DEMOCRATIC AND POPULAR REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA

MINISTERY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF ABDELHAMID IBN BADIS MOSTAGANEM

FACULTY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE

UNIVERSITE
Abdelhamid Ibn Badis
MOSTAGANEM

MASTER

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

The Interpretation of Discourse Markers in Trump's Political Speeches

Case Study: The Function of The Markers *so, anyway, you know* in Trump's Selected Speeches 2017

Submitted By:

DJENNANE Amine

Board of Examiners:

President: BENAGUROUZI FATIMA ZOHRA   University of Mostaganem

Supervisor: DERRAZ AMEL   University of Mostaganem

Examiner: KHAROUBI MOUNIRA   University of Mostaganem

Academic Year

2017-2018

Dedication

In the name of ALLAH, most gracious, most merciful, all the praise is due to ALLAH alone, the sustainer of all the worlds.

This project is lovingly dedicated to my respective family who has been my source of inspiration. To my mother who has sacrifice her life to make me the person I am today. To a person who I will not mentioned her name, this person support me during two years. To all friends with whom I shared the university life. To all my dearest English teachers. Special gratitude is due to all those extraordinary people who have stood by me in very hard moment. To all those who love me.

Acknowledgements

This work never be accomplished without the strength and ability that ALLAH Almighty gad given me, all praise is to ALLAH alone.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Mrs DERRAZ AMEL who has been generous in giving me her time and knowledge and for her perfect sense of understanding and patience during the progress of this work, and a special thanks to the member of jury namely Mrs MOUNIRA KHAROUBI and BENAGUROUZI FATIMA ZOHRA for offering their time to evaluate my work.

Moreover, my special thanks to my teacher and friend Mr Moulai Hassan Yacine who supplied me with books, and who guide me to how put all these information in an academic way.

A great thanks to all teachers generally and Ell teachers especially, also my gratitude to Mrs BENAGUROUZI FATIMA ZOHRA who gave me the inspiration to finish this work.

To all Ell students.

Abstract

The purpose is to investigate the role of discourse markers in Trump's speeches in influencing the audience. The main issue raised in this research is the source of the impact of Trump's language in his speeches on both U.S citizens and international community. The research tackles one aspect from many aspects that revealed this influence which is the function of discourse markers. To raise this research, a qualitative research design has been adopted where the observation was the method that has been applied in a descriptive framework. The sample was collected from several political speeches: 'How Donald Trump answers a question 2017' from 'The Washington Post'. Then, the other sample was from an interview with New York Times reporters. Hence, data analysis reveals the validation of the hypothesis which says that the function of DMs mentioned in this study research have a deep impact on the interpretation of the meaning behind their use. The findings of this study obtained from the analysis of the samples mentioned which reveals that the use of Donald Trump discourse markers in his speeches has a great influence on the audience. The study confirmed that Trump has a linguistic capacities in influencing people in general. As a result, this impact leads Donald Trump to be as the most influential president of United States in the history of America according to Washington Post.

*Keywords***:** discourse markers, political speeches, pragmatics, speech act, political ideology, Donald Trump.

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

List of figures

Table of Contents

General Introduction

Political discourse has been considered as the most debatable topic in the field of discourse analysis. Accordingly, political discourse reflects the power and the ideology of politicians. Their aim is to convince people or general opinion about their political ideas and ideologies. Political discourse then refers to the discourse practices engaged in by all actors – from politicians and organizations to citizens- in a political process. The interaction between political discourse and the audience comes through language. Hence, the politician use different techniques to convince, hook and influence the hearer or the audience. Therefore, the field of discourse analysis studies those techniques used in language and in their speeches. Politicians uses also what linguists call 'discourse markers'. Discourse markers are considered as a sub-field to discourse analysis. It studies the function of items used to connect ideas in a given text either spoken or written. The present study tackles the impact of Trump's language on the public opinion. The study examines different discourse markers and the most common ones in his speeches.

The study focuses on the language influence in Trump's speeches and his specific manner in expressing his ideas, and especially when it comes to the foreign policy. It aims at exploring the linguistic features on the political speeches, thus Trump's speeches are considered as a sample to this study. In other words, the research work focuses on a linguistic feature in Trump's language namely, 'discourse markers' and their function in manipulating hearers' understanding. This can be seen through the impact of Trump's language on the audience. Besides, the research goes on identifying pragmatic function of certain discourse markers namely *so, you know, anyway* in political speeches.

The main questions raised in this research are: Why Trump's language is effective? What are the different techniques used by him? What are the other linguistic techniques that leads his language to this effectiveness? Therefore, the main focus of the current research is dealing with is investigating the source of this effectiveness in Trump's language from a linguistic point of view.

The major interest of this study is proving and investigating the hypothesis, which focuses on the idea that the audience' influence is much bigger on Trump's language. That is Trump's language is more effective than the other presidents of United State specifically, and in the world generally.

To carry out this research, the study considered a qualitative approach as a methodology to this research which is based on two method tools, namely, observation and analysis data. While, the framework is based on linguistic study. The objective from this study is to gather data related to the topic of dissertation and attempt answering the aforementioned research questions.

The current study is divided into three chapters; the two first chapters constitute the two theoretical part and the third chapter is an analysis of data collected and a description of the findings. Chapter one attempts to define the concept of discourse analysis as a basic approach to analyze texts both written and spoken. Then, it seeks to shed light on the different sub-fields of discourse analysis as principle elements as the relation between discourse and pragmatics focusing on the context of a text. In addition, the chapter tackles the critical discourse analysis as an approach which is close to the political discourse. It focuses on the power and ideology behind a political discourse as Van Dijk and Foucault refer to as a mirror to the power and ideology speaking about political discourse. Thus, chapter one introduces the whole field in order to put the reader on the right rail.

Chapter two puts an emphasis on the giving main field of discourse markers which is the core of the study. It gives illustrations and explanations of discourse markers and the relation between DMs and political discourse and the function of DMs on the political speeches. Hence, it concentrates on pragmatic use of selected markers namely *so, you know, anyway,* in Trump's speeches. As a result, chapter two helps the reader to understand what is meant by DMs and their function. This chapter, gives an idea about the practical part which is chapter three.

The third chapter differs from the previous two chapters where the focus falls on the research tools and data analysis of Trump's speeches and the function of the selected markers in his language. There are some suggestions and recommendations to the students to carry on studying other discourse markers such as *tremendous, well*, and so on. The main suggestion is to study the paralinguistic features of Donald Trump and how these paralinguistic features influence the audience.

Chapter One:

The Theoretical Framework of

Discourse Analysis

1.1. Introduction

This chapter goes on theoretical framework of Discourse Analysis. For many linguist, the field of discourse is useful in the case of analyzing different texts. The study of discourse analysis is useful and functional to show the relation between the discourse and text, even so, the meaning behind the text either written or spoken. Additionally, it deals with a several points of view by the most scholars in the field of discourse. Discourse can be found in different areas and disciplines. Humans use language to realize what is abstract in their minds to something concrete, this realization 'text' contains meanings. The work of discourse is to analyze the language in use which means the function of language.

1.2. The Discourse Analysis (Definition)

The first definition of the term discourse analysis was introduced by Zelling Harris (1952). Hence, the field of discourse analysis is seen as a way of analyzing connected speech and writing (Harris, 1952, p.12). Many linguists introduced discourse as the study of analyzing the function of language in use. Recent scholars and linguists defines discourse slight differently. According (Gee, 2014), discourse is sequence of sentences. He adds 'Discourse concerns how various sentences flowing one after the other to create meanings or to facilitate interpretation' (Gee, 2014, p.89). It means that language is a communication system that includes sounds, morphemes, words and rules to create coherent and cohesive sentences and utterances; the discourse analysis studies the function behind these sentences and extrapolates the meaning behind these sentences.

Gee points the following citation by saying that' when we speak or write we craft what we have to say to fit the situation or context in which we are communicating. But, at the same

time, how we speak or write creates that very situation or context' (Gee, 2014, p. 89). Indeed, in conversations, the speaker express his ideas according to a given situation and the context. The term discourse is taken here to refer both to what a text producer meant by a text and what a text means to the receiver (Widdowson, 2007, p. 56). In this definition Widdowson explains the relation between the speaker's attention and the hearer's understanding which means the interpretation is interrelated as Paltridge confirmed this relation between speaker's message and hearer's interpreting.

> 'Discourse analysis examines patterns of language across texts and considers the relationship between language and social and cultural contexts in which it is used. Discourse analysis also considers the ways that the use of language presents different views of the world and different understandings'.

> (Paltridge, 2006, p. 2)

Furthermore, Paltridge (2006) points that discourse analysis studies the relation between the text and the social and cultural context, which means that the text is the reflection of the context in other words the meaning behind a sentence that is produced to reflect an idea. However, this idea is related to social or cultural context. That notion of 'context' is well explained in the following citation by Van Dijk.

> 'We use the notion of 'context' whenever we want to indicate that some phenomenon, event, action or discourse needs to be seen or studied in relationship to its environment, that is, its 'surrounding' conditions and consequences'. (Dijk, 2008, p. 4)

Van Dijk (2008) explains that our understanding from a given text is based on our understanding the context beyond the text, whatever the speaker use the language, there is

always a meaning   and that meaning is related to a given context or a situation which means the use of discourse in action.

1.3.   Context and Discourse

In this title the main idea will be the relation between the context and discourse and how it is important to know and to understand the connection between them. Van Dijk (2008) in his book 'Discourse and Context' tackles the main function of context and how they enable constrain the production and comprehension of text and talk. Evrin (2014) on the other hand points that the context controls the language parameters.

'My claim is that context permeates language, that contextual assumptions affect how we understand language, and that contexts of speech have to be better understood to develop realistic theories of language and of language learning' (Ervin-Tripp, 2014, p. 21).

The context controls the text and generates the ideas in a given text. Ervin claims that the context constrains our understanding language and it helps better our interpretation of text and it also clarify the meaning. Hence, the topic or the subject of text will be clear and understood. Van Dijk (2008) focuses in his book on the function of context, he points that:" I shall start with a conceptual analysis of the possible relationships between context and discourse. These may be described in many terms, such as 'influence', 'control', 'mapping', 'manifestation', 'expression' and 'indexing', among others" (Dijk, 2008, p. 111).The notion of context describes the nature of text which means that the participants use the suitable register to the context or situation in appropriate text including the environment and the nature of conversation and the subject or 'the context'.

Van Dijk (1987) goes explaining ' I shall examine some of the crucial notions that are often used to describe the product of this contextual influence on discourse, such as style, register, genre, variation and related notions' (Van Dijk, 1987, p. 111). In the light of this citation, Van Dijk (1987) tackles data analysis which are the notions above, those notions clarify better the description of the contextual influence on discourse as mentioned above. This leads   to points a concept which is 'The Context of Situation' by Malinovski. Malinovski (1965) is an anthropologist who had invented this concept. His study was based on the study of language in action from social and cultural perspectives. Every word in language has its own function, one word can have several meaning according to the situation and context. Malinovski made experiment on 'Trobiana tribes', he wanted to introduce 'Kirinuian' Trobiana's language to the English people. Malinovski's view focuses on the translation of Trobiana's language by introducing their culture, as a result, he provided the language in action including knowledge from cultural characteristics so he invented the concept of 'Context of Situation'.

Later on the Malinovski's concept was adopted by a linguist his name is Firth and he made a linguistic framework. According to Firth ' All linguistic was the study of meaning and all meaning was function in a context' (cited in Hassan, 1995, p. 8). The study of meaning is related to the context, and whenever there is context there is discourse. It is better to clarify and illustrate with an example, the word 'sorry' is meaningful but it does not mean always that someone apologize, it could be asking for request or asking for repetition for example, as a result, the word 'sorry' changes its meaning according to the context of situation.

Van Dijk states 'I shall focus particularly on the contextual control of discourse structure, assuming that the influence of context on grammar, that is, on phonology, prosody, syntax and lexicon, is well known' (cited in Widdowson, 2007, p. 111). The grammatical structures

and lexical grammar are controlled by the contextual influence, which means every change in context will influence on the lexical semantics and syntactic structure.

Widdowson points that the production of language in the process of communication does not come random but, the production comes in purpose. He said that the context is the head of our knowledge and believe. He continues by saying that the sense of our language is the realization of discourse from the text (Widdowson, 2007, p. 112). However, the context can be viewed on both written and spoken text.

1.4. Spoken and Written Text

First of all, it is very important to introduce the text so what is a text? Widdowson introduces the text as follows:" We identify a piece of language as a text as soon as we recognize that it has been produced for communicative purpose" (Widdowson, 2007, p. 4). Of course, every text has its purpose not only the matter of just producing the text random but, the aim from producing text is to connect the interpretation of what is behind the text to the other participant.

Second, it is very important also before getting to the main point which is obvious in the title, that to show the relation between text and discourse. Widdowson (2007) clarifies the point by saying that people produce language in order to communicate or express or pass a message through a text. He says 'We can refer to this complex of communicative purposes as the discourse that underlies the text and motivates its production in the first place' (Widdowson, 2007, p. 6). In the light of this citation, the discourse is a tool to analyze the purpose behind the text, and also to shed light on the interpretation of text. In addition,

Chapter One: A Theoretical Framework of Discourse Analysis

10

----

discourse focuses on what is meant and what is mediated in the text and sometimes it tackles different issues in different aspects of life through text.

Third, the main point is the spoken and written text. Starting with the spoken text, one knows that people when communicating they use language as a tool to express their ideas, feelings, experiences and so on. They use semantic resources encoded in their language, not only linguistic texts but also the paralinguistic language like tones of voice, face emotions, body gestures like in theatre for example and it is called also a performance language. Widdowson (2007) points that the participants communicate to get their intended message across to some second person party (Widdowson, 2007, p.6). On the other hand, in written communication, the written text can be shaped by typographical style and accompanied with pictures, diagrams, charts, and so on. For example, the writer in literature use his own style and his own techniques to hook and make the reader think. The reason behind that is to attract the reader's attention. However, the written use compressed language using semantic meaning, deep structures, for grounding, the aim behind the use of semantic meaning is to serve at the first position a pragmatic purpose. Eventually, it seems necessary to shed light the connection between the text and the context.

1.5. Text Meaning and Context

Text and context are working together, they cannot be isolated from one another. The text is considered as a representation of context and the context itself is shaped in a text. Moreover, the meaning of a passage or a story is the outcome of the relationship between text and context. Then, the context is classified as co-text, situational context and cultural context. A context in a conversation is a setting of words or events. Thus, participants in a

conversation uses utterances based on their social, cultural, personal identities, beliefs in the aim of interact one another in socially and culturally defined situations.

According to Widdowson (2007) the context is related to the actual circumstances of time and place, the here and now, he says ' When people talk to each other, they will naturally make reference to what is present in such situation-present in the sense of both place(here) and time(now)' (Widdowson, 2007, p. 19). It means that when people communicate, they take in consideration the environment and the present place, the context changes when the time and the place change, as a result, the text contains meanings related to the context of situation that is controlled by the place and the time. But, how could be the coherence of the ideas in a given context?

1.6.   Cohesion and Coherence of Co-textual relations

Widdowson (2007) explains the term cohesive and coherent as following 'Texts are made cohesive depending on the judgment of the producers of the texts in speech or writing' (Widdowson, 2007, p.28). It means that a text may be cohesive without necessarily being coherent, in other words, cohesion does not spawn coherence. Cohesion is determined by lexically and grammatically inter sentential relationships, whereas coherence based on semantic relationship.

As a way of illustrating, it is better to take example to understand better. After the tragedy that took place in 9/11, Americans took a stand from the terrorism in the world. So if one American read a text in newspaper or title or phrase written 'the terrorist threat', he relate the text to the event that he witnessed in 9/11. In other words, the phrase share knowledge but

there has been no mention to the threat in the text itself. As a result, the readers will already know about it and interpret the text to what happened in 9/11.

The main point in this relation between cohesion and coherence is no matter how cohesive a text can be related to the co-textual contents but the point is to focus on how cohesive a text is related to the co-textual realities and ideational and interpersonal function that participants are familiar with the social and culture realities in their daily life. Widdowson clarifies the function of 'cohesive devices' and its function.

> ' Cohesive devices are only aids to understanding and can
>
> only be effective to the extent that they enable readers to
>
> construct meaning that makes contextual sense to them, in
>
> other words to the extent that the cohesion in the text
>
> enables them to derive a coherent discourse from it'.
>
> (Widdowson, 2007, p. 49)

It is clear that the cohesion of text depends on to what extent the readers or listeners will understand and interpret the meaning that meaning is related to the contextual sense. Thus, in the previous example, text contain meanings which are related to co-textual realities. Furthermore, the cohesion of a text enable readers or listeners to make a coherent discourse for it. Mainly, the study of discourse focuses on the meaning in a context and this is the study of pragmatics.

1.7.   **Discourse and Pragmatics**

Before showing the link between discourse and pragmatics, it is essential to give a small hint about what is meant by pragmatics and what is the importance to know the link between discourse and pragmatics. There are many definitions about what is pragmatics but all linguists and scholars all over the world share the same concept of pragmatics. Paltridge (2006) identifies the concept as follows 'Pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to the context in which a person is speaking or writing' (Paltridge, 2006, p. 38). So it is obvious that pragmatics is concerns with meaning in a given context. In addition, there are many factors influencing the study of meaning like the social context, cultural context, the context of situation. Those factors are crucial of the impact in generating, understanding and interpreting the meaning. It is just like predicting the weather many factors are involved.

The analysis of an utterance of people interaction shows how important is the study of pragmatics. The text is the concrete action of what is behind the brain. The meaning behind a text is the underground of what is seen. Discourse analysis works to discover the underground, what is hidden, that why discourse and pragmatics are working together to give a clear image of the form and the meaning of a text. There are key aspects influencing the text, as it is mentioned in the previous paragraph. There is the context of situation, social and cultural context and so on. Paltridge illustrates 'Each of these impacts on what we say and how other people interpret what we say in spoken and written discourse' (Paltridge, 2006, p. 39). Of course, all these key aspects including physical context and mental words and even the role of people are involved in the interaction.

Discourse analysis focuses not only on the text but on the context which is behind the meaning. There is another key aspect that has influenced the production and the interpretation of discourse. This key is the 'background knowledge context' that is people generally in the interaction usually use their ideas from their experiences and background knowledge and this is called in the SFL by Halliday (1978), *'the textual meta-function'*. The textual meta-function means the generating of ideas used by people from their experiences or as it is called from their 'background knowledge'.

Some people confuse between pragmatics and semantics. Some of them claim that they are the same but in fact they are not. Semantics concerns with study of what does words means by themselves (Cutting, 2005, p. 2). Back to the main point, discourse and pragmatics look both to the discourse and study the function of language as known as both analyze the text as a piece of spoken or written discourse. Joun points that 'Discourse analysis calls the quality being 'meaningful and unified' coherence, pragmatics calls it relevance' (Joun, 2009, p.161). Both approaches focus on the cohesion of co-textual interpretation and the meaning behind the context discourse which should be appropriate to the context of situation. It is noticeable that pragmatics is field that is present in all aspects of discourse. In the domain of politics, the study of critical discourse analysis show the deep structure of the context and meaning behind a political discourse.

1.8. Critical Discourse analysis in the political speeches

The field of critical discourse analysis is based on the analysis of the social, gender, identity and how these are reflects a particular texts. It reflects the social and political issues which are constructed in discourse.

'Critical discourse analysis explores the connections between the use of language and the social and political contexts in which it occurs. It explores issues such as gender, ethnicity, cultural difference, ideology and identity and how these are both constructed and reflected in texts'.

(Cutting, 2005, p. 186)

As Cutting states, it is clear to notice that critical discourse analysis reflect the social relations through discourse (Cutting, 2005, p.186). It tackles the political issues, social power and ideologies presented in discourse texts. It is manifestation of how discourse is produced to rule people (tribes, nations, empire). In addition, critical discourse analysis studies the social world and how it is influenced by various sources of power. The CDA does not concern to contribute to a specific paradigm, school or discourse theory. It is primarily interested on the social issues, which is better understood through discourse (Dijk V. , Discourse and society, 1993, p. 54). According to Fairelough and Wodak (1997), the CDA addresses social problems and it shows that the relation between text and society is mediated (Van Dijk, 1993, p.55).

Without getting deeper into the field of CDA, the aim from this study is to show the objective of CDA as a sub-discipline to the discourse analysis. In the example of the political discourse, CDA works on the power mediated through a social context, this social context reflect an ideology based on power status and authority. The political texts either written or spoken practice a social abuse to the public opinion. This is wide spread nowadays like for example Trump's speeches. In his speeches he use many words which reflect his hatred towards other ethnic groups (black Americans), towards other religions (Muslim community) and so on. So he practices a social abuse and his speeches represent ideologies which is

produced and reflected in the use of discourse as Paltridge (2006) confirmed in the following citation.

> 'Whatever genre we are involved in, and whatever the register of the situation, our use of language will also be influenced by our ideological positions: the values hold (consciously or unconsciously), the biases and perspectives we adopt'. (Paltridge, 2006, p. 190)

Moreover, Fairelough (1997) said that CDA is characterized by the common interests in demystifying ideologies and power through the systematic investigation of semiotic data, be they written, spoken or visual (Clive Seale, 2006, p. 185_186). Thus, defining the features of CDA are its concerns with power and central condition in social life. In other words, the practice of power and ideology through a social discourse. Problems in societies are major and it may not be seen from a single point of view. It could be seen through different dimensions and in corporation of several disciplines and work in neighboring to analyze those different criteria and problems in societies. The field of discourse could not work isolated in investigating those criteria but in corporation with other fields like for CDA. There is no single definition or view unified the CDA but all agree about the function of the field in analysis and investigating the power and social discourse through different texts. It is said that power reflect ideology in the political discourse.

1.8.1. Critical Discourse Analysis to Power and Ideology

'The strongest is never strong enough always to be master, unless he transformed strength into right, and obedience into duty'. (Roussea, 2017, p. 4). In the light of Roussea's citation, it is clear to shed light on the relation between power and ideology through theories of the most

common scholars and linguists. According to the citation, a person who has powerful position and high status in society should not use his power to show his authority towards people in general. The position and power is used to serve people and society and to give them their rights, this is the real power and strength according to Roussea.

In the CDA, language both reflects and recreates power providing a useful starting point of knowledge of how power is exercised and practiced (Elsharkawi, 2017). Micheal Foucault (1979) extended the discussion of the concept of in terms of two principles: the first is decentralization of power position and the other is disciplinary power and knowledge (Foucault, 1979, p.92). Foucault (1979) introduced the concept of power in new disciplines such as medicine, psychiatry, penology and human sexuality. His work are wide extended and applied to new domains like criticism of literature, cinema, film, art, semiotics, feminist analysis, social history, and theories of planning (Foucault, 1979, p.92).

In the same time, power is considered as a reflection to ideology which mediated by political discourse and social discourse too. In contrast to Marxism and Marxist sociology, which focuses on power concentrated on ruling class and rooted in economies and involves class struggle. Foucault (1979) sees that power is not located in the state apparatus but in individuals (Ibid). Lukas (2005) broadly clarified his view of power, expanding a capacity rather than the exercise of such capacity. Foucault, therefore, stresses the importance of local study of discourse to analyze its power as nothing is meaningful outside discourse, following somehow a structuralist point of view (Elsharkawi, 2017, p. 4).

Theoretically, the roots of the concept of power have been grounded in political theory and political philosophy. Machiavelli saw power as a means, not a resource, and sought strategic

advantages, such as military ones. The power in the political practices is used to rule people through exercising obedience through social discourse. Therefore, the use of social discourse in political practices nowadays becomes a habit. Every source of power reflect an ideology. The reason behind that CDA investigate the sources of power and focuses on the study of ideology.

Language, in this respect, is not simply a tool of communication, but a means by which people demonstrate their commitment. Hence, it is also a tool to practice authority to rule, practice power under the shape of political position, not only political but even social position or status.

The intended power here is not the physical power (e.x, naked power) that is based on force and fear, coercing people into submission, but the one that goes beyond such very limited relations to be the means by which people communicate to make effect and change (Elsharkawi, 2017). As it is mentioned in the previous paragraphs, the power is not concerns with the power of ruling or as it is called 'the power of hammer', and it is not to practice ideology faked in a power face. In other words, it is manifestation of how discourse is produced to rule people. The role of CDA is to show the practice of power and its relation with ideology through the use of social discourse, in the aim to show the strength in order to submit people to the call of authority.

Fairclough and Van Dijk (1987) insist on considering media as the mind control mediated through discourse. They both perceive the recipients good receivers of beliefs, knowledge, and opinions specially, when it comes through discourse from scholars, experts, professors, reliable media. According to Van Dijk (1987), ideology is a system of belief which shared by

a member of social groups. Those ideologies are represented through discourse. There is the lack of explicit insertion which means what is said is not going be challenged, and the feedback will be either acceptance or rejection. There are other features that influence analysis of discourse such as, paralinguistic feature and so on. Austin has established his approach, it is called 'the speech act theory' which study those features. Austin's approach is based on how we can do things with words.

1.9.   Speech Act Theory

There are two leaders of this concept of speech act theory are J.L Austin and Searl (1962). Austin's concept is based on how people can do things with words. Austin formulated a method to describe a sentence in terms of speech situation where it is uttered: by means of associated linguistic conventions, the speaker, with an associated intention, actually performs an act to the hearer, which induces a certain response from hearer.

Speech act theory aims at relating three aspects of utterances; first, the types of actions that are being used to perform, such as asserting and convincing. Second, the syntactic and semantic features of the utterances, such as their sentence type (declarative, interrogative, imperative) propositional content, and intonation patterns. Third, the state of word before and after the utterance, particularly the mental state of participants and observers (Philip R. Cohen, 1990, p. 73).

Austin (1962) calls three levels of speech act theory. The first level is called locutionary act which means a clear well-formed sentence of English, with definite sense and reference syntactically, semantically, and phonetically speaking that means, the performance of an utterance. Second called illucionary act, for example, a person who is setting in a room with

his friend and he says: I feel cold, which means indirectly use utterance to turn on the hit or to shut the window since he feels cold, in other words the use of words to do things a performative words. Finally, by keeping the same example, he may convince him that it is cold, or even that you should turn up the heat. These actions performed by saying something Austin calls perloctionary acts. A speaker can perform an illuctionary act successfully while failing to carry out a related perloctionary act (Philip R. Cohen, 1990, p. 65).

Searle (1975) views illocutionary acts primary as moves made as part of a larger social activity, and he regards their felicitous performance as being governed by what he calls constitutive rules (Philip R. Cohen, 1990, p. 76). It is kind of critical view to Austin's theory which is not exactly as it is in reality. Searle views discuss the performative utterance as not always do or performe things under the shape of illuctionary act, but it has another side or a call which is as Searle calls constitutive rule.

Another view from other scholars such as Cohen and Levesque (1985) (hereafter C.L). They propose a theory of speech acts in four parts. First, an account of some propositional attitudes (such as belief, knowledge, intention). Second, a theory of action and its relation to the attitudes, describing those necessary to engage in action and those resulting from it, which means the performative message and the feedback of hearer intention. Third, a description of the effects of locutionary acts on the mental state of the participants, that is, of sentences with particular syntactic and semantic features. Hence, the analysis of the response of locutionary acts at the cognitive level and how the order of words sentences is grammatically accepted and semantically too. Finally, the definition of the performance of illuctionary acts as the performance of any action, linguistic or otherwise, under appropriate circumstances by speaker holding certain intention (Cohen, 1985, p.23).

Austin theory shows the importance of language, words precisely to do things and perform with an utterance phonetically, verbal, syntactically and semantically. Austin calls this loctionary, and he considered illuctionary act as the central of speech like promising, ordering…, which means how to do things with words, he said that by saying something, we do something. Finally, he calls the third part of theory the perlocutionary which means the reaction or the feedback of the hearer.

1.10. Conclusion

This chapter was an introduction to the field of discourse analysis and definitions of the main sub-field which are all related to discourse analysis. It has been revealed that discourse analysis is necessarily to analyze the language in use. Discourse analysis focuses on the study of text and its context. Hence, it is very important to show the reflection of context on the utterance of speaking. Thus, lead to examine text in relation to the context since, the context who rules and generates the text. Discourse examine both written and spoken text. The difference is that written text concerns with the style and syntactic structure and semantics, also the form and purpose. Therefore, the spoken texts concerns with the performance of the speaker and his intention. In addition, discourse analysis examines the meaning of the text, it shed light what is beyond the text, the underground of what is hidden which is the meaning. This meaning is controlled by what is called the context of situation. Then, the chapter tackles another essential point which is pragmatics. It is said that both discourse and pragmatics are two fields who works together. Accordingly, pragmatics examines the meaning of text in the social discourse. It reflects the sense of what is said or written. Van Dijk (1987) shows the

work practice of the CDA which it deals with politics to criticize ideology and political

system. Finally, Austin theory of the speech act which is the performance of utterance.

Chapter Two:

The Study of Discourse Markers in the Political Speeches: So, Anyway, You know

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the major study will be focused on the theoretical framework about discourse markers. It is important to show the relation between discourse analysis as a central background of the field of discourse markers. Thus, people use language to express the content of their ideas meanwhile, they use elements or words which helps them in the connection of their ideas. This elements is called 'marks'. Discourse markers can be seen in several field of speech. The chapter tackles the use of discourse markers in the field of political speeches. As the previous chapter, this chapter focuses on both semantic and pragmatics as approaches to the field of discourse markers and show the relation between them. Finally, the chapter clarify the whole approach in giving example of so, anyway, you know, to satisfy reader's understanding.

2.2. Discourse Markers (definition)

Discourse markers are words used in utterance or it is rhythm connect different parts of text structure. According to Schiffrin, he defines discourse markers as 'sequentially dependent element which brackets units of talk' (Deborah, 1988, p. 5). These elements unify the utterance in a given situation and helps reaching the actual context. Deborah states that language is potentially sensitive to all of the contexts in which it occurs, and, even more strongly, that language reflects those contexts because it helps to constitute them (Deborah, 1988, p. 8). Discourse markers signal a sequence relationship between the actual message and the previous discourse.

Blakmore defines discourse markers as 'discourse connections' (Blakmore, 2002, p. 16). Blakemore relevant theory (1992) provides theoretical perspective based on relieved theory, she worked on a group of discourse markers and she focused on semantic constrains on relevance (conventional implicature) (Blakmore, 2002). As it is seen, she changed the name of DM into 'discourse connectives'. The reason for changing the name as she claims, because they play (discourse connectives) a constraining role on implicatures. To more understanding about what is DMs, the DMs are words or connectors connect the link between two ideas. Benedito Almeida (1999) put DMs in the following table:

Table 1. List of DMs (Benedito Almeida, 1999, p.75)

Contrast	Addition	Condition	Time	Reason	Conclusion	Topic	purpose
Although	Moreover	If	While	Because	Therefore	On	In order to
But	Furthermore	Whether	Prior to	Because of	Then	About	So as to
Despite	In addition	Unless	Before	Due to	This	Concerning	
Even more	As well as	Otherwise(is not)	Then	As	Thereby	regarding	
However	Likewise	As long as	Since	Owing to	So		
In spite of	Besides	So long	Until	On the basis	According		

		as		that	ly		
Instead		Provided that	Afterwards	Since			
Nevertheless			Meanwhile	Considering that			
Notwithstanding			Thereafter				
On the other hand			Henceforth				
Otherwise							
Rather than							
Regardless							
Still							
Such that							
Hence							
As a result							
As a sequence							
Though							
Unlike							
Whereas							
Yet							

(Almeida, p. 75)

There still other DMs which are not mentioned in the previous table. As it seems to be clear that these connective forms are essential to make explicit implicit relations between clauses and sentences (Goutsos, 1997,2004, p. 7). In the other hand, considering Fraser and Shiffrin as the most common scholars in the field of DM, both have list of DMs (Blakmore, 2002, p. 12):

'Consequently, also, above all, again, anyway, alright, alternatively, besides, conversely, in other words, in any event, meanwhile, more precisely, nevertheless, next, otherwise, similarly, or, and, equally, finally, in that case, in the meantime, incidentally, OK, listen, look, on the one hand, that said, to conclude, to return, to my point, while I have you' (Frazer, 1990, cited in Blakmore, 2002 p.12).

Blakmore (2002) adds more list of DMs, the following citation shows the added list:

'Oh, well, but, and, or, so, because, now, then, I mean, y'know, see, look, listen, here, there, why, gosh, boy, this is the point, what I mean is, anyway, whatever' (Shiffrin, 1987, cited in Blakmore, 2002 p.25).

Blakmore (2002) comments about the previous lists of Fraser and Shiffrin by saying that the role of both Fraser and Shiffrin must be focused on the description of those terms at the level of discourse rather than the sentence. On the other hand, the term 'marker' is intended to underline the fact that their meanings must be analyzed in terms of what they indicate or mark rather than what they describe (Blakmore, 2002, p. 1).

The study of discourse markers focuses on the multifunctional forms operating on both a structural and an interactional level and developing from open-class words through processes of grammaticalization (Lutzky, 2012, p. 6). Phrasal and clausal discourse markers will, on the other hand, not be discussed as they do not form part of the empirical analysis (Lutzky, 2012, p. 6). DMs plays an important role on the coherence of the ideas in a text. It gives a transaction from the smallest shape of sentence which is the clause to another sentence or clause in a text.

Discourse markers appear short phonologically, and usual they are shape of a separate tone groups. Whereas, there are other DMs which are completely integrated prosodically as well as syntactically, and semantically (Urgelles-Coll, 2010, p. 9).

2.3. Types of Discourse Markers

One of the most scholars on the field of discourse markers is Bruce Fraser. He has distinguished DMs into 3 major types: the first one is basic, which means the signal of speaker's basic communication intention, it means that the force of the sentence in an utterance when used literal communication (Fraser, 1988, p.11). In addition, a basic marker is the declarative syntactic structure, signaling speaker belief (Fraser, 1988, p.11). Second type is commentary marker, which means signaling a comment in an utterance to the effect that the speaker does expect that his sentence content will be rejected from the hearer (Fraser, 1988, p.11). Fraser called the last type 'a parallel marker' which means that the speaker intends to clarify the difference to the hearer.

DMs contribute on the coherence of ideas in an utterance beyond the semantics and pragmatic senses. Fraser (1998, p.301) call discourse marker analysis 'a growth market in linguistic' (Deborah Shiffrin, 2008, p. 57). Halliday and Hasan analysis were based on the written text, when speaking about discourse and cohesion, they propose a set of cohesive devises such as (reference, repetition, substitution, ellipsis, and conjuctions) (Deborah Shiffrin, 2008, p. 61). Those devises help for creating a semantic relation in an underlying a set of content ideas (Deborah Shiffrin, 2008, p. 62). The DMs are the clue of pragmatic meaning in a written or spoken text. Every device of the previous devices mentioned is important for the cohesion of ideas and gives a correct shape and a correct grammatical structure.

2.4. Discourse Markers in the Political Speeches

Van Dijk (1977) says 'Political discourse is identified by its actors or authors, viz; Politicians' (Van Dijk, 1977, p.12). The majority of political discourse are provided by presidents, prime ministers and other members of government policy. The political discourse can be seen in many political fields and in several political domains practiced by politicians, they are 'Participating in political actions, such as governing, ruling, legislating, protesting, dissenting or voting' (Van Dijk, 1977, p.14). Thus, the domain of political context is crucial for political discourse. Almost, all political events have particular setting, circumstances, environment, functions and aims. Hence, the political discourse is seen in the political actions professionally in contextualized communicative events such as' cabinet meeting, parliamentary sessions, election campaigns, rallies, interviews with the media, bureaucratic practices, protest demonstrations'(Van Dijk, 1977, pp. 13-14).

Van Dijk (1977) suggests that there are characterizations of political genres and provides an exemplary illustrations of the political definition and contextualization of parliamentary debate (Van Dijk, 1977, p. 19), domain (politics), system (democracy), institution (parliament), values and ideologies (democracy, group and party ideologies), organizations (political parties, lobbyists), political actors (members of parliament, cabinet ministers), political actions (political decision making), political cognitions (attitudes about the relevant issue (e.x, about abortion, affirmative action or nuclear energy)) (Van Dijk, 1977, p.19).

Shiffrin (1987) says that DMs is important to organize speech act and ideas, which is useful for the coherence of ideas. Then, it helps the interaction and the presentation of information (Shiffrin, 1987, p. 315 cited in Junkova 2016, p.3). Hence, DMs helps to reduce hearer's effort to understand and interpret the message behind a text. DMs is functional for the coherence of ideas as it is said and helps the turning back of the previous subject of discussion or moving toward to the next subject of discussion. In addition, DMs are useful for explaining, clarifying, specifying, reorganizing the content of ideas in a given text.

Politicians use DMs for the connection of their ideas and even more for the communication with the audience and participants in different areas. DMs can be viewed in different speeches and in every political events. DMs hooks the hearer's attention and it helps to catch their interest and makes a reaction or the feedback to the listeners.

> 'Politicians will tend to emphasize all meanings that are positive about themselves and their own group (nation, party, ideology..) and negative about the others, while they will hide mitigate, play-down, leave

Chapter Two: The Study of Discourse Markers in the Political Speeches

30

----

implicit,information that will give them a bad impression and their

opponents a good impression' (Van Dijk, 1997 pp. 32-33).

In the light of previous citation, it is seen that the markers are devices which dictate and

organize and influence the connection between the audience and the development of the

interaction.

DMs are involved in the political discourse for aim that the markers have a role of

conveying the intended of context behind the message in either spoken and written texts.

Thus, it persuades the audience the validity of their ideas, ideologies, claim, and give the

impact to the public opinion, and also influence their beliefs and attitudes for the reason of

achieving a certain goals in addition, to mark speaker's attitude towards the listeners or

participants or audience.

2.5. The Semantic and Pragmatic of Discourse Markers

Blackmore sees that there is a class phenomenon which is called 'discourse markers'. She

calls them 'discourse connectives' (Blackmore 1987.1992), while (Fraser 1990, Shiffrin 1987,

Stubb 1983 cited in Junkova, 2016, p.13) names 'discourse markers'. According to

Blackmore, discourse markers must be analyzed within pragmatics rather than semantics

(Blakmore, 2002, p. 3). That semantics=truth conditions, while pragmatics=meaning minus

truth conditions (see Gazdar 1979 cited in Junkova, 2016, p.15).

In this way, it is noticeable that the expressions are classified as discourse connectives or

markers, but the more important are the theoretical assumption made by those scholars who

have examined expressions as connectives or markers. Blackmore explains the distinction between truth conditional (semantic) meaning and non-truth conditional (pragmatic) meaning which has been unpacked as distinction between describing and indicating (Blakmore, 2002, p. 14). She examines the example of '*but*' and '*so*' by saying that it is claimed that expressions such as '*but*' and '*so*' do not contribute to the descriptive content of utterance which contain them but merely indicate how these utterances are to be interpreted (Blakmore, 2002, p. 36).

Rieber (1997) remarks, while many theorists have been appealed to the speech act theoretic distinction between describing and indicating, there have been relatively few attempts to say what it means for an expression to indicate information rather than describe it (Blakmore, 2002, p. 15).

Grice (1989) introduced his notion of conventional implicature which has played an important role for explaining the non-conditional meaning (Blakmore, 2002, p. 47). She argues that an expression carries a conventional implicature simply amounts to saying it is non-truth conditional, which does not provide an account to what it is that an expression contributes to (see Blackmore, 2002, p.36).

Sperber and Wilson (1995), see that the distinction between semantics and pragmatics is a distinction between two kinds of cognitive processes involved in utterance or speech inter presentation, they continue saying that semantic meaning is a result of linguistic decoding processes which provide an input to inferential process constrained by a single cognitive principle (sited in Blakmore, 2002, p. 36).

Leech claims that 'we cannot understand the nature of language without studying (grammar and pragmatics) and interaction between them (1983, p. 4). Chomsky (1966) sees that grammar is a mentally represented system, does interact with pragmatics, which according to Leech, Mey and Shiffrin (1987) is a theory of something external to the human mind (Blakmore, 2002, p. 7).

The relation between DMs and semantics is quite an inter-related connection which explains the style of an utterance which seems to be conventional relation under circumstances. However, DMs seem close to pragmatics since they indicate the meaning behind an utterance. Hence, the study of pragmatics shows the deep meaning or what is hidden behind a speech or utterance and it is called interpretation. Semantics studies the description of an utterance providing the semantic meaning in a speech or discourse.

2.6. Discourse Markers in this Research Work

This research focus on three most frequently occurring DMs in spoken language (Schourup, 1999, p 251 and Shiffrin, 1987). Both of them used as conventional moves, in particular, they are using a pre-closing device (Shiffrin, 1985, p 641). They belong to the markers which facilitate the introduction or the opening to the topic in discourse in relation to forgoing context (Bolden, 2009 and Jucker, 1993, p23). The three DMs *so* or *anyway* or *you know* facilitate and allow the speaker to move from one idea to another and from one topic to another and from one sentence to another. Each of these DMs have a particular characteristic with a particular function. More details and illustration come when dealing with each of these DMs.

2.6.1. The use of DM 'So'

1. *So* what else is going on? (Bolden, 2002, p. 992, cited in Junskova, 2016, p.12)

2. Mary behave *so well* yesterday. (Markus, 2009, p. 218, cited in Junskova, 2016, p.12)

In the example above, the marker *so* shares function of introducing an opening to the new topic and shifting the topic focus on something else. The example shows how the marker *so* breaks with the old topic and introduces the new topic which it had not been talked about. In the second sentence or example, the marker *so* provides an opportunity to the speaker to initiate another shift by using the marker *well.*

The marker *so* 'developed from the conjunctive use or directly from adverbial use' (Brinton, 2009, p. 313, cited in Junskova, 2016, p.17). Hence, the marker *so* can be confused with a connective. '*So* can be deployed in a variety of other grammatical functions' than the one of a discourse marker (Bolden, 2009, p. 976). In the following example the marker *so* is considered as an adverbial or conjunction (Brinton, 2009, p.314). (The numbering and the words in bold are not original in both examples).

3. He is **so** nice. (cited in Junkova, 2016, p.15)

4. He took the taxi **so** as not to be late. (cited in Junkova, 2016, p.15)

As it was mentioned before, the marker *so* can be classified as conjunction, which is a common example of connectives (Sanders and Pander Maat, 2006, p. 33 cited in Junkova, 2016). Connectives are described as 'one-word item or fixed word combination that express the relation between clauses, sentences, or utterances in discourse of particular speaker' (Sanders and Matt, 2006, p.12). It is quite similar to the definition of DMs but, it is still different in dealing with analysis of the marker *so.* There are   certain differences between the

connectives and DMs. The marker *so* as a connective affects the truth-conditionality of the current sentence and is 'tightly integrated in the syntactic structure of the sentence' (Harper, 2002, p. 43). In contrast to *so* of the function of discourse analysis.

The following example shows the difference between *so* of sentence (5) and *so* of sentence (6) (the word in bold and the numbering are not original; Van Dijk, 1979, p. 453).

5. I was sick, **so** I stayed in bed. (Van Dijk, 1979, p.453)

6. John is sick. **So**, let's start. (Van Dijk, 1979, p.453)

In the first example (5), the word *so* has a semantic function as a conjunction which is a consequence, it links two segments in relation of cause or reason of the main action (Van Dijk, 1979, p. 453). In addition, *so* here is integrated and affects the truth conditions of sentence because it has propositional meaning which means in other words that *so* reflects the semantic meaning.

In contrast to the sentence or example (6), *so* here has a pragmatic meaning which means that *so* "links two speech acts of which the second functions as 'conclusion' with respect to the first speech act" (Ibid). So as a result, *so* here does not affect the truth conditions of sentence. Hence, *so* position is sentence initial which belongs to the typical function of DMs.

The sentence-initial use of *so* marks the speaker's conclusion about the topic which is based on the context of communication or the speech act as it is clear in the following example (7) (the word in bold and the numbering are not original; Van Dijk, 1979, p. 454).

7. A: I am busy. B: **So**, you are not coming tonight? A: I'm sorry.

Fraser claims that DMs come from various syntactic classes and their characteristics are associated with the syntactic membership, thus, in some cases he cannot clearly differentiate between DMs and connectives (Fraser, 1999, p. 946). Sometimes, the difference in meaning of *so* are not profound and this can be seen in the following examples (the word in bold and the numbering are not original in both examples; Fraser, 1993, p. 6).

8. John was sick. **So**, don't expect him.

9. John was sick, **so** he went to bed.

Fraser explains the two sentences by saying that the difference in these two examples with *so* lies in the fact that the first *so* links two separate sentences which is a characteristic feature of DMs, and the second *so* connects two propositions within one message as a subordinate conjunction (Fraser, 1993, p.6).

Fraser sees that the core meaning of marker *so* as 'signals that the following segment is to be interpreted as a conclusion which follows from prior discourse' (Fraser, 1999, p. 945). On other part of communication, the consequential relationship can be extended by participant's interpretation (Fraser, 1993, p. 7).

To clarify better, Redeker suggests that when the conjunction *so* is pragmatically used, it holds that 'the semantic relation between the conjoined [did] not correspond to the propositional meaning of the conjunction' (Redeker, 1990, p. 372 cited in Junkova, 2016, p.32), as a result, it can be referred to as a discourse marker. Redeker (1990) describes the marker *so* into two different uses, the first one is 'to mark the speaker's summing-up or conclusion' and the second use 'between successive elements in a chain of elements' (Redeker, 1990, p.372).

10…and he says you're gonna have to leave here. **So** he/he- kind of uhm kicks the guy out.

11. He talks to the girl and says that she has uhm her father has money due, uhm and **so** she

gives him sixty dollars asking if that would cover it. And **so** he leaves.

Bolden explains the use of *so* in the examples above by saying that it is' a marker of emergence from incipiency' (Bolden, 2009, p. 977). It means that *so* use initiates and starts an interaction. Bolden add that the marker *so* is most commonly said to "preface new (or previously abandoned) topics" (Bolden, 2009, p.977).

In other terms, the marker *so* has clusters in parallel with *you know* as Montenat Gonzalez (2008) provides in her analysis. Gonzalez says that 'cluster is used to open up a new segment, to return to the argumentative thread, and to introduce a comment' (Gonzalez, 2008, p. 61), and 'by means of *you know* there is an intended sharing of narrator-interlocutor implicit common ground that aims at facilitating the illocutionary point of the narrative' (Gonzalez, 2008, p. 59). In addition, there are consecutive DMs *so anyway* which 'are used to regain the argumentative thread and to introduce a conclusion' (Gonzalez, 2008, p. 61).

2.6.2. The use of DM 'anyway'

It is very important to know the function and the use of the discourse marker *anyway* in an utterance or conversation. The following given examples show the use of *anyway* (the words in bold are original but the numbering are not, Cambridge dictionary).

12. **Well**, you need a car.

13. Right.

14**. Anyway**, I was wondering if either of you would teach me how to drive.

According to Cambridge Dictionary's definition, the marker *anyway* use is to shift in a topic (for buying a new car to having driving lessons). The function of the marker *anyway* is

to change or manage a topic as it is obviously clear in the following example (the word in bold is original but the numbering is not, Cambridge Dictionary).

15. What does he like?

16. He likes geometric shapes. He hates flowers. **Anyway**, we eventually found some that we   both liked and when we went to pay for it, we realized that either of us has brought any money.

2.6.3. The Use of DM 'You know'

Schourup (1985) believes that the core meaning of DM *you know* has something to do with the intended speaker meaning and the hearer's information state. The marker *you know* use is to slide in the flow of conversation and to check the link. The most basic meaning of the marker *you know* is 'to invite addressee inferences' (Jucker and Ziv, 1998, pp. 171-201). It means that DMs role is to call for or provoke the addressee's overall understanding from the utterance.

In other words, the expectancy originates from the speaker's intentions in their particular repertoire of conversation. It marks probably the act for a listener to pay attention to the content of the speech or conversation or to mark the influence of the speaker's impact on the audience. The DM *you know* differs according to the various use in conversations and several contexts where participants or different parties in a conversation differ. For the example, in the interviews, there is always the absence of the audience which is one party in a conversation. Their absent existence influences the interlocutors which adds an extra dimension to attend in the flow of conversation, as a result, this kind of conversation differs from the ordinary one that takes place between two parties without a third party's influence.

The DM *you know* is very common in speaking. It is used to check with the audience that they share the same knowledge as the speaker's knowledge. Moreover, when DM *you know* is used in conversation, it is assumed that listeners do have the knowledge that the speaker want them to have as the following example show clearly the use of DM *you know* in conversation (the words in bold are original but the numbering are not, Cambridge Dictionary).

17. How was the match?

18. Well, they played OK but the defense, **you know**, the same as always.

The DM *you know* is also sometimes used to allow the audience time to think when the speaker is speaking:

19. Did you like the play?

20. Well, I'm not sure, it was, **you know**, it was interesting.

Jan-Ola Ostman (1981) in his book 'You Know' A Discourse-Functional Study says that, the basic function the expression *you know* serves in conversational discourse is said to be that of a pragmatic particle used when the speaker wants the addressee to accept mutual knowledge (or at least to cooperate with respect) the propositional content of his utterance (Ostman, 1981, p. 39). He says also that, the fact that *you know* is even used when the addressee is assumed not to know what the speaker is talking about, suggests that it is camaraderie relationship between the speaker and the hearer (Ostman, 1981, p.39).

In other words, the DM *you know* show that the speaker wants to share the information and knowledge with the hearer in manner that the speaker attracts the hearer in order to put him together in the same ray.

2.7. Political Discourse

Political discourse is considered as a sub-branch of the domain of 'Politics'. William E. Connolly (1993) defines 'Politics' as a concept to political life and political inquiry, and it is backed by legally binding authority of government (Connolly, 1993, p. 12).

Back to the main point, Van Dijk sees that the political discourse analysis is a social science that studies the text and talk. PDA is a political science which studies the political communication and rhetoric (Dijk V. , What is Political Discourse?, 1997, p. 3). But, the definition is still not clear about what is meant by PDA? Political discourse is identified by its actors or authors, [viz]; politicians. In addition, the research study of PDA is about the text and talk of professional politicians or political institutions, such as president and prime ministers and other members of government, parliament or political parties, both at the local, national and international levels. Politicians in this sense are the group of people who are being paid for their (political) activities, and who are being elected or appointed as the central players in the policy (Van Dijk, 1997, p.3).

As it is known in politics, it is not only politicians who are the only participants, there are others. Therefore, the case study should also include the various recipients in political communicative events, such as the public, the people, citizens, the 'masses', and other groups or categories. Hence, once politics is located and its discourse, many more participants in political communication appear on the stage (Van Dijk, 1987, p.13). Thus, political discourse concerns political speeches so what is meant by political speech?

2.8. Political Speech

Political speech is considered as a language which has an abstract conceptual term that is concerned with the most moral rather than philosopher senses, thus political language carries information in order to communicate with the recipient, and it deals with people's affaires and issues (Al-Majali, 2015, p. 6).

Moreover, political language has a number of functions which are reflected in the speech itself. However, political language disguises, transforms and deepens a particular phenomenon, and it is mainly used to convince receivers with the speaker's point of view by using techniques such as explanation and analysis.

The political speech may constitute a genre, a domain, or a field (Seide, 1985, cited in Al-Majali, 2015, p. 6). Moreover, it is an incredible achievement at a particular time and particular place, and it has three major elements; the addressor (the speaker who produce the speech), and the adrressee (the hearer who is the recipient of the speech), and the political speech itself (Seide, 1985, cited in Al-Majali, 2015, p.6).

Political discourse in this study is analyzed from a linguistic point of view, and it is an investigation on the linguistic features of language, and on how language is used to arrive at the intended goal of the speaker. The study of language provides too much to the domain of politics because political speeches are an adequate arena for the study of language (Seide, 1985, cited in Al-Majali, 2015, p.6).

In political speeches, the speaker or the addrressor uses elements to connect the content of his ideas. Those elements are called DMs.

2.9. Discourse Markers in political speeches

Discourse markers in political speeches draw upon the phenomenon which hold together utterances in the discourse context; in particular, it is concerned with the presence of discourse markers within speeches made by politicians (Junskova, 2016, p. 4).

The study focuses on the issues raised by hearer's different interpretations of the political speeches, and it also focuses on the use of DMs and their influence on the hearer's interpretation. Discourse markers have several different meanings which are hard to match with each other or have only one meaning for a given context. The interpretation of discourse markers is, nevertheless, important for the speaker and the hearer as they express the speakers' assumptions, his intentions, his emotions, and most of all, his attitude towards the hearer or towards the situation which they are speaking about (Junkova, 2016, p.4).

Discourse markers convey one or several meanings, which have to do with pragmatic perspective, including analysis of speaker intention (Grice 1957, cited in Schiffrin, 1988 , p.10), communicative strategies (Gumperz, 1982, Leech 1983, cited in Schiffrin 1988, p. 10).

Discourse markers in political speeches enable the speaker to move or shift from one idea to another and influence the hearer or the audience, and hook the attention of the audience, this influence make the speech more effective and powerful.

2.10. Conclusion

The discourse markers as it is clearly mentioned previously, organize the content of ideas in a conversation, speech, interview and so on. Moreover, the discourse markers reflect semantic and pragmatic meaning which gives the conversation more sense and connects between the ideas in an utterance. The chapter tackles specific discourse markers and sheds light on different functions and use in each of them.

Chapter Three:

Data Analysis and

Findings

3.1. Introduction

Political discourse very often relies on interpretation of the speech content. The chapter argues that the disciplines of translation studies and political discourse analysis can be beneficial for closer cooperation. The data tackled in the analysis are authentic translation of political texts, commented from the point of view of each function of DMs (*anyway, you know, so)*. These examples concern political effects caused by those DMs. The chapter also deals with the effectiveness of DMs and the influence that causes on the press community, U.S citizens and the international communities. The examples shared in the analysis are political speeches of Donald Trump since, he is considered as the most influential president in the history of the United States. Hence, the main question is what makes Trump's language effective? In order to answer this question, it seems to be important to introduce several points in this chapter to clarify the understanding of the function of DMs in political speeches, describe the data and the findings.

3.2 Description of Research Inquiry

Discourse markers are one of many neglected aspects in the political discourse. Through the samples analyzed, Trump bridges the gap between the politician and the audience. He developed a new methodology which based on linguistic materials like, the use of body language and the use of discourse markers which is the case of study of this research.

3.2.1 Research Hypothesis

This present study tackles the function of DMs in Trump's speeches. This leads to look for the effectiveness of such use and the influence behind this use. The major interest of the

present study is investigating the hypotheses which focuses on the idea that the audience'
influence is so much deeper and bigger on Trump's language. Hence, Trump's language is
more effective than other politician's language generally speaking.

3.2.2 Study Case

The analysis of the two samples which was taken from youtube, the first one is a press
conference that show Trump answering the reporter's questions. It is noticeable that in this
press conference Trump use DMs to move from one idea to another and from one topic to
another one. The second sample is an interview with Washington Press reporters. In this
interview Trump shows his ability to move swiftly from one idea to another and sometimes
escape from embarrassing questions through the use of DMs mentioned especially the marker
anyway.

3.3. Data, methodology and research questions

This section gives an overview background of the current case of study research. The
research study defines methodology and research tools used in this study. For the sake of this
investigation, a methodology is required. The research case is based on two speeches, the first
one is taken from Donald Trump victory speech and the second is taken from interview that
took place in Washington with New York Times reporters. A qualitative research seems better
for this research study paradigm and texts analysis written ones which are suitable elements of
research methodology used in describing and collecting data for the completion of this
investigation.

3.3.1 Data Collection

The data gathered in this research study are spoken texts which are taken from youtube. Those texts are considered as political speeches of Donald Trump the 45th president of the United States of America. The study is concerned with the use of the selected discourse markers namely*: so, you know, anyway* in Trump's speeches. Hence, the analysis in this research is based on the interpretation of those selecting DMs and the meaning beside their use on Trump's speeches.

3.3.2 Research Methodology

Research methodology is a systematic way to solve a problem or to carry out a solution following a method of describing, explaining, analyzing a phenomenon or a problem. Moreover, the research methodology is based on two distinctive paradigm; qualitative and quantitative research. In this study, the qualitative research is chosen for the data description.

3.3.3 Research Questions

The analysis of DMs focused on the following research questions:

The main question is what are the impact of DMs of *so* and *you know* and *anyway* on Donald Trump's speech?

As it is mentioned, the interpretation reveals the meaning and function of DMs, so the question which is mentioned above aims to find out about interpretation of the meaning

Chapter Three: Data analysis and Findings

-- 46

behind the sentence and behind the speaker's intention and to indicate the function of *so* and *you know* and *anyway*. Discourse markers are considered as an instrument used by individuals in order to attain a certain goal and also, facilitate the hearers' task of understanding the speakers' utterances. Hence, those markers which will be tackled in this research study has a function which is to convey a communicative meaning. Hence, speakers use linguistic expressions in such a way as to communicate messages that would manage to change the hearer mentally or emotionally, thus modifying their knowledge, convictions or feelings.

The sub-questions: Do the three markers tend to appear together with other discourse markers or other expressions?

Of course, the markers *so* and *you know* and *anyway* tend to appear with other expressions as well. Namely, it will be explored what the clustering with certain elements can reveal about the function or meaning of discourse markers. Indeed, the marker *so* seem to appear with other markers or expressions such as *so well*, *so as*, *so on,* Schiffrin (1987) calls them 'causatives markers' which are markers who are used to indicate a relation of premise and conclusion and indicating also a result and to establish a causal link among events (Schiffrin, 1987, cited in Hind, 2012, p.1263).

For the other markers, it is noticeable that they are already a combination of two words speaking about *you know* which is called 'certainty marker' its' function is to express a full commitment to the statement presented by the writer.

On the other hand the marker *anyway* also combined with two words *any* and *way*. The function of the marker *anyway* is to shift from one topic to another one. Sometimes, it is used

to escape from a critical topic. The aim from using the marker *anyway* is to move to the next topic without moving back to the previous one.

What makes Trumps' language more effective?

Most of linguistic experts see president Trump as the most influential president in the history of United States. The reason behind this influence is the manner how Trump speaks to the audience, not only his language which has a deep impact but also his body language speaking about his manner of pronouncing words, the way he looks, his body gestures, all these features help to give a deep impact on the audience. Those features are called 'paralinguistic features' and they are non-verbal.

What are people feedback to Trumps' language?

This question tackles the reaction of people in America and outside America. Some of Americans see trump as arrogant, racist, a fool. Some celebrities call him an adolescent who didn't do his homework. Many manifestations were made in all over America as a response to Trumps' policy and as a response to his irresponsible declarations for example when he talked about the wall on the borders between America and Mexico, also when he accused American Muslims as responsible of different terrorist attacks which took place in Chicago 2015. Of course many Muslim and Non-Muslim communities refuse those declarations. Even more, most of people all over the world see his way of talking full of hate and racism. On the other hand, Trump's supporters see him as a hero, they see him like the suitable president for a powerful America.

3.4. Analysis

This part of research is concerned about the description of data analysis. It includes texts which are parts from both same and different speeches of Donald Trump. The analysis is based on the function of DMs *so* and *anyway* and *you know,* the texts which follow show the function of the marker *so* (the word in bolds are not original from Donald Trump victory speech).

Section one: **The marker '*so'***

Text of Trumps' speeches		Description
Text one	'…. I pledge to every citizen of our land that I will be president for all Americans, and this **so** important to me ….' (Trump, Donald Trump Victory Speech, 2017)	In the text above, Trump starts with a complement of gratitude to the US citizens in the first part then he uses the marker *so* which has a semantic function as a conjunction which is a consequence: it links two segments in relation of cause or reason of the main action and it integrates and affects the truth conditions of sentence because it has propositional meaning which means in other words that *so* reflects the semantic meaning (Van Dijk, 1979, p.453).

Text two	'…for those who have chosen not to support me in the past, of which there were a few people. I'm reaching out to you for your guidance and your help, **so** that we can work together and unify our great country...' (Trump, Donald Trump Victory Speech, 2017).	The same description of the first one, *so* here serves to link the two segments and has a semantic function as consequence to the action.
Text three	'...Tremendous potential. I've gotten to know our country **so** well, tremendous potential. It's going to be a beautiful thing…' (Ibid).	The marker *so* here shares function of introducing an opening to the topic and shifting the topic focus on something else. Hence, the marker *so* breaks with the old topic and introduces the new one which it had not been talked about.
Text four	'…we've going to get to work immediately for the American people. And we've going to be doing a job that hopefully, you'll be **so** proud of your president, you'll be **so** proud. Again, it's my honor. It's an amazing evening…' (Ibid).	: *so* here is classified as conjunction, which is known as connectives between two clauses, sentences, or utterances and it is also considered as a consequence or a reaction to the action which is a kind of promise for doing better in work, as a result, the consequence Americans will be proud of their president which means that *so* shares also a semantic meaning.

The table shows different functions of the marker *so*. Thus, the functions change from one situation to another according to the topic chosen by Trump and according to the context of situation.

The next section shows the use of the marker *you know* in Donald Trump's interview that he made with New York Times reporters (the word in bold is not original from Donald Trump interview with New York Times reporters).

Section two: the marker '*you know*'

Text one	TRUMP: Hi fellas, how you doing? BAKER: Good. Good. How was your lunch [with Republican senators]? TRUMP: It was good. We are very close. It's a tough — **you know**, health care. Look, Hillary Clinton worked eight years in the White House with her husband as president and	The marker *you know* in the interview realized by Trump and New York Times reporters is used to attract the reporters' attention and to make them think about what is he saying and what comes next. It is served in conversational discourse to feed the pragmatic particle which means that Trump wants the reporter to accept a mutual knowledge or to

	having majorities and couldn't get it done.	cooperate with respect (Ostman, 1981, cited in Junskova, 2016).
Text two	'…look what happened last week in California with….with, **you know**, fourteen people dead. Other people going to die, they're so badly injured…'	Trump tries to manipulate the conversation in the interview, and avoid to mention the terrorist act which causes murder of fourteen victims. He uses the marker *you know* to share the information with the reporter. *You know* here has a pragmatic meaning sharing an information about something happened in the past (Bolden, 2006, p.12)

Text three	'… and what I wanna do is find out what, *you know*, you can't solve a problem until you find out what's the root cause…' (Trump, How Donald Trump Answers A Question , 2015)	In this part of conversation also *you know* have a pragmatic meaning that is to inform the reporter and the audience that his job and solving American problems will take time and a long process.

Trumps uses language in a specific way which makes him an exceptional president of United States. The samples given in the analysis study confirms the hypothesis. As a result, trump's language makes him different from other policy officers especially when speaking about candidates of presidential elections.

Another marker has an influence in the interpretation of political discourse, namely *anyway* (the word in bold is not original from Donald's first speech as elected president).

Section three: the marker '*anyway*'

Text one	'….a powerful nation like our country never be strong without a powerful borders….so we gonna build the wall, **anyway**, and I'll make Mexico pay it…'	The marker anyway is used to shift the topic and move into the next topic. It also has another function which is to close the topic and switch to the next one.

3.5. Discussion of Findings

Trumps particularly has a specific use of language. He likes what linguists call 'discourse markers' like '*anyway, so, you know*'. The difference between Trump and other U.S presidents for new, is that he uses DMs in political speeches to shift from one topic to another, and often the second topic is not related to the first one. This is usually accepted in normal conversation, but not in political speeches. As a result, this gives him an air of authenticity (Simms, 2018, p. 12). On the other hand, he uses paralinguistic features such as gestures, intonation patterns, etc. Trump tries to sound spontaneous. He is really spontaneous however, the use of DMs in his speech including the paralinguistic features leads him to be the most influential president in the history of America.

Discourse markers are not usually invested with much meaning; they instead have a function, in this of indicating something 'listen up': what I'm going to say next is especially important; and this is how his supporters interpret it. But opponents take the meaning of 'believe me' literally, and especially think that Trump cannot be believable if he has to tell his listeners to believe him all the time (Simms, 2018, p. 12). That is all which goes to show, by the way; that a politician's language use tends to reinforce the views people already have of them, rather than to change those views.

3.6.   The Interpretation of DMs *so*, and *anyway* and *you know* in Trump's Speeches

As it is clear in the analysis, the DMs have both semantic and pragmatic meaning, each of them has a function which differs from other markers. So that the comprehension securing function of the marker *you know* is also indicated by the interpretation of the hearers or the audience, it shows Trump's intention to get a confirmation to his statement. Speaking about the marker *you know* tends to show a demonstration of his purpose to elicit inference from the hearer. Trump uses the marker *you know* to attract the hearer's attention which is reflected in his speeches.

The same observation goes to the marker *so*, it has a pragmatic function. It indicates the opening of the topic. In addition, Trump usually uses the marker *so* to attract the audience and it shows Trump's ability to open and close and move from one topic to another. As to the marker *anyway,* Trump uses it to close a debate when it comes to the interviews and introduce the new one. It has a pragmatic function; it is just like he is saying that I've finished from the topic or answering questions and you have to move to another one. This is an interpretation to the pragmatic meaning to the marker *anyway*.

3.7.   The Impact of Such Use on the Audience

Trump's language is considered one of the most debatable topics in the different mass media. Hence, it shows that his language has a great impact on the audience opinion. Of

course, it has a negative and positive influence. Trump supporters encourage his style in addressing people and see that his language reflects his strength and gives America more power and ensures America's position as government and policy in the world. It shows that America has and still offers the opportunity to lead the world. Besides that, Trumps' language has a negative influence on the rest of both U.S citizens and people all over the world. They see his language as reflection to his ideology and his radical ideas. Even though, Trump's language has a great impact positive or negative.

Trump's use of DMs in his speeches shows his ability of manipulate his receivers through his mastering of language and also indicates his style speaking about his manner in expressing his ideas and shifting from one idea to another. Furthermore, this mastering in language reflects his manipulation on audience opinion and how he does things with words.

3.8.   Suggestions and Recommendations

As a suggestion to future students or researchers who want to study discourse markers or analysis, they should focus on other linguistic features such as, the body language or the paralinguistic features, and the speech act which based on how to do things with words. As recommendation to the politicians, it is very important to have linguistic skill to convince people or the audience. Hence, political discourse reflect a given idea or ideology. Thus, in order to have a powerful discourse, the first step is to master some linguistic features as for example, discourse markers, simple language not complex.

3.9.   Limitations

The impossibility to gather enough data because some websites require a registered account from the source. Some sources are not available in the library like the function of discourse markers and the interpretation of DMs in the political discourse.

This is the main limitation, which can be considered as the most hindering, is the total lack of resources. This lead to one option which is searching on the net to get data and samples to analyze the information gathered.

The lack of samples which is limited and some of them are secured as it is mentioned above, this makes the description limited especially when it comes to the marker *anyway,* which makes an obstacle in order to provide the research with a rich literature review.

3.10.   Conclusion

This study analysis indicates that the function of DMs mentioned above reflects Trump's intention and creates an area of responsiveness between Trump and the audience. Hence, the chapter can be considered as a logical consequence of the two previous chapters. The third chapter collects available theories about the various strategies proposed by scholars to the study of DMs as an essential point in political discourse. Thus, as well as their description, this study shows the function of DMs and may help readers to distinguish what are DMs as well as their function. Hence, the chapter enhances the use of DMs in communication performance and especially in the political speeches.

General Conclusion

The field of discourse markers is still in its infancy, ongoing in the present and future research will enrich the understanding of their roles in building and mastering the communication between the speaker and the hearer. It is hoped that the findings of this research can trigger more research on the aspect of political speeches. It is interesting to further research and explore a comparison between the use of DMs in political speeches and its function in ordinary speeches or other domains like religion speech and so on.

It has been revealed that discourse markers study is a widespread field in linguistic branches. Accordingly, it examines the linguistic items used in an utterance or in a conversation and even spoken and written texts. Since the notion of discourse markers is a complex and abstract one, many theories come to light with distinct perspectives. This research examine the function of discourse markers in political speeches. These functions are manifested in several political texts. As a case of study, Trump's language is the example in this research process.

This research study aims to look for the source of Trump's influence on the audience through his use of several linguistic features and techniques. These linguistic techniques lead to a deep impact on both U.S citizens at the first place and the international public opinion all over the world. This research study focuses on the use of DMs on the political speeches as one linguistic feature from other features. In other words, the present study has investigated the influence of certain markers namely *so, you know, anyway,* in Donald Trump's speeches.

The present research has adopted a qualitative approach which is based on observation and analysis. The gathered data of the present study reveal that incorporating discourse markers as a part of the political speeches language curriculum is possible since it will lead people to a better understanding of such influence on the audience.

This influence which is viewed in Trump's language triggers the thinking about what leads Donald Trump's language to be more effective from a linguistic point of view? On the basis of the examination of the data collected from the sample, the findings show that the hypothesis suggested in this research which sees that Donald's language is considered as the most effective and the reason behind this effectiveness is to affect the audience point of view. As a result, the findings prove such hypothesis.

As a suggestion to the students, it would be suitable to focus on the other linguistic features used in political speeches. Even more, the study of other markers in the domain of politics as well as the use of different strategies which can be helpful in introducing DMs in the field of politics since it is still a fresh field. In addition, it is a necessity to train politicians and get them ready to use such cohesive devices in their talk and speech.

It is recommended for future research to widen the corpus on the field of discourse makers in political speeches. There are other linguistic features that can be tackled in the future research as the study of the paralinguistic feature in political speeches or the study of the speech act in the political discourse.

References

Al-Majali, W. (2015). *Discourse Analysis of Political Speeches of the Ousted Arab Presidents During the Arab Spring Revolution using Halliday and Hassan's Framework of Cohesion.* Journal of Education and Practice , 14.

Almeida, B. (n.d.). *Discourse Markers*. Ingles Medico Baseado em Evidencias, 1.

Blakmore, D. (2002). *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning* . Cambridge University Press.

Clive Seale, G. G. (2006). *Qualitative Research Practice.* sage.

Connolly, W. E. (1993). *The Terms Of Political Discourse* . Princeton University Press.

Cutting, J. (2005). *Discourse and Pragmatics*. London and New York: Routeldge Taylor and Francis group.

Deborah Shiffrin, D. T. (2008). *The Handbook Of Discourse Analysis.* Blackwell Publishing.

Deborah, S. (1988). *Discourse Markers*. cambridge university press.

Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context.* Barcelona: Cambridge.

Dijk, V. (1993). *Discourse and society.* London Newbury Park and New Delhi: sage.

Dijk, V. (1997). What is Political Discourse? *Belgian Journal Of Linguistic*, 42.

Elsharkawi, A. (2017). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Power and Ideology.* grin.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (2014). *Social interaction, social context, and language.* psychology press.

Fraser, B. (1988). Acta Linguistica Hungarica. *Types of Discourse Markers*, pp19-33.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An Introduction To Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method.* Routledge.

Goutsos, A. G. (1997,2004). *Discourse Analysis.* Koinonia Manchester: Edinburgh University Press.

Harper, W. W. (2002). Investigating the effectivness of tightly integrating multiple knowledge sources. *The super ARV model* , 238-247.

Hassan, H. a. (1995). *Conext and Language.* Springer Link.

Hymes, g. a. (1972). directions in sociolinguistics .

Thesis

Junskova, A. (2016). Discourse Markers In Political Speeches. 14.

Lutzky, U. (2012). *Discourse Markers in Early Modern English.* John Benjamins Publishing.

Books

Mayr, A. (2008). *Language And Power(An introduction to Institutional discourse).* series editors:SALLY JOHNSON.

Ostman, J.-O. (1981). *You Know A discourse-Functional Study.* John Benjamins Publishing.

Paltridge, B. (2006). *discourse analysis.* London: BLOOMSBURY.

Philip R. Cohen, J. L. (1990). *Intentions in Communication.* MIT press.

Roussea, J.-J. (2017). *The social contract, or principles of political rights*. Dans A. Elsharkawy, *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Power and Ideology* (p. 4). Grin.

Schiffrin, D. (1988). *Discourse Markers.* Cambridge Press University.

Simms, D. K. (2018). *One Year of Trump: Linguistics Expert analyses U.S President's Influence on Language.* England: University of Liverpool .

Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking Voices.* Cambridge university press.

Trump, D. (2015, september 15). How Donald Trump Answers A Question . Washington, America .

Trump, D. (2017, january 20). Donald Trump Victory Speech. america.

Urgelles-Coll, M. (2010). *The Syntax and Semantics of Discourse Markers.* Continium Studies in Theoritical Linguistics.

Widdowson, H. (2007). *discourse analysis.* Vienna: oxford.

Zelling, H. S. (1952). *Discourse Analysis.*