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An Alternative Viewpoint or Agitprop? A Corpus-based Discourse Analysis of the Internet News-/Opinion Portal Sputnik

This paper will examine the discourse strategies in Sputnik, a recently launched internet news-opinion portal targeting the Czech-speaking audience (cz.sputniknews.com/). Sputnik sets as its goals to mediate and promote an alternative point of view: "Sputnik mluví o tom, o čem jiní mlčí" (Sputnik talks about what others are silent about).

Data will be drawn from keyword analysis (KWA) of the Sputnik texts in Czech. KWA (kwords.korpus.cz) extracts keywords (KWs), which serve as "keys" to text interpretation, "giv[ing] access to features of a text or corpus that are not immediately obvious" (Bondi 2010). Keyness (Scott 2010), i.e. varying strengths of KWs, will be measured with Difference Index (Authors, forthcoming). KWA will also uncover connections among KWs; these KW links will be especially helpful in revealing the discourse patterns in Sputnik.

We will contrast the Sputnik texts (on news from and about the Czech Republic) and the reference corpus of periodicals in Czech (SYN2013PUB or later); we expect to discover topics that are different from those found in other Czech journalistic texts (e.g., rusofobie ‘Russiaphobia’), interaction between evaluative expressions and context (e.g., zjevnou stopu amerických tajných služeb ‘apparent footprint of American intelligence services’), and less expected links among the keywords (e.g. intrik ‘of intrigues’ and českých tajných služeb ‘the Czech intelligence services’).

The quantitative data will be complemented by qualitative analysis of texts and by KWAs of articles dealing with similar thematic links in other Czech internet news portals (e.g. iDnes, Novinky, iHned).
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