Discourse Markers in Political Speeches:
Forms and Functions

Asst. Instructor **Hind M. Ismail**[*]

Abstract

Discourse markers are expressions used to connect sentences to what comes before or after and indicate a speaker's attitude to what he is saying.As linguistic items, they have important functions in discourses of various styles or registers. And being connective elements, discourse markers relate sentences, clauses and paragraphs to each other.

"One of the most prominent function of discourse markers, however, is to signal the kinds of relations a speaker perceives between different parts of the discourse". (Lenk 1997: 2)

Through political discourse, different types of discourse markers are used. This paper deals with the importance and functions of discourse markers and tries to shed light on the kinds of discourse markers used in political speech through analyzing the speech of the American president, Barack Obama, depending on Hyland and Tse's (2004) classification of discourse markers; interpersonal and textual markers. The results show that these discourse markers function as means of social interaction aimed at influencing the nation.

Introduction

The notion of political discourse is mentioned by Graber (1993:305-332) saying that a political speech is not only a monologue, but also an example of social interaction aimed at influencing the nation, or at least an important diplomatic tool allowing for the negotiations of specific meanings and references.

Through any political text, discourse markers play an important rule as a cohesive device in conveying the intended message. Discourse markers can be defined as linguistic expressions of different length which carry pragmatic and propositional meaning.They are used to combine clauses or to connect sentence elements and they appear in both speaking and writing to facilitate the discourse. Each discourse marker indicates a particular meaning and a relationship between two or more clauses.

Siepmann (2005: 37) points out that discourse marker can be applied to both written and spoken language and they carry pragmatic and propositional meaning. Though named differently, (comment clauses, pragmatic markers, discourse connectives, cue phrases lexical phrases, organizers or simply markers words), discourse markers assume a pragmatic function in a discourse. As discourse

---

[*] University of Anbar - College of Education for Women – Dept. of English.

markers underline relationships between text spans, they include extralinguistic features, as headings or indentations, contributing to textual progression and translate the communicative strategy of the author.

Halliday and Hasan (1976:226) identify five main cohesive devices in English discourse: reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion and conjunction. Conjunctions, or connective elements, which Halliday called *discourse markers*, involved the use of formal markers (i.e. discourse markers) to relate sentences, clauses and paragraphs to each other and signal the way the writer wants the reader to relate what is said to what has been said before.

Apparently, a conjunction is related to the entire environment of a text. The conjunctive elements (discourse markers) "presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse" (Halliday, 1976: 226). They do not only give cohesion to a text, they also cohere two sentences together.

Hyland and Tse (2004:156-177) explain that all "metadiscourse categories" (a notion used referring to text analysis), are essentially interpersonal since they need to take into account the readers' knowledge, textual experiences and processing needs and these categories ultimately aim to persuade the reader and express the writer's point of view.

This paper is an attempt to find out the markers included in President Obama's speeches. This study consists of four sections. The first section touches upon the notion of political discourse. The second section deals with the definition of discourse markers and their functions. While, the third section is analytical wherein two speeches of president Obama are analysed. Finally, the conclusion in the fourth section shows the result of the analysis.

1-Political Discourse

Chilton and Schaffner (2002:2) mention that political activity does not exist without the use of language and the doing of politics is constituted in language. The relationship between language and politics stems from the fact that language can be thought of as a resource which is drawn up on to achieve socio-political goals.

Language seems to be a very important tool used by political communities to establish group awareness and cement voters by making them feel that their votes count (Grabias, 2001: 290). So, Van Dijk (1997: 12) observes that each speech delivered by a politician is a realization of his intention and has its own function.

It is pointed out that in political discourses, the participants which are called "political actors", make their speeches at the higher level of correctness as part of the formal language style. In addition, the choices of words must be suited to the given situation and needs. (ibid: 14)

While the opinion of Chruszczewski (2002: 70-76) is that by directing presidents speeches (texts) into the desired direction, the texts can quite often manipulate a large number of recipients. Hudson (1978: 65) agrees with Chruszczewski by saying that language used in speeches is undoubtedly expected

by the audience and that professional politicians select specific phrases in order to persuade and influence receivers.

For politicians, language is a very important tool used to achieve something. In political discourse, there are the speakers and receivers. The speakers try to address all people in his process and the receivers try to interpret the texts delivered by politicians making use of their intertextual and political knowledge (Grabias, 2001:290).

So, as a tool, language will be used to achieve political aims and discourse markers will be part of this tool to indicate the speaker's attitude toward the audience. The next section, definition, classification and functions of *discourse markers* will be explained.

2-Definition of Discourse Markers:

Traditionally, (Ghil'ad, 2009:50) points that some of the words or phrases that were considered discourse markers were treated as "fillers" or "expletives": words or phrases that had no function at all, while, now they are considered functional at different levels of analysis: topic changes, reformulations, discourse planning, stressing, hedging, or channeling. So those functions can be classified into three broad groups: (a) relationships among (parts of) utterances; (b) relationships between the speaker and the message, and (c) relationships between speaker and hearer.

According to Lynn and Zic (2004:117), in linguistics, a discourse marker is a word or phrase that is relatively syntax-independent and does not change the meaning of the sentence, and has a somewhat empty meaning, while, Swan (2005:13) defines a *discourse marker* as "a word or expression which shows the connection between what is being said and the wider context". For him, it is something that first, connects a sentence to what comes before or after and second, indicates a speaker's attitude to what he is saying.

Therefore, *discourse markers* can be defined as linguistic expressions of varying length which carry pragmatic meaning and can facilitate the discourse. The main classification of discourse markers will be mentioned in the next section.

2.1 Classification of Discourse Markers

Hyland and Tse (2004:156 – 177) mention that discourse marker categories are intrinsically and ultimately interpersonal, and one of their main aims is to persuade the reader. They classify discourse markers into the functional headings of *interpersonal and textual markers. Textual discourse markers* refer to the organization of discourse. They also fulfill a persuasive function and attain a persuasive effect, while the *interpersonal* reflects the writer's stance towards both the content of the text and the potential reader. (ibid)

2.1.1 Textual discourse markers

Hyland and Tse (2004:156-177) sub-classify textual discourse markers into seven categories. They are:

1- **_logical markers_**: are markers which express semantic and structural relationships between discourse stretches, and help readers interpret pragmatic connections, which are:

A- **Additive** (*and*, *furthermore*. . .)

The marker "*and*" has both cohesive and structural roles; structural because they link two (or more) syntactic units such as clauses, phrases or verbs, and cohesive because the interpretation of the whole conjunctive utterance depends on the combination of both conjuncts. Also," *and* ", can precede support units of talk (explanation, evidence and clarification to previous units). It can also have a pragmatic effect in the sense that it indicates a speaker's continuation. However, "*and"* does not provide information about what is being continued. Such information is derived from the discourse content and structure. Also it is used to indicate the speaker's continuation (Schiffrin, 1987: 150).

B- **Adversative** (*but*, *however*. . .)

C- **Conclusive** relationships (*finally*, *in sum*. . .) in the text.

D- **Causatives** (*so, because, as a result)*. According to Schifrin (1987:330), *"because"* is used by the speaker to indicate a relation of 'cause and result'." *so"* is used to indicate a relation of 'premise and conclusion' and also indicating a result and to establish a causal link among events.

2- **_Sequencers_**: are markers which indicate particular positions in a series and serve to guide the reader in the presentation of different arguments in a particular order (in the first place, secondly).

3-**_Reminders_**: are markers that refer back to previous sections in the text in order to retake an argument, amplify it or summaries some of the previous argumentation. For example (as….said)

4-**_Topicalisers_**: are markers that explicitly indicate some type of topic shift to the reader so that the argumentation can be easily followed. For example (now).

Schiffrin (1987:241) claims that "*now"* *is* used to indicate a speaker's progression through a discourse which contains an ordered sequence of subordinating parts. It is also used to indicate the upcoming shift in talk, or when the speaker wants to negotiate the right to control what will happen next in talk.

5-**_Code glosses_**: are markers that explain, rephrase, expand or exemplify propositional content. Overall, they reflect the writer's expectations about the audience's knowledge or ability to follow the argument (*that is, in other words, for instance*).

6-**_Illocutionarymarkers_:** are markers that explicitly name the act the writer performs through the text (*I hope to persuade, I back up this idea*. *...*)

7- **_Announcements_**: are markers which refer forward to future sections in the text in order to prepare the reader for prospective argumentation (ibid.).

2.1.2 Interpersonal discourse markers

Hyland and Tse (2004:156-177) sub-classify interpersonal markers into five main categories. They are :

1- ***Hedges:*** are markers which refer to markers that withhold full commitment to the statements displayed in the text. From a linguistic point of view, epistemic verbs (*may, might, would*), probability adverbs (*perhaps, maybe*) and epistemic expressions (*it is likely, it is probable*. . .) have been analysed.

2- ***Certainty markers***: are markers that express full commitment to the statements presented by the writer (*undoubtedly, of course ,naturally, in fact ,you know).*

Schiffrin (1987:268) maintains that *"y'know"* has two discourse functions: a marker of meta-knowledge about what speakers and hearers share, and a marker of metaknowledge about what is generally known. It is also used to indicate a situation in which the speaker knows that the hearer shares some knowledge about a particular piece of information.

3- ***Attributors***: are markers that perform a double function in the text. They refer explicitly to the source of the information (*as the Prime Minister indicated*), or at the same time using these references of authoritative value with persuasive goals.(ibid)

4- ***Attitude markers***: are markers which express the writer's affective values towards the reader and the content presented in the text. Linguistically, these markers can adopt the following form:

A-**Denotic verbs**: (*must*, *have to*. . .)

B-***Attitudinal adverbs***: (surprisingly. . .)

C-***Adjectival constructions***: such as (*it is difficult, imposible*. . .)

D- ***Cognitive verbs***: such as (*I think, I believe*. . .)

5- ***Commentaries:*** These markers help to establish and maintain rapport with the audience by means of **rhetorical questions** (*is this the right attitude*?), **direct appeals** (*dear reader, you*), **personalisations** (*I, we , me, my feelings*). Personalisers, contribute to the development of a relationship with the reader.

A relationship that, ultimately, may convince or not but that is inherently persuasive (ibid).

Yumin (2007:22) mentions that the aim behind using the personal marker (*we*), is to shorten the distance between the speaker and the audience, regardless of their disparity in age, social status and professions and it may include both the speaker and the listener into the same arena, and thus make the audience feel close to the speaker and his points.

This classification will be the model to be adapted in analyzing the data in this research.

2.2 Functions of Discourse Markers

Muller (2005:8) points out that most researchers agree that the use of discourse markers facilitates the hearer's task of understanding the speaker's utterances. As Aijmer (1996:210) puts it, "they function as cues or guides to the hearer's interpretation".

Therefore, discourse markers have many functions. Basically, they have two fundamental functions: the *discoursal function* and the *interpersonal function*. First, "*the textual or discoursal function*" refers to signal relations between prior, present and subsequent discourse, marking off one text unit from another or linking discourse units further apart (ibid).

The "*interpersonal function*" helps in expressing speaker or writer stance. For example, "Sentence openers" can paint a picture in the reader's mind and grab their attention by drawing them into the composition. And a "sentence opener" can use a (*verb, plural noun, collective noun or a preposition*) (ibid).

So, by using *collective nouns*, one may give the reader more details about the issue: choir of singers, team of hockey players, and troupe of dancers. A *collective noun* can be defined as a word used to define a group of objects, such as: (animals, people, emotions, committee) or it refers to a group of countable nouns as a unit faculty of education, firm of lawyers, minority of conservatives, congregation of worshippers, department of health, majority of liberals, board of directors, and staff of teachers) (ibid).

In addition, *Prepositions* can refer to the position or placement of the subject: for example (between the gardens, under the new law, next to house, on the subject, close to the family, in the middle of something, about the problem, above the board) (ibid).

Apparentelly, pragmatic meaning is defined by Schiffrin (2006:315-338) especially in relation to discourse markers as the recurrent use of a certain marker to convey communicative meaning. She also adds that pragmatic meaning is dependant upon the relational functions that markers develop in the respective text or context of use.

Also, Dik (1987:81-100) explains that the functional view presupposes that language is an instrument used by individuals in order to attain certain goals which can be traced back to the complex pattern of social interactions.Therfore, in the functional view, speakers use linguistic expressions in such a way as to communicate messages that would manage to change the hearers mentally or emotionally, thus modifying their knowledge, convictions or feelings.

Thus, Schiffrin (1987:326) describes the contribution of discourse to coherence as follows: "discourse markers provide contextual coordinates for utterances: they index an utterance to the local contexts in which utterances are produced and in which they are to be interpreted".

According to Lenk (1995:341), discourse markers tend to be used when "the speaker feels a need to verbally express how it fits together well". As Hansen

(1998:197) observes, "markers such as "*by the way*" may indicate rather that the host utterance is not intended to cohere, or is at best intended to cohere in a rather loose fashion with what preceded it".

So, Schiffrin (1987:318) explains that the interpretation process of the hearer is guided by the use of markers because "markers select a meaning relation from whatever potential meanings are provided through the content of talk, and display that relation".

It is noticed that there is a similar idea found in Relevance Theory. And the general idea in Relevance Theory is that the linguistic form of a sentence or an utterance (i.e. propositional representations) potentially gives rise to a number of possible interpretations. Thus, the hearer's task then is to find the most relevant interpretation in the given context (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:50; Blakemore, 1992:150).

Blakemore (1992:150) points out that "discourse markers guide the hearer in this task by constraining the number of possible interpretations. So, they "encode instructions for processing propositional representations", which Blakemore also terms "encoding procedural meaning".

Thus, Muller (2005, 12) says "if we want to discover the functions of discourse markers, we need to consider not only their lexical context, but also the pragmatic context. Whatever the material, however, another important question is how the material is used, that is, which role it plays in the analysis".

Also, Risselada and Spooren (1998:132) explain that coherence relations depend "to a large extent on the addressee's interpretation of the content of the units involved", discourse markers thus contribute to coherence.

So, Blakemore (1988:183–195) defines discourse markers in terms of their function in establishing connectivity in discourse. Here, connectivity could be understood either as coherence or cohesion which mark text connections at different levels. And he refers to coherence as a cognitive notion which represents the hearer's integration of the received information into the larger representation of a text. So, it implies the structural connection between different units of a text as well as between different texts.

For Schiffrin (1987:13), cohesion depends upon a process of semantic inferencing that departs from words and sentences and reaches text and discourse level. Thus, according to many authors, discourse markers can function both as cohesive devices and, given the fact that they have a pragmatic meaning, they can also ensure text and discourse coherence. So, she refers to the contribution of discourse markers to coherence as follows: 'discourse markers provide contextual coordinates for utterances: they index an utterance to the local contexts in which utterances are produced and in which they are to be interpreted' (ibid: 326).

A set of main functions have discovered by several authors as an attempt to analyse the functions of discourse markers. (Schiffrin, 2006; Eggins, 2004; Müller,

2005; Blakemore, 2006; Downing, 2006; Murar, 2008) mention a list of functions from the general functions to the particular ones which are as the following:

1- Discourse markers take part in the cohesion and coherence relations in discourse involving speaker choice.Therefore, to construct meaning and accommodate the desired pragmatic meaning; the speaker must select the most appropriate sign (Blakemore, 2006:232).

2- Discourse markers help to constrain discursive and contextual relevance of the discourse. There are two types of relevance, discursive and contextual. For Halliday (1994) (cited in Eggins, 2004:9) , there are three variables of field; *the social activity* in which the speakers are involved or the subject matter of the text, *tenor*, the social distance (power and solidarity) between the participants in the speech event and which determines the degree of familiarity in the wording and *mode* which concerned with the medium (spoken or written) by means of which the text is expressed as well as with the amount of feedback of discourse .

3-Through discourse markers the interpretation process of the hearer is guided towards a desired meaning.Thus, this function involves the correct inferential path that has to be taken in view of a correct understanding of the message (Schiffrin, 2006: 315-338).

4- Discourse markers also functions as an interactive or expressive function which covers such aspects as politeness, face-saving or face-threatening, turn-taking, signaling emotional involvement of speakers in their contribution
 (Murar, 2008:135).

5- They have a deictic or indexical function which refers to the discourse markers' ability to show the relationship that is to be established by the hearer between prior and ensuing discourse (ibid).

6- Discourse markers are functional elements of discourse management used in *initiating discourse* (e.g.now, now then, so, indeed), *marking a boundary or a shift*, *serve as a filler* (e.g.em, well, like), *delaying tactic* and *holding or claiming the floor* (e.g. and, coz–because), *focusing attention* (e.g. look ,well), and *reformulating* (e.g. in other words, I mean, actually) and finally, *resuming* (e.g. to sum up) (Downing, 2006: 39-58).

7-They are also used in sharing knowledge or common ground between speakers**.** By using this function which is called *grounding*, discourse markers can display other-attentiveness. Attentiveness can be achieved by the permanent verification of the listener's understanding of information (e.g. *you see, got it*) or by showing awareness of the common knowledge (e.g. *you know, indeed*) (Murar:2008:125-139).

8-Discourse markers are used in responses to signal the hearer's attention and involvement. Many markers can be used to fulfill this function such as *(okay, right, see, all right)* etc.Also minimal responses such as *(mhm)* can be included in this category (Müller, 2005).

3- Speeches for Analysis
In this section, samples from two speeches for Obama will be analysed depending on the classification of discourse markers by Hyland and Tse (2004); textual and interpersonal markers.

Sample Speech 1: Obama's speech from the Oval Office on the change in mission of the Iraq War on Aug. 31, 2010, as provided by the White House.
Sample Speech 2: President Barack Obama's remarks on Iraq, as prepared for delivery to the Disabled American Veterans in Atlanta, on August 2, 2010, 11:38 AM.

We've endured a long and painful recession. And sometimes in the midst of these storms, the future that we're trying to build for our nation --.....
But this milestone should serve as a reminder to all Americans that the future is ours to shape if we move forward with confidence and commitment. It should also serve as a message to the world that the United States of America intends to sustain and strengthen our leadership in this young century.
.. As a next step, we're opening this competition to entrepreneurs and academics so the best minds in America can help us develop the best technologies to serve our vets, including those of you with multiple traumatic injuries..……for months, and it seemed possible that he might never wake up. But then something happened. His doctors can't explain it. His parents call it a miracle. Cory opened one of his eyes. A few weeks later, he moved a leg, then an arm.
.....Finally, we're keeping faith with our newest veterans returning from Afghanistan and Iraq. We're offering more of the support and counseling they need to transition back to civilian life. ....
...Americans across the political spectrum supported the use of force against those who attacked us on 9/11. Now, as we approach our 10th year of combat in Afghanistan, there are those who are understandably asking tough questions about our mission there. But we must never lose sight of what's at stake........And because of our drawdown in Iraq, we are now able to apply the resources necessary to go on offense. …………
And so at this moment, as we wind down the war in Iraq, we must tackle those challenges at home with as much energy, and grit, and sense of common purpose as our men and women in uniform who have served abroad. They have met every test that they faced. Now, it's our turn. Now, it's our responsibility to honor them by coming together, all of us, and working to secure the dream that so many generations have fought for -- the dream that a better life awaits anyone who is willing to work for it and reach for it.
.... And I made it clear that by August 31, 2010 America's combat mission in Iraq would end. And that is exactly what we are doing—as promised, on schedule.....And if Afghanistan were to be engulfed by an even wide insurgency, al

Qaeda and its terrorist affiliates would have even more space to plan their next attack. And as President of the United States, I refuse to let that happen.

That is why, after years in which the situation had deteriorated in Afghanistan, I announced a new strategy last December—a military effort to break the Taliban's momentum and train Afghan forces so they can take the lead for security; a civilian.....

We're offering more of the support and counseling they need to transition back to civilian life. That includes funding the Post-9/11 GI Bill, which is already helping more than 300,000 veterans and family members pursue their dream of a college education.

That is what we have done. We have removed nearly 100,000 U.S. troops from Iraq. We have closed or transferred hundreds of bases to the Iraqis. And we have moved millions of pieces of equipment out of Iraq.

....Yet no one can doubt President Bush's support for our troops, or his love of country and commitment to our security. As I've said, there were patriots who supported this war, and patriots who opposed it. And all of us are united in appreciation for our servicemen and women, and our hopes for Iraqis' future.

..Shortly after taking office, I announced our new strategy for Iraq and for a transition to full Iraqi responsibility. And I made it clear that by August 31, 2010 America's combat mission in Iraq would end. And that is exactly what we are doing—as promised, on schedule...

..Let us never forget—it was Afghanistan where al Qaeda plotted and trained to murder 3,000 innocent people on 9/11. It is Afghanistan and the tribal regions of Pakistan where terrorists have launched other attacks against us and our allies....

Because of our troops and civilians -and because of the resilience of the Iraqi people - Iraq has the opportunity to embrace a new destiny, even though many challenges remain. So tonight, I am announcing that the American combat mission in Iraq has ended. Operation Iraqi Freedom is over and the Iraqi people now have lead responsibility for the security of their country.

As so many of you know, P-T-S-D is a pain like no other—the nightmares that keep coming back, the rage that strikes suddenly, the hopelessness that has led too many of our troops and veterans to take their own lives. Today, I want to say to anyone who is struggling—do not suffer in silence. It's not a sign of weakness to reach out for support; it is a sign of strength. Your country needs you. And we are here to help you stand tall again……..

And since the rumors continue to fly, let me say it as clearly as I can. The historic health care reform legislation that I signed into law does not—I repeat, does not— change your veterans benefits. The VA health care and benefits that you know and trust are safe, and that includes prosthetics for our disabled veterans.

But this milestone should serve as a reminder to all Americans that the future is ours to shape if we move forward with confidence and commitment. It should also

serve as a message to the world that the United States of America intends to sustain and strengthen our leadership in this young century.

And we're already putting dozens of these innovative ideas into action. Additionally, we're enabling more veterans to check the status of their claims on-line and from their cell phone.As a next step, we're opening this competition to entrepreneurs and academics so the best minds ……

This afternoon, I spoke to former President George W. Bush. It's well known that he and I disagreed about the war from its outset. Yet no one can doubt President Bush's support for our troops, or his love of country and commitment to our security……Our troops are the steel in our ship of state. And though our nation may be travelling through rough waters, they give us confidence that our course is true, and that beyond the pre-dawn darkness, better days lie ahead.

And because of our drawdown in Iraq, we are now able to apply the resources necessary to go on offense. In fact, over the last 19 months, nearly a dozen al Qaeda leaders -- and hundreds of al Qaeda's extremist allies -- have been killed or captured around the world…..

And next month, we will change our military mission from combat to supporting and training Iraqi security forces. In fact, in many parts of the country, Iraqis have already taken the lead for security.

…..We will disrupt, dismantle, and ultimately defeat al Qaeda. And we will give our troops the resources and equipment to get the job done and keep our country safe. At the same time, every American who has ever worn the uniform must also know this—your country is going to take care of you when you come home.

…Through their extraordinary courage, confidence and commitment, these troops and veterans have proven themselves as a new generation of American leaders. While our country has sometimes been divided, they have fought together as one. While other individuals and institutions have shirked responsibility, they have welcomed it. And while it is easy to be daunted by overwhelming challenges, the generation that has served in Iraq has overcome every test before them.

For too long, we have put off tough decisions on everything from our manufacturing base to our energy policy to education reform. As a result, too many middle-class families find themselves working harder for less, while our nation's long-term competitiveness is put at risk…..

..to make sure America is serving our veterans as well as you've served us; and, most recently, to sign advanced appropriations into law so that veterans health care will never again be held hostage to the budget battles of Washington..

 But this milestone should serve as a reminder to all Americans that the future is ours to shape if we move forward with confidence and commitment.

This new approach reflects our long-term partnership with Iraq -- one based upon mutual interest and mutual respect. Of course, violence will not end with our combat mission.….And since the rumors continue to fly, let me say it as clearly as I

can. The historic health care reform legislation that I signed into law does not- I repeat, does not—change your veterans benefits.

Unfortunately, over the last decade, we've not done what's necessary to shore up the foundations of our own prosperity. We spent a trillion dollars at war, often financed by borrowing from overseas.

We've endured a long and painful recession. And sometimes in the midst of these storms, the future that we're trying to build for our nation -- a future of lasting peace and long-term prosperity -- may seem beyond our reach.

This was my pledge to the American people as a candidate for this office. Last February, I announced a plan that would bring our combat brigades out of Iraq, while redoubling our efforts to strengthen Iraq's Security Forces and support its government and people. .....

... Now, as we approach our 10th year of combat in Afghanistan, there are those who are understandably asking tough questions about our mission there. But we must never lose sight of what's at stake. As we speak, al Qaeda continues to plot against us,....We must jumpstart industries that create jobs, and end our dependence on foreign oil.We must unleash the innovation that allows new products to roll off our assembly lines, and nurture the ideas that spring from our entrepreneurs. This will be difficult. But in the days to come, it must be our central mission as a people, and my central responsibility as President.

Now, it's not every day that somebody gets past the Secret Service while wielding a baseball bat. I think you heard about this. Turns out it was a genuine Louisville Slugger—a thank you for going to bat for our veterans on advanced appropriations.

I know this historic moment comes at a time of great uncertainty for many Americans. We've now been through nearly a decade of war. We've endured a long and painful recession...This was my pledge to the American people as a candidate for this office. Last February, I announced a plan that would bring our combat brigades out of Iraq, while redoubling our efforts to strengthen Iraq's Security Forces and support its government and people.

That is what we have done. We have removed nearly 100,000 U.S. troops from Iraq. We have closed or transferred hundreds of bases to the Iraqis. And we have moved millions of pieces of equipment out of Iraq.

...... While our country has sometimes been divided, they have fought together as one. While other individuals and institutions have shirked responsibility, they have welcomed it. And while it is easy to be daunted by overwhelming challenges, the generation that has served in Iraq has overcome every test before them. ….. We must unleash the innovation that allows new products to roll off our assembly lines, and nurture the ideas that spring from our entrepreneurs. This will be difficult. But in the days to come, it must be our central mission as a people, and my central responsibility as President.

Discussion and Results

The tables below summarize the results of the forms and their functions in the two speeches.

Textual Markers

	Category	Type	Frequency
1- A-	Logical Additive	*and*	237
		also	8
		additionally	1
B-	Adversative	*But*	24
		as	30
		Though	2
		While	8
		yet	2
C-	Conclusive	*Finally*	1
		Shortly	1
		briefly	1
D-	Causatives	*So*	12
		Because	8
		As a result	2
2-	Sequencers	Next	3
		Then	1
3-	Reminders	*As.....said*	1
		let	2
4-	Topicalisers	*now*	17
5-	Code glasses	That is	5
		this is	3
6-	Illocutionary	/	/
7-	Announcements	*Next*	3
		Then	1

Interpersonal Markers

	Category	Type	Frequency
1-	Hedges	May	5
		Would	5
2-	Certainty	In fact	2
		Of course	2
		Clearly	1
		You know	2
3-	Attributors	/	/

4- A-	Attitude Denotic verbs	Must	17
B-	Attitudinal adverb	unfortunately	1
C-	Adjectival	Easy Difficult	1 1
D-	Cognitive	Think Believe	1 1
5-	Commentaries	*We* *I*	111 55

The results of the analyzed political speeches reveal that among the **textual markers**, the most frequently used markers are the "*logical markers*".The *addition logical connective* "*and*" is used 237 times. In the above examples, *"and"* is used to precede support units of talk through explanation and also it indicates a speaker's continuation. To introduce further evidences, the speaker depends on using specific markers to achieve his aim. Above, markers like "*also, additionally*" are used for this purpose. *"Also"* is used 8 times while "*additionally*" is used once.

Coherence is the main function of discourse markers. The using of *adversative* "*But*" in the above example text, indicates that what follows it contrasts with what precedes it. It is used 24 times.Obama refers to "milestone" to be a reminder to shape a good future. He used another marker like "*and*" to add explanation and clarification about "milestone". By using other *adversative* markers like "*yet, though*", the speaker here tries to deny the expectation. Both markers are used twice. The above example, when Obama uses "*yet*", he refers to the fact that First Bush disagreed about launching war then he supports their troop. The *adversative* marker "*as"* is used as sign for contrast while the using of "*while*" gives expression to two ideas which contrast but do not contradict each other. The marker "*as*" is used 30 times and the marker "while" is used 8 times.

In the above example, we find the using of *sequence* markers "next", "then". The speaker uses this marker as a sign of moving toward a new step or an event in future and they are also considered as announcement markers which refer forward to future sections in the text. The marker "next" is used 3 times while "then" is used once.

Also, the marker *conclusive* marker "*finally*" is used to give a conclusive relationship of the context ideas. And to summarize, the speaker uses markers "*shortly*, *briefly*..." in order not to give more details. Each one of these markers is used once.

To indicate cause and result of events, the markers "*as a result, so, because"* are used. Obama talks about the reason behind the existence of American troops in Iraq and then he refers to the result after their withdrawal. So here, we have the using of "*because*" and "*so*". Both markers contribute to the

coherence of discourse by signalling relations between discourse units. The marker *"because"* is used by the speaker to indicate a relation of 'cause and result' while "*so"* is used to indicate a relation of 'premise and conclusion' and also indicating a result and to establish a causal link among events. Obama declares the end of the American mission and links it to the role of his troops and of the resilience of the Iraqi people. The marker "*so*" is used 12 times, while "*because*" is used 8 times and "*as a result*" is used only twice.

The using of the *reminder* marker "*as…said*" is used by the speaker referring to what is mentioned before this point of speech. And in order to draw the audience attention and focus on a certain point, the speaker uses a condensed expression such as "*let…*" referring to an important point in his speech. Here Obama refers to Afghanstan where al Qaeda exists. The marker "as….said" is used once and "let..." is used twice.

The *topicaliser* marker "*now*" is used 17 times. In his speeches, Obama refers to some events and relate them to each other .He mentions the attack of September and then relate this to the war in Afghanistan and Iraq. In this respect the use of "*now*" indicates temporal relationships between units of talk. Moreover, the marker "*now*" is used to make a shift among different ordered events and refer to what will happen next.

The *code glosses* markers "*this* and *that*" are used. They are used both as "logical markers" having the textual function in connecting sentences to what is said before and as "openers sentences" having the interpersonal function in opening a new paragraph. In the example text, "*that*" is used as an "opener sentence" and at the same time as a connector. The speaker uses the marker "that is" trying to re-express what is said before and as a *Code gloss* marker that explains, rephrases, expands or exemplifies propositional content. To sum up, it reflects the writer's expectations about the audience's knowledge or ability to follow the argument. The marker "that" is used 5 times and "this" is used 3 times.

Among the **interpersonal markers,** the most frequently used markers are the "*commentaries markers*". The marker "*we*" is used 111 times and "I" is used 55 times.The aim behind using it by a president is to develop the relationship with the listener by shortening the distance, regardless of their disparity in age, social status and to feel close to the speaker points. In the commentaries, especially "*we*" is used widely in both texts.

To refer to the probability of an event, *Hedges* markers like "*may*, *would*" are used. Also; they are used to withhold full commitment to the statements displayed in the text. Each one is used 5 times.

The *certainty* markers "*in fact*, *of course, cl*early" are used to admit unexpected events and to express a degree of certainty. Opama refers with certainty that violence will not end with the end of the combat mission.Also,he used "*clearly*" to ensure that health care legislation will not change their veterans benefits. In addition, the marker "*you know"* is used *as* a marker of meta-

knowledge about what speakers and hearers share and what is generally known. It is also used to indicate a situation in which the speaker knows that the hearer shares some knowledge about a particular piece of information. Each one of these markers are used twice but "clearly" is used once.

As an *attitude* marker, "*must*" is used to express the writer's affective values towards the audience and the content presented in the text. It is used 17 times.

Marker like "*unfortunately*" is used to express an *attitude* by the speaker. The speaker used this marker as an opener marker to describe the situation. It is used once.

Then, other *attitude* markers but adjectival ones. He used "*difficult*" and "easy" referring to the situation. They are used once.

Also, the *cognitive* verbs markers such as "*think*, *believe*" are used as attitude markers which reflect the speaker's ideas. Each one is used once.

Conclusion

Depending on the statistical analysis above, it is clear that among the *textual* markers, the most frequently used marker is "*and*". It is used 237 times. The using of the marker "*and*" is very important because it has both cohesive and structural roles; it is structural in the sense of linking two (or more) syntactic units such as clauses, phrases or verbs, and cohesive because the interpretation of the whole conjunctive utterance depends on the combination of both conjuncts.

In addition, the marker "*and*" can precede support units of talk (explanation, evidence and clarification to previous units). Also, it can have a pragmatic effect in the sense that it indicates a speaker's continuation. However, "*and*" does not provide information about what is being continued. It is used to indicate the speaker's continuation.

Among the *interpersonal* markers, the most frequently used marker is   "*we*". The marker "*we*" is used 111 times. The importance behind using this pronoun lies in shortening the distance between the speaker and the audience, regardless of their disparity in age, social status and professions and it may include both the speaker and the listener into the same arena, and thus make the audience feel close to the speaker and his points.

The result of the analysis shows the following functions which are achieved by using the markers in the two speeches:
1- The most used metadiscourse markers in the analysis are the *logical* and the *personal markers* which play a key role in the construction of persuasion. *Logical markers* have a pragmatic effect, they add, sequence, contrast or conclude a number of ideas and they are essential to the overall persuasive effect of a text, in addition to the *personal markers* which also contribute to the development of a relationship with the reader that is inherently persuasive.

2- In addition, among the interpersonal markers, the "attitude markers" are used frequently to describe the situation to reflect the speaker's ideas and affective values towards the audiences and indicate his attitude.

3-Discourse markers assume a pragmatic function.So, in order to attain certain goals relatable to the complex pattern of social interactions; political figures (leaders) use specific discourse markers to influence the hearers mentally or emotionally, thus modifying their knowledge, convictions or feelings.

4- Among the textual markers, the logical markers are the most frequently used to convey the speaker's message and translate his communicative strategy.

5-Also, the textual markers are used more than the interpersonal markers because the textual markers play a cohesive role in constructing meaning.

6-Finally, The interpersonal markers help in shortening the social distance between the speaker and the hearer and sharing knowledge.

Bibliography

Aijmer, Karin (1996). *Conversational Routines in English: Convention   and Creativity*. London: Longman.

Blakemore, Diane (1988). "So' as a constraint on relevance". In *Mental Representations: The Interface between language and Reality*. (Ed.)R. M. Kempson.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

………………… (1992) *Understanding Utterances. An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

………………….(2006) "Discourse Markers" .*The Handbook of Pragmatics*. (Eds.) Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Chilton, Paul and Schaffner, Christina (2002).*Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse.*Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chruszczewski, Piotr (2002). *The Communicational Grammar of Political Discourse.* Berlin: Logos.

Van Dijk, Teun A (1997) "What is the Political Discourse?" In: *Belgian Journal of Linguistics: Political Linguistics*. (Eds.). J. Bloom mart and Ch. Bulcaen. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Company.

Dik, Simon, C (1987). "Some principles of functional grammar". In: *Functionalism in Linguistics*. (Eds). René Dirven and Fried, V. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Downing, Angela. (2006). "The English Pragmatic Marker surely and its Functional Counterparts in Spanish". In: *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*. (Eds.) Aijmer, Karin and Simon-Vandenbergen. Oxford: Elsevier.

Eggins, Suzanne (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Second Edition. New York/London: Continuum.

Ghil'ad, Zuckermann (2009). *Hybridity versus Revivability: Multiple Causation, Forms and Patterns.* In: *Journal of Language Contact*. Varia 2. p. 50.

Graber, Doris (1993) "Political Communication: Scope, Progress, Promise". In: *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II.* (Ed.) A.W. Finifter. Washington D.C. American Political Science Association.

Grabias, Stanisław (2001).*Language in Social and Cultural Behaviors.* Lublin: Skłodowskiej.

Halliday, M.A.K (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Second Edition,London & New York: Arnold.

Halliday,M.& Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hansen, Mosegaard (1998). *The Function of Discourse Particles.* Vol.53: Pragmatics & Beyond New Series. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hudson, Kenneth (1978).*The Language of Modern Politics.* London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). *Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. Applied Linguistics*: Oxford

Lenk, Uta (1995). "Discourse markers and conversational coherence". In: *Organization in Discourse. Proceedings from the Turku Conference.* B. Wårvik, S.-K. Tanskanen, and R. Hiltunen (Eds.). Turku: University of Turku.

…………. (1997). "Discourse markers". In: *Handbook of Pragmatics*. (Eds.) J. Verschueren, J.-O. Östman, J. Blommaert, and C.Bulcaen. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lynn, Carol; Moder, Aida and Martinovic, Zic. (2004). *Discourse Across Languages and Cultures*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Muller, Simone (2005).*Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse.* John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia

Murar, Ioana (2008). "The Functionality of Discourse Markers in Conversational Text". In: *Annals of the University of Craiova*, *Series Philology*.Craiova: Universitaria Craiova.

Risselada, Rodie and Spooren, Wilbert (1998). "Introduction: Discourse markers and coherence relations". In: *Journal of Pragmatics.30*, 131–133.

Schiffrin, Deborah (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

……………….. (2006). "Discourse marker research and theory" In: *Approaches to discourse particles.* (Ed.) Fischer, Kerstin. Oxford: Elsevier.

Siepmann, Dirk (2005). *Discourse Markers across Languages. A contrastive study of second-level discourse markers in native and non-native text with implications for general and pedagogic lexicography*. Routledge: USA and Canada.

Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Swan, Michael (2005). *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yumin, Cheng (2007)."An Analysis of Style Features of Inaugural Speeches Given by American Presidents Based on the Functional Theory of Han Lide". Thesis of a Mster. Tai Yuan science University.

مؤثرات الخطاب في الخطابات السياسية
الأشكال والوظائف

هند لؤي اسماعيل
جامعة الانبار / كلية التربية للبنات / قسم اللغة الانكليزية

الخلاصة

مؤشرات الخطاب هي مصطلحات تستعمل في ربط الجمل السابقة بالتي تليها وتستعمل ايضا للاشارة الى اتجاهات المتكلم.كونها مصطلحات لغوية, فإن مؤشرات الخطاب لها وظائف مهمه في مختلف انواع الخطابات.وكونها رابط فـأن مؤشـرات الخطـاب تستعمل فـي ربط الجمل والعبـارات والمقـاطع بعضها .   دة من اهم الوظائف ايضا هو استخدامها للاشاره الى نوع العلاقة بين المتكلم والمستمع خلال (لينك   :   ).

مـن خـلال الخطـاب السـياسي ,نلاحظ استحصال انـواع مختلفـه مـن مؤشـرات الخطاب.هذا البحـث سـوف يتنـاول أهميـة مؤشـرات الخطـاب ووظائفـه وسـيحاول تـسليط الـضوء عـلى أنـواع مؤشـرات الخطاب المستخدمة في الخطاب السياسي من خلال تحليل خطاب الرئيس الأمريكي، باراك أوباما، اعتمادا على تصنيف هايلاند وتسي (٢٠٠٤) لمؤشرات الخطاب؛ المؤشرات الشخصية والنصية. النتائج توضح بصفتها وسيلة للتفاعل الاجتماعي هدفها التأثير   .