Isabel Pizarro-Sánchez, Leonor Pérez-Ruiz

Rhetorical structure and promotional language in baked product descriptions: An English-Spanish contrastive analysis

Abstract: This study explores the relation between rhetorical communicative functions and grammatical categories and more specifically between persuasion and adjectives in online biscuit descriptions. Promotional genres make use of linguistic and non-linguistic strategies to achieve their persuasive function and among the linguistic ones, we find the use of positive adjectives. The purpose of this paper is twofold: (i) to describe the rhetorical structure of online descriptions and the distribution of adjectives in the different rhetorical sections of the genre, and (ii) to analyze the relationship between rhetorical communicative purposes and adjective frequencies to figure out how the communicative purpose of each move/step influences adjective distribution, in English and Spanish. The research is based on an English-Spanish comparable corpus of online baked descriptions, including cookies, cakes, muffins, pastries, crackers, and bread. The contrastive analysis was carried out in two stages, first the rhetorical level was described and then the grammatical one. The most frequent adjectives and their concordances were analyzed to classify them to establish common features that would explain their use in specific rhetorical moves and steps. There is an association between the frequency of positive adjectives and the different rhetorical moves of the genre in both languages. Objective moves and steps show a lower use of adjectives, whereas subjective ones show a greater frequency of adjectives in general and of positive evaluative adjectives in particular, which can be explained by the rhetorical function of the sections where they are used.

Keywords: Product description, rhetorical structure, persuasion, adjective, English, Spanish

Acknowledgements: This publication is part of the RDI project PID2020-114064RB-I00, funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033.

We would like to express our gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for taking the necessary time and effort to review the manuscript and for the valuable and thoughtful comments and suggestions that greatly contributed to improving its quality.

Isabel Pizarro-Sánchez, University of Valladolid, e-mail: isabel.pizarro@uva.es
Leonor Pérez-Ruiz, University of Valladolid, e-mail: leonor.perez@uva.es

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111101729-005

1 Introduction

Online product descriptions are the main elements that make up catalogues or e-catalogues when published on the Internet, being their function to increase mail order sales, phone sales, or in-store (Bennett, 1995), i.e., to sell the product. As many other genres and subgenres, they have evolved from being mainly informative to a "hybrid partly promotional genre" (Fairclough, 1993). This evolution is the result of a pressure to sell products and services in our consumer society and subsequently it leads to increasing promotional concerns and to the inclusion of elements of promotion in many social, professional, or academic genres that were not originally considered promotional (Bhatia, 2005), among them we can find food descriptions in general, and more specifically descriptions of baked products.

Total expenditure on advertising including all major media shows "a long-term stable growth factors" (Janoschka, 2004, p. 14), although there are media-related differences with online advertising showing the best figures, probably due to its comparatively low costs and the growing number of people using the Internet (Janoschka, 2004, p.15). In the professional marketing industry, marketers are particularly interested in how language influences people's purchasing decisions and how to use it to improve the sales of the products and services they advertise by means of different promotional genres, such as e-catalogues including online descriptions, web-ads, posters, radio spots, or billboards, to name a few. It is therefore common for advertising and marketing-related university degrees to include in their syllabus modules such as Advertising language, Creative communication, Professional writing, Content creation and the like. This interest is also reflected in the websites and blogs that deal with this topic and its specificities, such as the choice of words, so it is easy to find lists with marketing words to use or avoid in order to boost a brand, and even list of advertising adjectives or adjectives with punch.

In view of this interest, the present study explores the relation between rhetorical communicative functions and grammatical categories and more specifically between persuasion and adjectives. Promotional genres make use of linguistic and non-linguistic strategies to achieve their persuasive function (Bhatia, 2004) and among the linguistic ones, we can find the use of positive adjectives (Labrador, Ramón, Alaiz-Moretón, & Sanjurjo-González, 2014; Izquierdo, & Pérez Blanco, 2020). The purpose of this paper is twofold, on the one hand to describe the rhetorical structure of online baked descriptions and the distribution of adjectives within it, on the other hand to analyze the relation between rhetorical communicative purposes and adjective frequencies and find out how the communicative purpose of each move/step influences adjective distribution and types, in English and Spanish.

2 Online advertisements and persuasive language

Online product descriptions can be categorized as a genre since they fulfil Swales' (1990) definition of genre, i.e., they share a set of communicative purposes, shape the schematic structure, and constrain the choice of content and linguistic style. More specifically, they are a promotional genre as they show the main promotional communicative purposes, namely, to inform potential customers, to persuade them to buy the product or service, and to promote the image of the product and the brand (Bhatia, 1993). Although they are part of the colony of promotional genres, i.e., group of genres sharing promotion as their main communicative purpose, online product descriptions are a distinctive genre with differences in its communicative purposes (Bhatia, 2005): informative and persuasive, and promotional in the marketing sense. Like any other genre, product descriptions are made up of functional components called 'moves' that may include one or several functional subcomponents or 'steps' (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993) whose specific communicative functions contribute to the general purpose of the move and thus of the genre (Biber, Connor, & Upton, 2007).

Online advertising differs from traditional advertising such as print, radio, or TV in their interactive approach (Janoschka, 2004) and its medium. The medium, the Internet, frees advertisers from space restrictions and allows them to decide the length of the promotional text based on purely advertising criteria, being either a long or short copy (Cook, 2001). The interactional approach is found in rhetorical elements such as *Follow us*, *Reviews* or *Contact us* where there is the possibility of an exchange of ideas between participants, potential buyers and sellers in human or machine form, though online descriptions, as part of e-catalogues, are characterized as static web ads with a low level of interactivity, according to Janoschka's classification of web ads. As we will see below, this is reflected in the very low frequency of use of moves with interactive function, *Opinion* and *Contact* in the genre under study.

Persuasive and promotional strategies have been approached from different fields of expertise, mainly linguistics and marketing, and always with a similar objective, to find out how language is used to increase sales or promote the image of a company and its products. Fuentes Rodríguez and Alcaide Lara (2002) describe the linguistic mechanisms of persuasion, and, because of their relevance to our research, we single out the macro-textual structure (sequential organization), lexical resources, and technicisms as a specific persuasive technique. According to these authors, each genre has a pre–established organization in which the sequencing of information differs, hence creating different rhetorical structures

with moves and steps as defined by Swales and Bhatia. Their description of lexical resources includes emphatic lexical structures, repetition of lexical elements to emphasize part of the message whether opinion (subjective) or information (objective), and the use of positive evaluative adjectives sometimes with a pejorative or even ironic character, among others. Finally, technicisms are lexical elements whose original usage was intended as a mechanism of communication in the field of science and technology, since they are designations of specific concepts within a specific discipline. However, in the field of advertising and marketing, they are used to persuade the audience, which makes them argumentative techniques of a lexical nature. They are signifiers that acquire a positive meaning contextually, and although most readers are unable to decode their meaning, they can decode the positive context of use and hence predict a positive meaning; in short, technicisms act as purely promotional elements with an important appellative value. However, they are devoid of information because they cannot be decoded by most receivers, so they merely convey positive connotations and simply sound good to the target audience (Fuentes Rodríguez & Alcaide Lara, p. 348–358).

As mentioned before, adjectives are an essential element in the persuasive function of the language. Major grammars provide a detailed study on the lexical word class *adjective*, which is described by its morphological, syntactic, and semantic features (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985; Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999; Huddleston, & Pullum, 2002). Central adjectives characterize nominal expressions, serve attributive or predicative roles, and denote different attributes like color, material, size and dimension, shape, age, origin, material, etc. which are used in diverse conceptual semantic categorizations such as Dixon's (1982), on which we have partially relied for our own classification. Other categorizations follow morphological, syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic criteria or even a combination of these (Fragaki, 2010; Edo-Marzá, 2011). It should be noted that we have not made a grammatical distinction between participial adjectives and adjectives.

Numerous studies deal with the language of advertising and persuasion in general (Leech, 1966; Hyland, 1998; Rush, 1998; Cook, 2001; Fuertes-Olivera, Velasco-Sacristán, Arribas-Baño & Samaniego-Fernández, 2001), describing commonly found linguistic features such as catchphrases, abundance of non-finite clauses with positive information, complex noun phrases with premodifiers and postmodifiers, the frequent use and high variety of compound adjectives, and others. More recent research has investigated a similar matter although from a genre approach, but few are the studies published on the use of persuasive language in online food descriptions. Edo-Marzá (2011) describes the use of evaluative adjectives in promotional hotel websites giving her own categorization based on a collocational analysis. Labrador et al. (2014) analyze online advertisements of electronic products to establish their rhetorical structure and the linguistic ele-

ments that contribute to the persuasive function of the genre, including multiple modifications with two or more adjectives, compound adjectives, quantifying expressions with positive connotations, and emphatic devices, to name a few. Finally, Izquierdo and Blanco (2020) conducted a similar work although on food descriptions; they analyzed herbal tea promotional texts being their results consistent with previous research; furthermore, they categorized six promotional strategies "which are conveyed using descriptive and evaluative language" (p. 52) with features such as "evaluative adjectives that invoke something positive and pleasant" among others. Our work analyses the relationship between rhetorical communicative purposes and adjectives frequencies to gain insight into how the communicative purpose of each move or step of online biscuit descriptions affects the adjective distribution in English and Spanish.

3 Data and method

3.1 Corpus Description

This research is based on an English-Spanish small comparable corpus which is genre-specific, C-BakedGoods corpus. It includes online descriptions of bakery product such as cookies, cakes, muffins, pastries, crackers, and bread. It is part of CLANES, a comparable English/Spanish corpus consisting of seven sub-corpora in the fields of food and drink, with almost 1.5 million grammatically and semantically annotated words (Rabadán, Ramón, & Sanjurjo-González, 2021). C-BakedGoods is made up of 330 complete texts in each language, totalling 49468 running words in English and 59770 in European Spanish. All texts were originally produced and published under similar conditions and were randomly collected between 2014 and 2017. They were downloaded directly from manufacturers' or retailers' websites and were converted into UTF-8 encoded txt files. Images, illustrations, and any other non-verbal and multimodal elements were automatically deleted in this process. To avoid author or brand bias, texts belong to different well-known brands and were downloaded from the corresponding website brands or from well-known online shops, 42 in English and 40 in Spanish; examples are Cadbury, McVities, Burton, Wowbaking, PlumIsland, Archway, Nabisco, FarmHuse, Lismore, etc., in English, and Lu, Gullón, Milka, El Gorriaga, Cuétara, Belsi, Marbú, Reglero, Hero, etc., in Spanish. The complete list of files, including file tokens and sources, is available at http://contraste2.unileon.es/web/es/corpus0_C-BakedGoods.html.

Given that the size of the corpus is a key issue that depends on the type of research, we used ReCor computer program to evaluate the representativeness thresh-

old of the corpus, in terms of number of words and files (Seghiri, 2010; Corpas Pastor, & Seghiri, 2009). ReCor has to be used a posteriori, once the corpus has been compiled. It analyses "the lexical density of a corpus in relation to the increase in documentary material included" (Corpas Pastor, & Seghiri, 2009, p. 88); it thus establishes the representativeness for the most demanding type of study, the lexicographical, compared to grammatical or rhetorical studies whose elements show an even distribution due to a frequency effect (Hilpert, & Correira Saavedra, 2017). ReCor results indicate that the English subcorpus is representative from 55 texts and 8000 tokens onwards, whereas the Spanish one requires more data to achieve representativeness: 80 texts and 12000 tokens. In the light of these results and given that manual tagging is a labor-intensive and time-consuming task, we randomly selected 100 texts per language, which were manually tagged at the rhetorical level for further analysis. We set this number for two main reasons: it exceeds the number of texts and words marked by ReCor as representative of the corpus (significant sample), and because of the number of works related to grammatical and rhetorical aspects that use 100 files when working with specialized corpora.

3.2 Procedure

Once the corpus was compiled, the same procedure was applied to the Spanish and English sub-corpora. First, we conducted an analysis of the rhetorical structure of the texts to identify not only the moves and steps but also their frequencies, which was necessary to determine whether they are obligatory or optional and, thus, establish a common structure for the genre under study. Then, we retrieved and analyzed the adjectives of the moves and steps which are not used occasionally.

The rhetorical structure of the texts was manually tagged with *Rhetorical move tagger*® (ACTRES Tagger), a tool designed to help in the tagging process. Previously, we had to define the specific tag set for the genre of our interest (baked online product descriptions), load the corpus, and then tag it. As already mentioned, this is a laborious task carried out on a significant sample of the corpus (100 texts). To retrieve the tagged information, we used the complementary tool *Comparable corpus browser*® (ACTRES Browser), which allows the automatic retrieval of any previously used rhetorical tag to obtain as many subcorpora as rhetorical sections (moves and steps).

The set of rhetorical tags was established using Bahtia's (2005) generic structure of advertisements as the starting point. Since online product descriptions are not advertisements as such, they do not fully conform to Bhatia's structure, hence, the rhetorical tag set was modified to fit the corpus data. The final rhetorical tag set

was established after conducting a pilot coding test in a randomly selected small sample of the corpus and redefining the categories as needed. ACTRES Tagger was fed with these categories (Table 1) and two researchers manually chose among them to annotate the corpus at its rhetorical level. The identification of the different moves and steps of each text was a complex task since these functional elements do not necessarily have clear boundaries like punctuation marks. To solve this, we used all kinds of evidence, including content and linguistic clues such as section headings, titles, subtitles, key words, verbs, non-verbal elements (bold and italic types, layout), etc. and we applied a functional–semantic approach, which requires a very close reading. This tagging process was carried out by two researchers working together who had to agree on the tags prior to adding them; when discrepancies arose, a language informant helped to reach an agreement. The researchers coded the corpus manually, however, the coding was inserted electronically with the ACTRES Tagger so that it can be reused with other linguistic analysis tools. Then, each rhetorical subcorpus was automatically retrieved by ACTRES Browser, together with its statistic information referring to the frequency of use and the number of tokens. Thus, the description of the rhetorical structure includes their frequencies of occurrence (100 files per language) which we used to classify its moves and steps as compulsory (>80%), high priority (80–60%), medium priority (59–40%), low priority (39–20%) or occasional (<20%). It should be noted that there is no established threshold that delimits these categories as different scholars use different scales (Biber, Connor, & Upton 2007; Connor, 2000; López Arroyo, & Roberts, 2014; Rabadán, 2016; Pizarro-Sánchez, 2017). Following López Arroyo and Roberts (2014), we decided to discard any rhetorical element with low frequency, although we set a threshold of 20%, instead of the 40% used by them.

Table 1: Rhetorical tag set.

Moves	Steps
1.- Presentation	1.1- CompanyName 1.2- ProductName 1.3- ImageBiscuit 1.4- ImagePackaging
2.- Slogan	2.1- Slogan
3.- Main Product Description	3.1- Description 3.2- Ingredients 3.3- NutritionalValues 3.4- AllergenInformation 3.5- SuitableFor

Table 1 (continued)

Moves	Steps
	3.6- Packaging 3.7- StorageConditions 3.8- UseBy 3.9- Disclaimer 3.10- CodeReference 3.11- Video
4.- Opinion	4.1- Comments 4.2- ShareOn 4.3- FollowOn
5.- Tastyfacts	5.1- TastyFacts
6.- Flavours	6.1- FlavourName 6.2- FlavourDescription 6.3- FlavourNutritionalV 6.4- FlavourAllergenInfo 6.5- ImageFlavourBiscuit 6.6- ImageFlavourPack
7.- Contact	7.1- e-mail 7.2- Address 7.3- Telephone 7.4- Map
8.- Order	8.1- Order
9.- Other	9.1- Other

After identifying the rhetorical subcorpora with frequencies higher than occasional, we automatically retrieved the lists of their adjectives, cleaned them manually if necessary, and analyzed them. To retrieve them, we used SketchEngine (Kilgarriff, 2014), software designed for linguistic data analysis that fully supports English and Spanish. It annotates corpora with part-of-speech and lemma information, English corpora with TreeTagger and Spanish with FreeLing; its tagged output features an acceptable amount of noise (non-adjectives) that we only filtered out when the amount was excessive i.e., in *Nutritional Values*. We activated the case-insensitive option in the SketchEngine Advanced tab to get lowercase attributes. Next, we analyzed the adjectives from a semantic point of view, consulting the concordance lists generated with SketchEngine when in doubt about their use, which allowed us to study them in their specific context of use, and we grouped them according to Dixon (1982) and Edo Marzá's (2011) categorization. Finally, we identified the patters of use connected to the rhetorical move

or step in which they are used. This was done to determine any common feature that would explain their use in each rhetorical element. The English-Spanish contrastive analysis of the adjectives was conducted in an attempt to establish differences and similarities in their use.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Rhetorical structure

Table 2 compares the rhetorical structure of the genre in English and Spanish and provides detailed information on this structure, including frequencies.

Table 2: Contrastive rhetorical structure. Moves and steps frequencies.[1]

Moves	English %	Spanish %	Steps	English %	Spanish %	English	Spanish
M1 – Presentation	100	100	CompanyName	55	79	Med.	High
			ProductName	96	99	Comp.	Comp.
			ImageBiscuit	43	39	Low	Low
			ImagePackaging	77	88	High	Com.
M2 – Slogan	10	24	Slogan	10	24	Occ.	Low
M3 – Main Product Description	96	91	Description	95	82	Comp.	Comp.
			Ingredients	55	72	High	High
			NutritionalValues	66	62	High	High
			AllergenInformation / Contains	40	61	Med.	High
			SuitableFor / Diets	26	4	Low	Occ.
			Packaging	25	56	Low	Med.

1 Comp. stands for compulsory, High for high priority, Med. for medium priority, Low for low priority, and Occ. for occasional.

Table 2 (continued)

Moves	English %	Spanish %	Steps	English %	Spanish %	English	Spanish
			StorageConditions	7	17	Occ.	Occ.
			CodeReference	11	17	Occ.	Occ.
			Disclaimer	3	3	Occ.	Occ.
			Video – video	3	1	Occ.	Occ.
			UseBy	0	10	Occ.	Occ.
M4 – Opinion	9	2	Comments	6	0	Occ.	Occ.
			ShareOn	9	0	Occ.	Occ.
			FollowOn	1	1	Occ.	Occ.
M5 – TastyFacts	7	0	TastyFacts	7	0	Occ. Occ.	Occ. Occ.
M6 – Flavours	10	5	FlavourName	10	3	Occ.	Occ.
			FlavourDescription	5	5	Occ.	Occ.
			FlavourNutritional	3	0	Occ.	Occ.
			ImageFlavourBiscuit & Image Flavour pack	8	0	Occ.	Occ.
			FlavourAllergenInfo	0	0	Occ.	Occ.
M7 – Contact	2	1	e-mail	0	1	Occ.	Occ.
			Address	1	0	Occ.	Occ.
			Telephone	0	2	Occ.	Occ.
			Map	0	0	Occ.	Occ.
M8 – Order	18	9	OtherOrder	18	9	Occ.	Occ.
M9 – Other			Other	9	10	Occ.	Occ.

The macrostructure is common to both languages. As the table shows, there are only two moves in both languages whose frequencies are higher than 20% (occasional) and both are classified as 'compulsory' (frequency >80%): M1 and M3. They are the mandatory elements of the online product description structure, while the other moves can be classified as optional since their frequency of use is low or very low. M1 function is to provide basic information to identify the product and the company, and its steps refer to this in several ways including the com-

pany and product proper names, and non-verbal elements, namely the image of the product and its packaging; thus, there are no elements of linguistic interest for our research within M1.

M3 is the key move of this genre, being its function to describe the product in detail. If we compare English and Spanish subcorpora (Tables 2 and 3), we find that within M3 steps, there are five whose frequencies are not occasional and among them, *Description* is the most interesting from a linguistic point of view. The other steps include a low amount of running text (*Packaging*, *SuitableFor / Diets*), their frequencies of use are low, or they are lists of terms of great terminological interest, such as *Ingredients*, *Nutritional values,* or *Allergen information* but not so much to analyze their adjectives, as we will see below.

Table 3: M3 steps tokens and frequencies.

M3 – Main Product Description (En 96, Es 91). Steps:	Tokens English	English step Frequency	English	Tokens Spanish	Spanish step Frequency	Spanish
Description	4483	95	Com.	3054	82	Com.
Ingredients	2412	55	High	3172	72	High
NutritionalValues	4068	66	High	3255	62	High
AllergenInformation / Contains	712	40	Med.	1311	61	High
SuitableFor / Diets	108	26	Low	26	4	Occ.
Packaging	328	25	Low	523	56	Med.

Move 2 is classified as a low priority move in Spanish (24%) and occasional in English (10%). This move is not relevant for our research as it contains few words to analyse (119 in Spanish and 55 in English), furthermore, its specific character as a memorable phrase and marketing tool makes it short and simple, imposing clear restrictions on its wording, whereas our interest lies in a more natural use of the language. Finally, the other identified moves show very low frequencies in both languages and account for very few words out of the total corpus, thus, we treated M4, M5, M6, M7 and M8 as occasional results not worthy of further study. We hardly used M9 as most of the tagged text could be classified under one of the previous moves.

These results are consistent with the findings of Izquierdo and Blanco (2020:50), Labrador & Ramón (2015, 2020), and Ortego Antón (2019, 2020) who described the macrostructure of online descriptions of herbal teas, cheese, and dried meats, respectively. They reported that the compulsory moves refer to the product and company identification and the description, M1 and M3 in our work. Izquierdo and Blanco also identified a third common move (*Suggestions*), which we did not find, whose main steps are to advise customers on how 'to make the infusion' and on

how 'to consume', the second function is equivalent to the one described by Labrador & Ramón *Offering service suggestions*. The inclusion of this move in the description of certain products, such as herbal teas, is meaningful, but not in the products we have analyzed since they are ready-to-eat baked products and as such require no preparation. As for the M3 steps, the results are also similar, with the most frequent steps being *Description, Ingredients, Nutritional Values* and *Allergen Information*, although Izquierdo and Blanco (2020) classified each of them as independent moves and not as steps of a single move (*Main Product Description*), Ortego Antón (2019, 2020) included them as steps within the move *Información del producto* (product information) distinct from *Descripción del producto* (product description), and Labrador and Ramón (2015) identified *Ingredients* as a step within *Describing the product* move. Whether they are classified as move or step, they are identified as an essential part of the genre macrostructure. We considered that all these elements have the common function of describing several features of the product and, thus, we included them as part of the description move. The *Description* move provides information in either an objective or subjective way, corresponding to the objective characteristics of baked products such as ingredients, nutritional values, allergen information or storage conditions, and to the subjective, promotional, and persuasive elements: slogan and promotional description. This finding supports the work of Labrador et al. (2014) who also found this objective-subjective dichotomy in online electronic product advertisements: "promotional genres in general have two main parts, one describing the product to be sold and the other one evaluating it positively to convince the reader to purchase it" (2014:40).

The rhetorical macrostructure of online product descriptions in the agri-food domain seems to be pre–established, at least in terms of the obligatory common elements that always include *Identification*, *Description*, *Ingredients*, *Nutritional Values* and *Allergen Information*, the latter three being mandatory since the entry into force of EU Regulation 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers in 2016. Our corpus was compiled in 2014–2016, so not all texts include this information, as it was not yet compulsory at that time. As we have discussed, previous similar research includes in the macrostructure other rhetorical elements with frequencies between 40–79% that we have not found such as *Tasting Note / Describing smell and taste*, *Suggestions*, *Processing / Describing the process.* This may be due to the type of food described, in the sense given by Izquierdo and Blanco who refer to 'origin, ingredients and taste', but also to the type of food in terms of the level of processing according to the NOVA food classification (Monteiro et al., 2018). Herbal teas are natural or minimally processed food, cheeses are processed products that retain the basic identity and most of the components of the original food (milk), whereas most baked products and dried meats are highly processed or ultra-processed food with more than five ingredients including preserva-

tives, colorings, or chemicals. Finally, there may be a purely practical reason related to the number of characters of the information included in the descriptions. The list of ingredients of ultra-processed products is long, so rhetorical elements such as serving suggestions or tasting notes may be left out of the description. It is also interesting to note that, although move sequencing is not the subject of our study, the obligatory moves appear in the same order in the macrostructures of all online food descriptions. M1 is always at the beginning of the text, followed by a slogan if included, and then the product description; the other functional elements do not show a fixed sequencing. We also found that the Ortego Antón's (2020) rhetorical structure is the most similar to that of the baked product descriptions, probably because both deal with highly processed food.

4.2 Rhetorical structure and key adjectives

The distribution of adjectives within the moves and steps of the product descriptions reflects the same frequency patterns as the rhetorical elements of the macrostructure, and based on the results described above, we decided to analyze those whose frequencies are higher than occasional (20%) and include running text, i.e., M2 and M3. Table 4 shows the quantitative data related to the number of types and tokens in each move/step subcorpora and the adjectives used within them. As we have already discussed, we classified M3 steps according to their frequency, but they can also be classified according to the type of content they convey, which is either objective or subjective. Objective steps deal with verifiable information and data, without personal opinions or preferences such as *Ingredients* or *Nutritional Values*; subjective ones, on the other hand, refer to personal opinions, views and feelings, or even marketing-biased descriptions.

Table 4: Frequencies and rhetorical distribution of adjectives.

Move / Steps (SketchEngine data)	English adjectives Types / Tokens	Spanish adjectives Types / Tokens	Content type
M2.- Slogan	8 / 11	12 / 17	Subjective
M3.- Main Product Description. Steps:			
Description	231 / 618	130 / 407	Subjective
Ingredients	48 / 209	76 / 440	Objective
NutritionalValues	122 / 669	33 / 160	Objective
AllergenInformation / Contains	9 / 37	17 / 70	Objective
SuitableFor	5 / 25		
Packaging	17 / 28	14 / 37	Objective

As shown in Table 4, M2 includes few adjectives and with low frequencies of use, moreover, M2 is a move with distinctive wording as it refers to slogans (catchy phrases), so the results should be interpreted with caution. Furthermore, its frequency of use in English is 10%, clearly below our set threshold (20%). Even though there are few adjectives, most are subjective (wonderful, good, exquisite, delicious, chocolicious; sencillo, irresistible, delicioso, exquisito), one third of them coincide in both languages (healthy/sano, exquisite/exquisito, delicious/delicioso), and we found an English adjective coined for marketing purposes: chocolicious, made of chocolate and delicious.

Turning now to the next move, among M3 steps there are three of particular interest due to the number of adjectives they include in terms of types and tokens; two of them are objective steps (*Nutritional Values*, *Ingredients*) and one is subjective (*Description*). Most adjectives used in *Nutritional Values* can be described as technical and neutral in meaning in both languages, thus, reflecting the content of the step (saturated, monounsaturaded, carbohydared, nutritional, fat; energético, nutricional, graso, poliinsaturado, monoinsaturato, glucémico, etc.). Interestingly, although the total number of tokens in English (4068) is higher than in Spanish (3255), the relationship seemed to be the opposite when it comes to the analysis of the adjectives as we found 122 in English and 33 in Spanish, hence the need to examine the English adjectives more in detail. This closer analysis revealed that most of them were actually noise, referring to quantities related to weight and calories (e.g., 63g, 400mg, 414kj, etc.), leaving only 19 valid adjectives, all of them technical, with the exception of healthy, delicious, golden, and active.

Adjectives used in *Ingredients* show a greater variety than those found in *Nutritional Values*, with 48 types in English and 76 in Spanish, reflecting the higher diversity of the Spanish language in this step. As expected, most English adjectives are technical and objective (whole, unbleached, citric, organic, dried, inverted, condensed, defatted, etc.); on the other hand, and unexpectedly, Spanish adjectives reflect origin (árabe, italiano, chino, español, portugués, francés, alemán), colour (rojo, blanco, verde, negro), and opinion (delicioso), besides the expected technical content (emulgente, sódico, amónico, oléico, fólico, antioxidante, emulsionante, etc.) Among them, 'natural' and 'artificial' are of special interest. An analysis of their frequencies shows that both languages use 'natural' and 'artificial' with significant differences: 28 vs. 8 in English and 17 vs. 2 in Spanish, being the most frequent result in English. This extensive use of 'natural' reflects the general function of the genre (persuade) and although this step includes objective content, it also highlights the positive features of the ingredients, so that we find the persuasive function even within a simple list of ingredients that we would expect to be neutral.

Description adjectives show a great variety and many of them contribute to the function of this step 'providing a promotional description', therefore, as expected,

they are subjective adjectives used with a positive meaning such as delicious, perfect, special or delicioso, ideal, rico. A more detailed analysis made it possible to describe their main semantic features and revealed some differences in their use in English and Spanish. We would like to point out that some adjectives were classified into more than one category as they express different shades of meaning and that the classification, although based on the analysis of the use of the adjectives, is nevertheless a subjective process. However, our aim is to identify general trends rather than to conduct a more delicate study which will be the object of future research. Table 5 includes adjectives with frequencies higher than one due to space limitations. The list of adjectives was obtained using SketchEngine's lowercase attributes, so all adjectives are in lowercase as given by StechEngine, including adjectives of nationality.

Table 5: *Description* step adjectives and frequencies (English / Spanish).

***Description* step: English adjectives and frequencies**	***Description* step: Spanish adjectives and frequencies**
delicious 28, perfect 22, sweet 14, fine 12, good 12, rich 11, real 11, great 10, smooth 9, unique 9, chewy 9, fruity 9, golden 9, french 8, dark 8, special 8, crunchy 7, original 7, soft 7, free 7, crispy 7, crisp 7, new 7, available 7, organic 6, white 5, creamy 5, traditional 5, moist 5, simple 5, biscuit 5, thick 5, little 4, wonderful 4, big 4, beautiful 4, delightful 4, crumbly 4, artificial 4, old 4, fresh 4, generous 4, delicate 4, pure 4, classic 4, tasty 4, chocolate 4, hand-designed 4, high 4, sure 4, whole 4, single 4, corporate 3, everyday 3, natural 3, outside 3, belgian 3, full 3, popular 3, italian 3, raspberry 3, strawberry 3, different 3, wholemeal 3, juicy 3, mini 3, modern 3, indulgent 3, irish 3, more 3, various 2, fragrant 2, mid-afternoon 2, other 2, decadent 2, mouth-watering 2, possible 2, multi-packed 2, nice 2, oatmeal 2, orange 2, right 2, deep 2, reminiscent 2, green 2, disabled 2, easy 2, distinctive 2, chunky 2, subtle 2, homemade 2, iced 2, irresistible 2, blue 2, licensed 2, lemon 2, european 2, wrong 2, wide 2, famous 2, bubbly 2, favourite 2, winning 2, yellow 2, first 2.	delicioso 22, natural 18, crujiente 17, único 13, ideal 13, alto 11, conservante 9, grande 9, solo 8, integral 8, pequeño 8, colorante 8, relleno 7, mejor 7, original 7, auténtico 6, suave 6, rico 6, fresco 6, dulce 5, ecológico 5, mayor 5, exquisito 5, clásico 5, mediterráneo 5, glucémico 5, general 5, tradicional 5, marinero 4, artesano 4, nuevo 4, nutritivo 4, saludable 4, artificial 4, perfecto 4, irresistible 3, agradable 3, largo 3, diferente 3, ligero 3, bueno 3, especial 3, vitamínico 3, orgánico 3, fólico 3, habitual 3, cremoso 3, sano 3, trans 3, bajo 3, intenso 2, intestinal 2, diario 2, digestivo 2, blanco 2, menor 2, alimentario 2, mundial 2, esponjoso 2, neutro 2, extra 2, primero 2, completo 2, fácil 2, rojo 2, riquísimo 2, sabroso 2, práctico 2, sutil 2, cómodo 2

Most frequent usages relate to general appraisal, sensory appeal, and high-quality appeal in both languages. General appraisal is expressed in a neutral way in English (sweet, good, fine, beautiful), or with a strong positive or superlative meaning in both languages (perfect, unique, irresistible, wonderful; ideal, perfecto, irresistible, exquisito, mejor, auténtico, riquísimo). Few sensory appeal adjectives refer to general appeal (delicate; agradable, sabroso) and most of them relate to the food content of the genre (delicious, sweet, smooth, chewy, crunchy, soft, crispy, crisp, creamy, tasty, moist, crubly, fresh, juicy, mouth-watering, etc.; delicioso, crujiente, suave, rico, fresco, dulce, esponjoso, cremoso, exquisito, agradable, riquísimo, etc.); this finding is valid for both languages. High-quality appeal is found in both languages with similar frequency and variety (organic, fresh, natural, traditional, classic, hand-designed; natural, fresco, tradicional, artesano, ecológico). Close in meaning, we could identify some adjectives that express health appeal in Spanish (nutritivo, saludable, vitamínico, orgánico, glucémico, intestinal, sano), but none in English. There are other English-Spanish differences that refer to origin related adjectives, which are more frequent and specific in English than in Spanish with just one example (French, Belgian, Italian, Irish, etc.; mediterráneo), and size/strength related adjectives, which on the other hand are more common in Spanish (grande, pequeño, mayor, largo, bajo, menor), with only two examples in English (mini, wide). Finally, few adjectives show a natural negative meaning, but the concordance analysis revealed that they are in fact used in a positive (decadent) or neutral (disabled; trans, artificial) sense. Surprisingly, and contrary to Fuentes Rodríguez and Alcaide Lara (2002), we did not find technical adjectives used as promotional language in this informative-persuasive step, most probably because they are relatively frequent in other M3 steps.

Finally, as noted before, there are three small steps in terms of tokens, which is reflected in the number of adjectives used. *AllergenInformation / Contains* includes adjectives related to different allergens as we could expect (wheat, coconut; crustáceo, sulfuroso, etc.) but we also found the use of 'involuntario' four times in the repeated concordance "Presencia involuntaria de leche y sus derivados". *SuitableFor* step reflects a cultural difference, as we found four times the used of Kosher in English but none in Spanish. *Packaging* adjectives either make reference to size and weight in both languages (large, small, net, approx.; alto, largo, neto), or to origin in Spanish (europeo, castellano). Due to the limited data obtained from these steps, we cannot draw any conclusions, as the data might only be incidental data and therefore not indicative of any linguistic trend.

These results broadly support Edo-Marzá's (2011) previous research on adjectives. Since her work deals with promotional hotel websites, we introduced two food-related categories: sensory appeal and health appeal, the latter based on Izquierdo and Pérez Blanco's (2020) promotional strategies (strategy 2, praising the benefits); also based on their work, we added a third category, high quality ap-

peal (strategy 5, uniqueness). Furthermore, we use some of Dixon's (1982) classical categories: color, origin, dimension (size/strength in Edo-Narzá's).

Although we did not morphologically analyze the adjectives, it is interesting to note the use of compound adjectives in English, most of them with very low frequencies of use (mouth-watering, multi-packed, high-quality, perfectly-sized, fudge-like, fruity-delicious, chock-full, etc.). This finding was also reported by Rush (1998) and Labrador et al. (2014) among others. We also found some adjectives coined specifically for advertising use, such as dunkable or twistable in English and delizia in Spanish.

5 Conclusion

The rhetorical structure of online descriptions of bakery products is consistent with that of other food-related products; interestingly, the more processed the food product to which we compared baked products, the more similarities are present, as in the case of dried meats. Irrespective of the food under analysis, compulsory moves always head the rhetorical structure. The English-Spanish contrastive study reveals no interesting differences in the rhetorical structure, probably due to the globalized use of this genre.

Objective moves/steps show a lower use of adjectives, whereas the subjective step *Description* displays a greater frequency of adjectives in general and of positive evaluative adjectives in particular. This difference is explained by the rhetorical function of the sections where they are used, persuading potential customers to buy products or services in the less informative and more subjective steps, and merely informing in the objective ones, such as nutritional values, ingredients, or allergen information. Another finding revealed that both languages use positive evaluative adjectives in a similar way, to stress the positive characteristics of bakery products, although with some interesting differences. Our study revealed the use of health appeal in Spanish that is not found in English, and a more frequent occurrence of origin-related adjectives in English and size-related adjectives in Spanish. Within the persuasive *Description* step, we did not find technical adjectives used as promotional ones, nor negative adjectives used with their natural negative meaning.

It is expected that this study will contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between rhetorical functions and grammar and in particular adjectives. This research explored a specific genre, online baked product description, from an English-Spanish contrastive perspective and although further research on other promotional genres is required before generalizing results, these results may be of interest to professional technical writers, mainly marketers and advertisers, as they

can be applied to their work and training. The contrastive linguistic data we have described on the rhetorical structure and use of adjectives (types and frequencies) are valuable when writing online product descriptions and teaching how to write them.

References

Bennett, P. (1995). *AMA Dictionary of marketing terms*. McGraw–Hill Education.

Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysis genre: Language use in professional setting*. London: Longman.

Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Words of written discourse*. London: Continuum.

Bhatia, V. K. (2005). Generic patterns in promotional discourse. In H., Halmari & T. Virtanen (Eds.), *Persuasion across genres: A linguistic approach* (pp. 213–228). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.

Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (Eds.). (2007). *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Connor, U. (2000). Variation in rhetorical moves in grant proposals of US humanists and scientists. *Text and Talk* 20(1), 1–28.

Cook, G. (2001). *The discourse of advertising*. London: Routledge.

Corpas Pastor, G., & Seghiri, M. (2009). Virtual corpora as documentation resources: Translating Travel Insurance Documents (English-Spanish). In A. Beeby, P. Rodríguez-Inés, & P. Sánchez–Gijón (Eds.), *Corpus Use and Translating: Corpus use for learning to translate and learning corpus use to translate* (pp. 75–107). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dixon, R.W. (1982). *Where have all the adjectives gone? And other essays in syntax and semantics*. The Hague: Mouton.

Edo-Marzá, N. (2011). A comprehensive corpus–based study of the use of evaluative adjectives in promotional hotel websites. *ODISEA. Revista de Estudios Ingleses*, 12, 97–123.

EU Regulation 1169/2011 (2011). *Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the provision of food information to consumers*, OJ L, 304, 22.11.2011, 18–63. https://eur–lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2011/1169/oj

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 133–168.

Fragaki, G. (2010). A corpus–based categorization of Greek adjectives. *Online Proceedings of the 5th Corpus Linguistics Conference (CL2009)*, 21–23 July 2009. University of Liverpool. Retrieved from http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/publications/cl2009/

Fuentes Rodríguez, C., & Alcaide Lara, R. (2002). *Mecanismos lingüísticos de la persuasión*. Madrid: Arco Libros.

Fuertes-Olivera, P., Velasco-Sacristán, M., Arribas-Baño, A., & Samaniego-Fernández, E. (2001). Persuasion and advertising English: Metadiscourse in slogans and headlines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 1291–1307.

Hilpert, M., & Correira Saavedra, D. (2017). Why are grammatical elements more evenly dispersed than lexical elements? Assessing the roles of text frequency and semantic generality. *Corpora*, 12(3), 369–392.

Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 437–455.

Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Izquierdo, M., & Blanco, M. (2020). A multi-level contrastive analysis of promotional strategies in specialised discourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, 58, 43–57.

Janoschka, A. (2004). *Web advertising. New forms of communication on the Internet*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Leech, G. N. (1966). *English in advertising: A linguistic study of advertising in Great Britain*. London: Longman.

Kilgarriff, A., Baisa, V., Bušta, J., Jakubíček, M., Kovář, V., Michelfeit, J., Rychlý, P., & Suchomel, V. (2014). The Sketch Engine: ten years on. *Lexicography*, 1, 7–36.

Labrador, B., Ramón, N., Alaiz-Moretón, H., & Sanjurjo-González, H. (2014). Rhetorical structure and persuasive language in the subgenre of online advertisements. *English for Specific Purposes*, 34, 38–47.

Labrador, B., & Ramón, N. (2015). 'Perfectly smooth, creamy and full flavoured': Online cheese descriptions. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 198, 226–232.

Labrador, B., & Ramón, N. (2020). Building a second-language writing aid for specific purposes: Promotional cheese descriptions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 60, 40–52.

López Arroyo, B. & Roberts, R. (2014). A corpus–based writing aid for Spanish language authors: the scientific abstract generator prototype. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 2(2), 13–42.

Monteiro, C.A., Cannon, G., Moubarac, J.C., Levy, R.B., Louzada, M.L.C, &. Jaime, P.C. (2018). The UN Decade of Nutrition, the NOVA food classification and the trouble with ultra–processing. *Public Health Nutrition*, 21 (1), 5–17.

Ortego Antón, M.T. (2019). *La terminología del sector agroalimentario (español-inglés) en los estudios contrastivos de traducción especializada basados en el corpus: Los embutidos*. Berna: Peter Lang.

Ortego Antón, M.T. (2020). Las fichas descriptivas de embutidos en español y en inglés: un análisis contrastivo de la estructura retórica basado en corpus. *Revista Signos*, 53(102), 170–194.

Pizarro-Sánchez, I. (2017). A corpus-based analysis of genre-specific multi-word combinations. Minutes in English and Spanish. In T. Hegan & H. Dirdal (Eds.), Cross–linguistic correspondences: From lexis to genre (pp. 221–252). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Quirk, R., S., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London – New York: Longman.

Rabadán, R. (2016). Proposals in meeting minutes. An English-Spanish corpus–based study. *Languages in Contrast*, *16*(2), 213–238.

Rabadán, R., Ramón, N., & Sanjurjo-González, H. (2021). Pragmatic annotation of domain-restricted English–Spanish comparable corpus. *Bergen Language and Linguistics Studies*, 11(1), 209–223. https://doi.org/10.15845/bells.v11i1.3445

Rush, S. (1998). The noun phrase in advertising English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29, 155–171.

Seghiri, M. (2010). Metodología de diseño y compilación de un corpus representativo de seguros turísticos. In R. López–Campos Bodineau, C. Balbuena Torezano & M. Álvarez Jurado (Eds.), *Traducción y modernidad: textos científicos, jurídicos, económicos y audiovisuales* (pp. 59–70). Córdoba: Universidad

Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.