UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

ÚSTAV ANGLICKÉHO JAZYKA A DIDAKTIKY

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

Alena Neubauerová

Stylistický rozbor jazykových prostředků v rozhlasových debatách

v angličtině a v češtině

Analysis of stylistic features in English and Czech radio debates

Vedoucí diplomové práce

Praha 2014   prof. PhDr. Libuše Dušková, DrSc.

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

Zároveň souhlasím se zapůjčením diplomové práce ke studijním účelům.

V Praze dne 5. 5. 2014

....

Alena Neubauerová

Klíčová slova

Stylistická analýza; stylisticky příznakové prostředky; četnost výskytu stylisticky příznakových prostředků; česká rozhlasová debata; Speciál Martina Veselovského; Český rozhlas; anglická rozhlasová debata; Any Questions?; BBC; spisovnost/nespisovnost; formální/neformální prostředky; formálnost/neformálnost.

Key words

Stylistic analysis; stylistically marked features; frequency of stylistically marked features; Czech radio debate; Speciál Martina Veselovského; Český rozhlas; English radio debate; Any Questions?; the BBC; standard/nonstandard features; formal/informal features; formality/informality.

Abstrakt

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá stylisticky příznakovými prostředky ve dvou rozhlasových debatách: pořadu BBC Radia 4 nazvaném Any Questions? a českém Speciálu Martina Veselovského, pořadu vysílaného Českým rozhlasem 1 na stanici Radiožurnál.

Stylisticky příznakové jsou ty prostředky, jejichž výskyt je omezen na určitý kontext. V případě této diplomové práce jsou tím kontextem námi analyzované debaty vysílané veřejnoprávními institucemi. Prostředky, které jsou v průběhu analýzy označeny za příznakové, jsou popsány na morfologické, syntaktické a lexikální rovině, rozděleny do kategorií podle funkce a následně identifikovány jako spisovné či nespisovné. Zatímco se některé příznakové prostředky vyskytují v obou zkoumaných jazycích, některé jsou charakteristické jen pro jeden z jazyků, neboť jazykové systémy češtiny a angličtiny se navzájem liší.

Zkoumána je také četnost výskytu jednotlivých prostředků. Z těchto a dalších zjištění je potom vyvozen závěr o tom, do jaké míry mohou být obě debaty označeny za neformální.

Abstract

This MA thesis focuses on the stylistically marked features that occur in an English radio debate called Any Questions? aired by BBC – Radio 4 and a Czech radio debate called Speciál Martina Veselovského aired on Český rozhlas 1 – Radiožurnál.

Stylistically marked features are restricted to certain kinds of social context: in the case of this thesis, it is two radio debates broadcast by public service media. Those linguistics features that are considered stylistically marked in the two debates are identified on the morphological,

syntactical and lexical level, and classified into categories based upon a view of their functions. Subsequently, they are described as standard or nonstandard. Some of the features found are shared by both debates. However, some are, due to the different language systems concerned, symptomatic of only one of the languages.

The difference between the English and the Czech stylistically marked features is also revealed as to the frequency of their occurrence. Finally, the conclusions about the level of informality of the two debates are drawn.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

OALD.................Oxford Advanced Learner´s Dictionary

List of Tables

1. Introduction

The goal of this MA thesis is to provide a description and analysis of stylistic means used in English and Czech radio debates, followed by their respective comparison. The source material for this analysis has been gained from a British radio debate called Any Questions? broadcast by BBC Radio 4 on the 12th August 2011 and a Czech radio debate called Speciál Martina Veselovského aired on Český rozhlas 1 – Radiožurnál on the 4th September 2012.

This thesis deals with the general characteristics of spoken as opposed to written language, especially in conversational situations: the emphasis is put upon the morphological (both formal and functional) level and the syntactical level of the two languages concerned – English and Czech. Based on the two language systems, the thesis will explore all the structures that are somehow stylistically marked and subsequently described as being standard or nonstandard. These marked features will be considered with respect to the frequency of their occurrence in the two languages.

Also, the lexical level of the given material will be explored: the lexical means that are stylistically marked will be identified, along with their type and the degree of markedness (as to its standard/nonstandard use), and their frequencies in the two languages again compared. The result of this MA thesis will thus be to expose the extent to which the degree of informality in English and Czech can be regarded comparable, and which are the means that cause any potential differences.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. The purpose of stylistic analysis

According to Crystal et al. (1993: 3), the English language is not a homogenous phenomenon but a complex of different varieties of language in use and in different situations. The varieties can be distinguished as spoken and written English, regional dialects, and also according to the person who is speaking and the kind of social situation s/he is in. When in a language situation, a speaker has intuitive knowledge about what is linguistically appropriate, as pointed by Crystal et al. (1993: 5): naturally, we cannot choose to ignore the fact that not everyone masters the language as s/he really should. That means that the speakers use those stylistic features that do not really have to be a part of the intended message, but only a mistake that they make without realizing it or correcting it subsequently, and it is the necessity of linguistics to follow these as well. However, due to the existing language norms or regulations as a basis of this complex system of communication, we are still able to describe the language within the respective framework.

In order to provide a technique that would grasp the given material and in the end form a sound basis for the stylistic analysis itself, it needs to be explained sufficiently what stylistics, the field within which this thesis operates, is: it is an area of linguistics that interprets texts with the primary focus on language itself, applying objective criteria set for the language so it can be studied with a sense of organization or order, despite the fact that these criteria are difficult to define properly.

According to Crystal et a. (1993: 10), its goal is then to "analyze language habits with the main purpose of identifying, from the general mass of linguistic features common to English as used on every conceivable occasion, those features which are restricted to certain kinds of

social context; to explain, where possible, why such features have been used, as opposed to other alternatives; and to classify these features into categories based upon a view of their function in the social context".

The social context, one of the pillars of this definition, is the influence upon which we all perceive the world around us, with the influences being of various nature, such as social status, gender, race and others. It is always connected to a certain linguistic situation, which, as can be understood from the definition above, also concerns the non-linguistic aspects of the overall experience.

Crystal et al. (1993: 11) call these non-linguistic aspects a situation and define it as "the sub-set of non-linguistic events which are clearly relevant to the identification of the linguistic features". We can then see how a particular linguistic content is influenced by the context in which it is uttered.

Turner (1973: 203-204) then suggests the model of describing these situational variations as follows: the first level in the adjustment of language to its situation is time and place of the content uttered, the second the degree of technicality and formality, as the use of speech and writing, and the third one lies in the specific function that labels the adjustment of language to the given situation, such as declarative, ironical, metalinguistic and others. Therefore, due to stylistics, we can explore the full potential of the language and understand its purpose in the given situation.

2.2. Varieties of language distinguished in stylistic analysis

The different language forms appropriate for given situations are the reason for the existence of generally recognized labels - variety labels, as stated by Leech et al. (1975: 21). Many features that are stylistically neutral and therefore belong among what is called "common

core" can be found in all varieties: the rest has to be identified individually with respect to the given language situations. According to Crystal et al. (1993: 65), these situations can be understood, or broken down into, dimensions of situational constraint (also referred to as situational variables) to which every feature being described can be related; in addition, "all varieties of English have much more in common than differentiates them". According to Crystal et al. (1993: 64-65), only the common core features mentioned above occur regardless of these situational dimensions.

These linguistic features, however, do not always indicate only one variable, which is also true vice versa: according to Crystal et al. (1993: 62), a language situation does not make it possible to predict a certain set of linguistic features. That is the reason why, also according to Crystal et al. (1993: 63), we rather talk about the "ranges of appropriateness and acceptability of various uses of language to given situations". The constraints that influence this use of language then vary. Some situations are clearly predictable, having many constraints as, for example, the language of religion; others are, however, vague. According to Crystal et al. (ibid.), we should thus see this predictability as a scale rather than two extremes.

However, as Crystal et al. (1993: 87-89) further state, we cannot identify a specific language only by referencing the individual dimensions: there still remains much of the complexity of language use that cannot be explained in these terms. The dimensions naturally coexist since they are synchronic concepts, with some being more apparent than others in different language uses; at this point, we can also distinguish which categories from different dimensions are going to co-occur: for instance, there is a mutual dependence between legal and formal language, or a probable co-occurrence between conversational and informal language, as pointed out by Crystal et al. (ibid.).

These categories are only examples of those identified in English: we can distinguish national and regional language, spoken and written[1], impersonal and many others. These can fall, as mentioned above, within individual dimensions of language description that help to establish the domains in which a stylistic analysis can be carried out, with the dimensions being individuality, dialect, time, discourse, province, status, modality and singularity. According to Crystal et al. (1993: 67-68), the first three dimensions are said to be less interesting from the stylistic point of view since they can be less manipulated by the speaker than the others; they are merely the background features in respect to which the other features can be identified. In the following sections, the description of such features will be related to the language of dialogues in public broadcasting.

2.2.1. Standard and nonstandard aspects of language

When dealing with stylistic analysis, it needs to be explained how both English and Czech are perceived in terms of their features all of which can be ascribed to different categories, as suggested above. Firstly, they can be described as standard or nonstandard.

In English, the question of standard and nonstandard language is not clearly defined. Generally, standard English is regarded as the national norm that has a variety of registers that stylistics usually deals with, as the aforementioned language of religion, newspaper, academic prose and others. As nonstandard English, on the other hand, every dialect can be regarded that does not fall under what has been described as standard English, or that is, according to Merriam-Webster Dictionary (available online from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nonstandard), not normally used by most of the educated speakers.

---

[1] In Czech, spoken and written language does not necessarily have to be considered a variety.

In Czech, the question of standard and nonstandard language must be considered differently. Whereas Standard Czech is a codified form of Czech the rules of which must be strictly obeyed and which should be used for official purposes, nonstandard Czech is quite a common variety penetrating areas in which only standard Czech used to be considered appropriate, for example in media discourse, as will be proved in the empirical part of the thesis..

The most frequent variety is Common Czech: it is spoken by the vast majority of people in Bohemia and, perhaps contrary to general beliefs, it is viewed as nonstandard, as opposed to colloquial Czech that cannot be uniquely defined in terms of its status within the Czech language in general. According to Kopečný in *Naše řeč* (1949: available online from http://nase-rec.ujc.cas.cz/archiv.php?art=4100), it can be stated that colloquial Czech is a variety that we can imagine as lying at the edge of standard language where even the nonstandard features can be already traced.

2.2.2. Formal and informal aspects of language

Formal vs. informal language is one of the most discussed labels of varieties of English. According to Leech et al. (1975: 23-24), formal language is used for public purposes as official reports, business letters and regulations and it is mostly written, with the exception of formal public speeches, whereas informal (colloquial) language is the language of private conversations and personal letters and is generally easier to understand than formal English: as Leech et al. (1975. 24), further point out, that is the reason for its usage in public communication nowadays, as in advertising or popular newspapers. Urbanová (2008: 65) presents formality as a scale that reflects "the influence of the social setting or a type of

interaction on language choice"[2]. Both formal and informal features are ranked among standard English.

The degree of formality is naturally closely connected to the subject matter: in a debate, for example, the respective audience is involved in the subject and the relationship between these two is defined through the speaker´s use of language. According to Turner (1973: 190), it is possible to, with respect to the subject matter, use formal language and yet stay intimate with the audience.

In purely formal language, for example, institutionalized interviews can be led: however, according to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 117), even in these, we can trace aspects that belong to institutional as well as every day, informal discourse. In public service broadcasting, the institutional aspects prevail, as opposed to commercial broadcasting that, according to Čmejrková et al. (ibid.), displays an indisputably greater number of instances of a more personal approach to the guests or partners in the debates. This, however, does not mean that the interviews broadcast by public service radios do not display any features of personal communication – as Čmejrková et al. (ibid.) point out, it depends on the presenter how much s/he wants to know about the guests´ private lives and refer to it respectively.

According to Urbanová (2008: 65), the formality itself is defined by social distance, official approach, or stiff manners: it is, with reference to Crystal, "a level of language considered appropriate to socially formal situations". Informality, on the other hand, can be seen as "a style of writing or conversational speech characterized by simpler grammatical structures,

---

[2] The Czech original also uses the English quation.

more familiar vocabulary, and a greater use of idioms and metaphors"[3], as Urbanová (ibid.) also points out.

Therefore, the question is to which extent the statements made above reflect reality and whether it is even possible nowadays to draw a clear line between formal and informal language, meaning the relation between formality and informality can be viewed as a continuum in which we can identify different degrees. According to Urbanová (2008: 65-66), these degrees can be posh talk, distance, familiar tone, spontaneous and informal chat, and relaxed, casual conversation.

Čmejrková et al. (2011: 69-73) expand on this assumption, suggesting that although dialogues broadcast by public service radios are likely to be perceived as purely formal, the distinction between formal and informal communicative situation can be made easily, with political debates ranked among informal communicative situations. It explains that while official reports or ceremonial speeches are held in the form of formal monologues, the majority of public speeches are led in a dialogue form that, from its confrontational nature, provides a lot of space for informal features to be used in this formal, institutional form of spoken language.

2.3. Spoken language as the subject of stylistic analysis

According to Müllerová et al. (1994: 8), since 1960 world linguistics has been turning its attention from the language system as such to the concrete use of language – to the relationship of the language and its users in given situations, shortly to the discourse. That produced a significant shift of attention from the written form of language to the spoken, and since the aforementioned dialogue stands in the centre of spoken language, the following sections are dedicated to a more detailed description of it.

---

[3] The Czech original also uses the English quations.

The difference between spoken and written language lies in many factors. According to Leech et al. (1975: 23), for example, "in writing we usually have time to plan our message, to think about it carefully while writing, and to revise it afterwards if necessary. In speech (unless it is, say, a lecture prepared in advance), we have no time to do this, but must shape our message as we go". This is also connected to the fact that in spoken language, the connections between the clauses of simple structures are less clear, since the hearer also relies on his or her understanding of the context, as Leech et al. (1975: 23) also point out. The spoken interaction is then tightly bound to the direct contact of the participants and their mutual relationships.

According to Čmejrková et al. (2011: 152-153), spoken language contains many sequential signals: these are features that explicitly show that the speech can be divided into segments. They are of three kinds: structural signals concluding topics or making distinctions between them, as *takže, to tedy znamená...* (*therefore, so, meaning)*, contact signals that are part of turn taking, as *no dobře, jasně, že jo?* (*all right, OK, is that right?*), and signals of commentary nature that usually introduce opinions of the individual speakers, as *já bych myslel...* (*I´d think*).

Spoken language, as stated by Čmejrková et al. (2011: 153), also uses structures that appear in written texts or structures that are characteristic of written texts but can be modified for spoken language, and finally, there can appear structures specific solely of spoken language. Syntactic connections, in comparison with spoken language, can be sometimes clearly defective: to what degree will be seen in the empirical part of the thesis.

2.3.1. Description of dialogue

Dialogue is one of the forms of spoken communication. It can best be defined contrastively, in relation to monologue: according to Hoffmannová (1997: 9), while it is only one speaker who

utters a monologue, in a dialogue, there are two or more speakers who react to each other´s responses and are replacing each other in active and passive communicative roles. Hoffmannová (ibid.) states, with reference to Mukařovský´s view of the matter, that "a dialogue and a monologue are complementary forms, closely interconnected"[4], which is further explained by the fact that the majority of monologues are permeated by potential dialogues: therefore, in every utterance, there is "a temporary and always renewed balance"[5] of the basic polarity of monologue and dialogue natures.

A situation in which the boundaries of the latter are violated can occur quite frequently in real life conversations – in other words, a person´s monologue can be easily interrupted by another speaker: as Hoffmannová (ibid.) points out that we even do not have to try to differentiate between these two; for example, in cases in which a person dominates the conversation for a long time, uninterrupted by others because s/he is explaining something or telling a story, Hoffmannová (ibid.) mentions the possibility to speak about a monologue within a dialogue. In addition, Hausenblas in *Slovo a slovesnost* (1984: 3 - 4) states that a dialogue is not one entity which he calls *komunikát* in Czech but a complex of different entities. Hausenblas then continues that, as the individual speakers switch their roles within the dialogue, they are using different styles, so even the style cannot be perceived as a unifying element of the whole, and, despite the fact that the dialogue usually deals with one topic, it does not have to be unified in terms of its sense either, as Hausenblas also points out in *Slovo a slovesnost* (ibid.)

---

[4] "[...] dialog a monolog jsou formy komplementární, navzájem těsně propojené [...]"

[5] "dočasná a vždy obnovená rovnováha"

2.3.1.1. Dialogue genres: establishing terminology

As suggested above, dialogue is based on the switching of active and passive communicative roles (of the roles of the speaker and the hearer), being one of the basic forms of human interaction, needed for exchanging information, as Müllerová et al. (1994: 13) point out.

As regards the question of how the term dialogue and terms related to it can be used, concerning media discourse, we can state the following: in English, as Müllerová et al. (1994: 20) further point out, the usage of the term *conversation* is quite frequent; however, in Czech, the word *konverzace* is associated with an informal, social occasion, as a conversation of two friends, for example. The term *dialogue* then appears more appropriate: it is a more universal term and hence is more suitable for the purposes of theoretical description, as also pointed out by Müllerová et al. (1994: 20). Also, according to Crystal et al. (1993: 115-116), the term *conversation* is not so easily distinguishable from other terms that we might use on the subject: the distinction that can be drawn between *conversation* and *discussion*, for example, since it can relate to the subject matter and its seriousness, or the formality of the occasion. However, there are elements which both conversation and discussion combine. Thus, Crystal et al. (1993: 116) argue that there is no reason for clear demarcation, yet we can make an attempt to define it.

Discussion - a panel discussion in this case - is by *OALD* (available online from http://oald8.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/dictionary/discussion)   characterized   as   "a detailed conversation about something that is considered to be important". As can be understood from this definition, *discussio*n is a much broader term then *debate* that by *OALD* (available   online   from   http://oald8.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/dictionary/debate)   is identified as "a formal discussion of an issue at a public meeting or in a parliament. In a debate two or more speakers express opposing views […]". *Discussion* can also be even less

formal – it can be held among family members, for example. If we consider a *panel* discussion, the range of its denotation changes. *OALD* (available online from http://oald8.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/dictionary/panel) defines "panel" as "a group of specialists who give their advice or opinion about something; a group of people who discuss topics of interest on television or radio". A panel discussion can therefore be viewed se a highly formal event due to the presence of the specialists who are expected to be representative of the given field.

Since the debates, both English and Czech, that we deal with in this thesis take place in a venue rented by a public service institution and inside a public service institution respectively, we can adjust the definition above as follows: a radio debate can be viewed as a formal discussion of an issue held for a certain audience in which two or more speakers express opposing views.

It can be thus concluded that while *dialogue* is the most general term suitable for the linguistic description of the material selected for this thesis, *radio debate* is a narrower term, since dialogue is contained in a debate which itself is a journalistic genre.

2.3.2. Factors influencing dialogue

2.3.2.1. Relationship of the participants and their social roles in dialogue

The course of group dialogues, as in school classes, or, in our case, debates, is established in advance, according to a given communication model: the dialogues are directed. Within its limits, however, there can easily occur a change of a respective topic or spontaneous reactions to what is being said, especially when the participants know each other and have a certain relationship to each other. On these occasions, there is usually someone in charge – in radio

debates, it is the presenter who moderates the ongoing dialogues and therefore has a strong influence on the course of the debate.

According to Čmejrková et al. (2011: 62), apart from the spontaneous and directed, there can be interpersonal dialogues or, on the other hand, dialogues of mass character, depending on whether they are private or broadcast by media.

As opposed to those that are directed, ordinary communicative situations that people become involved in every day are symmetrical in terms of the speakers taking turns, as Čmejrková et al. (2011: 65) also point out. However, there are spontaneous dialogues that can be regarded asymmetrical, because their progression is defined by the institutional nature of the dialogues, with the speakers taking turns when they are asked, and sometimes even involuntarily. As Čmejrková et al. (ibid.) continue, in these types of dialogues, the speakers do not cooperate on regular basis: regarding the cooperative principles, these dialogues have a deficit.

Overall, the course of the dialogue is determined by the social position, or the social role which the participants fulfil in that particular linguistic situation – since we all fulfil more roles in our everyday lives (as a person who is, for example, a mother, a wife and an employee at the same time), we always have to choose a role appropriate for the given purpose, and, as Müllerová et al. (1994: 58) state, the success that we achieve in the dialogue lies in the extent to which we are able to identify ourselves with this role.

In the debates under study, broadcast by public service radios in the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic, the social roles of the presenter and the participants, as well as their statuses, have been established in advance, as is one of the possibilities noted by Čmejrková et al. (2003: 117). This situation then determines the whole course of the discussion.

2.3.2.2. The topic of dialogue

As regards the topic of dialogue, Müllerová et al. (1994: 35) state that the topic structure can be based on one main theme: this theme is then developed and discussed according to its different aspects which can be further specified. The topic can also be modified in the course of the dialogue: according to Müllerová et al. (ibid.), if that happens, it actually means that the participants have created a new topic to which they have then moved.

According to Müllerová et al. (ibid.), the participants can discuss many topics within the given dialogue, just as its purpose requires. For example, the participants are involved in a political debate that is scheduled to cover more topics that the public is interested in. The switching between topics is then achieved by special techniques, which, however, are not the interest of this thesis.

As opposed to informal interviews, the topics of formal conversations are not "scattered": there is usually one main topic that can contain several subtopics that are then debated subsequently, or there can be several minor topics that are less important than the main theme, as Müllerová et al. (ibid.) also point out: in the case of radio debates, this all depends, among others, on the format of the programme, the number of participants who can interfere in the course of the dialogue, and last but not least, on the presenter of the debate whose role can be defined differently, mostly according to the rules created by the respective medium.

2.3.2.3. The role of the presenter

The role of the presenter can be generally viewed in three ways that do not, however, exclude each other: according to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 118), the first is the presenter as a representative of an institution – s/he talks with the guests and the audience as a member of a certain institution – in our case of a public medium. The second role is the interactive one –

the presenter is a participant of the debate himself or herself. Also, it is s/he who has the power to decide the individual turns of the participants. The third role of his or hers is the private one: it is in this role that the presenter can afford to express his or her own views of the matters, his or her opinions and even his relationship to the guests. According to the way Čmejrková et al. (ibid.) present it, we can understand these three roles and their combination as the means that should lead, among others, to the desired goal and make the interview successful, which is, however, a field for discourse analysis.

According to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 137), the individual style of the presenter is another aspect that contributes to the overall image of the given programme, its quality and the extent to which the programme is popular and respected by the audience. The presenter´s style is defined by many features: by those that this thesis is not interested in, since they lie on the phonetical and phonological level, such as the speech tempo, intonation and others, and by those that define the style as such and influence the style of the whole programme as to the level of formality – in other words, the presenter´s style is what reveals his or her interest in the interview and therefore helps to create the image of the programme, as stated by Čmejrková et al. (ibid.).

Čmejrková et al. (2003: 137-140) conclude on the topic as follows: it is the politeness that is one of the leading principles in an interview: the presenter must show respect to his or her guests, and therefore uses a number of politeness formulas needed for leading the interview and maintaining contact: if needed, the presenter uses apologies, such as *sorry for the interruption*, and also self-criticism that often enables him or her to find the desired answer, for example *I apologize for my memory but...* .

Another means of the presenter, as Čmejrková et al. (2003: 143) see it, is to sometimes "enrich" the main topic by a "situational microdialogue", or to "spice it up" with a personal

question. According to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 148), situational humour or little jokes are usually quite appropriate as well, as long as they are not cheap, as we can sometimes hear them on commercial radios.

Above all, the presenter should stay unbiased: according to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 102), s/he should not be asking questions that are supportive to one participant and aggressive to another, for example. When a threatening question does occur, the presenter often resolves the situation by ascribing the opinion to someone else; since the presenter cannot really be neutral, s/he can only takes a "neutralistic" approach, meaning that s/he should only use those means that do not formally mark any attitude: for example, the presenter´s opinions can be disguised as questions, as Čmejrková et al. (ibid.) present it, or phrases as *Some people think that…* According to Čmejrková et al. (2011: 257), the presenter should place his or her guests in a position that might not be comfortable for them: the presenter then builds their identities in that concrete interaction, which may lead to them having challenging potential.

According to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 140), it is also essential to keep in mind that an interview in the radio is led face to face, but at the same time is meant to be received by the audience only by the audio channel: that leads to the use of other specific means that facilitate understanding, for example switching from the first to the third person with which the presenter refers to himself or herself, as in *Dobrý večer přeje Václav Moravec* (*Václav Moravec wishes you a pleasant evening*). This technique can also be applied to the second person, so the presenter makes understanding easier for his or her audience as to whose turn it is to speak now, for example *Ptám se Václava Havla…* (*I am now asking Václav Havel*).

2.3.2.4. The goal that the speakers fulfil in dialogue

According to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 154), whereas the strategy of the presenter, as explained above, aims at one goal of gaining as many pieces of clear information as needed, the strategy of the guests is often different: in a political debate in which the presenter demands an answer that is for a politician for many reasons impossible to utter, s/he then tends to avoid a clear answer by ignoring the question completely, by repeating what s/he has already said or by answering only parts of the question. To which extent the presenter is able to cope with these possibilities depends on the character of the presenter himself or herself, the character of the programme and of the provider of the interview. When we as listeners deal with a public service radio programme, we should have the right to demand clarity from the presenter and the guests of his or her programme, especially when the guests are politicians and people who are responsible for the public sphere and our living conditions in general.

According to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 154-162), recent development shows that the speakers respect the norms of the existing rhetorical style with all its rules in the course of the interviews, but at the same time they exceed them by their own individual means. The speakers often express themselves ambiguously, which, also according to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 162), can be their intention: for example, for a politician, ambiguous terms and manipulation by the use of language can be symptomatic of the occupation and the role that the particular person represents in public life. It is generally believed that public discourse has changed in the last decades, with many complaining about its decreasing quality: however, it is true that especially the politicians are well aware of the fact that the use of stylistic means along with their organization is what creates their technique of persuasion, and are able to act accordingly.

On the other hand, according to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 84), the goal of the presenter is to make a politician or any other person from the public sphere formulate a clear and simple answer that would unambiguously reveal that person´s opinion on the given matter. As we might already know, that creates an inevitable conflict. However, as Čmejrková et al. (ibid.) expand on the matter, the goal of all the participants should be to find a compromise, a mutual solution; this sometimes does not happen, since the more emotionally escalated or controversial the interview (or the debate) is, the greater numbers it generates in terms of listeners - although for media of public service, the presenter encouraging increasing tension between the participants should not be the desired option.

According to Čmejrková et al. (ibid.), media specialists point out that, despite all the controversies and potential personal attacks, the character of the debates is overall cooperative, since it normally does not happen that the participants stop communicating for good or leave the studio: with reference to Weizman, Čmejrková et al. (ibid.) conclude that what we deal with here is "a joint endeavour via perpetual conflicts"[6].

In addition to all this information, we cannot forget that a dialogue in the media that two people are involved in is in fact a dialogue for a third person, since, for example, in radio debates, the dialogue is orientated towards the audience, which to a large extent influences the means that the presenter uses as well as the means of his or her guests. The individual responses can then be explicitly addressed to somebody but may contain an implicit message for somebody else - for the audience, as Čmejrková et al. (2003: 85 - 87) point out. According to Čmejrková et al. (2011: 259), the audience are in fact participants of the communicative situations, since the guests of the debate can address them from time to time and also the presenter can formulate a question as a representation of the audience´s views.

---

[6] The Czech original uses the English quotation.

According to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 87), the points made above – the nature of dialogue as such, as well as its focus on the recipients - fulfil the same goal: they raise a certain topic in the form of questions and answers for the audience. The performance full of agreements and controversies then directly influences the audience, their opinions and their future decisions.

2.3.3. Linguistic features used in dialogue

2.3.3.1. Competition of standard/nonstandard features

As has already been suggested, stylistics deals with the choices that the speakers make in order to achieve the given goal; different means are then competing with each other, as to which the speaker will select. According to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 157), when analyzing "the competition" of standard and nonstandard, we have to keep in mind the two following things: first, what kinds of speeches it is possible to consider "strictly standard" and "every day language", and second, what nonstandard means can be regarded appropriate, or tolerable, in speeches that are not strictly standard but at the same time not private, and for that reason to what extent they can then be used.

Čmejrková et al. (ibid.). further mention the fact that the television debates are, with regards to what has just been stated, difficult to characterize uniquely, and the same may be true about radio debates as well. The media discourse is rapidly changing nowadays, because of the development and the expansion of new channels of communication, as, for example, internet due to which some language boundaries cease to exist, as some of the differences between spoken and written language, for instance, and many others.

In Czech, it can be thus understood that standard and nonstandard features mingle in their usages. Čmejrková et al. (2011: 205) show that, regarding spoken Czech - spontaneous and directed, this occurrence of marked features in the different situations can be seen as a result

of the following attempts: in spoken language, the speakers intend to distinguish between different registers, for example, between formal and intimate communicative situations, yet, they use idioms that directly call for nonstandard forms. Then, they choose nonstandard forms for rhythmical reasons or because their partner used this particular form, or because the speaker is well aware of the institutional nature of the communicative situation and wants to act accordingly, switching between nonstandard and standard forms intentionally.

In media, there are thus three problems identified by Čmejrková et al. (2013: 240): the coexistence of standard and nonstandard features as a result of the current process of erasing boundaries between high and low style, publicity of media broadcasts that allow formal as well as informal language, and the unclear ratio of what is standard and nonstandard in relation to what is considered sophisticated and what is not. As Čmejrková et al. (2013: 231) conclude, media discourse is based mainly on standard features of language, with nonstandard features occasionally penetrating the discourse. Although what has just been stated concerns the Czech environment, it can be considered true also for the English media discourse, as will be seen in the part of the thesis.

2.3.3.2. Stylistic features of dialogue in relation to the different language systems of Czech and English

The following section describes the characteristics of dialogue in relation to those levels of linguistics that were pointed out in the introduction. The characteristics of the Czech dialogue in media discourse are mainly demonstrated on the basis of the treatment presented by Čmejrková et al (2003) and Grepl et al. (1995). The nature of the English dialogue in media discourse is, on the other hand, more difficult to describe, since a detailed study that would, by its extent, correspond to Čmejrková et al. (2003) has not been published, at least to the knowledge of the author of this thesis. However, Turner (1973) forms a certain basis for

general description: his description, along with some observations from Enkvist (1973) is thus used. First, the Czech characteristics are described, since some of them are also valid for their English counterparts.

2.3.3.2.1. Stylistic features on the morphological, syntactical and lexical level found in Czech and English radio debates

As Čmejrková et al. (2003: 158) point out, on the morphological level, the features are mostly standard, more specifically colloquial, as can be seen in the case of verbs, whereas nonstandard features concern mostly nouns, adjectives and pronouns.

On the syntactical level, according to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 160), the following phenomena occur frequently: adjacent responses do not often correspond stylistically. Standard features can be followed by colloquial and nonstandard ones respectively. As regards the length of the clauses, long and clumsy ones are rather exceptional: more probably, according to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 161), they are joined asyndetically.

Grepl et al. (1995: 93) then comment upon the lexis: the colloquial style of an interview is still regarded standard, and so should be all the addresses intended for the public, as Grepl et al. (1995: 728) further point out. However, the language of a panel discussion cannot be regarded precisely the same as language of public speaking: as has been stated above, conversational features are present as well. Čmejrková et al. (2003: 166) point out that the lexis used can be divided into standard and nonstandard features, with the standard lexis including learned words and professional terms. Figurative expressions play a significant role in the language of public debates as well.

With reference to Jaroslav Bartošek, Čmejrková et al. (2003: 157) conclude that phonological, morphological and syntactical features of the language of our politicians, if they are involved

in the debates, are not as specific and marked, as we might think, and that their texts are quite "neat" regarding all the levels that we have just mentioned. All in all, they use neutral, standard language, and if marked features occur, according to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 172-173), it is mostly expressive and emotionally marked expressions.

In English, the division of grammar into the morphological and the syntactical level may not have, especially in comparison in Czech, a clear boundary: therefore, we can, although do not have to, treat phenomena on the morphological level as a part of syntax.

Turner (1973: 90), for example, states that stylistic variations are mostly found not in word order, but in terms of tense, aspect, voice and full or contracted forms: a passive construction, for instance, obscures the agent of the action, allowing the context to resolve the potential ambiguities, since it is sometimes even convenient for the speaker to leave the interpretations to the hearers.

On the syntactical level, Turner (1973: 196) mentions a number of phenomena that are symptomatic of spoken language: in unedited speech, hesitations, repetitions and cancellations occur when the speaker tries to deliver his or her message. Also, rearrangement of elements, placement of adjuncts, and the length of sentences already mentioned in relation to the Czech media discourse are prominent features.

Clausal linkage, marking the coherence between clauses within sentences and sentences within texts, displays certain preferences: according to Enkvist (1973: 122), additive, adversative and clausal linkages provide enough space for linguistic alterations.

On the lexical level, as Turner (1973: 174) points out, the style of radio debates is not as narrow as some others that are restricted to specific features. For example, the category of "big words", derived from classical languages, represents alternatives for "plain English

words" that the users of English are familiar with from every-day language, although according to Turner (1973: 123), there is not always a clear boundary between these two. As regards the rest of the features, suffice it to say that complete avoidance of mingling formal and colloquial vocabulary cannot be always achieved.

These two short summaries provide characteristics of the language of Czech and English radio debates: due to their analytical and inflectional nature, the two languages concerned display different features within their own language systems; some are, however, shared. The empirical part of the thesis then shows to which extent these marked features can be found in the two radio debates under study and to which extent they can be regarded comparable.

3. Material and method

For the stylistic analysis in this thesis, two public service broadcasts were selected: an edition of Any Questions? aired by BBC Radio 4 on 12th August 2011 and Speciál Martina Veselovského aired on Český rozhlas 1 – Radiožurnál on 4th September 2012. Both editions last for 45 – 50 minutes and involve a male presenter and four and five panellists, respectively. In the case of BBC, the panellists are people from the world of media, social sphere and politics, and in the case of Český rozhlas, members of different political parties representing communal politics. What is interesting about Any Questions? and Speciál Martina Veselovského in general is that every edition takes place at a different part of the country, so people from every region can participate and ask the panellists their questions directly every week: the British and the Czech edition selected for the analysis took place in the City of York in the United Kingdom, and in České Budějovice in the Czech Republic and can be listened to on the following websites:

http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/b0132pvf/Any_Questions_12_08_2011/ and

http://www.rozhlas.cz/zpravy/regiony/_zprava/video-predvolebni-debata-z-jihoceskeho-kraje--1106298, respectively.

The reason for selecting these particular editions is that they both have a very similar number of participants, which helps in the comparison of frequencies of respective stylistic features, and they both deal with social and political issues and involve people from the political spheres of the two countries who could be expected to have comparable education and social background. In addition, both of the discussions can be regarded quite controversial, which leads to the use of stylistically noteworthy means, and therefore creates a sound basis for the analysis in this thesis.

The transcript for each of the editions was obtained differently: for Any Questions?, the transcript was created by the author of this thesis for the purpose of a BA thesis that was defended at the Institute of Communication Studies and Journalism at the Faculty of Social Sciences of Charles University. In this BA thesis, the transcript served a different purpose than here, and that was to describe Any Questions? as one of the formats of radio broadcasting.. That led the author of this thesis to the decision to use it for the present purpose as well. Since the transcript was created by retyping from listening, it may contain some mistakes. For Speciál Martina Veselovského, the "raw" transcript was gained from Český rozhlas.

Both transcripts have been rewritten - adjusted using transcription symbols and the guidelines for transcribing audio materials created by Kaderka et al. (2006). When carrying out an analysis, it is customary that the transcript is created (or adjusted, if it already exists) using transcription symbols. These symbols are also needed for the analysis itself, because some of them are closely connected to the prosody of the debate, and therefore to the features under

study on the higher levels of language (for example, the use of pauses enables us to determine anacolutha or false starts on the syntactical level).

The whole transcripts serve as the basis of general descriptions of stylistically marked features on all the three levels of the languages concerned, which, however, disregard the questions of the audience and, in the case of Speciál Martina Veselovského, also the short pre-recorded reportage, since the reportage does not contribute to the unedited speech under study. The features in the language of the audience cannot be ranked among those used by the presenter or the participants, since they represent yet another party that, due to the scope of this thesis, cannot be analyzed.

The most frequent, therefore significant examples of features as well as solitary examples that are note-worthy will be introduced: however, it must be pointed out that in the extract subjected to statistical comparison (see paragraphs below), not all the phenomena described will occur. In the Czech analysis, the examples will be presented in the form in which they occur in the transcript, including the potential grammar mistakes and the lack of punctuation (the transcription symbols as the pauses and others are, however, omitted in the examples used in the text, since the features have already been identified and categorized in tables, so the transcription symbols are not needed in the thesis itself). Also, some of the examples will not be accompanied by their English equivalents but a description of the feature itself that can demonstrate the particular issue better.

For a better organization of the descriptions of the features on the individual levels, some features are grouped in one category; therefore the descriptions proceed differently on each level, as the identified features and the particular level logically require. Also, the description of stylistically marked features does not involve the discourse nature of the given dialogues, since discourse analysis lies beyond the focus of this thesis.

Both analyses then display statistical comparison of the stylistically marked features in the first 1, 000 words of both transcripts (with the reportage in Speciál Martina Veselovského excluded). In English, it is lines 1 - 68 with the last word *vacuum*, and in Czech, it is lines 1 - 84 with the last word *vyrostla*. These statistics compare the features in the language of the presenter and the participants in detail, drawing conclusions that were established as the goal of the thesis in the introduction. The statistics are also supported by the number of stylistically marked features that occur throughout the whole debates under study. However, this number is only approximate, due to the size of the material that exceeds the scope of this thesis.

The statistically considered features in all the tables then copy the order of features in the descriptions, followed by the conclusion about the occurrence of formal and informal features on the particular level in our 1,000 extract. Also, the ratio of the features in the extracts used by the presenter and the participants is precisely calculated and included in the tables. Therefore, we can see how many features from each category are used by the presenter and the participants, and how the use of these features differs regarding the roles that the speakers occupy in the debate.

4. Empirical part

4.1. The background of the English and the Czech radio debate under study

In order to fully understand the stylistic means used in the debates, we have to describe the extra-linguistic context in which they are used – in other words, the background of the British and the Czech medium of public service. (For an additional description of the participants and the presenters of the debates themselves –their occupations in the debates - see Appendix 4.)

BBC is an independent medium that has been built upon democratic values and has relied upon the support of the public. According to Hendy (2000: 18), "BBC has long been regarded

as the classic example of public service radio: a chartered organization, publicly funded but independent of direct political control as well as commercial pressures […]".

As every public service medium, BBC has goals and missions that have been clearly established by law, and their fulfilment is constantly under watch and, if needed, demanded by law. As BBC alone formulates it on its website (available from http://www.bbc.co.uk/aboutthebbc/insidethebbc/whoweare/mission_and_values/), their goal is "to enrich people´s lives with programmes and services that inform, educate and entertain".

To be able to do so, BBC needs a stable number of listeners, and, as other media of public service, is in constant risk of losing them to commercial broadcasters. This fact is closely linked to the journalistic genres broadcast by BBC: since these genres need to cover as many interests of the audience as possible, in Radio 4 as well as on any other station, BBC also needs to offer the language that the audience will find familiar and entertaining − as Hendy (2000: 18) presents it, the issue that the media of public service have to deal with is the dilemma how to carefully balance between populism and elitism. That dilemma inevitably concerns stylistic features as well.

The Czech equivalent of BBC, Český rozhlas, operates, according to its website (available from http://www.rozhlas.cz/informace/misevize) on the same principles of objectivity and impartiality, and its mission is to serve the public, to provide quality information, education, culture as well as entertainment, and to contribute to the preservation and development of the basic values of democratic society.

Its budget comes from the licence fees paid by the public: the radio must then be responsible for all of its content in terms of quality, neutrality and balance: linguistic means play a significant role in achieving this goal, although, as opposed to BBC, the language of Český

rozhlas is not generally regarded as establishing standards in the respective field: on the contrary, it should obey these standards.

4. 2. Analysis

4. 2. 1. Stylistically marked features in the edition of Any Questions? under study

According to the view presented by Quirk et al. (1985: 12), "grammar" includes syntax and that aspect of morphology that deals with inflections (spelling excluded). This "grammar" also embraces rules of codification for syntax and other levels, as also pointed out by Quirk et al. (1985: 13). In the course of the analysis, these rules are applied on the grammatical and the lexical level of the language of the presenter and the participants in the debate who are British, which means that as a national standard, British English is considered.

Generally, in comparison to Czech, the language in the selected episode of Any Question? is very urging and expressive, creating tension in some places: from the studied material, it is clear that the language of the English radio debate cannot be identified directly as to its formality/informality in comparison to the language of the Czech radio debate, which is mostly due to the smaller amount of material on the morphological level. However, as has been proved by the study of the material, formality/informality in English sometimes results from different features than in Czech.

At his point, the concrete criteria according to which formality/informality is determined have to be introduced: still, it should be kept in mind that the concepts are vague so when a particular feature is recognized as formal or informal, it is not a clear determination, but mere interpretation of the author of this thesis based on the source referenced below which has been selected for its supposed relevance to the studied material.

According to Richards et al. (1997: 109), formal speech is described as "the type of speech used in situations when the speaker is very careful about pronunciation and choice of words and sentence structure." This definition does not directly give us any information that could lead to precise identification of formal features, but considering the carefulness, we can arrive at another conclusion about formality: according to Heylighen et al. (1999: 1), it is "arguably the most important dimension of stylistic variation". For the purposes of this thesis, it can be defined by avoidance of ambiguity "by minimizing the context-dependence and fuzziness of expression". The features under study will then be considered by their explicitness or the degree of precise description of the elements of the context needed for interpretation, detachment, accuracy, rigidity and heaviness. As Heylighen (1999: 1) further points out, "an informal style", on the other hand, is more flexible, direct, implicit and involved. However, it has to be considered that there is no clear boundary between these two, as has already been pointed out in the theoretical part of this thesis: the features under study are more likely to appear in between these two, which makes the concept of formality/informality a continuum.

4.2.1.1. Stylistically marked features on the morphological level

On this level, features are organized from informal to formal ones. First, contracted forms of auxiliaries and as well as copular and lexical verbs characteristic of standard spoken language, attached as an enclitic particle, can be identified: *he´s right* (39), *that´s one of the reasons why* (47-48), or *they won´t be able to do the job* (179). This elision of vowels and other changes connected to contractions within the verb phrase are still considered standard, as opposed to the nonstandard use of contractions that are described below. According to Quirk et al. (1985: 123) these forms are institutionalized in both speech and writing and favoured in informal style.

The nonstandard contracted forms can be exemplified by *I am gonna carry on saying that* (304), or *you´re gonna throw people out* (611).

What is another very informal feature, even ranked among vulgarisms, is the use of the contracted form of auxiliary *don´t* instead of *doesn´t* in the third person singular, as, for example, *he then don´t do so* (169). Other nonstandard features that concern inflection presumably occur unintentionally, yet they are present, therefore they cannot be omitted, as *remotes buildings* (173), or *anti-police ideas which falls to legislation* (181).

Apart from these frequent, informal features there are condensed structures that cannot be directly regarded as formal or informal: as the analysis shows, they are very common in the language of a radio debate. According to Dušková et al. (2006: 583), participles in spoken language are used frequently. Those that are stylistically marked are, however, only engaged in the structures that enable the speaker to choose from more than one possibility: therefore only adverbials substituting for the respective clauses are considered from the material, as *not knowing how...* (59).

The use of passive constructions can be identified as frequent: it is usually motivated by the need to obscure the agent of the action or to obey the language rules as regards the distribution of information in the given sentence. As the analysis proves, the former is true mostly about the passives used in the edition of the Czech radio debate under study, whereas in the English debate, it is the latter that governs the use of passive constructions as *they are not directed by government, they are not directed by politicians* (26), or *the police are being emasculated by regulation* (169-170). The majority of passives from the material are included in the group that Dušková et al. (2006: 260) call passives with the expressed agent: this type of passive is, for the reasons stated above, quite rare. Here, the precise identification of the agent is included by the speakers, which can be explained by the functional sentence

perspective. Therefore, in this thesis, this type of passive with the expressed agent is treated as a distributional marker. It can then be considered rather formal, due to one of the criteria for determining the formality, which is the avoidance of ambiguity, and also due to the fact that passives are generally more frequent in formal styles.

A solitary example is represented by a deadjectival noun (*the dispossessed* in line 10): the adjective here functions as a syntactic noun, omitting the noun it really modifies. This example of conversion can be regarded as a feature of formal English, as opposed to the other features identified on this level.

Below, all the phenomena from the morphological level occurring in the language of the presenter and the participants are displayed:

Table 1: Stylistically marked features used by the presenter on the morphological level in Any Questions? (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature [7]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level [8]
contracted forms	3	33.3 %	21.4 %
passives	1	33.3 %	7.1 %
deadjectival nouns	1	100 %	7.1 %

---

[7] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[8] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

Table 2: Stylistically marked features used by the participants on the morphological level in Any Questions? (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature[9]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[10]
contracted forms	6	66.6 %	42.9 %
participles	1	100 %	7.1 %
passives	2	66.7 %	14.3 %

Table 3: Comparison of the number of stylistically marked features on the morphological level in the language of the presenter and the participants in Any Questions?

	Number of marked features	Percentage
the presenter	5	35.7 %
the participants	9	64.3 %

Broadly speaking, the morphological features on this level are both formal and informal. However, in the selected extract, the majority of the stylistically marked features are, due to the number of contracted forms, informal. As can be seen from the extract, on the morphological level, the language of the presenter can be regarded less marked than the language of the participants (in Table 1 and 2). The marked features of the presenter can be regarded formal (see Table 1A in Appendix 1), whereas in the language of the participants, the majority of the features can be regarded informal (see Table 2A).

4.2.1.2. Stylistically marked features on the syntactical level

Features on this level are ordered according to their occurrence within the individual elements, phrases, clauses and subsequently sentences. Where possible, they are also grouped

---

[9] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[10] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higheror lower than 100%.

according to other criteria, such as characteristics of unedited, spoken speech, emphatic devices and others.

Spoken language in its unprepared and unedited form displays a number of repetitions that are either intentional, performed for better understanding or greater emphasis, or accidental: *the police are not sitting around wasting their time, they don´t want to sit around <u>wasting their time</u>* (224-225), *and I say not to you Sayeeda <u>to the whole panel to the whole panel</u>* (257), or *<u>that that</u> he was taking decisions* (44), respectively.

Within this group of features, stutters and slips of the tongue along with multiple starts and self-corrections can be identified: *<u>treaden-trodden</u>* (28), *the <u>po- the prime</u> minister* (71), *<u>le- le-let´s</u> you we´ve got* (83), *<u>you were they were</u> spending* (230), or *that <u>many people several people</u>* (562). Unfinished utterances, *as I am <u>connect- yes</u> I am* (334), can be traced, as well as lexical and grammatical mistakes typical of unedited speech: *the politicians are many more spin doctors than the police <u>do</u>* (112), or *look <u>on</u> the context* (267). These all contribute to the informality of the debate, since the exemplified constructions can be characterised as unintentional.

An anacoluthon occurs when one syntactical structure changes to another within one sentence: this happens when the speaker "loses" his or her track in unedited speech, as exemplified by *<u>the police of course none of us</u> is going to denigrate police officers* (114) or *<u>it may well be the twenty percent cut is entirely inappropriate</u>* (197). The randomness of this feature represents also its informality.

The nature of dialogue as such directly calls for the presence of feedback signals and signals of approval that maintain the contact with a partner, along with various fillers that the speakers use to gain time before they begin to utter their responses: *well* (21), *yeah* (66) or

look (109). According to Quirk et al. (1985: 1481), these direct allusions to the hearer are characteristic of speech, as are informal comment clauses, as, for example, *you know* (47) which are described below. These features can be viewed as symptomatic of the informality of the discourse as well.

Another feature used for maintaining the contact with a partner is a question tag. This interrogative structure, as the examples from the material show, is used by the speakers only to reconfirm the content of the sentence, since, according to Dušková et al. (2006: 318), the speakers already presuppose the validity of the propositional content, as in *the police do seem to think the same way <u>do they</u>* (274), *we´ve been swimming in a sea <u>haven´t we</u>* (338). According to Quirk et al. (1985:1479), "such a use of tags occurs in very informal speech": this way, the speaker implies that the answer to the given question is self-evident.

Underspecification is a stylistic device as well, used by the speakers to lessen the impact of what they are saying, so that they cannot be accused of making any concrete statements: this opportunity is presented to the speakers when they are giving their opinion on a matter, as in *they wouldn´t dream of taking <u>a sort of</u> mad action* (187), *making <u>these sorts of</u> decisions* (187) This informal feature belongs among those that are usually used in spoken English.

Contrariwise, emphatic *"do"* is used on a number of occasions to add emphasis to the verb in the sentence, making the impact of its content stronger and more urging, as the examples with this emphatic auxiliary from the analysis show: *the police <u>do</u> seem to feel* (27), *as to what <u>did</u> happen* (94), *we <u>did</u> think and we <u>did</u> say* (204) or *I <u>do</u> get interrupted* (490). According to Dušková et al. (2006: 179), it is always stressed and emphasizes the positive polarity of the sentence. Due to its nature that makes the propositional content even more expressive, it can be viewed as rather informal: yet, its precise identification is not really possible.

Parallel structures form another significant feature contributing to the expressivity of the language of the speakers: *take missiles, take aggression* (59), *the police services, the emergency services* (76-77), along with another feature - an expressive use of coordination. As Quirk et al. (1985: 981) point out, it can be studied with nouns that repeat themselves, in our case, asyndetically: *day after day, night after night* (60). The emphasis placed upon these items results from the coordination, and also from existence of another parallel structure. As such, it can be regarded rather informal.

The emphasis is also expressed by inversion, namely by positioning *not only* initially: the example from the material - *not only do young people stay straight and narrow but they´ve got good parenting* (382-383) - creates a dramatic effect. According to Quirk et al. (1985: 941), with this type of conjoining of the clauses, "the emphasis is greater, suggesting that the content of the first clause is surprising". This is a feature that contributes to the sentence complexity, and therefore can be viewed as highly formal.

However, when considering all the above displayed features contributing to the emphasis altogether, they can be viewed as rather informal, due to the fact that the informal language is more involved. Further, other structures within the clause are identified some of which cannot be identified as formal and informal clearly.

Adjuncts are adverbials integrated in the clause structure, modifying clause elements. They usually stand at the end of the clause. Other positions are marked, as proved by the examples from the material: *we have <u>in this country</u> a very strong and proud tradition* (25), *we have <u>now</u> (...) more police officers* (164), and *if also <u>at the same time</u> you dismantle the Christian religion* (505). As the transcript of the given episode shows, these adjuncts are emphasized

also on the phonological level - either they are stressed or preceded by a pause; the phonological level is not the focus of this thesis, however, it helps to demonstrate that there exists the speakers´ motivation behind this use of adjectives: emphasis and expressivity that is again linked to informality.

Another device that emphasizes a certain piece of information, although it is not its main purpose, is the use of metalanguage: *I quote* (8), *as I quote again* (12), or *and I am quoting the statement* (89-90). It is used to make statements about statements, to ensure the right understanding on the side of the audience as well as of the partners in the debate. All of these clauses have been uttered by the presenter of the debate, introducing statements of others that were to be further expanded upon by the participants as a part of the subject matter discussed: this metalanguage is then used to deliver information to the hearer in the most precise way possible. This fact then ranks the feature among the formal ones from the debate.

According to Quirk et al. (1985: 1112), comment clauses are parenthetical disjuncts that express the speaker´s view of the content of the following clause: the frequency of examples as *I think* (21), *I mean* (46) or *I say* (117) show that these clauses are characteristic of spoken English, and even point to the fact that the speakers resort to devices that suggest the presence of hedging, another characteristic of spoken informal language.

Parenthesis is another feature, inserted into a passage as an explanatory device. The examples as *if you start arresting people today if that´s what you´re planning to do, do we have enough room in the cells* (73-74), or *which let´s be quite honest were quite incapable* (128-129) and many others suggest that parentheses are very frequent in spoken language, since they enable the speakers to add information to the structure. As to its formality and informality, it is

difficult to state, however, we can perceive it as a feature that makes the denotate more precise.

Another significant group is formed by those features that contribute to the expressivity of the debate: the speakers use a number of focusing devices, which are due to their frequency, as the studied material shows, of great relevance for the language of an English radio debate.

As to the number of examples, the greatest category is formed by cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences that the speakers utter to highlight their points, which mostly concerns the subjects of the underlying structures, as in *it was the government that was directing operations* (28-29), *it was they who chose the tactics* (30), *it was the police that was leading* (57). Adverbials of time can also be focused: *it wasn´t until he came back from his holiday that the grid was got on it* (41-42). According to Quirk et al. (1985: 1383), this grammatical device gives prominence to such item, dividing the respective sentence into two clauses each of which has its own verb and "*it*" as an empty theme, which is very common in spoken English.

The pseudo-cleft sentence has the same function, only a different distribution of clause elements, although it is also an SVC sentence, as the following examples from the analysis show: *what troubles me is that if we reinstate these numbers (…) we will have to find that money elsewhere* (192), *what we took very carefully into account is what Her Majesty´s Constabulary Inspectorate said* (206-207), or *what really matters is what the solutions are* (353). The majority of these pseudo-cleft sentences occur with the *wh*-clause as the subject, which, according to Quirk et al. (1985: 1388), enables to present the climax in the complement. Both of these types are used to express the propositional content of the sentences explicitly. This type of focusing brings more emphasis on the given information. In written language, these clauses are used to bring attention to the items that are focused, which in spoken language can be achieved prosodically. Therefore, the fact that the speakers in the

debate chose these devices is of great interest: it can be concluded that by using these in spoken language, the speakers want to be assured that the message will be stressed enough. The typical presence of these constructions in written language prevents us from stating that their expressive nature ranks them among colloquial devices.

According to Quirk et al. (1985: 631), conjuncts are relatively detached as clause elements: they conjoin independent units rather than add new information by filling the semantic roles as adjuncts. Their role is to provide sequential and logical links, as *then* - a resultive conjunct (24), *also* - an additive conjunct (38), *however* - adversative conjunct (341) or *therefore* - a causal conjunct (608). Disjuncts also have a superior role when compared with clause elements, and according to Quirk et al. (1985: 613) they have a scope extending over the whole utterance: for example, *clearly* (345) shows that the speakers express their opinion both to what is said and also how it is said, which attracts the attention of the audience. Disjuncts may also point out to the previous turns of the speakers, which also confirms the dialogue nature of the debate.

Due to their distribution, both of these types of adverbials can be recognized as marked: conjuncts help to organize the speech by providing links between clauses and sentences, which is doubtless a formal feature of spoken language: disjuncts, however, may signal the emotional involvement of the speakers or their personal views, which makes their identification as formal more difficult.

Forms of address are an essential part of the tone of a radio debate. It may be surprising that the presenter, after he introduces the panellists, addresses them and makes references to them by their first and last names rather than by the positions they occupy in the public sphere, as *Sayeeda Warsi* (51), or *Harriet Harman* (623). Towards the very end of the debate, the

presenter starts using only the first name of his guests (as *Peter* on line 48), which then contributes to the overall feeling of a more intimate atmosphere. The participants address each other by their first names throughout the whole debate - *Harriet* (246), *Sayeeda* (293), *Peter* (431) which only supports the feeling of an intimate environment. These forms of address serve as a distributional marker: the presenter, among others, addresses his guests in order to let the audience and the radio listeners know who the speaker is at the given moment: frequent addresses are thus symptomatic of the language of radio debates and can be viewed as rather formal.

When it comes to the features of direct expressions of politeness, this thesis does not deal with the politeness principle and its maxims as introduced by Geoffrey Leech, but only with the politeness features that are explicit, as *please* (325) or *I am afraid* (650), as the given material suggests. These doubtless contribute to the formality of the debate.

The last feature identified on this level is the complexity of sentences: a complex sentence consists of one main clause and one or more subordinate clauses. As such, the use of subordinate clauses is not a marked feature, but their complexity can be described and compared with their counterparts appearing in the Czech radio debate. In the English radio debate, the majority of subordinate clauses is formed by nominal content clauses that mostly function as an object, and adjectival relative clauses modifying their antecedents. Adverbial clauses can be traced, but in smaller numbers. The length of the sentences is not a decisive factor, yet most of the clauses are very extensive and can be regarded as marked when considered on the background of a political debate: spoken language usually prefers a simple structure joined by coordination. However, the complexity of sentences is not considered among the total number of stylistically marked features, since it would spoil the count - subordinate sentences as such are not stylistic markers. Due to the limited scope of this thesis,

for the individual sentences, see either Appendix 1 or Appendix 2 containing the whole transcript of the episode of Any Questions? under study.

Below, all the phenomena from the syntactical level occurring in the language of the presenter and the participants are displayed:

Table 4: Stylistically marked features used by the presenter on the syntactical level in Any Questions? (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature[11]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[12]
stutters and slips of the tongue	1	33.3 %	2 %
metalanguage	5	100 %	10.2 %
expressions of politeness	1	100 %	2 %
forms of address and references	3	75 %	6.1 %
subordinate clauses in complex sentences[13]	20	35.7 %	this number is not considered

[11] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[12] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[13] In this category, some features described in different categories should also be included, such as *it*-cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions: however, they are not listed in the table since the number of marked features would then be artifically raised.

Table 5: Stylistically marked features used by the participants on the syntactical level in Any Questions? (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature[14]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[15]
repetitions and repeats	3	100 %	6.1 %
stutters and slips of the tongue	2	66.7 %	4.1 %
multiple starts and self - corrections	1	100 %	2 %
anacolutha	2	100 %	4.1 %
feedback/contact signals	3	100 %	6.1 %
underspecifying expressions	1	100 %	2 %
emphatic *do*	1	100 %	2 %
parallel structures	2	100 %	4.1 %
expressive use of coordination	2	100 %	4.1 %
subject-operator inversion	1	100 %	2 %
adjuncts in marked positions	2	100 %	4.1 %
comment clauses	4	100 %	8.2 %
parentheses	1	100 %	2 %
it-cleft constructions	7	100 %	14.3 %
pseudo-cleft constructions	1	100 %	2 %
conjuncts	2	100 %	4.1 %
disjuncts	3	100 %	6.1 %
forms of address and references	1	25 %	2 %
subordinate clauses in complex sentences[16]	36	64.3 %	this number is not considered

---

[14] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[15] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[16] In this category, some features described in different categories should also be included, such as *it*-cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions: however, they are not listed in the table since the number of marked features would then be artifically raised.

Table 6: Comparison of the number of stylistically marked features on the syntactical level in the language of the presenter and the participants in Any Questions?

	Number of marked features (excluding subordinate clauses)[17]	Percentage
the presenter	10	20.4 %
the participants	39	79.6 %

Generally, on this level, the number of marked features is considerably higher with the participants: their language also displays a higher number of informal features (see Table 4A and 5A in Appendix 1). This can be explained by a number of mistakes characteristic of spoken language, and a number of devices that they use when being highly emotionally involved in the interaction: as already suggested, according to Heylighen et al. (1999: 10), informal speech styles do not describe things from "a detached, impersonal, "objective" point of view. When we apply this attitude to the features that are marked on this level, we arrive at a conclusion that more features can be identified as rather informal: this distinction is, however, not very clear since there is still a number of features that cannot be uniquely identified and the number of formal features is still very high. The informal features occur almost exclusively on the side of the participants, as has already been pointed out (see Table 7 and 8).

4.2.1.3. Stylistically marked features on the lexical level

On the lexical level, the speakers employ many lexical items that, as to their formality and informality, originate at both ends of the "spectrum". The most informal features are described first, followed by the more formal ones, complemented by other means that are generally studied on the lexical level, as figurative expressions.

---

[17] The number of marked features that will be considered in relation to features on other levels is the one that excludes the subordinate clauses, since it is not the number of clauses, but their complexity that is marked.

Among the informal expressions, there are phrasal verbs that consist of a verb and an adverbial particle. According to Dušková et al. (2006: 204), these form new entities. Their meaning then cannot be determined by their parts. The examples from the material - *sort out* (42), *hang on* (254), *take off* (471), *go on* (491) - show that there exist synonyms consisting of one word, so the choice of the speaker is representative of the informality of the debate.

According to Dušková et al. (2006: 205), there are idiomatic expressions, as *bring up* (373) from the material, and non-idiomatic expressions in which the entities retain the meanings of their parts, as *track down* (33) or *take away* (502). Many of these involve the verb *get*, as *get out of bed* (10-11), *get on it* (42), *get to (say something)* (261-262) or *get involved* (368) where the verb is copular[18], and also the verb *make,* as in *make sure* (76), or *make clear* (394). Verbonominal expressions are not as frequent as other colloquial expressions in the material, yet worth mentioning, the more that there occurs an expression symptomatic of the language of one particular speaker: *take (a) stop* (199). Another verbonominal expression consists of *have* and a nominal part (*have a think* about this on line 196).

Both groups mentioned above are generally regarded as informal. As a part of every-day language, lexical verbs consisting of one word are frequent as such, as *hit (numbers)* (290), *slash (windows)* (451). In addition, it is not only verbs that that belong in this group of features of every-day language; it is also, for example, *breakdown* (363), *sneaky* (438), or *outcome* (483).

However, not all the verbs are unable to exist without the particle as the essential part of their meaning: some particles are used only to express the aspect of perfectivization. According to

---

[18] Čmekrková et al. (2003) describe verbonominal constructions on the syntactical level, which, in the Czech part of the analysis, this thesis also obeys: in the English part, these constructions as *have a think* are foremost ranked among informal expressions. However, no verbonominal expressions that would be considered marked were identified in the extract so the total number of marked features on the respective levels is not spoilt.

Dušková et al. (2006: 243), there exist particles in the English language that directly point out to the terminal state of an action: the material studied offers us mostly *out* and *up* in *build up* (209), *cry out* (276), *clean up* (571) or *metered out* (625). Also, intensification is another function of particles, as in *speak up* (432). This usage of particles following lexical verbs in the sentence can be again viewed as another device of placing emphasis on the given item, making it more informal.

Features of reinforcement and agreement are typical of spoken language as well: in some cases, they can be regarded as fillers, since they do not carry any real lexical value, as in *actually* (46). Other examples as *what so ever* (91), or *ever* (149) are used only to reinforce or emphasize the given message, representing an informal feature.

Intensifiers, on the other hand, directly influence the propositional content: according to Dušková et al. (2006: 465), intensifiers form a special type of adverbials that mark, for example, the intensity of an action if the concerned item is a verb. Examples as *very* (25), *absolutely* (30), *completely* (77), *strongly* (90) or *directly* (93) prove that the intensifiers from the material contribute to the level of expressivity of the debate, yet, they cannot be objectively regarded informal, especially because they are, in some instances, engaged in the phrases *I completely agree* (641) and *I strongly agree* (191), which are both examples of formal expressions of agreement.

Emotionally marked words from the material as *appalling* (350), *terrible* (361), or *disheartening* (648) are used to provide commentaries on the subject: not all of them, refer to the riots that took place in the streets of London that were generally viewed as a catastrophe: some of the words are highly subjective commentaries that would not be normally considered very formal, since they are used in relation to controversial issues. Their purely emotive meaning contributes to the overall atmosphere of expressivity which this thesis, as suggested

above, views as closely linked to informality, since informality is provoked, among other devices, by emotions penetrating the discourse, as proved by expressions as *awful* (120) *hideous* (120), *ridiculous* (166), *foolish* (172) or *ludicrous* (293).

A rhetorical question is, according to Quirk et al. (1985:1478), not confined only to formal speeches of persuasion: it has a communicative effect, seeking confirmation of what the speaker has explicitly assumed to be agreed truth, as *who could possibly do that?* (115), or *is that what you want?* (125). Apart from those, the speakers use figurative expressions, namely irony – a device that enables the speakers to dramatize the message they are communicating, as *let´s all identify with the police* (113-114), *the (..) of this discussion is amazing* (307), a hyperbole (*hundreds and thousands* on line 230-231) and a play on words performed by the presenter himself: *if she made that order was she out of order* (54). Considering that these expressions dramatize the effect of the message delivered, they can be viewed as rather informal.

Idioms and fixed expressions can be traced as well, only it is not really easy to identify them as formal or informal: for example, *prominent figure* (329) is doubtless a part of formal language, whereas *by the by* (493) can be viewed as informal. There are not as many of this type of features when compared to the others, yet they reveal the atmosphere in which the speakers (including the presenter) are comfortable enough to utter such expressions.

Words that, on the other hand, can be viewed as formal are used by the speakers within the whole debate: the speakers who have chosen these are clearly aware of the fact that there exist synonyms that have not only semantic, but also stylistic differences, and therefore the motivation behind their usage can be identified in terms of "intentional" formality: *initiate*

(407), *espoused* (506) or *menace* (632) are some of the examples presented in addition to the neutral vocabulary in the debate.

Professional terms are undoubtedly considered as part of learned vocabulary: in this thesis, it covers a number of areas from legislation and economics to politics as such. Given the background that the speakers come from, they operate with these terms on a daily basis. Their function, unlike the function of "ordinary" words, is to determine or define the concept. This supports the formality of the debate, since accuracy, as stated above, is one of the pillars of a formal debate. From the examples from the material, the following can be pointed out: *COBRA meetings* (69), *budgetary cuts* (156), *repeal of laws* (172), *confidence targets* (230) or *PSA targets* (230).

Words of foreign origin that belong among expressions with elevated connotations also raise the level of formality of the debate: *intelligentsia* (12), *liberali* (316) or *moral malaise* (338) are used to elevate the discourse and, as may be observed, to raise the credit of the speakers, so that the audience feel that they are listening to a panel of professionals, although the occurences of these are only solitary.

In addition to these, archaic words are nowadays used very sporadically: even this public debate would appear without them if the presenter did not introduce the city in which the debate took place and to which some of the choices of lexis are connected, as *dringhouses* (1), *tenancy* (3) or *spouse* (332): the last can also be viewed as archaism since it is a literary word, no longer frequently used.

Below, all the phenomena from the lexical level occurring in the language of the presenter and the participants are displayed:

Table 7: Stylistically marked features used by the presenter on the lexical level in Any Questions? (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature[19]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[20]
informal expressions	1	16.7 %	2.4 %
intensifiers	1	16.7 %	2.4 %
figurative expressions and rhetorical questions	2	100 %	4.9 %
formal words	4	80 %	9.8 %
professional terms	6	40 %	14.6 %
archaic words	2	100 %	4.9 %

Table 8: Stylistically marked features used by the participants on the lexical level in Any Questions? (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature[21]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[22]
informal expressions	5	83.3 %	12.2 %
filler words	2	100 %	4.9 %
intensifiers	5	83.3 %	12.2 %
emotionally marked words	3	100 %	7.3 %
formal words	1	20 %	2.4 %
professional words	9	60%	22 %

---

[19] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[20] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[21] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[22] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

Table 9: Comparison of the number of stylistically marked features on the lexical level in the language of the presenter and the participants in Any Questions?

	Number of marked features	Percentage
the presenter	16	39 %
the participants	25	61 %

If we take into consideration that the vocabulary used is closely connected to the subject matter discussed, which, in our case, is politics and the happenings in the public sphere, it is not really surprising that some of the lexis chosen by the participants is highly emotively marked: the potential explanation might be the personal involvement of the speakers defending their views of the matter (see Table 7A and 8A in Appendix 1).

The number of marked features used by the presenter is lower than that of the participants (see Table 9), however, as regards the number of formal features, it is the presenter who uses them more, as opposed to the participants who more frequently resort themselves to the use of informal expressions (see Table 7 and 8) Altogether, mainly due to the professional terms, the number of formal expressions used exceeds the number of the informal ones.

4.2.1.4. The identification of all the stylistically marked features used in the given extract from Any Questions?

 From the numbers of features on the three language levels under study it can be concluded that the majority of marked features occur on the syntactical level, although the lexical level provides a significant number of features as well. Contrariwise, the lowest number occurs on the morphological level, which, due to the analytical nature of the language, was quite expected. On all the three levels, it is the participants who use more stylistically marked features and also more informal ones (see Table 9). As to the comparison of formal and informal features in general, it is the informal features on the morphological and syntactical

level that significantly influence the discourse in terms of their occurrence which slightly exceeds the occurrence of formal ones. Oppositely, the lexical level provides a greater number of formal features. Table 10 below shows the numbers of all the stylistically marked features in the given extract.

Table 10: Summary table of the features on the morphological, syntactical and lexical level in the 1,000 word extract of Any Questions?

	Levels of language under study		
	Morphological level	Syntactical level	Lexical level
number of marked features of the presenter	5	10	16
number of marked features of the participants	9	39	25
total sum of features on the level	14	49	41
percentage	13.5%	47.1%	39.4%

4. 2. 2. Stylistically marked features in the edition of Speciál Martina Veselovského? under study

4. 2. 2. 1. Stylistically marked features on the morphological level

The Czech language, as opposed to English, does not have a spoken variety that could be regarded standard as such. In spoken Czech, features from different varieties mingle: the features on this level are organized in a way that the standard and nonstandard suffixes are introduced first, followed by the rest of the features on this level and concluded by the features that display the intentions of the speaker to use higher style but as such cannot be really placed in one homogeneous group.

Considering the inflectional nature of the Czech language, the morphological level had been expected to provide a number of examples symptomatic of the potential informality of spoken language, and this expectation was fulfilled: in the given material, the analysis proves that the

most distinctive features on this level are doubtless suffixes: standard suffixes often compete with suffixes of Common, hence nonstandard Czech, as in the following examples of adjectives and pronouns (for a more detailed description of the feature see the footnote) [23]: *dobré odpoledne* (1), *jiný model* (65) versus *jedinej kdo* (375), *sme moc vstřícný* (341), and *v té koalici* (64), *lidi, kteří tam žijí* (441) versus *do svejch rukou* (690) , *kerej má odvahu* (497) respectively.

Similarly, nominal suffixes become a feature of nonstandard language, as a result of their frequent misusage in the instrumental plural: according to Čmejrková et al. (2011: 186-195), their occurrence can be caused by the lack of knowledge or can be a result of the influence of the partner´s previous turn under which the speaker utters his, as in, for example, *s těma třiceti korunama* versus *před volbami*: the latter is an instance of a standard suffix, fully obeying the rules of the codified language (for a more detailed description see the footnote)[24], perhaps because the speaker had time to think of the correct form or is accustomed to using the form in the given context.

The occurrence of the non-existing congruence of substantives of neutral gender in plural is, according to Čmejrková et al. (2011:186-195), generally considered a nonstandard feature as well. It can be exemplified on *zaznívaly stanoviska* (126): for a more detailed description see footnote[25].

---

[23] In the case of adjectives in singular from the extract, the difference between standard and nonstandard suffix lies in vowel alterations: standard *-é* for nonstandard *-ý* in neutral gender and standard *-ý* for nonstandard *-ej* in masculine gender. In the case of adjectives in plural from the extract, it is standard *-í* for nonstardard *-ý*. With the pronouns from the extract, one addtitional feature can be pointed out: in some cases, it is not only a vowel that alternates but also the preceding consonant.

[24] Standard suffix in this case is formed by *-ami*, as opposed to *-ama*, which is a nonstanrdard suffix.

[25] The correct form of the verb is in this case *zaznívala* - verbs of neutral gender in plural require the suffix *-a*.

The use of nonstandard *bysme/abysme* instead of *bychom/abychom* is more frequent in the first person plural conditionals, however, standard suffixes in this case prevail over a few instances of nonstandard suffixes of *abysme* (for example, in lines 94 or 238).

All the above mentioned features can be distinguished as standard or nonstandard. The presence of the nonstandard features "interrupts" the formality of the debate, directly implementing features that are very informal into the debate.

Further, epenthetic (prothetic) *"v"* before an initial [*o*] is also a relevant feature, often characteristic of Common Czech: examples from the material as *vo které kauze* (416), *voni* (440), or *vod tý doby* (681) shows that it is not a neglectable phenomenon, contributing to the number of nonstandard features present in the debate.

Next to these, there are suffixes that are considered colloquial, but still ranked among standard suffixes that, however, differ from the neutral ones: this phenomenon can be demonstrated by the examples of the verbal 1st person and 3rd person suffixes, such as *já si přeju* (145), *nepoužiju* (160), or *kandiduju* (483), compared to *kandiduji* (146), *považuji* (448) or *děkuji* (729) (for a more detailed description see this footnote)[26]. The colloquial form of *ukážou* (55) appears along with the neutral form of *nedokáží* (327), for example. These neutral forms might seem "higher" style to the reader, but are really labelled as neutral by the online language centre of the Institute of the Czech language. As the material shows, this switching from one form to another can be caused by the indisputable frequency of the usage of nonstandard suffixes in every-day life, combined with the participants´ awareness of the formality of the debate, which leads them to use standard forms, as with the adjectival and pronominal suffixes. These colloquial suffixes as such also lower the level of formality in the

---

[26] In the case of verbs in singular, the neutral standard -*i* alternates with standard, yet colloquial -*u*. With plural, the standard -*í* alternates with standard, yet colloquial -*ou*.

debate, although the fact that they are still considered standard distinguishes their impact from the nonstandard suffixes listed above.

Characteristic of media discourse, and another feature discussed according to its frequency, is the use of passives. Passive constructions generally obscure the agent of the action, allowing the context to resolve the potential ambiguities: as has already been suggested, it can be even convenient for the speaker to leave the interpretation to the hearers, which is clearly appealing for the language of a public debate. In Czech, two types of passives are recognized: participial passive, as, for example *nebylo (..) vydáno povolení – the permission (...) has been not granted* (136) or *územní plán byl zablokován – the plan has been blocked* (340), *je to zaparkované – it is stuck* (550) and others, and reflexive passive, as, for example, *se (..) nic nevyšetřilo – nothing has been proven* (491) or *když se tam zhaslo – when the lights went down* (367-368*)* which is, however, not considered marked in a way in which the participial passive is.

Within the group of participial passives, two types of suffixes can be identified that create either longer or shorter forms of the given participles. According to Čmejrková et al. (2013: 252), shorter forms are semantically different from the longer ones, depicting actions with circumstances, whereas the longer forms denote a rather stable characteristic, which is also supported by the findings within the analysis: the examples as *zmiňován – mentioned* (301), *slibována – promised* (302), *medializován – covered* (436) stand against the much less frequently used forms as *zaparkované* (in a figurative meaning) – *stuck* (550): these forms occur mostly with standard suffixes[27], however unexpected this may be due to the nature of unedited speech itself. The speakers´ tendency to use shorter forms can then be explained by

---

[27] The longer forms of participles can potentially involve either standard *-é* or nonstandard *-ý.*

the basic need to present themselves in the best possible manner in public, sounding educated, for the shorter form doubtless appears to be higher style to the audience.

The use of the possessive pronoun *svůj* is also worth commenting upon: it is used to refer to identical subjects within the clause: for example, when the subject of the clause is in possession of the object of the clause, in Czech, this possessive pronoun is used instead of *my, your, his* etc. As opposed to its presumably declining use under the influence of English, as pointed out by Čmejrková et al. (2013: 253), our analysis shows that the standard use of *svůj* still considerably outnumbers its nonstandard use, i. e. *vodložila svými usnesení* (221), *v tom svem předchozim vstupu* (337), or *abyste svým voličům* (381). Its presence then proves that the speakers are still aware of its correct usage.

Spoken language displays a number of features that do not involve switching between standard and nonstandard features: the analysis proves that the speakers in a public debate have the tendency to overuse pronouns, such as the indefinite pronoun *nějaký/some* in English (due to the speech tempo and the lack of careful pronunciation, it is mostly *ňáký*) or the demonstrative pronouns - *ten/ta/to* (*the* in English), as in *na základě nějaké té obžaloby – based on some charge* (589), *ňáké systémové řešení –some systemic solution* (285), *ten proces těch finančních korekcí – the process of those refunds* (546), or *na tom vašem bilbordu – on that bilbord of yours* (466). The indefinite nature of the first pronoun *nějaký* suggests that the speakers either do not have a precise concept in mind, creating a space for ambiguous interpretations, or even diminish the denotate by referring to it in this manner. The definite nature of the second pronoun *ten/ta/to*, on the other hand, the occurrence of which exceeds the occurrence of the indefinite pronoun, proves that the placement of the demonstrative pronoun before the head of the phrase puts emphasis upon the following lexical item, yet, creates the

feeling of informality. In addition, a lot of these pronouns appear redundant, mostly - but not only due to - the absence of reference to the previous context.

In the same solitary position, there are expressions that mark the speakers´ higher intentions. According to Čmejrková et al. (2003:158), some standard forms tend to be used in a very obvious manner, which is supported by the following examples from the analysis: *chtěl bych říci - I would like to say* (579), or *uvědomíme-li si* (50) in which the marked feature is the suffix *-li* that is added to the lexical verb in the first person plural, instead of standing on its own as conjunctions *jestli* or *zda*. As opposed to these, there are features indicating "lower" style, as *tajdle* (153), *teďka* (333) or *teďkon* (436): in these cases, the markedness lies in the alteration of a consonant or the added suffix.

Below, all the phenomena from the morphological level occurring in the language of the presenter and the participants are displayed:

Table 11: Stylistically marked features used by the presenter on the morphological level in Speciál Martina Veselovského (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature [28]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[29]
adjectival suffixes	standard 42/ nonstandard 0	62.7 % / 0 %	standard 36.8 %/ nonstandard 0 %
pronominal suffixes	standard 6/ nonstandard 0	46.2 %	standard 5.3 %/ nonstandard 0.9%
nominal suffixes	standard 4/ nonstandard 0	66.6 % / 0 %	standard 3.5 %/ nonstandard 0 %
verbal suffixes	standard neutral	33.3 % / 33.3 %	standard neutral

---

[28] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[29] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

	1/standard colloquial 1		0.9 %/ standard colloquial 0.9 %
participles	short 1/ long 0	50 % / 0 %	Short 0.9 %/ long 0 %
passives (participial)	1	50 %	0.9 %
demonstrative pronouns	standard 5/ redundant 3	31.3 % / 18.8 %	standard 4.4 %/ redundant 2.6 %

Table 12: Stylistically marked features used by the participants on the morphological level in Speciál Martina Veselovského (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature [30]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[31]
adjectival suffixes	standard 24/ nonstandard 1	35.8 % / 1.5 %	standard 21 %/ nonstandard 0.9 %
pronominal suffixes	standard 6/ nonstandard 1	46.2 % / 7.7 %	standard 5.3 %/ nonstandard 0.9 %
nominal suffixes	standard 1/ nonstandard 1	16.7 % / 16.7 %	standard 0.9 %/ nonstandard 0.9 %
verbal suffixes	standard neutral 1	33.3 %	standard neutral 0.9 %
congruence of verbs and substantives	standard 1/ nonstandard 1	50% / 50 %	standard 0.9 %/ nonstandard 0.9 %
first person conditionals	standard 2	100 %	standard 1.8 %
participles	long 1[32]	50 %	long 0.9 %
passives (participial)	1	50 %	0.9 %
demonstrative pronouns	standard 3/ redundant 5	18.8 % / 31.3 %	standard 2.6 %/ redundant 4.4 %
features of higher style	1	100 %	0.9 %

---

[30] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[31] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[32] Within the long forms of participles, standard and nonstandard suffixes can often be distinguished. In this case, however, the gender of the clause subject does not allow such variation.

Table 13: Comparison of the number of stylistically marked features on the morphological level in the language of the presenter and the participants in Speciál Martina Veselovského

	Number of marked features	Percentage
the presenter	64	56.1 %
the participants	50	43.9 %

Altogether, the examples provided prove that on the morphological level, the standard means used by the speakers considerably prevail over those that are regarded nonstandard (see Tables 11 and 12). Due to the number of standard suffixes, it is the presenter who uses more marked features, but, supposedly due to the habit of speaking Common Czech, it is the participants who use a greater number of features that are nonstandard, hence informal (see Table 11A, 12B, 12A and 12B in Appendix 1)

4.2.2.2. Stylistically marked features on the syntactical level

The description on this level is organized in a way that the features characteristic of spoken language are introduced first, followed by the rest of the features identified on the phrase level, the clause level and the sentence level, concluded by the description of the complexity of sentences.

Below, there is a list of phenomena characteristic of spoken language; because of the limited space of the thesis, English translations are not provided in these cases:

- repetitions and repeats that are either unintentional, or motivated functionally, for emphasis: *jak to uděláte jak to uděláte když* (99), *výsledky toho soustředěného tlaku tlaku* (215), and others. Some of these are self-corrections, as *do posledního chvíle do poslední chvíle* (111).

- cancellations that are sometimes closely connected to false starts of the sentences: *ano tomu: ta má poznámka se týká toho* (184), <u>*vy ste byl vaše strana*</u> *byla nazvána* (507), <u>*pro vládní pro-koalici*</u> (23) and others.

- unfinished syntactical constructions – i. e. *já nevim jestli je to Horní Stropnice absolutní máme vítězství* (113)

- contaminated constructions – an incorrect word in a clause, as in *ty nemocnice sme vám taky pomohli <u>zabránit</u>* (72)

- anacolutha – syntactical incoherence within a sentence – *když se dají zase sňatek z rozumu* (102-103), *měli podíl na rozhodování jak krajského zastupitelství z pozice je členství ve výborech* (186)

On this level, among the additive and hesitation signals as *no* (48), question tags can also be found at the end of the sentences, as *že jo – isn´t it,* along with other constructions formed accordingly (438). These forms in English can be considered to have either a clarifying or a verifying function. Examples from the extract prove that here, the question tags rather verify the message, or maintain contact with a partner*: takže pudete do koalice s čé es es dé <u>jo</u> - so you will form a coalition with čé es es dé, will you?* (516) *ty co to chtějí změnit <u>jo</u> - those who want to change it, right?* (613), or *to tady všichni znají <u>ano</u> - everybody knows that here, don´t they?* (670).

These all then contribute to the level of informality, since their unintentional nature appears rather disturbing in the course of the debate: in the case of questions tags, they are intentional, yet still informal.

A feature that is closely connected to this level, perceived as very frequent in a radio debate according to Müllerová et al. (1994:74-75), is the use of personal pronouns as *you* and *I*

following each other; usually, these pronouns are not overtly expressed in Czech. Therefore, when they are, they are perceived as marked.

Next, parentheses in spoken language, according to Čmejrková et al. (2011: 158-159), have the same function as in written language: they are inserted to spare the speaker his or her time, since s/he can incorporate the given information into the syntactic structure directly. They serve to tell the hearer about the importance of the given information and also to maintain the contact with the hearer or the audience, without disturbing the clause structure. The given material provides us with a number of these: either with shorter ones, as *řekl bych – I would say* (44), *řekněme – let´s say* (117), *promiňte mi to – pardon me* (310), *a to musíte uznat – and this is something that you have to acknowledge* (188), or longer ones, as *abych je úplně nebral za slovo – so I don´t take it so literally* (265). In this case, it is difficult to directly state if the presence of parentheses contributes to the formality or rather informality of the debate, yet this thesis chooses the latter, due to the nature of the parentheses under study in the extract.

According to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 161), the media discourse predicts the existence of certain phrases – mostly verbonominal constructions, with, for example, the verbs of movement, as *jít*[33]. The studied material shows the following: *jde o případ – it is a case of* (695), *nejde o korupční kauzu – it is not a corruption case* (579), *nejde a nešlo o konkrétní snahu obžalovaných – it has never been a matter of a concrete effort of...* (580), or *takže vono je to takový divný – so it all is kind of weird* (687-688) with the copular verb *být*. As Čmejrková et al (ibid.) point out, these constructions might be even too formal, interrupting the dynamics of the given speech.

---

[33] This copular verb is not translated easily, since in every particular context, the translation would use a different verb: *be, deal with* etc.

The respective copular verb is also a part of fixed constructions characteristic of spoken language, as *já sem pro − I am all for it* (440), along with constructions starting with the pronoun "*to*" ("*it*") in the position of a subject: *a potom bude to − and then it will happen* (440), or *proč už to není.- why it is not like that anymore* (606), displaying a certain degree of vagueness, since it can anaphorically or cataphorically refer to any topic. The concept of vagueness, as has already been discussed in the analysis of the English radio debate, contributes to the level of informality.

In order to indicate the individual steps of the dialogues, the speakers then use a number of conjuncts that divide the speech into segments, as *zaprvé – firstly* (257) *takže – so that* (262) and others. Since conjuncts provide logical and sequential links between clauses and sentences, they can be regarded as formal features.

Also, disjuncts, as *při vší úctě – with all due respect* (315) are used to introduce the speaker´s attitude to the content of the following sentence here. According to Quirk et al. (1985: 1112), among disjuncts (more specifically parenthical disjuncts), comment clauses may be ranked.

Comment clauses are very frequent: they properly anchor the statements of the speakers that follow them: i. e. *myslím si − I think* (48), *já říkám − I say* (59), *já sem toho názoru − my opinion is that* (95), *fakt je takový že*[34] *– the fact is that* (138), *dvě krátké poznámky – just two short comments* (144*), situace je taková že – the situation is the following* (166), *já sem přesvědčen – I am convinced* (360), or *já jenom chci dodat – I just want to add* (367).

Some of these clauses, as the above mentioned *já sem toho názoru* (95), can be even regarded as hedging devices, lessening the impact of the following utterance, which is yet another feature that the participants, and even the presenter in the debate, find convenient; it can

---

[34] The phrases are introduced precisely in the same way as they are written in the transcript, therefore they may lack proper punctuation, as may the rest of the examples.

happen that they are not entirely sure of a certain matter and need a device that would „hedge" their statements. This can be described as an informal feature of spoken language.

A significant part of the stylistic analysis is also formed by the strategies of the speakers involved that lead to fulfilling their intentions: for example, when the presenter wants his guests to answer a question, he does not use an imperative, since it would be considered impolite: he says, as one of the examples from the analysis suggests, *já mám pocit, že uhýbáte od dotazu − I have a feeling that you are avoiding the question* (441). When the presenter wants to correct his guests, for they are saying something that is clearly not true, he may do so in a rather tentative manner, as *možná mě (..) něco (...) minulo, ale.... − maybe, I have missed something...* (136). This is naturally not true only about radio debates: it is, however, an essential part of studying formality/informality in the given material, although the scope of this thesis does not really allow us to measure these in statistical terms: it only comments upon them since Čmejrková et al. refer to these in the bibliography used. Only overt expressions of politeness, as *děkuji - thank* (25) or *pardon - excuse me* (54) are considered.

The way the speakers in the debate address each other also contributes to the formality of the debate: forms of address influence the status of the whole communication. The material under study proves that the participants of the debate are fully aware of how to address their partners: in Czech, the polite form of address is *pane* (*mister*) followed by the post occupied by the addressee. The presenter addresses his guests exactly in this manner, as *pane hejtmane − mister governor*[35] (54), *pane senátore − mister senator* (407), using the polite form (*you-form*), whereas the guests are a little less formal: they either call each other by their first names, as *Luboši* (642), since some of them are apparently acquainted, or, more frequently,

---

[35] Due to the absence of the English equivalent in the administrative division of the country*., mister governor* is not a precise translation of the given title.

pane kolego - mister colleague (456). One of the guests then, speaking to his partner in the debate, refers to him with the use of the 3rd person (*když si do mě pan hejtman šťouchnul.. - when mister governor here nudged me like that...* on line 64). The respective response is meant mainly for the audience and along with the other addresses used by the participants, it is symptomatic of certain informality.

When one of the guests addresses the audience and the presenter, he uses the traditional address of *vážení posluchači – dear listeners* (560) and *pane redaktore - mister presenter* (560) respectively. Still, the participants maintain a certain level of formality established at the beginning. With the one exception described, the status of the whole debate, in terms of addresses, can then be viewed as formal.

The complexity of sentences is yet another feature that can be studied: next to the coordinated sentences that are every often conjoined asyndetically, there is a considerable number of complex sentences that the speakers utter, perhaps contrary to what would be generally expected from spoken language: due to the number of comment clauses and the speakers´ urge to explain their attitude to the given matter and subsequently expand on it, we can find a number of nominal content (mostly those functioning as an object) and adjectival relative clauses as well. The length of the sentences is not really relevant, but the fact that the complex sentences occur in considerable numbers is, since it is rather unusual for spoken language. Yet, the subordinate clauses are not considered within the total number of marked features, as has already been stated in the English part of the analysis. For their full account, see either Appendix 1 or Appendix 3 containing the whole transcript of Speciál Martina Veselovského.

Below, all the phenomena from the syntactical level occurring in the language of the presenter and the participants are displayed:

Table 14: Stylistically marked features used by the presenter on the syntactical level in Speciál Martina Veselovského (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature [36]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[37]
parentheses	2	100 %	3.1 %
conjuncts	8	53.3 %	12.5 %
commentary clauses	5	33.3 %	7.8 %
expressions of politeness	2	66.7 %	3.1 %
personal pronouns *I* and *you*	1 (*I*) / 3 (*you*)	11.1 % / 33.3 %	1.6 % / 4.7 %
forms of address	8	66.6 %	12.5 %
complexity of sentences[38]	14	45.2 %	this number is not considered

Table 15: Stylistically marked features used by the participants on the syntactical level in Speciál Martina Veselovského (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature [39]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[40]
repetitions and repeats	4	100 %	6.2 %
contaminated constructions	2	100 %	3.1 %
feedback/contact signals	2	100%	3.1%

---

[36] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher than 100%.

[37] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[38] In this category, some features described in different categories should also be included, such as commentary clauses followed by subordinate clauses as *já si myslím že...*: however, they are not listed in the table since the number of marked features would then be artifically raised.

[39] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher than 100%.

[40] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

conjuncts	7	46.7 %	10.9 %
commentary clauses	10	66.7 %	15.6 %
expressions of politeness	1	33.3 %	1.6 %
personal pronouns *I* and *you*	5 (*I*)	55.6 %	7.8 %
forms of address	4	33.3 %	6.3 %
complexity of sentences[41]	17	54.8 %	this number is not considered

Table 16: Comparison of the number of stylistically marked features on the syntactical level in the language of the presenter and the participants in Speciál Martina Veselovského

	Number of marked features (excluding subordinate clauses)[42]	Percentage
the presenter	29	45.3 %
the participants	35	54.7 %

Altogether, the examples on the syntactical level are found to be numerous. Regarding the number of features in the language of the presenter and the participants, it is the participants who have been proved to use more marked features than the presenter (see Table 16). On this level, the features cannot be directly regarded as standard or nonstandard, but according to other criteria some of which have already been introduced in the English analysis part of the thesis, the features can be viewed as formal or informal. Overall, it is the formal features that exceed the number of informal ones, although the numerical difference is not really great. It can be stated that the participants are those who use a greater number of informal features that are as such characteristic of spoken language and hedging devices as well (see Table 14A and 15A in Appendix 1). The expressions of politeness, forms of address and the complexity of

---

[41] In this category, some features described in different categories should also be included, such as commentary clauses followed by subordinate clauses as *já si myslím že...*: however, they are not listed in the table since the number of marked features would then be artifically raised.

[42] The number of marked features that is considered in relation to features on other levels is the one that excludes the subordinate clauses, since it is not the number of clasues, but their complexity that is marked.

sentences, on the other hand, support the overall formality of the debate that can be considered occasionally interrupted.

4.2.2.3. Stylistically marked features on the lexical level

The lexical level provides a number of stylistically marked features. The vocabulary used in a given situation is naturally related to the subject matter which, naturally, predetermines also the language of a public debate. In our case, the subject matter is expected to be formal. The debates under study deal with political and social issues and, what is more, the participants of the debate are mostly politicians who are emotionally highly involved, since their goal is to persuade the audience about being right or to defend their views, which also influences the means used. The description starts with nonstandard and colloquial expressions and proceeds to formal ones.

The usage of discourse markers and various fillers is governed by the context which also determines the choice of lexis. Discourse markers, such as *v podstatě – basically* (434), *jakoby – as if* (185), *vlastně – actually* (119), or *jaksi – like* (299) - this one is a nonstandard adverbial - can also be described on the syntactical level, but in the analysis, we treat them on the lexical level: according to Turner (1973: 109), the study of vocabulary cannot be separated from the study of sounds and syntax.

Overall, the given material displays features that, according to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 161-162), belong among nonstandard language, such as expressive words or neologisms. Occasionalisms and rare expressions can also be traced, in other words, expressions that are not frequently used in every-day situations but are generally expected to occur in public discussions: according to Čmejrková et al. (2003: 162-173), apart from clichés and idioms, it is, as has been stated, professional terms related to the topic of the debate.

The following categorization of the vocabulary of radio debates is based on the view of Čmejrková et al., using the terminology suggested by English stylistics (as *words with stylistically lowered or elevated connotations*), since it can make the subsequent comparison of the Czech and English vocabulary easier.

Among words with stylistically lowered connotations, there can be ranked one re-occurring neologism that Čmejrková et al. perceive as nonstandard: *lídr – leader* (14). This expression is, however, almost inevitable considering the topic of the debate.

What is highly relevant for the stylistic analysis are colloquial expressions that are usually used in informal language situations, but nowadays also in public, hence formal speeches. Among these expressions, intensifiers as *právě – right* (49) and modifiers *poměrně – relatively* (155), *úplně – completely* (490) reinforcing the message were used, and in addition to these, also diminutives, such as *kousek – a little piece* (13) and *trošku – a little bit* (94), presumably to express and enhance the attitude of the speaker.

More importantly, colloquial verbs and nouns were identified in a considerable number: these words are emotively marked, for they obviously carry the speaker´ s opinion in the given context. For example, *vykoledovat – deserve* (83), a verb has a rather pejorative meaning in the given context, *pohnout – move forward* (320) or *ošetřit – deal with* that (385), all marked in the given environment (for the context of the respective words see Appendix 3).

Other examples of words with stylistically lowered connotations are words that cannot either be found in *Slovník spisovné češtiny* at all or that are marked as expressive, which, as has already been stated, mostly means that those words are features of nonstandard language: for example, as *šťouchnout – to nudge* (64), *otloukánek – the bullied one* (104), *zplundrovat – to pillage* (437) *zašmodrchaný – tangled* (571), or *zašantročit – to mislay* (629). These words

prove that although the whole debate is public and therefore it should be formal, it happens that informal, more specifically colloquial, or even familiar vocabulary penetrates the discourse: the speakers are, as already stated, emotionally involved in the discussions and they either unintentionally stop watching their language or they intentionally use these marked words to engage the audience and to demonstrate their point better, since the audience are supposedly also familiar with the respective vocabulary.

As for the emotional engagement of the speakers, the analysis shows that familiar expressions occur – for example, when the speakers discuss the construction of two highways, they denote them as *dé trojk*a and *er čtyřka* (meaning highways *D3* and *R4*) (202) and the members of a certain political party – ODS – as *odeesáci* (400), by forming a name from the initialism itself. This shows that the speakers are operating on a very familiar field.

Also, even more expressive, derogatory words occur, despite the formal nature of the debate, as, for example, *zločinci – criminals* (148), which is a word with an indisputably attitudinal label that is used by one of the politicians to describe the members of the other political party. Also, *koryto – trough* (232) is a term used by one of the politicians discussing the morals of other politicians desperately keeping their elected positions: this term is highly derogatory and, according to Kroupová (2005: 145)*,* it could be even labelled as a Common Czech, hence a nonstandard word. The author of this thesis would even perceive it as a vulgarism which is the lowest when considered among the words with the stylistically lowered connotations. Both expressive words and vulgarisms – which form a special group of expressive words – then belong among the features of nonstandard language: it can then be stated that together with the above listed colloquial vocabulary these features "enrich" the media discourse with a new, perhaps even unexpectedly informal tone.

As for other characteristics of spoken language, a number of clichés and idioms are used, in other words, pre-established expressions the parts of which cannot be separated and which sometimes have figurative meanings: *jádro věci – the heart of the matter* (238), *v kostce – in a nutshell* (554), or *zlaté vejce – golden egg* (657). The figures of speech used are mostly metaphors and similes that are not associated with spoken language as such, but when discussing a point, the speakers feel strong about figurative expressions, supposedly for the following reason: they can easily draw comparisons that are used in every-day life by the audience, so they can understand, and subsequently accept the speaker´s point, as in the example of *sňatek z rozumu – marriage of convenience* (52), or the phrase *nést dobré ovoce – to bear fruit,* as it were (56). (Some of these expressions, as *slíbili modrý z nebe – they promised the moon* (489) display Common Czech, therefore nonstandard suffixes, yet, the majority of those expressions can be ranked among standard.)

In this debate, the field of discourse is politics: therefore, professional, or technical terms are more than frequent, more precisely, even called for, as the vocabulary of politics as a profession. Since politics, in addition, subsumes other areas of public life, such as economics, finance or law, the technical terms listed as examples originate in those areas as well.

The following part presents some of the characteristic examples found in their original form in Czech, providing English translations. These examples are: *schodek státního rozpočtu – budget deficit* (87), *spotřební daň – excise tax* (244), *bezpečnostní rady – security councils* (298), *trestní rejstřík – criminal record* (398) and many others. Within these, terms of foreign origin can be traced, as *koalice – coalition* (66), *preference – preferences* (46), *opozice – opposition* (119), *legislativní iniciativa – legislative initiative* (244).

What is also relevant for the stylistic analysis of the given material is the group of words that are of foreign origin but that are not symptomatic of any particular field, contrary to some of

the examples mentioned above: these words are nowadays becoming a part of our every-day language as a result of the influence of English and other languages. They do not necessarily have to be regarded as foreign words, since their form is already adapted to the Czech language system and their meaning is generally understood, yet, some of them are characteristic of a slightly "higher" style and this thesis treats them differently than the common core features. The following examples have thus been selected to demonstrate the need of the speakers to use these words that can be regarded to have stylistically elevated connotations, since we can easily trace the existing Czech equivalents not selected by the speakers. These words are, for example, *stabilní – stable* (58), *absolutní – absolute* (113), *alternativa – alternative* (120), *stagnovat – stagnate* (156), *impuls – impulse* (521), *aktuální – topical* (421), *anomálie – anomaly* (655), or *utopie – utopia* (716). (However, as has been pointed out, the degree of their adaption within the Czech language and therefore their potentially "neutral" nature can be a matter of another analysis.)

The speakers in the debate also use other words with stylistically elevated connotations – words that can even be regarded literary, such as *pardon – excuse me* (54), *zde – here* (684), *hovořit – converse* (106) , *téměř – almost* (123), *plakat – weep* (220), or *zcela – wholly* (362). These expressions, however, are quite unique, and from the fact that they are mostly used by the presenter of the debate, it can be understood that these words occur because of the high language culture of the presenter himself.

Below, all the phenomena from the lexical level occurring in the language of the presenter and the participants are displayed:

Table 17: Stylistically marked features used by the presenter on the lexical level in Speciál Martina Veselovského (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature [43]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[44]
filler words	1	33.3 %	1.6 %
neologisms	4	100 %	6.4 %
colloquial terms	1	50 %	1.6 %
clichés, fixed and figurative expressions	3	30 %	4.8 %
professional terms	16	57.1 %	25.6 %
words of foreign origin	6	66.7 %	9.6 %
expressions of higher style	3[45] (2)	40 %	3.2 %

Table 18: Stylistically marked features used by the participants on the lexical level in Speciál Martina Veselovského (listed according to their order in the description)

Features	Number of occurrences	Percentage of the total use of the particular feature [46]	Percentage of the contribution of the feature to the total number of features on this level[47]
filler words	2	66.7 %	3.2 %
colloquial terms	1	50 %	1.6 %
clichés, fixed and figurative expressions	7	70 %	11.2 %
professional terms	12	42.9 %	19.2 %
words of foreign	3	33.3 %	4.8 %

---

[43] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[44] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[45] In this case, only two marked features will be counted among the expressions of higher style: *pardon* has already been accounted for among the epxressions of politeness.

[46] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

[47] Rounding up may cause the total sum to be higher or lower than 100%.

origin			
expressions of higher style	3	60 %	4.8 %

Table 19: Comparison of the number of stylistically marked features on the lexical level in the language of the presenter and the participants in Speciál Martina Veselovského

	Number of marked features	Percentage
the presenter	33	54%
the participants	28	46 %

Altogether, the examples on the lexical level are found to be numerous. Regarding the number of features in the language of the presenter and the participants, it is the presenter who uses a greater number of marked features (see Table 19); as can be seen, it is mainly due to the number of professional terms used and the recurrence of the one neologism that the presenter needs in order to introduce his guests properly. The presenter is the one who uses more formal features, which again makes the participants the party that displays more informal features (see Table 17A, 17B, 18A and 18B in Appendix 1*).* On this level, some of the features cannot be directly regarded as standard or nonstandard: we can, however, distinguish formal and informal features. The lexical level then shows that the formality of the debate is occasionally penetrated by informal features, yet considering the lexical choices, the debate can be still regarded formal.

4.2.2.4. The identification of all the stylistically marked features used in the given extract from Speciál Martina Veselovského

In conclusion, on all the levels of linguistics under study, features of standard and nonstandard language were found. However, not all the features could be distinguished as to being standard and nonstandard. On the morphological level, we could recognize the features according to this particular criterion, since the linguistic variations performing the same

communicative functions were easily found and compared. Despite the existence of a number of nonstandard suffixes used mostly by the participants, standard features considerably prevail. On the syntactical level, as well as on the morphological level, the participants used more of those that are symptomatic of spoken language, as the mistakes in speech or the use of demonstratives, yet even this level can finally be considered more formal. The lexical level then "enriches" the debate by even more informal features –the cases in which these are involved usually represent the choices of the participants in the debate, as opposed to the professional terms used which do not really represent any functional alternatives. Overall, formal lexis occurs more frequently. The level with the greatest number of stylistic features is the morphological level, whereas the syntactical and lexical level can be regarded comparable in terms of marked features: however, the syntactical level displays more of them.

We could thus conclude that informal features found on all the language levels under study occasionally penetrate this formal, institutionalized form of language used in a public radio debate. Table 20 below then shows to what extent the individual levels of language under study contribute to the number of marked features in the extract, and therefore to the level of formality/informality in the debate.

Table 20: Summary table of the features on the morphological, syntactical and lexical level in the 1, 000 word extract of Speciál Martina Veselovského

	Levels of language under study		
	Morphological level	Syntactical level	Lexical level
number of marked features of the presenter	64	29	33
number of marked features of the participants	50	35	28
total sum of features on the level	114	64	61
Percentage	47.7 %	26.8 %	25.5 %

5. Conclusion

The goal of this thesis was to determine the stylistically marked features along with their frequencies and compare these features in the two materials under study - the English and the Czech radio debate. Table 21 below compares the features found on all the three levels in Any Questions? and Speciál Martina Veselovského in the given 1,000 word extracts.

Table 21: Comparison of the number of features in Any Questions? and Speciál Martina Veselovského

	morphological level	morphological level percentage	syntactical level	syntactical level percentage	lexical level	lexical level percentage
Any Questions?	14	13.5 %	49	47.1 %	41	39.4 %
Speciál Martina Veselovského	114	47.7 %	64	26.8 %	61	25.5 %

As can be seen, the greatest difference, due to the language systems of English and Czech, lies on the morphological level. The syntactical and the lexical level can be regarded comparable in both languages (especially in Czech, these two numbers are almost equal). Since the given extracts represent only one part of the debates, a summary of all the stylistically marked features found in the whole English and the Czech radio debate under study has to be made as well: the findings are displayed in Table 22 below. However, it should be pointed out again that, due to the very high number of stylistically marked features in both debates, the precise number cannot be really calculated. Therefore, the tables should rather be viewed as a piece of evidence that the ratios of the features that have been identified in the given 1, 000 word extracts on the three language levels correspond to the ratios of the features identified on these language levels in the whole debates.

Table 22: Comparison of the number of features in the whole editions of Any Questions? and Speciál Martina Veselovského (due to the large size of the material, the number of features identified is rather approximate)

	morphological level	morphological level percentage	syntactical level	syntactical level percentage	lexical level	lexical level percentage
Any Questions?	60	12 %	260	51 %	190	37 %
Speciál Martina Veselovského	730	54 %	320	24 %	290	22 %

Since the frequencies of the features occurring in Any Questions? and Speciál Martina Veselovského can only be precisely compared using a carefully calculated number of examples, it is necessary that the categories of features that do not occur in the extracts but only in the rest of the debate are omitted from the comparison. These features are, however, commented upon later, in relation to the respective language systems. From all these, the factors influencing the potential differences are then identified. As a result of these findings, it is suggested to which extent the informality in the two debates can be regarded comparable and what problems are involved in defining the concept of formality/informality.

In order to compare the frequencies of the features in the English and Czech debate, we have to determine which features are shared by both languages in the respective extracts. (The complexity of sentences is again not considered.) Table 23 below displays them on the three language levels under study.

Table 23: Stylistically marked features occurring in both extracts under study

Stylistically marked features found in both extracts		
Morphological level	Syntactical level	Lexical level
passives	repetitions and repeats	filler words
participles	comment clauses	informal/colloquial words
	parentheses	clichés, fixed and figurative

		expressions
	feedback/contact signals	formal words
	conjuncts	professional terms
	forms of address	
	expressions of politeness	

When considering the occurrences of the features listed in the table above, it can be stated that it is the Czech extract that displays a higher frequency of the majority of the features. These features with higher frequencies in Czech are the following: repetitions and repeats, comment clauses, parentheses, conjuncts, forms of address, expressions of politeness, filler words, clichés, fixed and figurative expressions, and professional terms - the number of formal words/expressions of higher style is the same in both extracts. Only passives, participles, feedback/contact signals and informal/colloquial words occur more frequently in the English debate. (Participles are an interesting case of a structure that exists in both languages but has different functions in them: in the English extract, participles are used to depict the circumstances of an action, whereas in Czech, they are a part of a passive (participial) construction.)

 The fact that it is the Czech extract whose features have been identified to occur with higher frequencies than their English counterparts is undoubtedly connected to the overall number of marked features used by the Czech speakers within the first 1,000 words of the debate: as has been discovered, this is more than twice the number of stylistically marked features in the 1, 000 word extract of Any Questions?.

Next to those features shared by both extracts, there are also features that occur in both debates, some of which, however, do not occur within the first 1,000 words. The frequencies of the features that occur in the given extract of Any Questions? and later in the course of

Speciál Martina Veselovského can be thus identified. These are stutters and slips of the tongue, multiple starts and self-corrections, anacolutha, disjuncts and intensifiers. These features can therefore be regarded more frequent in the English radio debate than in the Czech radio debate under study. Contrariwise, what is very often used in the Czech debate, as opposed to the English debate, is the words of foreign origin, supposedly because the speakers wish to sound more sophisticated: the reason for the existence of the respective words may be that the nature of Czech normally allows the acceptance of new words that are of classical or English origin.

Then, there are features that occur in both debates, only later: they are various mistakes that cannot be categorized, cancellations, unfinished utterances, questions tags and expressions of reinforcement. The frequencies of these features cannot be precisely measured, since they do not occur in the given extracts.

Finally, there are features that occur in only one of the extracts under study because they do not exist or are not considered marked in the other language concerned, or are not used at all in the course of the debates: these features are listed and described according to the individual language levels under study.

On the morphological level, the most significant difference is represented by the use of standard and nonstandard suffixes: due to the analytical nature of English, it is a uniquely Czech feature. Also, the use of demonstrative pronouns in Czech does not have its equivalent in Any Questions?, since articles in Czech are not obligatory - the speakers can easily omit demonstrative pronouns in general, as opposed to the defininite article in English.

As regards the English features, there are no equivalents used in the Czech debate for contracted forms of auxiliary verbs as *gonn*a, vulgarisms as *don´t* in the 3rd person singular

(although this feature can be compared to nonstandard verbal suffixes in Czech) or deadjectival nouns. In English, on the other hand, there are no equivalents of congruence of verbs and substantives within a clause, the possessive pronoun *svůj* or the use of prothetic "*v*" before the intial "*o*". The indefinite pronoun *nějaký/some*, on the other hand, can be regarded comparable to the feature of English identified on the syntactical level - to underspecifying expressions. (However, these comparisons already exceed the scope of this thesis and therefore they are not followed by others as to the functions of the individual features in the two languages.)

On the syntactical level, cleft constructions are used only in English: as a focusing device, this construction has its purpose, whereas in Czech, the same goal can also be achieved by the change of word order which in English is quite rigid. Pseudo-cleft constructions, similarly as *it*-clefts, are also used as focusing devices in English: in the Czech debate, similar constructions were not found, although we cannot say that they do not exist in Czech at all: they simply do not represent the choice of the Czech speakers involved.

Then, the English debate uses metalanguage: this, however, cannot be considered relevant since it can be only a circumstantial. The Czech presenter does not rely on any background information.

Further, in Czech, there exists no such feature as emphatic *do* or subject-operator inversion that is marked. Oppositely, parallel structures and expressive coordination are structures that generally exist in Czech but are not used by the Czech speakers in the course of the debate. Adjuncts are relevant for comparison in the two languages: in Czech, as opposed to English, due to the relatively free word order, the placement of adjuncts is not considered a marked feature.

What is, on the other hand, a Czech feature that cannot be identified as stylistically marked in English is the use of personal pronouns *I* and *you* which occur frequently in the given material: stylistically neutral are those clauses in which the pronominal subject is not separately (in addition to the verbal ending) expressed. Also, those contaminated constructions marked because of the wrong forms of verbs do not exist in English, due it its analytical nature.

On the lexical level, emotionally marked words and archaisms are used only by the English speakers: however, the use of archaisms appears rather circumstantial. In Czech, as opposed to English, there also occur neologisms and familiar expressions.

These findings then enable us to summarize the conclusions as to which factors influence the abovementioned differences: as has already been suggested, it is the inflectional and analytical nature of Czech and English. This also subsumes the difference as regards the features that exist in both languages but are marked only in one, and also features that are shared by both languages, only have different functions in them. Finally, it is the nature of the language as such that governs the use of words, as is proved by the frequency of the words of distinctly foreign origin.

As regards the formality/informality of the debates, it cannot be stated with absolute certainty which features significantly prevail: firstly, it cannot be precisely identified which features are strictly formal or informal. As has been mentioned before, their identification in the course of the thesis is rather suggestive than definite. In addition, apart from the cases in which we can lean to one side of this continuum based on the criteria that were agreed upon in the empirical part of thesis, there are examples which cannot be identified at all as to their formality/informality. It is also essential to point out that most of the informal features used by the English speakers in the debate are still considered standard (contractions as *gonna* or

grammatical vulgarisms are rather exceptional). In Czech, the concept of informality means that the features can be either ranked among standard or nonstandard features. As proved by the extract, the majority of informal features occur within the boundaries of standard language. This difference in the perception of informality then makes the comparison more difficult.

Despite the issues stated above, it is possible to arrive at the conclusion about formality and informality of the features which have been listed above and, where possible, compared.

In Any Questions?, the features that have been identified as formal and informal are competing with each other more closely than the ones in the Czech debate. In Speciál Martina Veselovského, more features are regarded formal on all the three language levels concerned.

As has been proved by the categorization and the frequencies of the features identified as informal, in Any Questions?, they prevail on the morphological and the syntactical level: on the syntactical level, however, the difference in the number of formal and informal features is very small. Oppositely, the lexical level is more formal. In Speciál Martina Veselovského, all the three levels display a greater number of formal features, although on the syntactical level, the difference is again very small. As might have been expected, in both debates, it is the participants who use a greater number of informal features.

Although this thesis is not concerned with the individual turn taking and the study of discourse as such, we can point out that it is the panellists in Any Questions? who contribute to the potential informality of the debate by raising their voices very often, interrupting each other´s speeches and arguing more frequently, when compared to their Czech "colleagues". This makes Any Questions? a debate in which the speakers are more emotionally engaged and the atmosphere more challenging, as has also been proved already by the analysis of the

stylistic means. Therefore, regarding the criteria established for recognizing formality and informality within the languages of the speakers, we may state the overall result: although to precisely identify and calculate the numbers of informal features is rather challenging than well defined, it is the English debate that displays more informal features than the Czech debate and therefore can be regarded more informal as such.

6. Bibliography and references

Crystal, D. and D. Davy (1969) *Investigating English Style*. London: Longman.

Čmejrková, S. and J. Hoffmannová (2003*) Jazyk, média, politika*. Praha: Academia.

Čmejrková, S. and J. Hoffmannová (2011) *Mluvená čeština: hledání funkčního rozpětí*. Praha: Academia.

Čmejrková, S. and J. Hoffmannová (2013) *Styl mediálních dialogů*. Praha: Academia.

Dušková et al. (2006) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia.

Enkvist, N. E. (1973) *Linguistic Stylistics*. Hague: Mouton.

Grepl et al. (1995) *Příruční mluvnice češtiny*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.

Hausenblas, K. (1984) Text, komunikáty a jejich komplexy (Zamyšlení pojmoslovné). *Slovo a slovesnost*, 45, 1-7.

Hendy, D. (2000) *Radio in the Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hoffmannová, J. (1997) *Stylistika a...: současná situace stylistiky*. Praha: Trizonia.

Kaderka, P. and Z. Svobodová (2006) "Jak přepisovat audiovizuální záznam rozhovoru? Manuál pro přepisovatele televizních diskusních pořadů". *Jazykovědné aktuality*. č. 3 a 4. Praha: Jazykovědné sdružení České republiky.

Kroupová, L. (2005) *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*. Praha: Academia.

Leech, G. and J. Svartvik (1975) *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London: Longman.

Müllerová, O. a J. Hoffmannová (1994) *Kapitoly o dialogu*. Praha: Ústav pro jazyk český AV ČR.

Quirk, R. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Richards, J. et al (1997) *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Turner, G. W. (1973) *Stylistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Urbanová, L. (2008) *Stylistika anglického jazyka*. Brno: Společnost pro odbornou literaturu - Barrister & Principal.

Internet sources used

"Any Questions? cancelled for first time in its history". *The Telegraph.* Available online from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/tvandradio/bbc/8454990/Any-Questions-cancelled-for-first-time-in-its-history.html (accessed: September 2013)

BBC. Available online from http://www.bbc.co.uk/ (accessed: September 2013 - May 2014)

Český rozhlas. Available online from http://www.rozhlas.cz (accessed: September 2013 - May 2014)

Heylighen, F. and J. Dewaele (1999) "Formality of Language: definition, measurement and behavioral determinants". Available online from http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/Papers/Formality.pdf (accessed: April 2014)

Kopečný, F. (1949) "Spisovný jazyk a jeho forma hovorová". *Naše řeč*. Available online from http://nase-rec.ujc.cas.cz/archiv.php?art=4100 (accessed: January 2014)

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Available online from http://www.merriam-webster.com/ (accessed: November 2013 - May 2014)

Oxford English Dictionary 2nd edition. Ver 4.0.0.1. Oxford University Press: 2009. CD-rom.

Oxford Advanced Learner´s Dictionary. Available online from http://www.oxfordlearnersdictinaries.com (accessed from November 2013 - January 2014)

7. Resumé

Tato diplomová práce nazvaná Stylistický rozbor jazykových prostředků v rozhlasových debatách v angličtině a v češtině si klade za cíl určit stylisticky příznakové prostředky v anglické rozhlasové debatě Any Questions? vysílané 12. srpna 2011 na BBC – Radiu 4 a v českém Speciálu Martina Veselovského vysílaném 4. září 2012 na stanici Český rozhlas 1 - Radiožurnál. V úvodu této práce (1) je vymezen i její postup: stylisticky příznakové prostředky v obou debatách jsou určeny z hlediska jejich zařazení do funkčních kategorií na morfologické, syntaktické a lexikální rovině a popsány jako spisovné či nespisovné. Výsledkem této práce je pak definování toho, jak tyto prostředky a četnost jejich výskytu přispívají k míře neformálnosti v daných debatách.

Práce je rozdělena na dvě hlavní části: teoretickou a praktickou. Teoretická část (2) nejprve definuje stylistiku jako jazykovědnou disciplínu, jejímž cílem je vymezení těch jazykových prostředků, které jsou specifické pro daný kontext. To vede k určení jazykových variet v angličtině a v češtině, na které jsou dané prostředky úzce navázány. Protože v zájmu této práce je jazyk mluvený, který je obecně považován za spíše neformální, pro účely této práce je nejdříve třeba popsat, jak mohou být stylistické prostředky nazírány z hlediska jejich spisovnosti a nespisovnosti, a tedy i úrovně formálnosti a neformálnosti. Tyto dva koncepty spolu úzce souvisejí: oproti spisovnosti a nespisovnosti není úroveň formálnosti a neformálnosti u daných stylistických prostředků jasně definovatelná: fakt, že se podle Čmejrkové v mediálním diskurzu často míchají spisovné a nespisovné prostředky, činí toto srovnání o to složitější.

Aby mohla být provedena analýza stylistických prostředků, musí být dostatečně definována oblast výzkumu: proto další sekce teoretické části předkládá termíny související s dialogem jako základní formou komunikace. Následně samotný dialog popisuje, a to z hlediska faktorů, které jeho průběh ovlivňují, jako jsou role účastníků v daném dialogu, plynoucí z jejich postavení, nebo role moderátora, která se od rolí účastníků liší. Moderátor jakožto reprezentant dané instituce je za průběh pořadu zodpovědný, zároveň je ale také jedním z účastníků debaty. Rovněž koriguje způsob, jakým si účastníci debaty berou slovo. Zároveň si však ze svojí pozice objektivního moderátora veřejnoprávní instituce nemůže dovolit vyjadřovat vlastní názor. Tyto poznatky jsou bezpochyby relevantní pro stylisticky příznakové prostředky, jejichž použití, co se týče spisovnosti a nespisovnosti, respektive formálnosti a neformálnosti a četnosti výskytu se liší u účastníků a moderátorů obou debat, jak později dokáže samotná analýza. Stejně důležité je z hlediska příznakových prostředků i téma daného dialogu, stejně jako cíl daného dialogu, který účastníci i moderátor diskuse sledují a jemuž přizpůsobují volbu užitých prostředků.

Prostředky, které se obvykle užívají v mediálním diskursu, jsou pak konkrétně popsány v další sekci teoretické části, a to na základě poznatků z použité literatury. Již tento stručný popis potvrzuje, že jazykové systémy angličtiny a češtiny znatelně ovlivňují podobu těchto dvou diskurzů a jejich formálnosti.

Kapitola určující metodologii práce (3) představuje transkripty daných rozhlasových debat: zatímco materiál pro Any Questions? byl vypracován autorkou této práce, materiál pro Speciál Martina Veselovského byl získán od Českého rozhlasu. Oba transkripty jsou v jednom z apendixů práce prezentovány včetně symbolů sloužících k přepisování audiovizuálních záznamů. Tyto symboly jsou v obou transkriptech použity jednak proto, že je to při práci s přepisy zvykem, a jednak proto, že v některých případech pomáhají lépe identifikovat

příznakové prostředky. Pro jejich kategorizaci a určení jejich frekvence není kvůli danému rozsahu práce možné detailně popsat celý materiál: v obou debatách jsou tedy vybrány jen vzorky čítající prvních 1 000 slov z obou debat. V těchto vzorcích jsou analyzovány všechny příznakové prostředky, a to způsobem popsaným v úvodu této práce.

Praktická část práce (4) nejprve seznamuje čtenáře s pozadím obou debat, tj. s BBC a Českým rozhlasem jako vysílateli veřejné služby, jejich zásadami a pravidly, kterými se jejich vysílání řídí a která nevyhnutelně zahrnují i používání spisovných a nespisovných jazykových prostředků.

Další sekce praktické části představuje nejdříve kritéria, podle kterých jsou nalezené stylisticky příznakové prostředky označeny za formální či neformální, a to pro případy, kdy dané prostředky nemohou být okamžitě identifikovány jako spisovné či nespisovné. Analýza vybraného vzorku debaty Any Questions? představuje příznakové prostředky na třech rovinách, rozdělené do skupin podle toho, zda byly užity moderátorem nebo účastníky debaty. Na morfologické rovině je to pět prostředků užitých moderátorem debaty a devět užitých účastníky debaty - toto nevelké číslo je bezpochyby způsobeno analytickou povahou angličtiny. Na syntaktické rovině je těchto prostředků více: kromě složitosti souvětí, které je nemožné přesně popsat počtem příznakových prostředků, je to 10 prostředků v jazyce moderátora a 39 v jazyce účastníků. Na lexikální rovině se pak vyskytuje 16 příznakových prostředků užitých moderátorem a 25 účastníky debaty. Z hlediska počtu prostředků je to tedy syntaktická rovina, která vykazuje jejich největší množství; nejmenší naopak rovina morfologická. Vyjádřeno procentuálně, morfologická rovina se na celkovém počtu příznakových prostředků v daném vzorku podílí 13.5 %, syntaktická rovina 47.1 % a rovina lexikální 39.4 %. Neformální prostředky pak převažují na morfologické a syntaktické rovině. Lexikální rovina jako jediná obsahuje více formálních.

Vzorek určený k analýze ze Speciálu Martina Veselovského vykazuje o poznání větší množství stylistických prostředků. Na morfologické rovině jich moderátor debaty užívá 65 a účastníci 55. Na syntaktické rovině je jich méně: jejich počet u moderátora debaty je 27 a u účastníků 33, není-li opět započítána složitost souvětí. Na lexikální rovině jich moderátor debaty užívá 33, účastníci 27. Z hlediska počtu prostředků je to morfologická rovina, která jich nese největší počet, zatímco syntaktická a lexikální rovina vykazují stejný počet. Vyjádřeno procentuálně, morfologická rovina zastupuje celkový počet prostředků ze vzorku z 48.9 %, a syntaktická s lexikální z 25.5 %. Oproti zkoumanému vzorku z Any Questions? všechny jazykové roviny ve Speciálu Martina Veselovského vykazují větší počet formálních prostředků.

Celkový počet prostředků v obou vybraných vzorcích je navíc podpořen počtem příznakových prostředků identifikovaných v celých dvou debatách. Ty nejsou kvůli velkému rozsahu materiálu popsány detailně a jejich číslo je pouze přibližné, ukazují však, že procentuální poměry prostředků vyskytujících se na všech třech rovinách v českém i anglickém vzorku odpovídají procentuálním poměrům všech prostředků v celé anglické i české debatě. Dané počty jsou následující: v Any Questions? je 6 (12 %) prostředků na morfologické, 260 (51 %) prostředků na syntaktické a 190 (37 %) prostředků na lexikální rovině. Ve Speciálu Martina Veselovského je to 730 (54 %) prostředků na morfologické, 320 (24 %) na syntaktické a 290 (22 %) prostředků na lexikální rovině.

V závěru (5) jsou pak shrnuty výsledky analytické kapitoly pro všechny stylisticky příznakové prostředky obsažené v obou našich vzorcích, neboť závěry mohou být vytvořeny pouze z přesně popsaných prostředků. Tato kapitola obsahuje také shrnutí všech kategorií, do kterých byly obsazeny všechny příznakové prostředky za účelem jejich identifikace z hlediska

formálnosti/neformálnosti. Také uvádí, do jaké míry mohou být výsledky obou analýz vnímány jako definitivní a kde se v průběhu analýzy vyskytly problémy.

Po srovnání počtu a distribuce stylisticky příznakových prostředků na jednotlivých jazykových rovinách obou zkoumaných vzorků dochází tato práce k následujícímu závěru: některé prostředky se vyskytují v obou jazycích. Jsou to pasiva a participia na morfologické rovině, prostředky charakteristické pro mluvený jazyk, jako opakování slov, dále uvozovací věty, vsuvky, konjunkty, oslovení a zdvořilostní výrazy na syntaktické rovině a výplňková slova, neformální nebo hovorová slova, klišé, ustálená nebo obrazná vyjádření a formální slova nebo odborné termíny na rovině lexikální. Vyšší výskyt většiny těchto prostředků vykazuje Speciál Martina Veselovského, což je také spojeno s celkovým počtem příznakových prostředků v daném vzorku.

Další prostředky jsou identifikovány ve zbylých částech transkriptů obou debat, jako například přeřeky, anakoluty, kontaktní výrazy nebo intenzifikační prostředky, dále nedokončené věty nebo tázací dovětky. Frekvence těchto prostředků nemůže být však kvůli rozsahu materiálu přesně změřena.

Prostředky, které se vyskytují pouze v jednom ze zkoumaných jazyků, jsou následující: na morfologické rovině to jsou spisovné a nespisovné koncovky, časté užití ukazovacích zájmen *ten/ta/to* nebo neurčitého zájmena *nějaký*, shoda podmětu s přísudkem, přivlastňovací zájmeno *svůj*, protetické "*v*" v češtině a stažené formy a podstatná jména odvozená z přídavných jmen v angličtině. Na syntaktické rovině to jsou vytýkací konstrukce a (pseudo)vytýkající konstrukce, také užití metajazyka, emfatického "*do*" nebo převráceného slovosledu jako příznakového prostředku. Paralelní struktury a „expresivní" koordinace sice v češtině existují, ale nevyskytují se ve Speciálu Martina Veselovského. Postavení příslovečných určení ve větě je v angličtině oproti češtině příznakové. V češtině je naopak

příznakové vyjádření osobních zájmen *vy* a *já*. Na lexikální rovině jsou to emocionálně zabarvené výrazy a archaismy v angličtině a častý výskyt slov pocházející z cizích jazyků v češtině.

Z těchto poznatků jsou následně vyvozeny závěry o tom, že rozdíl v užití a frekvenci stylisticky příznakových prostředků je zapříčiněn jednak povahou samotných jazyků (zatímco angličtina je analytický jazyk, čeština je flektivní), jednak "ochotou" daného jazyka přejímat nová slova z cizích jazyků, což čeští mluvčí také reflektují ve svých replikách.

Co se týče formálnosti a neformálnosti obou debat, ta nelze být určena s absolutní jistotou. Koncept formálnosti/neformálnosti ani není přesně definován. V češtině je navíc s neformálností často spojená i nespisovnost, jejíž přítomnost je v angličtině díky minimálnímu výskytu nespisovných prostředků spíše výjimkou. Vnímání neformálnosti v obou debatách je tak nutně spojeno i s dalšími kritérii než jenom se spisovností či nespisovností.

I přes tyto problémy v identifikaci míry neformálnosti lze vyvodit závěr o tom, která debata může být označena za méně formální. Po zvážení všech kategorií příznakových prostředků, četnosti jejich výskytu a míře jejich neformálnosti tato práce uvádí, že je to debata Any Questions?.

Bibliografie pak prezentuje seznam použité literatury seřazený abecedně a také internetové zdroje.

Dodatková část obsahuje výčet všech stylisticky příznakových prostředků uspořádaných v tabulkách podle jazykových rovin jejich výskytu: nejdříve ve vzorku debaty Any Questions?, následované vzorkem ze Speciálu Martina Veselovského. K práci jsou rovněž přiloženy transkripty obou analyzovaných debat a popis britského a českého mediálního prostředí stejně jako samotných moderátorů a účastníků debaty.