

# Authenticity and Linguistic Principles in Parliamentary Reporting

Remarks Inspired by Roberto La Rocca's Presentation

Eero Voutilainen

Records Office

Finnish Parliament



# The Problem of Authenticity



## 1) The Plenary Session



# The Problem of Authenticity



## 2) The Act of Reporting

# The Problem of Authenticity



3) Image Constructed by the Parliamentary Report

# The Constructive Nature of Reporting

Understandability, readability,  
clarity, dignity, decorum,  
"correct language" ...



Creation of two realities?



# Perspectives on Authenticity

## 1) Authenticity of **content**

- Even large editorial changes are possible, as long as the content and intention of the original speeches remains unchanged.

## 2) Authenticity of **form**

- No editorial changes should be made, because they distort reality.

## 3) Authenticity of **experience**

- *Some* carefully chosen expressions in the speeches must be edited *slightly*, so that their meaning and style does not change during reporting.



# Transforming Speech into Writing

## 1) **Transcription** (cf. Jenks 2011)

→ From vocal action to visual object

## 2) **Intermodal translation** (cf. Kress 2009)

→ From one mode of communication to another

## 3) **Recontextualization** (cf. Linell 1998)

→ From one genre and context to another



# Linguistic Principles of Parliamentary Reporting

- Ideologies that guide the interpretation and production of language in the Parliamentary Report
- Attitudes and values concerning language and interaction
  - Assumptions on language and its users
  - Definitions of "good" and "bad" language
  - Views of grammatical correctness
  - Perceived role of the official standard language
  - Norms of the genre: e.g. purposes, audiences, contents and appropriate styles of the parliamentary report

(Cf. Garrett 2010; Blommaert & Verschueren 1998; Milroy 2007; Schiffman 1996; Sposky 2004; Voutilainen 2012; forthcoming.)





# Workshops

- 1) What are the most important **target audiences** of parliamentary reporting and why? How should it affect our principles?
- 2) How should we approach **authenticity** in parliamentary reporting? How do we achieve balance between authenticity and readability?
- 3) Should we always apply the **norms of standard language** in parliamentary reporting? If not always, when?
- 4) How should we control the **quality of reporting**? How to give feedback to our colleagues?

