

## WORD FREQUENCY AND KEYWORD EXTRACTION

AHRC ICT Methods Network Expert Seminar on Linguistics  
8 September 2006, Lancaster University, UK

### Keywords and Moral Panics: Mary Whitehouse and Media Censorship

Tony McEnergy, *Lancaster University, UK.*

### Keywords

keywords, key keywords, aboutness, colligation, collocation, convergence, moral panic. Mary Whitehouse, censorship, media, bad language.

### Abstract

In this paper I will use an analytical framework based around the use of keywords to investigate the moral panic encoded in the writings of Mary Whitehouse in the 1960s and 70s in Britain. In doing so, I will be using keywords as a way of focusing on the *aboutness* of the moral panic, and a study of patterns of colligation and collocation to explore convergence in these texts.

Subsequently, I will consider the issue of bad language and consider how bad language was represented by Whitehouse's organisation VALA (Viewers and Listeners' Association). The paper will consider throughout how the moral panic in the corpus of Whitehouse's writings compares to that in the writings of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, religious organisations in the seventeenth century which opposed bad language (among other behaviours). The point of departure for all aspects of this investigation is the question of moral panics and the use of keywords to explore them.

### Introduction

In this paper I will use the analytical framework established in McEnergy (2005a) in order to investigate the moral panic encoded in the writings produced by Mary Whitehouse in the 1960s and 70s in Britain. In doing so, I will use keywords as a way of focusing on the aboutness of the moral panic. Through a study of patterns of colligation and collocation I will explore the moral panic in the Mary Whitehouse (henceforth MWC) corpus. To begin with, however, let me briefly review both 1. the corpora used in this paper and; 2. moral panics and the use of keywords to explore them.

### The Corpora Used in this Paper

#### *The Mary Whitehouse Corpus (MWC)*

The MWC includes the major writings of Mary Whitehouse in the period 1967-1977. This corpus covers three of her books, namely *Cleaning-up TV*, *Who Does She Think She Is?* and *Whatever Happened to Sex?*, amounting to 216,289 words in total.<sup>1</sup> These books, with their wide circulation, were the principal public output in this period from the organization that Whitehouse headed, a pressure group called the National Viewers and Listeners Association (VALA). As such I take them to be a good focus for a study of how VALA tried to excite a moral panic in the general population of Britain focused on the relationship between immorality, violence and the media.

### *The Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen and Freiberg-Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen Corpora (LOB and FLOB)*

Both the LOB and FLOB corpora are related to an earlier corpus, the Brown University Standard Corpus of Present-day American English (i.e. the Brown corpus, see Kucěra and Francis 1967). The corpus was compiled using 500 chunks of approximately 2,000 words of written texts. These texts were sampled from fifteen categories. All were produced in 1961. The components of the Brown corpus are given in Table 1.

**Table 1. Text categories in the Brown corpus**

Code	Text category	No. of samples	Proportion
A	Press reportage	44	8.8%
B	Press editorials	27	5.4%
C	Press reviews	17	3.4%
D	Religion	17	3.4%
E	Skills, trades and hobbies	38	7.6%
F	Popular lore	44	8.8%
G	Biographies and essays	77	15.4%
H	Miscellaneous (reports, official documents)	30	6%
J	Science (academic prose)	80	16%
K	General fiction	29	5.8%
L	Mystery and detective fiction	24	4.8%
M	Science fiction	6	1.2%
N	Western and adventure fiction	29	5.8%
P	Romantic fiction	29	5.8%
R	Humour	9	1.8%
Total		500	100%

LOB and FLOB follow the Brown model. The Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen Corpus of British English (iLOB) is a British match for the Brown corpus.<sup>2</sup> The corpus was created using exactly the same sampling frame with the exception that LOB aims to represent written British English used in 1961. The Freiberg-LOB Corpus of British English (FLOB) represents written British English as used in 1991 using the Brown sampling frame once more.<sup>3</sup> LOB and FLOB, as well as being corpora which allow one to study recent change in British English, may also be used, as they are in this paper, to stand as a proxy for general published written British English in the early 1960s and early 1990s respectively.

## **Moral Panic Theory**

The sociologist Stanley Cohen developed moral panic theory in the late 1960s to account for episodes where the media and society at large fasten upon a particular problem and generate an alarmist debate around it that in turn leads to action being taken against the perceived problem. The response to the problem is typically disproportionate to the threat posed. Cohen (2002:1) introduces the idea of a moral panic by saying that:

‘Societies appear to be prone, every now and then, to periods of moral panic. A condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests; its nature is presented in a stylized and stereotypical fashion by the mass media; the moral barricades are manned by editors, bishops, politicians and other right-thinking people; socially accredited experts pronounce their diagnoses and solutions’

McEnery (2005b) presents a lexically driven model of moral panic theory in which keywords arising from a moral panic can be allocated to one of a number of discourse roles within the moral panic. The roles are as follows:

*Object of offence* – that which is identified as problematic;

*Scapegoat* – that which is the cause of or which propagates the cause of offence;

*Moral entrepreneur* – the person/group campaigning against the object of offence;

*Consequence* – the negative results which it is claimed will follow from a failure to eliminate the object of offence;

*Corrective action* – the actions to be taken to eliminate the object of offence;

*Desired outcome* – the positive results which will follow from the elimination of the object of offence.

*Moral panic rhetoric* – lexis which is typically used to amplify the construction of members of any of the other categories in the model, e.g. negatively loaded modifiers such as *filthy, revolting, brutal, irresponsible, weak* and *degradation* being used to amplify the objects of offence

McEnergy’s model is both diagnostic and analytical. If keywords arising from a contrast of two corpora fit the model wholly or in large part, this indicates a corpus which contains a moral panic.

Simultaneously, populating the model is used as the first step in the analysis of that moral panic. McEnergy’s model is used both diagnostically and analytically in this paper.

## Keywords and Moral Panic

A comparison of the MWC and the LOB corpus produces a large set of positive keywords. Table 2 outlines the keywords derived from comparing LOB and the MWC.

**Table 2. Keywords of the MWC when compared with the LOB corpus.**

Positive Keywords
<i>bbc, sex, television, broadcasting, sexual, programmes, programme, pornography, children, public, violence, tv, whitehouse, people, our, viewers, censorship, we, society, greene, campaign, film, intercourse, abortion, listeners, denmark, governors, freedom, education, women, ita, who, permissive, radio, danish, obscene, manifesto, moral, director-general, responsibility, standards, corporation, humanist, child, obscenity, vala, debate, clean-up, pornographic, hugh, what, birmingham, rape, films, legal, parents, media, report, normanbrook, responsible, to, masturbation, my, morality, association, advisory, mrs, fpa, screen, laws, i, that, us, press, rang, crime, young, religious, postmaster-general, which, very, school, sexuality, contraception, concern, lobby, me, shewn, trevelyan, book, daily, itv, decency, dr, its, meeting, liberation, corrupt, viewer, homosexual, phone, porn, hoggart, calder, fox, law, parliament, sixties, support, interview, copenhagen, jury, human, letter, homosexuals, abortions, christian, audience, drama, wrote, of, relationships, girls, cosmo, publication, sexually, speak, opinion, prosecution, believe, homosexuality, kenneth, broadcast, about, reaction, invited, charter, adults, licence, series, listener, family, exploitation, medium, producer, compassion, dpp, buckland, anti-censorship, four-letter, creative</i>
Negative Keywords
<i>company, car, s, de, french, eyes, percent, two, looked, n't, water, ll, him, you, pound, his, her, she, he</i>

Before considering the keywords derived from a comparison of the MWC and LOB, I would like to consider the issue of the comparability of the MWC and LOB. I do not believe that the differences that I am looking for between the LOB corpus and the MWC are such that the differences in the sampling frame between the two should matter much. In order to explore this, I compared the MWC with the FLOB corpus (see Table 3). If the list of keywords is relatively stable across the comparisons, then my hypothesis has some weight. If the list is radically different, then my hypothesis is in serious doubt.

**Table 3. Keywords in the MWC derived from a comparison of FLOB**

Positive Keywords
<i>bbc, sex, television, broadcasting, pornography, sexual, programmes, our, programme, we, tv, children, violence, whitehouse, public, people, film, viewers, censorship, greene, society, obscene, obscenity, campaign, denmark, freedom, i, governors, films, danish, intercourse, pornographic, my, who, corporation, ita, director-general, that, hugh, which, listeners, me, clean-up, school, abortion, humanist, permissive, vala, meeting, morality, child, young, mrs, of, birmingham, moral, very, education, association, manifesto, this, responsibility, parents, normanbrook, standards, masturbation, postmaster-general, dr, rape, fpa, advisory, contraception, daily, to, book, what, press, debate, letter, decency, speak, responsible, one, girls, contraceptive, laws, not, shewn, upon, screen, hoggart, porn, copenhagen, would, professor, lord, council, legal, members, country, opinion, the, concerned, fox, doubt, ray, report, broadcast, cosmo, lobby, muggeridge, trevelyan, crime, calder, given, viewer, law, pilkington, us, swedish, attitude, husband, protest, many, parliament, rang, girl, values, contraceptives, medium, express, reply, williams, sir, propaganda, national, radio, homosexuality, showing, morals, buckland, anti-censorship, dpp, human, whole</i>
Negative Keywords
<i>market, local, water, ll, looked, uk, company, bullet, percent, him, you, n't, s, his, he, her, she</i>

Table 3 shows the keyword list derived from the comparison of the FLOB and MWC corpora. The similarity between the keywords in Tables 2 and 3 is quite remarkable and certainly adds weight to my hypothesis that in this case the mismatch in sampling frame is largely irrelevant, or at least is as relevant to a corpus (LOB) sampled some seven years before the first text of the MWC as a corpus (FLOB) sampled eleven years after the last MWC text was written. For example, the

LOB/MWC comparison yields 151 positive keywords, 109 of which are shared with the FLOB/MWC comparison, and 42 of which are unique to LOB/MWC (27.8% of the total). The FLOB/MWC yields 145 positive keywords, 109 of which are shared by both corpora and 36 of which are unique to FLOB/MWC (24.8% of the total). It is arguable that the 109 keywords may be the best focus of this study – in effect one is triangulating on the keywords in the MWC by using a pair of reference points, one before the MWC begins and one after, with the aim of extracting the keywords from the corpus that are relatively independent of the sampling frame. Additionally, one may be able to look at the keywords unique to the LOB set and identify words which, over the span of twenty years, have changed in frequency such that they are no longer key when FLOB is compared to MWC. Similarly the keywords indicate those words which have changed their frequency over the twenty year time frame to become key. Given the corpora available, I decided to proceed with my analysis of the moral panic using the LOB/MWC keyword list.

## The MWC/LOB Keywords, Key Keywords and Moral Panics

A problem arises with the use of keyword analyses here. In spite of setting the *p* value for the keywords to the maximum allowable by WordSmith, the MWC corpus generates a large number of keywords. While analysable, it would be preferable to analyse a smaller coherent subset of the keywords in order to expedite the analysis. In order to do this, I am using key keywords in this paper. Key keywords are keywords which are key in all, or the majority, of subsections of a corpus.

In order to determine the effect of key keyword analyses, I first analysed the keywords into the moral panic categories established in McEnery (2005b). In doing this I used the same methodology as McEnery (2005b) to verify the category membership, and cross-category membership, where appropriate, of each keyword. The results are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4. The keywords of the MWC placed into moral panic discourse categories.**

Category	Positive Keywords in that Category
Consequence	<i>public, violence, children, people, society, freedom, education, moral, responsibility, standards, rape, women, child, morality, young, concern, corrupt, viewer, human, audience, relationships, girls, adults, family, listener, exploitation, creative</i>
Corrective action	<i>copyright, campaign, ita, manifesto, debate, legal, parents, report, responsible, advisory, laws, press, rang, religious, postmaster-general, school, daily, meeting, phone, support, interview, parliament, jury, letter, wrote, speak, prosecution, reaction, invited, charter, licence, dpp</i>
Desired outcome	<i>clean-up, decency, christian, compassion, opinion</i>
Moral entrepreneur	<i>whitehouse, viewers, listeners, vala, association, buckland</i>
Object of offence	<i>sex, sexual, violence, pornography, intercourse, abortion, obscene, permissive, obscenity, pornographic, masturbation, crime, contraception, school, sexuality, liberation, homosexual, porn, homosexuals, abortions, sexually, homosexuality, broadcast, anti-censorship, four-letter,</i>
Scapegoat	<i>bbc, television, broadcasting, programmes, programme, tv, greene, film, governors, denmark, radio, danish, director-general, hugh, humanist, films, legal, media, corporation, report, normanbook, association, advisory, fpa, screen, press, postmaster-general, book, lobby, trevelyan, daily, itv, sixties, hoggart, fox, law, copenhagen, drama, publication, calder, cosmo, series, medium, producer, dpp</i>
Rhetoric	<i>our, we, who, what, birmingham, to, my, us, that, which, very, me, i, believe, about</i>
Unclassified	<i>shewn, dr, its, of, kenneth, mrs</i>

Following from the analysis of keywords in the moral panic discourse model categories, I undertook two key keyword analyses. In the first, I calculated the key keywords for each main text of the MWC. In the second, I calculated the key keywords for each chapter in each book of the MWC. In each case, I once again used the LOB corpus as a reference corpus. What were my intended goals in carrying out these analyses? First, I wanted to see how the key keywords organized themselves in terms of the moral panic categories – are the key keywords spread evenly across the categories? Second, I wanted to see what the key keywords were across the whole MWC (i.e. which key keywords are keywords across all of the texts in the MWC) and which keywords drew their strength from particular subsections of the MWC, as small as a single chapter perhaps. The first goal is methodological to some extent, as it allows us to explore the question of whether or not key keywords can give us sufficient data to allow us to populate the moral panic discourse model. Yet, it is also related to the content of the corpus data. The key keywords we find at the corpus level, i.e. shared between all four books in the MWC, highlight enduring themes of the MWC corpus. Certain other words, while keywords in the whole corpus, may have their keyness attributed to just one book, or

perhaps even one chapter. In short, we will be able to differentiate relatively transient keywords (those appearing, say, in the first book but not in later books) from those which are permanent, i.e. key across the whole corpus. In turn, when we then consider these transient and permanent key keywords in terms of the moral panic discourse categories, we may discover that a pattern emerges, e.g. scapegoats being more transitory and consequences being more permanent. We may see that part of the moral panic is prone to being more static than other parts.

Figures 1 and 2 below give the results of the key keyword analyses for all three texts and all 57 chapters in the MWC respectively. Following that, in Tables 4 and 5 the data from the two tables are placed in the moral panic discourse categories. In the figures and tables that follow, I have only listed the key keywords which were key in all of the MWC texts (Figure 1 and Table 5) and key keywords that were key in five or more chapters in the MWC (Figure 2 and Table 6). In Figures 1 and 2 the words are ordered in descending order of key keyness.

**Figure 1. Words which are key keywords in five or more chapters of the MWC.**

*television, broadcasting, bbc, sex, i, programmes, whitehouse, programme, sexual, pornography, tv, children, viewers, cannot, our, violence, we, people, greene, society, censorship, me, campaign, intercourse, my, vala, obscenity, public, phone, permissive, clean-up, women, pornographic, ita, parents, masturbation, freedom, film, sexuality, listeners, corporation, education, meeting, abortion, director-general*

**Table 5. Words which are key keywords in five or more chapters of the MWC mapped into the moral panic discourse rôles.**

Category	Positive Keywords in that Category
Consequence	<i>public, violence, children, people, society, freedom, corrupt, education</i>
Corrective action	<i>censorship, debate, parents, report, responsible, meeting</i>
Desired outcome	<i>decency</i>
Moral entrepreneur	<i>whitehouse, viewers, listeners</i>
Object of offence	<i>sex, sexual, violence, sexuality, abortion</i>
Scapegoat	<i>television, broadcasting, programmes, programme, greene, radio, director-general, humanist, report, film, corporation</i>
Rhetoric	<i>our, we, who, what</i>
Unclassified	None

**Figure 2. Words which are key keywords in all of the MWC texts.**

*broadcasting, television, bbc, sex, i, programmes, whitehouse, programme, sexual, pornography, tv, viewers, our, violence, censorship, children, we, people, greene, campaign, society, me, public, intercourse, my, vala, obscenity, permissive, phone, women, school, ita, pornographic, mrs, masturbation, freedom*

**Table 6. Words which are key keywords in all of the MWC texts mapped into their moral panic discourse rôles.**

Category	Positive Keywords in that Category
Consequence	<i>public, violence, children, people, society, freedom, women</i>
Corrective action	<i>censorship, campaign, ita, school, phone</i>
Desired outcome	None
Moral entrepreneur	<i>whitehouse, viewers, vala</i>
Object of offence	<i>sex, sexual, violence, pornography, intercourse, permissive, obscenity, pornographic, masturbation, school</i>
Scapegoat	<i>bbc, television, broadcasting, programmes, programme, tv, greene</i>
Rhetoric	<i>our, we, my, me, i</i>
Unclassified	<i>mrs</i>

Table 7 shows, for each moral panic category, which key keywords are moral panic keywords when key keywords are calculated both by book and chapter, as well as solely by book or chapter.

**Table 7. The distribution of chapter only, text only and chapter and text key keywords across the moral panic discourse categories.**

Category	Book based key keyword only	Both book and chapter based key keyword	Chapter based key keyword only
Consequence	<i>women</i>	<i>children, freedom, people, public, society, violence</i>	<i>corrupt, education</i>
Corrective action	<i>campaign, ita, phone, school</i>	<i>censorship,</i>	<i>debate, meeting, parents, report, responsible</i>
Desired outcome			<i>decency</i>
Moral entrepreneur	<i>vala</i>	<i>viewers, whitehouse</i>	<i>listeners</i>

<b>Object of offence</b>	<i>intercourse, masturbation, obscenity, permissive, pornographic, pornography, school</i>	<i>sex, sexual, violence</i>	<i>abortion, sexuality</i>
<b>Scapegoat</b>	<i>bbc, tv</i>	<i>broadcasting, greene, programme, programmes, television</i>	<i>corporation, director-general, film, humanist, radio, report</i>
<b>Rhetoric</b>	<i>i, me, my</i>	<i>our, we</i>	<i>what, who</i>
<b>Unclassified</b>	<i>mrs</i>		

Table 7 in particular is interesting as it shows that transience of key keywords is observable. In this table, however, transience is relative as even the most transient keyword is key in at least five chapters. This transience should become more profound if the cut-off of five applied to key keywords in this experiment is reduced further. Transient keywords will be returned to later in this paper.

Having calculated the chapter- and book-based key keywords, I would now like to consider the key keywords in Table 7 and discuss how they act as moral panic key keywords in each category of the moral panic discourse model. However, rather than exploring each category word by word, I will simply present the fully-populated model here and then address particularly important/surprising cases in a general discussion. My reason for doing that is that McEnery (2005b) has demonstrated how the model can be populated in this way. Given that the method was applied as easily to the MWC corpus as that studied by McEnery (2005b), albeit with a shift of emphasis to key keywords, I do not see any need to discuss the results on a case by case basis with the goal of justifying the method.

## The Key Keyword Populated Model

In this section, I will present the key keywords, placed into moral panic categories and divided into semantic fields, where appropriate.<sup>4</sup> See Table 8 for the populated model. I will then present a series of more detailed discussions of the key keywords and to a lesser extent the keywords. For the detailed discussions I will give the collocates for the words discussed, showing where those collocates are link collocates, i.e. shared between two keywords (emboldened, MI strength for link collocate plus the keywords linked to in parentheses after the MI score). Where the link collocate is also a keyword the word is underlined>. So, for example, the entry *clean-up* (6.38, *tv*) for the key keyword *campaign* indicates that *clean-up* is a collocate of *campaign*. It is also a keyword. The words collocate with an MI score of 6.38, and the word *tv* is a keyword which shares the collocate *clean-up* with *campaign*.

**Table 8. The key keyword populated model**

Semantic Field		Consequence	Key keywords
People		<i>public, children, people, women</i>	
Acts		<i>violence, corrupt</i>	
Abstractions		<i>society, freedom, education</i>	
Semantic Field		Corrective Action	Key keywords
Agitation		<i>campaign, debate, meeting, phone</i>	
Organizational		<i>school</i>	
Public		<i>parents, responsible</i>	
Self Regulation		<i>ita</i>	
Research		<i>report</i>	
Statutory		<i>censorship</i>	
		Desired Outcome	
		<i>decency</i>	
		Moral Entrepreneur	
		<i>whitehouse, viewers, listeners, vala</i>	
Semantic Field		Object of Offence	Key keywords
Crime		<i>violence</i>	
Obscenity		<i>obscenity</i>	

Pornography	<i>pornography, pornographic</i>
<b>Scapegoat</b>	
Semantic Field	Key keywords
People	<i>greene</i>
Research	<i>report</i>
Broadcast programmes	<i>programmes, programme, radio</i>
Media	<i>television, tv, film, broadcasting</i>
Media Organizations and Officers	<i>bbc, director-general, corporation</i>
Groups	<i>humanists</i>
<b>Moral Panic Rhetoric</b>	
Semantic Field	Key keywords
Pronouns/Determiners	<i>our, we, who, what, my, me, i</i>
<b>Unclassified</b>	
	<i>mrs</i>

Table 8 represents a diagnostic test of the MWC. The key keywords from the corpus fit the moral panic theory discourse model perfectly. However, in order to understand how the key keywords can move from being a diagnostic tool to being an expressly analytical tool, I need now to focus on the words in context themselves to show exactly how the sociological processes behind the discourse roles in the moral panic are realised. In the following sections, rather than analysing each key keyword in turn I focus, rather, on particularly interesting examples from Table 8, seeking to show how, through a key keyword analysis, we can focus in on the text at a number of levels, e.g. ideology, meaning and rhetoric.

## How to lobby without lobbying

The words in the corrective action category speak strongly of the day-to-day lobbying that VALA was engaged in, particularly in the agitation field (see Table 9). Letters are written, phone calls made, public debates undertaken, meetings held and interviews, typically in the media, are given. Throughout, there is an attempt to garner and maintain support from a range of organizations, such as the police federation.

**Table 9. Corrective action keywords**

Word	Freq	Collocates in MWC
<i>campaign</i>	143	<b>clean-up</b> (6.38, tv), supporter, <b>represent</b> (5.12, clean-up, tv), mount, begun, discredit, specifically, launched, <b>tv</b> (4.51, cleanup), swizzlewick (4.38)
<i>debate</i>	80	parliamentary, opening, <b>roy</b> (4.96, obscene), lords, dealt, continuing, <b>bill</b> (3.84, parliament), <b>annual</b> (3.69, ita, report), union, result (3.51)
<i>meeting</i>	143	anniversary, <b>library</b> (5.12, public), brighton, interruption, arrange, hall, <b>sponsored</b> (4.71, pornography), demanded, holding, <b>town</b> (4.52, itv)
<i>phone</i>	43	ringing, <b>calls</b> (7.06, hoggart), feb, call, stopped, hardly, <b>rang</b> , <b>received</b> (4.58, letter), down, next (3.55)

The agitation that VALA was engaged in seems to be a blueprint for other lobbying organizations. However, interestingly, the keyword *lobby* does not belong in the corrective action category at all. As shown in Table 4, *lobby* is most certainly a scapegoat category word.

*Lobby* in the MWC is a word with a powerful negative semantic prosody. As will be shown later (Figure 3), *lobby* links into a negatively-loaded collocational network with the words *homosexual* and *permissive* being its immediate link nodes. Its collocates (*anti-censorship*, *myths*, *tactics*, *permissive*, *claim*, *humanist*, *homosexual*), are linked to groups or concepts Whitehouse was opposed to (*anti-censorship*, *permissive*, *humanist*, *homosexual*) or represent a negative evaluation of the lobby concerned (*myths*). These lobbies make claims and use tactics. *Claim* and *tactics* are in turn words in the MWC with notably negative collocates. *claim* in its verbal form collocates with *lobby*. This verb is a marker of epistemic modality – a degree of uncertainty is being attributed to the

statement made. It is hardly surprising then, that when we explore the verb *lobby*, we discover that claims are typically made by those groups with whom Whitehouse disagreed. Those who are claiming are 'the secularist lobby', 'advocates of permissiveness', 'the new populists' and 'the anti-censorship lobby'. *Tactics* is another word which is coloured in a negative fashion in the MWC. Tactics are used by 'the permissive lobby', 'the anti-censorship lobby', 'the progressive left', 'the New Left' and 'the new morality wing of the Anglican church'. They are 'communist' and 'revolutionary'. In short, from Whitehouse's perspective, lobbies are bad – they are the encapsulation of all that she opposes, and their pronouncements lack certainty. In this way, Whitehouse generates an in- and an out-group. People who campaign for a cause which she approves of, such as her own group are not lobbies, and do not collocate with *lobby* – those people who campaign in exactly the same manner for things that she disapproves of are lobbies. The word *lobby* is in effect a snarl word in the MWC. So while Whitehouse undoubtedly lobbied, the word is not in the corrective action category, and is not a key keyword, as the word was taken to embody the activities of the groups to which she was opposed.

## Schools

One key keyword, *school*, is of interest as it is both a corrective action key keyword and a scapegoat keyword. Certain schools and schooling practices were viewed as not merely acceptable by Whitehouse, but as a means of combating changes she did not welcome in society. Those schools which adopted progressive schooling practices, or which failed to regulate children in a manner which Whitehouse found to be acceptable were however, a significant object of offence for Whitehouse. The contrast between the two types of school in the MWC is stark. An almost Enid Blyton picture of hyper-normality is painted of the 'good schools'. There is talk of a 'school choir', children attending art classes bringing with them 'little bags and boxes of samples of sand, bark and tea'. These schools are populated with children who always 'wear gloves when in school uniform' and 'carry a clean hankie' in their pockets. In contrast, the progressive school is interested in launching 'a campaign to persuade girls to carry condoms in their school satchels', is not 'terrified of thirteen year-olds starting sexual intercourse' and wishes there were 'several contraceptive machines in every school'. It may also take children to visit 'a sex show club in the course of their studies'. It is a place where 'boys were chasing the girls round her school playground punching them in the stomach'. If this were not bad enough, 'filthy books of no literary merit are to be found in school libraries' at this kind of establishment. The contrast could not be starker – between an idealised version of British childhood and an appalling, hell on Earth. The contrast in itself underlines the innate conservatism of Whitehouse's approach. She lionizes an approach to education based upon an idealized version of schooling in the 1950s. Only the good is emphasised in this argument, with the class bias inherent in the system ignored and the brutal treatment meted out to children in such schools overlooked.<sup>5</sup> Anything that deviates from this idealized norm is subversive, and all attempts are made to suppress any good aspect of the alternative, and to highlight and dramatize any possible negative aspect of it. The only people who could possibly agree with such schooling were, in Whitehouse's view, the constitutionally irresponsible. Indeed she claims only children themselves could approve of such libertinism:

'This is, admittedly, not in agreement with the wish of Swedish parents, 70% of whom would wish the school to exercise its authority to promote the ideal of youthful abstinence, but on the other hand in full accord with the wish of schoolchildren, 95% of whom are reported to share the view of their radical school authorities'

Whitehouse's was the responsible view. That of those who agreed with the 'radical school authorities' the childish one. Schools were key in promoting the responsible view for Whitehouse – hence their appearance as a corrective action key keyword also. For Whitehouse schools were to play an important rôle in the imposition of a new moral order, especially in the area of sex education. Yet in the 1960s and 1970s widespread national schooling was established, as was an approach to schooling which ran counter to the views of VALA. Consequently, *school* is cross-posted to both the corrective action and scapegoat categories. Those schools which Mrs. Whitehouse approved of were part of her corrective action (grammar schools, for example). Those which she disapproved of were



one of the many scapegoats targeted by VALA. Two examples from the MWC show how Whitehouse saw schools participating in her corrective action, in this case with regard to sex education:

1. This made me realize that the true function of the school is to help parents educate their own children, and this is what the majority of parents want to do.
2. Just as in my sex education work at school I worked from the very strong belief that the school's job in this matter was not to remove the privilege and responsibility from the parents, so I believe the TV screen should help the parent and not rush in to tell all without restraint.

Schools which were approved of by Whitehouse did not impose any morality other than that imposed in the assumed Christian home of the child by the child's parents.<sup>6</sup> In seeking to impose that morality Whitehouse would, where convenient, appeal to published or informal research, as the next section discusses.

## Reports and research

The use of the key keyword *report* in the MWC is usually focused upon advisory or research reports commissioned by either a public or private body. The key keyword does occur in the context of press reportage, but given that only seven of the occurrences of *report* occur with this sense, the key keyword *report* in the MWC can reasonably be viewed as almost exclusively used to refer to commissioned reports. One thing that is clear from looking at the collocates of *report* is that reports are often identified by their chairmen – hence frequent references to the Newsom and Pilkington reports, both commissioned by the UK government, generate the collocates *newsom* and *pilkington* for the key keyword *report*<sup>7</sup> (see Table 10).

**Table 10. The keyword *report***

Word	Freq	Collocates in MWC
<i>report</i>	127	<i>newsom</i> (6.39, education, religious), <i>pilkington</i> , revealing, debated, <b>council</b> (5.56, advisory, listeners), <b>annual</b> (5.34, debate, ita), <i>biased</i> , <i>authors</i> , <b>secondary</b> (4.66, school)

The Newsom report was published in 1963 and made recommendations for the future of secondary schooling in the UK. The Pilkington report was published in 1960 and was tasked with determining the future development of the BBC and the ITA. Given the importance of *school*, as a corrective action and a scapegoat, and television output as an object of offence, the prominence of these reports in Whitehouse's writings is hardly surprising. The surprise wanes yet further when one observes that these reports broadly support the position that Whitehouse was taking. It was the desire of Whitehouse to see the concerns of reports such as Newsom and Pilkington taken into account that places the key keyword *report* in the corrective action category. These reports are cited as support by Whitehouse for her own position. Talking of the concern generated by media output felt by the mass of citizens that Whitehouse claims she represents, Whitehouse asserts:

'It cannot be dismissed as the unrepresentative opinion of a few well-meaning but over-anxious critics, still less as that of cranks. It has been represented to us from all parts of the kingdom and by many organisations of widely different kinds'. So wrote the authors of the Pilkington Report in June 1960. "Disquiet," they said, "derived from an assessment which we fully accept" that the power of the medium to influence and persuade is immense; and from a strong feeling, amounting often to a conviction, that very often the use of the power suggested a lack of awareness of, or concern about the consequences.'

The Newsom report produced MWC conclusions in line with Whitehouse's own, leading her to cite it as a source of evidence and a guide for legislators:

'The fundamental questions by whom should sex education be given? when? and to what end?-have been increasingly submerged in a culture which, by its very nature, negates the basic privacy essential to healthy mental and emotional growth and deals with this most personal of matters in a conformist and impersonal fashion. It was an awareness of this growing threat that caused the compilers of the Newsom Report, Half our Future, published by the Ministry of Education, 1963 (still the most recent government report on secondary education), to declare that sex education must be given on the basis of "chastity before marriage and fidelity within it".'

The summation of a position that it is claimed Newsom supports, the assertion of the recency, and hence one assumes authority, of the report and the use of a quotation from the report that is very supportive of Whitehouse's views on the dangers presented to society by moral relativism, allow Whitehouse to take upon herself the authority of the report, claiming that her views were 'not simply my own, but also those set out in the Newsom Report'. While taking support from such reports, Whitehouse also supports them, presenting the reports as a good guide to corrective action. In a discussion of a case where parents in the Knapmann family withdrew their children from schooling because of what they saw as progressive sex education,<sup>8</sup> Whitehouse is quick to point out that corrective action taken was in line with the Newsom Report, and quotes Exeter local education authority as recommending the Newsom guidelines on spiritual and moral development as offering 'excellent guidance'. These guidelines, Whitehouse notes, coincide with those of VALA in so far as 'For our part we are agreed that boys and girls should be offered firm guidance on sexual morality based on chastity before marriage and fidelity within it'.

The finding that reports are used as support by Whitehouse raises a vexatious issue. Whitehouse often stated her clear opposition to certain forms of academic research, yet the Newsom and Pilkington reports were based upon research. A related issue links to another collocate of *report* – *biased*. It is clear from the references to reports such as Newsom and Pilkington that Whitehouse does not merely see these as the positive results of research, she sees them, especially Newsom, as blueprints for corrective action. Yet she also clearly sees some reports as biased. In order to begin to discover whether this split occurs with *report* only, I also decided to look at a clearly related word – *research*. Does a similar split occur there also, or is research viewed exclusively negatively?

The word *research* occurs 59 times in the MWC. If one distinguishes the cases where research is reported in positive terms from those in which it is presented in negative terms, the picture is somewhat surprising. Whitehouse's references to research are overwhelmingly positive – 50 out of the 59 cases see Whitehouse presenting research positively, typically in support of her own views. Collocates allow us to begin to see how the division between positively-evaluated research and negatively-evaluated research may be drawn. For positive mentions of research, *audience* collocates nine times, *own* six times and *my* four times. For the negative mentions of research, two collocates, *academic* and *sexual* occur twice each in complementary distribution. These results indicate that the research she cites is either her own (*own*, *my*) or that derived from viewers (*audience*). Academic research (either by academics in general or sexologists in particular) is marginalised in the sense that it is referred to fleetingly, and when it is referred to, it is referred to negatively. There are only two co-occurrences of *academic* and *research* in the MWC and both of these cases present research negatively. Does the same divide – research based upon the views of non-academics being good, research undertaken by academics being bad – apply to the reports? The answer to this question is no – the reports referred to by VALA are almost exclusively produced by organizations, whether they be public or private, and are not linked to academic or non-academic research sources explicitly.

In order to investigate the split between the positive and negative uses of *report*, I categorized each use of the word in the same way as I had categorized *research*, either as a positive or negative use of the word. As with the word *research*, the number of positive references to a report far outweighs the number of negative references, with counts of 98 and 24 respectively. Mentions of parliamentary reports (10), the Pilkington report (8), the Newsom report (5) and police reports (4) predominate. Other reports mentioned include those from religious organizations (e.g. the Church of Scotland) and medical authorities (e.g. the British Medical Association). There is an interesting link here between the source of the reports and the corrective action category. Parliament, as the ultimate source of the Newsom and Pilkington reports, is an important focus for corrective action, and its

reports are presented as such. The religious nature of corrective action is underlined by the reference to religious reports also. Yet what of the reports which are presented as problematic? In the case of these reports, it was the presentation of views with which Whitehouse disagreed that caused the negative evaluation. However, the sources of these reports form as coherent a group as the positive reports. Rather than linking to the corrective action category, though, they link to the scapegoat category. The negative reports are produced by such scapegoats as *bbc* (3), *bha* (1), *hoggart* (1),<sup>9</sup> as well as other organizations which, if they are not scapegoat keywords in the MWC, are certainly organizations which would fall into that category, such as the Greater London Council and the National Council for Civil Liberties. It would obviously be foolish to claim that the word *report* is at times used positively by Whitehouse because she collocates it with a corrective action keyword. It would be similarly foolish to make that claim with reference to negative uses of report and scapegoat keywords. However, the relationship between the word *report* and the authors of the report is shown clearly by the collocates here. Those reports written by organizations which Whitehouse approves of, giving advice she agrees with, are evaluated positively. Those produced by organizations she disapproves of, espousing views she disagrees with, are evaluated negatively. The negative evaluation of the reports Whitehouse disagrees with is further intensified by evaluative terms being attached to the word *report* – these reports display ‘ideological bias’,<sup>10</sup> are ‘biased’, ‘tendentious’<sup>11</sup> and display a mastery of ‘half-truth’.<sup>12</sup> By contrast, the reports Whitehouse approves of are typically presented with modifications that amplify the panic Whitehouse is trying to exploit, or are used to strengthen the credibility of the report. For example, Whitehouse states that ‘Recently the Chief Medical Officer to the Ministry of Health, Sir George Godber, presented a report on the disturbing increase in venereal disease among young people and called for ‘an all-out attack’ on the problem’. Whitehouse cites this as evidence in support of her own solution to the problem – sexual abstinence before marriage. No evidence is provided regarding Sir George’s own proposed solution, nor is there any discussion of the possible source of the increase – whether it was an increase in the report of the diseases, or an actual increase in the rate of infection. The quote is interpreted within a framework established by Whitehouse to give maximum support to her position. Another report used for this purpose is the British Medical Association’s 1955 report on Homosexuality and Prostitution. This is described by Whitehouse as a ‘famous’ report. The report describes how homosexuality may be ‘cured’ and Whitehouse uses this evidence to support her own view that homosexuality is an aberration which should be treated both physically and mentally. No major medical authority in the world now agrees with this position and even in 1977 when Whitehouse was writing she was not quoting from current research, and was citing a position that the medical profession had retreated from.<sup>13</sup> Nonetheless, such matters were overlooked and the report lionized as ‘famous’.

The use of research and reports by Whitehouse is complex. Research from non-academic sources is welcome. Academic research – which tends to disagree with her ‘common sense’ research – is shunned and vilified. Reports which are in tune with her own thinking, especially by agents of corrective action, are used to support her view, and are granted her approbation, even when this means endorsing out of date and discredited research which forms the basis of a report. On the other hand, reports which disagree with her positions, notably those produced by scapegoats, are dismissed as being biased. In looking at what Whitehouse thought of those organizations producing such biased reports, we find her describing a practice which could just as well be attributed to her as to any of those individuals and organizations she is complaining about:

‘So do big doors hang on little hinges - not because of the strength of the hinges themselves but because the intellectually committed believe what they want to believe, see what they want to see, and do their best to ensure that the rest of us see it their way too’.

## **In groups and out-groups - parents and responsibility**

In the corrective action category, the key keyword *parents* and *responsible* are interesting as they generate in and out-groups as two key in-groups are those who may be viewed as *responsible* and *parents*. There is also an assumption of considerable overlap between these two groups, though not all people represented as responsible by Whitehouse are parents (e.g. Pope Paul VI) and not all parents discussed by Whitehouse are assumed to be responsible, with Whitehouse being clearly

condemnatory of divorced parents, or, as she puts it, those who ‘run to a cigarette or a drink or out through the front door whenever there is trouble’.

Yet, these two groups are generally held up by Whitehouse as a crucial source of corrective action. It is parents working with such professionals as educationalists who can work to offset such undesirable practices as teachers who ‘use pornographic books’. Parents, in Whitehouse’s view of society, are the force which will anchor the moral absolutist position in the face of the floodtide of moral relativism. For Whitehouse, *parents* are typical of the ‘ordinary decent-minded people, who are so cruelly offended and worried’ by moral revolution. As such, they, and other responsible people, i.e. those opposed to this change in British society, represented the ‘silent majority’ that Whitehouse claimed to speak for.<sup>14</sup> Whitehouse was very clear on the point that her view was responsible, and those who supported her view were of necessity responsible also, as shown in Figure 3.

### Figure 3. The responsible.

1. The fact that the Postmaster-General met us in the middle of the postal strike of 1964 was an indication, in the words of one M.P., that ‘this campaign is regarded as the expression of the will of serious and responsible people in the country’.

2. As far as censorship is concerned it is quite clear to me that the people most likely to create a backlash are those in the arts who refuse to listen to the modulated voices of responsible opinion.

3. We may well agree with the Head of Religious Broadcasting when he says ‘We must go on trying to see that every responsible Christian viewpoint is given fair expression within the whole spectrum of religious broadcasting in television and radio’.

4. The FPA was founded fifty years ago to alleviate the child-bearing problems of women in countries all over the world, but it has travelled a long way since then, and not always to the satisfaction of those responsible people who worked so hard and selflessly for its original aims, or to the credit of those who have been involved in its change of emphasis and policy in recent years.

The quotes in Figure 3 are illuminating, as they define an in-group, the responsible, while also setting up a series of potential oppositions which define an out-group. The in-group is serious (1.), reasonable (2.) and selfless (4.). By contrast, one may imagine that the out-group is defined by the negation of these qualities. Similarly, it is established that there are responsible Christian viewpoints as well as ones which are not responsible (3.). In terms of this particular delineation of the in group, the quotation in (3.) above continues to clearly impose the in/out-group distinction based upon religious conservatism (Billy Graham, Cardinal Heenan)<sup>15</sup> in the in-group versus religious liberalism (Dr. Robinson, Werner Pelz)<sup>16</sup> in the out-group:

- 1.) But when he translates that unexceptionable principle into personal terms one cannot but shudder: ‘We must find room for Billy Graham as well as Dr Robinson, for Werner Pelz as well as Cardinal Heenan,’ he tells us.

## Porn, pornography and enclitics

Given that pornography was a major source of offence for VALA, its appearance in the object of offence category is hardly surprising.

**Table 11. Collocates of *pornography* and *pornographic***

Word	Freq	Collocates in MWC
<i>pornography</i>	197	<b>presidential</b> (5.07, <i>obscenity</i> ), <i>freely</i> , <i>sell</i> , <i>sale</i> , <i>pictorial</i> , <b>deviant</b> (4.66, <i>sexual</i> ), <b>commission</b> (4.52, <i>obscenity</i> ), <b>sponsored</b> (4.24, <i>meeting</i> ), <i>proof</i> , <i>link</i> (4.24)
<i>pornographic</i>	56	<i>enterprise</i> , <i>gross</i> , <i>sight</i> , <b>blasphemous</b> (5.60, <i>obscene</i> ), <b>pictures</b> (5.47, <i>porn</i> , <i>intercourse</i> ), <b>explicit</b> (5.25, <i>sexually</i> ), <i>cheap</i> , <i>erotic</i> , <i>magazines</i> , <i>material</i> (4.65)

What is interesting, however, is that its shortened form, *porn*, while a keyword, is not a key keyword. On closer investigation, one discovers that there is a marked difference between the collocates of *porn* (*harmless*, *pleasure*, *pictures*, *industry*) and those for *pornography* and *pornographic* (see Table 11). While the collocates of *pornography* and *pornographic* are broadly the type of words which one would expect to imbue these words with a negative semantic prosody, the collocates of *porn* do not merely not represent a failure to associate the word with a negative semantic prosody – it associates the word with a positive semantic prosody via collocates such as *harmless* and *pleasure*. However, an exploration of the concordances of *porn* reveals an explanation

– *porn* is a word Whitehouse rarely uses, though she does report the use of it in the speech of others. In the 22 examples of the word in the MWC, 14 occur in quotation. It is in these examples, where Whitehouse is quoting from those who oppose her views, that the word collocates with *harmless* and *pleasure* and has a positive semantic prosody, as shown in the examples in Figure 4.

**Figure 4. Porn is good.**

1.) 'But,' says the book, 'there are other kinds,' and it goes on to describe, in concrete terms, bestiality (in the specific sense of that term) and sado-masochism. The book's general comment on what it has thus described is as follows: '*Porn* is a harmless pleasure if it isn't taken too seriously and believed to be real life'.

2.) The 'soft' essence of the trendy churchman was encapsulated by the Reverend Chad Varah when, writing in *Encounter*, he used 'a great deal of language that most people would call simply filthy' and went on: 'In Soho, the soft *porn* is kept in the front room and the hard in the back ... In Denmark, thanks to the enlightened Danes' abolition of censorship it's all in the shop ... The best *porn* is not only therapeutic but appeals to our sense of wonder.'

In both examples, *porn* is a word used by others, and the word in itself becomes a marker of approval for pornography, being associated with a positive view of pornography to the extent that Whitehouse avoids the use of the word (using it herself only eight times) in favour of *pornography* (which is used in quotation by Whitehouse 17 times and by Whitehouse herself 180 times in the MWC). In quotation, *pornography* has a negative semantic prosody just as it does out of quotation. The word *porn* itself, it could be argued, is shunned by Whitehouse, and hence fails to become a key keyword, as she was aware of the positive semantic prosody of the word, and wished to avoid it, instead favouring its full form, as the semantic prosody of the full form better reflected her own views towards pornography. However, there is another possible explanation for her avoidance of the word *porn*. Whitehouse is a formal writer as, amongst other things, she tends to avoid enclitic forms. Note the presence of the enclitic forms *s*, *ll* and *n't* in the negative keyword list given in Table 2 Enclitic forms are markers of speech and informal writing,<sup>17</sup> and the presence of these enclitics in the negative keyword list indicates a more formal register for Whitehouse's writings. The formal style of Whitehouse's writing is one of its most notable features. However, a discussion of the enclitic forms begs two further questions which must be addressed before we can proceed further. Firstly, are there genres in LOB which are more similar to the MWC in terms of their use of enclitics and secondly, with reference to the form 's, is it a negative keyword as an enclitic verb form, a genitive marker or both? In the MWC, 's occurs as a genitive 597 times, and as an enclitic form of the verb *be* 140 times. Tables 13 and 14 compare the distribution of genitive and enclitic forms of 's in the MWC and LOB. While a description of the LOB categories is included in chapter one of this book, I have included a description of each category in Table 12 for ease of reference.

**Table 12. Enclitics which are negative keywords in the MWC when the MWC is compared to the subsections of LOB.**

LOB Section	Category description	Negative Keywords Enclitics When MWC is compared to the LOB section
LOB A	Press: reportage	<i>n't, s</i>
LOB B	Press: editorial	<i>n't, s</i>
LOB C	Press: review	<i>n't, s</i>
LOB D	Religion	<i>n't, s</i>
LOB E	Skills, trades and hobbies	<i>n't, s</i>
LOB F	Popular lore	<i>n't, s</i>
LOB G	Belles Lettres, biographies, essays	<i>n't, s</i>
LOB H	Miscellaneous	<i>s</i>
LOB J	Science	<i>m, s</i>
LOB K	General fiction	<i>m, d, ll, n't, s</i>
LOB L	Mystery and detective fiction	<i>m, re, ve, ll, d, n't, s</i>
LOB M	Science fiction	<i>ll, n't, s</i>
LOB N	Adventure and western	<i>re, ve, d, ll, n't, s</i>
LOB P	Romance and love stories	<i>m, d, re, ve, ll, s, n't</i>
LOB R	Humour	<i>ve, ll, n't, s</i>

This table shows two things quite clearly. Firstly, the form 's is a negative keyword for the MWC irrespective of which of the sub-sections of LOB the MWC is compared to. Secondly, LOB H is the sub-section of LOB which, in terms of its usage of enclitics, matches the MWC most closely.

Given that it is argued here that avoidance of enclitics is an indicator of formality, it is interesting to note that the LOB H category is composed of very formal texts indeed, largely government documents and official reports. It is also notable that those texts which use a wider variety of enclitics – such as LOB L and LOB P – are clearly more informal genres, composed of popular fiction. Importantly, these are also genres in which representations of speech occur most frequently. However, given the fact that ‘s is a negative keyword for the MWC irrespective of the sub-category of LOB it is compared to, the question of exactly what the ‘s in the corpora is – a genitive, an enclitic or both, becomes all the more pressing.

**Table 13. The relative frequency of genitive ‘s forms and enclitic ‘s forms in the MWC compared to the sub-section of LOB.**

Section	Frequency of Genitive ‘s	Frequency of Enclitic ‘s	MWC v LOB Genitive ‘s LL score	MWC v LOB Enclitic Verb LL score
LOB A	608	52	<b>240.89</b> (-)	0.39 (+)
LOB B	222	16	<b>24.8</b> (-)	<b>10.58</b> (+)
LOB C	327	30	<b>272.86</b> (-)	2.01 (-)
LOB D	124	30	<b>7.26</b> (-)	2.15 (-)
LOB E	215	34	0.12 (-)	3.95 (+)
LOB F	364	128	<b>33.77</b> (-)	<b>41.12</b> (-)
LOB G	800	41	<b>137.15</b> (-)	<b>29.04</b> (+)
LOB H	173	0	0.4 (-)	<b>67.87</b> (+)
LOB J	435	20	0.03 (+)	<b>68.31</b> (+)
LOB K	233	155	<b>18.22</b> (-)	<b>133.23</b> (-)
LOB L	279	168	<b>85.24</b> (-)	<b>195.7</b> (-)
LOB M	49	31	5.03 (-)	<b>34.05</b> (-)
LOB N	260	248	<b>32.16</b> (-)	<b>313.24</b> (-)
LOB P	276	242	<b>44.08</b> (-)	<b>302.3</b> (-)
LOB R	75	28	<b>8.99</b> (-)	<b>13.93</b> (-)
LOB Total	4440	1223	<b>127.06</b> (-)	<b>57.75</b> (-)
MWC	597	140		

In Table 13, the last two columns give a log likelihood (LL) score which tests the significance of the difference in frequency between the MWC and sub-sections of LOB for the occurrence of the genitive ‘s form (column four) and enclitic ‘s form (column five). Following each log-likelihood score is a + or a – in parenthesis. A plus indicates that the relative frequency of the form is greater in the MWC, a minus indicates that this relative frequency is higher in LOB. The log likelihood scores have been emboldened where these figures exceed the 99.9% significance level.

Table 13 shows that, with few exceptions, it is both the genitive and enclitic form of ‘s which is a negative keyword for the MWC. Both overall and in 10 of the 15 subsections, singular genitive marking is used significantly less frequently in the MWC than in LOB. Similarly, overall and in eight of the 15 subsections, the enclitic ‘s form is used significantly less frequently in the MWC than in LOB. However, the enclitic ‘s form does differ somewhat from the singular genitive – in three of the genres, LOB G, H and J, the enclitic form occurs significantly more frequently in the MWC than in LOB. One infers, therefore, that in Table 13 it is the effect of the combination of the genitive and enclitic form of ‘s which makes ‘s a negative keyword when compared to LOB G (Belles Lettres, biographies, essays), H (miscellaneous) and J (Science). When the different types of ‘s are separated, the formality of LOB G, H and J with reference to enclitic forms is underlined – it is even more formal than the MWC.

Given Whitehouse’s general avoidance of enclitic forms and the resultant formal style, the avoidance of the abbreviated form *porn* may simply be explained by her tendency to formality. However, I don’t believe that the two explanations for her preference of *pornography* over *porn* are antagonistic. Rather, they are complementary in that together they give an even stronger impetus for Whitehouse to use *pornography* rather than *porn*.

## Bad sex

Given the history of VALA, the presence of a cluster of keywords associated with sex in the discourse of the MWC is hardly surprising. Nor is the rather negative semantic prosody of the words in this cluster, with its emphasis upon what Whitehouse would view as deviance (*homosexual, torture*), transgression (*offences, pre-marital*) and indulgence (*fantasy, gratuitous, titillation*). The collocates

are revealing. Two out of the four link to the keyword *homosexual*, generating a link between *homosexual* and *masturbation* via *intercourse*, and *homosexual* and *minorities* via *sexual*. *Sex* is linked to *violence* through the collocate *gratuitous*. *Masturbation* is linked to *abortion* via *prior*. Then a link is made to the pornography semantic field of the objects of offence through the link collocate *pictures*. The impact of such links will be discussed in more detail later. For the moment it is sufficient to say that the 'sex' semantic field is tied to the scapegoat category (*homosexual*) and another 'object of offence' semantic field (*pornography*).

## Bad programmes

Words relating to the broadcast of programmes on the television and radio appear in the key keyword scapegoat list (see Table 14).

**Table 14. The collocates of *programme* and *programmes***

Word	Freq	Collocates in MWC
<i>programmes</i>	237	<i>olds, types, satirical, excellent, preview, screened</i> (4.39, <i>programme, television</i> ), <i>intervals, affairs, related, build</i> (4.17)
<i>programme</i>	282	<i>catholics, transmitted, complained, talkback, screened</i> (4.14, <i>programmes, television</i> ), <i>falling</i> (4.14, <i>tv</i> ), <i>braden, finished, thames</i> (3.73, <i>broadcast, tv</i> ), <i>night's</i> (3.73)

The discussion of these broadcasts almost always identifies the broadcast as a problem, and the act of broadcasting the material as a problem leading to negative consequences. The collocate *excellent* for *programmes* may lead us to assume, however, that not all programmes are identified by Whitehouse as having negative consequences. However, a closer inspection of the examples where *excellent* programmes are discussed shows that it is indeed those programmes to which Whitehouse objects that are being discussed – they are being accused of driving excellent programmes off the air or negating their positive effect, as in the following example from the MWC: 'What a great pity it is to spoil these excellent programmes and the excellent showing we get from the BBC by distasteful programmes'.

As well as blaming individuals for the objects of offence and consequences outlined by Whitehouse, the media, broadly conceived, is accused by Whitehouse of broadcasting and distributing the object of offence. Hence collocates with a negative semantic prosody such as *horrible, suffer, blue* and *x* occur with the key keyword *film* and the keyword *films*.<sup>18</sup>

**Table 15. The collocates of *film***

Word	Freq	Collocates in MWC
<i>film</i>	191	<i>censors, russell's, makers, horrible, cole's, distributed, glc, management</i> (4.29, <i>director-general</i> ), <i>exceptional, critic</i> (4.09)

Such collocates clearly form a bridge to the objects of offence category, as they are emblematic of the bad language, sex and violence Whitehouse objects to. It is hardly surprising, therefore, to see a link to the corrective action category: *broadcasting* and *television* are linked to the corrective action category by the use of language associated with the proposed regulation of the media, resulting in the collocates *accountable* and *accountability*.

**Table 16. The collocates of *television* and *broadcasting***

Word	Freq	Collocates in MWC
<i>television</i>	399	<i>screens, dimension, consumers</i> (4.23, <i>radio, broadcasting</i> ), <i>accountable</i> (4.23, <i>broadcasting, parliament</i> ), <i>independent</i> (4.05, <i>ita</i> ), <i>correspondent, radio</i> (3.92, <i>broadcast, jury</i> ), <i>myths</i> (3.90, <i>lobby</i> ), <i>companies, screened</i> (3.64, <i>programmes, programme</i> )

broadcasting	277	<b>accountable</b> (5.49, <i>broadcasting, television</i> ), <b>consumers</b> (5.17, <i>radio, television</i> ), <i>accountability, range, exempt, authorities, overall, affirm</i> , <b>urges</b> (4.17, <i>corporation</i> ), <i>temple</i> (4.17)
--------------	-----	--

Yet, if particular broadcast programmes are often presented as the scapegoat by Whitehouse, she is also clear that the decision to broadcast material is often the decision of individuals within a media organization, and the individuals, or a reified organization, may also be represented as scapegoats. As was demonstrated earlier, individuals are indeed represented as scapegoats in this way. But what of those bodies and groups associated with the decision to broadcast? As can be seen from the media organization and officers field of the scapegoat category, media organizations are identified as scapegoats by Whitehouse, and as such we could say that for her the scapegoating process encompassed the entire organization. The principal organization that was the subject of her disapproval is indicated by the key keyword *bbc*. As well as criticising the corporation itself, specific individuals associated with those different layers may be singled out for signal blame, e.g. Hugh Greene. The process of Whitehouse moving between levels in an organization while criticising it is a feature of Whitehouse's approach to attacking scapegoats, and the BBC in particular.

## The fragile nature of decency

The desired outcome identified in the MWC is the advent of a society in which *decency* reigns.

**Table 17. The collocates of *decency***

Word	Freq	Collocates in MWC
<i>decency</i>	29	<i>offend, taste, petition</i> (6.01, <i>parliament</i> ), <i>calling, good, against, feeling, faith</i> (4.52, <i>christian</i> ), <b>public</b> (4.32, <i>opinion</i> ), <i>standards</i> (3.23)

A form of Christian values based upon absolute morality were intimately linked to decency and compassion for the MWC. This link to Christianity becomes explicit for *decency* via the link collocate *faith*. However, it must be noted that in linking Christianity and decency, there is the implicit denial that those who oppose the MWC are either *christian* or *decent*. Those people identified in the scapegoat category must be those trying to frustrate this outcome and, hence, cannot be Christian and cannot be decent. Indeed, they are responsible for the state of the media that needs to be cleaned-up. Consider the examples in Figure 5.

**Figure 5. The call for the restoration of decency**

1. On a point of information, 1.1 million people signed the 1973 Nationwide Petition for Public *Decency* calling for more effective controls - 85% of those who had the opportunity to sign.
2. While they try to discredit with a yell of 'fascist' those who defend *decency* and culture, they themselves launch an assault upon the senses and freedom of the individual which is the essence of the worst kind of dictatorship.
3. She isn't afraid of being called a moral busy-body, a pedlar in cant, a prude, a hypocrite, or any of the other verbal weapons in the arsenal of those who despise taste, ridicule good manners, resent *decency*, applaud blasphemy and generally espouse the litter louts of the arts.
4. It was with this warning in mind that National VALA, with the support of the Festival of Light, launched a Petition calling upon the Government so to revise the Obscenity Laws that they become an effective and workable instrument for the maintenance of public *decency*.

The examples in Figure 5 claim that the public wanted decency restored, implying that it was under threat and in decline (1.). Those who sought to defend decency would have to suffer attacks from those that wanted to attack it (2.). The enemies of decency represent an out-group who are opposed to decency, amongst other things, and those who wish to defend decency (2. and 3.). Decency can be maintained or restored through the work of moral entrepreneurs who will persuade the government to institute changes to the law to enable the curbing of the out-group that wants to attack decency (1. and 4.). For VALA *decency* is a fragile object. It is also under attack and must be



defended by individuals and, ultimately, the state. Those seeking to attack *decency* are those ‘who despise taste, ridicule good manners, resent decency, applaud blasphemy and generally espouse the litter louts of the arts’. This is a powerful example of presenting an out-group negatively.

## Be Vague - Moral panic rhetoric

The presence of first person singular pronouns (*i, me, my*) as key keywords in the MWC texts is to some extent not surprising, as the texts in this corpus are largely written from the point of view of Mary Whitehouse herself. However, the fact that the corpus also has a first person plural pronoun (*we*) and the first person plural determiner *our* as key keywords makes the choice of the first person singular point of view an interesting one, as through the predominance of singular and plural first person pronoun/determiner forms the author is able to blur the distinction between the views which she holds, those which she and her supporters hold, and those which are held by a larger group, including both the author and the reader. First person plural pronouns/determiners are vague.<sup>19</sup> Consider the use of *we* and *our* in the manifesto of VALA as shown in Figure 6 (the examples in Figure 6 have been given superscript numbers by me to facilitate a discussion of the pronouns).

### Figure 6. Pronoun use by VALA

So we put *our*<sup>(1)</sup> heads together and produced *our*<sup>(2)</sup> manifesto.

THE MANIFESTO

1. *We*<sup>(3)</sup> women of Britain believe in a Christian way of life.

2. *We*<sup>(4)</sup> want it for *our*<sup>(5)</sup> children and *our*<sup>(6)</sup> country.

3. *We*<sup>(7)</sup> deplore present day attempts to belittle or destroy it and in particular *we*<sup>(8)</sup> object to the propaganda of disbelief, doubt and dirt that the BBC projects into millions of homes through the television screen.

(1) and (2) clearly encompasses only those people who sat down to write the manifesto. However, (3) encompasses a larger group, as not all of the Christian women of Britain sat down to write the manifesto and not all British women are Christians. Much as in the writings of the SRM, an in-group and out-group is set up here – the in-group being the Christian women of Britain who agree with the manifesto, the out-group being those women of Britain (whether they view themselves as Christian or not) who do not agree with the manifesto. (4), (5), (6), (7) and (8) may or may not refer to the groups identified by (1), (2) and (3) or to some other group. These pronouns/determiners have a sweeping and vague scope that is difficult to determine with certainty from the text. As well as exploiting the vagueness of the plural first person pronouns/determiners and generating in- and out-groups, these word forms can also be used to imply that the reader shares the views of VALA, as shown in Figure 7.<sup>20</sup>

### Figure 7: The assumption of christianity

The philosophical concept of the spontaneous apprehension of absolute good has lost all credence in a day when the entire concept of good is challenged, and *we*<sup>1</sup> need to be aware that it is largely *our*<sup>2</sup> Christianity and nothing else that has taught *us*<sup>3</sup> of goodness, justice, love, truth and beauty. And this is not something just for a reluctant Sunday.

(1), (2) and (3) in Figure 7 assume that the reader is a Christian. While this may indeed have been true for many readers, it is not axiomatic that those who would read Whitehouse’s works would be Christian. However, given the central rôle of a variety of Christianity based upon absolute morality in the campaigns of VALA, it is clear to see why Whitehouse wanted to assume that readers would be Christian, as she was claiming that she was representing the views of the silent Christian majority, who abhorred the switch away from absolute moral positions driven along by groups and individuals, such as the humanists or BBC Director General Hugh Greene, as shown in the examples in Figure 8.

### Figure 8. Speaking up for the silent majority

1. The Churches - as indeed had happened in other European countries where the pornographer Thorsen had tried to get his film made - not only came vigorously to life but united, one with another, under the leadership of the Queen, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Hume of Westminster and the Prime Minister. And they united with those lay people in the country who had been fighting pornography for years. The people spoke with one voice-all except, that is, for some pathetic bleats from some of the anti-censorship lobby whose gods are, of course, those same pieces of silver which betrayed Christ in the first place. This seemed to me the most wonderful thing. No longer could the publicists of the 'God is dead' school, or the hot gossellers of the secularist lobby, claim that we live in a post-Christian era. We may not all go to church, be we care.

2. There is at the heart of the nation a sound Christian core. Parents who know what they value for their children and are prepared to see that they get it.

Whitehouse's tactic when claiming that Britain was essentially Christian was to argue that, while the population was not visibly Christian, they were, so to speak, closet Christians. This may or may not have been true. What is true is that having adopted this position, the writing of Whitehouse is then bound to reflect that view, and that view in itself is crucial to the argument Whitehouse is putting forward. If Britain was not full of closet Christians then Whitehouse's arguments would have no force. Her battle would be lost before it began. Hence, in the use of first person plural pronouns and determiners to encompass groups in society larger than Whitehouse can rationally claim she was representing, Whitehouse was implying a support for the moral panic that she was promoting that she may – or may not – have had.

The *wh*-keywords in the MWC (*who*, *which*, *what*) merit some discussion, as they signal another important rhetorical device used in the corpus, the use of questions.<sup>21</sup> While not all of the uses of the *wh*-forms discussed here are questions, in the MWC 131 examples of *what*, 37 examples of *which* and 59 examples of *who* are questions. It is their importance as interrogative clause markers in the MWC that has led to their inclusion as *wh*-interrogatives in this discussion. What is the purpose and nature of questions in a discourse of the sort encoded in the MWC? The examples in Figure 9 illustrate the rôle of these *wh*-interrogatives well.<sup>22</sup>

### Figure 9. The use of *wh*-interrogatives by VALA.

1. When the Viewers' and Listeners' Association was formed Sir Hugh Greene that evening called it a 'lunatic fringe'. *What* does this so-called lunatic fringe consist of? Among its members are an Anglican Bishop, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in Britain, a high official of the British Medical Association, many chief constables and many Members of Parliament. I submit that the lunatic fringe who ought to look at their own misconduct are the minority to whom I have referred not the people who are trying to get things put right.

2. A month earlier the Managing Director of STV, the BBC's Scottish rival, had attracted a good deal of attention by announcing that he intended to act as a censor himself 'to fight some kind of rearguard action against progressive loosening of moral standards'. *Which* is the more responsible attitude? The BBC has always prided itself on exercising its own controls and gives this as a reason for rejecting any control from outside. In The Listener Sir Hugh Greene re-stated the theory: 'We have (and believe strongly in) editorial control ...' That is exactly what all this protest is about. Some simple clear principles must be defined.

3.) But *who* has the time for eternal vigilance? Mary Whitehouse, whom I first knew as a teacher in a School in my Diocese and had met at her parish Church, decided to give herself entirely to this new task and with great courage resigned from her teaching post.

In all three cases in Figure 9, a question is used as a rhetorical device to allow the writer to provide the answer that they prefer – the lunatic fringe consists of the critics of VALA, not VALA itself (1.), censorship is the responsible choice (2.), and Mary Whitehouse is the person who can stand watch over the nation's morals (3.). By posing and replying to questions, the texts give a semblance of debate, while remorselessly pursuing an agenda of moral absolutism in a context in which the answers given to questions, and the outcome of a supposed debate will be in harmony with the views of VALA.

## Conclusion

This paper, through an exploration of moral panic theory, has demonstrated the worth of keywords and key keywords. When faced with a mass of data, keywords may be of use in exploring that data in a structured and efficient manner. However, there are occasions on which the number of keywords are overwhelming or where the transience of keywords may become an issue. In such cases key keywords can be very useful in approaching corpus data. Using corpora and techniques such as

keywords one is able to approach and analyse volumes of text which, given a hand and eye led analysis, would be prohibitively time consuming. In allowing researchers to engage with large volumes of data rapidly and effectively, corpus linguistics promises not only the prospect of rapid and comprehensive results but also, as I hope this paper has shown, the gateway to a number of unexpected and illuminating insights into the data in question.

## References

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. and Reppen, R., *The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (London: Longman, 1999).
- Cohen, S., *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* (3rd edition, London: Routledge, 2002).
- Hundt, M., Sand, A., and Siemund, R., *Manual of Information to Accompany the Freiburg-LOB Corpus of British English (FLOB)*, [website], (1998) <<http://www.hit.uib.no/icame/flob/index.htm>>.
- Johansson, S., Leech, G. and Goodluck, H., *Manual of Information to Accompany the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English for Use with Digital Computers, Technical Report* (Bergen: Norwegian Computing Centre for the Humanities, 1978).
- Kucera, H. and Francis, W.N., *Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English* (Providence: Brown University Press, 1967).
- McEnery, A.M. 'Moral Panics, Keywords and Convergence: Bad Language in England, 1691–1745', *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* (forthcoming). (2005a)
- McEnery A.M., *Swearing in English: Bad Language, Purity and Power from 1586 to the Present*, (London: Routledge, 2005). (2005b)
- Munro, C.R., *Television, Censorship and the Law* (Farnborough: Saxon House, 1979).
- Newsom, J., *Half Our Future* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963).
- Pelz, W., *The Scope of Understanding in Sociology: Towards a More Radical Reorientation in the Social and Humanistic Sciences* (London: Routledge, 1974).
- Pilkington, H., *The Future of Sound Radio and Television* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1962).
- Whitehouse, M., *Whatever Happened to Sex?* (Hove: Wayland, 1977).

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to the Faculty of Social Sciences, Lancaster University, for a small grant which enabled me to construct this corpus. I would also like to thank Dan McIntyre, who undertook the bulk of the corpus construction work under my supervision.

<sup>2</sup> See Johansson, Leech and Goodluck (1978) for more details of the corpus.

<sup>3</sup> See Hundt, Sand and Siemund (1998) for more details of the corpus.

<sup>4</sup> Note that some semantic fields contain only one word. This is because the fields were initially developed for the full keyword list. When this is used, the fields with only one member gain further members. For example, the people field in the scapegoat category gains words such as *fox* and *hoggart*.

<sup>5</sup> For some excellent, if harrowing, first-hand accounts of discipline in such schools see <http://www.archivist.f2s.com/cpa/writtenaccounts.htm>

<sup>6</sup> See later in this chapter for a discussion relating to Whitehouse's assumptions regarding the christian nature of Britain.

<sup>7</sup> See Pilkington (1962) and Newsom (1963).

<sup>8</sup> See Whitehouse (1977:28-29).

---

<sup>9</sup> For a brief outline of Hoggart's attack on VALA see Munro (1979:132).

<sup>10</sup> A claim made of a US report produced by the American Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, 1970.

<sup>11</sup> A claim made of the Arts Council Report on Censorship of the Arts, 1969.

<sup>12</sup> A claim made of Enid Wistrich's report for the Greater London Council's Film Viewing Committee on the abolition of censorship in films intended for over-18 year old viewers, 1975.

<sup>13</sup> For example, by 1974 the American Psychiatric Association had removed homosexuality from its list of recognized diseases.

<sup>14</sup> See the discussion of pronouns later in this paper for a further discussion of Whitehouse's claim to speak for a majority of people in Britain.

<sup>15</sup> Billy Graham is a conservative American Southern Baptist evangelical preacher given to travelling the world trying to attract mass conversions. Cardinal Heenan was the doctrinally conservative Catholic primate of all England in the period 1963-1975.

<sup>16</sup> Dr. John A. T. Robinson was an English bishop who embraced liberal causes – he appeared for the defence in the *Lady Chatterley* trial, for example. He was also doctrinally liberal, and his book *Honest to God* (1963) which espoused a number of radical ideas (e.g. the non-existence of a personal God). Werner Pelz was a sociologist and author of Pelz (1974).

<sup>17</sup> See Biber et al (1999:1048, 1060-1062) for a discussion of the use of enclitics in speech.

<sup>18</sup> The phrase *blue film* is used to refer to pornographic films. At the time when Whitehouse was writing, *x* was a certificate awarded to films limited to an adult audience. Such films were limited because they contained bad language, sex or violence, either singly or in combination.

<sup>19</sup> See Biber et al (1999:329-330) for a discussion of the vagueness of this category of pronouns

<sup>20</sup> I include the keyword *us* in this analysis. While it is not a key keyword, the inclusion of *us* in this discussion seems appropriate in the context of discussing the way in which Whitehouse manipulates first person plurals.

<sup>21</sup> The words *who* and *what* are key keywords. I will also discuss *which* here as the word groups logically with the two other *wh*-forms under discussion.

<sup>22</sup> The third example in this figure is from the book *Cleaning Up TV* and is from the foreword written by the Bishop of Hereford.