

METAPRAGMATICS OF ACADEMIC WRITTEN DISCOURSE

Yaroslava Gnezdilova

Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv, Ukraine

Bibliographic description:

Gnezdilova, Ya. (2018). Metapragmatics of academic written discourse. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2018, III (1), June 2018, p. 46-79. DOI: [10.2478/lart-2018-0002](https://doi.org/10.2478/lart-2018-0002) ISSN 2453-8035

Full version of the text can be downloaded from our official web site:

<http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/lart> or using DOI.

Résumé

This article focuses on developing the main principles of metapragmatic analysis and singling out its three stages on the example of academic written discourse. The first step is connected with the elaboration of a unified classification of various meta-means in general, which the author differentiates into an autonomous group of meta-means, including contact means, interaction-regulating means, reflexive means and discourse-organizers; and a contextually-dependent one. Then, the metapragmatic functions they perform in academic written discourse are studied, with an emphasis on the specifics of their use in this discourse type. Thereafter, the metapragmatic calibration is examined from the point of view of the degree of metapragmatic intensity of a particular discourse type. The author falls back upon the quantitative method used in contrastive linguistics and adjusts it to metapragmatic analysis. Therefore, the meta-index of academic written discourse is estimated, as well as the

percentage of meta-means, which are used in the research articles under analysis. In relation to specifics of academic written metadiscourse, the research results show that most typical for this discourse type are commentating markers, performing the functions of specification, explanation, generalization, and accentuation; discourse organizers, i.e., frequency, coherent, cohesive, and conclusive markers; and reference markers, including citations and examples. Reference markers are, actually, a distinctive characteristic of academic discourse. On the contrary, due to peculiarities in structural organization of academic discourse, the whole group of contact markers is missing as well as some sub-types of markers-regulators in the function of stimulation and encouragement; reflexive markers are mostly introduced with neutral structures as to their author- / reader-orientation or with author-oriented meta-means, but not with reader-oriented meta-means; the use of contextually-dependent meta-means is also scarce in academic written discourse.

Key words: metapragmatic analysis, meta-index, metadiscourse, meta-means, academic written discourse.

<p>Contact data Yaroslava Gnezdilova, CSc. (Philology), Assistant Professor, Postdoctoral student at the Department of German and Finno-Ugrian Philology, Kyiv National Linguistic University, 73, Velyka Vasyl'kivs'ka St., Kyiv, 03680, Ukraine e-mail: yaroslava.gn@gmail.com</p>		<p>Fields of interest</p> <p>Pragmatics, discourse studies, rhetoric, public communication, speech manipulation, emotiology, grammar.</p>
--	--	--

Article was received by the editorial board 14.01.18;

Reviewed 14.02.18. and 26.03.18.

Similarity Index 19%