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1. Introduction

While most papers in this volume address cross-language comparisons, the contrast between texts written in the same language is also a valid area of concern. Various areas of monolingual contrastive studies include: register studies (differences in text due to differences in context: field, tenor or mode); gender studies (differences in text due to gender); cross-temporal studies (differences in a text-type over time), etc.

This paper falls into the first of these categories: it offers a comparison between the registers of two newspaper text-types: Front Page News (FPN) and Editorials. In particular, it explores how these text-types differ in the way they use grammatical tense, and tries to explain these differences. Note, however, at another level, it is offering a methodology for contrastive studies in general.

Most contrastive register studies concern themselves with either lexical or grammatical differences between corpora. They attempt to explain formal choices directly in relation to context of use. This paper will argue that this approach is limited, proposing a methodology of register analysis which first relates context to the meanings expressed in the text, and then relating these meanings to the forms that express them. I argue that this three level approach allows a clearer view of the registerial patterns, patterns which are obscured if context is related directly to forms.

Traditional register analyses of tense attempt to correlate grammatical selection directly with the context. I will go beyond these studies by examining the selection of tense in the context of the semantics it expresses (the realis of the process), and how this mapping between realis and tense is conditioned by register. I will demonstrate that the major differences between the newspaper text-types is due to differences in the semantic selections (realis), and that grammatical preferences form only a secondary factor.

2. Traditional Register Analysis

Traditional register studies examine the relationship between a contextual variable and a grammatical or lexical pattern. For instance, Nesbitt & Plum (1987) explore differences in clause complexes across text-type, and Bernstein (1971) looks at the incidence of passives in relation to class. Others study lexical selection in relation to context.

In relation to grammatical tense, there have been several studies that have tried to explain patterns of grammatical selection directly in terms of contextual variables. Plum & Cowling (1987) studied the correlation of social class, gender, and age with tense selection. They found that, for instance, use of past-tense (primary tense) increases with both age and rising social class. Halliday & James (1993) also looks at the variation of tense selection over differing registers.

To demonstrate what a single-level study of tense looks like, I will exemplify using my corpus. Table 1 shows the distribution of tense selections in two newspaper article-types. Each row of the table shows the percentage occurrence of each of the eight tenses studied here. For instance, 19% of Editorial finite clauses use simple-past tense, as opposed to 56% of the FPN clauses.

---

1 This study was partly funded by the National Science Foundation (USA), and was undertaken under the direction of Cécile Paris and John Bateman, who also provided part of the corpus for the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Editorial</th>
<th>FPN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple-past</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple-present</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple-future</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple-modal</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past-perfect</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present-perfect</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future-perfect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal-perfect</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Distribution of Tense Selections over Article Types

Throughout this paper, statistical significance of differences is shown using one or more ‘+’ sign.

- ‘+’ indicates significance at the 90% level (10% chance of error);
- ‘++’ indicates significance at the 95% level (5% chance of error);
- ‘+++’ indicates significance at the 98% level (2% chance of error).

The table thus shows four significant difference between Editorials and Front Page News as regards tense selection. Editorials use far less simple-past than FPN (19%+++ vs. 56%), made up for by a higher degree of simple-present (39%+++ vs. 19%), simple-future (8%+++ vs. 2%), and present-perfect (8%++ vs. 6%).

These results do not, however, explain much by themselves. It is up to the analyst to posit some explanation of these results, such that FPN tends to express events which have happened already, so simple-past is common, while editorials tend to express the consequences and background of these events, e.g., relational processes such as The United States has friends and interests in the Gulf: The correct policy today is to shift more of the costs of collective security onto our more prosperous allies.

However, this is the analyst intruding on the data -- the data does not tell us this -- all we know directly is the probabilities of particular grammatical choices. The analysis itself has not explained the data, just given the analyst a clearer idea of the patterns which need to be explained.

3. A Three-Layered Approach

Register studies which try to explain grammatical patterns directly in terms of contextual differences often show some result, but a result obscured. Writers do not make grammatical choices without taking semantics into account. A newspaper writer, for instance, does not say, this is an editorial, so I will use simple present tense for this sentence. Rather, they needs to take into account what kind of event or state they are writing about, whether that event/state happened in the past, is ongoing now, or is one predicted for the future.

A register study of grammatical phenomena thus needs to take into account the semantics of the text, and how different semantic patterns favour particular formal expressions. We can look at the problem in terms of two parts of the writing task:

1. Content selection: choosing what event/state to write about;
2. Content expression: choosing how to express a given event/state.

---

2 In the normal case, the writer chooses what to write first, and then how to express it. However, there is a level at which the expression controls what is said. For instance, in poetry, the rhythm and rhyme can be preset, and content selected to match this constraint. In normal writing also, often formal constraints take part in the decision as to whether or not to include content, for instance, a short paragraph may call for additional information as padding.
Some of the explanations of grammatical patterns lie in the first area -- what the writer chooses to
talk about may favour particular grammatical expressions. For instance, writing about past events
will favour the use of past tenses, while writing about the future will favour future tenses and
modals.

However, grammatical patterns are not entirely explained by the choice of content -- the language
system leaves possibilities for expressing any given event or state. For instance, an event can be
expressed as a clause (e.g., the US bombed Baghdad) or as a noun phrase (e.g., the bombing of
Baghdad). Similarly for tense, a past event can be expressed using present perfect (‘Baghdad has
been bombed’) as well as one of the past tenses.

So, a more complete explanation of the effect of register on grammatical patterns needs to take
into account both of these factors:

1. Does register influence what events/states are expressed?
2. Does register influence how particular types of events or states are expressed?

We are thus proposing to replace the typical two level register study (figure 1) with a three level
study (figure 2)³.

![Figure 1: Traditional Register Studies](image1)

![Figure 2: Three-Layered Register Study](image2)

4. A Three-Layered Study of Tense

For this study, a corpus of newspaper articles was collected from 7 newspapers (6 US, 1 British),
and segmented into finite clauses, resulting in a total of 558 tokens. Of these 312 were from
editorials, and 246 from FPN. The corpus was drawn from financial and military reporting.

The data was coded using the Systemic Coder, software which facilitates the coding of text
(O’Donnell 1995)⁴. All statistics in this paper were derived using the statistical functions of this
program.

4.1. The Model

Each clause was coded on three levels:
1. Text-Type: editorial vs. FPN;
2. Realis: a representation of the temporal semantics of each clause;
3. Grammatical Tense: the grammatical tense of each clause.

These categories, apart from text-type, will be explored below.

4.1.1 Semantics: Realis

Realis concerns whether or not an event/state has actually taken place, or is still occurring, or has
not in fact occurred. A realis process is one which has either actually occurred, or is still in the
process of occurring. The two subtypes of realis are:

- completed-process: the process completed before the point of speaking;
- ongoing-process: the process is ongoing at the point of speaking.

³ Caffarel (1993) also argues that tense needs to be explained by reference to an intermediating semantics.
All other processes are labelled *irrealis* - processes which have not happened, and are not happening now. This includes expectations of the future (e.g., *he will run*), statements of obligation (*he should run*), denials (e.g., *he did not run*), etc.

*Ongoing-process* should not be confused with the grammatical notion of *progressive* aspect -- an *ongoing-process* is ongoing at the time of speaking, while an event reported in progressive aspect is ongoing at some reference point, which may be the point of speaking, but is often not. For instance, *He was running yesterday* reports a completed-process (assuming the running finished), but it is reported in *progressive* aspect.

### 4.1.2 Grammar: Tense Selection

English provides six basic tenses, *simple-past, simple-present, simple-future, past-perfect, present-perfect* and *future-perfect*. However, we also need to take into account the possibility of modality -- *The US can bomb Baghdad*. Figure 3.1 shows the basic tense choices for English. The percentage occurrence of each tense in our corpus is also shown.

![Figure 3: English Tense Systems](image)

Each of these cases could also be expressed in the *progressive* aspect (e.g., *USA was bombing Baghdad*), although this somewhat changes the meaning. However, due to space limitations, I will not explore progressive aspect in this paper.

### 4.2 Results

We studied the relations between text-type, realis and tense in terms of three studies:

1. How do text-types vary in the realis they use?
2. How are realis types realised in terms of tense?
3. How do text-types vary in the way realis-types are typically realised?

By separating out these issues the patterns of tense selection are shown more clearly.

![Figure 4: Realis conditioned by Text-Type](image)

### 4.2.1 Register & Realis

The distribution of realis types in each of the text-types is shown in figure 4. As can be expected, FPN reports more completed-process (the events which are being reported). Editorials on the other hand provide more of:
• ongoing-processes (26% vs. 16%): these are for the most part states rather than events, e.g.,
  We are ready for war, or The public finances are healthy. Very few are ongoing actions, as in
  He is counseling the government;
• irreals (50% vs. 23%): Editorials include more than double the number of irreals clauses,
  which is also in keeping with the nature of the text-type - they need to talk about what may
  happen, what could have happened and did not, what people say could happen, etc.

4.2.2 Realis & Tense
The next study explores the ranges of tenses which can realise each realis type. We have ignored
irreals, because this category is very complex, taking in lots of different forms (negations,
conditionals, projections, modals, future, etc.), all of which behave differently. We thus look at how
both completed-processes and ongoing processes are realised. Figure 5 shows the results.

• Completed processes can be realised by 5 tense combinations. The most common is, as
  expected, simple past (81%). The present-perfect is used in 13% of the cases. This tense is
  used when the writer wishes to indicate that a past event still has consequences for the present
  (Moens & Steedman 1977). For instance, someone usually says I have spilt my coffee while the
  consequence of the action (the spill) is still to be cleaned up. The past-perfect is used 4% of the
  time (indicating one past event had consequences for another past event).
  Two instances used simple-present to report on a past event: i) Chirac intervenes in Merger
  row: this is a headline, which follow different rules to running text. ii) The decision follows
  Swissair’s announcement Tuesday: here two separate events, both completed, are related by an
  abstract process of sequence. This state is then reported in the present tense, as if it is a timeless
  truth. Note the alternative ‘followed’ would work equally as well.
  Two instances of a modal form were found expressing past events. These will be discussed
  below.
  In summary, the realis of an event partially constrains the tense options available. However, it
  still leaves a choice to be made by the writer.
• Ongoing processes can be realised by 3 tense choices. Simple-present is used in roughly 19
  out of 20 cases. Present perfect was used in 1 case in 20, for instance: [Sabena] has been
  refusing to honor Swissair tickets. As this policy was continuing at the time of writing, it is
  coded as an ongoing-process. This tense is also used to express completed-processes: basically,
  the tense implies that some event/state which at least started in the past still has
  consequences now, whether or not it has completed.
  The third tense seems rather an unusual option for realising an ongoing processes – simple
  past. The one instance was: [Sabena] was seeking protection from its creditors. The writer
  expressed this as part of the context for an earlier event. However, Sabena was still seeking
  protection at the time of writing, which makes it an ongoing-process. The writer was chosen to
  focus only on the fact that the state was ongoing at the earlier point of time.

4.2.3 Register and Realis-Tense Mapping
The 3-layered approach makes possible a third study: Do different registers differ in how realis
maps onto tense? Each realis option has a number of realisation possibilities, and we are interested
to see if the way realis is expressed changes across registers. In other words: how does the
expression of a given meaning type differ between registers? This relationship between one
linguistic level being realised in terms of the relation between two others has been termed
metaredundancy by Jay Lemke (as early as 1983, but see Lemke 1995).
  Figure 6 presents the results of this study. In relation to the expression options of completed-
processes, we can see that FPN more strongly prefers simple-past to express completed-processes
(87% vs. 69%), while editorials use more of the present-perfect option (23% vs. 7%). Part of the
job of an editorial is to show present significance of past events, and that is exactly what this tense
does. The purpose of FPN is more just to present events, without too much interpretation, so simple past is preferred.

Another option which exists for editorials, but not for FPN, is the use of a simple-modal to express a past event. There were 2 instances:

[Saddam did not care] that an alliance would come together.

[Saddam has devoted] what he could borrow [ ... into constructing a military machine].

The first expresses a past expectation about future events (which eventually took place, and are thus reals). The second expresses a past ability, which also was realised, and is thus reals. This kind of sentences occur in editorials because it is the function of editorials to draw messages from the past, to apply to the present, to influence the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Editorials</th>
<th>FPN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>simple-past</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple-present</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple-future</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple-modal</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past-perfect</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present-perfect</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future-perfect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal-perfect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6a: Tenses expressing completed-processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Editorials</th>
<th>FPN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>simple-past</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple-present</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple-future</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple-modal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past-perfect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present-perfect</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future-perfect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal-perfect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6b: Tenses expressing ongoing-processes

In regards to ongoing-processes, it seems that there are no significant differences in the way these resources are used in FPN and editorials. Possibly a larger data set would reveal differences.

5. Summary

We have argued against analysing registerial distribution of grammatical choices in isolation of the semantics they realise. Without taking the semantic context into account, we may reach conclusions about grammatical preferences which are not true grammatical preferences, but rather a reflection of skewed content selection.

This approach allows three sub-studies:

a) What semantic patterns are included in each text-type?

b) How are these patterns expressed lexico-grammatically?

c) How does the formal expression of meanings differ between text-types?

Our studies have shown that the major difference between the text-types is due to differences in reals. Subsidiary differences in expression of these reals cases also exist, and only become clear when separated from issues of content-selection.

This methodology can be extended to explore other areas of grammatical selection, for instance, separating out issues of speech function and grammatical Mood (interrogative/declarative/imperative).

In conclusion, it needs to be stated that text-type only partially explains tense choice. A full explanation needs to take into account the textual factors, such as the need for relating the time of an event to some previously mentioned event. For more details on this aspect of tense selection, see, for example, Schiffrin (1981) or Moens & Steedman (1988).
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