

DISCOURSE MARKER AS A MEANS OF MODELING INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS IN THE TEXT OF ANALYTICAL REPORT

^aVALENTINA V. KIKHTAN, ^bELENA N. KLEMENOVA,
^cMARGARITA V. ERESHCHENKO, ^dNADEZHDA V.
^eKOVALCHUK, ^fIGOR A. KUDRYASHOV

^aRostov State University of Economics, Bolshaya Sadovaya str.,
 69, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

^bRostov State University of Economics, Bolshaya Sadovaya str.,
 69, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

^cDon State Technical University, Gagarin square, 1, Rostov-on-
 Don, Russia

^dDon State Technical University, Gagarin square, 1, Rostov-on-
 Don, Russia

^eSouthern Federal University, Bolshaya Sadovaya str., 105/42,
 Rostov-on-Don, Russia

email: ^avalentine-kihtan@yandex.ru, ^bklemenova@yandex.ru,
^cmar.ereshchenko@yandex.ru,

^dnadezhda_kovachuk_2012@yandex.ru, ^eigalk@mail.ru

Abstract: In the course of conducting this research, it was revealed that discourse markers are an essential mechanism for achieving the goals that a journalist sets himself a priori when beginning the creation of the text of an analytical report. These markers serve as components of a stable communicative system, which is modeled in the text of an analytical report for implicit reflection of the event perspective, point of view in relation to this perspective and personal attitude to it. Thus, in our publication, discourse markers are analyzed as the key (mandatory) components of generation and interpretation of the text of an analytical report. The systematic study of their functional load sheds light on the effectiveness of the text of an analytical report as a way of influencing the views of the target audience on modern socio-political reality.

Keywords: text, analytical report, pragmatics, semantics, discourse markers, interpersonal relations, journalist, reader.

1 Introduction

In this publication, the research focuses on the pragmatic problems of the functioning of discourse markers that project interpersonal relationships between the participants and the objects of the current communicative situation, i.e. a journalist, a reader and the text of an analytical report. According to our observations, such markers are one of the most frequent interactive tools in the texts of the Russian-language analytical reports. The repertoire of these markers is formed by lexemes that belong to different grammatical classes that, as a rule, are used in the position the absolute beginning of the statement (judgment) expressing a journalistic opinion about the subject of social and political issues (compare *without a doubt / certainly, of course / obviously*).

The markers analyzed not only act as a means of connection between the adjoining fragments of the report text, but also largely predetermine the communicative perspective of the reader's interpretation of the integral journalistic work. Basing on these markers, the author of the analytical report implicitly expresses an assessment of the facts and phenomena of the current socio-political life and the addressee of the report interprets this assessment.

In our research, the text of the analytical report is analyzed as a communicative (interactive) event, in the context of which the actual meaning of the author is created and interpreted basing on certain discourse markers. Any text exhaustively implements the intentions of the author, if the addressee is able (has the appropriate competence) to recognize these intentions and perform their optimal interpretation. In this regard, in conducting our research we use primarily a semantic-pragmatic approach to the description of the form and functions of discourse markers, which, in turn, act not only as a means of creating a coherent and holistic text of the report, but also as a constructive mechanism for communicating implicit semantic content to the reader, revealing the specifics of the author's subjective vision of socio-political reality and the personal attitude to this reality.

In the process of studying the specified personal-subjective plan of the text of an analytical report, we define discourse markers as such language indicators, the primary function of which is to model the relationship of connectivity and integrity of the text. This relationship is formed between the adjusting text segments, various aspects of the social and political situation, and this, in turn, creates a pragmatic basis for interpersonal relationships between an author and a reader and, ultimately, sets the communicative perspectives of the reader's interpretation of the text.

An objective of this research is to systematically analyze the functional load of discourse markers at two levels of the structure of the text of an analytical report, namely in the context of a single statement and a complete text fragment. It seems that the realization of such an objective makes it possible to trace the pragmatic role played by discourse markers in the process of generation and interpretation of the text of an analytical report in the Russian language.

It can be said that the study of the functional load of discourse markers in the text of an analytical report also acquires an important methodological importance, since it makes it possible to determine a range of professional competencies of a journalist required for coherent and holistic representation of the text of an analytical report and for coding implicit meaning in this text.

2 Literature Review

Despite the fact that discourse markers as a textual phenomenon are studied in a multidimensional manner in modern linguistics (Smirnova, 2017; Ulanova, 2018; Fraser, 1990, 1998), there is still an absence of unanimity among researchers in terms of the coverage of the issues that are associated with their direct terminological and semantic definition. In current linguistic studies, the textual phenomenon under consideration is called "discourse particles" (Katsman, 2017), "discourse (pragmatic) signals" (Vinogradova, 2011), "discourse connectors or operators" (Celle & Huart, 2007; Unger, 1996), etc.

In our research we follow the point of view of D. Schiffrin (1987) and defend the feasibility of the term "discourse markers" due to the fact that it consistently reflects the essential characteristics of the relationship of connectivity and integrity in the text of the report, as well as the semantic content of language indicators that provide these relations. On the one hand, the component of the term "discourse" systemically reflects the fact that the means we are studying are functioning at the "supra-sentential" level determined by the sphere of discourse of the personality of a journalist. On the other hand, the component of the term "marker" is broader than, in particular, the terms "particle" or "connector" in its content and it suggests a broader range of pragmatic functions performed by these means in the text of the report. We believe that the term "marker" sheds light not only on the semantic relationship between text sequences within the near and distant context, but also on the communicative intentions of the author of the text to produce implicit meaning and discourse relationships between the author and the reader of the report.

Linguists give a variety of semantic definitions to the phenomenon under research, depending on the methodological approach used, the type of the studied (monologic / dialogic) text, the repertoire of linguistic means that implement a given pragmatic load and methods of analysis of these means and their functions (Zavgorodnyaya, 2010; Shtlikhina, 2015; Schourup, 1999).

Despite the widespread use of discourse markers in the Russian analytical report and their key role in the holistic organization, generation and interpretation of the semantic content of report statements, in the linguistics of the Russian text we discovered

only two studies that analyze the problems of interaction of the language indicators that are under our research and media reports. In this case, regardless of the text of an analytical report, the research attention of the linguists is paid to specific issues of the markers of "subjective reliability" *in reality / in fact* (Isachenko, 2012) and "epistemic vigilance" as a phenomenon implemented by these markers in comparative terms on the material of the English and Russian languages (Klepikova T. A. & Klepikova I. V., 2014). In contrast to these studies, our research analyzes a different repertoire of discourse markers. These markers are interpreted as means of implicit manifestation of the author's meaning and programming the reader's perception of the text of the analytical report, i.e. a strictly defined mass media genre.

In modern studies of the language and styles of communicating relevant information, analytical report is considered to be a journalistic phenomenon, which is formed in some discourse contexts with the inevitable possibility of being perceived and realized in another context (Baran & Davis, 1995; Fairclough, 1995; Spitulnik, 1997). Journalistic discourses systematically reflected in analytical reports are analyzed by linguists not only as a product of professional activity, but rather as a creative process (MacDonald, 2003; Manovich, 2001; McQuail, 1994). In order to study analytical reports in many aspects, both modern concepts of the text and the specifics of the social environment, in which the text works are implemented, are analyzed in detail (Moores, 2005). The text acts as an immanent part of discourse processes, and therefore the problems of text and discourse are studied in parallel, in close connection with each other (Gavrilova, 2015; Perse, 2001). On reviewing the broader issues, the text of the analytical report is the product of the initiator of the relevant semantic content, a constructive resource for the readers as the target interpreters of this content.

3 Research Methods

The illustrative material analyzed in our work includes one hundred contexts of uses of discourse markers *without a doubt / certainly, of course / obviously* selected by a continuous sampling method from analytical reports. The texts under analysis were published in the weekly journal "Russian Reporter" No. 25-52 for the period July–December 2018. This periodical was chosen by us because of its particular popularity among the readers and the comprehensive coverage of social and political issues. At the same time, the authors of the publications under analysis recreate the modern socio-political reality, which, as a rule, is based on the discourse markers under our study, which implicitly express a subjective point of view in relation to this reality.

The pragmatic purpose of the studied texts is to exert a certain influence on the reader's interpretation of the relevant facts and events, and therefore they are characterized by an implicit personal attitude to the recreated events. Argumentative and subjective-evaluative nature of the texts of analytical reports suggests a frequent use of the discourse markers *moreover, of course, I think*. Our observations show that these markers build the arguments of the author and implicitly express the point of view of the journalist on the facts and phenomena of socio-political reality covered. The markers under our study are frequently used in the texts of analytical reports. As a result, the texts of such reports are interpreted by us as factual material which plays a constructive role in the semantic and pragmatic analysis of the functional load of discourse markers.

The starting point of the pragmatic study of discourse markers in our work is the idea that the text of an analytical report is a communicative event that is generated by the author and interpreted by the reader on an interactive basis. Being a hierarchically structured work of journalist creativity, this text implies segmentation which is based on the functional interaction between the text components which systematically reflect the pragmatic intentions and illocutionary intentions of the author.

At the first stage of the analysis, we segment the texts under our study in order to trace the boundaries of the report statement in which the discourse marker is activated. As a result, we focus our attention on such levels of the structure of the text of an analytical report as a single statement and a text fragment which is a context for this statement. The second stage of the analysis describes the semantic and pragmatic relationships that underlie the coherence of the text fragments. At the third stage of the analysis, the discourse markers which are used, on the one hand, at the beginning of the statement and, on the other hand, at the beginning of the text fragment are distinguished. In both cases, discourse markers incorporate deep semantic content inherent either in a single statement or in an autonomous fragment of the text. The description of the context in which a discourse marker is used sheds light on the specifics of the functioning of the marker in the given context.

4 Results and Discussion

As we have already noticed, discourse markers projecting interpersonal relationships between a journalist, a reader and a text in the context of their use in an analytical report are strongly associated with two types of functional relationships – journalistic assessment and reader's interpretation. The dominant function of such language units is to implicitly fix the types of interpersonal relationships that develop, on the one hand, between the journalist and the text of the analytical character and, on the other hand, between the journalist and the reader of the text.

A variety of discourse markers under analysis specifies the assessment content, which is implicitly manifested by a report statement. A journalistic assessment is added to the sentential value rendered by this statement. The assessment content implemented by these markers is interpreted in our study as a pragmatic effect they have on the propositional value of a report statement. Compare:

(1) *"We are passing by the yards. And finally, we go out to the garages, behind which there is a small patch for a laundry, it is behind a high fence and wire. Ideally, it will be open here from 10 am to 6 pm, and at night the staff will wash the clothes, which the Moscovites will without **doubt** donate to the homeless"* (Solovieva, 2018, p. 24).

In the fragment of the analytical report (1), a discourse marker *without a doubt* enables the reader to trace the personal attitude of a journalist to the propositional content of the report statement. The pragmatic purpose of this statement is to implicitly present the author's subjective comment to the objective fact which is made public in the proposition of the statement. In particular, a journalist expresses a strong degree of confidence that the propositional content of the statement is true and will become true in the coming future. Being based on this pragmatic content, the discourse marker activated in the text fragment (1) performs two constructive functions:

1. reflects the personal attitude of the journalist to the objective fact that constitutes the proposition of a report statement;
2. fixes the nature of the interaction which is established between the journalist and the text generated by him.

Decoding these functions of the discourse marker, a reader enters into a dialogical contact with the author of the text and gets the opportunity to initiate a positive or negative reaction to the original stimulus (i.e. he agrees or disagrees with the personal attitude of the author to the fact which is published in the report message). In the process of expressing a reactive message, the addressee establishes an interpersonal relationship with the journalist. Revealing the author's attitude to the reported objective fact, the reader fixes the orientation of the discourse marker on the psychological personality of the journalist, as this marker implements a subjective assessment to the social realities reflected in the report, and this assessment is manifested by the creator of the text.

This assessment, in turn, is considered by us as a way of subjectivation of the report narration. Tracing the specifics of the interaction which is formed between the text of the report and its creator, the reader establishes a dialogic nature of the discourse marker and its focus on the personality of the reader, as this marker stimulates the addressee of the text to come into communicative contact with the creator of the text.

In the end, the reader realizes that the proposition of the interpreted report statement should be recognized on the basis of the subjective perspective of the journalist. Discourse marker *without a doubt* builds the interaction between the journalist and the proposition realized in a report statement by using the implicit reference of the reader to how the journalist interprets this proposition. It seems that it can be said that this marker implicitly manifests a subjective assessment of the content of a report statement and a personal attitude to this content, which belongs to the journalist.

Our observations show that the entire repertoire of the markers under our study, which express a strong degree of certainty of a journalist that the proposition published in the report statement is true, has a similar functional load. The statistical analysis of the discourse markers under our study is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Statistical analysis of the discourse markers projecting interpersonal relations between a journalist and a reader in the text of an analytical report

Discourse marker	Number of uses in the text
<i>without a doubt</i>	31
<i>certainly</i>	28
<i>of course</i>	21
<i>obviously</i>	20

Source: authors on the basis of the Journal "Russian Reporter", July-December, 2018

The discourse markers presented in Table 1 reveal a relatively similar frequency of use in the text of an analytical report (based on one hundred contexts chosen by the continuous sampling method). Their basic pragmatic purpose is to implicitly manifest the journalistic assessment of the content of the statements they introduce. Basing on these language expressions, the author of the report text shows the reader (target readership) how he initially interprets the actual social or political phenomenon from the personal point of view.

Using discourse markers which reflect a strong degree of confidence in the veracity of the proposed proposition, a journalist focuses the reader's attention on the special importance of the fact, event, phenomenon that makes up the propositional content of a report statement for the current development of social or political life. The author of the text publishes this content as an obvious objective fact, which should be recognized without preliminary critical remarks. Focusing the reader's attention on the subjective / assessment perception of the subsequent information content, the discourse markers under our study consistently reflect the pragmatic specificity of the text of the analytical report.

By implementing these markers in a report narrative, a journalist implements the communication strategy aimed to ensure that in the process of interpretation of an individual statement, the reader takes into account the peculiarities of the structure of the text organization of the report. Introducing the opinion of the author reflecting the subjective perception of the discussed event, the discourse markers implicitly indicate to the reader that the subsequent information is more important and relevant than the previous information. In other words, these language expressions serve as a constructive means of de-automatization of reader's attention in the process of perception of an analytical report as a complete text work.

The discourse markers analyzed in our study focus the attention of the reader on the specific realities of the problem discussed in

the text of an analytical report. In one way or another, they implement the text function, because they act as a means of linking the previous fragment of the report and the current author's judgment, which embodies the original thesis and its personal assessment. We believe that in this regard, all the analyzed markers can be considered as complete doublets, i.e. synonymous expressions that implement a similar pragmatic load in the text of the analytical report. At the same time, our analysis has shown that the discourse marker *of course* conveys the personal attitude of a journalist to the proposition of the statement more detailed than the other markers. Compare:

(2) "The Kuznetsovo case was high-profile and it spread around the news feed not only because of the dramatic physical confrontation between the authorities and people rushing under the excavator, but also, *of course*, due to the fact that the residents who are setting a cross in the park, at the right time glibly defend themselves in the legal field (set up a public organization, hire a group of lawyers) and busily use the figures" (Ryzhkova et al., 2018, p. 14).

As the markers *without a doubt*, *certainly*, *obviously*, a marker *of course* expresses a personal journalistic attitude, a subjective assessment of the subsequent proposition. However, the assessing personal comment, which is coded by the author in this language expression, also involves the fixation of the emotional-volitional state of the author at the time of generation of a report statement. This discourse marker more explicitly indicates that the subsequent statement should be interpreted as the author's point of view on the facts that are covered in the report.

The report statement under analysis is logically divided into two thematic blocks:

1. confrontation between the authorities and people has become the subject of numerous discussions in the media (statement of fact; discourse markers manifesting the personal attitude of a journalist to this fact are absent);
2. The residents of Kuznetsov take an active social position (the opinion of the author of the report introduced by a discourse marker *of course* and supported by lexemes with colloquial colouring: *glibly defend themselves in the legal field*, *busily use the figures*).

A discourse marker *of course*, being an element of the semantic structure of the second thematic block, forms the modal frame of the report statement: the psychological personality of a journalist and a subjectively assessed fact are manifested in the context of those social motives that are relevant to modern Russian society. A journalist as an author of the personal judgment represented by the second thematic block positions himself as a subject who is actively involved in the sphere of social relations, as a representative of modern society embodying the point of view and the emotional-volitional moods of this society.

The reader is aware of the positive emotions experienced by the journalist at the moment of generation of a report statement and interprets these emotions as a constructive way of reflective representation of the state of affairs that is relevant for the Russian society in the text of the report. We consider the report manifestation of the specified emotional-volitional state as a socially significant communicative action in the sense that this state is controlled by a journalist as a consequence of the manifestation of his professional competence based on the moral standards of discourse behavior and knowledge of the socio-cultural nature. A rationalized manifestation of the positive emotional-volitional state of a journalist in interpersonal interaction with a reader supports a socially oriented contact between the participants of interaction and the moral foundations of his discourse organization.

5 Conclusion

In the aspect of the study of discourse markers, in our work the texts of analytical reports are considered as such phenomena of journalistic activity, which can be empirically observed and

assessed. These markers function in the report narrative as a means of implementing the pragmatic category studied in this publication in the aspects of interpersonal interaction, which, in turn, is implemented as:

- a communicative mediation between individuals and socio-political competencies of a journalist and a reader;
- a communicative phenomenon that can potentially be transferred from one context of use to other contexts (for example, a scientific or popular science text).

In the process of journalistic coverage of the relevant social and political events and facts, the discourse markers we have studied occupy one of the strong positions in the texts of analytical reports. Focusing the reader's attention on the dynamically covered phenomena, the author of the report initiates a discourse act of representation of the subjective point of view in terms of the issues to which the text is devoted. At the same time, the discourse markers, to which the author resorts in the process of presenting his semantic position to the readership, introduce assertive speech actions, since the very expression of the subjective point of view is interpreted as its categorical statement. In this regard, in our work the discourse markers are studied as a kind of indicators of subsequent speech acts, and therefore as the central elements of these acts and constructive means of their direct verbal embodiment.

We conclude that a journalist focuses the evaluative (positive) connotative stratifications characteristic of discourse markers not so much on the unique differential properties of the events covered, but on the social or political predetermination of these events. These markers mainly reflect the correlation of the events covered with the motives and objectives of the appropriate activities of individuals, which is interpreted from the position of the social-group belonging of these individuals (cf. fragment (2) which covered the activities of the ordinary residents of one of the Moscow districts).

Serving as components of the structure of journalistic assessment, discourse markers form a modal frame of a report judgment, which consists of a person initiating the assessment and the objects being assessed, assessment elements, stereotypes and scales, which are designed to be perceived in the direct context of those ideas that are relevant for modern society. At the same time, in the context of the report narrative, a journalist who initiates the subjective assessment acts as a subject involved in the system of effective social relations, as a representative of the advanced public expressing dominant opinions or emotional-volitional moods.

The undeniable fact that report judgments including discourse markers in their structure inform the readership of the new relevant informative content and predetermine the novelty and theoretical significance of linguistic (semantic and pragmatic) analysis. The peculiarities of functioning of these markers in the media can be interpreted (which is done in our work) as a constructive mechanism for establishing and maintaining the interpersonal (dialogic) contacts between journalists and readers which are aimed at the assessing (personal) discussion of the content of the important socio-political information. We believe that the subsequent studies of discourse markers as a way of expressing a high degree of truth of the illuminated actual information content (not only in the context of analytical reports, but also other types of mass media discourses and texts) are designed to provide an analytical basis for the systematic study of the following issues:

- clarification of the research model combining such pragmatic categories as the voice of a journalist, evidentiality and epistemic modality;
- the ratio of opinions and ideas about the socio-political reality expressed by a journalist and the objects of journalistic narrative;
- manipulative possibilities of discourse manifestation of the personality of a journalist in texts.

Literature:

1. Baran, S. J., Davis, D. K.: *Mass Communication Theory: Foundations, Ferment, and Future*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1995. P. 112.
2. Celle, A., Huart, R.: *Connectives as Discourse Landmarks*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007. 1–11 pp.
3. Fairclough, N.: *Media Discourse*. L.: Arnold, 1995. P. 47.
4. Fraser, B.: *An Approach to Discourse Markers*. Journal of Pragmatics, 14, 1990. 383-395 pp.
5. Fraser, B.: *Contrastive Discourse Markers in English*. In Jucker & Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse Markers*. NY: John Benjamin's Publishing Company, 1998. 301-326 pp.
6. Gavrilova, G. F.: *Sentence and Text: System and Functionality*. Rostov-on-Don: AkademLit, 2015. P. 55.
7. Isachenko, O. M.: *Discourse Markers of Reality: Semantics of Reliability*. Bulletin of Novosibirsk State University. Series: History, Philology, 11(2), 2012. 25-33 pp.
8. Katsman, E. M.: *Discourse Particle "Kak Raz" and its Functions within a Statement*. Scientific Dialogue, 12, 2017. 139-150 pp.
9. Klepikova, T. A., Klepikova, I. V.: *Cognitive Variation in Discourse: Discourse Markers of Epistemic Vigilance in the English and Russian Languages // Cognitive Studies of the Language*. — 2014. — No. 19. — P. 366-369 pp.
10. Macdonald, M.: *Exploring Media Discourse*. L.: Arnold, 2003. P. 32.
11. Manovich, L.: *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: The MIT Press, 2001. P. 67.
12. McQuail, D.: *Mass Communication Theory*. L.: Sage, 1994. P. 17.
13. Moores, S.: *Media Theory: Thinking about Media and Communications*. L.: Routledge, 2005. P. 121.
14. Perse, E. M.: *Media Effects and Society*. Mahwah, New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 2001. P. 32.
15. Ryzhkova, A., Reznichenko, A., Arefieva, A.: *Purely Moscow Protest. What are the People in Kuntsevo and Other Areas of the Capital Are Fighting for and Why*. Russian Reporter, 24(463), 2018. P. 14.
16. Schiffrin, D.: *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. 321 p.
17. Schourup, L.: *Discourse Markers: Tutorial Overview*. Lingua, 107, 1999. 227-265 pp.
18. Shilikhina, K. M.: *The Study of Discourse Markers by the Methods of Corpus Linguistics*. Bulletin of Voronezh State University. Series: Linguistics and Intercultural Communication, 3, 2015. 120-125 pp.
19. Smirnova, V. V.: *Discourse Markers of Supposition in the Russian Language: Cognitive Interpretation*. Cognitive Studies of the Language, 30, 2017. 303-307 pp.
20. Solovieva, D.: *"Laundry Room". The Idea of a Laundry Service for the Homeless Drives the Residents of Savelovskiy Mad*. Russian Reporter, 18 (457), 2018. P. 24.
21. Spitulnik, D.: *The Social Circulation of Media Discourse and the Mediation of Communities*. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 6(2), 1997. P. 169.
22. Ulanova, E. E.: *Discourse Markers of the Category of Authority (Based on the Russian Talk Show)*. Philological Sciences. Questions of Theory and Practice, 7-1(85), 2018. 181-185 pp.
23. Unger, C.: *The Scope of Discourse Connectives: Implications for Discourse Organization*. J. Linguistics, 32, 1996. 403-438 pp.
24. Vinogradova, E. M.: *Word "Tipa" as a Postmodern Discourse Signal*. The Russian Language at School, 8, 2011. 72-79 pp.
25. Zavgorodnyaya, N. I.: *Discourse Markers in Modus Organization of the Field Conditionality in the Languages of Different Structures*. Bulletin of Chuvash University, 1, 2010. 186-191 pp.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AI, AJ, AD, AO