The Function of Reported Language in the Discourse of Newspaper Reports

Zuzana Urbanová
University of Pardubice, Czech Republic

Abstract

Direct and indirect forms of presentation have become an integral part of newspaper reports. This paper presents preliminary findings obtained in an early phase of research into the function of reported language in the discourse of British broadsheet newspapers. The aim of the research is threefold: first, to ascertain the ratio of reported and non-reported language; second, to identify the main types of reported language and their frequency of occurrence; third, to determine the function of reported language in this type of discourse. The main types of reported language examined include direct and indirect forms, mixed forms and fragmented forms. More general pragmatic functions of reported language in newspaper reports are set against the analysis of functional coherence relations within the framework of Rhetorical Structure Theory. The paper offers tentative suggestions concerning the communicative intentions reported language helps to achieve most often. The data suggest that individual types of reported language participate in the construction of a small number of relations; moreover, there seem to be a connection between a particular form of reported language and its nuclear/satellite status in a given relation. Though the conclusions must be taken as tentative rather than definite due to a limited amount of data gathered so far, they might be used as a good working hypothesis about the ways reported language is put to use in the quality British press.

1 Introduction

For the purpose of the analysis, a small corpus of thirty articles has been analysed so far; the news reports were excerpted from the on-line versions of the main British broadsheet newspapers, such as The Times, The Guardian, The Daily Telegraph and The Independent. The reports cover various topics ranging from world and home politics to economy and business or socio-cultural issues. In general terms, news reports have referential and epistemic function and in their focus on the description of the real world they claim factuality, accountability and credibility (Waugh 1995: 132-133, 151). In this paper, however, attention will be paid to more specifically defined functional coherence relations and the way reported language is integrated into the text. In the corpus examined, reported language covers a significant portion of 36,6%. As emphasised by Waugh (1995), all language phenomena should be studied within the frame of a given genre or text-type; the paper tries to ascertain whether there are any systematic ways reported forms of presentation (further only RFP) are employed or even preferred to non-reported language. Given the fact that, when preparing news reports, newspaper reporters mostly rely on external sources of information (van Dijk 1988: 125-129, 179; Waugh 1995: 133), most of what is subsequently included in the text can be in fact considered reported language. Then, the issue could be also viewed as a matter of choice between attributing a message to a particular source or leaving it unattributed. The pressures or conventions to attribute may vary from genre to genre, but if the potential to bring another voice into the discourse is exploited, it should be explained (Thompson 1996: 504, 506-7).

2 Reported language in newspaper reports

For convenience' sake, the discussion starts with the canonical forms of reported language, namely direct and indirect forms. Direct forms are generally defined as those that provide the exact wording of the original (Huddleston et al. 2002:1023; Quirk et al. 1985:1021). Apart from conventional editorial changes made to the original text, they are verbatim presentations and thus show a greater degree of iconicity and autonomy of the original speaker (Waugh 1995: 137-8, 155; for faithfulness criteria see Semino et al. 1997 or Short et al. 2002). On the other hand, indirect forms are not bound by the verbatim presentation criterion and the reporter uses his words to give only the content of the original utterance (Huddleston et al. 2002:1023; Quirk et al. 1985:1021). Since indirect forms are mere paraphrases with a lower degree of iconicity, the original speaker has no autonomy (Waugh 1995: 137-8, 155). Naturally, the differences in the degree of faithfulness correlate with orthographic, grammatical and semantic-pragmatic differences. Since direct and indirect forms are well-entrenched concepts in the linguistic tradition, no more will be said about them here. Nevertheless, it seems expedient to comment briefly on the much-discussed notion of verbatim presentation not only in connection with direct forms but also with reported language in general.

Very often, objections are raised against the claim purporting verbatim presentation a key feature of direct forms. The objections concern removing signs of on-the-spot production of spoken language, dialect or register variation (Waugh 1995: 156; Clark and Gerrig 1990: 785). However, in newspaper reports such corrections seem to be a norm rather than a deliberate impingement on the verbatim presentation criterion. What seems to be more interesting for language reporting are the principles of selectivity and markedness introduced by Clark and Gerrig (1990). According to the former, reporters are selective in what they present as direct presentation of the whole original speech event, including (a stretch of) the exact wording, propositional content or illocutionary act (Clark and Gerrig 1990: 769, 774-779). The latter principle relates to the reporters' intention to make their readers recognize a piece of language as an instance of direct quote (ibid.:774). In other words, what is formally marked and presented as direct reported language is meant to be accepted as such. Also, a stretch of reported text may be only a fraction of what was uttered in the original speech event. Though Clark and Gerrig relate these principles to direct forms of presentation only, it is assumed that selectivity and markedness principles can be extended to apply to some extent to

other forms of reported language as well. Reporters select a piece of information, present it in a certain manner and mark their report accordingly. The label verbatim presentation will be employed here with the proviso that a direct quote can undergo the changes described above.

The next most frequently found type of RFP was so-called mixed form, and as the term suggests, it has close affinity with both direct and indirect forms of presentation. In most cases, it has a form of embedded indirect speech, i.e. an initial reporting clause followed by a reported content clause (Huddleston et al. 2002:1024) a part of which is, however, enclosed in quotation marks, giving a verbatim presentation of the original. In these cases, an instance of RFP starts as an indirect form but then shifts into a direct form. Mixed forms are elsewhere referred to as combined forms (Waugh 1995), embedded quotation phenomena (Semino et al. 1997) or incorporated quotations (Clark and Gerrig 1990).

An important aspect of indirect forms is the possibility to condense, reduce and summarize the original piece of text (Waugh 1995: 160-161). The degree of condensation may lead to reductions both in the framing clause and reported message, resulting in gradual loss of information regarding the original content and speech act. Semino et al. (1997:24-25, 30) and Short et al. (1998: 43-45) refer to these constructions as "narrator's representation of a speech act" and give them a separate treatment. In these, a verb of saying or its nominalization appears with the topic stated in the form of a noun phrase (*The President warned about the problem of unemployment; the President's proposal of a new policy*) or the topic is omitted altogether. In the present analysis, such structures are included only in combination with embedded quotes, under the heading of fragmented forms of presentation. In the absence of the verbum dicendi or a nominalization, the only context in which a stretch of language enclosed in quotation marks could qualify as fragmented form of presentation is its simultaneous occurrence in a separate instance of direct, indirect or mixed form of presentation, giving a clear indication of it being a case of reported language. The selectivity principle can be operative in the reductions accompanying indirect reported forms but can also manifest itself in the choices made as to what portions and aspects of the original speech event are presented as direct quotes in mixed and fragmented forms. The following examples illustrate mixed and fragmented forms of presentation.

1. *The head of the main Palestinian security service, General Jamal Kayed, said he had put his forces "on maximum alert".*   [mixed form, The Times, March 12 2007]

2. *He condemned the police for a "bandit attack on citizens of Russia, who did nothing illegal but were just walking on the streets of their capital".*
          [fragmented form, The Daily Telegraph, April 15, 2007]

RFPs will be treated mainly in terms of the four broad categories delimited; reported writing appears in minority and no distinction was made as far as the spoke-written dichotomy is concerned. Free direct forms deviate from the prototypical ones in terms of the absence of quotation marks and/or framing clause (Leech and Short 1981: 258) and, as follows from the discussion in Semino et al. (1997), the instances of free direct forms in newspaper reports do not constitute a large proportion – they do not exceed 1% of the total number of words in the examined corpus. Due to low frequency of free direct forms in general and a limited extent of the corpus created for the purposes of the present analysis, free direct forms were not given a

separate treatment and were included in the category of direct reported form. Free indirect forms seem to show greater heterogeneity as far as the treatment of different linguists is concerned: they differ from the prototypical ones in terms of the paratactic final reporting clause (Halliday 2004: 465) or its total absence (Slembrouck 1986: 59-63; Leech and Short 1981: 325), partial retention of the original deictic centre (Waugh 1995: 150; Semino et al. 1997: 24) or any combination of these. It will have been noticed that forms without the reporting clause but with but with a verb of saying or its nominalization correspond to Semino et al.'s (1997) and Short et al.'s (1998) narrator's representation of a speech act mentioned above. With the purpose of the research in mind, neither the position of the framing clause nor the absence of deictic shifts is considered as important as to substantiate separate treatment. For these reasons, cases with paratactic reporting clause and/or partially retained deictic centre were dealt with together with the prototypical indirect forms. As explained above, indirect structures that could be characterised as narrator's representation of a speech act were included in the present analysis if they contained an embedded quote. The forms without a portion of verbatim presentation were excluded on account of great degree of compression and reduction of the original. Admittedly, the decision is to a degree arbitrary and necessarily influences the overall results of the research. For a discussion of ambiguity and cline-like character of reported language see Semino et al. (1997), Short et al. (1998); for a sequential view separating clearly the clines of direct and indirect forms in the discourse of newspaper reports see Waugh (1995).

One more comment needs to be made on cases where a reporting clause contains a cognitive verb, such as *think, believe, know, suspect, hope* etc. These were excluded from the analysis since there is no guarantee of any prior statement(s) being uttered (Palmer 1986:136). It can be argued that since the reporter has no access to one's thoughts or believes, some prior utterance must be necessarily involved and the verbs of thinking and believing are used only to indicate a degree of (un)certainty on the part of the person quoted. However, writers can base their assumptions of one's believes, thoughts etc. on some other evidence or indications than actual prior statement(s). The analysis does not try to offer a complete overview or typology of how language and thought of others are presented; rather it tries to look at the functional coherence relations the selected RFPs enter with the rest of the text.

3 Rhetorical Structure Theory
This section offers a short introduction into Rhetorical Structure Theory. RST is one of the possible means of studying coherence in texts and has been given priority here since it offers a detailed descriptive framework for analysing relations between pieces of text and thus makes the notion of coherence more tangible and subject to description. RST is a descriptive method for uncovering coherence in texts; it establishes functional relations between portions of text and organizes them into a tree hierarchical structure (Mann and Thompson 1988: 243-4). Following from this brief description, the structure yielded by RST reveals two important aspects about how texts are organized and how portions of text relate to one another. These are captured in the concepts of functional relations and an asymmetric satellite-nucleus status of the elements building each relation. Some relations can be also multinuclear and their relation symmetric. The nature of relations and their connection with coherence will be dealt with first. In RST, the concept of relation is bound to an

information surplus that is added in the course of interpretation and which can be derived from related units as a whole but does not follow from any of the units in isolation (Sanders, Spooren and Nordman 1992: 5; Man and Thompson 1986: 58). Thus, information surplus is not based solely on the content or meaning of individual segments but it is a result of interpretative work – "functional and semantic judgements" on the part of the reader (Mann and Thompson 1988: 250).

The relations are conceived of in terms of the writer's communicative purpose and the effect a portion of text is intended to have upon the reader (Gruber and Muntingl 2005: 87; Mann and Thompson 1987). The analysis yielded by RST can reveal whether reported forms of presentation are typically employed by news writers to achieve a particular communicative goal. With the notion of communicative goal in mind, it seems plausible to argue that a possible prevalence or absence of certain relations in a given genre and/or text-type can be a reflection of the communicative purpose and/or presentation strategies, so-called rhetorical repertoire (Gruber and Muntingl 2005: 87; Mann and Thompson 1988: 250). In this paper the interest is narrowed down not only to a particular genre but also to one particular phenomenon, i.e. the use of reported forms of presentation. In Waugh's (1995) words, the aim of the analysis is to determine which relations reported language helps to construct in a text type that strives at an accurate and reliable description of the external world. In the vast literature on RST, it is possible to find a number of different taxonomies of RST relations; the present analysis relies on the classification proposed by Carlson and Marcu (2001). Naturally, only those relations will be commented upon in whose realization RFPs frequently participate and thus bear direct relevance to a completion of a particular communicative intention.

The second central concept in RST stems from the idea of hierarchical structure of texts. The hierarchy is captured in the notions of nucleus and satellite; the asymmetry between the nuclear and satellite part is based on the assumption that some portions of text (nuclei) are more central to the writer's communicative purpose than others. Their centrality is also reflected in that they seem to be less suitable for the processes of substitution or deletion and their absence results in a relatively high degree of incomprehensibility (Mann and Thompson 1988: 266; 1987:3-5). Therefore, the question addressed here must not only concern the type of relation that reported forms of presentation enter but also their nuclear or satellite status in the hierarchy, i.e. their relative central or ancillary role in the completion of writer's intentions. For an overview of RST and the problems associated with this type of approach to the construction and interpretation of texts the reader is kindly referred to e.g. Taboada and Mann (2006), Martin (1992); Wolf and Gibson (2005) discuss the problems of low flexibility of tree structures; Gruber and Muntingl (2005) offer a comparison of RST with Register and Genre Theory.

4 Results of the analysis

The following sections present the results of the analysis and offer conclusions as to the overall ratio of reported and non-reported language, frequency of occurrence and the most common relations reported language participates in. Also, a comment will be made concerning the status of reported language in the tree structure, i.e. its nuclear or satellite function in a specific type of relation. Though the RST relations relevant to the employment of RFPs will be dealt with in chapter 4.2, it seems convenient to introduce now one of the relations that is specifically connected to reported language and to which constant reference will

be made, namely the rhetorical relation of Attribution (Carlson and Marcu 2001). The relation of Attribution is mononuclear: the satellite represents the source of attribution and corresponds to a reporting clause in direct, indirect and mixed forms; the nucleus, on the other hand, corresponds to the message expressed in a reported clause. The combination of nucleus and satellite is generally referred to as relation scheme, in this case an Attribution scheme (Mann and Thompson 1988: 248-9).

4.1 Proportion and frequency

As has been explained above, the product of RST analysis is of hierarchical nature. Since RST does not work with otherwise well-established concepts such as clause or sentence, the ratio of reported and non-reported language was measured by means of arc length[18]. The whole corpus has the arc length of 1831, out of which 671 are realized by reported language, amounting to 36,6%. The fact that reported language comprises more than one third of the news reports studied suggests that it is a notable phenomenon and deserves due attention. As for the proportion of the individual forms of reported language, the ratio is as follows: the most extended are direct forms with the arc length of 383 (57,1% out of the reported language arc length total), followed by indirect forms with the arc length of 191 (28,5%), mixed forms extending up to 92 arcs (13,7%) and fragments with only five arcs in length (0,7%). The high arc length of direct forms can be explained by the fact that very often Attribution nuclei are realized by two or more sentences, which in RST correspond to more complex hierarchical structures with higher arc length. The lower arc length of indirect forms may reflect their summarizing and condensing function, which helps to present information in a more economical and space-saving manner. Greater freedom of the reporter to manipulate the content and form presented gives a possibility to select or combine particular ideas (Waugh 1995: 158-9, 162-3). Mixed and especially fragmented forms enable the reporter to highlight the quoteworthy and at the same time incorporate it easily and neatly into the rest of the discourse (Semino 1997: 31; Waugh 1995: 147). The low arc length of fragmented forms seems to be in agreement with this highlighting selective function; they usually appear only in the form of a phrase which itself is not further analysable within RST, its arc length thus being zero. Arc length is only in partial correspondence with the frequency of occurrence of the individual forms: the most frequent have shown to be indirect forms (99), followed by direct forms (92), mixed forms (41) and fragmented forms (23). In case of direct, indirect and mixed forms, each Attribution scheme corresponds to one occurrence[19]; in case of fragmented forms, a single instance was demarcated by initial and final quotation marks. The data related to the ratio of reported and non-reported language, the frequency and arc length of the individual forms are summarized in Table 1 below. On the whole, out of the four RFPs examined, it seems that broadsheet writers adhere to the more conservative types. Even though the forms of presentation discussed may possibly evince different

---

[18] The concept of arc length appears e.g. in Gruber and Muntingle (2005). It refers to a number of arcs, i.e. lines connecting units in a relation scheme. It was preferred to count in words or sentences since it captures the complexity and length of a hierarchical tree structure and is thus closer to the overall approach adopted. Naturally the ratio of reported vs. non-reported language would be different if a different unit of measure had been used.

[19] In case a direct reported message extended over more than one sentence, it was still counted as one single instance of reported speech/writing on account of it constituting one Attribution nucleus. Therefore, each direct Attribution nucleus was delimited by the initial and final quotation marks.

numbers of prototypical features, graphical and grammatical signalling seems sufficient to separate them from the reporter's language (on ambiguities see Semino et al. 1997; Short et al. 1998). The employment of RFPs is dealt with in the following section.

Total Arc Length: 1831/100%				
Reported Language Arc Length: 671/36,6%				
	Arc Length		Frequency	
Direct	383	57,1%	92	36,1%
Indirect	191	28,5%	99	38,8%
Mixed	92	13,7%	41	16,1%
Fragmented	5	0,7%	23	9%
Total	671	100%	255	100%

Table 1

4.2. Reported forms of presentation and RST relations

The following paragraphs will be devoted to the description of the relations and their connection to RFPs. The analysis relies on a partially modified taxonomy proposed by Carlson and Marcu (2001). The list of the relations together with the employment of RFPs can be found in Table 2. The relations listed represent only major categories or relation sets; each relation set contains a subset of minor semantically or pragmatically similar sub-relations. In most cases, description will be limited to the major categories only. Minor sub-relations will be specified further only if appropriate or necessary.

Relation set	F1		IS		Relation set	F1		IS	
		%		%			%		%
Elaboration	120	47,1	152	34,3	Evaluation	24	9,4	32	7,2
Background	18	7,1	31	7	Joint	21	8,2	83	18,8
Cause	2	0,8	3	0,7	Manner-Means	2	0,8	3	0,7
Comparison	0	0	9	2	Topic-Comment	2	0,8	5	1,1
Condition	0	0	12	2,7	Summary	22	8,6	8	1,8
Contrast	27	10,6	25	5,6	Attribution	0	0	35	7,9
Explanation	3	1,2	10	2,3	Temporal	7	2,7	25	5,6
Enablement	0	0	10	2,3	Title	7	2,7	0	0
TOTAL	170		252			85		191	
TOTAL	F1	255	IS	443					

Table 2

The function of RFPs was approached from two perspectives. First, the function of the whole RFP with respect to the rest of the text was examined and will be referred to here as Function 1. Function 1 (F1) refers to the relation of a RFP with the immediately connected portion of text; it is a function in the most local sense. Second, the analysis addresses the question of the relations identified within RFPs – mostly in complex Attribution nuclei, less frequently in complex Attribution satellites or any type of schemes realized by fragmented forms. Such relations are covered under the heading of Internal Structure (IS)[20]. Table 2 above summarizes the function of RFPs with respect to the rest of the text (F1) and the relations identified within RFPs (IS). For the sake of convenience, the relations that will be of interest in the present section have been shaded. Since F1 refers to the relation in whose construction the whole instance of RFP participates, be it an Attribution scheme or a unit in the tree structure containing a fragmented form, the total of 255 of F1 relations is identical with the total number of occurrences of RFPs. The number of relations identified within IS is much higher (443) than the number of F1 relations, which also justifies the inclusion of the former in the analysis. Even though the relations identified in the IS can possibly exert influence on their F1, such correspondences have not been studied in detail. Consequently, despite the temptation, no attempts to establish correlations between F1 and IS will be made in any of the relations examined. Moreover, varying occurrence and percentage frequencies of F1 and IS relations indicate that the correspondences would be necessarily partial.

As mentioned above, the choice of relations that will be

more closely inspected depends on the degree of involvement of RFPs. Though it is not only the presence but also the absence of a particular relation type that is worthy of explanation, especially with respect to a given genre/text-type or, in RST framework a writer's communicative intention, only those relations whose frequency justifies at least tentative conclusions as to their systematic employment in the discourse of newspaper reports will be commented upon. For the comments concerning relation frequency and occasional differences between F1 and IS, reference will be made to Table 2. Table 3 gives more detailed information about the satellite or nuclear status of RFPs in the F1 relations under discussion.

Now the discussion will proceed with a more detailed treatment of the most frequent and/or relevant relations, i.e. Summary, Evaluation, Contrast and Elaboration. Drawing on the results presented in Table 2, Elaboration clearly outnumbers the other relations, covering 47,1% in F1 and 34,3% in IS. Elaboration is defined as a relation where the satellite provides additional, more detailed or specific information about the situation presented in the nucleus (Carlson and Marcu 2001). Elaboration also notably exceeds other relations irrespective of the reported vs. non-reported language distinction, the overall percentage being 37,4% (see Table 5 below). Such high occurrence may be explained in terms of the principles governing the presentation of information in newspaper reports, namely the principle of "cyclic ordering and top-down presentation of facts" (van Dijk 1985). According to these, information is not presented to the reader linearly but discontinuously, in installments on a more general to a more specific scale (ibid.:78, 83, 89). The operation of these principles contributes to a specific discourse pattern (Östman 1997) characterised by frequent shifts in, recurrence of and gradual elaboration on topics and referents; hence the high frequency of Elaboration relation. Reported language seems to be utilised in a way that fits this general pattern of

---

[20] Due to the absence of reporting clause, fragmented forms do not meet the conditions for forming Attribution schemes as defined in Carlson and Marcu (2001). Theoretically, they can function as (a part of) satellite or nucleus in any other relation or even constitute a whole scheme. Hence the distinction between fragmented forms on the one hand and direct, indirect and mixed forms constituting Attribution schemes on the other.

presentation or even contributes to its creation.

Out of the total 120 RFPs in F1 Elaboration, 77 appear as satellites and the remaining 43 as nuclei. In other words, RFPs are usually employed to continue the topic or sub-topic introduced in the nucleus by adding further information, detail or specification and are only ancillary or supplementary to the message or the writer's communicative goal. Only in 43 cases are RFPs further developed and elaborated upon and thus can be considered to play a more central or essential role in the text in that the rest of the message is dependant on them in the process of interpretation. Irrespective of the status of RFPs in an Elaboration relation, it is a relation in which RFPs are most frequently utilised. The writer relies on RFPs to develop a topic and carry a story further.

Function 1: Number of occurrences			
Relation set	Satellite	Nucleus	TOTAL
Elaboration	77	43	120
Contrast	5	22	27
Evaluation	21	3	24
Summary	12	10	22
TOTAL	114	79	193

Table 3

The function of nucleus and satellite has been also examined with respect to a given type of reported language. As indicated in Table 4, the occurrence of Indirect Attribution schemes in nucleus (22) and satellite (21) seems to be evenly distributed. The occurrence in nucleus function can bear relation to the summarizing potential of indirect forms; one or more

(sub)topics are introduced by means of indirect RFPs on a general level and are further specified and elaborated upon via either reporter's language or another instance of RFP. Still, the summarizing potential is a mere possibility; by means of indirect forms reporters can select and report any information given in the original speech event on any level of particularity. Consequently, there is nothing to prevent an instance of indirect form to appear in Elaboration satellite function and provide more details or specification. Thus, due to a lower degree of commitment to faithfulness, indirect forms seem to be quite flexible as to what information they provide and the purposes they serve. In contrast, 36 direct Attribution schemes are employed in satellite function and only nine in nucleus function. The ratio seems to suggest that direct forms are predominantly used to supply the type of information that may not be (intentionally) given in indirect ones, i.e. the information abundant in detail. Though the frequencies of mixed (13 satellites, eight nuclei) and fragmented forms (seven satellites, four nuclei) are too low to allow any generalisations, on account of partial verbatim presentation their prevailing occurrence in satellite function can be explained along the same lines. Apart from newsworthiness, the employment of RFPs in general in Elaboration relation can be related to evidentiality and personalisation of news reports (Waugh 1995: 144). Moreover, since direct forms of presentation evince lowest degree of reporter's autonomy or influence over the reported forms, direct quotes serve the function of detachment and more direct experience of the original speech event (Clark and Gerrig 1996: 792-3).

Function 1	Direct			Indirect			Mixed			Fragmented			TOTAL
Relation set	T	S	N	T	S	N	T	S	N	T	S	N	
Elaboration	45	36	9	43	21	22	21	13	8	11	7	4	120
Contrast	1		1	21	5	16	5		5	0			27
Evaluation	17	16	1	4	3	1	3	2	1	0			24
Summary	11	10	1	9		9	1	1		1	1		22
TOTAL	74	62	12	77	29	48	30	16	14	12	8	4	193

Table 4

The second relation in which RFPs find their employment most frequently is the relation of Contrast. According to Carlson and Marcu (2001), in Contrastive relations the information presented in the nucleus/satellite contrasts or expresses a violated expectation with respect to what is presented elsewhere in the text. As follows from Table 2, Contrastive relations cover 10,6% (27) in F1 and 5,6% (25) in IS. If a need arises to give information contrary to what is expected or present conflicting views of a situation where the veracity of the reference to the external world could be questioned, the responsibility for this incompatibility is shifted to a different source than the reporter himself. Often, separate instances of RFPs are combined in such a way as to express Contrastive relation, sometimes contrasting opinions of different sources, sometimes two different views of one source are contrasted along some dimension.

Concerning the nuclear or satellite status of RFPs, the former (22) predominates over the latter (5). A higher number of nuclei can be explained by the fact that Contrastive relations, as opposed to Elaboration and Summary, often appear as multinuclear. The role of RFPs in Contrastive relations can be thus interpreted in two ways: if an instance of RFP appears in a multinuclear relation with another instance of RFP or a stretch of non-reported text, both nuclei are presented and interpreted as equally essential to the writer's intention and are given equal prominence; if, on the other hand, in a mononuclear relation the contrasting

information expressed by a RFP is assigned the function of satellite or nucleus, its importance reduces or increases, respectively. Consequently, one viewpoint of the situation is presented to readers as more important or perhaps more likely to be true than the other.

As for the form of reported language participating in the formation of Contrast relations in F1, out of 27 instances of RFPs 21 involve indirect Attribution schemes, 16 in nuclear function. On the other hand, forms containing a stretch of verbatim presentation participate in the Contrast relations minimally: one instance of direct form and five instances of mixed forms, in all cases in the function of nucleus. A possible motivation for the prevalence of indirect forms may be the need to formulate the views expressed by different speakers on different occasions in such a way that the contrast stands out clearly; for this purpose indirect forms may be more appropriate. Though the number of attested examples may not be high enough to warrant reliable conclusions, the results seem to suggest a tendency to prefer pure indirect forms to direct, mixed or fragmented forms. However, further data are needed to support and explain these tendencies.

The next relation on the frequency scale is Evaluation. In an Evaluation relation the information presented in the satellite provides a subjective comment, evaluation or interpretation of the information presented in the nucleus (Carlson and Marcu 2001). As shown in Table 2, Evaluation comprises 9,4% of F1 and 7,2% of IS relations. However, due to a higher total number of

relations in IS, the IS (32) outnumbers F1 (24) in terms of number of occurrence. As will be explained later, the alignment of Evaluation with RFPs seems to be very close. If reporters wish to include a subjective opinion or comment on an event depicted, an instance of RFP may seem an attractive option. Thus, writers manage to incorporate subjective interpretations without presenting them as their own opinions or of a given newspaper. Naturally, their sole inclusion (or exclusion) in a news report may be indicative of a political stand as well.

Given the fact that it is the satellite that offers evaluation of the nucleus, it is not surprising that in F1 21 instances out of the overall 24 function as satellites (Table 3), which indicates that reported forms of presentation are employed to provide subjective comments rather than being commented upon. However, in three cases it is the reported language itself that is evaluated; nevertheless, it must be added that here all nuclei and satellites are instances of RFPs. In other words, one Attribution scheme is used to evaluate the other.

The 21 Evaluation satellites are realized by direct forms in 16 cases, two are instances of mixed forms and three of indirect forms. Since the information offered by Evaluation satellites is of highly subjective and interpretative nature, the preference of (partially) direct forms to indirect ones is apparently connected with the degree of personalization and authenticity. Direct forms involve minimal reporter's interference in the original speech act, content and exact wording (Semino et al. 1997: 23) and may be thus perceived as more reliable and accurate. They enrich the reporting discourse with direct, unmediated experience of the 'real-world' speech event. At the same time, the identification of an external source may be especially important for quality press since it enables the reporter to remain detached and refrain from passing unattributed judgments.

The last relation that remains to be commented upon is Summary. In a Summary relation the information in the nucleus or satellite summarizes or restates what is said elsewhere (Carlson and Marcu 2001). Out of all relations in whose realization RFPs participate (Table 2), Summary covers 8,6% in F1 but only 1,8% in IS. The difference in the percentage and frequency of occurrence (22 in F1 and 8 in IS) seems to suggest that even though original speakers/writers do not summarize or restate within their own messages (IS), their utterances are nevertheless employed by the reporter to summarize or restate what is said elsewhere in the report (F1).

For the discussion of satellite (12) and nucleus (10) status of RFPs in F1 Summary relation (Table 3), it seems expedient to make a distinction between the sub-relations in this major category. The category of Summary contains two minor sub-relations: Summary and Restatement. As for the former, in news reports it is the nucleus that summarizes another portion of text functioning as satellite. The nuclear summarizing function of RFPs is much less frequent (three nuclei) and is attested in the Lead section of the report. In a Restatement relation, it is the satellite that restates in other words what is presented in the nucleus. In this relation reported language is found both in nuclear (7) and satellite (12) function. All seven nuclear RFPs are found in Restatement schemes realized solely by reported language, i.e. the content expressed by an instance of RFP (nucleus) is reiterated by means of a separate instance of RPF (satellite). Restating RFP satellites give supporting evidence and contribute to the authenticity, objectivity and reliability of the report.

As shown in Table 4, direct forms are employed predominantly in satellite function (10). Fragmented and mixed forms appear in satellite function only once

each. In Restatement satellite function direct forms seem to be preferred to condensed prototypical indirect forms probably on account of the assumed authenticity of the former. The two instances of mixed and fragmented satellites appear in Restatement schemes as well. Their occurrence has no statistical value, but since both contain an element of verbatim presentation, they are, at least, in accordance with the findings for direct forms. On the other hand, in nuclear Restatement function indirect forms are preferred, perhaps again due to their flexibility in content presentation. The seven Restatement schemes realized entirely by RFPs fit this pattern, i.e. the content expressed by an indirect form (nucleus) is then restated by means of a form containing the exact wording as the original (satellite). Regarding the three nuclei in the minor category of Summary sub-relation, two were realized by indirect forms and one by an instance of direct form.

As for the link between a type of reported language and the IS relation, any correlations are hard to find. This is due to the fact that IS relations are mainly found within complex Attribution nuclei, which are in most cases realized by direct quotes containing more than one sentence. The overall predominance of direct forms of presentation in IS relations seem to be more a matter of their greater potential to appear in more extensive and complex RST structures than an evidence of a systematic preference for direct forms on grounds of the pragmatic functions associated with them.

Since frequency of occurrence in F1 and/or IS (Table 2) is the main criterion for considering reported language pertinent to the realization of a particular relation, a few words should be added about Joint relation (F1 8,2%, IS 18,8%) as well. According to Carlson and Marcu (2001), Joint relation (multinuclear) is established between portions of text that are similar in content and syntactic structure. Though syntactic and semantic parallelism between units is indicative of the integration of RFPs into the discourse of news reports, nothing more particular can be said about the mutual relation between the nuclei in Joint schemes. Nevertheless, it is not without interest that out of 21 Joint schemes in F1, ten appear in Elaboration, six in Contrast and one in a Summary relation one step upwards in the tree structure. This seems to support the findings presented in the above paragraphs; Joint schemes only add a feature of parallelism between the nuclei that in conjunction realize satellites or nuclei in the relations on the level above. The higher percentage of Joint relations in IS is not surprising.

In the preceding paragraphs, the starting point for the discussion was a single instance of RFP; then the relation it realized and its respective status in the hierarchy were commented upon. The discussion closes with the ratio of reported and non-reported language participating in the construction of Elaboration, Contrast, Evaluation and Summary.

4.3 Reported vs. non-reported language in Elaboration, Contrast, Evaluation and Summary

In this section attention will be paid to the proportion of reported and non-reported language in the realization of Elaboration, Contrast, Evaluation and Summary relations. The results are summarized in Table 5. Since the frequency of Attribution schemes in Elaboration relations is sufficiently high (Table 2), there seems to be no doubt about the relevance of RFPs for this relation. However, due to their lower frequencies the significance of RFPs for the realization of Contrast, Evaluation and Summary can be questioned. Moreover, the frequencies are not considerably different from e.g. Background relation (Table 2: 7,1% in F1, 7% in IS), which has been so far excluded from the discussion. Consequently, the dividing line may seem to have been drawn rather

arbitrarily. The following discussion will hopefully justify the connection postulated between RFPs and the relations of Contrast, Evaluation and Summary.

Relation set	Total Number of Occurrence	Function 1	Internal Structure	Reported forms of presentation
Summary	45/2,6%	15 (7)	8	23/51,1%
Contrast	88/5%	20(7)	25	45/51,1%
Evaluation	80/4,6%	21(3)	32	53/66,2%
Elaboration	658/37,4%	100(20)	152	252/38,3%
Background	169/9,6%	18	31	49/29%

Table 5

The second column in Table 5 summarizes the total occurrence and percentage count of Summary, Contrast, Evaluation and Elaboration irrespective of reported and non-reported language distinction. At first sight the relations of Summary, Contrast and Evaluation do not constitute a significant proportion in the total number of relations in general since their frequencies do not exceed 5%. However, from the perspective of the function of reported language, there seems to be a close link between RFPs and the three relations under scrutiny. In 51,1% of all Summary and Contrast relations some form of reported language was employed, either as a satellite or nucleus; the involvement of RFPs in the construction of Evaluation is even greater – 66,2%. Thus, even though we cannot claim that Summary, Contrast and Evaluation are exclusively bound to RFPs, the data seem to suggest a systematic employment of RFPs in these relations. Moreover, in none of the relations identified was the ratio of the involvement of reported and non-reported language so balanced or even in favour of reported language. The numbers enclosed in brackets in F1 indicate that the whole Summary (7), Contrast (7) and Evaluation (3) schemes are realised by RFPs[21]. In these cases one instance of RFP restates, contrasts with or evaluates a different instance of RFP. Background relation was included in Table 5 in order to offer a comparison with Summary, Contrast and Evaluation. As shown in Table 2, F1 (7,1%) and IS (7%) frequencies of RFPs are very similar to those of Summary, Contrast and Evaluation. Nevertheless, on closer inspection it is clear that the link between Background relation and RFPs is much looser since RFPs are involved only in 29% of all Background relations. The connection between Elaboration and RFPs seems to be likewise more tenuous; even though RFPs participate in the construction of 252 Elaboration schemes, a number largely exceeding the occurrence of RFPs in the other relations, it is preferred to non-reported satellite/nucleus only in 38,3%. The number of whole-RFP Elaboration schemes amounts to 20; in these one form of reported language elaborates upon the preceding one.

5 Conclusion

In news construction, newspaper reporters seem to rely on reported language to a great extent. Measured in arc length, reported language constitutes a significant proportion of 36,6% of the news reports examined. RFPs participate mostly in the construction of Elaboration, Contrast, Evaluation and Summary relations. If the communicative intention is to summarize/restate, evaluate or offer contrasting views of a situation, news writers are likely to recourse to reported language. On the other hand, despite high frequency, the link between Elaboration and reported language does not seem to be so strong. Even though direct and indirect forms of reported language cannot be claimed to be used complementarily, they seem to evince differing tendencies as regards satellite/nucleus status in a particular relation. The potential of indirect forms to offer either condensed and/or deliberately selective information may be exploited to a varying degree in their nuclear function in Elaboration, Restatement and Summary (as a more specific relation in the major Summary category). On the other hand, direct forms seem to be preferred in satellite function in Elaboration and Restatement: in the former function they supply more details or specification and in the latter they give supporting evidence on account of their relatively high degree of faithfulness to the original. By the same token, direct forms seem to be germane to Evaluative satellites, whereas indirect forms are preferred in Contrastive relations. Due to different degrees of reduction or accuracy of presentation, different forms of reported langue seem to be not only relation-specific but also tend to predominate in either satellite or nucleus function. Reported language is employed in newspaper reports for the reasons of newsworthiness, evidentiality, objectivity, authenticity and personalisation of the report (Waugh 1995). It allows the reporter to partially detach himself from the content of the report (Clark and Gerrig 1990). These functions seem to reflect in the results yielded by RST analysis where each relation is defined in terms of the communicative intention pursued. However, due to a limited amount of data a larger corpus and closer inspection are needed to support the assumptions made concerning the tendency of given RFPs to appear in the relations and functions just outlined.

---

[21] The discrepancy between the numbers specifying the occurrence of RFPs in Elaboration, Evaluation, Contrast and Summary given in Table 2 and Table 5 is caused by different perspectives adopted. In Table 2 the starting point for the description is an Attribution scheme or a complete instance of fragmented form; consequently, even though two different instances of RFPs formed a single relation, each of them was counted separately. In Table 5, however, focus is placed on a relation, i.e. the whole relation scheme. For a comparison of the reported/non-reported language ratio in the relations concerned, in order not to double-count, the occurrence of a RFP was counted only once even in cases of whole-RFP schemes with at least two separate instances of RFP.

References
CARLSON, L., MARCU, D. *Discourse Tagging Manual* [online]. Unpublished manuscript. 2001. [viewed September 09, 2008]
Available from WWW: http://www.isi.edu/~marcu/discourse/tagging-ref-manual.pdf
CLARK, H.H., GERRIG, R.J. Quotations as Demonstrations. *Language.* 1990, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 764-805.
GRUBER, H., MUNTINGL, P. Generic and Rhetorical Structures of Texts: Two Sides of the Same Coin? *Folia Linguistica.* 2005, XXXIX/1-2, pp. 75-113. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
HALLIDAY, M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* 3rd ed. London: Hodder Arnold, 2004.
HUDDLESTON, R., PULLUM, J. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language.* Cambridge: CUP, 2002.
LEECH, G., SHORT, M. *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose.* London: Longman, 1981.
MANN, W.C., THOMPSOM, S. A. Relation Propositions in Discourse. *Discourse Processes.* 1986, vol. 9, pp. 57-90. London: Routledge.
MANN, W.C., THOMPSOM, S. A. *Rhetorical Structure Theory: A Framework for the Analysis of Texts.* (No. ISI/RS-87-185). 1987. Marina del Rey/ California: Information Sciences Institute.
MANN, W.C., THOMPSOM, S. A. Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text.* 1988, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 243-281. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
MARTIN, J. R. *English Text: System and Structure.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Company, 1992.
PALMER, F.R. *Mood and Modality.* Cambridge: CUP, 1986.
QUIRK, R. et al. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman Group Limited, 1985.
SANDERS, T.J.M., SPOOREN, W.P.M., NOORDMAN, G.M. Toward a Taxonomy of Coherence Relations. *Discourse Processes.* 1992, vol. 15, pp. 1-35. London: Routledge.
SEMINO, E., SHORT, M., CULPERER, J. Using a corpus to test a model of speech and thought presentation. *Poetics.* 1997, vol. 25, pp. 17-43.
SHORT, M., WYNNE, M., SEMINO, E. Reading Reports: Discourse Presentation in a Corpus of Narratives, with Special Reference to News Reports. *Anglistik and Englishunterricht.* 1998, pp. 39-65.
SHORT, M., SEMINO, E., WYNNE, M. Revisiting the notion of faithfulness. *Language and Literature.* 2002, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 325-355. Sage Publications.
SLEMBROUCK, S. Towards a description of speech presentation and speech reportage in newspaper language. *Studia germanica gandensia.* 1986, vol. 9, pp. 44-115.
TABOADA, M., MANN, W.C. Rhetorical Structure Theory: Looking Back and Moving Ahead. *Discourse Studies.* 2006, vol. 8, no.3, pp. 423-259. Sage Publications Ltd.
THOMPSON, G. Voices in the Text: Discourse Perspectives on Language Reports. *Applied Linguistics.* 1996, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 501-530. Oxford University Press.
ÖSTMAN, J. O. Coherence through Understanding Discourse Patterns: Focus on News Reports. In Bublitz et al. (eds.). *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse: How to Create it and How to Describe it. Selected Papers from the International Workshop on Coherence, Augsburg, 24 – 27 April 1997.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1997, pp. 77-98.
WAUGH, R.W. Reported speech in journalistic discourse: The relation of function and text. *Text.* 1995, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 129-173. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
WOLF, F., GIBSON, E. Representing Discourse Coherence: A Corpus-Based Study. *Computational Linguistics.* 2005, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 249-288. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
van DIJK, T.A. Structures of News in the Press. In T.A. van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse and communication: new approaches to the analysis of mass media discourse and communication.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985, pp. 69-93.
van DIJK, T.A. *News as Discourse.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1988.

Primary Sources
TIMES ONLINE and AGENCIES IN GAZA. BBC journalist abducted in Gaza. *The Times* [online]. March 12, 2007. [viewed March 12, 2007]. Available from WWW:
http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle_east/article1504869.ece
WOMACK, H. Hundreds held in Moscow in anti-Putin protests. *The Daily Telegraph* [online]. April 15, 2007. [viewed April 15, 2007]. Available from WWW: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1548684/Hundreds-held-in-Moscow-anti-Putin-protests.html