The Role of Neutral Projecting Frames in the Quest for Media Objectivity

Warren Hancock

Abstract

This article explores the textual properties of arguably one of the most influential textual domains in contemporary society; that of mass-media discourse. Within this genre, it examines English-language hard news media reports from the United States, Great Britain and Australia focussing on the concepts of objectivity within this domain. Drawing inspiration from White's (2001, 2002a) and Martin's (2000, 2004) heteroglossic engagement perspective, and Halliday's (1978, 1994) semiotic theory and model of transitivity, this paper examines a range of linguistic mechanisms employed within the genre of hard news. In particular it focuses on the linguistic resources of the so called neutral projecting clauses of attributed messages and the ways that reporters can indirectly convey attitudinal positions and engagement using these neutral mechanisms. The analysis shows that even with these so called neutral attribution framers it is still possible through semantic and linguistic means for reporters to adopt stances, to construct textual personas and to manage interpersonal positioning and relations within the genre of objective hard news.

Introduction

It is commonplace for newspapers to contain more or less distinct register categories like news, leading editorials, sports, feature stories among many others. These are normally divided into categories of *hard news* and *soft news*[1]. Among these, hard news reporting has been studied intensively by academics especially those from within the field of mass communication (for a review of this literature, see Cottle, 2003; Schudson, 1989; Tuchman, 2002). The hard news category has also attracted the attention of linguists and social discourse analysts within the fields of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) with research ranging from *global* organization of news, such as thematic and schematic structure (Van Dijk, 1980); orbital structure, (Iedema, Feez, & White, 1994,1997); syntactic and local semantic level of discourse (Fowler, Hodge, Kress, & Trew, 1979; Fairclough,1989; Fowler, 1991); rhetorical features of sentences and sentential connections (Chen, 2005; Chilton,1994).

There is some consensus among researchers as to the general social, semantic and functional load of hard news stories. They are generally seen as the prototypical news event: stories of considerable public events which have

significance for large numbers of people and tend to be very timely and immediate and are time-bound to immediacy (Rodríguez, 2006, p. 150). Patterson (2000) explains that hard news is the "coverage of breaking events involving top leaders, major issues, or significant disruptions in the routines of daily life, such as an earthquake or airline disaster" (p. 3). Ochi (2006) considers this form of discourse field-oriented because of its social purpose, describing and chronicling events. White (2009, p. 30) goes into more detail on this point and describes it as events which are typically associated with material (disaster, riot, terrorist attack) and communicative (speech, interview, report, press release) happenings.

Media institutions generally identify objectivity as one of the main characteristics of hard news reports (Jacobs, 1999; Sleurs & Jacobs, 2005; White, 2009). Mindich (1998) terms the "ethic of objectivity" as the defining feature of modern journalism and that neutrality is key components of this notion of *objectivity*"(p. 22). White (2009) explains that it is this type of text that "... journalistic institutions assert the objectivity of their discourse" and claim that these "... are free of any of the journalistic author's own opinions and perspectives" (p. 30). Consequently, hard news can thus be seen as embodying the concepts of seriousness, timeliness and objectivity.

However, these observations only attend to the easily observable features of text and function. Boukes and Boomgaarden (2012) criticise the general perception that hard news is "the serious, enlightening kind of journalism that enhances democracy" arguing that this view tends to neglect "...the magnitude and complexity of (hard) news" (p. 23). Van Dijk (2001) and Gamson (2002) both observe that the basic communicative purpose of hard news stories is not only to inform but more specifically, to convince the reader of the true value of the information supplied. This tension between informative and persuasive objectives results in the interdiscursivity of news and promotional discourse (Catenaccio, 2008*)*. White (1997) agrees with the notion of interdiscursivity explaining that far from being objective, hard news discourse is actually riddled with "... lexis which encodes a sense of intensity or heightened involvement by the author" (p. 108) He goes on to say that this lexis "... positions the reader to view the events or statements described as significant, momentous or emotionally charged" (pp. 108-109).

White is not alone in his observations. While the notion of "objectivity" is construed in discussions of media reporting (e.g., Bell, 1991), most media discourse research has identified ideological biases in the language of news in various ways (e.g., Bell, 1991; Bell & van Leeuwen, 1994; Butt, Lukin, & Matthiessen, 2004; Fairclough,1995; Fowler, 1987; White, 2009). Fowler (1987) makes the point that there is no neutral representation of reality: "It is not simply a question of objectivity on one hand, and bias on the other" (p. 67). White (2009)

explains that the ways that hard news texts are slanted is a reflection of their "... author's own social identity, ideological position and communicative objectives" (p. 31). This tension between news reporting and its "objectivity" is explained by Fairclough (1995a, pp. 103-104) as a rhetorical effect, for example, what is foregrounded and what is backgrounded, and what is made explicit or implicit. Iedema et al. (1994) note that this "rhetorical effect" neutralises the ideological biases in hard news where, traditionally, using overtly evaluative meanings is to some degree constrained. That is, it functions to background the selective role of the author's voice in the text and to give a perception of neutrality. Iedema et. al (1994) further explain

> the "impartiality" or the "factuality" of a text are not measures of the degree to which it accurately reflects reality - as human subjects we use language to construct rather than reflect reality - but measures, rather, of the success of the text in presenting its underlying set of value Judgements and ideologically informed responses as "natural" and "normal", as fact rather than opinion, as knowledge rather than belief. (p. 4)

Literature Review

One of the most pervasive features of hard news texts is the reporting of what was said. As most news is "what people say more than what people do" (Bell, 1991, p. 53), reporters make frequent use of reported speech to recontextualise into the media text all manner of accusations, criticisms, demands and claims from all manner of people. After all, as Cappon (1982) observed, "News, to a remarkable degree, is what people say and how they say it" (p. 79). As such reported speech is a pervasive feature of news text and has fascinated discourse analysts from a wide range of linguistic approaches, who have attempted to discern its specific characteristic and general functions.

One of the major themes in the study of reported speech in news discourse is the relationship between source selecting and power relations in society. White (2006, p. 58) summerizing up the available research in this area notes that "Many analysts, as a counter to such a characterisation, have noted that the very act of selecting a source and a particular sub-selection of their words for inclusion in the report carries with it evaluative and ultimately ideological consequences." Van Dijk's (1991) study of racism in Europe certainly supports this hypothesis. His research showed that media tendency to marginalize ethnic minorities, and media bias in the coverage of ethnic affairs is reflected in its selection of sources and quotation patterns. Another study by Teo (2000) of two Sydney-based newspapers' reports of a Vietnamese gang in Australia also found that quotation patterns can function ideologically to further disempowers the powerless — the poor, the young,

the uneducated, etc. — by backgrounding their opinions and perspectives. But access to the Press is not only socio-economically determined. Research by Caldas-Coulthard (1993) into gender bias media coverage found that news texts are basically oriented to a male audience and exclude women from the speaking position.

The relationship between reported speech and discourse manipulation is found not only in who gets quoted but also in how attributed material is framed and projected. The Glasgow University Media Group (1980, p. 163), focussing on British TV news, argue that media's presentation of the speech correlates with the status of the speaker; that is, the more elite the speaker, the more verbatim the presentation is likely to be. Fairclough (1988, p.1) looking at the issue from a critical perspective argues that the reporting of what was said is "representation of speech" instead of a "transparent report of what was said or written [because] there is always a decision to interpret and represent" what was supposedly said. There is general consensus among researchers towards Fairclough's words. Bakhtin (1981, p. 330) notes, prior words are "transmitted with varying degrees of precision and impartiality (or more precisely, partiality)." Caldas-Coulthard (1994) also believes that "No speech representation is objective or simply neutral. … Sayings are transformed through the perspective of a teller, who is an agent in a discursive practice" (p. 307). Kress (1985) explains that this is because a reporter is a social agent "located in a network of a social relation" (p. 5) and has a specific place in a social structure, reflecting its values. As such her/his texts will also reflect these values and work to align or disalign his/her readership towards certain worldviews and ideological stances. Indeed, at the most basic level it can be said the use of attributed material is a way of relieving the reporter from responsibility: "[P]resenting opinions in the form of quotations from important people is more effective and seemingly objective than presenting the writers own opinion" (Jukanen 1995, p. 44).

But there are of course significant differences in how reporters can manipulate the features of reported speech events. In appraisal terms, reported speech events acts to insert external voices into the text and as such belongs to the system of intertextuality (White, 2001). At one extreme of the cline, such attributive material is inserted directly into the text. At the other end, the attributive material is reworked into the text and the distinction between external and internal voices becomes somewhat blurred (White 2002a). Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 454) explains that within the system of transitivity, the former is identified as representing the wording of what was said and as such is considered the projection of a locution. In S.F.L terms this is known as quoted but is more commonly described as direct speech. The latter, however, is identified as reporting of "the gist of what was said" and as such is considered the projection of an idea. This is termed by SFL practitioners as 'reported thought' but in more

traditional grammars is described as indirect speech. With direct speech the "projected clause retains all the interactive features of the clause as exchange" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 446) whereas with indirect speech that which is projected only needs to contains the sense of what was originally said. In SFL terms this means that the projected clause of indirect speech represents the ideational content but not necessary the exact lexical form of the reported discourse (Halliday 1985, p. 232). Between these two contrasting forms exists "free indirect" which is best described as "not so much intermediate as a blend" (Halliday et al., 2004, p. 465).

Indirect discourse is the statistically leading form of recontextualisation of news sources' discourse (Bell, 1991, p. 209). From a reporters perspective there are significant advantages to employing this form of projection. Principally, indirect discourse is much further away from the original than is direct discourse "… in that it purports to provide only a paraphrase of the original utterance through rewording, condensing and inferencing" (Kuo, 2007, p. 282). This integration of the reporter's own discourse into what is projected provides significantly more control over how something is reported (Caldas-Coulthard, 1993) permitting the reporter to draw on the primary speech event in order to assert the factuality of a news item, without, as pointed out by Politis and Kakavoulia (2005), needing to adhere faithfully to the primary wording. As such, reporters can interfere in the secondary discourse in order either to position the reader to favour a particular value position. As Sacks (1992, p. 49) points out, the reported speech frame works to convey to listeners "how to read what they're being told." This point is also taken up by Fairclough (1988) who maintains that indirect discourse is ambivalent to what it represents and it is never neutral in relation to the secondary discourse.

This, as argued by Short (1988), is in contrast to direct speech where a straightforward faithful relationship exists between the ideational form of speech and what it is supposed to represent. Hence what is directly quoted as a source of information can always be challenged in terms of veracity (Caldas-Coulthard, 1993). From this perspective, direct speech provides a sense of what Parmentier (1993) calls "a reverential obeisance" (p. 263). However, as argued by Kuo (2007) "it is precisely this presumed distancing of the quoted utterance that allows the news reporter to harness the authority attached to the quotation, without calling attention to the creative purpose of doing so" (p. 286). But it is not only who is quoted but what is quoted that can function as a powerful ideological tool to manipulate readers' perceptions of media reality. As Van Dijk, (1991) notes quotations also "…allow the insertion of subjective interpretations, explanations, or opinions about current news events, without breaking the ideological rule that requires the separation of facts from opinions" (p. 192). Davis (1985) agrees with

these views by noting that a quoting pattern in news discourse is not a neutral system but a mediated system loaded with ideological bias.

However, regardless of indirect or direct speech, how the original message is really perceived may depend more on how the speech is framed by the projecting clause. As Caldas-Coulthard (1993, 1994) points out there is considerable scope for subjectivity in the choice of verbs used in the projecting clause that not only marks the power/status of the speaker but also covertly conveys the journalist's attitude toward and evaluation of the projected utterance or the speaker. That is, in choosing a reporting verb, the reporter is inevitably intervening between the reader and the words of the person being reported.

Available linguistic research into this area certainly indicates that the degree of mediation will vary with the choice of projecting verb. One of the earliest researchers working in this area, Caldas-Coulthard (1987, p. 157), developed a typology of speech report verbs based on notions of reporter mediation. She categorised them as either "canonical neutral speech verbs" (Bell, 1991, p. 206) – involving very little mediation on the part of the reporter – or as "illocutionary reporting verbs" - typically involving a high degree of meditation. She also identified another neutral category which she termed "structuring verbs." These include processes such as ask, question, reply and answer; and function mainly indicate that the speaker was engaged in an exchange. Drawing on the transitivity resources of SFL, Chen (2005) also developed a typology of verbal processes based on news articles. She identified the existence of three sub-categories of verbal process – positive, negative and neutral – within media texts. She showed how the occurrence of positive and negative verbal processes in media texts could indicate bias on the part of a reporter towards the speaker. Working within what is known as appraisal theory, White (2006 p. 59) examined resources of evaluation by which broadsheet readers can be interpersonally aligned or disaligned towards attributed material. Similar to Chen, he categorised projecting causes as those which overtly indicate reporter endorsement or distancing from attributed material. But White (2006) also identified another sub-category in which the social standing or authority of the original source is such that it can effectively frame the attributed material as "Well-founded, reasonable or otherwise credible."

Of principal concern for this articles is the sub-category of projecting formulations defined here as giving the reporter a "neutral" and "objective" voice. Although notions of a "neutral" and "objective" projecting frames is a problematic one requiring more extended treatment at a later stage in this section, the verbal process said along with that of tell and describe has been widely cited from a range of researchers from a variety of linguistic backgrounds as the most neutral and unmarked that gives no indication of the reporter's attitude towards the reported

message, (Caldas-Coulthard, 1994). They are the "canonical neutral speech verbs." (Bell, 1991, p. 206). The advice to journalists on this point is clear:

> Among attributive verbs, said usually says it best. It's short, clear, neutral and unfailingly accurate, a verb for all seasons. (Associated Press Guide to News Writing, 1991, p. 73)
>
> The verb to say is usually the best, neutral choice in reporting a speech or statement. (Reuters Handbook for Journalists, 1992, p. 98)
>
> "Said" ... pegs a statement to a source unmistakably and unobtrusively. That is, readers are so used to seeing it they know it signals attribution, but it does not stand out and stop them. Their attention remains on what was said, not how it was said. To skilled news writers, it is the best attributive (Lorenz & Vivian, News Reporting and Writing, 1996, p. 122).

So from the reporter's perspective, the verb said is factual, objective and impersonal. However, this apparent objectivity itself can be used for persuasive ends in more subtle and effective ways than by more explicit semiotic resources. This study looks at how these projecting clauses which are commonly considered "neutral", can be subtly manipulated for framing attributive material whilst still remaining in the sphere of objectivity. It shows that reporters have the potential through the mechanisms of subtle prosodic realisation to position the reader to favour a particular value position on the "basis of what they [compliant readers] may take to be factual evidence (White, 2009, p. 48).

Aim

The subtle mechanisms of evaluation, which operate to position the reader to favour particular attitudes and viewpoints, are of particular importance for the analysis of hard news text and is of general interest to this paper. However, the main purpose of this paper is the deep exploration of the linguistic resources through which hard news reporters from three English-speaking countries construct a perception of objectively whilst employing subtle language items to align themselves with or against what has been quoted and recontextualised. That is to say, the communicative and rhetorical functionality by which reporters committed themselves towards the truthfulness or, to use Halliday's (1994) preferred term, "validity" of what others have to say. Attention is also paid to how language resources typically used to signal absence of commitment can be

covertly used for the creation of interpersonal relationships with potential recipients.

This paper is particularly interested in the mechanical functions of projecting clauses and their potential to invoke attitudinal alignment in readers and reveal the ideological stances of reporters. These attribution framers form the central components to Halliday's Transitivity System (1985) and described by Halliday as the crucial elements of the structure of text because, they function to introduce the representation of the "goings on" of reality. Chen (2005) explains that the system of projecting processes is particularly powerful for media analysis, because it is through choosing certain processes rather than others that the reporter is able to foreground certain meanings in discourse whilst backgrounding others, thus aligning the reader towards one sense of social reality rather than another. Although there are six categories of processes within the Transitivity System, this paper focuses on the ones which are used for the processes of projecting attributions. These are the elements of the clause which introduce speech and can reveal much about the recontextualisation mechanisms by which reporters go to work on readers' perceptions of reality. As Fowler points out (1991):

> In the papers, a large amount of report is based on speeches, statements, replies to questions and interviews. Critical analysis should pay particular attention to how what people say is transformed: there are clearly conventions for rendering speech newsworthy, for bestowing significance on it. (p. 231)

Others have extensively covered the linguistic mechanisms by which reporters encode attributed material (Chen, 2005; Floyd, 2000; Hyland, 1998; Thompson, 1996). However, this study posits to going beyond much of the current literature on projecting processes by focusing on what has traditionally been described as neutral attributional framers. Of particular concern is the ways in which these so called neutral mechanisms provide reporters with the linguistic resources to subtly indicate alignment or disalignments with the views contained within attributed material.

Theoretical background

The theoretical framework is influenced by the work of (Caldas-Couthard, 1994; Declerck, 1991; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Hornstein, 1991; Lundquist, 2004; Martin, 2000; McGregor, 1997; Thompson, 1996; Vandelanotte, 2004; White, 2002a). In particular this research framework draws inspiration from Halliday's (1978, 1994) semiotic theory and model of transitivity. It also borrows

extensively from White's (2001, 2002a) and Martin's (2004, 2000) model of appraisal and the sub-systems of engagement and attitude. As such, a multidisciplinary perspective is taken and combines an analysis of the linguistic, cognitive, social and cultural aspects of the news articles in context. There is a strong focus on describing and explaining the subtle ways that language is used to evaluate, to adopt stances, to construct textual personas and to manage interpersonal positioning and relations within the genre of objective hard news.

Before turning to an examination of the corpus and the various forms of neutral processes, it is important to briefly outline some of the key aspects of the account of evaluative meanings and engagement provided by the Appraisal framework and the Transitivity System, and how these accounts can be applied to analyses of attribution neutral framers operating in hard news reports.

The genre or register of hard news involves the reporter weaving projecting and projected clauses into the discourse as they quote and report from various sources and align and disalign themselves from what was said. From a Hallidayian perspective, the projecting clause can be seen as a semiotic object that represents non-linguistic experiences while projected clauses are representations of representations, and therefore function as semiotic abstractions. Here the Transitivity System is construing experiential meaning - "...transmission of ideas representing 'processes' or 'experiences': actions, events, processes of consciousness and relations" (Halliday, 1985, p. 53). Transitivity enables the linguist to analyse how, by choosing certain verb processes over others, the reporter is able to "foreground" certain meanings in discourse while others are "backgrounded", thus aligning the reader's perception of the meaning of attributive material in one direction rather than another. The system is particularly powerful for media analysis of attributive material because it takes into account not only how the "goings on" of reported speech themselves are ideologically represented in a text, but also the way in which the participants involved in those goings on are represented ideologically.

Halliday identified six categories of process within his System of Transitivity: These are material (i.e., processes of doing), mental (i.e., processes of sensing), verbal (i.e., processes of saying), behavioral (i.e., a mixture of material and mental), existential (i.e., being/existing), and relational (i.e., assigning attributes or identities). This paper focuses on just two, principally verbal processes or "processes of saying" such as "he said …" and to a lesser degree mental processes such as "he believes that …". In particularly, it focuses on a sub-category of verbal process identified by Chen (2004) and labelled as 'the neutral verbal processes. Chen (2007) points out that:

> Verbal processes are a particularly useful tool for the linguistic analysis of media texts because they are what Halliday calls predicates of

> communication. That is, they are the element of the clause by means of which the authors of a text introduce the speech of those they are reporting on. The verbal processes can thus reveal much about what a journalist feels about those whose words are deemed reportable; and also much about the way in which a journalist pushes the reader towards a certain view of that person. (p. 30)

The participants associated with this exchange of meaning are the Reporter (appraiser simultaneously of both the content of exchange and the voice projecting the content), the Sayer (the addresser), the Receiver (the reader), the Target (the entity that is targeted by the process of saying), and the Verbiage (the content of what is said or indicated). Verbal processes include all modes of expressing and indicating, even if they need not be verbal, such as “showing”. The content of what is said or indicated can be realised paratactically or hypotactically.

The System of Appraisal is located within the traditions of SFL but extends the framework by including the semantics of evaluation. Briefly, this means the categorisation of three broad sub-types of meaning by which attitudinal assessment may be conveyed: Judgement (semantic resources for evaluating human behaviour); Appreciation (evaluating things aesthetically) and Affect (evaluating emotions). It is also concerned with the engagement resources of intersubjective positioning. Each of these semantic resources can evaluate attitudinal and dialogical positioning in positive or negative terms and together “constitute an interconnected and interactive system of evaluation” (White, 1998, p. 107). Appraisal theory attends closely to the possibility that these attitudinal evaluations and engagement resources may be explicit (inscribed attitude) or implicit (invoked attitude) depending on the linguistic mechanisms that are used to frame the formations.

The Appraisal framework also provides a distinction between attribution formulations that are inscribed and those that are invoked. Under the Appraisal framework these distinctions determine the classification of verbal processes as either non-neutral or neutral framers. The former employ mechanisms which imply Reporter support for, or distancing from attributed material. In contrast, with the latter, formulations are seen as “neutral” in the sense that the Reporter leaves it open to the Receiver as to whether s/he are favourably or unfavourably disposed towards the Verbiage (White, 1998). Instances include “X told Y that...”; “X says that...”, and “X describes Y as...” (pp. 38-42). These processes have been widely cited from a range of researchers from a variety of linguistic backgrounds as the most neutral and unmarked that give no indication of the reporter's attitude towards the reported message, (Caldas-Coulthard, 1994; Chen, 2005).

However, the apparent objectivity of neutral verbal clauses can be used for persuasive ends in more subtle and effective ways than by explicit semiotic and linguistic resources. Strictly speaking, even the most interpersonally neutral utterance is interpersonally charged in that a degree of tension exists between utterances made and alternative and contradictory views. This paper now examines the ways in which these canonical neutral attribution framers can subtly function to dialogically position Receivers.

Corpus and Methodology

Six media publications from The United States, Great Britain and Australia were analysed. The newspapers were: *Australian*, *Melbourne Age*, *Times*, *Guardian*, *Wall Street Journal* and *New York Times*. These are some of the longest-established broadsheets published and arguably some of the most influential papers within English speaking countries. These were analysed quantitatively using Simple Concordance and Weft QDA Programs. Individual instances of attribution framers were then qualitatively analysed in some detail in the context of the article in which they occurred to tease out the subjective elements of hard news texts; what they might reveal about the attitude of reporters towards the validity of those whose words were being recontexualised and the way in which the reporter might be trying to dialogically align the reader's perception of a text and of the textual participants in a certain direction. The analysis also sheds light on the ways that reporters can covertly encode a particular world view of attributed wordings and thus subtly push the reader's perception of social reality in a particular direction.

The 480 article corpus was assembled from the register of traditional hard news-news about the government, military, domestic policy, and foreign policy in the three months leading up to the second Iraq war. The texts shared the same Field, Tenor and Mode. That is, all the texts are from the register of 'hard news', the news items that make use of linguistic devices which signal factuality excluding any overt commitment to extra-vocalised utterances, and which allows the authorial voice to remain absent from the surface of the text (Iedema et al., 1994). Iedema et al. (1994) observe that with objective hard news articles there are no authorial values or explicit judgements. Hence when compared, therefore, "with journalistic commentary and many other types of texts, it [they] appear[s] to put significantly fewer interpersonal values at risk and hence is not felt to position the reader emotionally or attitudinally." (White, 1997, p. 25). Any explicit judgements that are included are located in the quoted statements of external voices.

Textual Integration: Reporting versus Quoting

One of the main mechanisms in which embedded attributions may be interpersonally manipulated is, of course, through reporting verbs. But, there are other ways for Reporters to indicate alignment or disalignment with the views contained in attributed material. One of the most subtle is through utilising the semantic distinctions that exist between the parataxis form of reporting speech and hypotaxis form of quoting speech. In Extract 1, the utterance is projected through a paratactical verbal clause, whilst a hypotactic arrangement was chosen in Extract 2. It is important to ask what, if any, degree of difference do these degrees of assimilation have on the neutrality of a clause giving that they have both been projected by the same neutral verbal process:

> Extract 1:
> He said Iraq had deployed rocket-launchers and warheads containing biological agents, which had been hidden in palm groves, to sites in western Iraq and had created biological weapons factories in lorries and railway carriages
> (James Bone, "US makes the case for war", *The Times*, 2 February 2003)
>
> Extract 2:
>
> Ari Fleischer, the White House spokesman, said yesterday that the tubes "far exceed any specifications required for non-nuclear capabilities".
> (Roland Watson and Elaine Monaghan, "Us says aluminium tubes are evidence of Iraq's nuclear goal", *Times*, 31 January 2003)

Looking at it from a functional perspective, it is possible to see with Extract 2, "…one clause is set up as the linguistic content of another" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 443). In other words, this kind of projecting consists of "…a phenomenon – the projecting clause – and a metaphenomenon – the "content of the projecting clause…" - the content of the projected clause represents a close proximity of the attributed source (Halliday, 1994, p. 453). With Extract 1, on the other hand, the hypotactic representation of the verbal event is a reflection of the "gist of the meaning" – the distinction between the original utterance and Reporter's voice has been blurred[2] (Halliday, 1994, p. 454).

So, from a functional perspective, patterns of direct speech discourse introduce voices and wordings, whilst patterns of indirect speech interpolate meanings[3]. It then has to be asked what effect this has on the intertextual positioning of the two extracts. It is true that the two sets of complex clauses belong to the neutral category. Yet, looking at the issue more closely, it does seem that whilst quoted wording indicates a higher degree of faithfulness to the content of the projecting clause, it also distances the Reporter from the language, highlighted by the quotation marks, by making clear that the words are sourced. This detachment may be sought for a number of reasons including dissociation from the validity of the original utterance or from the Sayer (source) of the projecting clause[4] (Thompson, 1996).

> Extract 3:
> President Bush said today that even if Iraq agreed to destroy all of its prohibited missiles, they are "'just the tip of the iceberg" in its illegal arsenal and that Saddam Hussein had no intention of disarming. (Elisabeth Bumiller, "Threats and responses: The President; prohibited missile is 'tip of iceberg' in Iraq", Bush says, *New York Times*, 23 February 2003)

This technique of distancing is also evident in Extract 3. Here, there is also a neutral verbal process of "said", acting as the projecting clause. But instead of being a straightforward paratactical or hypotactic structure, it combines features of quoting and reporting. The projected clause is set up as a reported clause introduced by the binder "that". But quoting is introduced part way through the projected clause. This use of quotation marks does make the language, in this case a metaphorical catchphrase "more immediate and lifelike" but it also gives it an independent status and functions to distance the Reporter from the source (Thompson, 1996, p. 513).

> Extract 4:
> Security Council, Secretary of State Colin L. Powell said Iraq: Had engaged in a systematic and sustained effort to deceive United Nations weapons inspectors and to hide prohibited weapons and equipment. "'Harbors a deadly terrorist network, headed by Abu Musaab al-Zarqawi, an associate and collaborator of Osama bin Laden and his Al Qaeda lieutenants." Had moved and evacuated materials from nearly 30 chemical weapons and other munitions sites using cranes and truck convoys before inspectors arrived
> (Steven R. Weisman, Power in U.N. speech, presents case to show Iraq has not disarmed, *New York Times*, 6 February 2003)

Conversely this grounding in the words of external sources rather than those of the reporter themselves, may be to give an air of general interpersonal neutrality to a hard news report. For instance, with, Extract 4, the projecting is carried through by the neutral verb *said* and is once again a combination of quoting and reporting. But here the quoted utterance contains explicit lexical items *Harbors a deadly terrorist network* which evokes negative moral judgement. This type of "scare quote" is obviously capable of engaging the reader emotionally in the text, but because the description is an attributed one it can function without "... damaging the author's mask of interpersonal neutrality"[5] (White, 2005, p. 10).

Verb Tense

Following from what Declerk (1991), Halliday and Matthieson (2004) and Van Leeuwen (1993) have observed, tense also plays a critical role in epistemic meaning and thus intertextual positioning of text. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) explain:

> The finite element, as its name implies, has the function of making the proposition finite. That is to say, it circumscribes it; it brings the proposition down to earth, so that it is something that can be argued about. A good way to make something arguable is to give it a point of reference in the here and now; and this is what the finite does. It relates the proposition to its context in the speech event. (p. 115)

This can be done two ways. One is by reference to the time of speaking; the other by reference to the judgement of the speaker (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 115).

It is this selection of tense that relates directly to the deictic centres of the external textual voice and Reporter and this in turn reflects the reporter's commitment to the recontextualised utterance. That is to say, with any form of discourse reporting, temporal recontextualisation renders different interpretations of the speech or thought act.

What is of critical importance, and with this, the researcher's views converge with those of Vandelanotte (2004, p. 1), is that the original Sayer textual voice deictic centre needs to be given high importance when analysing the connection between tense choice and the intertextual positioning of propositions. This is particularly true when considering direct speech when the projected utterance relates directly to the external textual voice's, not

Reporter's deictic centre. But even with indirect speech, the secondary deictic centre is tied up to that of the external textual voice.

The distinction between the present and recontextualised speech situation (McGregor 1997, p. 252) is fundamental and needs to be kept in mind when dealing with any form of speech attribution. Logically, any utterance that a Reporter recontextualises is something that has already been said. The temporal domains of an utterance being made and an utterance being recontextualised are distinct from one another. However, the simple present tense in English is atemporal, in that in addition to present events, it can also express future and past events, habits or generalisation, (an extended now) as well as occur in "a more 'relational' sense of 'expresses the opinion that" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 254).

Extract 5:

Dr Labib Kamhawi, a leading Palestinian-born political commentator in Jordan, says the situation is entirely different from 1991, when five Arab regimes and many Arab people saw the justice of actively joining the war to free Kuwait.

"Now people think if the US invades Iraq the whole region will be held to ransom and its future dictated by an outside power," he says.
(Ed O'Loughlin**,** "Caught in the middle of war", *Age*, 4 March 2003)

Extract 5 is a case in point of an utterance being projected by an atemporal present tense with universal reference even though the original speech act was obviously committed in the past. The employment of the present tense in the projection of both the leading and subsequent paragraphs gives a sense of "here and now" or "recency" to the attributed messages; thus bridging the gap between the temporal domains of the external textual voice (Sayer) and Reporter and by association the audience (Receiver).

This temporal positioning of the text in the "here and now" is further enhanced by the projected clauses. In the case of the leading paragraph there is a mixing of past and present tenses within the projected clauses which function to contrast the temporal domains of what is happening now to what happened in the past. With the second sentence, the projecting clause is in the simple present tense; but here it is also the lexico-grammatical realization of a time adjunct working in conjunction with the primary present tense "mirror concord" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 343). "Now people think" which firmly positions the recontextualised statement in the here and now deictic centre of the Reporter/Receiver - even though the projected clause is in the

hypothetical future. As a result, the deictic centres of the former and latter are blended into the same temporal domains.

> Extract 6:
> President Bush said that Iraq's weapons declaration showed Saddam Hussein was not serious about disarmament and marked “a disappointing day for those who long for peace”.
>
> “We expected him to show that he would disarm and ... it's a long way from there,” the President said. “We're serious about keeping the peace. We are serious about working with our friends in the UN.” (Sandra Sobieraj, “Iraq filing ‘a long way’ from truth”, *Times*, 20 December, 2002)

In contrast, the use of *said* as the reporting verb in Extract 6 firmly situates the temporal domain in the external textual voice’s and Reporter's past. Looking at the first direct speech clause, it is clear that the external textual voices time of interference coincides with the temporal location of *said* on the reporter’s temporal domain. This is in keeping with the observation of Vandelanotte (2004, p. 9) that direct speech or thought is characterised by the“... absolute tense across both component clauses, with the reported tense being related directly to the external textual voice original t (time).” What is notable is the movement to the progressive aspect in the final clausal group. Unlike traditional modality that focuses on speaker or writer authority (Fairclough, 1989, p. 1126), the progressive aspect focuses on time. However, by looking at the two sentences more closely, it is possible to see that the use of the progressive aspect is also covering the quoted material with a coat of ambiguity by not providing exact reference to the start or completion of the activity, even though we know that logically speaking direct speech is located in the external textual voice’s deictic centre. This sense of temporal ambiguity is further heightened by the omission of a projecting clause and associated reporting verb that normally would provide temporal location. The text is comprehensible, because the readers make the logical connection with the temporal domains and external textual voice of the preceding clauses that ensures that the processes are correctly decoded, in spite of the manipulation and shift of deictic centres.

> Extract 7:
> Jack Allinson kicks off proceedings by saying that terrorist attacks will continue regardless of whether or not we go to war.
> (John Crace, “Question of war”, *Guardian*, 4 February 2003)

Extract 8:
John Reid, the Labour party chairman, took the marchers head on, saying they recommended doing nothing, and that such a moral choice meant sustaining a status quo "under which there are people being murdered, tortured and dying and starving".
(Ewen MacAskill and Michael White, "Blair to defy anti-war protests", *Guardian*, 17 Feb. 2003)

Extract 9:
In his annual state of the union address, the president set out the case against Iraq, saying there was no evidence Saddam Hussein had destroyed his weapons of mass destruction and emphasising the threat he could pass them on to terrorists.
(Julian Borger and Ewen MacAskill, "Bush: new al-Qaida link to Iraq", *Guardian*, 29 February 2003)

A sense of ambiguity continues when the three Extracts 7, 8 and 9, that also have progressive aspects, are considered. Here the progressive aspects are functioning as a circumstance of manner within projecting clauses. This process consists of two activities, one of projecting the recontextualised utterances and the other of describing how (the means) the Actor accomplished certain material processes (*kicks off, proceedings etc*.) Here the dual functions of expansion and projection have come to meet and overlap.

What this means in a temporal sense is that by making the verbal process part of a propositional phrase there is an avoidance of tense. Although the temporal deictic centre of the external textual voices is in fact tied up with the tense of the phrasal verb, the employment of a non-finite verbal process within a prepositional phrase allows the juxtaposition of tenses and shifting of deictic centre from the external textual voices already established domain to the establishment of new ones without being considered marked for tense.

Extract 10:
But Mr Straw, coming at the issue from a different direction, will say that terrorist groups could in future secure biological, chemical or nuclear weapons from rogue states.
(Staff and agencies "Weapons inspectors denounce spying claims", *Guardian*, 6 January 2003)

In Extract 10 the neutral verbal process of *say* is reformatted as a primary future tense and positioned after a contrastive *but*. However, the finiteness is realised by the positive verbal operator *will*. According to Halliday (1994) this finite element can act either as a modal or temporal operator. Hornstein (1991) continues this observation by claiming that *will* as future tense acts quite differently from modal *will* " (p. 38). However, it is obvious, in this example, that although the finite element is projecting the proposition into the future, it is also construing a region of uncertainty of this speech act occurring; the Reporter is making a prediction/assumption that the external textual voice would say this. As Lyons (1977) points out, "Futurity is never a purely temporal concept; it necessarily includes an element of prediction or some related notions" (p.677) It is worth noting that *will* can be replaced by other modal operators, such as *may* or *might* which would result in a loss of certainty but not of futurity. Thus with Extract 10, the finite element is giving the clause a point of reference both in terms of locating the temporal domain and opening the semantic space of uncertainty.

It is somewhat difficult to analyse how the tense selection *to say* exactly affects the validity of recontextualised propositions. Wolfson (1982) experienced the same problem in determining the alternation between "says" and "said" in spoken language, going on to say that they seem to be an anomaly. This is essentially an admission that these lexical items have lost their distinctive meaning in tense through overuse. The issue becomes even cloudier when you consider the difference between direct and indirect projection and the juxtaposition of different tenses. Language is about semiotic choices, and especially with written language there is time for reflection on what tense options would best suit the Reporters aims to be neutral or to interpersonally align the reader to some degree.

According to Van Leeuwen, (1996, p. 400) this is most readily observable in the projecting clause; highly credible utterances are projected through the present tense, whilst less credible texts are projected through past or future tenses. Thus, by looking at the primary tenses it is possible to see "what was" may no longer be the case, and what will be may not happen, whilst "what is" is. This is a somewhat simplistic reading of the issue when taking into account the juxtaposition of tenses that can occur within a projecting and projected clause complex. Neither does this take into account that tense in recontextualised speech or thought utterances is fundamentally different from tense in non-reported clause complex (Vandelanotte, 2004, p.14).

There is some validity in what Van Leeuwen claims, and this can be observed by looking at the ideational and interpersonal function of present and past tenses. The domain "said" is situated in the reporter's past time and

functions ideationally by specifying the temporal context of the projected clause (cf. McCarthy 1998, p. 94). Interpersonally, as Vandelanotte (2004, p. 14) points out, the absolute past tense in the projecting clause tends to function to downplay the reporter's involvement or level of commitment in the projected proposition by clarifying that the external textual voice´s deictic centre is temporally and spatially distinct from the reporter's.

However, the selection of the atemporal present tense "says" in the projecting clause functions ideationally to remove the projected proposition from a time perspective. This lack of what is in essence a reference to a specific time also functions interpersonally to close down the arguability of the projected clause (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) conceding them the status of facts and indisputable truths. This is not to say that the projected clause is awarded positive status, rather it is being communicated as an objective truth (Vandelanotte, 2004, p. 12). In other words, the aim is to persuade readers of the validity of propositions in an objective rather than a subjective manner.

The lack of a finite element in the progressive aspects (functioning as a circumstance of manner) can also be seen to be operating ideationally and interpersonally in a similar manner. By itself, the progressive aspect introduces strategic ambiguity by not providing exact reference to the start or completion of an activity, but the removal of finite tense and conversion into a gerund adds an extra layer of temporal ambiguity and thus removes the arguability potential of the projected clause. In contrast, the operator *will* is both temporal and modal. Ideationally it is giving it "a point of reference to the context of the speech event" which, in itself, is a manipulation of time in order to report on events that have yet to happen (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.115). Interpersonally, this then opens up the dialogical space or arguability of the projected clause on two fronts, that of reference to occurrence and that of reference to semantic content. This finding is in alignment by a number of linguistic researchers (see, for example, Pomerantz, 1984, or Hutchby, 1996a, 1996b) who argue that in conversation said can also be used to convey some distance between the speaker and the claim being reported.

Neutral Cognitive Reporting Verbs

> Extract 11:
> The diplomats believe the Bush administration is further radicalising Arab and Muslim opinion with its emphasis on military might against the long-term interests of the west. Many also share the view of the security and intelligence agencies that the al-Qaida terrorist network

represents a more serious threat than Iraq and that there is no evidence of a link between the two.
(Richard Norton-Taylor, "Envoys called home for Iraq talks", Guardian, 3 January 2003)

Verbal processes were not the only forms of projection found in the corpora. The reporting verb in Extract 11 is also a neutral verb; but it is not projecting a locution, rather representation of expert's opinion is being projected. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 449) describe this as the projection of ideas. That is the projecting clause is a mental process clause functioning to project meaning. This type of mental process clause belongs to the field of cognitive verbs. These in turn can be finely graded for epistemic modality, from "know", via "think" to "believe" and "guess". As such Extract 11 is an example of low modality and comes under the classification of non-factitive. That is, the verb gives no clear signal as to the reporter's attitude towards the original textual voice's opinion. Another semiotic option for the reporter would have been to use the mental verbs such as guess or know but the former, whilst also a non-factive verb, would be too low in modality indicating a negative stance; and the latter comes within the category of factice verb – thus proclaiming the validity of the recontextualised utterance.

But no recontextualised utterance is completely free of subjective baggage: The hypotactic projection of the represented utterance in Extract 11 means that reference to the Sensor remains reporter-related (Vandelanotte, 2004, p. 2). Thus, it is the reporter's choice of which process and which tense to use for projection. The selection of unmarked present tense indicates that the reporter subscribes to the content of the represented clause as factual information - albeit in an objective neutral manner (Declerck & Tanaka, 1996).

Extract 12:
Angela Tsang, 21, a Barnard College student who was part of a contingent called the Columbia University Antiwar Coalition, said her group believed that an American attack on Iraq would achieve nothing but death and injustice. "'We see the war against Iraq as unjust," she said. "We don't believe Bush's rhetoric. I think he's not acting in the best interest of the American people. We're risking the lives of hundreds of American soldiers and an untold number of lives in the Middle East, and a war will not solve the problem of terrorism. It disgusts me. I can't accept that."
(Robert D McFadden, "From New York to Melbourne, protest against war on Iraq", *New York Times,* 16 February 2003)

It is necessary to then ask what happens when the thought projection clause is itself projected by a verbal process as the case in Extract 12. To see how this double projection is behaving on a deeper level, it is important to understand "When something is projected as meaning it has already been processed by the linguistic system" this is opposed to direct quotation where "... a phenomenon of experience is construed first as a meaning and then in turn as a wording" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 451). Thus, Extract 12 has been reconstructed lexicogrammatically, even though there was the semiotic option of being presented semantically as meaning. To use the words of Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) "A wording is, as it were, twice cooked…" in that it has "…undergone two steps in the realization process" (pp. 451-452) – meaning deictic orientation of the projecting clause shifts to the external textual voice[6]Interpersonally, this spatial element, along with temporal coordinates of tense, is functioning to distance the reporter's deictic centre from that of the external textual voice. In this case projecting clause and tense selection are making clear that it is the original textual voice, not the reporter, who is grounding the projecting clause and proposition in his own individual, contingent subjecthood.

Other Neutral Reporting Verbs

A fairly limited range of non-factual reporting verbs can be pressed into service under this last heading. It is clear that *say* is by far the most frequent choice. The next most frequently used verb is the neutral projecting verbal process: tell. In neutral quoting "tell" is used less frequently than "say". This may be attributed to the latter requiring a Receiver, the one to whom the message is directed. This in turn dictates that the reporter needs to specify the target of the message. Additionally, with the projection of a giving proposition, stylist convention in the register of hard news demands that tense selection is limited to past tense or other tense selection requiring the placement of a modal element – the selection of simple present or present in present would be considered marked for tense.

> Extract 13:
> He told the Nine Network's Sunday program that he would tell the Labor caucus tomorrow that the party should oppose war unless it has outright approval from the Security Council. This approach would be more militant than Labor's previous position, which reserved the right to support a war even if one of the Security Council members exercised a veto.

(Annabel Crabb, Peter Fray & Marian Wilkinson, “Divisions on eve of war”, *Age*, 17 March 2003)

In Extract 13, the Target is identified as an institution *Nine Network's Sunday program* and the projecting process is realised by the past tense *told.* Here, use of the verbal process “tells” is clearly functioning to inform the audience who made the speech act and to whom. It is, in this case, functioning ideationally to provide context of situation; the where and to whom the utterance was directed; but it could also be viewed, somewhat tentatively, as a spatial distancing device, the reporter is making clear that the original utterance was not directed to him/her.

Another significant way of projecting is when an external textual voice is identified by their name (or social role or any other label) followed by a colon, introducing what is seemingly the news actor’s verbal comment instead of a reporting verb as can be seen in Extract 14.

Extract 14:
Senator ROD KEMP, Minister for the Arts and Sport (Vic, Liberal): " A monstrous evil exists in Iraq and it deserves every action to be taken by the international community to deal with it. The Labor Party must recognise that there are national interests beyond those of a bitter and divided party." (Gay Alcorn, “Labor MPs declare opposition to war”, *Age*, 6 February 2003)

The colon has essentially the same function as the verbal process “says” but its use enables the focus to be on the semantic content of projected proposal itself, rather than meaning being shared by the reporting verb.

There are also other neutral verbs projecting more elaborate language functions.

Extract 15:
Yesterday, Mr Fleischer was asked about the President repeatedly citing Saddam Hussein's gassing of the Kurds as evidence of his place in the axis of evil. "He gassed his own people with our help," said one reporter. Mr Fleischer replied: "He gassed his own people as a result of his decisions to use the weapons to gas (them). (Marian Wilkinson, “White House refuses to rule out, but is unlikely to use, its ultimate weapon”, *Age*, 29 January 2003)

Extract 16:

But, like many Americans, they have reservations about the Bush administration's position on Iraq. "Is it right to go into Iraq?" Mr. Goodwin asked. "I really don't know yet." (Lynette Clemetson, “Threats and Responses: In uniform; to child of Vietnam dissenters, recent call to arms ring true”, *New York Times*, 2 February 2003)

The study now looks at other neutral verbs projecting more elaborate language functions. In Extract 15, the verbal process “replied” is used to show how the external textual voice (a political voice) opposed/rejected the preceding assertive proposition. Extract 16 demonstrates how projecting verbs can set-up a proposal, in this case a rhetorical type question that is subsequently renounced by the same external voice. Here propositions and proposals are opposed, renounced and rejected. The contribution to the creation of discourse is further enhanced by the fact that such processes of projection contribute to the discourse by creating mini-dialogues of argumentation within the text. This rhetorical function clearly would not be achievable with the more general projecting verbs of “say” or “tell”.

Discussion

This paper has looked at the use of “so called” neutral projecting processes in a corpus of 480 article corpus assembled from the register of traditional hard news-news about the government, military, domestic policy, and foreign policy in the three months leading up to the second Iraq war. Analysis of the corpus of texts made it possible to identify a number of subtle but often overlapping linguistic mechanisms for interpersonal and temporal positioning.

These were:

1. The parataxis form of reporting speech and hypotaxis form of quoting speech were used by Reporters to subtly align or disalign themselves with what was being recontextualised. The study shows that the paraphrasing of reporting speech makes it possible for the reporter to covertly distance themselves from attributed material. As Halliday et al (2004, p. 462) notes “the quoted material is closest to the reporter’s news source whereas the reported material is already, at least potentially, at some distance from what was actually said.” This hold true even when neutral projecting verbs are employed. It, however, must be remember that with news articles, “reporting often precedes quoting” as the reporter moves along a cline from their own voices to reported voices to quoted voices (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004, p. 462).

2. Verb tense also plays a critical role in epistemic meaning and thus interpersonal positioning of readers. The selection of verb tense signals the "recency" of the attributed messages with past tenses signalling a distance in the 'here and now' whilst present tenses highlights the current relevance of what was quoted. Additionally, the selection of the atemporal present tense functions ideationally to remove the projected proposition from a time perspective. This lack of what is in essence a reference to a specific time also functions interpersonally to close down the arguability of the projected clause (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

3. The progressive aspect introduces strategic ambiguity by not providing exact reference to the start or completion of an activity. The removal of finite tense and conversion into a gerund adds an extra layer of temporal ambiguity and thus interpersonally removes the arguability potential of the projected clause (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

4. Mental projecting processes, which were used by the reporters to project ideas. This type of mental process clause belongs to the field of cognitive verbs and can function to distance the reporter's deictic centre from that of the external textual voice by presenting the attributed material as an idea rather than more concretely as a locution. This suggest that the reporter is presenting the proposition as a personal belief rather than as factual information. Interpersonally, this can be viewed as a disalignment mechanism in which the reporter is clarifying that the information is an opinion.

5. The verbal process "tells" functions to inform the audience who made the speech act and to whom it was made. It can function ideationally to provide context of situation; the where and to whom the utterance was directed; but it could also be viewed interpersonally, somewhat tentatively, as a spatial distancing device, the reporter is making clear that the original utterance was not directed to him/her but was in fact said to somebody else.

6. Structuring verbs: these processes of projection contribute to the discourse by opening discursive space for mini-dialogues of argumentation within the text. Opening up discursive space for heteroglossic diversity would not be so achievable with the more general projecting verbs of say or tell.

Conclusion

In broad terms the finding from this study further undermine the notion of "objectivity" as it is typically construed in everyday discussions of hard news media practice. While these forms of media practice serve as an effective source of information and powerful mode of mass communication, traditional notions of objectivity can be refuted even when the reporter's subjective voice and authorial attitude has been deliberately and strategically backgrounded and made less salient. Indeed, the findings suggest that all hard news texts as with other forms of media are in some way subjective; conditioned extrinsically by institutional practices and expectations and intrinsically by the reporter's own ideological position and communicative objectives.

Specifically, this study found that notions of objectivity and neutrality are indeed idealistic concepts that can never be fully realised on linguist or semantic grounds. This is true for attributed sources and, as has been shown by other studies, propositions and points of view (Nunn & Nunn, 2006; White, 2001). In fact, the findings identify the ways in which language items traditionally classified as neutral projections can be manipulated whilst still remaining in the sphere of objectivity. The reporter still has subtle means to imply how much responsibility he or she lends to truth value of the attributed message. This does not mean that it is not possible to distinguish between media attempts to be fair or deliberately biased or even determine the linguistic decisions that are taken purely on stylistic grounds, but it does explain the major challenge of identifying the way ideologies are embodied in media texts.

This study, of course, does not reach specific conclusions about the power of neutral frames which are covertly attitudinal to influence or change the beliefs, understandings and attitudes of readers. It is clear, however, that the potential effect of media power is, not of texts or covert linguistic devices operating in isolation, but rather of accumulation of media discourses, operating in conjunction with others. Indeed at the very least, linguistic manipulation of this type have the potential to reinforce the value systems views of readers who already support the ideological position being subtly favoured by the reporter.

References

Bakhtin, M. (1981). The dialogic imagination (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.) In M. Holquist (Ed.), *Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (pp.270-434). Austin: University of Austin Press. Retrieved November 28, 2012, http://www.public.iastate.edu/~carlos/607/readings/bakhtin.pdf

Banfield, A. (1982). *Unspeakable sentence. Narration and representation in the language of fiction*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bell, A. (1991) *The language of news media*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bell, P., & van Leeuwen, T. (1994) *The media interview: Confession, contest, conversation*. Kensington, N.S.W.: University of New South Wales Press.

Boukes, M., & Boomgaarden, H. (2012, Feb) Politicians appearing in talk shows and political cynicism: An experimental study of the effects of infotainment. *Leuven*, 9-10.

Butt, D., Lukin, A., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004) Grammar - the first covert operation of war. *Discourse & Society,* 15(2-3), 267-290.

Caldas-Coulthard, C. R. (1993). From discourse analysis to critical discourse analysis: The differential re-presentation of women and men speaking in written news. In J. Sinclair, M. Hoey, & G. Fox (Eds.), *Techniques of description: Spoken and written discourse* (pp. 96–208). London: Routledge

Caldas-Couthard, C (1987) Reporting Speech in narrative written texts. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Discussing discourse* (pp 149-167), Discourse Analysis Monographs 14, English Language Research, University of Birmingham.

Caldas-Couthard, C. (1994). On reporting reporting: The representation of speech in factual and factional narratives. In Coulthard, M. (Ed.), *Advances in written text analysis* (pp. 295–309). London/New York: Routledge.

Cappon, R. J. (1982). *The word: An Associated Press guide to good news writing*. New York: Associated Press.

Catenaccio, P. (2008). Press releases as a hybrid genre: Addressing the informative/promotional conundrum pragmatics. *International Pragmatics Association, 18*, 19-31.

Chen, L. (2005, Jan.) Transitivity in Media Texts: negative verbal process sub-functions and narrator bias. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Teaching, 43*(1), 33–51.

Chen, L. (2007) Analysing attitude: Ppositive verbal process sub-functions and media bias. *RASK, an International Journal of Language and Communication, 25*, 25-55.

Chilton, P. (1994). La plaie qu'il convient de fermer...': les métaphores du discours raciste (The plague that needs to be stopped... : The metaphors of racist discourse). *Journal of Pragmatics, 21*, 583-619.

Clark, H., & Gerrig, R. (1990). Quotations as demonstrations. *Language,* 66 (4), 764-805.

Cottle, S (2003) Media organisation and production: Mapping the field. In S. Cottle (Ed.), *Media organisation and production,* (pp. 2-24). London: Sage Publications.

Davis, H. H. (1985) Discourse and media influence. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse and communication: New approaches to the analysis of mass media discourse and communication* (pp. 44–59). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Declerck, R., & Tanaka, K (1996) Constraints on tense choice in reported speech. *Studia Linguistica, 50*, 3.
Declerck, Renaat (1991) *Tense in English: Its structure and use in discourse*. London: Routledge.
Fairclough, N. (1988) Discourse representation in media discourse, *Sociolinguistics, 17*(2), 125-139.
Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and power*. London: Longman.
Fairclough, N. *(1995) Media discourse*. London; New York: E. Arnold.
Floyd A. (2000). The reporting verbs and bias in the press *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, 13*, 43-52.
Fludernik, M. (1993). *The fictions of language and the languages of fiction.* London: Routledge.
Fowler, R. (1987). The intervention of the media in the reproduction of power. In I. M. Zavala, T. A. van Dijk, & D. M. Diaz (Eds), *Approaches to discourse, poetics and psychiatry* (pp. 67-80). Amsterdam Benjamins,
Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news*. London: Routledge.
Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control*. London: Routledge.
Gamson, W. A. (2002). How storytelling can be empowering. In K. Cerulo (Ed.), *Culture in mind: Toward a sociology of culture and cognition* (pp. 187-198). New York: Routledge.
Geis, M. L. (1987). *The language of politics*. New York: Springer.
Glasgow University Media Group. (1980). *More bad news.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
Halliday, M. A. K. (1978a). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
Halliday, M. A. K. (1985) [2nd ed.n 1994]. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *Introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
Hornstein, N. (1991). *As time goes by: Tense and universal grammar.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Hutchby, I. (1996a). *Confronting talk: Arguments, asymmetries and power on talk radio.* Hillsdale, N.J: Erlbaum.
Hutchby, I. (1996b). Power in discourse: The case of arguments on talk radio. *Discourse and Society, 7*, 161–179.
Hyland K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. John Benjamins B.V., Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Iedema, R., Feez, S., & . White, P. R. R. (1994) *Media literacy*. Sydney, Australia: Disadvantaged Schools Program, NSW Department of School Education.

Jacobs, G. (1999a). *Preformulating the news: An analysis of the metapragmatics of press releases.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Jacobs, G. (1999b) .Self-reference in press releases. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 219-242.

Jukanen, L. (1995). *Features of discourse in foreign news*. Unpublished master's thesis. Tamere University, Tampere, Finland

Kress, G. (1985). Ideological structures in discourse. In van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Discourse analysis in society,* (pp. 27-42). London: Academic press

Kuo, S. (2007). Language as ideology analyzing quotations in Taiwanese news. *Discourse Journal of Asian Pacific Communication. 17*(2), 281–301.

Lorenz, L., & Vivian, J. (1996). *News reporting and writing.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Lundquist, L. (1989). Argumentative text structure: A procedural model. In M. Charolles (Ed.), *The resolution of discourse*, Papers in Textlinguistics (22-39), vol. 54, Helmut Buske Verlag, Hamburg.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, J. R. (2000). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunton, & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in Text* (pp. 142–175). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. R. (2004). Mourning: How we get aligned. *Discourse & Society. 15*(2-3), 321- 344.

Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1991). Language on language: The grammar of semiosis. *Social Semiotics, 1*(2), 69-111.

McCarthy, M. (1998) *Spoken language and applied linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGregor, W. (1997). *Semiotic grammar.* Oxford: Clarendon Press

Nunn, R., & Nunn, F. (2006, Nov). Teaching language and research skills through an international media project. *Asian ESP Journal*. *2*(2). Retrieved November 28, 2011, http://asian-esp-journal.com/journal-index/author-index/193-nunn-roger-nunn-francoise-teaching-language-and-research-skills-through-an-international-media-project

Ochi A. (2006). *The reporter's voice in hard news reports in English and Japanese – Views from context, semantics, and lexicogrammar.* Proceedings 33rd International Systemic Functional Congress (pp.763-774). PUCSP, São Paulo, Brazil. Retrieved November 28, 2011http://www.pucsp.br/isfc/proceedings/Artigos%20pdf/36n_ochi_763a774.pdf

Parmentier, R. (1993). The political function of reported speech: A Belauan example. In J. Lucy (Ed.), *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics* (pp. 261-286). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patterson, T. E. (2000) *Doing well and doing good: How soft news and critical journalism are shrinking the news audience and weakening democracy - and what news outlets can do about it*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Harvard University, Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy. Research Working Paper 01-001.

Politis P., & Kakavoulia, M. (2005). Direct discourse in the Greek press: From evidentiality and subjectivity. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, 19,* 345-36. Retrieved November 28, http://rua.ua.es/dspace/bitstream/10045/5204/1/RAEI_19_19.pdf

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rodríguez, M. J. G. (2006*).* Tracing context in the discourse of the media: Features of language-in-use in the British Press. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses.* 19, 149-168. Retrieved November 28, http://rua.ua.es/dspace/bitstream/10045/5174/1/RAEI_19_09.pdf

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Schudson, M. (1989) How culture works. Perspectives from Media studies on the efficacy of symbols. *Theory on Society, 18*(2), 153-180.

Short, M. (1988). Speech presentation, the novel and the press. In W. van Peer (Ed.), *The taming of the text* (pp. 61–81). London: Routledge.

Sleurs, K., & Jacobs, G. (2005). Beyond preformulation: An ethnographic perspective on press releases. *Journal of Pragmatics, 37,* 1251-1273.

Teo, P. (2000). Racism in the news: A critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australia newspapers. *Discourse & Society, 11*(1), 7–49.

Thompson, G. (1996). Voices in the text: Discourse perspectives on language reports. *Applied Linguistics, 17*(2,501-530.

Tuchman, G. (2002), The production of news. In K. B. Jensen (Ed.), *A handbook of media and communication research. Qualitative and quantitative methodologies* (pp. 79-92) London: Routledge. Retrieved November 28, 2013 http://www.rasaneh.org/Images/News/AtachFile/16-11-1390/FILE634640305123552500.pdf

Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructure.s* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the press: critical studies in racism and migration.* London: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). *Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity.* In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *The representation of social actors.* In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32-70) London: Routledge.

Vandelanotte, L. (2004). Deixis and grounding in speech and thought representation. *Journal of Pragmatics,36*(3), 489-520.

White, P. (n. d.). *Appraisal: An overview.* Retrieved November 21, 2012, from http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide/Framed/Frame.htm

White, P. (2006). Evaluative semantics and ideological positioning in journalistic discourse – a new framework for analysis. In I. Lassen (Ed.) *Mediating ideology in text and image: Ten critical studies* (pp. 37-69). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.White, P. (1998). *Telling media tales*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sydney. Retrieved November 18, 2012, from http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal.

White, P. (2002a). *Appraisal: The language of attitudinal evaluation and intersubjective stance.* Retrieved November 20, 2012, http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal.

White, P. (2009). Media power and the rhetorical potential of the “hard news” report – attitudinal mechanisms in journalistic discourse. *Käännösteoria, ammattikielet ja monikielisyys. VAKKI:n julkaisut, 36*, 30–49.

White, P. (1997). *Death, disruption and the moral order: The narrative impulse in mass media 'hard news' reporting.* In F. Christie & M. James (Eds.), *Genre and Institutions: Social processes in the workplace and school* (pp. 100-133). London: Cassell.

Wolfson, N. (1982) *CHP: The conversational historical present in American English narrative*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Language Corpora

Corpora accessed from the Factiva database:
https://global.factiva.com/factivalogin/login.asp?productname=global

Notes

[1] The classification of media genres is in reality much more complex than this and often elements of subjective voice are blended into the discourse of hard news and soft news can contain elements of objectivity.

[2] Reported speech is in reality more complex than the examples given here and can be further categorised into free direct speech and free indirect speech which as the names imply are freer forms of direct and indirect speech.

[3] This seems to be an oversimplification of the case: it is only in certain registers such as court cases, that truly verbatim representation is likely to be achieved. Even with newspaper language, there exists some cleaning up of people's language in terms of grammar and register (see Clark & Gerrig, 1990, Fludernik, 1993, pp. 409-414).

[4] But care must be taken when analysing reported speech that the intertextual positioning is interpersonal not textual based. It tends to be common practice within the register of hard news reporting for the leading clause complex/paragraph projected as indirect speech/thought and for the following to comprise paratactic projections. "There is a cline from the reporter's own voice via reported voices to quoted ones. The quoted material is closest to the reporter's news source whereas the reported material is already, at least potentially, at some distance from what was actually said." (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 462). In this case, it can be argued, the relationship of the clause complex is textual not interpersonal.

[5] There is still disagreement among linguists as to who is responsible for loaded lexical items or modality within indirect speech projections. Vandelanotte (2004, p. 2) holds that certain expressive lexemes are to be interpreted as voicing the external textual voice's attitude. Banfield (1982, p. 56), however, believes that they "… must mean that the quoting speaker so assented to the quoted speaker's opinion that s/he expressed similar ones. In the researcher's understanding, when the positioning is textual Vandelanotte´s position holds merit, but when it is interpersonally positioned Banfield´s view dominates.

[6] Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) point out that this is symbolized in English punctuation by the use of single quotation marks for meaning and double quotation marks for wording (p. 452).

Notes on Contributor

Warren Hancock has a PhD in Linguistics from Macquarie University. He has worked for the last twenty years as a teacher, at graduate and postgraduate levels, and linguistic researcher in South America, Asia and Australia. He is currently working as an independent researcher looking at the manipulative properties of language in mass media and political discourse. Email: warren.hancock@yahoo.com.au