



FUNCTIONS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN ORAL POLITICAL SPEECH

Djumabaeva Jamila Sharipovna,

Professor, DcS, National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Kenjaeva Gulbadanbegim Alibekovna,

Master Student in Linguistics, Urgench State University, Uzbekistan

Kenjaeva Mumtozbegim Alibekovna

Student, Faculty of Foreign Philology, Urgench State University, Uzbekistan

A B S T R A C T	K E Y W O R D S
<p>The article is devoted to the analysis of the linguistic features of modern political discourse (PD). The purpose of the study is to consider the features of the use of discursive markers (DM) in the oral speech of American politicians on the example of television debates. The functions of discursive markers are singled out, and a classification of these speech elements is proposed in relation to the chosen type of political discourse. Examples of the distribution of DM in political speech are analyzed, and an interpretation of the functioning of specific types of DM is given. The characteristics of the intonational design of DM in oral PD are discussed.</p>	<p>Political discourse (PD), political debates, discursive markers (DM), classification of DM, functioning and intonation of DM in PD.</p>

INTRODUCTION

The modern world is hard to imagine without politics, the main function of which is to resolve conflicts between individual groups of society or states. Language in the world of politics acts as a tool for influencing society to achieve certain political goals ¹. It is with this that the aspect of linguistic manipulation in the speech behavior of politicians is connected, it must have certain strategic and tactical features, an influencing force, contain specific terminology, be characterized by political correctness, comply with the norms of the language and have rhetorical pathos. Linguists call such a language the "language of politics", or "political discourse", the analysis of which is devoted to many modern works. The interest of linguists in the problem of interaction between language and politics is not accidental. Political discourse, which exists in a variety of oral and written genres, is a complex communicative phenomenon aimed at the struggle of power which combines text, situational, socio-cultural and sociopolitical context, as well as specific linguistic means. The actualization of the language of politics consists, first of all, in the manipulation of the political consciousness of the

¹ Robin Lakoff. The Language War. 2001.

masses, in the construction of a certain conceptual and informational model of reality in the human mind, reflecting the socio-political situation in society.

MATERIALS AND DISCUSSION

The most striking example of a politician's speech behavior is political debates. This type of oral communication is characterized by spontaneity, dialogue, situationality, the presence of colloquial lexical and phraseological units². Important features of parliamentary debates are highlighted: anthropocentrism, democracy, dialogue, emotionality, improvisation. In political debate, every politician has as his goal to show his candidacy from the best side and point out the opponent's weaknesses. In this case, the addresser resorts to the technique of manipulating consciousness, which is closely related to the process of argumentation.

The argumentative discourse of parliamentary debates is a specific strategic discourse, which is characterized by the presence of a thesis and a set of arguments, reflects the process of proving an explanation, a refutation.

Argumentative discourse uses such speech means as substantiation, justification, objection, debunking, explanation and conclusion. It is these means that allow you to manipulate the consciousness of the addressee. During oral speeches, the problem of accurately conveying the meaning of the statement to the addressee becomes especially acute, since the word is a powerful means of influencing the mass consciousness of voters. Discursive markers (DM) are a class of words with unique and formal possibilities, an important component of which is the pragmatic aspect. DM include conjunctions, circumstances, prepositional groups, etc., the frequency of which in the text is quite high. Discursive markers are key words, since their main function is the structural and semantic organization of the text - the design and ordering of reasoning, linking individual text fragments. However, they also act as elements of the text, which, on the one hand, help clarify the transmitted information, and on the other hand, make it non-categorical. R.I. Babaeva notes the following functions of discursive markers:

- "structuring" the organization of discourse, which replaces the grammatical rules that are not always observed in spontaneous speech;
- emotionality of speech, which allows you to form a certain "tonality of communication";
- "an expression of a subjective attitude, manifested in the assessments and comments accompanying the main content"³.

This article attempts to offer its own classification of DM encountered in political discourse. The material of the study was fragments of televised debates between 2000 US presidential candidates A. Gore and G. Bush, 2008 B. Obama and J. McCain, and fragments of televised debates between 2012 US presidential candidates from the Republican Party R. Santorum, M. Romney, R. Paul and N. Gingrich.

The classification proposed by B. Fraser is taken as the initial basis in this article. The classifications available in other works of domestic and foreign scientists devoted to the functioning of DM were also

² Бельчиков Ю.А. О роли СМИ в процессе демократизации русского литературного языка // Вестник электронных и печатных СМИ. 2004. № 13. URL: <http://www.ipk.ru/index.php?id=2100> (25.02.2013).

³ Babaeva R.I. Neznamenatel'naya lexika v nemetskom obikhodnom discurse (pragmatischesky aspekt): autoref. dis.... doc. Philol. science M., 2008. S. 13.

used. When compiling the new classification, we also took into account the DM that we identified in a narrow research corpus.

Comparative markers

In the classification of the American linguist B. Fraser, 2 classes of DM were distinguished, each of which has subclasses. In the first class, certain DMs were identified, which the scientist calls comparative (Contrastive). B. Fraser included a large number of markers in this group. In the course of the study, it was found that politicians use certain DMs of this type: *but, however, instead of, although, though, etc.* The use of other speech elements similar in function to markers of this subclass was not noted⁴.

Information markers

J. Bergman, based on Fraser's classification, proposed a category of markers, which he called informational (Informational)⁵. The scientist attributed such markers as y'know, oh and then to this group. In the analyzed speech of politicians, the use of the mentioned, as well as other connecting elements, was revealed. Thus, it was advisable to take as a basis the category put forward by the scientist, while adding to it such DMs as (as) you know, you see and as a matter of fact.

Example #1: "You know, 10 days ago, John said that the fundamentals of the economy are sound." (Barack Obama, 2008)

In the above remark of presidential candidate B. Obama, there is the DM you know, followed by certain information intended for the voter.

markers as y'know, oh and then to this group. In the analyzed speech of politicians, the use of the mentioned, as well as other connecting elements, was revealed. Thus, it was advisable to take as a basis the category put forward by the scientist, while adding to it such DMs as (as) you know, you see and as a matter of fact. Example #1: "You know, 10 days ago, John said that the fundamentals of the economy are sound." (Barack Obama, 2008) Presidential candidate B. Obama's remark above has the DM you know followed by certain information intended for the voter.

Example #2: "You see, in order to get something done on behalf of the people, you have to put partisanship aside." (J.W. Bush, 2000)

The beginning of the sentence of the president of the United States is marked with the use of the element *you see*, after which, as in the previous example, there is some information, an explanation.

Example #3: "I've never voted for a budget deficit. I never voted to increase the national debt. As a matter of fact, there's only one appropriation bill I voted for." (Ron Paul)

The example shows that a politician confesses that he once had to vote for the adoption of a certain law. In this case, the DM performs the function of information disclosure. An analysis of politicians' speeches quite clearly shows that these DMs are most often at the beginning of a sentence, while the speaker uses a short pause before continuing the statement. This technique helps to attract the attention of listeners and highlight the statement from the general context. **Implicative markers.**

The third and fourth groups, according to Fraser, are very similar. The elements contained in this group signal that one of the statements contains an argument or reason, and the second sentence contains a message made on the basis of this argument. In one of the groups, the argument is contained

⁴ Fraser B. What Are Discourse Markers? // Journal of Pragmatics. 1999. No 31. P. 931–952.

⁵ Bergman J. The Use of Discourse Markers in Chat Room Conversation. Lund: Department of English at Lund University, 2003.

in the first sentence, followed by DM; in the second group, the DM is preceded by a conclusion, while in the second sentence, an argument is displayed. In the work of Bergman, these two groups are combined into one. In the course of this study, another type of DM was identified in political discourse, similar in function to the markers of this group: **that's why**.

Example #4: "And I think that the fundamentals of the economy have to be measured by whether or not the middle class is getting a fair shake. *That's why* I'm running for president. (Barak Obama, 2008)

As you can see from the example, **that's why** signals that the first sentence contains a reason, an argument, and the second contains a conclusion, a conclusion from what was said earlier. Since the function of this marker corresponds to a group of implicative markers, it is possible to include it in the specified subclass. **Complementary markers.**

One of the subclasses identified by B. Fraser combines a large number of markers that indicate the presence of a quasi-parallel relationship between the content of two sentences: the second sentence complements the first. In the course of the analysis of linguistic facts, in addition to the particles described by the American scientist, the connecting elements of speech were identified, which can also be attributed to this group.

Example #5: "I vote for the least amount of spending and the least amount of taxes, *which means that* some of the conservative ratings."

Example #6: "I think it's important to have *what's called* Immediate Helping Hand, which is direct money to states so that seniors, poor seniors, don't have to choose between food and medicine." (J. McCain, 2008)

The given examples clearly show that the DM which means, *that means, what's called* allows you to add clarifying information to the statement. Theme change markers

The second class, according to B. Fraser, contains markers of relationships between topics. In this class, DMs for changing the topic were highlighted. When analyzing the speech of politicians, certain markers were noted that can significantly complement the specified class of words. From the name it is clear that DMs allow the speaker to change the topic of conversation, direct him in the right direction in order to get away from a direct answer to possible questions.

This technique is especially important for the speech of politicians, where the speaker often cannot afford a direct answer. Politicians' speech is filled with a large number of topic change DMs, many of which, according to our observations, were not mentioned in Fraser's classification.

Example #7: "As I said before, Jim, there are going to be things that end up having to be."

Example #8: "I would like to say *something* right now at the beginning of this debate following on the moment of silence for Mel Carnahan and Randy Carnahan and Chris Sifford." (A. Gore, 2000)

Example #9: "The question is for the next president, are we making good judgments about how to keep America safe precisely because sending our military into battle is such an enormous step. And the point that I originally made is that we took our eye off Afghanistan." (B. Obama, 2008)

Example #10: "The problem is the government is getting involved in things they shouldn't be involved in, especially at the federal level." (R. Paul, 2012)

Example #11: "...I will make them famous. You will know their names. Now, Senator Obama, you wanted to know one of the differences." (J. McCain, 2008)

Example #12: "I want to streamline the approval of the competing generic drugs and the new kinds of treatments that can compete with them so we bring the price down for everybody. Now, briefly, let me tell you how my prescription drug plan works..." (J.W. Bush, 2000)

Enumeration Markers

Another new group of PD markers should be singled out. This group includes DM relationships between messages that perform the function of enumeration.

Example #13: “*Two points* I think are important to think about when it comes to Russia. *Number one* is we have to have foresight and anticipate some of these problems... *The second point* I want to make is - is the issue of energy”.

(B. Obama, 2008)

Example #14: “*First of all*, I think that we are safer in some ways.” (B. Obama, 2008)

Example #15: “*And then finally*, with what’s left of government, I’m going to cut the employment by 10 percent.” (M. Romney, 2012)

It is worth noting that the described DMs are similar to addition markers, as they allow the speaker to complete the utterance with new messages. Given the specifics of political discourse, it is necessary to take into account the fact that argumentation plays a huge role in a politician’s speech, a characteristic feature of which is focusing the attention of listeners on certain ideas of the speaker. In this case, DM enumerations help to follow the laws of argumentation and, in addition to adding a certain portion of information, draw the addressee's attention to the thought being expressed. This type of DM includes *the first thing, number one / two / three / four, finally, second, first of all, next*. It is noteworthy that before the use of these connecting elements, a generalizing phrase is very often used, which prepares listeners for the fact that the speaker is going to enumerate certain facts. Such phrases include the following: *There are two / three / four points, Here what I would do, etc.*

Hesitation markers

In the course of the study, in the corpus of examples, DMs were identified, which make up a small group, but their frequency in the speech of politicians is quite high. These particles are described in the dissertation of E.V. Ledyeva, devoted to the analysis of discursive markers in the oral speech of speakers of the Yorkshire dialect of the English language. The author of the work characterizes DM *look, listen, well as* words expressing a call or a call to action. The same function of DM is seen in examples of political discourse.

Example #16: “Well, *look*, I understand your frustration and your cynicism...” (Barack Obama, 2008)

The above example demonstrates the use of DM *well* and *look*, which not only sound like a call to pay attention to the statement, but also allow the speaker to pause to collect his thoughts. In this case, it is advisable to include these elements in the proposed classification and mark them as hesitation markers.

Comment markers

A special group of DM, the so-called "hedges", can also be attributed to the class of markers for expressing the relationship between statements or commenting. For the first time, George Lakoff⁶ mentions markers of this type. Later, this type of DM was analyzed in the mentioned work by Bruce Fraser. The scientist noted the evaluation functions inherent in these connecting elements. These DMs are referred to as units of indirect communication and are called “barriers”, intensifiers, de-intensifiers, quantifiers, “lexical delimiters”, etc. These DMs perform the function of expressing the restraint of the

⁶ Lakoff G. Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts // Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1972. P. 183–228.

statement, the caution of the speaker in the comments. They reduce the degree of sharpness of statements, judgments.

Example #17: “*It requires a different kind of leadership style to do it...*”

(J.W. Bush, 2000)

Example #18: “*I would just like to say that this debate in a way is a living tribute to Mel Carnahan...*”

(A. Gore, 2000)

Example #19: “*He’s out there on television ads right now, unfortunately...*”

(R. Santorum, 2012)

Example #20: “*Well, there are a range of things that are probably going to have to be delayed*”. (B. Obama, 2008)

It can be seen from the examples that DMs are used to soften the harshness of the statement, as well as to emphasize one's opinion, attitude to the situation of the utterance - regrets, hopes, doubts, etc. The following DMs should be included in this category: *kind of, in a way, frankly, actually, probably, somehow, unfortunately, some, obviously, surely*.

Masking markers

In this article, in addition to the classification known in the specialized literature, it is proposed to single out another important group of discursive markers that function in the selected material - markers of speech action masking. This type of markers combines elements of speech that are very important in the speech of a politician, as they play a big role in the methods of argumentation and manipulation of consciousness. Disguise markers allow a politician to express his suggestions or wishes, while hiding his true intention or attitude to the situation⁷. Using this technique, the speaker absolves himself of responsibility, letting the audience know that he is only expressing his hopes, promising to take some positive action in the future. For example:

Example #21: “*I hope we’re going to be talking about tonight.*”

(B. Obama, 2008)

Example #22: “*And I believe I can.*” (J. W. Bush, 2000)

This category includes the following markers: *I suggest, I hope, I believe, I’m afraid, I promise*. Thus, the proposed classification of DM based on the material of the selected political discourse (political debates) is based on the classification of the American scientist B. Fraser and the analysis of the linguistic facts of the collected research corpus. In the course of the phonetic analysis of the sounding texts, three intonational types of DM design were identified depending on their location in the utterance. In political speech, connecting particles are most often used at the beginning (48%) and in the middle (49.5%) of a sentence. Only 2.5% of connecting elements are used at the end of phrases. The most common hesitation markers, enumerations, and the conjunction and are found in the initial of a sentence. In the middle of the utterance, contrasting and complementary markers most often appear. The third group includes such DMs as *and, though*: they are used at the end of a statement, in a situation where the speaker is suddenly interrupted by another participant in the discussion. Discursive elements in the initial position are most often formed in an even nuclear tone (33%) and are accompanied by hesitation pauses, a fast tempo, reduced sound volume, and a narrow

⁷ Ter-Minasova S.G. Language and cultural communication. M.: Slovo, 2000.

pronunciation range. In most cases, the DM is unstressed in preposition (25%). Discursive elements at the beginning of a sentence can be formed in low descending (16%) and high descending (16%) tones. The intonation of connecting elements located in the middle of a sentence is most often characterized by the absence of their separation into a separate syntagma (55%). DM of this type, as a rule, are delimited by a small pause from the previous syntagma and form a single intonational whole with the subsequent syntagma. Markers used at the end of an utterance most often stand in an unstressed position and do not form a separate syntagma.

The intonational design of connecting elements in speech depends on the modal-emotional attitude of the speaker, on his manner of communication and the very situation of the utterance, so here we can talk about the intonation variability of the design of DM in the phrase. However, the inhomogeneous organization of particles still makes it possible to single out some specific intonation patterns that characterize this type of lexical units that perform the function of coherence in the text. The successful outcome of a politician's election is influenced by many factors, such as: the use of administrative resources, the authority of a politician, his glorification of outstanding ideas, personal meetings with voters, a well-chosen PR company. However, the nature of a politician's speech in political debates, his political rhetoric, sometimes plays a leading role in a positive assessment of his political image.

CONCLUSION

Political discourse, more than any other, is persuasion oriented. And, of course, as in any other type of oral communication, the use of DM as "linguistic markers" of political discourse plays a significant role in this. The task of a linguist is not only to describe the status quo of a particular language, or a particular type of discourse in a particular language, but also the existing processes of interaction between languages in the context of world globalization in many areas of society, including the prospects for the linguistic development of a new society. The role of language in the life of society is reflected in the deep linguistic concept of the outstanding humanist of the 19th century, Wilhelm von Humboldt, about the identity of the "spirit of the people" and its language. In the 21st century, in the era of political cataclysms and conflicts, the socio-political and humanistic value of the language is increasingly increasing and goes beyond purely linguistic views.

References

1. Robin Lakoff. *The Language War*. 2001. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001.
2. Belchikov Yu.A. The role of SMI in the process of demokratizatsii russkogo literaturnogo yazyka // *Vestnik elektronnyx i pechatnyx SMI*. 2004. No. 13. URL: <http://www.ipk.ru/index.php?id=2100> (25.02.2013).
3. Babaeva R.I. *Neznamenatelnaya lexika v nemetskom obikhodnom discurse (pragmatichesky aspekt): autoref. dis.... doc. Philol. science M., 2008. S. 13.*
4. Fraser B. What Are Discourse Markers? // *Journal of Pragmatics*. 1999. No. 31. P. 931–952.
5. Bergman J. *The Use of Discourse Markers in Chat Room Conversation*. Lund: Department of English at Lund University, 2003.
6. Lakoff G. Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts // *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1972. P. 183–228.

7. Ter-Minasova S.G. Language and cultural communication. M.: Slovo, 2000.
8. Arizona Republican Presidential Debate (transcript). 22.02.2012. URL: <http://archives.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1202/22/se.05.html> (12.03.2012).
9. Arizona Republican Presidential Debate (video). 22.02.2012. URL: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IoFfUg8YtC0> (12.03.2012).
10. The First McCain — Obama Presidential Debate (transcript). 26.09.2008. URL: <http://www.debates.org/index.php?page=2008-debate-transcript> (12.03.2012).
11. The First McCain — Obama Presidential Debate (video). 26.09.2008. URL: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F-nNIEduEOw&feature=relmfu> (12.03.2012).
12. The Second McCain — Obama Presidential Debate (transcript). 07.10.2008. URL: <http://www.debates.org/index.php?page=october-7-2008-debate-transcrip> (12.03.2012).
13. The Second Obama — McCain Presidential debate (video). 07.10.2008. URL: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F-nNIEduEOw&feature=relmfu> (12.03.2012).
14. The Third Bush — Gore Presidential Debate (transcript). 17.10.2000. URL: <http://www.debates.org/index.php?page=october-17-2000-debate-transcript> (12.03.2012).