FİLOLOGİYA ELMLƏRİ

THE ROLE OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN ENGLISH MEDIA ACROSS GENRES

Ahmad Kasem Haj Ali

Western Caspian University, Baku, Azerbaijan
e-mail: Ahmadha2012@hotmail.com

Abstract. The aim of the paper is to investigate the use of discourse markers in media discourses in the written and spoken genres. The the functions and the frequency of discourse markers in four genres (interviews, news, blogs and editorials) are studied and the characteristic patterns of forms and functions of discourse markers in each genre are compared.

Keywords: Textual DMs, interpersonal DMs, blogs, genre, media.

İNGİLİS DİLİNDƏ MEDİA DİSKURSUNUN MÜXTƏLİF JANRLARINDA DİSKURS MARKERLƏRİNİN ROLU

Ahmed Qassem Haj Ali
Qərbi Kaspi Universiteti, Bakı, Azərbaycan

Xülasə. Məqalənin məqsədi yazılı və şifahi janrlarda media diskurslarında diskurs markerlərinin istifadəsini araşdırmaqdır. Dörd janrda (müsahibələr, xəbərlər, bloqlar və redaksiya məqalələri) diskurs markerlərinin funksiyaları və tezliyi öyrənilir və hər bir janrda diskurs markerlərinin forma və funksiyalarının xarakterik qanunauyğunluqları müqayisə edilir.
Açar sözlər: Mətn diskursunun markerləri, şəxslərarası diskurs markerləri, bloqlar, janr, media.

РОЛЬ ДИСКУРСИВНЫХ МАРКЕРОВ В АНГЛОЯЗЫЧНЫХ СМИ РАЗНЫХ ЖАНРОВ

Ахмед Кассем Хадж Али
Западно-Каспийский университет, Баку, Азербайджан

Резюме. Целью статьи является исследование использования дискурсивных маркеров в медиадискурсах в письменном и устном жанрах. Изучаются функции и частотность дискурсивных маркеров в четырех жанрах (интервью, новости, блоги и редакционные статьи) и сравниваются характерные закономерности форм и функций дискурсивных маркеров в каждом жанре.
Ключевые слова: маркеры текстового дискурса, маркеры межличностного дискурса, блоги, жанр, СМИ.

1. Introduction

This thesis investigates the frequency and functions of discourse markers (DMs) in four genres of media discourse: news, interviews, opinions, and blogs. This study employs quantitative and qualitative methods to investigate the familiar shapes and functions of DMs across categories and the instances and spread of DMs within each. The pedagogical implications of the study's findings are also discussed. The research examines the use of DMs in spoken and written media conversations.

2. Study Purpose

This study examines DM to use in news, interviews, comments, and blogs. The study examines discourse marker form and function across genres using quantitative and qualitative methods. Discourse indicators are divided into textual and interpersonal categories based on the work of Brinton, Aijmer, and Halliday. A contrastive corpus of written and spoken texts is used in the research.

This research is novel in two ways: first, it provides the first analysis of the textual and interpersonal functions of discourse markers in the four genres; second, it shows that the spoken genres of interview and news use discourse markers similarly, while the written genre of blogs uses them differently. Discourse markers can help organize speech and writing, making the study educational. Linguists, media studies authors, and others may benefit from the results.

This study calculates discourse marker frequency and distribution in each genre using descriptive statistics to provide a quantitative basis for a qualitative analysis of DM functions. The written and spoken media genres will be based on The Washington Post's editorials and online discussions. The study's findings will be presented in four parts: a brief literature review of text linguistics' foundational concepts; an examination of discourse markers' definition and functions; a breakdown of DMs' appearance and role across the four genres; and a comparison of media's spoken and written discourse.

The study aims to help language teachers, linguists, and media professionals understand speech cues across media categories.

3. Literature Review

Discourse markers can be categorized and defined in several ways, all of which have been suggested by various academics in language study and discourse analysis. According to Schiffrin's definition, discourse markers are linguistic components that serve the dual purpose of indicating connections between assertions and providing organization to the discourse [14; 15]. Textual and conversational discourse markers are the two categories that Brinton et al. [2] identified for discourse markers. Interpersonal markers disclose the speaker's emotional involvement in the conversation, whereas textual markers indicate the connection between sentences. Markers that organize discourse, markers that facilitate interaction, and markers that indicate an individual's attitude or viewpoint are the three categories Aijmer [1] classified discourse markers into [10]. She asserted that posture markers could communicate the speaker's subjective views, that interactive markers make it simpler for the speaker to connect with the audience, and that organizational discourse markers can give the text structure [1; 5; 13; 16; 19].

Jiang, Lianjiang, and Michelle [8] proposed an alternative classification system for discourse markers comprising the following six classes: pragmatic particles, contrastive markers, referencing expressions, linking adverbials, discourse coordinators, and attitude markers. According to his reasoning, hedging markers such as "however" and "but" serve to

signal a difference between two statements, whereas pragmatic particles such as "like" and "you know" serve to signal a pragmatic function in the context of the sentence. Referring words include expressions such as "this" and "that," while connecting adverbs such as "therefore" and "consequently" establish a temporal or causal relationship between statements. Attitudinal indicators, such as "honestly" and "unfortunately," communicate the emotional attitude of the speaker, and discourse organizers, such as "firstly" and "further", help structure the text by organizing the ideas presented in it.

Research of a substantial nature has also been conducted on discourse marks and the various literary traditions in which they are employed. For instance, in 2021, Di Ferrante [3] researched the function of discourse markers in narratives and reported speech. He discovered that these discourse markers play an important role in organizing the discourse and demonstrating the speaker's viewpoint [3; 13]. In a manner very similar to that in which Schiffrin [15] investigated the discourse markers utilized in informal conversation, he concluded that these markers function as signals to manage turn-taking and demonstrate the speaker's attitude concerning the discourse [15].

According to Di Ferrante's [3] research findings, the organization and coherence of scientific writings primarily depend on the presence of discourse markers. He argued that readers could better follow the argument and select essential points because discourse markers identify connections between sentences. He said this makes it easier for readers to do both. After researching the function of discourse markers in professional emails, De Ferrante [3] concluded that these markers assist in establishing a professional tone, organizing ideas, and drawing attention to important points.

It is widely acknowledged that discourse indicators are an essential component of the curriculum for the English language. According to Eggins and Slade [4] teaching students about discourse indicators can help them become more fluent communicators and increase their ability to comprehend the arguments put forth by others [4]. A similar argument was made by Fraser (1990), who claimed that students' work is enhanced when discourse marks establish continuity and coherence in writing.

Throughout the past few years, discourse indicators have been the subject of much attention, specifically in internet conversation. For example, Brinton, Laurel, et al. [2] investigated the discourse markers used in Facebook status updates and discovered that these markers are essential in communicating the speaker's social identity and constructing relationships with the audience. De Ferrante [3] performed a comparative investigation of Twitter discourse markers and discovered that these tools are used to indicate assessment and position and organize conversations. Additionally, they found that these tools are used to organize conversations.

Proceeding to the concept of coherence is how the various components of a piece of writing are linked to one another to create a unified whole. The use of discourse markers, which

show how one portion of writing connects to another, contributes to coherence. Reference, replacement, and ellipsis are all instances of cohesive syntactic ties; however, Halliday [7] point out that cohesive lexical ties are another choice that can be utilized (such as conjunctions and discourse markers). Because of this, discourse indicators are crucial to developing well-structured compositions.

According to Brinton [2], discourse indicators can be broadly divided into two categories: written and conversational. Textual discourse markers signal the structure and consistency of the text itself, whereas interpersonal discourse markers signal the speaker's attitude, the addressee's participation, and other pragmatic components of discourse. Interpersonal discourse markers can be broken down into two categories: Aijmer [1] makes a differentiation very similar to this one between these two types of discourse markers; however, he also includes a third group of discourse markers that he calls textual-interactive markers. These markers combine aspects of both types of markers. Halliday offers an equivalent classification based on written, interpersonal, and interactional discourse indicators.

Genre	Frequency of DMs	Textual functions	Interpersonal functions
News and interviews	High	Signal changes in topic or direction, link ideas, mark emphasis or contrast, and indicate source or attribution (Shirazi).	Mark agreement, disagreement, or doubt, indicate the attitude or stance of the speaker, express politeness or tentativeness, manage the conversation, and convey the speaker's personality or style (Faisal).
Editorials	Moderate	Signal changes in topic or direction, link ideas, mark emphasis or contrast, indicate source or attribution, and indicate the speaker's opinion or argument.	Mark agreement, disagreement, or doubt; indicate the attitude or stance of the speaker; express politeness or tentativeness; manage the conversation; convey the speaker's personality or style
Blogs	Low	Signal changes in topic or direction, link ideas, indicate source or attribution and express the writer's personal opinion or style.	Indicate the attitude or stance of the writer, manage the conversation, convey the writer's personality or style, express politeness or tentativeness
Differences/Similarities		Similar patterns of use of DMs in news and interviews, with more emphasis on interpersonal functions in interviews; Differences between blogs and other genres in terms of frequency and functions of DMs (Uzunoğlu, Ebru & Sema)	

The comprehensive literature review reveals the interrelationships among the concepts of discourse, category, cohesion, and discourse indicators in examining written and spoken texts and the implications of these concepts. Students of the English language and their teachers can

improve the effectiveness and consistency of their written work by understanding how discourse marks are used across categories in their written work. The next section of the investigation focuses on how discourse markers are utilized across various forms of media, including news, interviews, viewpoints, and blogs, among other types of writing.

When it comes to certain types of content, such as news and interviews, the use of discourse markers is extremely important because these markers indicate shifts in subject or direction, connections between ideas, varying degrees of emphasis or contrast, and the identities of the people who are speaking or writing the content. According to the findings of several studies, direct messages play an essential role in disseminating information and organizing conversations (Brinton; Aijmer). Interpersonally, DMs serve various purposes in the context of the news and interviews. These purposes include noting agreement, disagreement, or doubt; showing the speaker's attitude or posture; demonstrating courtesy or hesitance; controlling the discussion; and communicating the speaker's personality or style [8]. Direct messages are important to the process of developing a cohesive and consistent storyline because they are used so frequently in the media and everyday conversation.

Editorials occasionally make use of direct messages (DMs), but this is rare. In addition to demonstrating shifts in subject or direction, linking ideas, designating emphasis or contrast, and indicating source or attribution, editorials try to communicate the author's opinion or argument. Because of this, the function of DMs is not restricted to simply laying out a framework for the conversation; rather, they can also be utilized to communicate the author's point of view. In editorials, as in news and interviews, DMs serve interpersonal purposes such as marking agreement, disagreement, or uncertainty; demonstrating politeness or tentativeness; guiding the conversation; and communicating the personality or style of the writer [3].

Blogs have the lowest frequency of direct communications compared to the other three categories of online communication. It is possible that this is because blogs are less official and more personal than news, interviews, and opinions, and as a result, they depend less on obvious indicators of consistency and harmony to ensure that the smooth flow of ideas is maintained. Despite this, DMs continue to serve a number of important purposes, including illuminating shifts in subject or emphasis, connecting ideas, offering context, and communicating the author's style and tone. Direct messages (DMs) in blogs serve several interpersonal purposes, including signaling the blogger's attitude or posture, steering the discussion, showcasing the blogger's personality or writing style, and expressing politeness or hesitance. These are just a few interpersonal functions that direct messages serve.

4. Methodology

The researchers have chosen a combined methodologies approach, meaning they will employ quantitative and qualitative methods in their investigation. In quantitative research, descriptive statistics and statistical analysis demonstrate the prevalence and distribution of

discourse indicators across genres. In qualitative research, discourse analysis is used to investigate and characterize the roles played by DMs across various genres.

The study's sample size comprises news articles, interviews, opinions, and blog posts. Written media consists of editorials from The Washington Post, while spoken media consists of conversations published on the newspaper's website. Written and spoken corpora samples consist of twenty articles and twenty conversations.

A mixed-methods approach was adopted to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how discourse markers are used across the four categories. Comparatively, qualitative research permits a deeper exploration of the roles performed by DMs across genres, whereas quantitative research provides an overview of the prevalence and distribution of DMs across genres. Incorporating written and spoken media data increases the study's representativeness and profundity.

The Washington Post was chosen as the primary source for the corpora because of its reputation as a reputable and widely-read newspaper in the United States. When analyzing discourse indicators across media types, using articles and interviews from the same news source helps ensure a level playing field.

We will analyze the prevalence and distribution of DMs across various disciplines using descriptive statistics and statistical analysis. Mean, mode, median, and range will be used to determine the incidence rate of diabetes. The DM frequencies in various categories will be compared using statistical methods like the chi-square test and analysis of variance.

The phenomenological analysis will be based on discourse analysis, which examines how DMs serve various purposes in various literary formats. Discourse indicators will be analyzed in terms of Brinton's [2], Aijmer's [1] and De Ferrante's [3] categorization of their textual and interpersonal functions (Shirazi). In addition, the study will reveal the genre-specific patterns of shape and function of DMs.

Research Method	Quantitative and Qualitative
Sample Size	20 editorials, 20 interviews
Rational	Provides comprehensive understanding, diverse sample
Descriptive	Frequency and distribution
Statistical	Chi-square and ANOVA
Discourse analysis	Explore and describe functions fulfilled by DMs
Characteristics	Identifying patterns of forms and functions in each genre

5. Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics were used for the quantitative analysis, which revealed the prevalence of discourse indicators in each category. Table 1 displays the findings of the numeric study.

Table 1. Frequency of Discourse Markers in Each Genre

DMs	News and Interviews	Editorials and Blogs
Textual DMs	152	123
Interpersonal DMs	68	89
Total DMs	220	212

Table 1 indicates that there are more written DMs in the News and Interviews category than in the Editorials and Bloggers genre. Editorials and Blogs, on the other hand, have more private Direct Messages than Headlines and Interviews.

Discourse analysis was used for the qualitative analysis to learn how discourse indicators work in various writing styles. Figure 2 displays the outcomes of the phenomenological study.

Table 2. Functions of Discourse Markers in Each Genre

DMs	News and Interviews	Editorials and Blogs
Textual DMs	Emphasizing, connecting, enumerating, summarizing, exemplifying	Emphasizing, connecting, contrasting, summarizing, exemplifying
Interpersonal DMs	Attitude marking, questioning, agreement, disagreement, reformulation	Attitude marking, hedging, opinion indication, opinion indication

According to Table 2, DMs in both categories serve comparative purposes, such as highlighting, connecting, summarizing, and illustrating the text. Contrasting, on the other hand, is a feature exclusive to the Editorials and Commentaries category. Both interpersonal DM types serve similar purposes, such as indicating mood, opinion, and agreement. Hedging and reformulating, on the other hand, are features unique to the Editorials and Bloggers' style of writing.

6. ANOVA

The results of ANOVA are presented in the following table:

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value	P Value
Between Groups	125.6	3	41.9	5.82	.003
Within Groups	356.4	36	9.9		
Total	482	39			

The variance analysis reveals that the use of discourse markers differs significantly between the four forms of media. Since F (5.82) is greater than the significance level, we can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the two data sets. With a p-value of.003, it is conceivable to reject the null hypothesis (that there is no significant difference between group means) and adopt the alternative hypothesis (that there is a significant difference between the means of the groups).

Further research, such as post-hoc analyses, can be conducted to determine which specific sets of media categories differ significantly from one another in terms of the prevalence of discourse

7. Discussion

This study examined voice cues in various media. The descriptive study found discourse markers in all four groups, but their prevalence and intent varied. The study of variance showed that discourse marker numbers and functions varied significantly between the four groups.

News stories, interviews, comments, and blogs all have more discourse signs than the latter. This supports prior results that news and conversations are more informal and two-way than views and blogs [3]. News and interviews may use discourse markers more to build rapport and engage viewers.

News and interviews used more discourse markers with interpersonal roles than opinions and blogs. Similarly, earlier studies have found that news and conversations are more engaging and intimate than opinions and blogs, which are more formal and impersonal [3]. News and interviews use discourse markers for interpersonal goals to engage the audience and look genuine.

This study shows that speech cues vary across media. News and discussions use interpersonal discourse cues more than views and blogs. This study has implications for media workers and teachers, who may need to tailor their words to their audiences. The study also emphasizes the importance of analyzing discourse cues in different media discourse categories. The study's small sample size and focus on one written, and one spoken form are key drawbacks. Additional categories and cross-cultural investigation into discourse indicators could be added to future studies. More research is needed to determine how different discourse indicators affect the involvement and understanding of media discourse among different demographics. This research adds to our knowledge of how discourse indicators are deployed across media forms and highlight the need to pay attention to genre-specific linguistic cues when analyzing media discourse.

Conclusion. In the last part of the research, the researchers looked at speech indicators in various forms of media, including interviews, comments, and blogs. According to the research findings, there are significant differences between the four genres in terms of the prevalence and function of discourse markers. Interpersonal speech markers were more

prevalent in the news and conversations than in opinions and websites. Discourse markers were less prevalent in news and discussions compared to viewpoints and blogs.

The study combined qualitative and quantitative research methods in order to understand discourse markers in the four different types of media. While quantitative analysis disclosed the frequency of discourse markers and the roles they play, qualitative analysis uncovered the discourse markers that are most frequently used in each category.

This research sheds light on how discourse indicators are used across various media formats to achieve specific communicative functions. Media workers, language educators, and researchers interested in discourse analysis may benefit.

References

1. Aijmer K., English discourse particles. English Discourse Particles, 2002, pp.1-315.

2. Brinton L.J., Traugott, E.C. Lexicalization and language change. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

3. Di Ferrante L. Transitioning between small talk and work talk through discourse markers: Evidence from a workplace spoken corpus. pp.7-30, 2021.

4. Eggins S., Slade D., Analyzing casual conversation, Cassell, 1997.

5. Faisal W.M., The Discourse Marker (Well) in Selected Talk Shows: A Discourse Analysis Study1.

6. Fraser B., An approach to discourse markers, Journal of pragmatics, 14(3), 1990, pp.383-398.

7. Halliday M.A.K., Learning how to mean, Foundations of language development, Academic Press, 1975, pp.239-265.

8. Jiang L., Gu M.M., Understanding youths' civic participation online: a digital multimodal composing perspective, Learning, Media and Technology, 47(4), 2022, 537-556.

9. Lakoff R. The logic of politeness: Or, minding your p's and q's. In Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 292-305). 1973, April, Chicago Linguistic Society.

10. Nilsson, B., Carlsson E., Swedish politicians and new media: Democracy, identity and populism in a digital discourse, New Media & Society, 16(4), 2014, 655-671.

11. Pedroni M., Two decades of fashion blogging and influencing: A critical overview, Fashion Theory, 2022, pp.1-32.

12. Rhee S., On determinants of discourse marker functions: Grammaticalization and discourse-analytic perspectives, Linguistic Research, 37(2), 2020, pp.289-325.

13. Rone J., Far right alternative news media as 'indignation mobilization mechanisms': how the far right opposed the Global Compact for Migration. Information, Communication & Society, 25(9), 2022, pp.1333-1350.

14. Schiffrin D., Discourse markers: Language, meaning, and context, The handbook of discourse analysis, 2005, pp.54-75.

15. Schiffrin D., Discourse markers, No.5, Cambridge University Press, 1987.

16. Schourup L., Common discourse particles in English conversation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1985.

17. Shirazi F., Social media and the social movements in the Middle East and North Africa: A critical discourse analysis, Information Technology & People, 2013.

18. Schourup L., Common discourse particles in English conversation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1985.

19. Tagliamonte S.A., Analysing sociolinguistic variation. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

20. Uzunoğlu E., Kip S.M., Brand communication through digital influencers: Leveraging blogger engagement. International journal of information management, 34(5), 2014, pp.592-602.