

Theme, Attribution, and Risk in a VOA Report on Australia's COVID-19 Vaccination Campaign: A Systemic Functional Case Study

Tri Wahyuni Floriasti^{1*}, Arina Makarimal Fasya¹

¹Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

*Corresponding Author. Email: triwahyunifloriasti@uny.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines how a short news report organizes campaign action, public health conditions, and attributed assessments through Theme–Rheme choices. The data are the complete prose body of Phil Mercer's VOA report on an Australian COVID-19 vaccination campaign, published on 25 June 2022. An inventory of 30 finite clause units distinguishes reporter narration, dependent and reported content, relative constructions, and direct speech. Descriptive counts are restricted to 15 well-formed independent clauses in reporter narration: 13 have unmarked topical Themes and two have marked circumstantial Themes; 13 have simple Themes and two have multiple Themes. Close analysis extends beyond these counts to thematic development, numerical comparisons, source attribution, modality, and evaluative language. The report repeatedly moves between institutional responses and adverse health conditions. Circumstantial openings frame campaign action and unequal vaccination coverage, while concessive relations preserve caution alongside an account of improvement. Direct speech adds explicit commitment and intensified assessments that a count of reporter clause openings would obscure. The findings demonstrate how relatively simple thematic composition can coexist with substantial evaluative positioning. They support a bounded interpretation of one historical text, rather than claims about audience comprehension, journalistic impartiality, or campaign effectiveness. A complete clause inventory makes the analytical decisions available for inspection.

Keywords

Theme and Rheme; systemic functional linguistics; news discourse; attribution; COVID-19; thematic development

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Citation (APA Style): Floriasti, T. W., Fasya, A. M. (2026). Theme, Attribution, and Risk in a VOA Report on Australia's COVID-19 Vaccination Campaign: A Systemic Functional Case Study. *LingTera*, 13(1), 58–72. <https://doi.org/10.21831/lt.v13i1.64841>

INTRODUCTION

A report about a vaccination campaign must connect an announced action with the conditions that make the action newsworthy. It may introduce infection figures, distinguish populations, report an official explanation, and incorporate expert assessments. These elements do not form a coherent account merely because they concern the same disease. Their relationships are constructed through choices about what each clause starts from, what it develops, and whose voice supplies an assessment. Examining these choices can explain how a particular report organizes a public health problem without assuming that textual organization establishes successful public communication.

The present study investigates Phil Mercer's VOA article, "Australia Launches Campaign to Address High COVID-19 Numbers," published on 25 June 2022. The report concerns an Australian government vaccination campaign during continuing COVID-19 transmission and anticipated winter pressure on health services. Its short body juxtaposes high vaccination coverage in one population with lower coverage in others, the removal of restrictions with continuing

mortality, and official confidence with warnings against complacency. This combination makes the article a useful case for examining how grammatical starting points participate in the presentation of apparently competing developments. All numerical statements are treated here as claims made in the historical report, rather than independently verified epidemiological observations.

The distinction between a report about a campaign and the campaign's own publicity is central to the inquiry. The VOA article mediates official statements through journalistic narration, attribution, selection, and quotation. Consequently, a thematic analysis should investigate the relationship between reporting and reported voices. Describing the text as government communication would obscure that relationship, while treating every evaluation in a quotation as the reporter's direct assertion would collapse a different distinction. The study therefore attends to the grammar of attribution alongside the organization of the propositions being attributed. There is already a substantial basis for analysing Theme in pandemic discourse. Kalotong (2020) examines COVID-19 headlines, Nisar et al. (2020) investigate institutional health awareness posts, and Nurlela et al. (2024) study Theme types, progression, and markedness in COVID-19 news. Humaizi and Yusuf (2024) also examine thematic construction in pandemic reporting. These studies prevent the novelty of the present case from resting simply on its topic or the selection of a different outlet. Its more specific contribution is an inspectable account of how clause openings, dependent framing, numerical contrasts, and attributed voices interact across one complete report.

Three questions guide the analysis. First, how are topical markedness and simple or multiple Theme composition distributed within the comparable independent clauses of the reporter's narration? Second, how do thematic choices connect campaign action, vaccination differences, and continuing health risks across the report? Third, how does the movement between narration, reported propositions, and direct speech organize authority and evaluation? The first question receives a restricted descriptive answer; the second and third require a contextual reading of the whole finite-clause inventory. Keeping these levels distinct allows the analysis to explain more than a distribution of labels while respecting the evidential limits of a single short text.

Theme, markedness, and thematic progression

In the systemic functional account used here, Theme is the clause's point of departure and Rheme is the remainder developed from it. The topical component is identified through the first experiential constituent; preceding textual or interpersonal elements can also belong to the thematic span (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). A simple Theme contains only the topical component. A multiple Theme additionally includes a textual or interpersonal component. In the declarative clauses examined here, a Subject functioning as topical Theme is treated as unmarked; a fronted circumstance is treated as marked. Composition and markedness thus describe different properties and must be coded separately. These distinctions resolve several possible ambiguities. A coordinating conjunction before a Subject produces a multiple Theme even when the clause develops one straightforward proposition. Conversely, an initial circumstantial phrase can constitute a simple but marked Theme. Theme is not necessarily the most important information in a clause, and thematic position does not guarantee that an expression is already familiar to a reader. Moore (2016) distinguishes thematic organization from information structure and highlights the relevance of punctuation to written interpretation. The present analysis accordingly keeps grammatical starting point, referential accessibility, and the foregrounding of new information analytically separate.

Thematic progression concerns relationships across messages, including the maintenance of a point of departure and the development of material introduced earlier. Daneš's (1974) account provides a historical basis for investigating such relationships. Applying progression categories nevertheless requires decisions about which clauses are compared and what counts as continuity. Exact repetition, a pronoun, a related institutional expression, and a semantically associated problem are different kinds of connection. Moreover, the Theme of a reporting clause and the Theme of its reported proposition occur at different structural levels. Treating them automatically as an ordinary sequence would misrepresent how the report is organized.

Fries (1995) connects thematic selections with a text's method of development. The present study consequently examines recurrent starting points in relation to the article's changing stages,

rather than treating an isolated Theme as an adequate account of textual organization. For this reason, the study uses qualitative thematic development rather than assigning every adjacent pair to a progression category. It records identifiable connections and explains their grammatical location. Gómez González and García Varela (2014), in their comparison of English and Spanish news reports, place thematic organization and progression within the organization of a news genre. Their work supports asking how local choices participate in a report's broader arrangement. Here that arrangement is investigated through recurring lexical fields, shifts between sources and conditions, and the relationship between opening campaign action and closing cumulative harm. These are text-specific interpretations, not an inferred universal pattern of news writing.

Pandemic discourse, evaluation, and attribution

The earlier pandemic studies offer useful comparisons, but their units and settings matter. Kalotong's (2020) headline data concern condensed introductions to news stories. Nisar et al. (2020) examine WHO and CDC Instagram awareness posts, where institutional advice is itself the communicative product. Nurlela et al. (2024) investigate news body texts through Theme type, progression, and markedness, making their work more directly relevant to the present grammatical questions. Humaizi and Yusuf (2024) connect thematic construction in news items with possible teaching applications. None of these settings makes a proportion calculated from one reporter-only subset automatically comparable with a percentage based on another corpus or a different clause inventory. White's (2003) dialogic account further treats modality, attribution, and concession as resources for positioning an utterance among alternative views. It therefore supports examining source reporting and concessive relations together while keeping their grammatical realizations distinct.

Evaluation requires an additional distinction. McCabe and Heilman (2007) investigate textual and interpersonal resources in a news report and an editorial, demonstrating the value of relating message organization to positioning rather than treating genre labels as explanations. Martin and White's (2005) appraisal framework provides concepts for considering evaluative intensity and the presentation of other voices. This study draws selectively on those concepts to interpret a small number of salient expressions. It does not claim a comprehensive appraisal annotation. A clause can have an unmarked topical Theme while its Rheme contains an evaluative adjective, a modal qualification, or an attributed commitment.

Broader media research also shows why the object of analysis must be specified. Mach et al. (2021) study COVID-19 public health and policy coverage across national newspaper settings. Thomas et al. (2020) investigate how Australian newspaper reporting frames responsibility during an earlier period of the pandemic. Such work addresses features of coverage through broader textual datasets. The present case instead offers detailed grammatical evidence about one report. Its findings can inform questions for a larger study, but neither the existence of a grammatical pattern nor agreement with an earlier textual interpretation demonstrates an effect on audiences. Cheung et al. (2023) examine how UK COVID-19 reports connect representations of scientific activity and institutions through epistemic network analysis. Their approach highlights a further distinction relevant here: naming data or experts as a source does not by itself explain how scientific knowledge was produced. A comparative extension could therefore examine whether source-oriented Themes introduce explanations of evidence or primarily institutional assessments. Grammatical framing also needs to be distinguished from media framing. Entman (1993) treats framing as selection and salience in the presentation of problems, causes, evaluations, and remedies. A circumstantial Theme can contribute to such an arrangement, but its presence alone does not establish a media frame.

RESEARCH METHOD

The primary data are the complete prose body of Mercer's (2022) report as recovered from the publisher's public webpage on 17 October 2026. The body contains nine paragraphs and 15 orthographic sentences. The headline, byline, publication time, photograph caption, navigation, and related-story material are excluded from the clause inventory. The complete analysed body is reproduced in Appendix B to establish the source version and preserve the punctuation relevant to segmentation. The article was selected because it is the text under investigation, not through random

sampling or a claim of typicality. The design is therefore an intensive single-case analysis of a historical news text. The source contains an apparent editing error: an additional occurrence of “Australians” follows the minister’s name in sentence 11. This wording is preserved. Its reporting clause is identified as C18 and excluded from the main grammatical frequency calculations because its Subject boundary is malformed. The associated reported-content clause and the following coordinated reporting clause remain analysable. Excluding the anomalous matrix clause does not justify discarding the entire sentence or silently repairing the source. A separate sensitivity calculation shows what would happen if the surplus word were removed.

Segmentation identifies 30 finite clause units, numbered C01–C30 in source order. A finite comparative clause with an ellipted predicate is retained because its modal auxiliary is expressed. Non-finite constructions, such as infinitival statements of campaign purpose, remain part of their containing units and receive qualitative attention where relevant; they are not separate observations in the finite-clause counts. Coordinated finite clauses are separated, even when they occur in one sentence. Relative clauses, reported propositions, and the parenthetical comment in direct speech are also recorded, allowing their local Themes to be distinguished from those of their containing clauses.

Five mutually exclusive inventory strata are used. There are 15 well-formed independent clauses in reporter narration, six other narrated finite units, two relative clauses, six finite units within direct speech, and one malformed reporting clause. The six quoted units comprise three independent clauses and three nested units. The six other narrated units comprise dependent or reported-content clauses. These strata account for all 30 observations; they are not six or thirty independent texts. Table 1 makes the distinction between coverage of the source and the denominator used for the main descriptive proportions explicit.

Table 1. Scope of the finite-clause inventory

Stratum	Units	Treatment	Inventory IDs
Reporter independent clauses	15	Main descriptive set	C01–02, C04–05, C07–09, C12–13, C15, C17, C20, C27, C29–30
Other narrated finite units	6	Local coding and contextual analysis	C10–11, C14, C16, C19, C28
Relative clauses	2	Linking and experiential functions recorded together	C03, C06
Direct-speech finite units	6	Separate local coding; no pooled percentage	C21–26
Malformed reporting clause	1	Preserved; sensitivity analysis	C18

Each well-formed unit is inspected for its initial textual and interpersonal material, its first experiential constituent, and the resulting thematic boundary. The complete Subject nominal group is retained where it functions as topical Theme. Material occurring after the first experiential constituent is assigned to Rheme even when it repeats the country, supplies a time, or introduces important new information. Conjunctions coordinating alternatives within a nominal group are not treated as separate clauses. The two relative uses of “where” combine a linking function with a circumstantial role; they are recorded as conflated cases rather than forced into the same simple/multiple and marked/unmarked comparison as independent declaratives. The analysis first establishes segmentation and local coding, then calculates the primary totals, and finally traces thematic development and changes of voice. Referential links, numerical comparisons, contrastive relations, and evaluative expressions are checked against their locations in the complete source. Table 3 summarizes selected development paths, while Appendix A exposes all local decisions. Rheme summaries in that inventory are paraphrases for orientation; they do not replace the source wording. The source-oriented and condition-oriented groupings used in the findings are descriptive groupings developed for this case, not additional systemic functional grammatical categories.

Two decisions receive explicit sensitivity treatment. Restoring C18 by deleting its surplus token would increase the primary denominator from 15 to 16 and add one simple, unmarked Theme. In the quotation, “Now” in C24 is read primarily as a discourse transition. A temporal reading would

instead produce a marked circumstantial Theme and a different boundary in that quoted clause. Neither reading changes the reporter-only primary counts. In C22, the parenthetical clause has a commenting function in its containing message while also receiving its own local analysis as C23; these are different levels, not two independent examples of an audience response.

The coding constitutes one analytical record produced for this revision. There was no independent second-coder assessment, and no intercoder reliability statistic is reported. Transparency is provided through the source, complete inventory, explicit alternatives, and reproducible arithmetic; it does not substitute for independent interpretive scrutiny. Percentages describe the 15-clause primary subset only. No inferential test is used because dependent observations within one short report do not supply a representative sample of journalism. Claims about comprehension, attitudes, learning, vaccination behaviour, or the accuracy of the reported health statistics fall outside the evidence collected. Wakefield et al.'s (2010) review locates campaign outcomes within questions of audience exposure, message delivery, and the availability of supporting services and policies. Establishing an effect of this particular report would therefore require a separate evaluation design; its Theme distribution is not a behavioural outcome measure.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

A common grammatical pattern contains several kinds of starting point

Thirteen of the 15 primary clauses have unmarked topical Themes, and two have marked circumstantial Themes. Independently, 13 have simple Themes and two have multiple Themes. The identical totals conceal different classifications: the marked cases are C04 and C07, whereas the multiple cases are C09 and C20. Both marked Themes are simple; both multiple Themes contain a textual conjunction followed by an unmarked topical Theme. The two dimensions should therefore not be combined into a single hierarchy of complexity. No separate interpersonal element occurs in the thematic spans of the primary subset, but this finding concerns a precisely bounded set of clause openings.

Table 2. Theme distributions in the 15 primary clauses

Dimension	Classification	Clauses	Percentage
Topical markedness	Unmarked	13	86.7%
Topical markedness	Marked	2	13.3%
Theme composition	Simple	13	86.7%
Theme composition	Multiple	2	13.3%

The substantive diversity within the unmarked group is important. Six primary Themes begin from an institution or an attributed source: the country as campaign actor, the government, government data, epidemiologists, and two pronouns referring to the minister. Seven begin from reported conditions or affected populations, including infection counts, vaccinated people, public health measures, the population being urged to remain cautious, and cumulative outcomes. The remaining two are circumstantial frames. This grouping gives a 6–7–2 distribution, but it is a semantic reading of these particular openings rather than a transitivity classification. A source, a patient-like Subject, and an institutional actor can share unmarked thematic status while organizing very different messages.

The opening links public action to continuing harm

C01 begins with “Australia” and develops governmental encouragement of further vaccination. The same Rheme introduces infection and death as the outcomes the action seeks to reduce. C02 then places a current infection quantity in thematic position and develops its daily reporting and national setting. The opening thus moves from an institutional response to an adverse condition relevant to that response. The connection is available through lexical and semantic relations between the Rhemes and Themes; it should not be redescribed as proof that the audience understands the policy rationale. No audience observations accompany the text. The embedded relative clause C03 adds that most

controls have been removed. Its opening “where” refers back to the country and also functions circumstantially within its own clause. This supplementary information changes the interpretive setting of the infection figure: the quantity is presented in a context of relaxed controls. However, the grammar does not itself establish that lifting controls caused the reported infections. The clause supplies an associated condition, and a causal explanation would require further evidence. Distinguishing contextual association from demonstrated causality is necessary even when the textual juxtaposition invites a causal question.

C04 then begins with “In the face of stubbornly high case numbers.” The complete circumstance is the marked topical Theme. “Australia” and the time reference occur in Rheme, where the campaign launch is developed. Thematic position therefore shifts from the nation or the infection count to the relationship between persistent case numbers and a response. The evaluative colouring of “stubbornly” does not turn the circumstance into an interpersonal Theme: grammatical function and evaluative meaning are different dimensions. Its contribution is to frame action as a response to continuing difficulty, rather than merely to name the entity taking action.

Vaccination differences are developed through framing and comparison

C05 returns to an institutional starting point, “The government,” while its Rheme specifies attention to First Nations communities and children aged five to eleven. The initial country name in C01 and the government in C05 are institutionally related, but they are not interchangeable references to the entire Australian population. The sequence narrows a national announcement into differentiated targets. This development is consequential because it prevents the campaign from being presented solely as a uniform appeal to an undifferentiated national public. The groups appear within a description of governmental activity, however; the report does not include their own attributed accounts of vaccination access or decision-making. The supplementary relative C06 interrupts the first part of that coordination to provide a vaccination percentage for First Nations communities. The source’s dashes mark the interruption, after which “and among children” resumes the government’s two-part focus. Reading that resumed phrase as part of the relative clause would attach children to the wrong grammatical environment. The punctuation therefore matters to identifying both the scope of the statistic and the coordination in C05. The relative “where” has an experiential circumstantial role as well as a linking role. Treating it as merely a textual connector would leave its local clause organization incompletely described.

C07 begins with “At 40%,” which frames a comparison between the younger children’s inoculation rate and that of another age group. The pronoun “their” occurs after this initial circumstance and consequently belongs to Rheme. Its reference connects the sentence to the children introduced in the previous Rheme, but the connection is not a straightforward case of preceding Rheme becoming following Theme. Referential continuity and thematic progression do not coincide mechanically. The percentage is made the point of departure, while the population reference and comparative relationship are developed from it. This distinction is obscured if analysis simply searches for repeated topics across sentences. The next sentence changes the population base again. C08 starts with the proportion of those aged sixteen and over, and C09 adds a clause about lifted public health measures. The figures in this sequence are not presented as observations from one common denominator: they concern different groups and formulations of vaccination status. The report’s contrasts can therefore be analysed as textual selections without converting them into a new epidemiological comparison. Its national coverage statement and its targeted lower-coverage statements are placed near one another, producing a differentiated account of progress. Theme–Rheme analysis explains that arrangement; it does not validate the comparability of the underlying measures.

Coordination and concession qualify a narrative of improvement

In C09, “and” precedes the Subject nominal group referring to public health measures. This creates a multiple Theme, with the conjunction supplying a textual connection and the nominal group supplying the topical component. The coordination links high vaccination coverage with the lifting of measures while allowing each proposition its own point of departure. Nothing about this multiple

composition implies several competing storylines or an inherently confusing message. Its local role is additive, and an explanation of its function is more informative than describing it as a departure from simplicity.

The following clause complex makes a different relation explicit. C10 begins “While officials,” with the conjunction identifying a concessive relation and the official-source Subject providing its topical Theme. C11 supplies the content of the confidence being attributed: the country has passed the worst stage. The main clause C12 then begins from “Australians” and develops the continuing appeal against complacency. Improvement is thus acknowledged without being allowed to cancel the relevance of caution. This is a local tension constructed in the text, not a contradiction that the analyst must resolve by deciding whether the country was actually safe. The preposed concessive clause frames the main assertion at the level of the clause complex. It is not counted as a second topical Theme inside C12. Nevertheless, excluding it from the primary frequency denominator does not make its discourse contribution peripheral. The same caution reappears in C20 after the minister’s positive assessment of the population’s response. The two passages therefore give continuing vigilance a repeated place after expressions of progress or approval. The analysis identifies this recurring concessive or contrastive arrangement without claiming that it persuaded readers to adopt the recommended attitude.

Source Themes distinguish evidence from projected pressure

C13 and C15 begin with “Government data” and “Epidemiologists.” Both are unmarked topical Themes, but they introduce different kinds of warrant. The former attributes a mortality proposition to data; the latter attributes an assessment of possible winter pressure to an expert group. Their Rhemes lead into C14 and C16, whose topical Themes concern people dying and the health care system respectively. Separating matrix source from reported content reveals two layers of message organization. The journalist first establishes the stated basis of a proposition, and the proposition then has its own grammatical point of departure.

The verbal contrast also matters. The report presents the government data as showing a recurring mortality quantity, while the expert assessment contains the modal “could.” The projected strain on the health care system is consequently grammatically qualified as a possibility, rather than presented in the same form as an observed recurring outcome. This distinction occurs largely in Rheme and would be missed by a thematic inventory that stopped after naming the source Subjects. Source placement, reporting verb, and modality work together, but none establishes that the source is correct or that the reporter has independently verified it. C17 returns to an infection-count Theme and specifies a particular reporting day. Its recurrence reconnects the expert warning with a current adverse condition rather than allowing the article to move entirely into prediction. The earlier daily quantity and this later quantity are similar in scale, but they differ in time reference and formulation. The report does not provide a time series from which a trend can be calculated. The defensible finding is that infection numbers recur as thematic anchors at separated points in the text, supporting the continuity of the risk topic while other clauses introduce institutional actions and assessments.

Direct speech changes the speaking position and intensifies evaluation

The malformed C18 still identifies a named minister in the recovered wording, although its grammatical opening is excluded from the primary totals. C19 attributes a favourable assessment of Australians’ conduct to that minister. C20 then begins with “but he,” preserving reference through the pronoun while marking a contrast between approval and an appeal against complacency. The contrast parallels the earlier relation between official confidence and continued caution. The reporting sequence presents renewed effort as compatible with acknowledgement of prior achievement, rather than requiring a wholly negative description of the public’s response. The extended quotation changes the deictic centre. C21 begins with “We,” while C24 places “I” after the opening transition. These pronouns belong to the minister’s speech, not to a newly collective VOA narrator. The repeated first-person plural can align the speaker with others, but the quotation does not precisely delimit its membership at every occurrence. It would therefore be excessive to treat “we” automatically as an inclusive reference to all Australians. The first-person singular, by contrast,

directly locates the stated determination in the quoted speaker. The reporting tag C27 then returns to the reporter’s attribution through “he said.”

The quoted Rhemes contain intensified descriptions of loss, disruption, and pressure. Repetition and the words “enormous” and “massive” increase the represented scale of the problem; the earlier “magnificently” supplies an attributed positive judgement. These are salient evaluative resources even though they do not constitute separate interpersonal Themes in the primary narrator-only set. C24 also presents determination explicitly, and C25 develops the collective outcome that the increased effort is intended to secure. The distinction between attribution and direct assertion remains necessary, but attribution does not make the selection and placement of those assessments irrelevant to the report’s overall organization.

Textual and interpersonal resources become more visible inside the quotation

Five of the six locally coded finite units inside the quotation have multiple Themes under the primary reading; only C21 has a simple Theme. This count includes nested finite units and is therefore reported as a description of the quotation inventory, not as a percentage directly competing with the independent reporter clauses. C22 begins with an additive conjunction and connective phrase before the topical “influenza.” The parenthetical C23 intervenes as a comment appealing to shared knowledge. Within that parenthetical, “as” precedes “we.” The comment’s interpersonal function in the containing message and its own local textual/topical composition answer different analytical questions.

The appeal to what is supposedly already known presents influenza’s return as a shared basis for the argument. It is an invitation to alignment in the wording, not evidence that actual readers accepted the premise. “Now” in C24 similarly merits contextual explanation. Read as a transition, it marks movement from diagnosing pressure to expressing commitment; read temporally, it selects a present-time circumstance as the topical point of departure. The alternative changes one quoted classification, but the movement from problem to intended action is evident in the surrounding clauses under either reading. Reporting the ambiguity is more informative than suppressing it to produce a single apparently precise global percentage.

The closing returns to outcomes introduced at the beginning

C28 introduces a temporal frame beginning with “Since,” while C29 gives cumulative infection experience as its main-clause starting point. C30 ends the article with a mortality quantity. The temporal dependent clause and the following nominal Theme are separate local observations; the whole opening can nevertheless frame the cumulative statement within the report’s historical horizon. The final clauses return to the infection and death outcomes named in the opening Rheme. This creates a semantic link between the campaign’s stated purpose and the harms recalled at the end, even though several intervening clauses concern vaccination coverage, removed measures, sources, and winter pressures. The report consequently does not close on the announcement of governmental determination. It closes on accumulated consequences. This ending gives continuing risk the final textual position, while the opening gave institutional action the initial position. That arrangement can be interpreted as sustaining the relevance of the campaign after passages about improvement, but it does not reveal a journalist’s private intention. Table 3 gathers the main development paths. They include exact recurrence, referential continuity, semantic resumption, and cross-level attribution. Their differences explain why a single progression label would provide a thinner account of this report.

Table 3. Selected development paths across the report

Path	Clause locations	Observable connection	Interpretive limit
Action and continuing harm	C01–04; C17; C29–30	Opening outcomes recur as infection and mortality starting points	No causal effect or audience response demonstrated
Differentiated vaccination coverage	C05–08	Group references and quantitative frames develop comparisons	Different population bases remain distinct

Progress and caution	C10–12; C19–20	Concession and contrast preserve the warning	No inference that readers became vigilant
Source and proposition	C13–16	Matrix source Themes introduce locally themed content	Not a sequence of equivalent independent clauses
Winter pressure and commitment	C16; C21–26	A reported possibility is resumed and intensified in quotation	Speaker attribution and modality remain distinct
Speaker continuity	C18; C20–27	Named minister, third-person reporting, and first-person speech	Grammatical person changes with voice

Discussion

Grammatical simplicity does not exhaust communicative organization

The primary distribution answers the first research question narrowly: most comparable independent narrator clauses begin with their Subjects, and most contain no preceding textual or interpersonal element. The more consequential answer to the second question comes from examining what those Subjects designate and how their Rhemes develop. Institutional action, quantified conditions, affected people, and attributed sources alternate within the same predominant grammatical form. The repeated simple or unmarked pattern therefore supports no single substantive interpretation by itself. A frequency table becomes analytically useful when connected to the changing kinds of message built through that pattern. The two marked cases show why markedness should not be treated as defective writing or as an automatic measure of difficulty. C04 places persistent case numbers before the campaign action; C07 places a percentage before an age-group comparison. In each case, the fronted circumstance selects a relevant interpretive frame. A hypothetical rewrite beginning from the Subject would change that point of departure, although it would not by itself establish an improvement in comprehensibility. Similarly, the multiple Themes in C09 and C20 make additive and contrastive connections explicit. These observations explain the local contribution of the forms without prescribing a universal preference for one thematic type.

Thematic development constructs a continuing-risk rationale

The complete reading identifies an organized movement between improvement and unresolved harm. High national vaccination coverage and official confidence appear alongside targeted coverage differences, continuing mortality, expert concern, and renewed caution. The campaign is repeatedly situated within that combination. C04 explicitly frames action against persistent cases, while the final cumulative outcomes resume the opening account of the harms the campaign seeks to reduce. The resulting rationale is distributed across the article rather than contained in one isolated causal sentence. It is a defensible interpretation of the arrangement, provided that it is not converted into a claim that the arrangement caused public compliance. In van Leeuwen’s (2007) account, references to official authority and to the purposes of action provide resources for legitimation. In this report, attributed expertise, campaign purpose, and continuing harm support that interpretation, although a full classification of legitimation strategies is outside the present coding.

This finding also refines the relationship between thematic and referential analysis. The children introduced in one Rheme remain referentially accessible through “their” in the next sentence, yet that pronoun does not become the next topical Theme. Likewise, the country name can recur in Rheme after an initial circumstance, and influenza can resume a previously mentioned winter problem across a change of voice. A method based only on recurring words at sentence beginnings would miss these distinctions. Following Daneš’s (1974) concern with textual organization requires attention to actual grammatical positions and the level of comparison, rather than mechanically assigning a familiar progression label wherever a topic recurs. The reading is consistent with treating news organization as a relationship between local and broader choices, as suggested by Gómez González and García Varela (2014). It does not establish that all short public health reports follow the same pattern. Here, the ending, numerical recurrences, and contrastive passages jointly support a continuing-risk interpretation. Another report might organize an identical campaign around service availability, political disagreement, or personal testimony. Those alternatives identify meaningful

dimensions for comparison because they concern the relations constructed among messages, rather than simply whether another text also contains many unmarked Themes.

Attribution distributes authority without establishing neutrality

The third research question is answered through the distinction between source Themes, reported-content Themes, and quoted speech. Government data provides the stated basis for one recurring-outcome claim; epidemiologists supply a qualified projection; the minister supplies praise, caution, intensified descriptions, and commitment. The presence of several attribution formats makes the provenance of these propositions visible in different ways. It does not establish balance among social perspectives. The report identifies institutional and expert voices but contains no direct quotation from the population groups whose coverage is discussed. That is an observable feature of this text, not evidence of a systematic exclusion across VOA coverage.

The difference between attribution and evaluation also clarifies what the absence of primary interpersonal Themes can and cannot mean. Judgement, intensity, and modality are present in the report, including in Rhemes and in speech attributed to a source. Martin and White's (2005) concepts help explain why evaluative positioning is not confined to one clause-initial category. McCabe and Heilman's (2007) attention to both textual and interpersonal resources similarly cautions against deriving authorial neutrality from thematic composition alone. The present analysis therefore identifies the location and attribution of evaluative resources instead of declaring the article objective on the basis of a zero in one restricted coding category.

White (2012) shows how apparently impersonal news reporting can favour value positions through attribution and implicit evaluation. Here, distinguishing the minister's explicit assessments from the reporter's selection and sequencing of them provides a more precise analysis than equating attributed speech with neutrality. Thomas et al. (2020) examine responsibility framing across Australian pandemic coverage; their object is broader than local Theme selection. In the present report, institutional action and population outcomes receive recurrent thematic positions, but a full claim about blame or responsibility would require further analysis of agency, causation, alternatives, and evaluative relations. The passive constructions also cannot simply be counted as a uniform ideological strategy: being reported, being urged, and being infected represent different processes. Theme analysis supplies evidence about starting points. It needs additional, explicitly specified work before it can support a comprehensive account of responsibility or ideology.

What a transparent single case contributes to existing research

The case adds methodological detail to the established investigation of pandemic Theme patterns. Kalotong (2020), Nisar et al. (2020), Nurlala et al. (2024), and Humaizi and Yusuf (2024) demonstrate that thematic analysis has already been applied to related discourse. The present contribution lies in exposing the connection between an inventory and an interpretation: nested clauses are retained, reporting voices are distinguished, malformed wording is preserved, and competing readings are shown. These details matter because different decisions about the denominator can produce different proportions without any change in the underlying article. The restricted counts are useful precisely because their scope is explicit. The sensitivity checks strengthen that bounded contribution. Repairing C18 changes the primary unmarked and simple proportions from 86.7% to 87.5%, leaving their predominance intact. Reclassifying "Now" changes the quoted local analysis without changing the primary result. These are robustness observations about specified decisions, not evidence of coding reliability or statistical generalizability. The stronger qualitative claims also remain tied to visible passages: the continuing-risk interpretation depends on the beginning, contrasts, and ending, while the voice interpretation depends on attribution and person shifts. Neither requires every ambiguous boundary to resolve in the analyst's preferred direction.

Broader investigations such as Mach et al. (2021) address coverage through larger datasets and additional dimensions. A productive extension of the present study would sample campaign reports across outlets or dates, retain equivalent source versions, and apply the same segmentation rules before comparing distributions. It could then investigate whether source-first reporting, circumstantial risk frames, or outcome-focused endings vary systematically. That design would

answer a different question from the present close reading. Enlarging a corpus should follow an explicit comparative purpose rather than merely increasing the number of examples available for the same descriptive labels.

The study analyses one short historical article selected as an existing object of inquiry. Its clause proportions cannot characterize VOA, Australian news reporting, public health journalism, or campaign discourse generally. The same limitation applies to the source pattern: the absence of direct community testimony in this text does not establish a recurring outlet practice. Descriptive frequencies are conditional on a finite-clause inventory and a reporter-only primary subset. Non-finite constructions and the headline could support additional analyses, but they are not silently combined with the present observations. The recovered version contains a malformed reporting clause, and its punctuation requires interpretive judgement in the relative and quoted material. The full source and inventory make those decisions inspectable, while the sensitivity calculations identify the effects of two alternatives. Nevertheless, there is no independent coder check, no journalist interview, no production history, and no reception evidence. The study consequently cannot determine intention or claim improved understanding or behaviour. Its supplementary observations of evaluation and modality are selective contextual analyses, not a complete appraisal or transitivity coding. The reported health figures are analysed as historical textual claims and have not been independently audited.

CONCLUSION

The report's predominantly simple, unmarked narrator Themes coexist with a more differentiated organization of campaign action, public health conditions, and attributed assessment. Fifteen well-formed independent narrator clauses produce two separate 13–2 distributions for markedness and composition. The complete 30-unit inventory shows why those distributions are only a starting point. Circumstantial Themes frame action and comparison; concessive and contrastive relations preserve caution alongside improvement; matrix source Themes distinguish the stated basis of propositions; and direct speech introduces intensified evaluation and explicit commitment. The report begins with institutional action and ends with accumulated harm, repeatedly reconnecting its vaccination campaign to continuing risk. This interpretation depends on the relation between Themes, Rhemes, clause complexes, and voices rather than on grammatical simplicity alone. The case therefore offers a transparent account of textual organization and a basis for more carefully specified comparative research. Its contribution remains textual: it explains how this report is arranged, without treating that arrangement as evidence of neutrality, audience comprehension, or campaign effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- Cheung, K. K. C., Chan, H.-Y., & Erduran, S. (2023). Communicating science in the COVID-19 news in the UK during Omicron waves: Exploring representations of nature of science with epistemic network analysis. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10, Article 282. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01771-2>
- Daneš, F. (1974). Functional sentence perspective and the organization of the text. In F. Daneš (Ed.), *Papers on functional sentence perspective* (pp. 106–128). Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111676524.106>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Fries, P. H. (1995). Themes, methods of development, and texts. In R. Hasan & P. H. Fries (Eds.), *On subject and theme: A discourse functional perspective* (pp. 317–360). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.118.10fri>
- Gómez González, M. Á., & García Varela, A. P. (2014). Discourse-organizational patterns in English and Spanish: Some notes on the thematic management of news reports. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada/Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 87–117. <https://doi.org/10.1075/resla.27.1.04gom>

- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203431269>
- Humaizi, & Yusuf, M. (2024). Thematic construction in the news coverage of the COVID-19 pandemic: The pattern and its implication in teaching English news-item text. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(1), 65–72. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n1p65>
- Kalotong, A. T. (2020). Theme-rheme analysis of the Jakarta post headlines on covid-19 issue. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 4(2), 226–234. <https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v4i2.2105>
- Mach, K. J., Salas Reyes, R., Pentz, B., Taylor, J., Costa, C. A., Cruz, S. G., Thomas, K. E., Arnott, J. C., Donald, R., Jagannathan, K., Kirchhoff, C. J., Rosella, L. C., & Klenk, N. (2021). News media coverage of COVID-19 public health and policy information. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8, Article 220. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-00900-z>
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511910>
- McCabe, A., & Heilman, K. (2007). Textual and interpersonal differences between a news report and an editorial. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 20, 139–156. <https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2007.20.07>
- Mercer, P. (2022, June 25). *Australia launches campaign to address high COVID-19 numbers*. Voice of America. <https://www.voanews.com/a/australia-launches-campaign-to-address-high-covid-19-numbers/6632880.html>
- Moore, N. (2016). What's the point? The role of punctuation in realising information structure in written English. *Functional Linguistics*, 3, Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-016-0029-x>
- Nisar, M., Noor, A., & Irshad, S. (2020). The language of COVID-19: A theme-rheme analysis of the health awareness campaigns. *Linguistics and Literature Review*, 6(2), 215–225. [Publisher record](#)
- Nurlela, Septina, L., & Yusuf, M. (2024). Types, progression, and markedness of Theme in The Jakarta Post news on the COVID-19 outbreak. *Studies in Media and Communication*, 12(1), 410–419. <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v12i1.6475>
- Thomas, T., Wilson, A., Tonkin, E., Miller, E. R., & Ward, P. R. (2020). How the media places responsibility for the COVID-19 pandemic—An Australian media analysis. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 8, Article 483. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00483>
- van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & Communication*, 1(1), 91–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481307071986>
- Wakefield, M. A., Loken, B., & Hornik, R. C. (2010). Use of mass media campaigns to change health behaviour. *The Lancet*, 376(9748), 1261–1271. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(10\)60809-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60809-4)
- White, P. R. R. (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text*, 23(2), 259–284. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2003.011>
- White, P. R. R. (2012). Exploring the axiological workings of 'reporter voice' news stories—Attribution and attitudinal positioning. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 1(2–3), 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2012.10.004>

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Complete finite-clause coding inventory

S1–S15 refer to the body-text sentences in Appendix B. U = unmarked topical Theme; M = marked topical Theme. The separator | divides thematic elements; it is analytical notation, not source punctuation. P = primary reporter independent clause; N = other narrated finite unit; R = relative clause; Q = direct-speech unit; X = excluded anomaly. A quoted unit can be nested within another quoted unit. Relative “where” combines linking and circumstantial functions and is not forced into the independent-declarative comparison. Rheme summaries are paraphrases; Appendix B preserves the source text.

ID / stratum	Thematic span	Local coding	Rheme focus / structural note
C01 S1 P	Australia	U simple	has begun urging Australians to get further COVID-19 vaccination
C02 S2 P	Around 30,000 new infections	U simple	are reported each day in a country containing C03
C03 S2 R	where	conflated	most COVID-19 controls have been removed
C04 S3 P	In the face of stubbornly high case numbers	M simple	Australia on Thursday launched a vaccination campaign
C05 S4 P	The government	U simple	is focusing on rates in First Nations communities (C06) and among children
C06 S4 R	where	conflated	only 53% of the population have had two vaccine doses
C07 S5 P	At 40%	M simple	their rates of inoculation are about half those of 12- to 15-year-olds
C08 S6 P	More than 95% of those 16 and over	U simple	are fully vaccinated
C09 S6 P	and most public health measures, including mask mandates at most airports	U multiple	have been lifted
C10 S7 N	While officials	U multiple	are confident of the content in C11
C11 S7 N	the country of 25 million people	U simple	is through the worst of this pandemic
C12 S7 P	Australians	U simple	are urged not to be complacent
C13 S8 P	Government data	U simple	shows the proposition in C14
C14 S8 N	that more than 300 Australians	U multiple	die from COVID-19 every week
C15 S9 P	Epidemiologists	U simple	say the proposition in C16
C16 S9 N	the health care system	U simple	could struggle with winter flu and high coronavirus rates
C17 S10 P	More than 30,000 new infections	U simple	were reported Saturday
C18 S11 X	Health Minister Mark Butler	uncoded	has said the proposition in C19; surplus Australians retained
C19 S11 N	Australians	U simple	had responded magnificently during the pandemic
C20 S11 P	but he	U multiple	has urged the country not to be complacent
C21 S12 Q	We	U simple	are still seeing loss, dislocation and pressure
C22 S12 Q	and on top of that as we all know [C23] influenza	U multiple	has returned to the country as well
C23 S12 Q	as we	U multiple	all know [parenthetical comment]
C24 S13 Q	Now I	U multiple	am determined to increase efforts to ensure C25
C25 S13 Q	that we	U multiple	get through this winter as safely as C26
C26 S13 Q	as we	U multiple	possibly can [ellipted predicate]
C27 S13 P	he	U simple	said [postposed reporting tag]

C28 S14 N	Since the pandemic	U multiple	began [preposed temporal dependent clause]
C29 S14 P	almost 8 million Australians, or about a third of the population	U simple	have been infected with COVID-19
C30 S15 P	Nine thousand five hundred people	U simple	have died

For C18, deleting the surplus occurrence of “Australians” would yield the minister’s name and title as a simple, unmarked Theme: the primary totals would become 14/16 (87.5%) for both unmarked and simple Themes. For C24, reading “Now” as temporal would make it the marked topical Theme and place “I” in Rheme. Under that alternative, the quotation inventory would have five unmarked and one marked topical Theme, with two simple and four multiple Themes. Under the primary transition reading, it has six unmarked Themes, one simple and five multiple. These are local descriptions of differently ranked quoted units, not percentages to pool with the primary set. C22 includes C23 as an interpersonal comment in its containing thematic span; C23 separately has its own local textual and topical elements.

Appendix B. Analysed source body

Source: Mercer, P., VOA, 25 June 2022; public webpage recovered 17 October 2026. Paragraph numbers below are analytical additions. The prose, including the apparent surplus word in paragraph 7 and the source's dash forms, is retained. No photograph or third-party material is reproduced. VOA's Terms of Use identify exclusively VOA-produced text as public domain. This reproduction supplies a stable reading copy for the clause inventory.

P1. Australia has begun urging Australians to get third or fourth COVID-19 vaccines in a bid to bring down alarming rates of infection and death. Around 30,000 new infections are reported each day in a country where most COVID-19 controls have been removed.

P2. In the face of stubbornly high case numbers, Australia on Thursday launched a campaign to encourage Australians to get a third or fourth dose of COVID-19 vaccine.

P3. The government is also focusing on improving vaccination rates in First Nations communities – where only 53% of the population have had two vaccine doses -- and among children aged 5 to 11. At 40%, their rates of inoculation are about half of those of 12- to 15-year-olds.

P4. More than 95% of those 16 and over are fully vaccinated, and most public health measures, including mask mandates at most airports, have been lifted. While officials are confident the country of 25 million people is “through the worst of this pandemic,” Australians are urged not to be complacent.

P5. Government data shows that more than 300 Australians die from COVID-19 every week.

P6. Epidemiologists say the health care system could struggle to cope with a severe winter flu season combined with high coronavirus rates. More than 30,000 new infections were reported Saturday.

P7. Health Minister Mark Butler Australians has said Australians had “responded magnificently” during the pandemic, but he has urged the country not to be complacent.

P8. "We are still seeing enormous loss of life, enormous dislocation and massive pressure on our health and our hospital systems, and on top of that, as we all know, influenza has returned to the country as well. Now, I am determined to increase our efforts to ensure that we get through this winter as safely as we possibly can," he said.

P9. Since the pandemic began almost 8 million Australians, or about a third of the population, have been infected with COVID-19. Nine thousand five hundred people have died.