

UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

**Framing in News Translation: A Comparative Analysis of
Estonian- and Russian-Language Versions of International
News on the War in Ukraine**

MA thesis

VIVIKA KONSAP

SUPERVISOR: Prof. LUC VAN DOORSLAER, PhD

TARTU

2026

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines how framing is reshaped in the translation and editorial processing of international news across Estonian- and Russian-language versions of articles originating from Reuters and Bloomberg, focusing on coverage of Russia's war in Ukraine. The theoretical framework covers key concepts in news translation alongside framing theory and agenda-setting. The methodology presents a qualitative corpus study of seven article sets published by Delfi, analysed using Entman's (1993) framing model and Baker's (2006) concept of selective appropriation, the latter extended in line with Schäffner (2012), Bielsa and Bassnett (2009) and Kamyants (2022). The analysis identifies systematic patterns of framing simplification across both language groups, with notable differences in how Estonian and Russian versions adapt the source material. The conclusion synthesises the findings in response to the four research questions.

Keywords: news translation, framing, selective appropriation, indirect translation, bilingual media

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
INTRODUCTION.....	4
1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	6
1.1 News Translation.....	6
1.2 Characteristics of News Translation.....	7
1.2.1 Intralingual translation and transediting.....	7
1.2.2 Multi-source production of news texts.....	8
1.2.3 Audience adaptation and domestication.....	10
1.2.4 Invisibility of translation in journalism.....	12
1.3 Framing and Agenda-Setting in News Translation	13
2. METHODOLOGY	20
2.1 Research design.....	20
2.2 Corpus description.....	20
2.3 Selection criteria.....	25
2.4 Analytical framework.....	26
2.5 Units of analysis and analytical procedure.....	28
2.6 Limitations	30
3. ANALYSIS OF FRAMING AND SELECTIVE APPROPRIATION IN TRANSLATED NEWS	31
3.1 Analysis of Article Set 1	31
3.2 Analysis of Article Set 2.....	46
3.3 Analysis of Article Set 3.....	58
3.4 Analysis of Article Set 4.....	67
3.5 Analysis of Article Set 5.....	76
3.6 Analysis of Article Set 6.....	87
3.7 Analysis of Article Set 7.....	96
CONCLUSION	105
References	110

INTRODUCTION

Translation is central to the way international news circulates. When a report published in English by Reuters or Bloomberg reaches readers in Estonian or Russian, it goes through a series of editorial and translational decisions that determine what is included, what is omitted, how events are characterised, and which actors are foregrounded. These processes are often not made visible to readers, yet they significantly shape how international events are understood across different linguistic communities.

The present study focuses on the coverage of Russia's war in Ukraine, examining how English-language source texts are reshaped in Estonian- and Russian-language versions published in Estonian media. The corpus consists of seven sets of articles drawn from the Estonian news outlet Delfi, which publishes content in both Estonian and Russian. The source texts originate from Reuters and Bloomberg, two major international news agencies. The Russian-language target texts in the corpus are not translated directly from the English source but are mediated through intermediary Russian-language outlets, creating relay translation chains that the analysis traces as part of its broader examination of framing across the translation chain.

The study is guided by four research questions: how translation reshapes framing across Estonian- and Russian-language target texts; how specific processes of selective appropriation — including reordering, reformulation, addition and omission — contribute to framing shifts; what differences in framing can be observed between the two target language groups; and how indirect relay translation influences the transmission and transformation of framing across the translation chain. These questions are developed in full at the end of the theoretical framework.

The thesis is structured as follows. Chapter 1 outlines the theoretical framework, discussing key concepts in news translation and framing, including transediting, selective appropriation and the relationship between framing and agenda-setting. Chapter 2 presents the methodology, including the research design, corpus description and analytical procedure, and introduces the research questions in detail. Chapter 3 contains the analysis of the article sets, organised comparatively across language versions. Finally, the findings are summarised and discussed in the Conclusion.

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1.1 News Translation

News translation comprises the various processes through which news is transferred across languages, including written and oral dissemination, transediting practices and news interpreting (Bielsa 2020: 365). However, translation in journalistic practice is rarely limited to direct interlingual transfer. As van Doorslaer (2021: 170) notes, news texts are more often the result of processes of rewriting — both interlingual and intralingual — as well as recontextualization and localisation, rather than straightforward translation. This blurring between translating and (re)writing has become particularly visible in the digital era, where intralingual translation contributes to the hybrid character of news production alongside interlingual and intersemiotic forms (Moreno Tovar, van Doorslaer 2025: 733).

Over the past two decades, scholarly attention to news translation has grown markedly. In 2009, Bielsa and Bassnett observed that research within translation studies had traditionally prioritised other text types, leaving news translation comparatively underexplored (2009: 17). However, more recent scholarship suggests a shift in this trend. Since the mid-2000s, academic interest in news translation has expanded considerably, and the topic has developed into a flourishing area of interdisciplinary research (Bielsa 2020: 366).

The close relationship between translation and journalism is reflected in the historical origins of news agencies. The first news agency, Agence Havas (the predecessor of Agence France-Presse), was initially established as a translation agency in 1832 (Bielsa 2020: 365). This historical origin highlights the central role translation has played in the international circulation of news since the earliest stages of modern journalism.

1.2 Characteristics of News Translation

1.2.1 Intralingual translation and transediting

A theoretical framework useful for understanding the full scope of translational activity in journalistic contexts is Jakobson's (1959: 233) tripartite distinction between interlingual, intralingual and intersemiotic translation. While interlingual translation — the transfer of verbal signs between languages — has traditionally occupied the central position in Translation Studies, Jakobson's broader definition opens the concept of translation to include intralingual translation, defined as the rewording or rewriting of signs within the same language (Moreno Tovar, van Doorslaer 2025: 727). As van Doorslaer (2010: 182) notes, Jakobson's explicit enlargement of the object of Translation Studies is clearly present in everyday newsroom practices: an English-language telex message from a source in India rewritten for a British newspaper constitutes intralingual translation, even though no change of language is involved. Van Doorslaer (2021: 170) further observes that journalistic text production of local news is often the result of intralingual translation in the Jakobsonian sense, since translating and rewriting are to a large extent merged into a single process in newsrooms.

The concept of transediting was originally introduced by Stetting (1989, as discussed in Schäffner 2012: 867) to account for the blurred and often indistinguishable boundary between translating and editing in journalistic texts. It was intended to draw attention to the fact that translation frequently involves textual interventions such as addition, omission and restructuring, rather than mere word-for-word transfer (Schäffner 2012: 873). But as Schäffner (2012: 875) notes, the label transediting has not been universally adopted by researchers investigating news translation or journalistic translation. She also questions, whether transediting offers additional explanatory value, arguing that the transformations observed in news translation are characteristic of translation

more generally (Schäffner 2012: 876). Analyzing media translation thus requires attention to the broader institutional and ideological contexts that shape both the processes and the outcomes of translation (Schäffner 2012: 881). In line with this view, the present study retains the term news translation while recognizing the central role of editing and rewriting practices within journalistic production.

1.2.2 Multi-source production of news texts

A key characteristic of journalistic text production is the frequent reliance on multiple sources. News items are often produced through the combination and reshaping of information drawn from several written or oral sources rather than from a single, stable original text. Through processes of information selection, transformation and editorial rewriting, the resulting news report emerges from a complex multi-source workflow. (van Doorslaer 2010: 182)

Such a multi-source production process challenges traditional source–target models of translation that assume a clear relationship between one source text and one target text. In journalistic contexts, identifying a single source text is often difficult, since journalists frequently combine material from different sources when producing a news item. (Davies, van Doorslaer 2018: 242) Similarly, Schäffner (2012: 876) notes that journalistic texts are frequently based on multiple written and oral sources, which further complicates the notion of a stable source text.

In online journalism, the classical one-to-one relationship between source and target texts is further complicated by the existence of multiple versions of target texts created through updates, corrections or additions of information (van Doorslaer 2021: 176).

Valdeón (2015: 442–443) draws on Hernández Guerrero’s distinction between stable and unstable sources to characterise the range of translational approaches observed in news production. While opinion columns and editorials tend to be treated as stable sources whose content and integrity are preserved, most informative news articles function as unstable sources subject to substantial rewriting, reorganisation and adaptation.

A related phenomenon is indirect translation — also referred to as relay translation (Assis Rosa, Pięta & Bueno Maia 2017: 116) — broadly defined as a “translation of a translation” (Gambier 1994, as cited in Davier 2022: 395), whereby a target text is produced not from the ultimate source text but from an intermediary text in another language. Research on indirect translation emphasizes that such processes involve a chain of relationships between an ultimate source text, one or more mediating texts, and an ultimate target text (Assis Rosa, Pięta & Bueno Maia 2017: 120–122), thereby foregrounding the role of intermediary stages in shaping the final output. Rather than assuming a simple linear transfer, this perspective highlights the multi-layered and dynamic nature of translation processes.

Importantly, indirect translation is not limited to cases involving different languages. Mediation may also occur within the same language, when a target text is produced from a previously mediated version in that language rather than from the ultimate source text (Assis Rosa, Pięta & Bueno Maia 2017: 120). This phenomenon, referred to as ultimate target-language mediated indirect translation (Assis Rosa, Pięta & Bueno Maia 2017: 122), is particularly relevant in journalistic contexts, where texts are frequently rewritten and redistributed across media outlets. Although Davier (2022: 406) notes the difficulty of finding clear instances of this category in news contexts, the present study offers a traceable example because the Russian-language target texts are mediated through an intermediary Russian-language outlet rather than translated directly from

the English-language source, and this relay is made visible within the body text of the target articles themselves.

This study therefore focuses on cases where the source–intermediary–target relationship is identifiable, namely articles in Estonian- and Russian-language media that explicitly attribute their content to international news agencies and mediating outlets. Although such cases represent only a small fraction of news output, parallel corpora of this kind are particularly valuable for translation studies because they allow researchers to analyse translation shifts, examine editing and rewriting strategies, and compare how events are represented across language versions (Davier, van Doorslaer 2018: 245).

1.2.3 Audience adaptation and domestication

Traditional translation theories have often emphasized the notion of equivalence between source and target texts. However, this model proves difficult to apply to journalistic texts, where translation is closely intertwined with processes of editing, condensation and rewriting. In the context of news production, these processes are frequently guided by the communicative needs of the target audience rather than by the aim of reproducing the source text as closely as possible. (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009: 10; 12)

Bielsa and Bassnett (2009: 93), for example, identify three main processes involved in news translation: the selection and synthesis of relevant information, the adaptation of content to the needs of the target audience, and the modification of news angles when required by the new context. These processes illustrate how the translation of news often involves substantial

transformation of the source material, resulting in different representations of the same global event for different local audiences.

Such transformations are reflected in a range of textual modifications commonly observed in news translation. These include changes to titles and leads, the elimination of information considered irrelevant for the target audience, the addition of contextual or background information, changes in the order of paragraphs, and the summarisation of information. Such modifications are typically motivated by news relevance and the presumed background knowledge of the target audience. As a result, translated news texts frequently function as original news reports specifically tailored to the needs and expectations of the publication and its audience. (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009: 64)

Within this context, scholars have identified domestication as the dominant translation strategy in news production. Domestication involves adapting the content of the source text to the linguistic, cultural and contextual expectations of the target readership. (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009: 10) Such strategies are generally associated with fluency and readability, which are highly valued in journalistic writing. By contrast, foreignizing strategies retain elements of the source text's foreignness and are therefore often considered less compatible with the conventions of news reporting. (Bielsa 2020: 368)

Another consequence of this audience-oriented approach is the possibility of modifying the angle from which a news event is presented. Bielsa and Bassnett (2009: 67) argue that changing the angles in news translation is a routine aspect of journalistic practice when it is justified by the background knowledge of the audience and the perceived relevance of the information. In this sense, the adaptation of news texts for new audiences may involve not only linguistic changes but also shifts in perspective and emphasis in the representation of events.

1.2.4 Invisibility of translation in journalism

Within news production, translation plays a largely invisible role. Although translation is central to the circulation of international news, it is rarely explicitly acknowledged as such in journalistic contexts. Bielsa and Bassnett (2009:72–73) argue that this invisibility operates on two levels: the preference for domestication that promotes fluency and renders invisible any traces of mediation; and the absorption of translation into journalistic routines, where it is no longer recognised as a distinct activity.

The integration of translation into journalistic practice has led several scholars to emphasize the close relationship between journalism and translation. Van Doorslaer (2021: 169), for example, argues that journalism and translation should be understood as overlapping practices, since newsroom work often involves translating and reformulating foreign-language material. Schäffner (2012: 874) notes that in many newsrooms, translation is frequently undertaken by journalists rather than specialized translators, as translation forms part of routine journalistic practice and journalists' familiarity with genre conventions, stylistic norms and newsroom procedures positions them as competent agents in the production and adaptation of news texts.

To conceptualize this hybrid professional role, van Doorslaer has introduced the term *journalator* to describe a journalist who systematically employs translation in the transfer and recreation of news texts (van Doorslaer 2012: 1049). This concept highlights the extent to which translation is embedded within journalistic practice rather than functioning as a separate professional activity.

Van Doorslaer argues (2010: 183) that the convergence of original reporting with acts of translation and rewriting explains the institutional invisibility of translators in newsrooms: translation is so embedded in everyday journalistic routines that it rarely manifests as a distinct occupational category. As a result, while translation plays a crucial role in the production of international news, its presence often remains hidden both within journalistic institutions and in the final news product presented to readers.

1.3 Framing and Agenda-Setting in News Translation

The processes of selecting and transforming information in news translation extend beyond aiding audience comprehension, as news and other mass media texts can play a significant role in shaping ideological perspectives (Schäffner 2012: 879). As discussed, news translators decide which elements of the original information are preserved, adapted or omitted, thereby influencing how events are understood in the target context (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009: 93).

One theoretical approach frequently used to analyse these processes is framing theory. In 1993, Robert M. Entman proposed a widely used definition of framing:

To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described (Entman 1993: 52).

Framing therefore provides a useful analytical tool for examining how discourse shapes audience perceptions and interpretations. Through frame analysis, researchers can identify the mechanisms through which communicated information (e.g. speeches, statements or news reports) affects the way audiences understand and interpret events. (Entman 1993: 51–52) In the context of news translation, these processes become particularly significant, as translation often involves not only linguistic transfer but also the restructuring and adaptation of information originating from

foreign sources. Through processes of framing and reframing, journalists select and omit elements from their source texts, thereby implicitly or explicitly influencing the audience's interpretation of the reported events (van Doorslaer 2021: 171). As a result, the translation can contribute directly to the framing of international events in the receiving media environment.

Entman (1993) further identifies four key functions of framing in communication. Frames define problems by identifying relevant issues and assessing their implications, often with reference to shared cultural values. They diagnose causes by attributing responsibility to particular actors or processes. Furthermore, frames make moral evaluations of these actors and their actions, and suggest remedies by proposing solutions and predicting their likely consequences. (Entman 1993:52)

Framing plays a significant role in the exercise of political power, since the dominant frame in a news text often reflects the influence of particular actors or interests that have shaped how events are represented (Entman 1993: 55). As Baker (2006: 108) notes, the same set of events can be framed in different ways to promote competing narratives, often with significant implications for the parties involved. These framing differences may become particularly visible in translated news, where the choice of terminology can reinforce or alter the interpretation of the event for different audiences. For example, while many Western news sources (e.g. The New York Times) describe Russia's actions in Ukraine as an invasion or war, Russian official discourse (e.g. TASS) frames the conflict as a special military operation (Rudakova 2024: 35). These different frames define the nature of the event in contrasting ways and guide audiences toward different interpretations of responsibility, legitimacy and appropriate responses.

Translation practices themselves can further influence framing. Translators may modify texts by adding explanatory information or omitting elements that may be unfamiliar or

inaccessible to the target audience (Bielsa and Bassnett, 2009: 7). Valdeón (2014: 56) argues that translation contributes to framing processes by mediating both the selection and deselection of events, as well as through linguistic transfer and the adaptation of textual elements such as headlines and quotations. Consequently, journalistic selectivity in the appropriation, translation and editing of source materials contributes directly to the framing of world events and thus influences the construction of public perception (van Doorslaer 2010: 181).

One specific textual mechanism through which framing operates in translation is what Baker (2006: 122) terms framing by labelling, which refers to the use of lexical items or phrases to identify key elements in a narrative. In translation, such choices are never merely linguistic: when a translator selects one label over another — or reproduces the source text's terminology uncritically — they inevitably participate in the circulation of a particular narrative, whether or not this is a conscious decision. Baker's central point is that neutrality in labelling is an illusion: every terminological choice in translation frames the event for the target reader in a particular way. (Baker 2006: 128)

Agenda-setting theory addresses a related but distinct dimension of media influence: which issues receive public attention and become salient in the first place. According to McCombs and Shaw (1972: 176), audiences learn not only about particular issues from the news, but also how much importance to attach to them based on the amount of coverage and prominence given to those issues in the media. The transfer of salience from the media agenda to the public agenda, repeatedly demonstrated in agenda-setting research, represents a key mechanism in the early formation of public opinion (McCombs 2005: 544). Agenda-setting research has also introduced a distinction between two levels: the first level focuses on the salience of issues themselves, while the second level — attribute agenda-setting — examines the characteristics and attributes associated with

those issues, addressing not only what the public thinks about but how they think about it (McCombs 2005: 546). It is at this second level that agenda-setting and framing converge, as the attributes given salience in news coverage are precisely what translation shapes through its textual choices.

The agenda-setting role of translation is not limited to textual choices within news articles but extends to the very selection of what enters a given media environment. Valdeón (2021: 34) draws a parallel between agenda-setting research's focus on the agents who determine what the public is invited to think about, and translation scholars' concern with the initiators and commissioners who decide what gets translated, for whom and in what form. Van Doorslaer (2009: 90) demonstrates this empirically in a study of Belgian newspapers, showing that language knowledge and the absence of translation in newsrooms function as agenda-setting factors: the countries covered in international news correlate almost perfectly with the linguistic origin of the press agencies used, meaning that what does not get translated effectively disappears from the public agenda. This suggests that translation shapes media agendas not only through how events are framed but through which events reach audiences at all.

The agenda-setting function of translation has also been demonstrated at the level of content selection across language versions of the same outlet. Valdeón (2023: 208–217) analyses the English, Spanish and Chinese versions of the New York Times and shows that, despite sharing the same source publication, the three versions differ markedly in which topics receive salience: the English and Chinese editions foreground political and economic issues, while the Spanish edition undergoes tabloidization, giving prominence to human-interest stories at the expense of hard news. These divergences result from translational choices at both levels — which articles are selected for translation and how they are rendered for respective audiences — illustrating that translation does

not replicate a source agenda across languages but actively constructs different agendas for different readerships (Valdeón 2023: 217).

Building on both journalism studies and translation studies perspectives, Valdeón (2021:32) proposes a dual-function model that synthesizes the framing and agenda-setting dimensions of translation. At the macro level, translation functions as a filter through which news writers and translators — along with the media institutions they represent — determine what content merits publication and what does not. At the micro level, translation governs the selection of specific textual elements from source articles, determining what is adapted, added or omitted in the course of the translational and editorial process. (Valdeón 2021: 32) Together, these macro- and micro-level processes illustrate how framing is not merely a journalistic choice but an outcome of translational decision-making, whereby the selection, adaptation and omission of textual elements across languages ultimately shape how international events are constructed and interpreted for target audiences.

The textual mechanisms through which these macro- and micro-level decisions are realised can be further understood through Baker's (2006: 114) concept of selective appropriation, which refers to patterns of omission and addition in translation that serve to suppress, accentuate or elaborate particular aspects of a narrative encoded in the source text. Baker distinguishes between two levels of selective appropriation: a higher level, concerning which texts are selected for translation at all, and a within-text level, concerning what is retained, omitted or added in the course of the translational process (2006: 114). This dynamic has been demonstrated empirically in news translation in a context closely related to the present study. Kamyantets (2022: 1563) analyses BBC news reports translated into Ukrainian and Russian and finds that, while Ukrainian versions remain broadly ideologically aligned with the English source texts, the Russian versions are systematically

reframed through omissions and additions that soften criticism of the Russian government and supplement it with legitimizing statements from Russian officials. These findings suggest that framing through selective appropriation operates differently across target languages even when the source text is identical — a pattern the present study examines in the Estonian and Russian contexts using Reuters and Bloomberg as the English-language source.

However, as the broader literature on news translation makes clear, the transformation of news texts is not limited to omission and addition alone. As noted above, scholars have identified a range of further textual operations characteristic of journalistic translation, including restructuring (Schäffner 2012: 873), changes in paragraph order, and summarisation (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009: 64), all of which may contribute to shifts in framing. The present study therefore treats selective appropriation as the overarching analytical concept while extending its scope to account for the full range of transformations observed in the corpus and operationalising it through four textual mechanisms: omission, addition, reordering and reformulation.

Building on the theoretical framework outlined above, this study examines how framing is reshaped in the process of news translation across different language versions. Particular attention is paid to the role of selective appropriation and the effects of relay translation on the transmission of news content. The analysis is guided by the following research questions:

1. How does translation reshape framing in international news reporting across Estonian- and Russian-language target texts published in Estonian media?
2. How do processes of selective appropriation – including reordering, reformulation, addition and omission – contribute to framing shifts in translated news texts?
3. What differences can be observed in framing between Estonian- and Russian-language versions of the same source texts?

4. How does indirect (relay) translation influence the transmission and transformation of framing across news texts?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research design

This study adopts a qualitative, product-oriented approach to the analysis of news texts. Product-oriented research in translation studies takes the translated text itself as its primary object of inquiry, examining the choices realised in the final textual product rather than the cognitive or institutional processes through which it was produced (Saldanha and O'Brien 2014: 50). The primary aim is to examine how framing practices differ across the Estonian- and Russian-language versions of news articles originally published by Reuters and Bloomberg, and to what extent those differences can be understood as the outcome of translational and editorial decision-making. The study does not attempt to reconstruct the translation process itself — for instance through interviews or newsroom observation — but focuses on the textual products that result from it.

2.2 Corpus description

The corpus analysed in this thesis consists of seven sets of news articles selected on the basis of traceable source–target relationships.

The English-language source texts analysed in this study originate from Reuters and Bloomberg, two major international news providers with global reach. Reuters operates according to the Reuters Trust Principles (from 1941), which emphasise independence, integrity, reliability, and freedom from bias. It plays a central role in the production and circulation of international news (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009: 54). Bloomberg News is a global news organisation producing political, economic, and international reporting. As outlined in *The Bloomberg Way*, Bloomberg

News positions itself as a provider of definitive, fact-driven journalism addressed to a global audience (Winkler 2014).

International news is produced by a range of agencies, including Reuters, Bloomberg, AP, AFP, and others. This study focuses specifically on Reuters and Bloomberg, because they function as major providers of international political news and are frequently cited as sources by Estonian- and Russian-language media outlets. Importantly, Reuters and Bloomberg articles in Estonian- and Russian-language media outlets are typically accompanied by explicit source attribution, which allows for the identification of plausible and traceable source-target relationships.

The selection of these agencies is therefore motivated by methodological considerations rather than representativeness. By restricting the corpus to articles originating from Reuters and Bloomberg, the study ensures consistency across language versions and facilitates a systematic analysis of framing in translated texts.

The Estonian- and Russian-language target texts are drawn exclusively from Delfi and its Russian-language counterpart Delfi RUS. Delfi Meedia is a privately owned digital media company, holding the highest number of paid digital subscriptions among member publications of the Estonian Association of Media Enterprises — approximately 121,000 as of March 2026 (Eesti Meediaettevõtete Liit 2026). Delfi publishes content in both Estonian and Russian, which makes it suitable for cross-linguistic comparison undertaken in this study. Limiting the corpus to a single outlet ensures consistency across article sets in terms of publication context and outlet conventions and reflects the study's focus on news and translation flows across languages rather than on variation between Estonian media outlets.

The Russian-language versions of the articles are mediated through intermediary outlets such as Latvian Delfi RUS, the Latvian edition of the Delfi in Russian; Meduza, an independent Russian-language news outlet based in Latvia; Radio Svoboda, the Russian-language service of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty; and Deutsche Welle's Russian-language service, part of Germany's international public broadcaster. All explicitly attribute Reuters or Bloomberg as their ultimate source in the articles included in the corpus. This relay structure is consistent across all article sets in the corpus, making the source-intermediary-target relationship traceable in each case and allowing for a systematic examination of how framing is transmitted and transformed across successive stages of translation.

Table 1 provides an overview of the article sets included in the corpus, listing the source texts, their Estonian- and Russian-language versions, publication dates, and the presence of any intermediary sources.

Table 1. Corpus overview

Set	Source text	Date	Estonian target text	Date	Russian target text	Date	Intermediary
1	<i>Russians Who Fled Abroad Return in Boost for Putin's War Economy</i> (Bloomberg)	02.05.2024	Delfi: <i>Sõja eest välismaale põgenenud venelased on sunnitud kodumaale naasma. „Putin ei eksinudki – nad vihkavad meid“</i>	05.05.2024	Delfi RUS: <i>„Они и правда ненавидят нас“. Bloomberg: вернувшиеся россияне обеспечили до трети роста экономики РФ</i>	04.05.2024	Latvian Delfi RUS
2	<i>Ukraine Opposes Size of Minerals Fund to Pay Back US War Aid</i> (Bloomberg)	22.02.2025	Delfi: <i>Portaal: Ukraina lükkas taas tagasi uue USA pakkumise maavarade loovutamiseks</i>	23.02.2025	Delfi RUS: <i>Bloomberg: Украина отвергла условия нового соглашения с США по добыче полезных ископаемых</i>	23.02.2025	Radio Svoboda
3	<i>Exclusive: US readies Russia sanctions over Ukraine, unclear if Trump will sign, sources say</i> (Reuters)	02.05.2025	Delfi: <i>Reuters: USA valmistas uue sanktsioonipaketi Venemaa vastu, kuid Trumpi heakskiit pole kindel</i>	03.05.2025	Delfi RUS: <i>Reuters: США разработали новые санкции против российских компаний и банков</i>	03.05.2025	Meduza
4	<i>Russia Weighs Ukraine Air-Truce Offer to Trump Without Ending War</i> (Bloomberg)	05.08.2025	Delfi: <i>Bloomberg: Kreml võib pakkuda Trumpile Ukrainas õhurelvarahu</i>	06.08.2025	Delfi RUS: <i>Bloomberg: Россия в качестве уступки Трампу рассматривает возможность прекращения огня в воздухе — но не на земле</i>	05.08.2025	Meduza

5	<i>Putin Decides He Can Step Up Attacks on Kyiv and Trump Won't Act (Bloomberg)</i>	20.09.2025	<i>Delfi: Kremli allikad: Putin järeldas Alaska kohtumiselt, et võib Ukrainas teha, mida tahab</i>	21.09.2025	<i>Delfi RUS: Bloomberg: переговоры на Аляске убедили Путина, что Трамп не будет вмешиваться в войну. Теперь РФ стала наносить удары по Украине в два раза чаще</i>	20.09.2025	Meduza
6	<i>US could hit Russia with more sanctions over Ukraine war, but also wants Europe to increase pressure (Reuters)</i>	25.10.2025	<i>Delfi: Reuters: USA on ette valmistanud täiendavad sanktsioonid Venemaale</i>	25.10.2025	<i>Delfi RUS: Reuters: США готовят новые санкции против России</i>	25.10.2025	Meduza
7	<i>Exclusive: Trump's Ukraine envoy Kellogg to leave post in January, sources say (Reuters)</i>	19.11.2025	<i>Delfi: Reuters: Trumpi Ukraina eriesindaja Kellogg lahkub jaanuaris ametist</i>	20.11.2025	<i>Delfi RUS: Reuters: Келлог уйдет с поста спецпредставителя по Украине</i>	20.11.2025	Deutsche Welle

2.3 Selection criteria

The articles selected for the corpus were required to address Russia’s war in Ukraine, with a particular emphasis on sanctions, diplomatic initiatives, and other international political responses to the conflict. This thematic focus was adopted to ensure comparability across article sets and to examine framing practices in a context where political language and adaptation play a central role.

The corpus was compiled through purposeful sampling: only articles with explicit attribution to identifiable source texts were included. Purposeful sampling (also called purposive sampling) is a strategy in which cases are selected on the basis of principled criteria that are directly tied to the research question, rather than on the basis of statistical representativeness (Saldanha and O’Brien 2014: 34; Patton 2002: 230). In order to ensure a clearly traceable source-target relationship, only news articles that explicitly identified their source text were included. Estonian- and Russian-language articles were selected only if they clearly indicated Reuters or Bloomberg as the source, either through source labels such as “*Allikas: Reuters*” [‘Source: Reuters’], or through the inclusion of “*vahendab Reuters*” or “*vahendab Bloomberg*” [‘via Reuters’ or ‘via Bloomberg’] in the lead, or “Reuters:”/“Bloomberg:” in the headline.

Furthermore, only article sets for which both Estonian and Russian target texts could be identified were included in the corpus. In several instances, articles were found that had been translated into Estonian with clear source attribution to Reuters or Bloomberg, but for which no corresponding Russian-language version could be located, or where the Russian-language version was explicitly based on a different source. Such cases were excluded in order to maintain cross-linguistic comparability and to ensure that each article set allowed for systematic analysis across all three languages. This absence of direct equivalents reflects the inherently selective nature of

news translation, where decisions about which texts are translated are shaped by editorial priorities and target audience considerations. As discussed in the theoretical framework, such processes can be understood in terms of agenda-setting and selective appropriation (Valdeón 2023: 206), whereby not all source texts are transferred across linguistic and media contexts.

The articles included in the corpus were published in 2024 and 2025. This time frame was selected for data availability and event comparability rather than for chronological uniformity. The two-year window allows for the inclusion of a sufficient number of comparable article sets while maintaining a consistent geopolitical context.

2.4 Analytical framework

This study adopts an analytical framework grounded in framing theory and the concept of selective appropriation, which together provide a coherent model for examining how translated news texts construct meaning through processes of omission, addition, reordering and reformulation. Building on the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter 1, the analysis focuses on how translational and editorial decisions shape the representation of events across language versions.

Framing serves as the primary analytical tool in this study. As discussed in Chapter 1.3, translation contributes directly to framing by mediating which elements of a source text are retained, modified or omitted. Translators and journalists therefore participate in the construction of meaning not only through linguistic transfer but also through editorial intervention. This is particularly relevant in journalistic contexts, where translation is embedded within broader processes of news production and audience adaptation.

In this study, framing is operationalized through a comparative analysis of source and target texts. The analysis focuses on how the same event is represented differently across language versions, with particular attention to shifts in:

- Problem definition (what the issue is presented as),
- Causal interpretation (who or what is held responsible),
- Moral evaluation (how actors and actions are judged),
- Treatment recommendation (what responses are implied or suggested).

These dimensions, derived from Entman's (1993: 52) model, provide a structured way of identifying how meaning is constructed and transformed in translation.

The concept of selective appropriation (Baker 2006: 114) offers a more fine-grained tool for analysing the textual mechanisms through which framing is realised in translation. Selective appropriation refers to patterns of addition and omission through which certain aspects of a narrative are foregrounded while others are suppressed or backgrounded. However, as established in Chapter 1, the transformation of news texts in journalistic contexts involves a wider range of operations than omission and addition alone. The present study therefore operationalises selective appropriation through four textual mechanisms: omission, addition, reformulation and reordering. This corresponds closely to the analytical categories employed by Kamyantets (2022), who identifies omissions, additions, substitutions and permutations as key strategies in news translation. In this context, reformulation corresponds to substitution, while reordering corresponds to permutation.

2.5 Units of analysis and analytical procedure

The unit of analysis in this study is the article set, which consists of one English-language source text (from Reuters or Bloomberg) and its corresponding Estonian- and Russian-language target texts published by Delfi. Each of the seven article sets in the corpus is analysed comparatively, with the English source text serving as the reference point against which the target texts are examined.

The following table summarises the relationship between the research questions and the analytical methods employed in this study. Each research question is addressed through one or more of the analytical frameworks outlined above, and together they guide both the structure of the analysis chapter and the synthesis presented in the conclusion.

Research question	Method
1. How does translation reshape framing in international news reporting across Estonian- and Russian-language target texts published in Estonian media?	Qualitative framing analysis based on Entman's (1993) four framing functions, applied comparatively across all article sets in the corpus.
2. How do processes of selective appropriation — including reordering, reformulation, addition and omission — contribute to framing shifts in translated news texts?	Systematic identification and analysis of selective appropriation strategies in each target text relative to its source, drawing on Baker's (2006) concept of selective appropriation, extended in line with Schäffner (2012), Bielsa and Bassnett (2009), and Kamyranets (2022).

3. What differences can be observed in framing between Estonian- and Russian-language versions of the same source text?	Cross-linguistic comparison of framing patterns across the two language groups, conducted within each article set analysis and synthesised in the conclusion.
4. How does indirect (relay) translation influence the transmission and transformation of framing across news texts?	Tracing of relay translation chains in article sets where a Russian-language intermediary mediates between the English-language source and the Delfi RUS target, drawing on the indirect translation framework of Assis Rosa, Pięta and Bueno Maia (2017).

At the level of each individual article set, the analysis follows a consistent four-step procedure:

1. Identification of the dominant frame(s) in the source text,
2. Identification of the dominant frame(s) in each target text,
3. Analysis of selective appropriation patterns (and comparison across language versions),
4. Interpretation of how these patterns contribute to shifts in framing.

This approach allows for a systematic examination of how translation shapes the representation of international events across linguistic and media contexts.

2.6 Limitations

The present study is limited in its scope by the size of the corpus and the methodological decision to focus exclusively on cases where source attribution is explicit. As Davier and van Doorslaer (2018: 245) note, parallel corpora of this kind — while analytically valuable — represent only a small fraction of actual news translation practice, since the majority of translated journalistic content does not carry traceable source attribution. In addition, the corpus is restricted to a single media outlet, Delfi, which limits the generalisability of the findings to other news organisations. The findings of this study therefore cannot be taken as representative of all translation practices at Delfi nor of Estonian- and Russian-language news production in Estonia more broadly. Rather, the study offers a close examination of a specific, traceable subset of translated news, with the aim of identifying framing patterns that may warrant further investigation in future research using larger or differently constructed corpora.

3. ANALYSIS OF FRAMING AND SELECTIVE APPROPRIATION IN TRANSLATED NEWS

This chapter presents the comparative analysis of the selected article sets, focusing on framing and selective appropriation across English, Estonian and Russian versions of the texts. Each article set is analysed individually, following the analytical framework outlined in Chapter 2. Particular attention is given to how differences in reordering, reformulation, addition and omission contribute to shifts in framing across language versions.

3.1 Analysis of Article Set 1

3.1.1 Overview and translation chain

The source text for this article set is a Bloomberg News article published on 2 May 2024, reporting on the return of Russians who had fled abroad following the full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022. The article examines the economic and political implications of this reverse migration, arguing that the returnees provide both a propaganda victory for Putin and a measurable boost to Russia's wartime economy.

This article set involves a complex translation chain that is made visible within the texts themselves. The Estonian-language target text was published on 5 May 2024 on Ärileht, the business supplement of Delfi, edited by Kadri Sildmets, and attributes its content directly to Bloomberg. The Russian-language target text, published on Delfi RUS on 4 May 2024, explicitly states in its lead that its source is Rus.Delfi.lv, the Russian-language edition of the Latvian Delfi portal, which had published its own version of the Bloomberg article on 3 May 2024. The Estonian

Delfi RUS article therefore represents a republication of a mediated Russian-language version, which itself translates and adapts Bloomberg. This creates a three-stage relay chain: Bloomberg (English) → Latvian Delfi RUS (Russian) → Estonian Delfi RUS (Russian), with the Estonian Delfi RUS making this relay visible through its attribution. This is a particularly clear example of ultimate target-language mediated indirect translation (Assis Rosa, Pięta, Bueno Maia 2017: 122), since both the intermediary and the final target text are in Russian. This layered structure allows for the identification of where framing shifts are introduced and how they are subsequently reproduced.

3.1.2 Framing in the source text

The Bloomberg source article constructs a predominantly economic frame, in which the return of Russian emigrants is presented as a factor contributing to economic resilience under wartime sanctions. The central problem is defined in terms of labour shortages and economic adjustment under wartime conditions.

The problem is defined as the unintended economic and political consequences of reverse migration: returnees boost Russia's economy and supply Kremlin propaganda with ready-made narratives, regardless of their own motivations.

Causal interpretation is primarily structural: return migration is explained through labour demand, economic necessity, and changing living conditions abroad.

Moral evaluation remains limited, with the article maintaining a relatively natural, analytical tone. Putin is positioned indirectly, as a beneficiary of these developments rather than as an active agent responsible for them.

The treatment dimension remains implicit: while no explicit recommendations are offered, the narrative suggests that the return migration contributes to economic stabilization.

3.1.3 Framing in the Estonian-language target text (Delfi)

The Estonian-language article introduces a noticeable shift in framing. While the economic dimension remains present, it is supplemented by a social and ideological frame emphasizing alienation, hostility, and disillusionment among returning Russians.

The problem definition shifts from economic adaptation to a broader issue of social tension and identity. This is particularly evident in the headline and lead, which foreground emotionally charged statements such as “*Putin ei eksinud – nad vihkavadki meid*” [‘Putin wasn’t wrong – they really hate us’]. The lexical choice introduces a stronger evaluative dimension and redefines the problem from economic adjustment to social rejection.

Causal interpretation becomes more individualized and affective. Rather than focusing primarily on structural economic factors, the Estonian version highlights negative experiences abroad and perceived hostility toward Russians as key reasons for return.

Moral evaluation is significantly more pronounced than in the source text. The inclusion and foregrounding of emotionally charged quotations contribute to a more polarized representation of the actors involved.

The implied treatment dimension shifts accordingly: instead of economic stabilization, the article implicitly suggests a narrative of failed emigration and return driven by social rejection. At

the same time, the broader analytical context present in Bloomberg is reduced, resulting in a less fully developed account of the phenomenon.

3.1.4 Framing in the Russian-language versions (Delfi RUS and Latvian Delfi RUS)

The two Russian-language versions are almost identical at the level of content, which indicates that the Estonian Delfi RUS article is not an independent translation from Bloomberg, but rather a mediated reproduction of the Latvian RusDelfi version, with only minor differences discussed in section 3.1.5.

The Russian-language versions further intensify the shift observed in the Estonian target text, while adding further layers of context suited to a Russian-speaking readership.

The problem definition is framed less as an economic issue and more as a question of how Russians are treated abroad. The headline foregrounds the statement "*Они и правда ненавидят нас*" ['They really hate us'], transforming what is a secondary element in the source text into a central organizing idea of the article.

Causal interpretation is strongly reoriented toward external actors: hostility from foreign societies becomes the primary explanation for return migration, with structural economic factors retained but backgrounded.

Moral evaluation becomes stronger, creating a clear divide between Russians and external actors. As a result, return migration is framed less as an economic phenomenon and more as a response to social and ideological pressures.

In terms of treatment, the narrative implicitly legitimizes return migration as a rational response to hostility, rather than as an economically motivated decision.

3.1.5 Selective appropriation patterns

Reordering

The most consequential act of selective appropriation in this article set is the elevation of Kuleshova's embedded quote ("they really hate us") from body text to headline in all three target texts. In the source text, her observation that returnees came back feeling that "Putin was not so wrong after all – they really hate us" appears in the penultimate paragraph as an illustrative emotional data point within a longer analytical argument. In the target texts it becomes the primary framing device. The structural recontextualization changes the dominant narrative logic: what is presented in the source as one voice among many becomes the thematic frame through which the entire article is read.

Beyond this shared intervention, the Estonian-language version introduces no substantial reordering of the body text. Although the article is significantly condensed, the material that is retained largely follows the sequence of the Bloomberg source. The structural interventions in the Estonian-language target text are realised instead through omission and headline restructuring, as discussed in the relevant sections below.

The Russian-language versions, by contrast, involve several clear instances of structural reordering that affect the organisation of the article as a whole, beginning at the level of the lead itself. The two waves of emigration — February–March 2022 and the September mobilisation announcement — are taken from Bloomberg's fourth paragraph and promoted into the opening

sentence of the article. What Bloomberg presents as contextual background, introduced only after the lead and the first human story, becomes in the Russian-language version the primary frame through which the entire article is introduced.

This pattern continues in the body of the article. The Alfa Bank estimate, that Russia lost approximately 1,5% of its workforce, is moved from a later analytical section to the second paragraph, foregrounding statistical information early. At the same time, individual accounts are displaced. Alexey, who appears in the third paragraph of the source as the first person example, is moved further down, delaying the introduction of the individual testimony.

Taken together, these changes reorganise the article's opening logic. While the Bloomberg source moves from individual accounts toward broader analytical framing, the Russian-language versions foreground contextual and statistical information and delay personal narratives. As a result, individual stories become less noticeable, and the phenomenon is presented in a more general way.

Reformulations

The opening sentence of the Russian-language articles represents a significant reformulation of the source text. The source article leads with the scale of the issue and attributing it to the Kremlin: "As many as a million Russians fled abroad in the first year of Kremlin's invasion of Ukraine." The Russian-language versions open instead with: *"После начала полномасштабного вторжения в Украину сотни тысяч антивоенно настроенных россиян покинули РФ."* ['After the start of the full-scale invasion of Ukraine, hundreds of thousands of anti-war-minded Russians left Russia.'] This reformulation makes two simultaneous moves. First, it reduces the stated scale from the source article's 'as many as a million' to the less specific and

lower ‘hundreds of thousand’. Second, and more significantly, it introduces the political identity of the emigrants — their anti-war stances — as a defining characteristic from the outset, whereas the source article develops this element gradually. Additionally, Bloomberg’s ‘Kremlin’s invasion’ is replaced with ‘the full-scale invasion’, which is factually precise but removes the attribution of agency that Bloomberg’s formulation carries.

By contrast, the Estonian-language target text renders the opening much closer to the source: “*Pärast Ukraina sõja algust põgenes välismaale umbes miljon venelast*” [‘After the start of the Ukraine war, about a million Russians fled abroad’], retaining Bloomberg’s approximate figure and introducing no mention of the emigrants’ political stance in the lead. The reduction in scale and the upfront politicization of the emigrants’ identity are therefore specific to the Russian-language versions. The omission of ‘the Kremlin’s invasion’ in favour of a more neutral formulation, however, is a shared feature across all three target texts.

A related reformulation concerns Tatiana Stanovaya’s commentary on discrimination as a factor in return migration. Bloomberg frames the comeback stories as “actively used in propaganda as a confirmation of ‘Russophobia’ in the West.” The Russian-language versions render this through the following passage:

Такие истории — как про невозможность обустроиться на новом месте, так и про возвращение из-за опыта дискриминации — помогают кремлевской пропаганде в поддержании нарратива о «руссофобии» на Западе, считает старший научный сотрудник Центра Карнеги по изучению России и Евразии Татьяна Становая. «Это подпитывает Путина, дает ему дополнительные доказательства того, что он был прав», — объясняет она. [Such stories — both about the inability to settle in a new place and about returning due to experiences of discrimination — help Kremlin propaganda sustain the narrative of ‘Russophobia’ in the West, said the senior fellow at the Carnegie Russia Eurasia Center Tatiana Stanovaya. ‘This feeds Putin, giving him additional proof that he was right,’ she explains.]

This reformulation operates on both a linguistic and structural level. The phrase ‘*как про возвращение из-за опыта дискриминации*’ [‘about returning due to experiences of discrimination’] recasts discrimination as an explicit cause of return migration. Structurally, this

detail appears only in the final paragraphs of the Bloomberg source, cited as one finding among several from a survey of returned Russians. In the Russian-language version, this peripheral detail is reformulated into an explicit cause of return migration, giving it considerably greater analytical weight than it carries in the original. The Estonian-language version omits the Stanovaya passage entirely, meaning that the propaganda dimension is conveyed only through the emotionally charged headline and the Kuleshova quote, without the support of independent expert commentary.

Another reformulation specific to the Russian-language versions concerns the treatment of Putin's public response to the return of emigrants. The Bloomberg source text includes a passage in which Putin praises the return of business people, entrepreneurs and highly qualified specialists as a 'good trend,' while noting that he holds up the influx as a sign of support for his policies 'regardless of the actual reasons for their homecoming.' This critical qualifier — Bloomberg's own sceptical commentary on Putin's motives — is retained in the Estonian-language version:

Putin kiitis ärimeeste, ettevõtjate ja kõrgelt kvalifitseeritud spetsialistide tagasitulekut ja nimetas seda 'heaks trendiks'. Ta peab seda oma poliitika toetamiseks, olenemata naasmise tegelikest põhjustest /.../ [Putin praised the return of business people, entrepreneurs and highly qualified specialists and called it a "good trend". He considers it support for his policies, regardless of the actual reasons for the return /.../].

The Russian-language versions, however, omit this passage entirely and replace it with a different Putin statement about conditions in Western countries as a reason for return:

/.../ все больше и больше [есть] желающих вернуться на родину из тех, кто уехал. Трудно растить детей в тех условиях, которые в некоторых странах Запада сегодня создаются. Извините, общие туалеты для мальчиков и девочек, еще что-то такое. [/.../ more and more of those who left want to return home. It is difficult to raise children in the conditions that exist in some Western countries today. Excuse me, shared toilets for boys and girls, and other things like that.]

The critical framing of Putin's motives is preserved in both cases, but through different mechanisms: the Estonian version retains Bloomberg's own sceptical commentary, while the Russian-language versions introduce a different Putin quote and construct their own editorial rebuttal. This substitution illustrates how the critical perspective is not simply carried over from

the source text but reformulated — the Russian-language versions construct their own editorial rebuttal rather than reproducing Bloomberg’s analytical framing.

A further example of reformulation concerns Alexander’s account of his colleagues’ attitudes. The Bloomberg source text states that ‘most of his colleagues support Putin and believe the propaganda about the war,’ explicitly linking support for the war to both political leadership and exposure to propaganda. The Russian-language version reformulates this as: “Его коллеги, рассказывает мужчина, в большинстве поддерживают войну в Украине.” [‘Most of his colleagues support the war in Ukraine.’]. This shift involves both reformulation and partial omission. The reference to ‘Putin’ and, more importantly, to ‘propaganda’ is removed, thereby reducing the evaluative and critical force of the statement. As a result, support for the war is presented as a more generalised and less ideologically mediated position.

By contrast, the Estonian-language target text retains the reference to Putin: ‘/.../ enamik tema kolleege toetab Putinit’ [‘/.../ most of his colleagues support Putin’], preserving the personalised political allegiance that the Russian-language version removes.

The Russian-language versions restructure Bloomberg’s presentation of the return statistics, shifting both the evidential hierarchy and the evaluative register. In Bloomberg, the Kremlin’s claim that half of all émigrés had returned is introduced first, marked with the verb ‘boasted,’ and then only partially corroborated by Finion’s more conservative 40–45% estimate. The structure and verb choice signal scepticism toward the Kremlin’s self-congratulatory framing. The Estonian-language version preserves both the evaluative register and the evidential hierarchy of the source, rendering the verb as ‘*uhkustama*’ [‘to boast’] and retaining Finion’s 40–45% range as partial corroboration following the Kremlin claim. The Russian-language versions, by contrast, alter both the structure and the evaluative register simultaneously. The order is reversed: Finion’s

figure appears first as an independent data point, and Putin’s statement follows as corroboration, rendered with the neutral verb ‘озвучивал’ (‘stated’). “*Похожие данные летом 2023 года озвучивал и президент РФ Владимир Путин.*” [‘Similar figures were also stated by Russian President Vladimir Putin in the summer of 2023.’]

What Bloomberg presents as a self-serving assertion loosely supported by industry data becomes two mutually reinforcing data points, with the Kremlin figure arriving as confirmation rather than as the claim requiring verification.

A further instance of reformulation concerns the treatment of bureaucratic obstacles faced by Russian emigrants abroad. The Bloomberg source text describes these difficulties in neutral, source-attributed terms, presenting the tightening of residence permit policies as a reported observation by Finion’s head Kartamyshev. The Estonian-language version preserves both the attribution and the neutrality of the source: “*Mitmed Euroopa riigid on muutnud ajutiste elamislubade saamise või pikendamise palju raskemaks*” [‘Several European countries have made obtaining or renewing temporary residence permits much more difficult’]. The Russian-language version, by contrast, reformulates this as an unattributed statement of fact, while using more evaluative language:

“*Многие европейские страны, в том числе Латвия, заметно усложнили эту процедуру, сделав получение документов почти невозможным.*” [‘Many European countries, including Latvia, have significantly complicated this procedure, making the acquisition of documents almost impossible.’]

The shift from ‘much more difficult’ to ‘almost impossible’ reduces the nuance of the original claim and presents the situation as more uniformly restrictive across European countries than the source text suggests. The removal of Kartamyshev’s attribution further elevates the claim from a reported observation to an unqualified statement of fact. This passage also involves the addition of Latvia as a named example, discussed separately in the additions section. Taken

together, these interventions produce a more categorical and evaluative account of the bureaucratic obstacles facing Russian emigrants than either Bloomberg or the Estonian version provides.

Additions

The Russian-language versions introduce several additions that have no equivalent in either the Bloomberg source text or the Estonian-language target. One of the most significant concerns the scale of emigration. While the Bloomberg source provides a general estimate, the Russian-language versions introduce a wider range of figures, stating that between 400,000 and 1.3 million people left Russia, and explicitly note the methodological difficulty of calculating migration using data such as visas, border crossings, asylum requests, and financial activity. This adds analysis and detail that Bloomberg does not include.

This expansion is reinforced by the inclusion of additional expert estimates: “*Демографы Юлия Флоринская и Алексей Ракша оценивали волну эмиграции 2022 года в 400-800 тысяч человек.*” [‘Demographers Yulia Florinskaya and Alexey Raksha estimated the 2022 wave of emigration at 400,000–800,000 people.’] These references introduce new sources not present in the original article and broaden the evidential base of the discussion.

Both passages draw on identifiable external sources. The methodological discussion links to BBC News Russian Service and the Florinskaya and Raksha estimates link to Novaya Gazeta. Instead of in-text citations, these sources are shared through hyperlinks. Their inclusion confirms that the Latvian Delfi RUS article is a multi-source compilation rather than a straight translation of Bloomberg.

Another addition concerns the specific mention of Latvia among the European countries that have tightened residence permit rules for Russian citizens. Bloomberg refers only generally to

“several European countries, particularly in the east,” while the Russian-language versions state: *“Многие европейские страны, в том числе Латвия, заметно усложнили эту процедуру, сделав получение документов почти невозможным.”* [‘Many European countries, including Latvia, have significantly complicated this procedure, making the acquisition of documents almost impossible.’] The addition of Latvia by name has clear audience-adaptation logic for the Latvian Russian Delfi readership, for whom the country’s permit policies are directly relevant. The mention is subsequently retained in the Estonian Russian relay, where it carries less immediate audience relevance but is inherited as part of the wider republication of the Latvian Delfi RUS version.

Another addition present in the Russian-language versions but absent from Bloomberg is the following generalising statement:

Впрочем, от неприятия войны многие из них не отказались и спустя два с лишним года после начала полномасштабного вторжения, отмечает Bloomberg. [However, many of them have not abandoned their rejection of the war even after more than two years since the start of the full-scale invasion, Bloomberg notes.]

While the Bloomberg source text includes references to individuals who remain critical of the war, these are presented through specific examples rather than as a generalised claim. The Russian-language version reformulates this information into a collective statement, thereby transforming individual positions into a more stable and homogeneous group characteristic.

Both target texts also introduce editorial subheadings absent from Bloomberg. The Estonian-language version adds four: *“Putin kiitis naasjaid”* [‘Putin praised the returnees’], *“Pakutakse paremaid võimalusi kui enne sõda”* [‘Better opportunities offered than before the war’], *“Elamislubasid enam ei pikendata”* [‘Residence permits no longer renewed’], and *“Kolleegid toetavad Putinit”* [‘Colleagues support Putin’]. The Russian-language versions add three: *“Кто уезжал и кто вернулся?”* [‘Who left and who returned?’], *“Почему бежавшие россияне возвращаются?”* [‘Why are fleeing Russians returning?’], and *“Ощущение, что*

‘Путин не так уж и неправ’” [“The feeling that ‘Putin wasn't so wrong after all’”]. Neither set corresponds to Bloomberg's own subheadings. The two sets reflect different organisational logics: the Estonian subheadings are actor-centred and descriptive, with two of the four foregrounding Putin by name, while the Russian subheadings follow a question-and-answer structure that frames the article as a guided narrative. The third Russian subheading is particularly notable — by reproducing the Kuleshova quote's emotional core as a section header, it embeds the article's central framing claim into the organisational structure of the text itself, reinforcing it beyond the headline level.

Omissions

Bloomberg's phrase ‘the man who started it’ (referring to Putin, used in the lead) is retained in the Estonian translation (*‘mees, kes seda alustas’*) but does not appear in either Russian-language version, which refer neutrally to Putin announcing partial mobilisation. This asymmetry is notable: the charged personalisation of responsibility for the war is preserved for the Estonian-language audience but absent in both Russian-language versions.

All three target texts omit the Kurchatov Institute/CERN anecdote, in which Mikhail Kovalchuk welcomes the return of Russian scientists following CERN's decision to end collaboration with Russian specialists. In Bloomberg, this passage adds an institutional and geopolitical dimension to the brain-drain story, extending the analysis beyond individual economic decisions to the level of international scientific policy. Its collective absence from all three target texts consistently narrows the frame to the individual human experience of emigration, removing the institutional level entirely.

The Estonian-language target text omits several passages that reduce the analytical depth of the source article. The Bloomberg Economics box, including Alex Isakov's explanation of migrants' disproportionate economic impact, is removed, so the main finding is left without the supporting commentary that contextualises it in the source. Tatiana Stanovaya's commentary on the propaganda use of return narratives is also omitted, meaning that the propaganda dimension is conveyed mainly through the headline and Kuleshova's quote rather than through independent analysis. In addition, the reference to the European University Institute study — which provides statistical support for continued repatriation — is absent, removing the article's forward-looking perspective.

By contrast, both Russian-language versions retain these elements, offering a more comprehensive account that includes expert commentary and supporting evidence.

The one substantive difference between the Latvian and Estonian Russian-language versions concerns the Kuleshova pull-quote. In Latvian Delfi RUS, the passage in which Kuleshova explains that returnees came back feeling that Putin was not so wrong after all appears as a visually prominent formatted block quote near the end of the article. In the Estonian Delfi RUS this passage is absent entirely. This is particularly notable because Kuleshova's words form the headline of both versions: the Estonian Delfi RUS presents her statement as the defining frame of the article without ever attributing it to her or contextualising it in the body text. The reader encounters the emotional claim at the top of the article but never finds the sociologist behind it or the circumstances in which she made it.

3.1.6 Summary of framing patterns

The selective appropriation patterns identified in this article set reveal systematic differences in how the Bloomberg source text is reframed across the Estonian- and Russian-language versions.

The Bloomberg article constructs an analytical frame in which return migration is explained as a structural paradox: Russians who left for political reasons are pushed back by external constraints, and their return unintentionally supports both Russia's economy and its propaganda. This perspective is conveyed primarily through analytical commentary and evaluative language embedded in the text.

The Estonian-language version largely preserves this framing at the lexical level but modifies it through reordering and omission. By foregrounding Kuleshova's emotional statement in the headline and omitting several passages that provide expert commentary and statistical grounding, the text becomes more emotional in its presentation. While the core argument remains, it is less analytically developed and relies more heavily on narrative emphasis than on evidential support. The Estonian version's selective appropriation operates primarily through omission, headline restructuring, and the addition of editorial subheadings that reorganise existing content.

The Russian-language versions exhibit a more substantial reframing. In addition to foregrounding the same emotional headline, they expand and reorganise the source material, introducing additional contextual elements and reformulating key passages. The dominant frame shifts from an economic explanation toward a narrative centred on external hostility and the failure of emigration. This shift is achieved through a combination of reordering, reformulation, omission

and addition, including the emphasis on emigrants' political identity, the restructuring of statistical evidence, and the amplification of bureaucratic and social constraints abroad.

At the same time, the Russian-language versions do not simply replace one evaluative framework with another. Critical perspectives on the Kremlin are largely retained, while references that portray ordinary Russians as influenced by propaganda are mitigated. This points to a selective change in evaluation, not a complete ideological shift.

This contrast underscores a broader difference in adaptive strategy: the Estonian text condenses and reframes, while the Russian-language versions expand and contextualise.

Finally, the comparison between the Latvian and Estonian Russian-language versions highlights the cumulative effects of indirect translation. The Estonian Delfi RUS version reproduces the Latvian version with minimal modification but introduces an additional omission that removes the attribution of a key quote. This results in a further shift in framing, demonstrating how each stage in the translation chain can contribute incrementally to the transformation of the original text.

3.2 Analysis of Article Set 2

3.2.1 Overview and translation chain

The source text for this article set is a Bloomberg News article published on 22 February 2025, reporting on Ukraine's opposition to US demands for a \$500 billion minerals fund as part of a deal that would give Washington a share of Ukraine's natural resource revenues. The article presents the issue as part of a broader negotiation over wartime aid, reconstruction and future

strategic alignment, combining financial disagreement with political tension and unresolved security concerns.

This article set involves a multi-stage translation chain. The Estonian-language target text was published on 23 February 2025 on Delfi, authored by Kaarel Kressa, and explicitly attributes its content to Bloomberg in the lead (*‘Portaali Bloomberg teatel’* [‘According to Bloomberg’]). The Russian-language Delfi RUS version, also published on 23 February 2025, does not translate directly from Bloomberg, but instead relies on a mediated Russian-language version published by Radio Svoboda. This relay status is made explicit in the lead sentence: *‘сообщаем „Радио Свобода“ со ссылкой на источник агентства Bloomberg’* [‘Radio Svoboda reports, citing a Bloomberg source’], which identifies both the intermediary and the original source. The Delfi RUS article is a near-identical reproduction of the Radio Svoboda version. The translation chain is therefore: Bloomberg (English) -> Radio Svoboda (Russian) -> Delfi RUS (Russian). The Estonian-language translation represents a parallel, direct adaptation from the Bloomberg source.

3.2.2 Framing in the source text

The Bloomberg source article constructs a predominantly diplomatic and political frame. The minerals agreement is presented as a contested negotiation between unequal parties, taking place under conditions of time pressure and mutual distrust.

The problem is defined as a disagreement over the scale and conditions of a proposed compensation mechanism. The source article identifies two points of contention: the disparity between the US-demanded \$500 billion fund and Ukraine’s estimate of approximately \$90 billion

in actual aid received, and the absence of US security guarantees. Ukraine is positioned as an active party disputing both the figure and the framework.

Causal interpretation foregrounds power asymmetry and political pressure. Trump's insistence on financial reimbursement and his characterisation of Zelenskiy as a 'dictator' with 4% approval rating is presented as the context within which Ukraine's resistance must be understood.

Moral evaluation remains relatively restrained and is channelled primarily through attribution. The previous US proposal is described as denounced by critics as 'reminiscent of colonialism' and Bloomberg's article supplies a factual rebuttal to Trump's approval rating claim and characterises Zelenskiy as 'democratically-elected'. The overall critical orientation is visible but restrained.

The treatment dimension remains implicit, suggesting that further negotiations and adjustments to the proposal are needed for an agreement to be reached.

3.2.3 Framing in the Estonian-language target text (Delfi)

The Estonian-language Delfi article condenses the Bloomberg source into approximately half its length. This compression has significant consequences for the framing, as a number of contextualising elements are absent from the target text. What remains is a more procedural account of the financial dispute.

The problem definition is retained at a basic level: Ukraine has rejected a new US proposal for a \$500 billion minerals fund. However, it shifts from a technical disagreement to a more evaluative framing of resource concession, particularly in the headline's use of '*loovutamiseks*'

['to relinquish'], which reframes the deal as a transfer of assets rather than a mutual agreement (discussed further in section 3.2.5).

Causal interpretation is reduced in scope. Trump's CPAC statements are included in summary form, but the political confrontation present in the source text is absent. The impasse is presented as a financial disagreement rather than a broader geopolitical confrontation.

Moral evaluation is largely muted. The 'colonialism' characterisation and the source article's description of Zelenskiy as 'democratically-elected' are omitted, and the broader evaluative tension present in the source text is largely absent. However, two subtle evaluative gestures remain: the scare quotes around '*tasu*' ['payment'] implicitly questioning the legitimacy of the US framing, and the addition noting that the US had previously described the aid as unilateral and non-returnable introduces a mild critical undertone toward the US position.

The treatment dimension is also largely reduced. Elements present in the source text that point to possible diplomatic outcomes are omitted, and the article closes on Bessent's reassurances without articulating a clear resolution. However the phrase about work on the agreement continuing ('*.../ töö lepinguga jätkub*') does retain a minimal treatment element, implying that negotiation is ongoing rather than stalled.

3.2.4 Framing of the Russian-language versions (Radio Svoboda and Delfi RUS)

The two Russian-language versions are near-identical in body text, confirming that Delfi RUS reproduces the Radio Svoboda article rather than translating independently from Bloomberg. Unlike the Estonian version, they draw on additional sources, incorporating material from Radio

NV and The New York Times. Despite this, both Russian-language versions remain shorter than the Bloomberg source, selecting and condensing rather than expanding on the original.

The problem definition is framed less as a negotiation over technical parameters and more as a fundamentally unequal agreement. The Russian-language target articles draw on The New York Times to add that the new US draft contained conditions that were *‘еще жестче, чем в предыдущем варианте’* [‘even harsher than the previous version’], which Kyiv had already described as *‘обременительным’* [‘burdensome’]. This reframes the issue as one of increasing pressure on Ukraine rather than a technical disagreement over fund size.

Causal interpretation is placed within a broader historical frame. The Russian-language target texts explicitly link the proposal to Trump’s shift in foreign policy, situating the minerals dispute within a larger geopolitical realignment. This dimension is absent from both Bloomberg and the Estonian-language version.

Moral evaluation produces a moderately asymmetrical picture of the US-Ukraine relationship. The NYT-sourced detail that the new draft was ‘even harsher’ adds evaluative weight not present in the source article. At the same time, the ‘dictator’ exchange and ‘colonialism’ characterisation are absent, as across all target texts, which prevents the article from becoming more sharply critical.

An implied treatment recommendation emerges more clearly here than in any other version. Both Russian-language texts close by presenting Ukraine’s agreement to the resource partnership as condition, with the absence of security guarantees positioned as a key obstacle. The implied outcome is that the agreement cannot be resolved on financial terms alone.

3.2.5 Selective appropriation patterns

Reordering

At the micro-level, the most consequential reordering in this article set occurs in the Russian-language versions and concerns the placement of the security guarantees point. In the source text, the observation that the lack of assurances of future military and financial aid remains a sticking point appears late in the article – after the description of Kellogg’s Kyiv visit, the account of the earlier rejected proposal, and the colonialism characterisation of the initial offer. In the Russian-language versions, this information is elevated to the third paragraph, immediately after the lead and the fund size dispute. This structural promotion substantially changes the relative weight of the two points of contention: where the source article presents the \$500 billion fund size as the primary dispute and security guarantees as a subsidiary concern raised later, the Russian-language versions co-elevate security guarantees to co-equal prominence alongside the financial disagreement. The effect is to rebalance the overall framing of what the negotiations are actually about.

A secondary reordering is observable in the Estonian version, where Trump’s CPAC statements are presented before the summary of Bessent’s Financial Times article. In the source text, the Bessent material appears considerably earlier than the CPAC remarks, which come near the end of the article. The Estonian version inverts this sequence, placing Trump’s demands ahead of Bessent’s counter-framing. The effect is limited, but it means the reader encounters Trump’s rhetoric before the US administration’s more measured position.

At the macro level, all three target texts share a consequential reordering of the overall narrative structure. In the Bloomberg source text, Ukraine’s resistance is presented within a

broader discussion of ongoing negotiations, with emphasis on the need for further talks and adjustments — the framing is one of a complex diplomatic process in motion. In all three target texts, rejection becomes the primary organising principle. Both the Estonian and Russian-language headlines foreground Ukraine’s refusal as the central event, restructuring the narrative so that negotiation appears secondary. What the source article presents as a contested but active process becomes, in the target texts, a more binary confrontation between opposing positions.

Reformulations

Headline-level reformulation is the most visible site of framing intervention across the article set. Source article’s headline “Ukraine Opposes Size of Minerals Fund to Pay Back US War Aid” identifies the specific point of contention: the scale of the fund. This framing positions Ukraine’s objection as targeted and conditional rather than categorical. The Estonian headline, “*Ukraina lükkas taas tagasi uue USA pakkumise maavarade loovutamiseks*” [“Ukraine once again rejected a new US proposal to relinquish its mineral resources”], introduces two significant modifications. The word ‘*taas*’ [‘once again’] reframes Ukraine’s position as a pattern of repeated non-compliance rather than a response to specific new terms, while ‘*loovutamiseks*’ [‘to relinquish’] introduces a connotation of compelled relinquishment absent from the source’s more neutral framing of the story as a financial disagreement. Radio Svoboda’s headline “*Bloomberg: Украина не согласна с условиями сделки по ресурсам*” [“Bloomberg: Ukraine does not agree with the terms of the resource deal”] generalises the objection from size to conditions, while Delfi RUS’s headline “*Bloomberg: Украина отвергла условия нового соглашения с США по добыче полезных ископаемых*” [“Bloomberg: Ukraine rejected the terms of a new agreement with the USA on the extraction of mineral resources”] uses the perfective verb ‘*отвергла*’ [‘rejected’],

which in Russian conveys a more completed and categorical refusal than Radio Svoboda's 'не согласна' ['does not agree'], which conveys an ongoing and less final negotiating position.

A related headline-level observation concerns the attribution tag. Both Russian-language headlines foreground Bloomberg by name, giving the source's institutional identity immediate visibility. The Estonian-language headline, by contrast, uses the tag '*Portaal:*' ['Portal:']. Bloomberg is named in the lead ("*Portaali Bloomberg teatel*" ['According to Bloomberg']), but a reader who encounters only the headline has no way of identifying the source. This creates a paradox: the Estonian version is a direct translation from Bloomberg, yet it is the one that most obscures Bloomberg's identity at the headline level, while the Russian-language versions — which also incorporate material from two other outlets — both prominently foreground Bloomberg as the sole attributed source.

A subtler reformulation in the Estonian version appears in its use of punctuation. When describing the deal as compensation for earlier military aid, the word '*tasu*' ['payment'] is in scare quotes:

Pakkumise järgi loovutatakse maavarad „tasuna“ senise sõjalise abi eest /.../. Seejuures on USA poolt seni Ukrainale antud abi hulk „tasust“ mitu korda väiksem ja jääb alla 100 miljardi dollari /.../ [According to the proposal, the mineral resources would be relinquished as 'payment' for previous military aid /.../. Meanwhile, the amount of aid provided by the US to Ukraine so far is several times smaller than the 'payment' and remains below \$100 billion /.../]

Neither the Bloomberg source nor the Russian-language versions use equivalent punctuation here. These scare quotes create a sense of distance from the US view of the arrangement as simple compensation, signalling scepticism without making a direct editorial statement.

A further reformulation concerns Trump's statements. Bloomberg reports his CPAC remarks in the first person, preserving the directness and pressure implicit in his phrasing,

including the self-imposed urgency of “we’d better be close to a deal”. The Estonian version renders his position in summary paraphrase, omitting this urgency and recasting his demands in softer terms. The Russian-language versions do not include Trump’s CPAC statements at all, substituting instead a contextualising description of his changed foreign policy stance since January. In each case, the most combative and personally charged elements of Trump’s rhetoric are either softened or removed.

A subtler instance of reformulation through de-attribution concerns the sourcing of the security guarantees claim. Bloomberg’s article attributes the observation that the lack of assurances of future military and financial aid “remains a sticking point in the talks” to “a Ukrainian official familiar with the talks” — a formulation that identifies the information as coming from Kyiv’s side of the negotiating table and signals its directional significance accordingly. The Russian-language versions render the same attribution as ‘*собеседник агентства*’ [‘the agency’s source’], a generic formulation that strips the source of any national or institutional identity. The informational content is retained, but the reader can no longer determine whether the claim originates from a Ukrainian, American, or third-party perspective. As a result, the directional significance of the claim is lost.

Additions

The Russian-language versions are the only target texts to introduce substantive additions, drawing on two sources beyond Bloomberg: Radio NV and The New York Times. From Radio NV, both versions add that Ukraine had already submitted counter-proposals to Kellogg proposing a reduced fund of \$100 billion, presenting Ukraine’s position not merely as one of rejection but as one of active counter-engagement. From The New York Times, they add that the new US draft would give Washington a 100% financial stake in the fund, and that its conditions were even harsher than a previous version Kyiv had already called burdensome. Both versions also include a

historical contextualisation of Trump's changed foreign policy since January, situating the minerals dispute within a larger geopolitical realignment. Together, these additions make the Russian-language versions informationally richer than both the source and the Estonian version in their account of the negotiations.

The Estonian version introduces no substantial new information but instead relies on condensation and selective emphasis.

Omissions

Across all three target texts, the most consistent omission is Trump's characterisation of Zelenskiy as a 'dictator' with a 4% approval rating, and the source article's factual rebuttal identifying Zelenskiy's actual approval at 57% in a recent poll, as well as its description of him as 'democratically-elected', and Zelenskiy's response characterising Trump's statements as Russian 'disinformation'. The omission of this exchange is notable given its significance in the source text as a moment that reveals the personal and political hostility underlying the negotiations. All three target texts suppress this confrontation, presenting the impasse as a matter of financial terms rather than personal antagonism.

The characterisation of the original US proposal as 'reminiscent of colonialism of centuries past', attributed by the source article to unnamed critics, is omitted across all three target texts. This is significant because it represents the source's strongest evaluative characterisation of the deal's terms, and its collective removal softens the moral register of the coverage in every target text.

The Estonian-language version omits additional contextual elements, including the role of security guarantees as a central point of contention. This narrows the framing to a primarily financial dispute and reduces the strategic dimension of the negotiation.

3.2.6 Summary of framing patterns

The selective appropriation patterns identified in this article set reveal systematic differences in how the Bloomberg source text is reframed across the Estonian- and Russian-language versions.

The Bloomberg article constructs an analytical geopolitical-economic frame, presenting the minerals dispute as a complex diplomatic process involving financial disagreement, political confrontation, and unresolved security concerns. This perspective is conveyed through balanced attribution and a relatively neutral narrative voice, positioning Ukraine as an active negotiating party rather than a passive recipient of US demands. The personal hostility between Trump and Zelenskiy, including the ‘dictator’ characterisation and the ‘disinformation’ rebuttal, forms a significantly evaluative layer that is entirely absent from all three target texts.

The Estonian-language version condenses this framework substantially. While it retains the financial dimension of the dispute, it omits the political confrontation, the security dimension, and much of the evaluative apparatus. The most distinctive intervention occurs at the level of the headline, where the introduction of *‘taas’* [‘once again’] and *‘loovutamiseks’* [‘to relinquish’] subtly reframe Ukraine’s position as repeated resistance and emphasize the transactional nature of the agreement as a form of resource transfer. The scare quotes around *‘tasu’* [‘payment’] introduce a further subtle evaluative gesture, implicitly distancing the text from the US framing of the arrangement as legitimate compensation. At the same time, the retention of Bessent’s denial of

debt and asset seizure introduces a degree of internal tension, softening the headline's more critical framing. The Estonian version's selective appropriation operates primarily through omission and headline-level reformulation.

The Russian-language versions adopt a different strategy. By incorporating material from Radio NV and The New York Times, they expand the informational scope of the article and foreground the asymmetry of the proposed agreement more explicitly than the source. The dominant frame shifts toward a more confrontational and evaluative representation, emphasizing the burdensome nature of the deal, Ukraine's counter-proposals, and the absence of security guarantees. This reframing is achieved through a combination of reordering, reformulation, omission and addition.

Across the two language groups, the most notable contrast lies in the direction of framing intervention. The Estonian version reduces and depoliticises, while the Russian-language versions expand and recontextualise. Both omit the most confrontational elements of the Bloomberg source — the 'dictator' characterisation, the 'disinformation' rebuttal, and the 'colonialism' critique — but the consequences differ: in the Estonian version their absence produces a narrow financial dispute, while in the Russian-language versions it is offset by additions that foreground the deal's burdensome nature.

The comparison between Radio Svoboda and Delfi RUS highlights the cumulative effects of indirect translation, as the latter largely reproduces the intermediary version, demonstrating how framing shifts introduced at one stage are transmitted and reinforced in subsequent iterations.

3.3 Analysis of Article Set 3

3.3.1 Overview and translation chain

The source text for this article set is a Reuters exclusive article published on 2 May 2025. It reports that US officials have finalized a package of economic sanctions against Russia, targeting the energy and banking sectors, but that it is unclear whether President Trump will approve the measures. The article is built around this central uncertainty, situating the sanctions package within the broader context of Trump's shifting stance toward the Kremlin and Putin's continued rejection of ceasefire calls.

The translation chain in this article set follows the same structure as the previous two sets, involving both direct and mediated translation. The Estonian-language target text was published on 3 May 2025 on Delfi, authored by Lenel Kivi, and attributes its content directly to Reuters in both the headline and the lead. The first Russian-language target text was published on the same date by Meduza and also translates directly from Reuters, citing it as its primary source. Meduza supplements the Reuters content with material from two additional sources: a Bloomberg report and a reference to a US Senate bill on sanctions. The second Russian-language target text was published on Delfi RUS on 3 May 2025. Its relay status is made explicit in the lead sentence, which ends with '*nuuem Meduza*' ['reports Meduza'], identifying Meduza as the immediate intermediary and Reuters as the ultimate source. The translation chain is therefore: Reuters (English) → Estonian Delfi (Estonian) and Reuters (English) → Meduza (Russian) → Delfi RUS (Russian). A key structural feature of this set is the behaviour of Delfi RUS within the chain. Unlike in Article Set 2, where Delfi RUS reproduced the intermediary version including its additions, here Delfi RUS relays Meduza while omitting all of Meduza's additions, producing a text that is shorter than

both the source and the intermediary. The Estonian version represents a parallel direct adaptation from the Reuters source.

3.3.2 Framing in the source text

Reuters constructs the story around a single central tension: a sanctions package has been prepared, but whether Trump will deploy it remains undecided. This uncertainty is present in the headline, the lead and multiple paragraphs throughout the article.

The problem is defined as the need to increase pressure on Russia while managing internal uncertainty within the US administration, particularly regarding Trump's willingness to approve the sanctions. The issue is framed not only as a policy decision but also as a question of political leadership and strategic consistency.

Causal interpretation is layered. On one level, the sanctions are presented as a response to Putin's rejection of Trump's ceasefire calls. On another, Reuters provides background context that complicates this picture: since taking office, Trump has taken steps seen as accommodating toward Russia, including disbanding a Justice Department task force formed to enforce sanctions and target Kremlin-linked oligarchs, making pro-Moscow statements, and calling Zelenskiy a 'dictator'. This context positions the possible sanctions as a shift in Trump's approach rather than a continuation of existing policy.

Moral evaluation is present and, in places, direct. Reuters states that Trump "has made pro-Moscow statements, falsely blaming Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskiy for starting the conflict" — a notably direct evaluative claim in otherwise factual reporting. Kurt Volker's

assessment, that Trump has “been bending over backwards to give Putin every opportunity” and that “Putin is now the outlier”, further frames Russia as the party responsible for the impasse.

The treatment dimension is articulated through Volker, who describes the sanctions as “the next phase of putting some pressure on Russia.” The sanctions are presents as part of a broader strategy aimed at achieving a ceasefire and eventual settlement.

3.3.3 Framing in the Estonian-language target text (Delfi)

The Estonian-language Delfi article condenses the Reuters source significantly, reducing both its length and contextual detail. It preserves the central uncertainty frame but becomes more narrowly focused on the sanctions package itself.

The problem definition is closely aligned with the source. The headline “*Reuters: USA valmistas uue sanktsioonipaketi Venemaa vastu, kuid Trumpi heakskiit pole kindel*” [“Reuters: The US prepared a new sanctions package against Russia, but Trump’s approval is not certain”] retains the uncertainty frame that is central to Reuters’ framing. The lead similarly conveys the dual structure of preparation and uncertainty. At the same time, it becomes more narrowly defined as a procedural issue — whether Trump will approve the measures — rather than a broader question of US policy toward Russia.

Causal interpretation remains broadly aligned with the source but is simplified. The article retains the idea that sanctions are intended to increase pressure on Moscow, but omits the broader diplomatic context and references to Trump's prior accommodations toward Russia.

Moral evaluation is more neutral than in the source. Reuters' statement that Trump is 'falsely blaming' Zelenskiy for starting the conflict is absent. The Volker quotes are retained, including his characterisation of Putin as 'the outlier,' which preserves some evaluative weight. However, the broader critical framing of Trump's prior accommodations toward Russia is removed. The result is a more neutral and less politically charged presentation.

The treatment dimension is preserved in a simplified form. The Estonian version retains Volker's framing of the sanctions as "the next phase of putting some pressure on Russia" and includes the explanation of secondary sanctions and their potential significance. However, the broader strategic framing is reduced, and the emphasis shifts toward uncertainty about Trump's decision rather than the longer-term policy trajectory.

3.3.4 Framing in the Russian-language versions (Meduza and Delfi RUS)

The two Russian-language versions in this set are not near-identical, in contrast to the preceding article sets. Meduza translates directly from Reuters and adds material from two further sources. Delfi RUS relays Meduza but omits all Meduza's additions, producing a text that is shorter than both its source and its intermediary.

The problem definition is reformulated in both Russian-language versions. Both headlines drop the uncertainty that Reuters places at the centre of the story. Meduza's headline "*Reuters: США разработали санкции против «Газпрома» и российских банков*" ["Reuters: The US developed sanctions against Gazprom and Russian banks"] and Delfi RUS's "*Reuters: США разработали новые санкции против российских компаний и банков*" ["Reuters: The US developed new sanctions against Russian companies and banks"] both present the sanctions as a

completed action rather than a contingent one. The uncertainty over whether Trump will sign is retained in the body text but removed from the headline, shifting the framing from an ongoing decision-making process to a more definitive presentation of the sanctions.

Causal interpretation remains consistent with the source in presenting sanctions as a means of pressuring Russia but is reduced in scope. The broader causal context present in Reuters, including references to Russian escalation and detailed diplomatic developments, is absent from both versions.

Moral evaluation is the most limited of any version. Reuters' 'falsely blaming' formulation is absent. The Volker quotes, which carry the most evaluative weight in the source text, are omitted entirely from both Russian-language versions. The overall moral register is more neutral than either Reuters or the Estonian version.

The treatment dimension is largely absent. The Volker 'next phase' framing and the explanation of secondary sanctions are both omitted from Meduza and Delfi RUS. The reader is told that sanctions have been prepared and that Trump may or may not approve them, but the conditional and strategic aspects of the policy are less developed than in the source text.

3.3.5 Selective appropriation patterns

Reordering

The most significant reordering in this article set occurs in the Estonian version and concerns the placement of Trump's Truth Social post. In Reuters, Trump's Truth Social post announcing he was "strongly considering large scale Banking Sanctions, Sanctions and Tariffs on

Russia” appears near the end of the article, presented as the most recent public signal of his thinking. The Estonian version moves this, along with the preceding Vatican meeting with Zelenskiy, to the second paragraph of the body text. This changes its function: in Reuters it appears as the latest development in an evolving narrative; in the Estonian version it becomes the immediate context that explains why the sanctions package is being discussed at all. This foregrounds Trump’s public statement more prominently and to links it more directly to the sanctions story.

The Russian-language versions do not introduce comparable paragraph-level reordering.

Reformulations

The most consequential reformulation in this article set concerns the headline framing of Trump’s role. Reuters’ headline “Exclusive: US readies Russia sanctions over Ukraine, unclear if Trump will sign, sources say” makes Trump’s decision the central unknown and signals the sourcing through both the ‘Exclusive’ label and the ‘sources say’ qualifier. The Estonian headline “*Reuters: USA valmistas uue sanktsioonipaketi Venemaa vastu, kuid Trumpi heakskiit pole kindel*” [“Reuters: The US prepared a new sanctions package against Russia, but Trump’s approval is not certain”] drops both qualifiers but preserves the uncertainty clause retained in the headline. Meduza’s headline “*Reuters: США разработали санкции против «Газпрома» и российских банков*” [“Reuters: The US developed sanctions against Gazprom and Russian banks”] drops the uncertainty entirely and specifies the targets, presenting the sanctions as an accomplished development. Delfi RUS’s headline “*Reuters: США разработали новые санкции против российских компаний и банков*” [“Reuters: The US developed new sanctions against Russian companies and banks”] follows the same pattern but generalises Meduza’s specific reference to Gazprom into the broader category of “Russian companies.”

A further instance of reformulation can be observed in the translation of idiomatic language. The Reuters original describes Trump as having been “bending over backwards” to achieve ceasefire and end the war, while the Estonian-language translation renders this as “*Trump on relvarahu ja sõja lõpetamise nimel pingutanud*” [“Trump has made an effort to achieve ceasefire and end the war”], reducing the intensity of the expression and producing a more neutral tone.

Further reformulation occurs through condensation. In both target versions, complex passages in the source text are summarised, reducing the level of detail and smoothing over internal tensions within the US policy process.

Additions

Meduza is the only target text to introduce substantive additions. The first is a reference to a Bloomberg report from 2 May, which noted that US officials had prepared several options to increase economic pressure on Russia due to Putin’s delays in ending the war. The second is a note that more than 70 US senators had supported a bill on “crushing” sanctions against Russia, including 500% tariffs on imports from countries that buy Russian oil, gas or uranium. Both additions provide wider context for the sanctions story but come from separate sources and extend the article beyond the Reuters exclusive.

The Estonian version and Delfi RUS introduce no substantive additions.

Omissions

The most significant omission shared across all three target texts is the contextual account of Trump’s prior accommodations toward Russia. Reuters devotes several paragraphs to this: Trump disbanded a DoJ task force formed to enforce sanctions and target Kremlin-linked

oligarchs; he made pro-Moscow statements and called Zelenskiy a ‘dictator’; and his special envoy Witkoff has advocated a peace strategy that would cede four Ukrainian regions to Moscow. This context is essential to Reuters’ framing of the possible sanctions as a shift in direction rather than a continuation of policy. Its removal from the Russian-language versions means that the sanctions story is presented without the background that explains its significance. The Estonian version retains a brief implicit reference, noting that sanctions could signify a hardening of Trump’s stance toward the Kremlin (“/.../ *mis võiks tähendadata seiskoha karmistumist Kremli suhtes*”), but without the supporting context, this observation carries less weight than it does in the source.

All three target texts also remove ‘Exclusive’ and ‘sources say’ from the headline. These markers indicate that the story is based on undisclosed sources and Reuters’ exclusive reporting; removing them gives the impression of greater certainty than the source text warrants.

Consistent across all three target texts is also the omission of Reuters’ editorial judgement that Trump was ‘falsely blaming’ Zelenskiy for starting the conflict. Its collective removal suggests a shared reluctance to reproduce a source agency’s explicit editorial verdicts, even when the underlying factual claim is not in dispute.

Two further omissions are shared across all target texts: the history of sanctions since Russia’s 2022 invasion and Moscow’s circumvention of them, and the March Reuters report that the US had been drawing up a plan to potentially give Russia sanctions relief. Both contextualise the current sanctions package within a longer trajectory of US policy. Without this context, the new sanctions package appears in isolation rather than as part of a longer policy.

The Russian-language versions omit substantially more than the Estonian version. Both Meduza and Delfi RUS drop the Volker quotes entirely, removing the most evaluative content in

the source text. They also omit Trump's Truth Social post, the Vatican meeting with Zelenskiy, the connection to the recently signed US-Ukraine minerals deal, and the explanation of secondary sanctions. The result is a much more compressed account that presents the sanctions package and the uncertainty about Trump's approval but provides little of the political context that Reuters uses to explain both.

Delfi RUS omits an additional layer of content relative to its intermediary: the Bloomberg report and the Senate bill reference that Meduza introduces as additions are absent from Delfi RUS entirely. This means that the relay transmission in this article set involves cumulative omission: content present in Reuters is lost in the move to Meduza, and content added by Meduza is lost in the move to Delfi RUS.

3.3.6 Summary of framing patterns

Reuters frames the story around a central uncertainty: a sanctions package has been prepared, but Trump has not decided whether to deploy it. This uncertainty is reinforced by the contextual account of Trump's prior accommodations toward Russia, which positions the possible sanctions as a departure from an established pattern. The evaluative dimension is carried primarily through Volker's quotes and Reuters' own 'falsely blaming' formulation.

The Estonian version retains the uncertainty frame at the headline level and preserves more of the source content than the Russian-language versions. It omits the contextual account of Trump's prior pro-Moscow stance but retains the Volker quotes and the secondary sanctions explanation. The main structural intervention is the reordering of the Truth Social post and Vatican

meeting to an early position in the article, which makes Trump's public statements the immediate context for the sanctions story rather than a late development within it.

The Russian-language versions drop the uncertainty from the headline, which reframes the story as a completed policy development rather than a deliberation in progress. Both omit the Volker quotes, the Truth Social post, the Vatican meeting, and the contextual account of Trump's changing stance. The result is a significantly compressed account that retains the basic facts of the sanctions package but removes the political context that Reuters uses to explain their significance. Meduza partially compensates for these omissions by adding the Bloomberg report and the Senate bill reference, though neither is transmitted to Delfi RUS.

Across the two language groups, the most notable contrast lies in the treatment of uncertainty. The Estonian version preserves the uncertainty frame at the headline level while condensing the surrounding political context; the Russian-language versions remove uncertainty from the headline entirely, producing a more categorical account of the same story. Both language groups omit the evaluative and contextual material that gives Reuters' framing its critical force.

The most distinctive feature of this article set is the pattern of cumulative omission in the relay chain, where content present in Reuters is lost in the move to Meduza, and content added by Meduza is lost in the move to Delfi RUS.

3.4 Analysis of Article Set 4

3.4.1 Overview and translation chain

The source text for this article set is a Bloomberg News report published on 5 August 2025. It reports that the Kremlin is considering offering an air-truce in Ukraine to avoid secondary

sanctions imposed by the US. The article presents this possible measure as part of a broader diplomatic context in which Russia seeks to avoid further sanctions while continuing its military campaign.

The translation chain in this article set follows the same relay structure observed in the preceding sets. The Estonian-language target text was published on 6 August 2025 on Delfi, edited by Lauri Laugen, and attributes its content directly to Bloomberg with the ‘Bloomberg:’ in the headline and ‘*kirjutab Bloomberg*’ [‘writes Bloomberg’] in the lead. Both Russian-language target texts were published on 5 August 2025. Meduza translates directly from Bloomberg and supplements its account with material from Reuters report published earlier the same day. The Delfi RUS article attributes its content to Bloomberg in the headline (‘Bloomberg:’) and to Meduza in the lead (“*Об этом пишет Meduza со ссылкой на Bloomberg*” [‘reports Meduza with reference to Bloomberg’]), identifying Meduza as the immediate intermediary and Bloomberg as the ultimate source. The translation chain is therefore: Bloomberg (English) → Delfi (Estonian) and Bloomberg (English) → Meduza (Russian) → Delfi RUS (Russian).

3.4.2 Framing in the source text

The Bloomberg source article constructs a geopolitical and strategic frame, presenting a proposed air truce as a limited tactical concession within an ongoing war that Russia does not intend to end.

The problem is defined as the difficulty of reaching a broader ceasefire settlement, given Russia’s unwillingness to abandon its war aims, despite growing external pressure. The possible

air truce is framed as a narrowly defined measure that does not fundamentally alter the overall conflict dynamic.

Causal interpretation foregrounds a combination of US pressure, including the threat of secondary sanctions, and Russia's strategic calculations. The article links the potential concession to Trump's efforts to push for a ceasefire, as well as to Russia's desire to manage its relationship with the US while maintaining its position on the battlefield.

Moral evaluation is present but embedded rather than explicit. The detail that Russia has "stepped up air attacks on Ukraine in recent weeks, including with record numbers of drones, as Putin maintains hardline demands" contextualises any potential concession as occurring against a backdrop of intensified violence. The inclusion of Putin's specific peace conditions and the corresponding note that Ukraine rejects them frames Russia's demands as the obstacle to progress. The Levada Center poll, which closes the article, introduces a further contrast: two-thirds of Russians favour ending the war at current positions, implicitly setting popular sentiment against Putin's stated war aims.

The treatment dimension is handled with ambiguity. The air truce is not presented as a likely or sufficient path to peace, but rather as a tactical move aimed at managing Trump's frustration. Lukashenko's remark ("Tell Zelenskiy to go along with it") further frames the proposal less as a genuine negotiating offer and more as a unilateral demand for Ukrainian compliance, adding a further layer of scepticism to Bloomberg's overall framing.

3.4.3 Framing in the Estonian target text (Delfi)

The Estonian-language Delfi article substantially condenses the Bloomberg source, reducing both its length and contextual detail. Despite this condensation, the central framing of the source text is retained but becomes more narrowly focused on the idea of potential concession and its immediate political implications.

The problem definition remains broadly aligned with the source, presenting the possibility of an air truce alongside Russia's intention to continue the war. The headline: "*Bloomberg: Kreml võib pakkuda Trumpile Ukrainas õhurelvarahu*" ['Bloomberg: The Kremlin may offer Trump an air ceasefire in Ukraine'] preserves the conditionality of Bloomberg's formulation through the modal '*võib*' ('may'), and the lead likewise retains the dual structure of potential concession and continued war: the Kremlin is considering an air ceasefire as a concession to avoid sanctions, "*aga kavatseb sõda muidu jätkata*" ['but intends to continue the war otherwise'].

Causal interpretation remains similar in structure but is reduced in scope. The Estonian version retains the link between US pressure and Russia's willingness to consider concessions but omits much of the surrounding diplomatic and military context that gives this relationship great depth in the source text.

Moral evaluation is preserved in part through the retention of the Markov quote: Trump needs "some kind of a 'gift', a concession from Russia," and an air truce "could be such a gift." This quote, attributed to a political consultant described as close to the Kremlin, carries an ironic register: it frames Russia's potential concession as a performative gesture calibrated to Trump's psychological needs rather than as a genuine peace initiative. Its retention in the Estonian version maintains some of the source text's sceptical framing of the proposal's sincerity.

The treatment dimension is present but simplified. The air truce is still presented as a possible step toward de-escalation, but its conditional and limited nature is less clearly developed, meaning that the reader receives the concession story without the surrounding evidence of continued military pressure.

3.4.4 Framing in the Russian-language versions (Meduza and Delfi RUS)

The two Russian-language versions are shorter and aligned with each other, confirming that the Delfi RUS article is a relay reproduction of the Meduza version rather than an independent translation. Meduza translates from Bloomberg and adds material from Reuters. Delfi RUS relays Meduza but omits Meduza's additions, producing a text that is shorter than both its intermediary and the source.

The problem definition is simplified compared to the source. The focus shifts toward the proposal of an air truce as a concession to Trump, with less emphasis on the broader strategic tension between de-escalation and continued warfare. Meduza's headline: *"Bloomberg: Россия в качестве уступки Трампу рассматривает возможность прекращения огня в воздухе — но не на земле"* ["Bloomberg: Russia is considering a ceasefire in the air as a concession to Trump — but not on the ground"], makes explicit the contrast that Bloomberg leaves implicit in the phrase 'without ending war'. The added clause *'но не на земле'* ['but not on the ground'] foregrounds the limited scope of the proposal, shifting the emphasis from Russia's deliberation to the specific form of concession. Delfi RUS reproduces this headline unchanged, meaning the reframing at the headline level is carried through the relay chain without modification.

Causal interpretation remains broadly consistent with the source in linking the potential truce to US pressure and the threat of sanctions, but it is reduced in scope. The Russian-language versions omit much of the surrounding diplomatic context and focus on the immediate relationship between sanctions pressure and Russian decision-making.

Moral evaluation is more limited in both Russian-language versions than in the Bloomberg source or the Estonian version. Neither retains the Markov quote, which carries the ironic ‘gift’ framing. The escalation context, including the detail about record drone numbers, and Putin’s stated peace conditions are absent from both. The result is a more neutral and less nuanced presentation.

The treatment dimension is most compressed in Delfi RUS. Having omitted Meduza’s additions, it presents a three-paragraph account that conveys the core proposition: Russia is considering an air truce, but Putin will not agree to a general ceasefire — without the supplementary context added either by Bloomberg or by Meduza. The article’s relay status is thus not only a textual feature but also a structural one. Delfi RUS reproduces only what was transmitted from Meduza, and what Meduza chose not to transmit from Bloomberg does not reach Delfi RUS readers.

3.4.5 Selective appropriation patterns

Reordering

No significant reordering is present in either of the target text versions. Both the Estonian- and Russian-language versions follow the overall narrative structure of the Bloomberg source, condensing it through selective omission of paragraphs rather than reordering.

Reformulations

Headline-level reformulation again represents the clearest point of intervention. Bloomberg’s headline (“*Russia Weighs Ukraine Air-Truce Offer to Trump Without Ending War*”) foregrounds Russia’s agency (‘weighs’) while immediately limiting the proposal (‘without ending war’), establishing a tension from the outset. The Estonian headline (“*Kreml võib pakkuda Trumpile Ukrainas õhurelvarahu*” [“The Kremlin may offer Trump an air ceasefire in Ukraine”]) replaces this with a simpler modal construction, presenting the truce as a possible offer and omitting the limitation. The Russian-language headline, used by both Meduza and Delfi RUS, takes a different approach: instead of omitting the limitation, it makes it explicit as a contrastive clause (‘но не на земле’ [‘but not on the ground’]), shifting the framing from deliberation to the scope of the proposal.

A further instance of reformulation is found in Meduza’s treatment of Bloomberg’s reference to Trump’s tariff threats. In the source, this appears as a brief embedded reference (“The US president is threatening to impose heavy tariffs from Friday on countries including China and India that buy Russian oil and other goods”) – from which the August 8 deadline and the scale of the measures must be inferred. Meduza renders it as a standalone bullet point specifying both the deadline and the characterisation of the tariffs as triple-digit, making the whole segment more explicit and prominent and giving the information greater salience in the target text than it carries in the source.

Additions

Russian-language article by Meduza is the only target text that introduces an addition not traceable to the Bloomberg source: a reference to a Reuters report from the same day. It states that

Putin did not want to anger Trump but prioritised military objectives and intended to capture all four Ukrainian regions before entering peace negotiations. This adds a more specific account of Putin's strategic reasoning than is present in the Bloomberg text. Neither this addition nor the reformulated tariff bullet is transmitted to Delfi RUS, which otherwise reproduces Meduza's rendering of the Bloomberg material.

The Estonian version introduces no substantive additions.

Omissions

Omission is the dominant strategy across all three target texts. The most significant omissions concern the broader diplomatic and military context present in the Bloomberg article, including detailed references to ongoing battlefield developments, negotiation dynamics, and the wider geopolitical setting.

An omission specific to the Russian-language versions concerns Bloomberg's statement that "Russia's war aims remain unchanged." The Russian-language versions retain the observation that Putin will not agree to a general ceasefire because Russian forces "continue steady advances on the battlefield," but drops the second clause entirely. This is a meaningful shift: Bloomberg frames Putin's refusal as rooted in unchanging strategic objectives, while the Russian-language version presents it as situationally motivated by current battlefield conditions.

The Estonian version omits a substantial portion of the diplomatic and military context present in Bloomberg, resulting in a more narrowly focused account centred on the potential air truce itself. The Russian-language versions similarly reduce contextual depth, though they retain slightly more of the immediate causal framing. Overall, the effect across all target texts is a simplification of the source's more complex and layered narrative.

Delfi RUS omits an additional layer relative to Meduza, losing the Reuters-sourced Putin analysis. This produces a pattern of cumulative omission across the relay chain: content present in Bloomberg is lost in the move to Meduza, content added by Meduza is lost in the move to Delfi RUS, and the terminal text in the chain is therefore the least informationally complete of any version, despite drawing on an intermediate text that had itself introduced supplementary material.

3.4.6 Summary of framing patterns

The selective appropriation patterns in this article set show a consistent reduction of the source text's internal tension and contextual complexity. The Bloomberg article constructs a geopolitical frame in which the proposed air truce is presented as a limited tactical concession within an ongoing war, combining the possibility of de-escalation with the continuation of military objectives.

The Estonian-language version largely preserves this framing but narrows its scope. While it retains the dual structure of concession and continued war, it reduces the surrounding diplomatic and military context and foregrounds the idea of the truce as a discrete political move.

The Russian-language headline, shared by both Meduza and Delfi RUS, performs a different kind of adaptation: rather than preserving the tension between concession and continued war, it renders the contrast explicit by distinguishing between an air truce and a ground ceasefire. This version is more direct and trades the ironic ambiguity of the Bloomberg headline for a clearer but less politically charged statement. The emphasis shifts toward the air truce as a concession to Trump, with less attention to the broader strategic tension present in the source.

Across the two language groups, the most notable contrast lies in how each handles Bloomberg's sceptical framing. The Estonian version preserves the irony of the 'gift' formulation, maintaining a degree of critical distance from the proposal's sincerity. The Russian-language versions remove this element entirely and replace Bloomberg's deliberative framing with a more declarative account of Russia's position, foregrounding the air/ground distinction without the surrounding evaluative context.

Across all target texts, the dominant pattern is the reduction of analytical layering and progressive simplification, with each stage in the translation chain reducing the layered and ironic framing of the Bloomberg source toward a more straightforward account of the diplomatic proposal itself. As in previous sets, the comparison between Meduza and Delfi RUS highlights the cumulative effects of indirect translation: Delfi RUS reproduces only what is transmitted through the intermediary, resulting in the most compressed and least contextually developed version of the story.

3.5 Analysis of Article Set 5

3.5.1 Overview and translation chain

The source text for this article set is a Bloomberg News report published on 20 September 2025. It reports that President Vladimir Putin has concluded that military escalation is the optimal strategy for forcing Ukraine into negotiations on his terms, and that Donald Trump is unlikely to intervene meaningfully on Kyiv's behalf. The article presents this assessment as emerging from the August meeting between the two leaders in Alaska and situates it within a broader pattern of intensified Russian attacks and strategic calculation.

The translation chain in this article set follows the same relay structure as the preceding sets. The Estonian-language version was published on 21 September 2025, authored by Kaarel Kressa, and attributes its content to Bloomberg in the lead. Both Russian-language target texts were published on 20 September 2025. Meduza translates directly from Bloomberg, citing it as its source. The Delfi RUS article attributes its content to Meduza in the lead (“*Подробнее об этом сообщаем ‘Медуза’*” [‘Meduza reports on this in more detail’]), identifying Meduza as the immediate intermediary and Bloomberg as the ultimate source. The translation chain is therefore: Bloomberg (English) → Delfi (Estonian) and Bloomberg (English) → Meduza (Russian) → Delfi RUS (Russian).

What distinguishes this article set from the preceding ones is the scope of the Estonian version. While condensing the Bloomberg source, the Estonian Delfi article incorporates material from Reuters and other sources, producing the most comprehensive account in the set. Unlike in previous sets, Meduza introduces no additions from external sources, translating Bloomberg without supplementary material. This means the relay chain in this set involves less transformation at the Meduza stage than in preceding sets.

3.5.2 Framing in the source text

The Bloomberg source article constructs a geopolitical and strategical frame in which escalation is presented as a deliberate policy choice rather than a reactive development. The central tension lies in the contrast between increasing Russian military pressure and absence of decisive US intervention. This is presented not as speculation but as the assessed view of people close to Kremlin.

The problem is defined as the failure of US-Russian diplomacy to constrain Russian military behaviour, compounded by what Bloomberg characterises as Washington's passivity. The Alaska summit, presented as a missed opportunity, functions in the article as the turning point from which Russia's escalation follows.

Causal interpretation links Putin's strategic calculation to Trump's conduct. The Alaska talks are described as having "left Putin convinced that Trump has no interest in intervening in the conflict," while "signs of restraint from Washington" are presented as emboldening Kremlin. The result is a framing in which US passivity functions as a contributing factor in Russia's escalation.

Moral evaluation is present but distributed rather than explicit. The strongest evaluative elements appear in the expert attribution: Nikolai Petrov describes Putin as "failing on the battlefield" and turning to "nuclear blackmail and psychological pressure, including mass bombardments." The inclusion of data on increased drone and missile strikes and references to failed territorial advances introduces a further layer of evaluative contrast between military escalation and limited battlefield success.

The treatment dimension is indirect. Trump's frustration with Putin is noted, and Bloomberg reports that he has floated the idea of tougher sanctions, though while simultaneously insisting that European allies act first. The implied treatment is increased Western economic pressure, but Bloomberg doesn't endorse any particular course of action.

3.5.3 Framing in the Estonian target text (Delfi)

The Estonian-language Delfi article condenses the Bloomberg source material significantly, omitting much of its analytical detail, while supplementing what remains with additions from Reuters and ISW that introduce a different layer of contextual information. The result is an article that is considerably longer and more contextually diverse than either Russian-language version in this set.

The headline, “*Kremlis allikad: Putin järeldas Alaska kohtumiselt, et võib Ukrainas teha, mida tahab*” [“Kremlin sources: Putin concluded from the Alaska summit that he can do what he wants in Ukraine”], is notable in two respects. First, it does not carry the ‘Bloomberg:’ attribution label present in the headlines of previous Estonian target texts in this corpus. Instead, Bloomberg is referenced in the lead. This gives the headline a more assertive tone, presenting the claim as established rather than as one agency’s account based on anonymous sources. Second, the headline reformulates Bloomberg’s framing in more assertive terms: where Bloomberg’s headline, “Putin Decides He Can Step Up Attacks on Kyiv and Trump Won’t Act”, foregrounds Putin’s decision and Trump’s inaction as parallel claims, the Estonian headline compresses these into a single conclusion attributed to ‘Kremlin sources,’ framing Putin’s reasoning as a direct inference from the Alaska meeting. The phrase ‘*võib Ukrainas teha, mida tahab*’ [‘can do what he wants in Ukraine’] is broader than Bloomberg’s formulation and carries a more explicitly critical register.

The problem definition remains broadly aligned with the source but introduces an additional layer of source criticism. The Estonian version cites ISW analysis suggesting that Kremlin-linked sources may have spoken to Reuters on the authorities’ orders to increase pressure on Europe. However, this warning refers specifically to Reuters, while the article itself is based on Bloomberg. As a result, the Reuters claim is implicitly problematised, while the parallel

Bloomberg claim remains unqualified. This reflects how combining material from different sources can introduce internal inconsistencies not present in a single-source text.

Causal interpretation is deepened through the Reuters additions. The Estonian version incorporates material on the cancellation of Baltic Security Initiative funding, Trump's calls for greater European burden-sharing, and the approval of a billion-dollar arms deal funded by European allies. These additions place the story within a broader transatlantic context and help explain the conclusions linked to Putin, while much of Bloomberg's original analytical detail is reduced or omitted.

Moral evaluation is preserved but redistributed. The escalation context remains present through references to intensified attacks and pressure on Ukraine, while additional material introduces a more explicitly evaluative dimension, for instance through discussion of Western responses and internal Russian vulnerabilities.

The treatment dimension is present but unevenly developed. The Reuters additions point to a developing Western response through references to Trump's frustration, economic pressure, and continued military support. At the same time, the longer-term strategy (the slowing of Russian advances and Ukraine's military success) remains less developed, with the focus placed more on recent events than on ongoing resistance or negotiation.

3.5.4 Framing in the Russian-language versions (Meduza and Delfi RUS)

The two Russian-language versions are closely aligned, confirming that Delfi RUS reproduces Meduza's rendering of the Bloomberg source. The main difference between them lies in the headline: Meduza's "*Bloomberg: переговоры на Аляске убедили Путина, что Трамп не*

будет вмешиваться в войну” [“Bloomberg: the Alaska talks convinced Putin that Trump won't intervene in the war”] is a condensed and declarative rendering of Bloomberg’s claim, while Delfi RUS extends it with an additional clause: *“Теперь РФ стала наносить удары по Украине в два раза чаще”* [“Now Russia has started striking Ukraine twice as often”]. This extension is a reformulation of Bloomberg’s statistical detail, where a 46% increase in attacks in the month following summit is rendered as a headline claim, giving the escalation data greater prominence than it carries in either Bloomberg or Meduza.

The problem definition is simplified compared to the source. The focus shifts toward the conclusion that Putin believes Trump will not intervene, with escalation presented as a direct consequence of this perception. The headline foregrounds this causal link more explicitly than the Bloomberg source, presenting the Alaska talks as the decisive factor shaping Russian behaviour.

Causal interpretation remains broadly consistent with the source but is more linear. The Russian-language versions present a clearer cause-effect relationship between the Alaska meeting, Trump’s perceived inaction, and increased attacks, while omitting some of the additional analytical layers present in Bloomberg.

Moral evaluation is more limited than in the Bloomberg source. The expert quotes that carry the most evaluative weight in Bloomberg are absent. While the texts retain references to intensified attacks and statistical data on escalation, they omit some of the broader evaluative context present in the source. The result is a more streamlined and less analytically complex account.

The treatment dimension is the most reduced in the Russian-language version. The Western response present in Bloomberg — including Trump’s frustration, tariff threats, and G7 pressure —

is omitted. As a result, the reader is presented with the escalation and its Kremlin-side rationale without a parallel account of how the US and Europe are responding. The report is thus framed more as a description of Russian strategic behaviour than as an ongoing interaction between competing actors.

3.5.5 Selective appropriation patterns

Reordering

Reordering is relatively limited in this article set. The overall narrative structure of the Bloomberg source is largely preserved across target texts.

Some minor reordering is observable in the Estonian version, where the conclusion drawn from the Alaska meeting is foregrounded more strongly at the outset, increasing its interpretive weight. A further instance concerns the placement of the Gaza comparison, which in Bloomberg appears after the discussion of battlefield developments but is moved earlier in the Estonian version. This gives it greater prominence and introduces the broader geopolitical context before the more detailed account of military developments.

Reformulations

The most significant reformulation in this article set occurs at the headline level. The Bloomberg headline, “Putin Decides He Can Step Up Attacks on Kyiv and Trump Won’t Act” presents two parallel elements, combining Putin’s decision to escalate with Trump’s inaction. The Estonian headline reformulates this as a single conclusion attributed to ‘Kremlin sources,’ with the phrase *‘võib Ukrainas teha, mida tahab’* [‘can do whatever he wants in Ukraine’], presenting the

relationship in more general terms. Meduza’s headline shifts this further into a causal formulation, presenting the Alaska talks as having convinced Putin. The Delfi RUS headline extends this by adding the escalation statistic as a second clause, making explicit a consequence that in Bloomberg appears later in the article.

A further instance of reformulation concerns the Delfi RUS headline’s rendering of Bloomberg’s 46% figure as *‘в два раза чаще’* [‘twice as often’]. This is an approximation rather than a direct translation, introducing a degree of imprecision not present in the source.

Another reformulation can be seen in the Estonian version’s rendering of Bloomberg’s core claim about Putin’s strategy. Bloomberg states that escalation is the best way to force Ukraine into talks on his terms, whereas the Estonian version presents this as the possibility of militarily defeating Ukraine: *‘/.../ veendunud, et tal on võimalik Ukraina sõjaliselt alistada /.../’* [‘/.../ convinced that he can militarily defeat Ukraine /.../’]. This makes the statement stronger and moves the focus from negotiation to a definite outcome.

A further example can be seen in the rendering of Putin’s peace conditions. Bloomberg describes the demand as requiring Kyiv to “cede unconquered territory in two eastern regions,” foregrounding the political dimension of the concession. In the Russian-language versions, this is reformulated as a withdrawal of troops from the Donetsk and Luhansk regions, shifting the framing toward a more procedural military action and omitting the detail that the territory remains unconquered.

A further, smaller reformulation concerns the rendering of Putin’s Gaza comparison. Bloomberg states that Western acceptance of Israel’s campaign has been “undermining their criticism of Moscow,” suggesting a weakening of criticism. The Russian-language versions render

this as *‘не могут критиковать Москву’* [‘cannot criticise Moscow’], replacing this with a more categorical formulation.

Additions

The Estonian version is the only target text to introduce substantive additions. It incorporates material from Reuters and ISW analysis, including references to Baltic Security Initiative funding, transatlantic burden-sharing, US military support, and Trump’s public statements. These additions extend the contextual scope beyond the Bloomberg source and introduce new elements related to Western policy and regional security. As a result, the article functions less as a translation and more as a multi-source reconstruction in which Bloomberg is only one of several inputs.

The Russian-language versions do not introduce comparable additions and remain closer to the Bloomberg source in terms of informational scope.

Omissions

Omission remains a dominant strategy across all target texts, though its extent differs by versions. The most significant omissions concern the analytical layering of the Bloomberg source, including expert attribution, statistical contextualisation, and the broader evaluation of Russia’s strategic position.

The Estonian version omits a substantial portion of this material. The expert quotes that carry much of the evaluative weight in the source are absent, as is the detailed statistical framing of the escalation and the fuller account of battlefield developments, including Ukrainian strikes on Russian infrastructure and Russia’s redeployment of forces. What remains of this strand is a more generalised summary. These omissions are partly offset by additions from Reuters and ISW, but

these introduce a different type of contextual information rather than replacing Bloomberg's analytical content.

In the Russian-language versions, omission is more extensive. Both Meduza and Delfi RUS remove Bloomberg's account of the Western response to Russian escalation, including Trump's reactions, tariff threats, and G7 pressure. The result is a more compressed and linear account focused on Russia's strategic reasoning and the escalation itself.

As in previous sets, the relay structure produces cumulative effects. Delfi RUS reproduces Meduza's condensed version, meaning that omissions introduced at the intermediary stage are carried through unchanged.

3.5.6 Summary of framing patterns

The selective appropriation patterns in this article set show a reduction of the analytical complexity present in the Bloomberg source. The original article constructs a geopolitical frame in which escalation is presented as a strategic choice shaped by both Russian calculation and US inaction, while also including a counterbalancing strand that highlights the limits of Russia's battlefield position.

The Estonian-language version retains the core claim but condenses much of this analytical detail. The expert attribution, statistical framing, and counterbalancing strand are largely omitted, while additional material from Reuters and ISW introduces a different layer of contextual information related to transatlantic relations. The most consequential reformulation occurs in the rendering of Putin's objective, which is strengthened from forcing Ukraine into talks to the possibility of militarily defeating it. The absence of the 'Bloomberg:' attribution in the headline

and the inclusion of source-critical ISW commentary further distinguish the Estonian version from the other target texts.

The Russian-language versions are more narrowly focused. They follow the core causal logic of the source but present it in a more linear form, foregrounding the link between the Alaska meeting and subsequent escalation while omitting the Western response, expert evaluation, and counterbalancing material. The result is a more compressed account centred on Russia's strategic reasoning and the escalation itself, without any analytical layers that give Bloomberg's framing its ambivalence.

Across the two language groups, the contrast in adaptive strategy is the most pronounced of any article set in this corpus. The Estonian version expands Bloomberg with Western policy context, producing an article in which Russia's escalation is situated within a developing transatlantic response. The Russian-language versions compress Bloomberg into a Kremlin-focused causal account, foregrounding the Alaska talks and the escalation that followed while omitting the surrounding evaluative and strategic context. Both language groups omit Bloomberg's counterbalancing strand, but the consequences differ: the Estonian version replaces it with external policy context, while the Russian-language versions leave the escalation narrative unqualified.

The comparison between Meduza and Delfi RUS in this set is less analytically distinctive than in previous sets, since Meduza introduces no additions of its own. The relay transmission is therefore more straightforward: Delfi RUS reproduces Meduza's rendering of Bloomberg with minimal modification, and the cumulative omission dynamic that characterised earlier sets is not evident in this set.

3.6 Analysis of Article Set 6

3.6.1 Overview and translation chain

The source text for this article set is a Reuters report published on 25 October 2025. It reports that the Trump administration has prepared additional economic sanctions targeting key sectors of the Russian economy, which may be implemented if Russia continues to delay ending the war in Ukraine. The article situates these potential measures within a broader policy context, including US coordination with European allies and discussions about the use of frozen Russian assets to support Ukraine.

The translation chain follows the same relay structure as the preceding sets. The Estonian-language target text was published on 25 October 2025 on Delfi, authored by Lenel Kivi, and attributes its content to Reuters in both the headline ('Reuters:') and the lead ('*uudisteagentuuri Reutersi teatel*' ['as reported by Reuters']). Meduza published its Russian-language version on the same day, also citing Reuters directly in the headline. The Delfi RUS article, published on 25 October 2025, carries 'Медуза' in the position normally occupied by the author's name, indicating that Meduza is treated as the producer of the content rather than merely as a source cited within the article. The headline and the lead of the article attribute the content to Reuters, identifying it as the ultimate source. The translation chain is therefore: Reuters (English) -> Delfi (Estonian) and Reuters (English) -> Meduza (Russian) -> Delfi RUS (Russian).

Unlike in some preceding article sets, Delfi RUS in this case reproduces not only Meduza's rendering of the Reuters core but also Meduza's additions, meaning the two Russian-language versions are closely aligned in both content and scope.

3.6.2 Framing in the source text

The Reuters source article constructs a geopolitical and policy-oriented frame, presenting sanctions as a strategic instrument within an ongoing effort to pressure Russia to end the war. The story is presented around two parallel narrative strands: the sanctions package itself and the chaotic diplomatic week that preceded its imposition. These two strands are formally separated by a subheading “A Week of Whiplash”, which signals that the sanctions are best understood not as a planned policy initiative but as the outcome of an improvised and unstable decision-making process.

The problem is defined as the continued delay in ending the war by Russia, with sanctions framed as a conditional response available to the US administration if diplomatic progress is not achieved. The article also presents a secondary problem: the need for coordinated action with European allies.

Causal interpretation is layered. Sanctions are presented as a response to Russia’s continued delay in ending the war, but also as part of a broader policy framework linking US actions to both Russian behaviour and transatlantic dynamics. The article emphasises ongoing policy deliberation, including internal discussions, coordination with European partners, and uncertainty about implementation. At the same time, Reuters outlines a sequence of rapid shifts in US decision-making — including plans for a Trump-Putin meeting, pressure on Ukraine, and the cancellation of talks — which presents the process as reactive and uneven rather than as a coherent strategic approach.

Moral evaluation is present at several levels. The article includes a more explicit evaluative strand in the Ukrainian Embassy spokesperson's statement that dismantling Russia's war machine is 'the most humane way' to end the war. A more critical register is also visible in the description of European allies as 'buffeted' by Trump's policy shifts and in the characterisation of his diplomatic approach as 'irrational exuberance.' At the same time, Reuters includes Kirill Dmitriev's claim that the US, Russia and Ukraine are 'close to a diplomatic solution,' providing a counterpoint to the more sceptical framing.

The treatment dimension is present but limited. Sanctions are framed as a form of available pressure rather than a decisive step, with the article emphasising European burden-sharing as a condition for further US action. Trump's refusal to meet Putin without progress toward a deal reinforces this conditional framing.

3.6.3 Framing in the Estonian-language target text (Delfi)

The Estonian Delfi article condenses the Reuters source significantly, retaining the core sanctions story while omitting both the "Week of Whiplash" narrative and most of the evaluative and diplomatic content.

The problem definition is aligned with Reuters at a basic level but is narrowed to the sanctions package itself. The Estonian version retains the connection between the sanctions and Putin's delay in ending the war, as well as the European pressure dimension and Ukraine's proposals for cutting Russian banks from the dollar system. However, the framing of the sanctions as the product of a chaotic and improvisational week is entirely absent.

Causal interpretation is simplified. The Estonian version presents the sanctions as a straightforward US policy response to Russia's continued delay, without the broader account of shifting US decisions present in Reuters. Trump's planned pause to assess Russia's reaction is retained, as is the uncertainty about whether the measures will be implemented.

Moral evaluation is more limited than in the source. The Ukrainian Embassy spokesperson's quote is absent, as are the 'irrational exuberance' characterisation and the description of European allies as buffeted by Trump's inconsistency. This leaves the Estonian version with a more neutral moral register than the Reuters source.

The treatment dimension is preserved but simplified. The Estonian version retains the signal that Washington has a developed toolkit and that Europe is expected to act next, but the conditional and uncertain character of the sanctions, emphasised repeatedly in Reuters, is less prominent.

3.6.4 Framing in the Russian-language versions (Meduza and Delfi RUS)

The two Russian-language versions are closely aligned, with Delfi RUS reproducing both Meduza's rendering of the Reuters core and Meduza's additions. This makes article set 6 one of the cases in the corpus where the relay transmission does not involve cumulative omission: Meduza's additions are transmitted in full to Delfi RUS readers.

The Russian-language headline "*Reuters: США готовят новые санкции против России*" ["Reuters: The US is preparing new sanctions against Russia"] is shared by both Meduza and Delfi RUS and condenses the two-part Reuters headline into a single statement. The European pressure dimension is omitted, and the conditional 'could hit' is replaced by the present tense

‘*готовят*’ (‘are preparing’), which presents the sanctions as ongoing process rather than a contingent possibility. This reduces the uncertainty present in the source and presents the outcome as more settled.

The problem definition follows Reuters’ core framing, presenting sanctions as a potential response to Russia’s continued delay in ending the war. However, the framing of the sanctions as the product of a chaotic and improvisational diplomatic week is absent, meaning the reader receives the sanctions story without the account of how the decision was actually reached.

Causal interpretation is consistent with the source. The Russian-language versions preserve the link between US policy and Russian behaviour, as well as the expectation that European partners will take further steps.

Moral evaluation is similarly limited as in the Estonian version in terms of what is omitted from Reuters. The Ukrainian Embassy spokesperson’s statement and the ‘irrational exuberance’ characterisation are absent from both. At the same time, the Russian-language versions introduce a different evaluative element by including Putin’s response to the Lukoil and Rosneft sanctions, in which he describes them as ‘pressure on Russia’ but not significantly affecting the country’s economic wellbeing. This addition is not present in either Reuters or the Estonian version and shifts the evaluative balance by incorporating Russia’s official framing of the sanctions.

The treatment dimension is present in both Russian-language versions in the same condensed form as the Estonian version, with the note about Trump’s anticipated pause and the European pressure expectation retained.

3.6.5 Selective appropriation patterns

Reordering

The most significant reordering occurs in the Russian-language versions. Reuters introduces the prepared sanctions and then turns to US support for using frozen Russian assets to buy weapons for Ukraine. Meduza and Delfi RUS instead move from the general sanctions claim to the targeted sectors and then to Ukraine's proposal to disconnect Russian banks from the dollar system. The frozen-assets issue is moved later, which gives greater early prominence to banking sanctions and Ukrainian proposals than they have in the Reuters source. Trump's planned pause is also moved down. In Reuters it appears before the detailed discussion of banking and oil infrastructure sanctions, helping frame the package as conditional and politically delayed. In the Russian-language versions it appears later, which reduces the salience of uncertainty.

In the Estonian version, the most notable reordering concerns the senior US official's statement that he would like to see European nations make the next big Russia move. In Reuters this appears as part of the early European pressure strand, but in the Estonian version it is repositioned to a later point in the article, after the material about banking sector sanctions and Ukrainian proposals. This reduces the prominence and makes the European dimension less central to the overall framing.

Reformulations

The most consequential reformulation occurs at the headline level across all three target texts. Reuters' headline "US could hit Russia with more sanctions over Ukraine war, but also wants Europe to increase pressure" is structured around two parallel claims: the conditionality of further sanctions and the European pressure expectation. Both Estonian and Russian-language headlines

drop the European pressure clause entirely, reducing a two-part headline to a single-focus statement about sanctions preparation. Additionally, the modal ‘could’ in Reuters, which signals that further sanctions are possible but not certain, is rendered in the Estonian headline as a completed preparation (“*Reuters: USA on ette valmistanud täiendavad sanktsioonid Venemaale*” [“Reuters: The US has prepared additional sanctions against Russia”]) and in the Russian-language headlines as an ongoing process (“*Reuters: США готовят новые санкции против России*” [“Reuters: USA is preparing new sanctions against Russia”])). Both reformulations reduce the conditionality of Reuters’ framing, though in different directions: the Estonian headline implies the work is done, while the Russian-language headline implies its in progress.

Additions

The Estonian version introduces two additions not traceable to the Reuters source text. The first is a reference to Treasury Secretary Bessent calling on the EU to follow the US steps in tightening the financial sanctions against Russia. The second is a detailed account of why full blocking sanctions on Lukoil are more difficult for Europe than for the US, attributed to a senior EU official, including specific references to Lukoil’s refineries in Bulgaria and Romania and its retail network across the continent. Both additions concern the European dimension of the sanctions story and likely reflect the relevance of this dimension for an Estonian readership.

Meduza introduces three additions in the form of bullet points, all of which are transmitted in full to Delfi RUS. The first notes that the US imposed sanctions on Lukoil and Rosneft on 22 October, describing these as the first sanctions against Russia since Trump returned to office. The second reports that four Chinese state oil companies subsequently suspended purchase of Russian oil. The third introduces Putin’s response, in which he describes the sanctions as pressure on Russia but stated they would not significantly affect the country’s economic position. These additions

provide contextual background for the sanctions story that Reuters distributes across its longer article, but they also introduce Putin's dismissal of the sanctions' effectiveness, which is absent from both Reuters and the Estonian version and subtly modifies the impression of US leverage that the core sanctions story conveys.

Omissions

The most significant omission shared across all three target texts is the "Week of Whiplash" section, which in Reuters provides the causal context for understanding why sanctions were imposed at this moment. The planned Budapest meeting, the Trump-Zelenskiy encounter and the US pressure on Ukraine to cede Donbas territory, Russia's diplomatic note, Trump's cancellation of the Putin meeting, and the 'irrational exuberance' characterisation are all absent from every target text. This is the most substantial single omission in this article set and the one with the greatest framing consequences, as its removal strips the sanctions story of the account of internal US policy dysfunction that Reuters treats as central to understanding the decision.

Further omissions across all target texts include several elements of political and economic context, such as the Volker quote, Trump's Truth Social post, the Senate sanctions bill, and the Ukrainian Embassy response. The result is a more procedural and less contextualised account than in the Reuters source.

3.6.6 Summary of framing patterns

The selective appropriation patterns in this article set show a consistent reduction of the analytical and contextual complexity present in the Reuters source. The original article constructs a policy-oriented frame in which sanctions are presented as part of a broader and unstable decision-

making process, shaped by both Russian behaviour and shifting US policy. This framing is supported by the “Week of Whiplash” narrative, which introduces the second layer of interpretation and situates the sanctions within a sequence of diplomatic reversals.

All three target texts remove this analytical layer, reducing the story to a more straightforward account of sanctions as a response to Russia’s delay in ending the war. This shift is reinforced at the headline level, where the conditionality of Reuters’ ‘could hit’ is reduced and the European pressure dimension is removed. Reordering across the target texts further contributes to this pattern by prioritising the concrete details of the sanctions over the broader political and diplomatic context.

The Estonian- and Russian-language versions differ primarily in their additions. The Estonian version introduces two additions from supplementary sources concerning the European dimension of the sanctions story, which deepen the European strand of the story in a way that may reflect its relevance for an Estonian readership. The Russian-language versions add Putin’s dismissal of the sanctions’ effectiveness, which introduces a framing absent from both Reuters and the Estonian version and slightly modifies the impression of US leverage that the core story conveys.

The comparison between Meduza and Delfi RUS illustrates a relay dynamic distinct from most preceding sets: Delfi RUS reproduces Meduza’s additions in full, meaning no cumulative omission occurs at the relay stage. This makes Article Set 6 one of the cleaner relay transmissions in the corpus.

3.7 Analysis of Article Set 7

3.7.1 Overview and translation chain

The source text for this article set is a Reuters report published on 19 November 2025 and updated on 20 November 2025. It reports that Keith Kellogg, Trump’s special envoy for Ukraine, plans to leave the administration in January. Reuters frames the departure as politically significant because Kellogg is presented as one of the more Ukraine-sympathetic figures in an administration whose Ukraine policy has shifted repeatedly.

The translation chain in this article set involves Deutsche Welle’s Russian-language service (DW Russian) as the intermediary between the Reuters source and the Delfi RUS target text. The Estonian-language target text was published on 20 November 2025 on Delfi, edited by Lauri Laugen, and attributes its content to Reuters in both the headline and the lead. The DW Russian article, published on 20 November 2025 and authored by Olga Lebedeva, translates from Reuters and supplements its account with material from separate reporting on the Witkoff peace framework. The Delfi RUS article, published on 20 November 2025, carries the same author name (Olga Lebedeva) and reproduces the DW Russian text with only one minor modification, the addition of (*‘nepeɔaem DW’* [‘DW reports’]) in the first paragraph of the body text, while the lead attributes the content to Reuters directly. The translation chain is therefore: Reuters (English) → Delfi (Estonian) and Reuters (English) → DW Russian → Delfi RUS (Russian).

3.7.2 Framing in the source text

The Reuters source constructs a political and institutional frame, presenting Kellogg's planned departure not only as a personnel change but as a potential loss for Ukraine within the Trump administration.

The problem is defined as the removal of a figure seen as a sympathetic ear for Kyiv at a moment when US policy toward Ukraine is shifting.

Causal interpretation links Kellogg's departure to the 360-day limit on special presidential envoys, presenting it as procedurally motivated. At the same time, Reuters also provides a more politically charged context: Kellogg's clashes with Witkoff, his absence from the October Zelenskiy meeting and the broader account of Trump's inconsistent Ukraine policy all suggest that the departure reflects deeper tensions within the administration rather than a purely technical matter.

Moral evaluation is conveyed through contrast. Kellogg is presented as a Ukraine-supportive figure who more forcefully condemned Russian attacks. Witkoff is associated with Russian talking points and proposals involving a 'lopsided territorial swap'. The use of 'lopsided' is an evaluative term that frames Witkoff's position as inherently unfair to Ukraine.

The treatment dimension remains implicit. Reuters notes that it is unclear who would replace Kellogg, and that the US has yet to appoint a Senate-confirmed ambassador to Ukraine. The article does not propose a solution, but suggests that Kellogg's departure may weaken Ukraine's position within US policymaking.

3.7.3 Framing in the Estonian-language target text (Delfi)

The Estonian-language Delfi article condenses the Reuters source substantially but retains its core framing. Kellogg's departure is presented as the loss of Ukraine's main supporters within the Trump administration.

The problem definition is aligned with Reuters. The article presents Kellogg's departure as significant because he had been '*üks peamisi Ukraina eest seisjaid*' ['one of the main advocates for Ukraine'] in the administration. The headline itself remains neutral and factual, focusing on the departure rather than its political consequences.

Causal interpretation is simplified. The 360-day term explanation is retained, as is the account of Kellogg's clashes with Witkoff and his absence from the October Zelenskiy meeting. However, the broader Reuters account of shifting US policy toward Ukraine is largely omitted.

Moral evaluation is broadly preserved. The sympathetic portrayal of Kellogg is retained, including his more forceful condemnation of Russian attacks on civilian infrastructure and his clashes with Witkoff.

The treatment dimension is reduced. The Estonian version suggests that Kellogg's departure matters for Ukraine, but it omits the broader account of Trump's changing Ukraine policy and the latest US peace proposals. As a result, the implications of his departure are less fully developed than in Reuters.

3.7.4 Framing in the Russian-language versions (DW Russian and Delfi RUS)

The two Russian-language versions are essentially the same article, with Delfi RUS reproducing the DW Russian article verbatim, the only modification being the attribution to DW in the first paragraph of the body text.

The problem definition is broadly aligned with Reuters but is rendered in more evaluative terms. The lead characterises Kellogg's departure as '*станет ударом для Киева*' ['a blow to Kyiv'], which is a stronger formulation than Reuters' 'unwelcome news', and attributes this assessment to journalists rather than presenting it as the article's own position.

Causal interpretation is more explicit. The Russian-language versions connect Kellogg's departure to conflict with Witkoff and to the broader shift in US policy represented by the new peace plan. This creates a clearer causal chain: Kellogg leaves, Witkoff's line gains prominence, and Ukraine faces more pressure to accept unfavourable terms.

Moral evaluation is present but partially softened relative to Reuters and the Estonian target text. The sympathetic portrayal of Kellogg is retained, including his more forceful condemnation of Russian attacks on civilian infrastructure. However, the evaluative framing of Witkoff's position is more neutral than in the source, and Reuters' own assessment of the broader policy direction is absent.

The treatment dimension is reduced, with no account of US policy inconsistency or the uncertainty about Kellogg's successor.

3.7.5 Selective appropriation patterns

Reordering

Reordering is most pronounced in the Russian-language versions and is present from the opening paragraph. While the lead sentence follows Reuters' first paragraph, the subsequent characterisation of the departure as a 'blow for Kyiv' is drawn from a later point in the source and moved forward. The procedural explanation of the 360-day term, which appears early in Reuters, is shifted further down, following the account of Kellogg's clashes with Witkoff. The effect is to foreground the political significance of the departure before its institutional explanation, altering the emphasis of the opening section.

The Estonian version follows Reuters' paragraph sequence more closely for the content it retains.

Reformulations

The most consistent reformulation across all three target texts occurs at the headline level. The Estonian headline "*Reuters: Trumpi Ukraina eriesindaja Kellogg lahkub jaanuaris ametist*" ["Reuters: Trump's Ukraine envoy Kellogg is leaving his post in January"] removes both 'Exclusive' label and the 'sources say' qualification present in Reuters, presenting Kellogg's departure as an established fact rather than a report based on anonymous sources and removing the uncertainty that Reuters builds into its framing from the outset. The Russian-language headline "*Reuters: Келлог уйдет с поста спецпредставителя по Украине*" ["Reuters: Kellogg will leave the post of special representative for Ukraine"] follows the same pattern and is slightly more condensed than the Estonian headline, omitting the January timeframe. Across both target

languages, these omissions reduce the uncertainty built into the source and present the departure as more definitively confirmed than Reuters warrants.

A further reformulation concerns the framing of Kellogg's departure. Reuters states that it 'will be unwelcome news in Kyiv,' while the Russian-language versions render this as '*станет ударом для Киева*' ['a blow to Kyiv'], strengthening the evaluative force of the statement. The formula '*считают журналисты*' ['journalists believe'] adds a further layer to this shift: the stronger claim is introduced but attributed to an unspecified journalistic consensus rather than presented as the text's own position. The Estonian version does not introduce a comparable reformulation at this point, retaining a more measured characterisation of Kellogg's significance.

Reformulation is also visible in the handling of Witkoff. Reuters' formulation of a 'lopsided territorial swap' carries a clear evaluative charge, which is removed in all target texts. The Estonian version omits the qualifier, leaving: '*/.../ pooldanud Ukraina territooriumi loovutamist rahukokkuleppe osana.*' ['.../ supported territorial concessions by Ukraine as part of a peace agreement.'], while the Russian-language versions render the proposal more neutrally as territorial concessions by Ukraine: '*/.../ новый мирный план, включающий территориальные уступки со стороны Украины.*' ['.../ a new peace plan involving territorial concessions by Ukraine.']. Across all versions, the effect is a softening of the implicit judgement present in the source. The Estonian version, however, compensates for this by retaining Reuters' characterisation of Witkoff as someone who has repeated Putin's talking points, whereas the Russian-language versions omit it entirely, resulting in a meaningfully more neutral overall portrait of Witkoff in the Russian texts.

A further, smaller reformulation concerns the description of Kellogg's relationship with Witkoff. Reuters states that he 'at times clashed with Witkoff,' while the Russian-language versions render this as '*возник конфликт*' ['a conflict arose'], presenting the disagreement in more

definite terms. This shifts the formulation from an occasional pattern of disagreement to a more concrete instance of conflict.

Together, these reformulations reduce uncertainty and soften evaluative elements present in the source, though the extent of softening differs between the two target language groups.

Additions

The Russian-language versions introduce the most substantial additions. In addition to reproducing the Reuters core, they include a more detailed account of the US peace framework: *‘/.../ об отказе от территорий на востоке страны, сокращении численности вооруженных сил и отказе от некоторых видов вооружения.’* [‘/.../ renouncing territories in eastern Ukraine, reducing the size of the armed forces, and abandoning certain types of weapons.’]. This level of detail is not present in the Reuters source, which says: ‘Kyiv giving up territory and some weapons.’ This addition represents an expansion of the policy context, making the demands more explicit and giving them greater prominence than in the source.

A further substantial addition in the Russian-language versions is the expanded description of the US peace framework. While Reuters briefly reports that Ukraine is being asked to accept a US-drafted plan involving territorial and military concessions, the Russian-language versions develop this into a more detailed account, describing it as a 28-point framework and outlining four key aspects: peace in Ukraine, security guarantees, security in Europe, and the future of relations between Washington, Moscow and Kyiv. This level of detail is not present in the Reuters source and represents a clear expansion of the policy context.

The Estonian version does not introduce comparable additions and remains closer to the Reuters source, though in much more condensed form.

Omissions

The most significant omissions are shared across all three target texts. The Reuters' section about Trump's varied approach to Ukraine is absent from all versions. Also absent from all target texts are Kellogg's hostage release achievement, the Driscoll delegation's fact-finding mission in Kyiv, and the uncertainty about Kellogg's successor including the Julie Fisher reference.

A further omission concerns the description of Witkoff. While Reuters notes that he has repeated Putin's talking points: 'Witkoff, who has repeated some of Russian President Vladimir Putin's talking points and has long advocated a lopsided territorial swap as part of a long-term peace deal', this element is absent from the Russian-language versions, which retain the reference to his role but omit the evaluative detail: *'.../ спецпосланником президента США Стивом Уиткоффом, который продвигает новый мирный план, включающий территориальные уступки со стороны Украины.'* [*'.../ U.S. presidential envoy Steve Witkoff, who is promoting a new peace plan that includes territorial concessions by Ukraine'*]. By contrast, the Estonian version retains both the Putin talking points characterisation and the reference to his advocacy for territorial concessions.

Together, these omissions result in a more narrowly framed account of Kellogg's departure as a personnel change, without the broader context of US policy inconsistency present in the Reuters source.

3.7.6 Summary of framing patterns

The selective appropriation patterns in this article set show a consistent narrowing of the political and analytical framing present in the Reuters source. The original article constructs a

layered account in which Kellogg's departure is presented not only as a personnel change but as part of a broader pattern of internal tensions and inconsistencies in US Ukraine policy. This framing is supported by the contrast between Kellogg and Witkoff and by the wider contextual material on shifting policy positions.

All target texts reduce this complexity, presenting the departure in more straightforward terms. The removal of the 'Exclusive' and 'sources say' markers present the departure as an established fact, while the softening or omission of evaluative language reduces the critical framing present in Reuters.

Within this shared pattern, the Estonian and Russian-language versions differ in how they develop the surrounding context. The Estonian version remains closer to the source but condenses the broader policy background, resulting in a more limited account focused on Kellogg's role. The Russian-language versions foreground the political significance of the departure more strongly and introduce a more detailed account of the US peace framework, while omitting elements of Reuters' broader policy analysis.

Overall, the result is a shift from a layered and contextualised account of Kellogg's departure within a fluctuating policy environment to a more direct and simplified representation of it as a personnel change with immediate implications for Ukraine.

CONCLUSION

The present study examined how framing is reshaped through translation and editorial processing of international news in Estonian- and Russian-language versions of articles originating from Reuters and Bloomberg. Drawing on Entman's (1993) framing model and Baker's (2006) concept of selective appropriation, the analysis compared seven article sets across three language versions, with the English-language source text as the reference point. The following section addresses the four research questions in turn and synthesizes the broader patterns identified across the corpus.

How does translation reshape framing in international news reporting across Estonian- and Russian-language target texts published in Estonian media?

The analysis shows that framing is consistently simplified and reduced in its analytical complexity. While the core problem definition is generally retained, the multi-layered framing of the source texts — in which causal interpretation, moral evaluation and treatment implications are developed in parallel — is systematically condensed in the target texts. This results in narrower problem constructions, less developed causal accounts, and a reduced presence of explicit evaluation. Treatment-related elements are particularly affected, as broader policy implications and forward-looking dimensions are frequently omitted.

At the same time, this reduction does not result in neutrality. The removal of contextual and analytical material increases the relative prominence of the elements that are retained, meaning that even limited evaluative cues may carry greater framing weight in the target texts than in the source.

How do processes of selective appropriation contribute to framing shifts in translated news texts?

Of the four categories of selective appropriation discussed in this thesis — reordering, reformulation, addition and omission — omission is the most extensive and carries the greatest cumulative consequences for framing. The systematic removal of contextualisation, expert attribution and evaluative language narrows the frame without any visible intervention in the text.

Reformulation operates most visibly in headlines and attribution structures, where markers of uncertainty and attribution — such as ‘sources say’ or similar qualifiers — are frequently removed, resulting in a more definitive presentation of information than in the source text.

Reordering alters the relative salience of elements within the text, foregrounding certain aspects of the story while backgrounding others. These structural interventions do not introduce new content but change the relative prominence of elements in the text. This may influence how readers prioritise different aspects of the story, although this would need to be confirmed through further research, for example using reader reception analysis.

Addition is less uniform but occurs more frequently in the Russian-language versions, where material from intermediary sources is incorporated into the narrative. Taken together, these strategies show that framing shifts are the result of systematic textual operations rather than isolated editorial choices.

What differences can be observed in framing between Estonian- and Russian-language versions of the same source text?

While both Estonian- and Russian-language versions follow an overall pattern of reduction, their approaches diverge consistently. The Estonian-language texts tend to condense the source

material while preserving selected evaluative elements, resulting in shorter and more focused accounts in which individual characterisations are foregrounded but provide less context. The Russian-language texts, by contrast, more frequently combine reduction with expansion through the incorporation of additional material from intermediary sources. At the same time, evaluative language directed at Russian-aligned actors is more often softened or omitted. This does not amount to a uniform ideological shift, but rather to a rebalancing of which actors and positions are evaluated critically, and which are not. The differences between the two language groups is most pronounced in cases where the source text constructs a complex frame: the Estonian versions focus on the main evaluative points, while the Russian-language versions expand the policy context and reduce the evaluative register.

How does indirect (relay) translation influence the transmission and transformation of framing across news texts?

The relay structure observable across all Russian-language target texts in this corpus shapes framing in two principal ways. First, shifts introduced at the intermediary stage are carried through to the final target text, so Delfi RUS versions reflect multiple stages of intervention rather than a single translation. Second, relay translation produces cumulative modification: material omitted is not recovered, while additions may be selectively retained or removed.

At the same time, the relationship between relay translation and informational reduction is not uniform: intermediary additions may also be preserved, depending on editorial choices. What remains consistent, however, is that the translation chain is not transparent to the reader. As a result, framing choices introduced at intermediate stages are presented as if they originated in the source text, obscuring the extent of transformation.

Taken together, the findings of this study suggest that news translation at Delfi operates as a systematic process of framing simplification, in which the analytical complexity and evaluative richness of source texts are consistently reduced across both language groups. This reduction follows recognisable patterns: condensation for target audiences, the omission of contextual material that would require extended background explanation, and the softening of evaluative language that might otherwise appear as the outlet's own editorial position. The differences between the Estonian and Russian versions suggest that this logic is inflected differently across the two editorial contexts, with the Russian-language versions more likely to draw on additional sources and neutralise evaluative charges directed at Russian-aligned actors, while the Estonian versions more frequently preserve such charges while omitting the analytical context surrounding them.

These findings support and extend previous research (e.g. Kamyanyets 2022) by demonstrating that such asymmetries are observable not only across different media systems but within a single media organisation operating across languages. The analysis further shows that these differences cannot be explained solely in terms of outlet ideology or audience orientation but are shaped by the specific translation chains through which content circulates and by the cumulative effect of editorial decisions at each stage.

The study's limitations — a small corpus, a single outlet, and a restricted time frame — mean that the findings cannot be generalised beyond the specific articles and translation chains analysed here. Future research using larger parallel corpora, multiple outlets, or mixed methods incorporating newsroom perspectives would allow for a more systematic account of these patterns and their institutional determinants. What the present study demonstrates is that even within a

single, traceable subset of translated news, framing is not simply transmitted from source to target but is actively shaped at each stage of the translational and editorial process.

References

Primary Sources

- Bloomberg News. 2024. Russians who fled abroad return in boost for Putin's war economy. *Bloomberg*, May 2. Available at <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2024-05-02/russians-who-fled-war-return-in-boost-for-putin-s-war-economy>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Bloomberg News. 2025a. Russia weighs Ukraine air-truce offer to Trump without ending war. *Bloomberg*, August 5. Available at <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2025-08-05/russia-weighs-ukraine-air-truce-offer-to-trump-without-ending-war>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Bloomberg News. 2025b. Putin decides he can step up attacks on Kyiv and Trump won't act. *Bloomberg*, September 20. Available at <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2025-09-20/putin-decides-russia-can-step-up-ukraine-attacks-and-trump-won-t-act>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Delfi RUS. 2024. „Они и правда ненавидят нас". Bloomberg: вернувшиеся россияне обеспечили до трети роста экономики РФ ["They really do hate us". Bloomberg: returning Russians accounted for up to a third of Russia's economic growth]. *Delfi RUS*, May 4. Available at <https://rus.delfi.ee/statja/120290128/oni-i-pravda-nenavidyat-nas-bloomberg-vernuvshiesya-rossiyane-obespechili-do-treti-rosta-ekonomiki-rf>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Delfi RUS. 2025a. Bloomberg: Украина отвергла условия нового соглашения с США по добыче полезных ископаемых [Bloomberg: Ukraine rejected the terms of the new agreement with the US on mining natural resources]. *Delfi RUS*, February 23. Available at <https://rus.delfi.ee/statja/120358959/bloomberg-ukraina-otverгла-usloviya-novogo-soglasheniya-s-ssha-po-dobyche-poleznyh-iskopaemyh>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Delfi RUS. 2025b. Reuters: США разработали новые санкции против российских компаний и банков [Reuters: the US developed new sanctions against Russian companies and banks]. *Delfi RUS*, May 3. Available at <https://rus.delfi.ee/statja/120374756/reuters-ssha-razrabotali-novye-sankcii-protiv-rossiyskih-kompaniy-i-bankov>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Delfi RUS. 2025c. Bloomberg: Россия в качестве уступки Трампу рассматривает возможность прекращения огня в воздухе — но не на земле [Bloomberg: Russia is considering the possibility of a ceasefire in the air as a concession to Trump — but not on the ground]. *Delfi RUS*, August 5. Available at <https://rus.delfi.ee/statja/120395242/bloomberg-rossiya-v-kachestve-ustupki-trampu-rassmatrivaet-vozmozhnost-prekrashcheniya-ognya-v-vozduhe-no-ne-na-zemle>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Delfi RUS. 2025d. Bloomberg: переговоры на Аляске убедили Путина, что Трамп не будет вмешиваться в войну. Теперь РФ стала наносить удары по Украине в два раза чаще [Bloomberg: the Alaska talks convinced Putin that Trump will not intervene in the war. Russia has now started striking Ukraine twice as often]. *Delfi RUS*, September 20.

- Available at <https://rus.delfi.ee/statja/120405043/bloomberg-peregovory-na-alyaske-ubedili-putina-cto-tramp-ne-budet-vmeshivatsya-v-voynu-teper-rf-stala-nanosit-udary-po-ukraine-v-dva-raza-chashche>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Delfi RUS. 2025e. Reuters: США готовят новые санкции против России [Reuters: the US is preparing new sanctions against Russia]. *Delfi RUS*, October 25. Available at <https://rus.delfi.ee/statja/120412779/reuters-ssha-gotovyat-novye-sankcii-protiv-rossii>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Kivi, Lenel. 2025a. Reuters: USA valmistas uue sanktsioonipaketi Venemaa vastu, kuid Trumpi heakskiit pole kindel [Reuters: the US prepared a new sanctions package against Russia, but Trump's approval is not certain]. *Delfi*, May 3. Available at <https://www.delfi.ee/artikkel/120374750/reuters-usa-valmistas-uue-sanktsioonipaketi-venemaa-vastu-kuid-trumpi-heakskiit-pole-kindel>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Kivi, Lenel. 2025b. Reuters: USA on ette valmistanud täiendavad sanktsioonid Venemaale [Reuters: the US has prepared additional sanctions against Russia]. *Delfi*, October 25. Available at <https://www.delfi.ee/artikkel/120412780/reuters-usa-on-ette-valmistanud-taiendavad-sanktsioonid-venemaale>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Krasnolutska, Daryna and Volodymyr Verbianyi. 2025. Ukraine opposes size of minerals fund to pay back US war aid. *Bloomberg*, February 22. Available at <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2025-02-22/ukraine-opposes-us-demand-for-500-billion-fund-in-minerals-deal>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Kressa, Kaarel. 2025a. Portaali: Ukraina lükkas taas tagasi uue USA pakkumise maavarade loovutamiseks [Portal: Ukraine once again rejected the new US offer on surrendering mineral resources]. *Delfi*, February 23. Available at <https://www.delfi.ee/artikkel/120358964/portaal-ukraina-lukkas-taas-tagasi-uue-usa-pakkumise-maavarade-loovutamiseks>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Kressa, Kaarel. 2025b. Kremli allikad: Putin järeldas Alaska kohtumiselt, et võib Ukrainas teha, mida tahab [Kremlin sources: Putin concluded from the Alaska summit that he can do what he wants in Ukraine]. *Delfi*, September 21. Available at <https://www.delfi.ee/artikkel/120405080/kremli-allikad-putin-jareldas-alaska-kohtumiselt-et-voib-ukrainas-teha-mida-tahab>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Landay, Jonathan, Gram Slattery, Erin Banco and Steve Holland. 2025. Exclusive: US readies Russia sanctions over Ukraine, unclear if Trump will sign, sources say. *Reuters*, May 2. Available at <https://www.reuters.com/world/us-readies-russia-sanctions-over-ukraine-unclear-if-trump-will-sign-sources-say-2025-05-02/>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Laugen, Lauri. 2025a. Bloomberg: Kreml võib pakkuda Trumpile Ukrainas õhurelvarahu [Bloomberg: the Kremlin may offer Trump an air ceasefire in Ukraine]. *Delfi*, August 6. Available at <https://www.delfi.ee/artikkel/120395266/bloomberg-kreml-voib-pakkuda-trumpile-ukrainas-ohurelvarahu>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Laugen, Lauri. 2025b. Reuters: Trumpi Ukraina eriesindaja Kellogg lahkub jaanuaris ametist [Reuters: Trump's Ukraine envoy Kellogg is leaving office in January]. *Delfi*, November

20. Available at <https://www.delfi.ee/artikkel/120418386/reuters-trumpi-ukraina-eriesindaja-kellogg-lahkub-jaanuaris-ametist>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Lebedeva, Olga. 2025a. Reuters: Келлог уйдет с поста спецпредставителя по Украине [Reuters: Kellogg will leave the post of special representative for Ukraine]. *Deutsche Welle*, November 20. Available at <https://www.dw.com/ru/reuters-specpredstavitel-trampa-po-ukraine-kit-kellog-ujdet-v-otstavku-v-2026m/a-74814755>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Lebedeva, Olga. 2025b. Reuters: Келлог уйдет с поста спецпредставителя по Украине [Reuters: Kellogg will leave the post of special representative for Ukraine]. *Delfi RUS*, November 20. Available at <https://rus.delfi.ee/statja/120418391/reuters-kellog-uydet-s-posta-specpredstavitelya-po-ukraine>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Meduza. 2025a. Reuters: США разработали санкции против «Газпрома» и российских банков [Reuters: the US developed sanctions against Gazprom and Russian banks]. *Meduza*, May 3. Available at <https://meduza.io/news/2025/05/03/reuters-ssha-razrabotali-sanktsii-protiv-gazproma-i-rossiyskih-bankov>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Meduza. 2025b. Bloomberg: Россия в качестве уступки Трампу рассматривает возможность прекращения огня в воздухе — но не на земле [Bloomberg: Russia is considering the possibility of a ceasefire in the air as a concession to Trump — but not on the ground]. *Meduza*, August 5. Available at <https://meduza.io/news/2025/08/05/bloomberg-rossiya-v-kachestve-ustupki-trampu-rassmatrivaet-vozmozhnost-prekrascheniya-ognya-v-vozduhe-no-ne-na-zemle>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Meduza. 2025c. Bloomberg: переговоры на Аляске убедили Путина, что Трамп не будет вмешиваться в войну [Bloomberg: the Alaska talks convinced Putin that Trump will not intervene in the war]. *Meduza*, September 20. Available at <https://meduza.io/news/2025/09/20/bloomberg-peregovory-na-alyaske-ubedili-putina-chto-tramp-ne-budet-vmeshivatsya-v-voynu>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Meduza. 2025d. Reuters: США готовят новые санкции против России [Reuters: the US is preparing new sanctions against Russia]. *Meduza*, October 25. Available at <https://meduza.io/news/2025/10/25/reuters-ssha-gotovyat-novye-sanktsii-protiv-rossii-iz-za-otkaza-ot-mirnyh-peregovorov>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Radio Svoboda. 2025. Bloomberg: Украина не согласна с условиями сделки по ресурсам [Bloomberg: Ukraine disagrees with the terms of the resources deal]. *Radio Svoboda*, February 23. Available at <https://www.svoboda.org/a/bloomberg-ukraina-ne-soglasna-s-usloviyami-sdelki-po-resursam/33324749.html>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Rus.Delfi.lv. 2024. "Они и правда ненавидят нас". Bloomberg: вернувшиеся россияне обеспечили до трети роста экономики РФ ["They really do hate us". Bloomberg: returning Russians accounted for up to a third of Russia's economic growth]. *Rus.Delfi.lv*, May 3. Available at <https://rus.delfi.lv/51164905/istorija-dnja/120020576/oni-i-pravda-nenavidyat-nas-bloomberg-vernuvshiesya-rossiyane-obespechili-do-treti-rosta-ekonomiki-rf>, accessed May 13, 2026.

- Sildmets, Kadri. 2024. Sõja eest välismaale põgenenud venelased on sunnitud kodumaale naasma. „Putin ei eksinudki – nad vihkavad meid” [Russians who fled abroad because of the war are forced to return home. "Putin was not wrong – they hate us"]. *Delfi Ärileht*, May 5. Available at <https://arileht.delfi.ee/artikkel/120290471/soja-eest-valismaale-pogenenud-venelased-on-sunnitud-kodumaale-naasma-putin-ei-eksinudki-nad-vihkavad-meid>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Slattery, Gram, Max Hunder and Steve Holland. 2025. US could hit Russia with more sanctions over Ukraine war, but also wants Europe to increase pressure. *Reuters*, October 25. Available at <https://www.reuters.com/business/finance/us-could-hit-russia-with-more-sanctions-end-ukraine-war-first-wants-europe-2025-10-25/>, accessed May 13, 2026.
- Slattery, Gram and Humeyra Pamuk. 2025. Exclusive: Trump's Ukraine envoy Kellogg to leave post in January, sources say. *Reuters*, November 19. Available at <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/trumps-ukraine-envoy-kellogg-leave-post-january-sources-say-2025-11-19/>, accessed May 13, 2026.

Secondary Sources

- Baker, Mona. 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Bielsa, Esperança and Susan Bassnett. 2009. *Translation in Global News*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bielsa, Esperança. 2020. News translation. In Mona Baker; Gabriela Saldanha (eds). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 365–370. London: Routledge.
- Davies, Lucile. 2022. Translational phenomena in the news: Indirect translation as the rule. *Target*, 34: 3, 395–418.
- Davies, Lucile and Luc van Doorslaer. 2018. Translation without a source text: Methodological issues in news translation. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 19: 2, 241–257.
- Entman, Robert M. 1993. Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43: 4, 51–58.
- Estonian Media Companies Association's webpage. 2026. Available at <https://meedialiit.ee/statistika/>, accessed April 19, 2026.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1959. On linguistic aspects of translation. In Reuben Arthur Brower (ed). *On Translation*, 232–239. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kamyantets, Angela. 2022. Selective appropriation in the BBC news translated into Ukrainian and Russian. *Journalism*, 23: 7, 1548–1566.
- McCombs, Maxwell. 2005. A look at agenda-setting: Past, present and future. *Journalism Studies*, 6: 4, 543–557.
- McCombs, Maxwell and Donald Shaw. 1972. The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36, 176–187.

- Moreno Tovar, Manuel and Luc van Doorslaer. 2025. Blurring borders in intralingual translation research: the case of journalistic translation. *Perspectives*, 33: 4, 726–742.
- Rosa, Alexandra Assis, Hanna Pięta and Rita Bueno Maia. 2017. Theoretical, methodological and terminological issues regarding indirect translation: An overview. *Translation Studies*, 10: 2, 113–132.
- Rudakova, Alina. 2024. News framing of the Ukrainian-Russian war: A comparative analysis of Russian and American news media. MA thesis. University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, USA. Available at <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/5230>, accessed March 21, 2026.
- Saldanha, Gabriela and Sharon O'Brien. 2014. *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Schäffner, Christina. 2012. Rethinking Transediting. *Meta*, 57:4, 866–883.
- Valdeón, Roberto A. 2014. From adaptation to appropriation: Framing the world through news translation. *Linguaculture*, 5: 1, 51–62.
- Valdeón, Roberto A. 2021. Translation: From mediation to gatekeeping and agenda-setting. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 21: 1, 24–36.
- Valdeón, Roberto A. 2023. Agenda-setting and journalistic translation. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 24: 2, 203–220.
- van Doorslaer, Luc. 2010. Journalism and translation. In Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (eds). *Handbook of Translation Studies*, vol. 1, 180–184. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- van Doorslaer, Luc. 2012. Translating, narrating and constructing images in journalism with a test case on representation in Flemish TV news. *Meta*, 57: 4, 1046–1059.
- van Doorslaer, Luc. 2021. Journalism and translation: Overlapping practices. In Esperança Bielsa (ed). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Media*, 169–182. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL

TÕLKEÕPETUSE JA -UURINGUTE OSAKOND

Vivika Konsap

Framing in News Translation: A Comparative Analysis of Estonian- and Russian-Language Versions of International News on the War in Ukraine

Raamistamine uudistõlkes: rahvusvaheliste Ukraina sõja uudiste eesti- ja venekeelsete versioonide võrdlev analüüs

Magistritöö

2026

Lehekülgede arv: 115

Annotatsioon:

Magistritöö eesmärk on uurida, kuidas muutub raamistamine rahvusvaheliste Ukraina sõja uudiste tõlkimisel inglise keelest eesti ja vene keelde. Töö teoreetiline ülevaade käsitleb uudistõlke põhimõisteid ning raamistamise teooriat ja päevakorraseade teooriat (inglise keeles *agenda-setting*). Metoodika peatükis antakse ülevaade korpusest ja analüüsimeetoditest. Korpus koosneb seitsmest artiklikogumist, mis on valitud Delfi Meedia eesti- ja venekeelsetest portaalist aastatel 2024–2025 ning mille lähtetekstid pärinevad Bloombergist ja Reutersist. Kõik venekeelsed sihttekstid olid tõlgitud läbi vaheallika. Analüütiline raamistik hõlmab Entmani (1993) raamistamise mudelit ning Bakeri (2006) selektiivset omastamist (inglise keeles *selective appropriation*), mida on laiendatud kooskõlas Schäffneri (2012), Bielsa ja Bassnetti (2009) ja Kamyantsi (2022) käsitlustega. Peamised tulemused näitavad, et raamistamine lihtsustub mõlemas sihtkeeles süstemaatiliselt. Väljajätt on kõige ulatuslikum ja enim raamistamist kujundav strateegia. Eestikeelsete artiklite puhul ilmnas, et hoolimata artiklite lühendamise säilis lähtetekstist tulenev hinnanguline keelekasutus. Venekeelsed artiklid täiendasid lühendatud artikleid sageli kolmandatest allikatest pärineva materjaliga ning pehmendasid kriitilist keelekasutust.

Märksõnad: uudistõlge, raamistamine, kakskeelne meedia

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina, Vivika Konsap,

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) enda loodud teose

Framing in News Translation: A Comparative Analysis of Estonian- and Russian-Language Versions of International News on the War in Ukraine,

mille juhendaja on prof. Luc van Doorslaer PhD,

1.1. reprodutseerimiseks säilitamise ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemise eesmärgil, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace-is lisamise eesmärgil kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni;

1.2. üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna kaudu, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace'i kaudu kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni.

2. olen teadlik, et punktis 1 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.

3. kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei rikuta teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse seadusest tulenevaid õigusi.

Vivika Konsap

Tartus, 14.05.2026

Autorsuse kinnitus

Olen lõputöö kirjutanud iseseisvalt. Kõigile töös kasutatud teiste autorite töödele, põhimõttelistele seisukohtadele ning muudest allikatest pärinevatele andmetele on viidatud.

Vivika Konsap

Tartus, 14.05.2026