds.), *Kieli, diskurssi & yhteisö.* Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, soveltavan kielentutkimuksen keskus.

Porcher, J. (2011). The Relationship Between Workers and Animals in the Pork Industry: A Shared Suffering. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 24(1), 3–17.

Ritchie, H. and Roser, M. (2020). Meat and Dairy Production. *OurWorldInData.org*. https://ourworldindata.org/meat-production (15 May, 2020).

Sealey, A. and Charles, N. (2013). "What Do Animals Mean to You?": Naming and Relating to Nonhuman Animals. *Anthrozoös* 26(4), 485–503.

Shultz, B. (2001). Language and Natural Environments. In A. Fill and P. Mühlhäusler (eds.), *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment.* London: Continuum.

Smith-Harris, T. (2004). Language usage and human perceptions of other animals. *Revision* 27, 12–15.

Special Eurobarometer 422: Attitudes of Europeans towards Animals Welfare 2016. European

Union [online]. https://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/S2096_84_4_442_ENG (15 May, 2020).

Stibbe, A. (2001). Language, power and the social construction of animals. *Society & Animals* 9, 145–161.

Stibbe, A. (2003). As Charming as a Pig: The Discursive Construction of the Relationship Between Pigs and Humans. *Society and Animals* 11(4), 375–392.

Stibbe, A. (2012). *Animals Erased: Discourse, Ecology, and Reconnection with the Natural World*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Stibbe, A. (2014). An Ecolinguistic Approach to Critical Discourse Studies. Critical Discourse Studies 11(1), 117–128.

Trampe, W. (2001). Language and Ecological Crisis: Extracts from a Dictionary of Industrial Agriculture. In A. Fill and P. Mühlhäusler (eds.), *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment.* London: Continuum.

Trampe, W. (2017). Euphemisms for Killing Animals and for Other Forms of Their Use. In Fill, A. and Penz H. (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Ecolinguistics.* New York: Routledge.

Waldau, P. (2013). *Animal studies: an introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wasley, A. and Davies, M. (2017). The rise of the "megafarm": How British meat is made. *The Bureau of Investigative Journalism*. https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com /stories/2017-07-17/megafarms-uk-intensive-farming-meat (15 May, 2020).

Wilkie, R. (2010). *Livestock/Deadstock: Working with animals from birth to slaughter.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of Discourse*. London: Longman.

Wodak, R. (2011). Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. In Zienkowski, Östman, and Verschueren (eds.), *Discursive Pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.