ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN AMERICAN POLITICAL SPEECHES

Kenjayeva Gulbadanbegim Alibek kizi
Master Student, Faculty of Foreign Philology, Urgench State University
E-mail: gulbadambegimkenjayeva@gmail.com

Annotation

The article is devoted to the analysis of the linguistic features of modern political discourse (PD). The purpose of the study is to consider the features of the use of discursive markers (DM) in the oral speech of American politicians on the example of television debates. The functions of discursive markers are singled out, and a classification of these speech elements is proposed in relation to the chosen type of political discourse. Examples of the distribution of DM in political speech are analyzed, and an interpretation of the functioning of specific types of DM is given. The characteristics of the intonational design of DM in oral PD are discussed.

Keywords: Political discourse (PD), political debates, discursive markers (DM), classification of DM, functioning and intonation of DM in PD.

Introduction

The modern world is hard to imagine without politics, the main function of which is to resolve conflicts between individual groups of society or states. Language in the world of politics acts as a tool for influencing society to achieve certain political goals. It is with this that the aspect of linguistic manipulation in the speech behavior of politicians is connected.

Politician's speech must have certain strategic and tactical features, influencing force, contain specific terminology, be characterized by political correctness, comply with the norms of the language and have rhetorical pathos.

Linguists call such a language the "language of politics", or "political discourse", the analysis of which is devoted to many modern works. The interest of linguists in the problem of interaction between language and politics is not accidental. Political discourse, which exists in a variety of oral and written genres, is a complex communicative phenomenon aimed at the struggle for power, which combines text, situational, socio-cultural and sociopolitical context, as well as specific linguistic means. The actualization of the language of politics consists, first of all, in the manipulation of the political consciousness of the masses, in the construction of a certain conceptual and informational model of reality in the human mind, reflecting the socio-political situation in society.[1, 67p]

The most striking example of a politician's speech behavior is political debates. This type of oral communication is characterized by spontaneity, dialogue, situationality, the presence of colloquial lexical and phraseological units.

Important features of parliamentary debates are highlighted: anthropocentrism, democracy, dialogue, emotionality, improvisation. In political debate, every politician has as his goal to show his candidacy from the best side and point out the opponent's weaknesses.

In this case, the addresser resorts to the technique of manipulating consciousness, which is closely related to the process of argumentation.

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

- "structuring" the organization of discourse, which replaces the grammatical rules that are not always observed in spontaneous speech;
- emotionality of speech. This function allows you to form a certain "tonality of communication";
-"an expression of a subjective attitude, manifested in the assessments and comments accompanying the main content". [2,32p]

This article attempts to offer its own classification of DM encountered in political discourse. The material of the study was fragments of televised debates between 2000 US presidential candidates A. Gore and G. Bush, 2008 B. Obama and J. McCain, and fragments of televised debates between 2012 US presidential candidates from the Republican Party R. Santorum, M. Romney, R. Paul and N. Gingrich. The classification proposed by B. Fraser is taken as the initial basis in this work. The classifications available in other works of domestic and foreign scientists devoted to the functioning of DM were also used. When compiling the new classification, we also took into account the DM that we identified in a narrow research corpus.

Comparative Markers

In the classification of the American Linguist B. Fraser, 2 classes of DM were distinguished, each of which has subclasses. In the first class, certain DMs were identified, which the scientist calls comparative (Contrastive). B. Fraser included a large number of markers in this group. In the course of the study, it was found that politicians use certain DMs of this type, namely: but, however, instead of, although, though, etc. The use of other speech elements similar in function to markers of this subclass was not noted. [3,145p]

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

Example #1: "You know, 10 days ago, John said that the fundamentals of the economy are sound." (Barack Obama, 2008) Presidential candidate B. Obama's remark above has the DM you know followed by certain information intended for the voter.

Example #2: "You see, in order to get something done on behalf of the people, you have to put partisanship aside." (J.W. Bush, 2000) The beginning of the sentence of the future president of the United States is marked with the use of the element you see, after which, as in the previous example, there is some information, an explanation. [4, 74-79p]

#3: "I've never voted for a budget deficit. I never voted to increase the national debt. As a matter of fact, there's only one appropriation bill I voted for." (Ron Paul) The example shows that a politician confesses that he once had to vote for the adoption of a certain law.

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

The third and fourth groups, according to Fraser, are very similar. The elements contained in this group signal that one of the statements contains an argument or reason, and the second sentence contains a message made on the basis of this argument. In one of the groups, the argument is contained in the first sentence, followed by DM; in the second group, the DM is preceded by a conclusion, while in the second sentence, an argument is displayed. In the work of Bergman, these two groups are combined into one. In the course of this study, another type of DM was identified in political discourse, similar in function to the markers of this group: that's why.

Example #4: "And I think that the fundamentals of the economy have to be measured by whether or not the middle class is getting a fair shake. That's why I'm running for president. (Barak Obama, 2008) As you can see from the example, that's why signals that the first sentence contains a reason, an argument, and the second contains a conclusion, a conclusion from what was said earlier. Since the function of this marker corresponds to a group of implicative markers, it is possible to include it in the specified subclass.

Complementary Markers

One of the subclasses identified by B. Fraser combines a large number of markers that indicate the presence of a quasi-parallel relationship between the content of two sentences: the second sentence complements the first. [5,89p] In the course of the analysis of linguistic facts, in addition to the particles described by the American scientist, the connecting elements of speech were identified, which can also be attributed to this group.

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

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

McCain, 2008) The given examples clearly show that the DM which means, that means, what's called allows you to add clarifying information to the statement.

Enumeration Markers

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

Example #7: "Two points I think are important to think about when it comes to Russia. Number one is we have to have foresight and anticipate some of these problems... The second point I want to make is - is the issue of energy". (B. Obama, 2008)

Example #8: "First of all, I think that we are safer in some ways." (B. Obama, 2008)

Example #9: "And then finally, with what's left of government, I'm going to cut the employment by 10 percent." (M. Romney, 2012) It is worth noting that the described DMs are similar to addition markers, as they allow the speaker to complete the utterance with new messages. Given the specifics of political discourse, it is necessary to take into account the fact that argumentation plays a huge role in a politician's speech, a characteristic feature of which is focusing the attention of listeners on certain ideas of the speaker. In this case, DM enumerations help to follow the laws of argumentation and, in addition to adding a certain portion of information, draw the addressee's attention to the thought being expressed. This type of DM includes the first thing, number one / two / three / four, finally, second, first of all, next.

It is noteworthy that before the use of these connecting elements, a generalizing phrase is very often used, which prepares listeners for the fact that the speaker is going to enumerate certain facts. These phrases include the following: There are two / three / four points, Here what I would do, etc. Hesitation markers

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

Example#10: "Well, look, I understand your frustration and your cynicism..." (Barack Obama, 2008) to gather my thoughts. In this case, it is advisable to include these elements in the proposed classification and mark them as hesitation markers.

Conclusion

To conclude, discourse markers are expressions used to connect sentences to what comes before or after and indicate a speaker's attitude to what he is saying. As linguistic items, they have important functions in discourses of various styles or registers. And being connective elements, discourse markers relate sentences, clauses and paragraphs to each other. Through any political text, discourse markers play an important rule as a cohesive device in conveying the intended message. Discourse markers can

be defined as linguistic expressions of different length which carry pragmatic and propositional meaning. They are used to combine clauses or to connect sentence elements and they appear in both speaking and writing to facilitate the discourse. Each discourse marker indicates a particular meaning and a relationship between two or more clauses.

References

1. Babaeva R.I. Non-significant vocabulary in German everyday discourse (Pragmatic aspect): Author. Sciences. 67p, 2008.
2. Belchikov Yu.A. On the role of the media in the process of democratization of the Russian literary language // Bulletin of electronic and printed media. 32p, 2004.
3. Introduction to political science: dictionary-reference book / ed. V.P. Pugachev. Moscow: Aspect Press, 145p, 1996.
4. Vishnevskaya G.M., Likhareva I.P. On the connecting elements of discourse in oral text // Phonetic variability: Bilingualism and diglossia. Interuniversity. Sat. scientific works / otv. ed. Ph.D. G.M. Vishnevskaya. Ivanovo: IvGU, 74-79p, 2000,
5. Voloshina N.V. Debate as a speech genre in the professional activity of a teacher. Sciences. 89p, 2006.