

Univerzita Karlova v Praze
Filozofická fakulta
Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

Studijní obor: Filologie
Studijní program: Anglický jazyk

Zuzana Urbanová

Formy a funkce přímé řeči v žánrové struktuře novinových zpráv
The Function of Direct Forms of Presentation in the Generic Structure
of Newspaper Reports

TEZE

Vedoucí práce: prof. PhDr. Libuše Dušková, DrSc.

2013

The thesis focuses on the occurrence of direct forms of presentation in the generic structure hard news. The function of direct forms is discussed along several lines: their syntactic and deictic properties, the repercussions for the perspective and role of the reported and reporting speaker; the way direct forms reflect or contribute to the function of hard news in general and the role of the individual parts of the generic structure in particular; the concepts of dialogue and heteroglossia.

The function of hard news is to identify an event perceived as potentially damaging, destabilizing and disruptive to the status quo and the social norms, and mediate it in a manner that effaces the reporter and favours reiteration of the point of impact to evaluation, analysis and argumentation (Iedema et al. 1994, White 1998). This is achieved primarily by means of two aspects – the generic structure of hard news, referred to as the orbital structure, and significant absence of authorial evaluation, referred to as reporter voice (Iedema et al. 1994, White 1998). Reporter voice and orbital structure are explained by the need to acknowledge alternative points of view among the audience, and even though reported language plays its due role in both, it is primarily assessed in connection with the generic structure (Bakhtin 1981, White 1998). The function of hard news is closely related to news values, including recency, negativity, unexpectedness, consonance, unambiguity, relevance, proximity, eliteness, attribution and personalization (Bell 1991).

Chapter 2 defines the basic concepts, namely hard news, genre and forms of presentation. It draws a distinction between hard news, soft news and feature article. It contrasts the notion of genre with other related concepts, including text-type, style and register, and briefly compares the ideas advocated by the Australian Sydney School followed in the present work with the Swalesian ESP approach and the American New Rhetoric (Biber 1989, Crystal and Davy 1969, Biber and Conrad 2009, Martin 1992, Eggins and Martin 1997, Swales 1990, Freedman and Medway 1994). The issue of reported language is considered with regard to the concepts of point of view and perspective dealt with mainly in the area of literary and stylistic analysis, in connection with dialogue and heteroglossia discussed in discourse analysis, and in terms of its place in the language system and its role at the interpersonal level in different frameworks of appraisal (Vološinov 1986, Bakhtin 1981, Fairclough 1992, Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, White 1998, Martin and White 2005, Bednarek 2006).

Chapter 3 describes the corpus. The analysis is based on 175 print hard news reports on home and international topics, excerpted from the main British broadsheets (*The Times*, *The Independent*, *The Guardian*, *The Daily Telegraph*) in 2010 and 2011. The selection of texts took account of some of the factors discussed in Bell (1991) and Biber (1990, 1993) but

the main linguistic criteria were the orbital generic structure and reporter voice. The corpus consists of 76,945 words out of which 17,960 (23.3%) words are quoted directly in 1027 unambiguous direct forms of presentation. In the four sub-corpora the ratio of direct forms occurring per 1000 words ranges between 12.2 and 14.6.

Chapter 4 briefly touches upon different approaches to the structure of hard news, including van Dijk's cognitive approach (1988), Bell's narrative approach (1991), van Leeuwen's (1987) bottom-up generic approach and the concept of the inverted pyramid, characterised by radical editability, i.e. the possibility to reduce or reorder portions of text without affecting negatively its content or coherence (White 1998, Fink 1997, Bell 1991). The thesis draws on the work by White (1998), whose approach is informed by the ideas proposed by the Sydney School and Systemic Functional Linguistics. Genre is defined as a "staged, goal-oriented social process" (Martin et al. 1987; Iedema et al. 1994, 76; Martin and Rose 2008, 6). Stages are understood as text segments whose presence (and sometimes sequence) is necessary for successful completion of the desired goal. The goal of hard news is to identify a socially significant event and present it in an objective, uninterpretative manner which responds dialogically to and expresses solidarity with various viewpoints of the audience. This is achieved by the orbital structure based on an unequal relation between the stages of the Headline and Lead functioning as the nucleus, and the stage of the body of the text, comprising a number of satellites.¹

The nucleus serves as the interpersonal, ideational and textual peak of prominence. Its interpersonal role lies in that by identifying the socially or otherwise threatening event it helps to maintain the social norms. Since the *raison d'être* of the report is revealed in the beginning, the nucleus helps to establish the angle on the event and reduce potential differences in interpretation. The nucleus is the peak of ideational prominence for it provides the abstract or synopsis of the text. The satellites do not link between themselves but reach back to the nucleus and specify it, creating an impression of a collection of unrelated facts clustering round the nucleus, which contributes to the objective, impersonal and non-analytical style of reporting (Iedema et al. 1994, White 1998). The incessant creation and re-creation of the nucleus-satellite relation maintains the nucleus in relief, rendering it also the peak of textual prominence. The generic functionality of hard news is thus based on the interaction between

¹ Deviations from the strictly orbital pattern are represented by sub-satellites, characterised by inter-satellite dependency, and compound satellites, multi-nuclear satellites comprising two rhetorically equally significant parts (the prototypical satellites) which retain their relation to the nucleus but are graphically united within one paragraph. They will not be discussed here on account of their low frequency. Also, the analysis took account of the so-called concessive/concurring sequences, i.e. linear sequences of adjacent satellites related loosely by means of expressing disagreement or agreement on a particular issue. The analysis of concessive/concurring sequences is parallel or complementary to the orbital structure.

the orbital structure, underlying the nucleus-satellite relation, and the periodic structure, consisting in the repetitive wave-like alternation of peaks (nucleus) and troughs (satellites) (White 1998, Martin 1992, Martin and Rose 2008).

The corpus contains 235 Headlines (14%), 175 Leads (10.4%) and 1274 unambiguous satellites (75.6%). The taxonomy of nucleus-satellite relations was adopted from White (1997, 1998, 2000). Elaboration (588, 34.9%), based on repetition, specification and exemplification of the elements of the nucleus, contributes with its high frequency to the reiteration of the point of social significance throughout the whole text. Appraisal (148; 8.8%) provides evaluation in affective, aesthetic or moral terms, underlies the importance of the nucleus and provides the second, albeit less significant, peak of interpersonal prominence. Contextualization (370; 22%) specifies temporal, local or social setting or provides comparison to other events; it embeds the nuclear event in broader context without directly explaining or interpreting it in causal terms, which renders it very convenient with regard to reporter voice and the objective of hard news.

On the other hand, the lower frequency of Cause-Effect relations is attributable to their rhetorical purpose: Consequence (84; 5%) offers purpose, causes, reasons and consequences and is thus basically explanatory and analytical; Concession (17; 1%) frustrates conclusions or expectations following from the nucleus and is largely counter-expectational, the function usually reserved for the nucleus; Justification (23; 1.3%) gives evidence and advances arguments for the ideas in the nucleus whereas Counter-Justification (33; 2%) undermines and challenges them, which imbues the text with argumentative and debate-like flavour. Moreover, the presence of Counter-Justification indicates that despite dialogic interaction in the body of the text, the event is presented primarily from one preferred angle benefitting from the privileged status in the generic structure, which points to the selectivity and only seeming impartiality of hard news (White 2000).

In addition, based on observation of hard news texts and with the function of hard news in mind, despite their scarce occurrence two more satellite types were added to the taxonomy – Balance (6; 0.3%) and Wrap-Up (5; 0.3%). Balance explains the absence of certain point of view in the text and thus to an extent admits failure to avoid ideological bias. Wrap-up explains the absence of resolution or conclusion in the extra-linguistic reality and hence also in the text. As can be noticed, not all satellites occur with the same frequency and belong to the rhetorical repertoire of hard news (Gruber and Muntigl 2005, Mann and Thompson 1988).

Chapter 5 introduces various forms of presentation but focuses mainly on direct forms, discussed in terms of the relative deictic and syntactic (in)dependence of the reported element,

and if the topic is presented, also its form of realization (clausal/phrasal). Traditionally, forms of presentation are examined with regard to the faithfulness claims to words and structures, content and speech act value but since the issue of verbatimness and the presupposition of the existence of the original are not entirely unproblematic, attention was paid to the potential to present the (original) utterance from the (deictic) perspective of the reported or reporting speaker and the degree of intervention into or control over the reported content/form (Leech and Short 1981, Semino et al. 1997, Semino and Short 2004, Sternberg 1982, Tannen 1986, Short et al. 2002). Perspective is understood as “a subjective viewpoint that restricts the validity of the presented information to a particular person in the discourse” (Sanders and Redeker 1993, 69); Toolan (1988, 68) talks about the angle from which things are felt, understood and assessed, and Genette (1980, 162) defines it metaphorically as “participant’s vision” of an event. Consequently, whatever is reported belongs to the discourse world of the reported speaker and may have the effect of distancing, removing responsibility or impersonal reporting, excluding the perspective of the reporting speaker.

Forms of presentation are the source of dialogue in the text, defined as “the background of other concrete utterances on the same theme, a background made up of contradictory opinions, points of view and value judgements ... in the consciousness of the listener, ... pregnant with responses and objections” (Bakhtin 1981, 281). The presence of dialogue in the text is also known as heteroglossia, whereas its absence as monoglossia (Bakhtin 1981, White 1998, Martin and White 2005); Fairclough (1992, 104) talks about “manifest intertextuality”, i.e. explicit presence of other texts. Confining what is reported to one voice presents it as an opinion peculiar to that individual and hence not entirely fact-like and taken for granted, something potentially negotiable or challengeable. The presence of one voice acknowledges indirectly the existence of other voices and opens space for dialogic negotiation and interaction with the voices resonating in the text itself or around it, i.e. in other different (potential) texts. Since hard news deals with events which are relatively recent, socially significant and whose interpretation is open to change, it is these voices at the background that the hard news report needs to take into account (Bakhtin 1981, 381; White 1998, Martin and White 2005).

There are a number of classifications of reported language, accenting to different extent the faithfulness claims, gradient and the degree of control of the reporting/reported speaker (McHale 1978, Leech and Short 1981, Semino et al. 1997), deictic and/or syntactic autonomy of the reported element (Sternberg 1982, Vandelanotte 2009) or the combination of these (Thompson 1996). The thesis applies the categorization introduced gradually in Leech

and Short (1981), Semino et al. (1997) and benefits from their corpus study, which also includes a sub-corpus of broadsheet news reports (Semino and Short 2004).

The basic criterion is the distinction between speech (S), writing (W) and thought (T) forms of presentation, referred to also by the umbrella term of discourse (D) presentation. Leech and Short (1981), Semino et al. (1997) and Semino and Short (2004) distinguish forms of presentation on the basis of the presence or absence of faithfulness claims and understand reported language as a scale of directness, reported/reporting speaker's perspective and control. These aspects are, however, to an extent derivable from deictic and syntactic features, which are highlighted as crucial e.g. in Sternberg (1982) and Vandelanotte (2009) and which can be applied independently of the concept of the presumed original. The present analysis is a synthesis of the above views: deictic and syntactic criteria constitute the core of the classification but are interpreted in pragmatic/functional terms, including perspective and the degree of intervention and interpretation by the reporting speaker.

Free direct (FDD) and direct discourse (FDD), including (free) direct speech (F)DS, writing (F)DW, and thought (F)DT, are characterised by the deictic and syntactic autonomy of the reported element, enabling the occurrence of deictic expressions bound to the reported context, vocatives, interrogative and imperative structure, incomplete sentences, certain discourse markers and other forms less likely to appear in indirect discourse (Banfield 1973, Sternberg 1982, Vandelanotte 2009). As a deictically dual structure with clear separation of the reporting and reported situation, (F)DD is found at the most direct end of the scale, conforms to the faithfulness claims to form, content and speech act value and fully re-enacts or demonstrates the presented speech situation (Semino et al. 1997, Vandelanotte 2009, Clark and Gerrig 1990). Due to the identity of features FDD and DD are sometimes considered pragmatic variants rather than two separate forms. FDD differs from DD in the absence of reporting clause, quotation marks and/or both (Leech and Short 1981, 322).

Indirect discourse (ID), including indirect speech (IS), writing (IW) and thought (IT), evinces deictic and syntactic dependence of the reported clause on the reporting clause, which reduces the degree of directness and faithfulness only to content and speech act value (Semino et al. 1997). As the reported clause is deictically geared to the orientation of the reporting clause, the former is also restricted in terms of the structures freely occurring in (F)DD and the potential to fully re-enact and demonstrate the presented event (Banfield 1973, Vandelanotte 2009, Clark and Gerrig 1990). On the other hand, ID offers a possibility of summarization and interpretation (Semino and Short 2004). As the thesis limits its focus to direct forms of presentation, ID is of interest only if combined with a partial direct quote separated from the rest of the indirectly reported content by quotation marks (e.g. IS-q: *Sara*

Payne, ..., said she was “*disgusted*” by the Government's actions ...; Whitehead, The Daily Telegraph, October 6, 2010, p.10). All non-direct forms which can report content can occur with a partial quote, abbreviated to *-q* (Semino and Short 2004, 54-55).

Free indirect discourse (FID), including FIS, FIW, and FIT, is often interpreted as a blend of (F)DD and ID: whereas the reported element is syntactically independent of the reporting element (if present), the deictic independence is limited since tense and first and second person pronouns take the deictic orientation of the reporting situation (Redeker 1996, Oltean 2003, Leech and Short 1981). The intermediate status is reflected in the degree of directness, faithfulness claims (content, speech act value and to an extent form) and the potential to partially demonstrate and re-enact the reported event (Semino et al. 1997, Vandelanotte 2009, Clark and Gerrig 1990). FID also appears combined with a partial quote (FID-q), which makes the form deictically even more complex and which is probably also one of the reasons for its low occurrence in hard news (see Table 1 below).

As we move on the scale of directness towards the more non-direct end, next to ID is situated the so-called narrator's representation of discourse act (NRDA), subsuming speech (NRSA), writing (NRWA) and thought (NRTA). It disposes of the potential to report only speech act value, and thus lies outside the scope of the thesis (Semino et al. 1997). A variant of NRDA, however, can report content, albeit in a phrasal form, which distinguishes it from ID and simultaneously makes it compatible with a partial quote and relevant for the present discussion. The form is referred to as narrator's representation of discourse act with topic, partially quoted directly (NRDA_{p-q}) (e.g. NRSAP-q ... *he branded the Gaza Strip a “**prison camp**”*; Elliott and Hider, The Times, July 28, 2010, p.3).

At the most non-direct end of the scale characterised by a minimum or no degree of directness are found forms which only note the existence of a communicative event, do not claim faithful rendition of any of the aspects, cannot combine with a partial direct quote and are beyond the scope of the paper (Semino and Short 2004, 42-48). A form that in fact falls off the scale of presentation but was nevertheless included in the analysis on account of its combination with a partial direct quote is partially quoted narration (N-q). This form is characterised by the presence of quotation marks and the absence of the reporting signal (...*after a flood of toxic sludge escaped from a factory, killing at least four people, injuring 120 and unleashing an “**ecological catastrophe**”*; Day, The Daily Telegraph, October 6, 2010, p.15).

Considering the forms which were the focus of concern, i.e. direct and combined forms of presentation, in the corpus of 175 hard news reports there were 1027 unambiguous and 90 ambiguous forms. The unambiguous forms were the following: 188 cases of free

direct discourse (177 FDS and 11 FDW), 482 of direct discourse (440 DS, 36 DW and 6 DT), 11 of free indirect discourse combined with a partial quote (10 FIS-q and 1 FIW-q), 211 of indirect discourse combined with a partial quote (181 IS-q, 21 IW-q and 9 IT-q), 95 of narrator's representation of discourse act with a partially quoted topic (72 NRSAp-q, 16 NRWAp-q and 7 NRTAp-q), and finally 40 instances of narration combined with a partial quote (N-q). The data suggest two strong directions: the predominance of (free) direct discourse (670) over combined forms (357) and the predominance of speech (880) over writing (85), thought (22) and partially quoted narration (40).

The scale of perspective runs alongside or overlaps with the scale of directness of presentation. Due to its maximum degree of directness, full retention of the reported speaker's deictic centre and perspective and full re-enactment and demonstration of the supposed original on the one hand, and minimum or no intervention of the reporting speaker on the other, (F)DD may be employed in contexts where it is of vital importance that the presence of the reporting speaker is not traceable and the only perspective that is evoked is that of the reported speaker. On the contrary, even though combined forms bring the voice of the reported speaker to the scene, they show lower degree(s) of directness, display to different extent the perspective of the reporting speaker and hence his intervention and control. They are a convenient means of summary, interpretation and paraphrase while simultaneously they highlight the words in quotation marks and set them apart from the perspective of the reporting speaker. The presence of the reporting speaker is also apparent in the choice of the words highlighted in the partial quote.

Table 1 summarizes the frequency of occurrence of (free) direct discourse (F)DD, free indirect discourse combined with a partial quote (FID-q), partially quoted indirect discourse (ID-q), narrator's representation of discourse act with partially quoted topic (NRDAp-q) and partially quoted narration (N-q). The table shows their occurrence in the individual parts of the generic structure listed in the first column. Only satellites with unambiguous relation to the nucleus are dealt with, which also explains the difference between the total number of direct forms in Table 1 (shaded, 941 unambiguous, 87 ambiguous) and the total number of direct forms in the corpus (1027 unambiguous, 90 ambiguous). The numbers and percentage given in the second and third column (no shading) refer to the proportion of Headlines, Leads and satellites containing direct/combined forms. The total numbers showing the occurrence of the nuclear and satellite sections were discussed above.

Nuc/Sat	№		FDD		DD		Combined with a partial quote -q								Ambig.		Total	
							FID	ID		NRDAp		N						
														%				
Headline	71	30.2	12	16.9	1	1.4	0	0.0	2	2.8	6	8.5	23	32.4	27	38.0	71	100
Lead	35	20.0	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0	9	25.7	9	25.7	5	14.3	11	31.4	35	100
Elaborat.	287	48.8	73	16.9	197	45.5	3	0.7	90	20.8	35	8.1	5	1.1	30	6.9	433	100
Appraisal	126	85.1	44	21.8	118	58.4	2	1.0	19	9.4	13	6.4	0	0.0	6	3.0	202	100
Context.	121	32.7	29	16.2	77	43.0	3	1.7	39	21.8	14	7.8	5	2.8	12	6.7	179	100
Conseq.	40	47.6	8	15.1	25	47.2	0	0.0	14	26.4	4	7.5	1	1.9	1	1.9	53	100
Concess.	7	41.2	0	0.0	4	44.4	0	0.0	5	55.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100
Justificat	12	52.2	6	30.0	8	40.0	1	5.0	4	20.0	1	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	100
Counter-Just.	18	54.5	3	13.0	12	52.2	0	0.0	7	30.4	1	4.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100
Balance	6	0.3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100
Wrap-Up	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	100
Total			176		445		9		189		83		39		87		1028	100

Table 1: The distribution of direct and combined forms in the generic structure

Out of the 235 Headlines, only 71 (30.2%) were built upon direct/combined forms of presentation, containing the total of 71 forms. Out of the total of 175 Leads, 35 (20%) of them contained 35 direct/combined forms. The numbers suggest that there is only one direct/combined form per section. Although the actual numbers differ, in both the Headline and Lead there is a tendency to eschew direct/combined forms and therefore rely on narration or non-direct forms (FID, ID, NRDA(p), minimal forms): narration does not evoke any other voice via attribution and in this respect is relatively monoglossic and reflects the perspective of the narrator; non-direct forms reflect to different degrees the perspective of the reported or reporting speaker, but never the reported speaker only. These forms allow summarization and interpretation, offer the reporter room for manoeuvre and enable him to portray the source of disruption from a particular angle, which may prove convenient in the effort to establish the common optics and eliminate possible diverging points of view.

(F)DD (13 in the Headline, 1 in the Lead), on the other hand, offers the perspective of the reported speaker only, and may be too individualized and specific to serve the purpose of unification. This also explains its low occurrence in the Headline and with one exception its absence in the Lead. The FDD in the Headline reflects the attention-seeking function that is not performed by the Lead and due to its subjectivity and expressivity FDD achieves the effect of personalization, drama and appeal. Combined forms (31 in the Headline, 23 in the Lead) offer a fusion of the two functions: they bring into the text the voice of others to accommodate different reading positions and partially absolve the journalist from

responsibility, and simultaneously they interpret the event in the extra-linguistic reality in such a way as to imbue it with a common social significance. The number of ambiguous forms is significant (27 in the Headline, 11 in the Lead) and reflects coding conventions, insufficient context and features peculiar to each section.

In line with reporter voice, Appraisal is a satellite the occurrence of which is inextricably bound to direct/combined forms of presentation. Out of the 148 Appraisal satellites 126 (85.1%) featured one or more direct/combined forms of presentation – 202 in total. Appraisal is notable for the high proportion of unambiguous (F)DD (162) over combined forms (34). Appraisal evaluates the nucleus in affective, aesthetic or moral terms and like nucleus is a locus of heavy concentration of interpersonal meaning. However, there is a marked difference between the interpersonality of the nucleus and the interpersonality of Appraisal, connected to the prevailing forms of presentation/narration.

Whereas the nucleus serves to establish common ground and bridge possible differences in the way the point of disruption may be approached, Appraisal responds to the heterogeneity of the audience in a completely different manner. It accepts possible diversity in point of view and creates space for the existence of alternatives by accentuating the subjectivity of the individual and by making a particular interpretation and understanding one of many. This reflects in the high incidence of (F)DD, which lays bare the expressivity of the reported speaker and at the same time excludes the perspective of the reporter, as opposed to combined forms in which the reporting speaker is present in the interpretation or summary of the reported content and the selection of words for the partial quote. High frequency of (F)DD thus also responds to the requirements of reporter voice. The combination of the nucleus and Appraisal offers the reinforcement of what is already accepted inter-subjectively as a breach of social norms i.e. something conventional, taken for granted and hence not questioned, as well as its intra-subjective and individualized evaluation.

Following Elaboration, Background belongs to the second most frequent satellite. This, however, does not apply to direct forms since out of the total of 370 satellites, only 121 (32.7%) were characterised by the occurrence of 179 direct/combined forms. Even though the frequency of (F)DD (106) is still higher than the frequency of combined forms (61), in comparison to Appraisal the occurrence of the latter has increased at the expense of the former. The meanings or rhetorical strategies which could be considered risky to the impersonal key of reporter voice (e.g. evaluation, explanation or argumentation) are not of primary concern to Contextualization and thus possible intervention of the reporting speaker may not have serious consequences. Direct forms of presentation occur as Contextualizing verbal events mainly in issues reports, i.e. reports in which the nucleus is also construed as a

verbal event (White 1997), especially if the satellite contains evaluative lexical items. Or, Contextualization with direct forms may act as subtle and implicit argument or cue for interpretation, constructed or supplied by the reader rather than explicitly stated in the text.

The most frequently occurring satellite is Elaboration (588). With its 287 satellites (48.8%) featuring direct/combined forms of presentation, Elaboration is found between Contextualization and Appraisal, though in terms of the proportion of (F)DD (270) and combined forms (133) it is closer to Contextualization. Since Elaboration, and hence a substantial part of the hard news structure, repeats and specifies the elements in the nucleus, there may be an overlap between the forms of presentation in terms of the reported content, speech act value, key phrases (reported directly in partial quotes) or patterns created between direct and/or non-direct forms. On the other hand, there may be differences regarding the degree of directness: forms of presentation employed in the nucleus tend to be less direct and more summative, reflecting the reporting speaker's perspective, whereas forms employed in Elaboration tend to be more direct, less interpretative and reflecting the reported speaker's perspective. The unifying angle in the nucleus is reiterated in Elaboration but already in the more subjective perspective of a concrete individual.

As noted by van Dijk (1985, 78-84; 1988, 41, 43-44, 48), the points mentioned in the nucleus are specified in the body of the text gradually, with increasing detail and a number of disruptions and shifts in topic. Satellites appear in cycles or strings – sequences of satellites specifying gradually one theme – and since Elaboration shows a substantial amount of repetition, it is prone to form strings. Consequently, the occurrence and role of reported language in Elaboration was assessed with respect to the order of the satellite in the string. This approach can accommodate the cyclic and instalment-like presentation of information, germane to the hard news structure and most apparent precisely in Elaboration. Elaboration satellites (653, including 24 ambiguous and 41 compound satellites, see Note 1 above) were organized in the total of 322 strings: 132 one-satellite strings, 109 two-satellite strings (218 satellites), 41 three-satellite strings (123 satellites), 25 four-satellite strings (100 satellites), 10 five-satellite strings (50 satellites) and 5 six-satellite (30 satellites) strings. The numbers show that the frequency of occurrence of the individual strings decreases with the increase in the number of satellites per string. Although the inclusion of ambiguous satellites may skew the results to a certain extent, it makes possible to retain complete strings.

Even though narrative and non-direct forms were not studied in detail, they seem to be preferred in the initial parts of strings, whereas direct and combined forms tend to appear in later satellites. This pattern seems most apparent in the case of two-satellite Elaboration string. For instance, in 109 two-satellite strings 68 initial satellites were based on non-direct

forms and/or narration, and 41 contained pure direct and/or combined forms; in the case of the second satellite in the string the situation is reversed, i.e. 41 lack any direct form and 68 feature combined or pure direct forms. Moreover, in the initial satellite the occurrence of unambiguous (F)DD (48.1%) and unambiguous combined forms (48.2%) is balanced, whereas in the second satellite (F)DD (70.3%) prevails over combined forms (23.7%). Even though the distribution of narration and (non-)direct/combined forms of presentation in three- and more-satellite strings to different extent supports the tendency outlined for two-satellite strings, the patterns are more difficult to ascertain due to greater variability of possible combinations and lower number of satellites and direct forms. On the other hand, similar patterns have been attested in Contextualization and Cause-Effect strings, and the sequences of narrative/non-direct and combined/direct forms have also been found within a single satellite, irrespective of its type.

As mentioned, the functionality of the generic structure of hard news is based on the combination of the orbital and periodic pattern, which keeps the nucleus in the foreground in a wave-like movement created every time a satellite reaches back to the nucleus. But repetition is not vital only for the functionality of the nucleus for the periodic pattern seems to be exploited to an extent in the satellite stage too. The sequence of narrative/non-direct forms in the initial satellites of strings and combined and/or pure forms in later satellites makes use of the periodic pattern for a gradual increase in directness and a step by step introduction of the reported speaker and his subjectivity. In these strings on each successive occurrence of the satellite there is a shift from narrative/non-direct forms to combined or direct forms, and hence a shift to the perspective of the reported speaker. The shift in perspective may be best seen as illustrating a prosodic pattern, commonly associated with the expression of interpersonal meaning (Martin 1992). Prosody is described as a non-discrete, continuous, gradually intensifying and amplifying pattern which “smears across” elements of structure (Martin 1992, 11, 553; Martin and Rose 2008, 26-28; also Lemke 1998, 47). The scale of reported language, deictic centre, directness and perspective seems comparable to the prosodic pattern and in that sense it is possible to see the perspective of the reported speaker as smeared across a satellite string, gradually intensifying from one satellite to the other.

The combination of the periodic pattern and the orbital pattern produces one main, constant peak of interpersonal prominence in the nucleus; in case the above described tendency is applied to the body of the text, the combination of the periodic and prosodic pattern may produce a number of smaller peaks in the strings. Whereas the peak in the nucleus identifies the point of disruption, unifies the angle and reflects predominantly the perspective of the reporting speaker/narrator, the potential smaller peaks forming towards the

end of Elaboration strings, i.e. in satellites with a comparatively higher degree of directness and subjectivity of the reported speaker, particularize and individualize the point of disruption and the selected angle.

However, it needs to be borne in mind that idea of interpersonal intensification and gradual strengthening reflects the focus of the thesis, i.e. direct forms of presentation, but if the opposite angle was adopted, i.e. the role of narration, non-direct forms and the perspective of the journalist, the strings in the body of the text would be characterised by gradual backgrounding of the reporting speaker. Moreover, in order to obtain a complete picture of the interplay between the orbital, periodic and prosodic patterns, more attention needs to be paid to non-direct and narrative forms, studied here only marginally, and other lexicogrammatical means which convey interpersonal meaning and are realized prosodically. Finally, the combination of the periodic and prosodic pattern operates between satellites in strings the relation of which is by no means fundamental to hard news. Consequently, the cooperation of the prosodic and periodic pattern cannot be placed on a par with the orbital and periodic patterns but must be seen as their offshoot which is not exploited systematically as a text organizing principle governing the occurrence and order of the individual stages with a specific generic function. The arrangement of Elaboration satellites according to the presence of narration/non-direct forms, combined and pure direct forms is only a tendency which seems to assert itself to different extent in dependence on the number of satellites per string, and even in the case of two-satellite strings its application is not invariable and not necessary.

In general, the frequency of Cause-Effect satellites is lower than the frequency of other satellites. A possible explanation lies in their rhetorical purpose: Consequence provides causes, reasons and consequences and is thus more explanatory, analytical and interpretative. Justification and Counter-Justification give hard news a flavour of debate-like style; the nucleus-Justification arrangement is reminiscent of the thesis-argument structure, which has been either transferred (re-created) from the original context or newly created after recontextualization. But argumentative strategies may not be fully compatible with the ultimate goal of hard news, which may explain the low frequency of Cause-Effect satellites and the fact that with the exception of Concession (7, 41.2%) approximately half of each Cause-Effect satellite type relies on some direct/combined form of presentation: Consequence (40, 47.6%), Counter-Justification (18, 54.5%), Justification (12, 52.2%). Moreover, the satellites except Concession (44.4% of DD) are marked for the preponderance of unambiguous (F)DD over unambiguous combined forms: Consequence (62.3%), Justification (70%) and Counter-Justification (65.2%). (F)DD ensures the reporting speaker maximum distance from the rhetorical strategy. In addition, mere employment of reported language

makes the argumentative and explanatory sections covert, or hidden behind the overt purpose of reporting, creating a kind of double purpose structure enabling the reporting speaker to avail himself of the rhetorical potential of Cause-Effect relations while preserving the impersonal style of reporter voice (van Leeuwen 1987).

The presence of reported language can be looked at paradigmatically and syntagmatically. Syntagmatically speaking, hard news is a collage of original texts (and genres) which have been pasted together and which may gain the status of reported language whose form, content, focus of concern and communicative purpose may be adapted to suit the generic objectives of the recontextualizing text. Paradigmatically speaking, the social purpose of hard news contrasts with other texts and genres. As pointed out by White (1998, 352-353), there is a tension between the report's ultimate goal of documentation, which categorizes it taxonomically with other reporting genres, and the original purpose of the extra-textualized or extra-vocalised material. On the surface reading, the text is a report on what the news actors believe about a particular issue, on the deeper reading it is a constructed debate on the issue.

The extent to which the presence of extra-vocalisation may affect the nature of the new text may vary in dependence on how much of the original purpose has been retained, how much it asserts itself or how much it has been overridden by the communicative objective and the generic structure of the recontextualizing text. Topologically, the original texts that "lurk behind" may affect the proximity of the newly created text token to the centre or periphery of the family genre in dependence on the configurations of meaning communicated by the text and how the meanings are phased as the text unfolds (Martin and Rose 2008, 240, 248). This may also be affected by forms of presentation since the degree of directness is related to the degree of subjectivity with which a point of view is presented and the strength with which a voice resonates in the text.

References (selected):

- Banfield, Ann. 1973. "Narrative Style and the Grammar of Direct and Indirect Speech." *Foundations of Language* 10: 1–39.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Translated by Caryl Emerson, and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bednarek, Monika. 2006. *Evaluation in Media Discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Bednarek, Monika. 2009. "Polyphony in Appraisal: Typological and Topological Perspectives." *Linguistics and Human Cognition* 3(2): 107–136.
- Bell, Allan. 1991. *The Language of News Media*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Biber, Douglas. 1989. "A Typology of English Texts." *Linguistics* 27: 3–43.

- Biber, Douglas. 1990. "Methodological Issues Regarding Corpus-Based Analyses of Linguistic Variation." *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 5(1): 257–269.
- Biber, Douglas. 1993. "Representativeness in Corpus Design." *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 8(4): 243–257.
- Biber, Douglas, and Susan Conrad. 2009. *Register, Genre and Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, Herbert H., and Richard J. Gerrig. 1990. "Quotations as Demonstrations." *Language* 66: 784–805.
- Crystal, David, and Derek Davy. 1969. *Investigating English Style*. London: Longman.
- Eggins, Susan, and James R. Martin. 1997. "Genres and Registers of Discourses." In *Discourse as Structure and Process*, edited by Teun A. van Dijk, 231–256. London: Sage.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fink, Conrad. 1997. *Introduction to Professional Newswriting: Reporting for the Modern Media*. London: Longman.
- Freedman, Aviva, and Peter Medway. 1994. *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Genette, Gérard. 1980. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Gruber, Helmut, and Peter Muntigl. 2005. "Generic and Rhetorical Structures of Texts: Two Sides of the Same Coin?" *Folia Linguistica* 39(1–2): 75–113.
- Halliday, Michael A. K., and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Iedema, Rick, Susan Feez, and Peter White. 1994. *Media Literacy*. Sydney: Disadvantaged Schools Programme, NSW Department of School Education.
- Leech, Geoffrey, and Michael H. Short. 1981. *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman.
- Lemke, Jay. 1998. "Resources for Attitudinal Meaning: Evaluative Orientations in Text Semantics." *Functions of Language* 5(1): 33–56.
- Mann, William C., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1988. "Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a Functional Theory of Text Organization." *Text* 8(3): 243–281.
- Martin, James R. 1992. *English Text: System and Structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Martin, James R., Frances Christie, and Joan Rothery. 1987. *Working Papers in Linguistics 5*. Sydney: University of Sydney.
- Martin, James R., and Peter R. R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Martin, James R., and David Rose. 2008. *Genre Relations. Mapping Culture*. London: Equinox.
- McHale, Brian. 1978. "Free Indirect Discourse: A Survey of Recent Accounts." *A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 3: 249–287.
- Oltean, Stefan. 2003. "On the Bivocal Nature of Free Indirect Discourse." *Journal of Literary Semantics* 32(2): 167–176.
- Redeker, Gisela. 1996. "Free Indirect Discourse in Newspaper Reports." In *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1996*, edited by Crit Cremers, and Marcel D. Dikken, 221–323. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sanders, José and Gisela Redeker. 1993. "Linguistic Perspective in Short News Stories." *Poetics* 22: 69–87.
- Semino, Elena, Mick Short, and Jonathan Culpeper. 1997. "Using a Corpus to Test a Model of Speech and Thought Presentation." *Poetics* 25: 17–43.
- Semino, Elena, Mick Short, and Martin Wynne. 1999. "Hypothetical Words and Thoughts in Contemporary British Narratives." *Narrative* 7(3): 307–334.
- Semino, Elena, and Mick Short. 2004. *Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Short, Michael. 1988. "Speech Presentation, the Novel and the Press." In *The Taming of the Text*, edited by Willie van Peer, 61–81, London: Routledge.
- Short, Mick, Martin Wynne, and Elena Semino. 1998. "Reading Reports: Discourse Presentation in a Corpus of Narratives, with Special Reference to News Reports." *Anglistik & Englishunterricht*: 39–65.
- Short, Mick, Elena Semino, and Martin Wynne. 2002. "Revisiting the Notion of Faithfulness in Discourse Presentation Using a Corpus Approach." *Language and Literature* 11(4): 325–355.
- Smirnova, Alla V. 2009. "Reported Speech as an Element of Argumentative Newspaper Discourse." *Discourse and Communication* 3(1): 79–103.
- Sternberg, Meir. 1982. "Point of View and the Indirections of Direct Speech." *Language and Style* 15(2): 67–117.
- Swales, John. 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1986. "Introducing Constructed Dialogue in Greek and American Conversation and Literary Narrative." In *Direct and Indirect Speech*, edited by Florian Coulmas, 311–331. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Thompson, Geoff. 1996. "Voices in the Text: Discourse Perspectives on Language Reports." *Applied Linguistics* 17(4): 501–530.
- Toolan, Michael J. 1988. *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Vandelanotte, Lieven. 2009. *Speech and Thought Representation in English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1985. "Structures of News in the Press". In *Discourse and Communication*, edited by Teun A. van Dijk, 69–93. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1988. *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Earlbaum.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo. 1987. "Generic Strategies in Press Journalism." *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 10(2): 199–220.
- Vološinov, Valentin N. 1986. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- White, Peter R. R. 1997. "Death, Disruption and the Moral Order: The Narrative Impulse in Mass-Media 'Hard News' Reporting." In *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*, edited by Frances Christie, and James R. Martin, 101–33. London: Continuum.
- White, Peter R. R. 1998. *Telling Media Tales: The News Story as Rhetoric*. PhD diss., University of Sydney.
- White, Peter R. R. 2000. "Media Objectivity and the Rhetoric of News Story Structure". In *Discourse and Community: Doing Functional Linguistics*, Language in Performance 21, edited by Eija Ventola, 379–397. Tübingen: Gunter Nar Verlag.

Sources:

- Day, Matthew. 2010. "8ft wave of toxic waste hits villages." *The Daily Telegraph*, October 6, p. 15.
- Elliott, Francis, and James Hider. 2010. "Cameron lashes out at Gaza 'prison camp'." *The Times*, July 28, p. 3.
- Whitehead, Tom. 2010. "McCanns attack the merger 'that may put children in peril'." *The Daily Telegraph*, October 6, p. 10.