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ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to investigate the use of discourse markers in legal and media discourses in the spoken and written genres. In order to achieve the aim of the study, the following objectives were set: to analyse the frequency and the functions of discourse markers in four genres: editorials and interviews; conventions and criminal trials; to compare the characteristic patterns of forms and functions of discourse markers in each genre. The approaches to the research were quantitative and qualitative as well as discourse analysis method was chosen for the analysis. The results of this study revealed that the general distribution of discourse markers and the functions of these items in the four genres are quite different. The frequency of occurrences of discourse markers is higher in the spoken genres than in the written ones, furthermore, the textual discourse markers are more frequent than interpersonal in the analysed genres. Despite the fact that textual functions of discourse markers are prevailing, the interpersonal functions also fulfil significant role in the texts, especially in the spoken discourse. On the whole, the results of the analysis showed that the frequency of DMs in the texts and their functions can be influenced by the genre. This leads to a conclusion that the forms and functions of DMs which correspond in the interviews and trials indicate the similar communicative purposes of the two genres.
INTRODUCTION

Discourse markers play an important role in achieving the communicative goals of socially situated language both in written and spoken discourse. As pointed by Kohlani (2010, 5), discourse markers function across sentences boundaries to connect textual units above the sentence and guide the text-receivers’ interpretation of text according to the text-producers’ communicative intentions. Despite their considerable role in producing texts, discourse markers are thought to be semantically empty and grammatically optional. However, rather than seeing them as meaningless and merely stylistic, Brinton (1996) claims that discourse markers fulfil a variety of pragmatic functions on the textual and interpersonal level of discourse. Discourse markers, which signal various kinds of boundaries, and assist in turn-taking in spoken discourse or marking of episode in written discourse, are claimed to fulfil textual functions. Discourse markers with interpersonal functions express speaker or writer’s attitude, and keep intimacy between the participants. Indeed, discourse markers are communicative tools which organize and evaluate the ideas in the discourse, thus, the use of these linguistic elements is tied to the communicative purpose of the text. Due to the fact that a genre comprises a class of communicative events defined by a set of communicative purposes (Swales, 1990, 58), the forms, frequency and functions of discourse markers that render texts acceptable differ among genres. The present study focuses on distribution and functions of discourse markers in different genres and follows the concept of genre developed by Swales (1990) and Bhatia (2013).

Studies related to analyzing the function and distribution of discourse markers across genres are numerous. They have focused on various aspects of discourse markers in genres, for example, variation of conjunctive discourse markers in the genres of textbooks and scientific research articles (Verikaitė, 2005), use of discourse markers in telephone conversations and television interviews (Verdonik, et al., 2008), discourse markers in essays (Feng, 2010), the function of discourse markers in Arabic newspaper opinion articles (Kohlani, 2010), inferential discourse markers in research articles of psychology across English and Persian (Kaveifard & Allami, 2011), causal markers across genres of newspaper articles, blogs and research papers (Mulkar Mehta, et al., 2011), forms and functions of discourse markers in President Obama’s political speeches (Ismail, 2012), discourse markers in academic report writing (Sharndama, Yakubu, 2013), the functions and the importance of discourse markers through political discourses in Albania (Dylgjeri, 2014). Although discourse markers have been examined in
different genres, still relatively little attention has been given to the media discourse of editorial and interview genre and to the legal discourse of convention and trial genre.

This paper deals with the distribution and functions of discourse markers in spoken and written language of legal and media discourse. Discourse markers are the subject of such investigation because they find their use in every genre and may serve as indicators of genre differences. Their frequency in the text and their functions can be influenced by the genre. Taking into consideration such a fact, the research question guiding this study is:

- What are characteristic patterns of forms and functions of discourse markers in legal discourse in the genres of the convention and criminal trial, and in media discourse in the genres of the editorial and interview?

Therefore, the aim of the study was to investigate the use of discourse markers in legal and media discourses in the above mentioned spoken and written genres. In order to achieve the aim of the study, the following objectives were set:

- To analyse the frequency and the functions of discourse markers in four genres: editorials and interviews; conventions and criminal trials;
- To compare the characteristic patterns of forms and functions of discourse markers in each genre.

To achieve the above mentioned objectives, the occurrences of discourse markers were explored and described both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative side of the analysis was performed by the use of descriptive statistics which consisted of statistical analysis such as frequency calculations in order to show the occurrences and distribution of discourse markers in each genre. The quantitative analysis was taken as a starting point for a qualitative analysis of the functions fulfilled by DMs in these particular genres. The qualitative approach was based on discourse analysis.

The data for the research analysis were taken from two contrastive corpora, one written and one spoken in two legal and two media genres. The written media genre consisted of editorials taken from the broadsheet *The Guardian*, whereas the spoken media genre consisted of interviews taken from *The Guardian* website. The following interviews were analysed: *Great
Interviews of 20th century, e.g. Diana, Princess of Wales interviewed by Martin Bashir in November, 1995. The written legal genre comprised conventions taken from the United Nations for Human Rights website, whereas the spoken legal genre comprised the criminal trial which was available in The Simpson Trial Transcripts website. The scope of data sources was 82,108 words (editorials- 20,098 words; interviews- 21,617 words; conventions- 20,440 words; criminal trials- 19,993 words). The data were analysed depending on the classification of discourse markers into textual and interpersonal developed by Brinton (1996), Aijmer (2002) and Hyland (2013). The taxonomies of functions, displayed in the researchers’ studies, were chosen due to their exhaustive categorization of textual and interpersonal functions of discourse markers in spoken (Brinton, 1996, Aijmer, 2002) and written discourse (Hyland, 2013).

The novelty of the study lies in two aspects. First, the work offers the analysis of textual and interpersonal functions of discourse markers in the four genres. As far as it is known, none of the previous studies has focused on the discourse marker use in the convention genre, and only few studies have focused on the discourse marker use in legal and media discourse from the perspective developed by Brinton (1996), Aijmer (2002) and Hyland (2013). Second, the study shows the similarities in the use of discourse markers between the spoken genres of the interview and criminal trial, and the differences between the genre of the convention and the other three genres, which is also fairly new in the investigated field.

This paper suggests applying the results of the study for pedagogical purposes. The displayed forms and functions of discourse markers can be helpful in organizing coherent speech and writing. Teachers and learners of English could use the models of discourse markers in relation to a particular genre. The results of the study could be relevant to those studying linguistics as well as producing texts in some other fields, e.g. in legal or media studies. Beside the practical value of the study, there is also the possibility of using its results for further investigation of the use of discourse markers in different contexts and for the development of the genre theory in general.

This paper consists of introduction, four chapters and conclusions. The first chapter presents a brief literature review on the basic notions in text linguistics such as discourse, discourse analysis, genre, cohesion and coherence. The second chapter deals with the definition
of discourse markers and their functions presenting points of view of the most influential linguists on the study of discourse markers. The third chapter focuses on the forms, frequency of occurrences and functions of DMs in the four above mentioned genres. The fourth chapter compares the characteristic patterns and the main functions of discourse markers in the spoken and written discourse of the media and legal genres. Finally, the results of investigation are summarized in the conclusions.
1. ON THE CONCEPT OF DISCOURSE

Discourse markers form a group of linguistic expressions that are inseparable from discourse and fulfil important functions in spoken and written discourse interpretation. As Schiffrin (1987, 49) points out, “the analysis of discourse markers is a part of the more general analysis of discourse coherence” which is always associated with discourse cohesion. While cohesion is represented by formal linking signals in text, coherence is the underlying relations that hold between the propositions of a text on the one hand, and relations between text and context, on the other hand (Kohlani 2010, 22). Every coherent text has some sort of structure and its communicative purpose. “The communicative event which is characterized by a set of communicative purposes” is called a genre (Swales, 1990, 58). The concept of genre is more effective in representing that theoretical construct which intervenes between language function and language form.

Because the theoretical framework in which this study operates draws on different concepts in the field of discourse analysis such as written and spoken discourse, cohesion and coherence, genre, these concepts are discussed below, and their relevance to the study is determined.

1.1 Discourse and discourse analysis

The terms discourse and discourse analysis are often presented with some confusion due to the fact that the field of discourse analysis is extremely diverse. As McCarthy (1991, 6) points out, discourse analysis grew out of works in different disciplines, including linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology, and sociology. The term discourse analysis was first introduced by Harris in 1952 as a way of analysing connected speech and writing beyond the level of the sentence and the relationship between linguistic and non-linguistic behaviour.

There are in fact a number of different views on what discourse analysis actually is. Linguists such as Hymes (1972), Van Dijk (1972), Halliday and Hasan (1973; 1978), Bhatia (2004) developed the theory of discourse analysis. Paltridge (2011, 3-8) examines different descriptions of discourse analysis and presents the main points in this field:
The relationship between language and context (analysis of both spoken and written interaction);

- Discourse analysis and pragmatics (the interpretation of language depends on knowledge of the real world);
- The discourse structure of the texts (how people organize what they say in the sense of what they typically say first, and what they say next and so on in a conversation or in a piece of writing);
- Cultural ways of speaking and writing (looking at the ways in which language is used by particular cultural groups);
- Communicative competence and discourse (mastery of the grammatical competence, knowledge of appropriate language use, knowledge of how to connect utterances in a text so it is both cohesive and coherent and mastery of the strategies the speakers use to compensate for breakdowns and to enhance the effectiveness of the communication),
- Discursive competence (textual, generic, social).

*Discourse* is a fashionable word which is used by authors in radically different views of what *discourse* is and the way that the term ought to be used (Richardson 2007, 21). For Cameron (2001, 17), *discourse* “is not pure content, not just a window on someone’s mental or social world”; it is “a form of language with certain characteristics which are dictated by the way language and communication work”.

Schiffrin (1994) argues that there are two general approaches to the definition of discourse. One is formalism or structuralism: an interest in the abstract form and structure of language. The other is functionalism: an interest in what language is used to do. Schiffrin (1994) also claims that *discourse* is not amenable to “pure” formalist analysis, but it is amenable to functionalist analysis which has always been concerned with form as well as function. Cameron (2001, 13) makes an observation that most discourse analysts who locate themselves within the academic discipline are concerned with both form and function though the balance between these concerns may vary.

To sum up, *discourse analysis* is “a wide-ranging discipline which finds its unity in the description of language above the sentence and interest in the contexts and cultural influences which affect language in use” (McCarthy 1991, 7). The two main approaches of form and function help us to understand what is happening in discourse; therefore, they are essential while analysing the discourse markers which are the main focus of the study.
1.1.1 The spoken and written discourse

Generally, discourse is divided into two broad units, the spoken and the written. Despite the fact that there is no an absolute dividing line between spoken and written discourse, speech and writing are not interchangeable modes of communication with no distinctive features at all (Cameron 2001, 13). Paltridge (2011, 13-18) presents his understanding of a number of commonly held views on differences between spoken and written language devised by Biber as following:

- Writing is more structurally complex and elaborate than speech (However, Halliday (1989) argues that speech is no less highly organized, and it has its own kind of complexity);
- Written discourse tends to be more lexically dense than spoken discourse;
- Written texts typically include longer noun groups than spoken texts (nominalization);
- Writing is rather more explicit than speech;
- Writing is more decontextualized than speech (speech depends on a shared situation whereas writing does not depend on such a shared context);
- Spoken discourse is often produced spontaneously (it contains more half-completed and reformulated utterances than written discourse);
- Speaking uses more repetition, hesitation and redundancy than written discourse (the use of pauses and fillers).

These characteristics can be true for some spoken and written genres, but false for some others. As McCarthy (2001) claims, spoken and written styles may intermingle with each other, i.e. forms that are typically associated with spoken language may also occur in written language, such as informal letters or advertising, due to the fact that they both underlie the same grammatical system. Biber suggests (1988) that spoken and written genres are rather multidimensional constructs as they have not only different features with other spoken and written genres, but also a great number of common characteristics.

As it is evident above, the spoken and written discourse can have not only different features, but also isomorphic features of discourse. Owing to the fact that discourse markers appear both in speech and writing, and the present study focuses on the use of DMs in the two modes of discourse, the differences and similarities between the two modes of communication are necessary in this study.
1.2 The notion of genre

A separation of discourse into broadly spoken and written categories is one way of dividing up the world of language and texts. But there are many studies on language variation within discourse analysis which suggest more operational divisions of the language. One of the most influential theories of language variation is developed by Halliday (1978, 1989), Swales (1990), Bhatia (2013).

The functions of language are divided by Halliday (1978; 1989) into the following: field, tenor and mode of discourse. Field refers to the ideational function of the language (topic of the discourse), tenor to the interpersonal function (the role of the participants) and mode to the textual function (what the language is doing itself as a channel of communication). The findings that language varies with its function led to a variety of different kinds of texts. As McCarthy (2014, 22) points out the theory lays an emphasis on language as social semiotic, on language variation in relation to social contexts, on descriptions of language according to the user (dialects) and according to use (registers). Trosborg (1997) describes registers as varieties (or styles) of language typical of occupational fields, such as the language of legal documents, the language of newspapers, medical language, etc. Register analysis marks language variation in terms of lexico-grammatical features which is a surface level description. A deep description of language use is performed by genre analysis. The description below defines what is meant by non-fictional genre in this study.

The present study follows the concept of genre developed by Swales (1990) and Bhatia (2013), the two influential scholars in developing a genre theory. In the definition, presented by Swales (1990, 58), the scholar underlies the importance of communicative purpose as the criterion to distinguish one genre from another:

A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purpose. The purposes are recognizable by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constraints choice of content and style.

Bhatia (2013) makes further distribution to the definition given by Swales (1990). According to the scholar (Bhatia, 2013, 13), there are several aspects which need further elaboration:
• Genre is a recognizable communicative event characterized by a set of communicative purposes identified and mutually understood by members of the professional or academic community in which it regularly occurs.
• It most often is a highly structured and conventionalized communicative event.
• Various genres display constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their intent, positioning, form and functional value.
• These constraints are often exploited by the expert members of the discourse community to achieve private intentions within the framework of socially recognized purpose.

The two influential views on genre (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 2013) give a comprehensive description of genre. According to their definitions, the language use in a genre is dependent on rules and conventions which could be social, linguistic, cultural, academic, or professional (Deng & Zhang, 2014). The members of academic or professional groups operate within specific genres with awareness of the rules and conventions, i.e. they are generically competent. Generic competence, which refers to the ability of identifying, constructing, interpreting, and exploiting the specific genres constitutes an important part of discursive competence (Bhatia, 2013).

Genre Analysis focuses on situated linguistic behaviour in academic or professional settings, and attempts to explain conventions and regularities in texts within discourse communities with shared communicative purposes. As pointed out by Deng and Zhang (2014, 7), genre analysis offers “thick description of language use in order to arrive at significant form–function correlation”.

From the point of view of genre analysis, the present study, firstly, attempts to characterize typical textual and interpersonal features of discourse markers in the genre-specific texts, then, to identify form–function correlation of these items in each genre, and finally, to compare the form–function correlation between the genres.

1.3 Cohesion and coherence

The two concepts of cohesion and coherence underlie this study. Cohesion is a property of the text that is realized through lexico-grammatical system, while coherence is the result of the interpretation process of the text. It means that some texts may be coherent and understandable to some receivers and uninterpretable to others. Coherence is, therefore, “a matter of semantic and pragmatic relations in the text” (Reinhart 1980, 164).
Halliday and Hasan (2006) view cohesion as a means for creating coherence. In their seminal work “Cohesion in English” they focus on cohesion across sentence boundaries. The aim of their study is to identify the text as “unified whole”, conversely to a “collection of unrelated sentences”. Their division of the function of language into ideational, interpersonal and textual distinguishes the textual component as resource that creates continuity between one part of the text and another. Halliday and Hasan (2006) list five types of cohesive ties: reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion, and conjunctions. These ties are divided into grammatical and lexical. The grammatical devices include reference, ellipsis and substitution, while the lexical ones include repetition and collocation.

Conjunctions, which are the focus of this study, are the link between both the grammatical and lexical categories. They differ in nature from the other cohesive relations due to the fact that they are cohesive not in themselves, but indirectly. They express certain meanings which presuppose the other elements in the texts (Halliday & Hasan, 2006, 236). Describing conjunctions as cohesive devices, the attention is focused not on the semantic relations, but on “the function they have of relating to each other linguistic elements that occur in succession but are not related by other, structural means” (Halliday & Hasan, 2006, 237).

The present study focuses on cohesion between units above sentences, furthermore, Halliday and Hasan’s (2006) view on conjunctions is regarded as an aspect underlying various classifications of discourse markers which are exploited in the research.
2. DISCOURSE MARKERS

Discourse markers (DMs) serve as an object of investigation in the last few decades. Numerous studies in different languages, genres and interactive contexts deal with their definition, classification and functions. As pointed out by Fraser (1999, 931), “although most researchers agree that they are expressions which relate discourse segments, there is no agreement on how they are to be defined or how they function”. Scholars even do not agree in terms of their terminology. DMs have been studied under various labels, including discourse particles, discourse operators, discourse connectives, pragmatic connectives, pragmatic markers, pragmatic particles, sentence connectives. As noted by Zarei (2013, 108), the term DM is merely the most popular of all those terms used.

Owing to the understanding of the function of DMs, different approaches have been developed. The most influential proposals are from systemic functional grammar (SFS) founded by Halliday and Hasan (1973), the coherence model developed by Schiffrin (1987), grammatical pragmatic perspective proposed by Fraser (1987), the Relevance Theory adopted from pragmatics by Blakemore (1992). Despite the large disagreement in the area of DMs studies, it is possible, as Schourup (1999, 230) argues, “to identify a small set of characteristics on which nearly all variant uses of the term DM draw selectively and with varying emphasis”. The different studies of DMs also distinguish several domains where they may be functional, in which there are included textual, attitudinal, cognitive, and interactional parameters (Castro, 2009, 60). Most of the studies of functional domains of DMs are based on Halliday’s language functions (1973): ideational, interpersonal and textual. For instance, Brinton (1996), Ajimer (2002), Hyland and Tse (2004), Muller (2005) classify DMs into the functional headings of two main categories: interpersonal and textual. According to Hyland and Tse (2004, 162), textual discourse markers refer to the organization of discourse, while the interpersonal ones reflects the writer’s stance towards the content of the text and the potential reader. They can be also multifunctional serving both textual and interpersonal functions.

In the following sections there are discussed the main definitions, classifications, similar features, and functional domains of DMs, with reference to some of the most influential studies that examine this linguistic phenomenon.
2.1 Definition and classification of discourse markers

Definition of DMs varies among different researches. The researchers describe these items differently due to the way that discourse is viewed in each study. As pointed out by Blakemore (2002), there is “more than one view of what discourse is and accordingly more than one view of what it means for an expression to operate at discourse level”. In this section there are presented major trends that can be generalized in the studies of DMs, namely Schiffrin’s (1987; 2006; see Schiffrin et al, 2001) discourse perspective, Fraser’s pragmatic approach (1996; 1999), Halliday and Hasan’s (2006) semantic perspective on cohesion and Blakemore’s (1987) theoretical perspective within the Relevance Theory.

According to Schiffrin (1987; 2006), the first scholar to bring the most detailed effort regarding DMs, discourse includes several different planes of coherence and structure. She proposes a discourse model with five planes: a participation framework, information state, ideational structure, action structure, exchange structure. Schiffrin (et al 2001, 57) claims that DMs can work at different levels of discourse to connect utterances on either a single plane or across different planes. The scholar proposes (ibid. p. 58) that DMs are multifunctional despite having their primary functions (e.g. the primary function of and is on ideational plane). Being located in the five planes of talk of coherence model, DMs are defined by Schiffrin (1987, 31) as “sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of talk, i.e. non-obligatory initial items that function in relation to ongoing talk and text”. The scholar (see Schiffrin et al 2001, 57) also suggests that discourse markers comprised a set of linguistic expressions from word classes such as conjunctions (e.g., and, but, for), interjections (oh), adverbs (now, then) and lexicalized phrases (y’know, I mean). Another aspect of her analysis shows that DMs display relationships that are local (between adjacent utterances) and global (across wider spans and structures of discourse). Schiffrin (2006, 14) also points out that some discourse markers are based on their propositional meaning (e.g., I mean, y’know), whereas other markers (e.g. oh) have no propositional meaning. Finally, the scholar (Schiffrin, 1987, 322) does not only compare DMs to indexicals or to contextualization cues, but pursues the indexical properties of DMs more fully and suggests that markers are a subclass of indexicals which have meaning not only in discourse, but also grammatical (aspectual) meaning.
The second influential approach to the study of DMs is provided by Fraser (1988; 1996; 1999), who works within a grammatical-pragmatic perspective. Fraser’s (ibid.) theoretical framework concerns the meaning of sentences and depends upon a differentiation between the propositional and non-propositional part of a sentence. The aspect of sentence which represents a state of the world when the speaker wishes to bring to the addressee’s attention is regarded by Fraser (1996, 2) as propositional content. The non-propositional content is called by Fraser (ibid.) “everything else”. This part of sentence meaning, which represents non-propositional content, the scholar proposes (Fraser, 1996) to analyse as different types of signals, called Pragmatic Markers. Although the pragmatic markers do not contribute to the propositional content of the sentence, they signal different types of messages (ibid. p. 936). Messages, and hence their associated pragmatic markers, are divided into four types (ibid. p. 2-3): basic messages, commentary messages, parallel messages, discourse messages. Discourse messages, and hence the presence of discourse markers, are optional and signal a message specifying how the basic message is related to the foregoing discourse (ibid. p. 3). Fraser (ibid.) suggests that there are four naturally occurring classes of DMs: topic change markers (e.g., back to my original point, by the way, on a different note), contrastive markers (e.g., in contrast, nevertheless, though), elaborative markers (e.g., above all, what is more, in particular), inferential markers (e.g., all things considered, consequently, therefore). He (ibid. p. 391) defines DMs as lexical expressions, drawn from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbs and non-propositional phrases, which “signal a relationship between the interpretation of the segment they introduce, S2, and the prior segment, S1”. “They have a core meaning which is procedural, not conceptual, and their more specific interpretation is negotiated by the context, both linguistic and conceptual” (Fraser 1999, 950).

The third approach is that of Halliday and Hasan (2006) whose work on cohesion in English proves that cohesion is a part of the text-forming component in the linguistic system. They (Halliday & Hasan 2006, 303) discuss cohesion under the five heading, i.e. reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Although Halliday and Hasan (2006) do not speak directly of DMs, their analysis includes conjunctive items which are parallel to the words called DMs in other studies. Conjunctions are somewhat different from the other cohesive relations. They are based on the assumption that there are in the linguistic system forms of systemic relations between sentences (ibid. p. 320). They can be located in the phenomena that
constitute the content of what is being said (external), or in the interaction itself, the social process that constitutes the speech event (internal) (ibid. p. 321). The meanings conveyed by conjunctions can be additive (e.g., and, in addition, for instance), adversative (e.g., but, however, rather), causal (e.g., so, because, under the circumstances) and temporal (e.g., then, next, finally) (ibid. p. 241-244). The multiplicity is found not only in forms, but in function, too, i.e. each type of cohesive meaning can be conveyed not only through a variety of words, but also a single word can convey more than one conjunctive relation. Halliday and Hasan (2006, 226) define conjunctive elements as following:

Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meaning; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse.

The fourth approach to the study of DMs is provided by Blakemore (1987, 2002) who works within the framework of Relevance Theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1996). The object of the study in the Relevance Theory is not discourse itself, but “the cognitive processes underlying successful linguistic communication” (Blakemore 2002, 5). For Blakemore (1987), discourse connectives are employed to signal how one discourse segment is relevant to another. Her analysis focuses on the procedural nature of discourse connectives in the sense that they constrain the process of utterance interpretation. In other words, the meaning encoded by such expressions as therefore, so, after all, but controls the choice of context under which the utterances containing them are relevant (Blakemore 1987, 75). Blakemore (1992, 138) suggests four ways in which information conveyed by an utterance can be relevant:

- it may allow the derivation of a contextual implication (e.g., so, therefore, too);
- it may strengthen an existing assumption, by providing better evidence for it (e.g., after all, moreover, furthermore);
- it may contradict an existing assumption (e.g., however, but, nevertheless);
- it may specify the role of the utterance in the discourse (e.g., anyway, by the way, finally).

To sum up, different researchers have provided different definitions for DMs and come up with their own classification of DMs. Each researcher integrates discourse markers analysis into the study of language. Schiffrin (1987; 2006) defines DMs within her discourse model, Fraser (1996, 1999) approaches a pragmatic theory of meaning applied both within and across sentences, Halliday and Hasan (2006) analyse conjunctive relations in their study of cohesion,
Blakemore adopts the Relevance Theory in her studies of DMs. According to Kohlani (2010, 72), sharing common features that facilitate the recognition of DMs as a linguistic group “does not necessarily lead to a general definition under which all items of this group can be included”. Lenk (1998) states that to give a common definition for DMs is rather impossibly. The scholar (ibid.) also adds that every research of discourse markers should come up with its own definition depending on items, type of discourse, and framework of the study.

2.2 Isomorphic features of discourse markers

Some basic characteristic and features shared by discourse markers have been identified in DMs studies. The most prominent characteristics are compiled by Brinton (1996), Jucker and Ziv (1998), Schourup (1999), and Kohlani (2010). The most common features that Schourup (1999) realizes in these expressions are: connectivity, optionality, non-truth-conditionality, weak clause association, initiality, orality, and multi-categoriality.

The most prominent studies in definitions of DMs agree that these expressions connect utterances or other discourse units. But this connectivity is conceived differently due to the way discourse is viewed. Kohlani (2010, 39) claims that in coherence-based studies DMs are seen as connecting textual units by marking the relationships between them, whereas within the relevance theory they do not connect one segment of text to another but underlie the interpretation of the segment they introduce. The connectivity does not necessarily relate two segments of text; it can create also other kinds of relation. For example, Kohlani (ibid. p. 41) mentions that DMs can encode a message which expresses the author’s perspective on the content of the basic message. He (ibid.) claims that this kind of relations creates connectivity between the author and text on the one hand, and between the author and reader on the other hand. Schourup (1999, 231-232), who revises different studies on connectivity of DMs, concludes that if connectivity is criterial for DM status, it can be used to distinguish DMs from various other initial elements such as illocutionary adverbials (e.g., confidentially), attitudinal adverbials (e.g., sadly) and from primary interjections (e.g., oops).

Being optional is another feature of DMs. To Schourup (1999, 231), DMs are optional in two distinct senses: “syntactically optional in the sense that removal of a DM does not alter
grammaticality of the sentences and in the further sense that they do not enlarge the possibilities for semantic relationship between the elements they associate”. He claims (ibid. p. 231) that “if a DM is omitted, the relationship it signals is still available to the hearer, though no longer explicitly cued”. But “despite such observations”, Schourup (ibid.) argues, “it is never claimed that the optionality of DMs renders them useless or redundant”. They are not pragmatically optional or superfluous; instead, they guide the hearer toward a particular interpretation and rule out unintended interpretations, i.e. they reinforce or clue the interpretation intended by the speaker (Brinton 1996, 34).

Non-truth-conditionality is also a feature of DMs that Schourup (1999) distinguishes in his study. He (1999, 232) claims that DMs are generally thought to contribute nothing to the truth-conditions of the proposition expressed by an utterance. For Kohlani (2010, 43), being non-truth-conditional is an essential characteristic of DMs because it distinguishes discourse markers from other identical counterparts that are not used as markers and which contribute to propositional content (e.g., adverbials now, then). Nevertheless, Kohlani (ibid. p. 44) points out, that while these expressions are not constituents of the propositional structure, their absence does not imply that they do not affect its meaning; they do affect the propositional meaning by guiding and constraining its interpretation.

The next feature of weak clause association is similar to the non-truth-conditionality feature in the sense of the detachment of DMs from their host sentences. As Brinton claims (1996, 34), DMs usually occur “either outside the syntactic structure or loosely attached to it”. Although DMs are at best weakly related to more central clause elements, Schourup (1999, 232) points out that some of them have their syntactic structure (e.g., on the other hand) and some DMs (e.g., y’know) are clausal despite their apparent non-truth-conditionality.

The initiality is one of the most noticeable features of items belonging to this group. The tendency of DMs to occur sentence initially is predominant. However, DMs can appear also sentence medially and sentence finally with functions fundamentally identical to those they serve initially (Schourup 1999, 233). Nevertheless, Kohlani (2010, 48) argues that initial position gives for DMs wide scope over the whole sentence or paragraph to influence hearer or reader interpretation of everything that follows, whereas other positions are only responsible for subtle changes in meaning or function. The reason for the fact that initial position of DMs is
prototypical, as Schourup (1999, 233) indicates, relates to their “superordinate” use “to restrict the contextual interpretation of an utterance: it will make communicative sense to restrict contexts early before interpretation can run astray”.

The feature of orality is based on claims that DMs occur primarily in speech, but, according to Schourup (1999, 234), there is no principled grounds “on which to deny DM status to similar items that are largely found in written discourse”. He (ibid.) claims that association of a particular DM with the written or spoken channel is not strict and is often tied to the formal or informal event in which is used DM. The meaning of discourse marker may also relate to one mode or the other. Some DMs may “encode a high degree of utterance planning”, while other DMs may be associated with speech “because their meaning presupposes a familiarity with the addressee not typical of impersonally addressed writing” (Schourup 1999, 234).

**Multi-categoriality** is the last feature of DMs presented by Schourup (1999). There is a view that DMs constitute a functional category that is heterogeneous with respect to a syntactic class. Schourup (1999, 234) distinguishes categories to which extrinsic DM function has been attributed: adverbs (e.g., now, actually, anyway), coordinating and subordinating conjunctions (e.g., and, but, because), interjections (e.g., oh, gosh, boy), verbs (e.g., say, look, see), and clauses (e.g., you see, I mean, you know). The fact that DMs are drawn from various word classes means that they have identical counterparts that are not used as markers. Kohlani (2010, 39) points out that despite the great dispute regarding “the coexistence of two structurally identical items that function differently in discourse”, they do not overlap in discourse: when an expression functions as a discourse marker it does not express the propositional meaning of its identical counterparts.

To sum up, the characteristics of DMs discussed in this section suggest that the typical DM is a syntactically and semantically optional expression that does not affect the truth-conditions associated with an utterance. The DM also comprises a functionally related group of items drawn from other classes and is used to connect utterances or larger discourse units. Moreover, DM appears in the initial position predominantly, and its meaning may relate to spoken or written channels.
2.3 Functional domains

According to isomorphic features of DMs, they are grammatically optional and semantically empty. However, Brinton (1996, 35) claims that they are not pragmatically superfluous: they serve a variety of pragmatic function. She (ibid. p. 36) argues that “if such markers are omitted, the discourse is grammatically acceptable, but would be judged “unnatural”, “awkward”, “disjointed”, “impolite”, “unfriendly”, or “dogmatic” within the communicative context”.

Despite the agreement of functionality of DMs, to distinguish their certain major functions is a difficult task. Taxonomies of DMs, which are generally functionally based, differ significantly. But there is also tendency in this area to base heterogeneous functions on the three modes or functions of language identified by Halliday (1994). Within Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), language is seen as realizing three “metafunctions”: the ideational function, the interpersonal function and the textual function. For Halliday (ibid.), the ideational function represents ideas and the speaker’s experience. It is representational, referential and informational functions which correspond to the propositional meaning. The interpersonal function is concerned with relations among people. It allows participants to interact with others, to take on roles and to express and understand evaluations and feelings. Finally, the textual function aims to create coherent texts related to the world and to readers. Textual meaning is relevance to the context: to the preceding (and following) text, and the context of situation.

Many discourse and metadiscourse analysts have drawn on Halliday’s metafunctions to code their data. For example, Brinton (1996, 38) divides the function of pragmatic markers (the term of markers used in her studies) into two categories: textual and interpersonal. The Halliday’s ideational function of language she calls the “propositional mode” and claims that pragmatic markers generally fall outside the propositional component. Aijmer (2002, 39) also claims that “textual and interpersonal function should be seen as potential meaning of the particles, which can co-occur in the same discourse: discourse particles are at the same time signposts in the communication and expressions of the speaker attitude and emotions”. Metadiscourse analysts (Koople, 1985; Crismore, 1993; Hyland, 2005), whose metadiscourse signals remind pragmatic markers, have based their studies on Halliday’s language functions as well. To do this, they distinguished metadiscourse items from propositional matter and then categorized the former as
either performing a textual function by organizing a coherent discourse, or performing an interpersonal function by conveying the writer’s attitudes to the text (Hyland, 2005, 26).

The analyses of DMs reveal that they fulfill a number of textual and interpersonal functions, but it is also clear that they can be multifunctional and they serve both textual and interpersonal functions (Castro 2009, 73). The *multifunctionality* of discourse markers has been described first by Schiffrin (1985, 2001) in her discourse model. Following Schiffrin (et al 2001, 60), DMs are context-dependent so they “can gain their function through discourse”. Therefore, DMs can work either on a single plane or on different planes of discourse simultaneously. Aijmer (2002) also points out that an important property of discourse particles is their *flexibility* and *multifunctionality*. For Petukhova and Bunt (2009), discourse markers may have various communicative functions simultaneously as well. For example, if the speaker wants to provide additional information about something that he/ she mentioned before, he/ she can signal the relation by using discourse markers (e.g., *and, moreover*), but the same discourse markers can be also used to show that the speaker wishes to continue in the speaker role (turn keep function).

Generally, the discourse markers studied by researchers fulfill more than one function or at least fulfill more than one sub-function within the same macro-function, either textual or interpersonal. However, the *multifunctionality* of DMs is a complex category, as DMs can be more associated with one function than another. In other words, DMs can have their primary or dominating functions. Therefore, DMs can be multifunctional not only simultaneously, but also sequentially. Beside this, the same DMs may fulfill different functions in different contexts (see Schneider et al, 2014).

The present study focuses rather on dominating functions of discourse markers, but a few examples also shows how discourse markers may have various functions simultaneously or sequentially. The main analysis of the study is based on how the same form of DM can fulfil different sub-functions within the same macro-function, either textual or interpersonal.
2.3.1 The textual function of discourse markers

For Halliday (1994), the textual function is realized in the theme focus structure of discourse, in the distribution of given and new information, and in cohesive relations. The cohesive relations which correspond to DMs are conjunctive relations which relate text elements together. The classification of conjunctive relations into additive, adversative, causal, and temporal is adopted by many researchers in the area of discourse analysis.

However, Brinton (1996, 38) claims that to analyse the functions of discourse particles in spoken language “one needs a more global conception of the textual component than Halliday uses”. She (ibid. p. 35-40) presents her inventory functions in the study about pragmatic markers. Castro (2009, 61) presents her understanding of the inventory of the textual functions of DMs devised by Brinton as following:

- To initiate discourse, including claiming the attention of the hearer (opening frame marker);
- To close discourse (closing frame marker);
- To aid the speaker in acquiring or relinquishing the floor (turn takers);
- To serve as filler or delaying tactic used to sustain discourse or hold the floor (fillers);
- To indicate a new topic or a partial shift in topic (topic switchers);
- To denote either new or old information (information indicators);
- To mark sequential dependence (sequence/relevance markers);
- To repair one’s own or other’s discourse (repair markers).

The second version of categorizing functions of DMs is given by Aijmer (2002), who distinguishes between particles functioning on the global or local level of the discourse. She (ibid.) talks about a frame function when a discourse particle has a global coherence function and use of qualifying function with a local coherence function. “Discourse particles with a frame function are not needed when the interaction goes smoothly but to draw the hearer’s attention to a transition or a break in the conversational routines” (Aijmer, 2002, 41). Therefore, different functions signaled by a special marker are needed in the frame textual functional domain. Aijmer (2002) differentiates such functions as marking transitions, introducing a new turn, introducing an explanation, introducing or closing a digression, self-correction, introducing direct speech. Another qualifying function signals that some qualification is needed because the dialogue does not “go well”. The functions of discourse particles as qualifiers are following: indicating
agreement/disagreement, response to a question (a request), indicating comparison or contrast
(ibid.).

Finally, adopting a certain theoretical background from *Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)*, metadiscourse analysts also propose *textual metadiscourse markers*. Most taxonomies in metadiscourse studies are based on that proposed by Kopple (1985). She believes (1985, 87) that *textual metadiscourse* “shows how we link and relate individual propositions so that they form a cohesive and coherent text and how individual elements of those propositions make sense in conjunction with other elements of the text”. Koppler’s categorization of textual metadiscourse consists of four metadiscourse markers: *text connectives* (sequences, reminders, topicalizers); *code glosses* (used to help readers to grasp the writer’s intended meaning); *validity markers* (used to express the writer’s commitment to the probability or truth of a statement); *narrators* (used to inform the reader of the source of the information presented).

To conclude, all functions analysed on the textual macrolevel contribute to coherence and textuality in discourse. Despite their different subclassifications among the researchers mentioned above, we can see only slight differences in the function itself. The researchers, mentioned above (Brinton, 1996; Castro, 2009; Ajimer, 2002; Kopple, 1985), offer a clear analytical tool with functional classification for describing DMs.

### 2.3.2 The interpersonal function of discourse markers

According to Brinton (1996, 38), *the interpersonal functions* of pragmatic markers belong within Halliday’s interpersonal component. Markers with an interpersonal function refer to the nature of the social exchange and express attitudes, feelings and evaluations. The most exhaustive studies of the interpersonal function of DMs are those of Brinton (1996), Castro (2009), Aijmer (2002), Kopple (1985) and Hyland, (2005; 2013).

Interpersonal functions of DMs adapted from Brinton (1996, 35-40) are presented in Castro’s (2009, 61) research. They consist of subjective functions and interpersonal functions:
- Subjectively, to express a response to the preceding discourse including also back-channel signals of understanding and continued attention while another speaker is having his/her turn (response/reaction markers; back-channel signals).
- Interpersonally, to effect cooperation or sharing, including confirming shared assumptions, checking or expressing understanding, requesting confirmation, expressing difference or saving face (confirmation-seekers, face-savers).

Castro (2009, 71) argues that the interpersonal functions of DMs are precisely more related to the reactions, responses and relations built by the participants during interaction, i.e., to the role of the speaker and hearer during the social and communicative exchange.

A similar point of view is proposed by Aijmer (2002). The researcher (ibid.) points out that discourse particles can be used as hedges expressing uncertainty and as hearer-oriented appeals to the hearer for confirmation. Aijmer (ibid.) also gives such examples of interpersonal function of discourse particles as expressing a response or a reaction to the preceding utterance and backchannelling. The particles with interpersonal functions are called by Aijmer (ibid.) as phatic discourse particles because they underlie the interactive structure of conversation. The phatic discourse particles can be also analysed in terms of face-saving, politeness and indirectness which are characteristic of everyday conversation.

The next classification of interpersonal functions is presented by Kopple (1985, 88). The interpersonal macro-function which conveys the writer’s attitude to the text is subdivided into illocution markers (used to make explicit the discourse act the writer is performing at certain points); attitude markers (used to express the writer’s attitudes to the propositional material he or she presents); commentaries (used to address readers directly, drawing them into an implicit dialogue by commenting on the reader’s probable mood or possible reaction to the text). It is worth noting that these functions are not performed in isolation, and the writer may be trying to achieve several purposes at once. Kopple’s taxonomy has been refined by many researchers.

The most substantial revisions have been those of Hyland and Tse (2004) and Hyland (2005; 2010; 2013). Hyland and Tse (2004) suggest that all metadiscourse is interpersonal in that it takes account of the reader’s knowledge, textual experiences and that it provides writers with an armoury of rhetorical appeals to achieve this. For Hyland (2005), textual metadiscourse (realized by conjuncts and adverbials) can be oriented towards either propositional or interactional meaning. “Our tendency to see conjunctions as expressing connections between ideas”, Hyland
(2005, 41) points out, “is a result of our primarily ideational orientation to the world, but we can also see conjunctions as interactionally motivated, contributing to the creation and maintenance of shifting interpersonal orientations”. Hyland concludes (ibid. p. 43) that the so-called textual devices organize texts as propositions by relating statements about the world and as metadiscourse by relating statements to readers; they do not function independently of these two functions. Due to the fact that metadiscourse is distinct from propositional aspects of discourse, the function of its markers can be only interpersonal.

The interpersonal model of metadiscourse functions, proposed by Hyland (2013, 77), is comprised of the two dimensions of interaction: the interactive and the interactional dimension. Interactive resources are used to organize propositional information in ways that a target audience is likely to find coherent and convincing. But they are not simply text-organizing due to the fact that their deployment depends on what the writer/speaker knows of his/her readers/listeners and how the writer/speaker assesses the reader/s/listener’s comprehension capacities, understanding of related texts and need for interpretative capacities. In other words, they are a consequence of the relationship between participants. The interactive resources are divided by Hyland (2013, 78) into five broad categories: transition markers (additive, adversative, causative), frame markers (e.g., finally, to conclude), endophoric markers (e.g., noted above), evidentials (e.g., according to), code glosses (e.g., in other words). The interactional resources are essentially evaluative and engaging, expressing solidarity, anticipating objections, and responding to an imagined dialogue with others. That is to say, the interactional dimension concerns the ways writers conduct interaction by intruding and commenting on their message. There are five subcategories of interactional markers presented by Halliday (2013, 80): hedges (e.g., perhaps, possible), boosters (e.g., in fact, it is clear that), attitude markers (e.g., unfortunately, surprisingly), engagement markers (e.g., you can see that), self-mentions (e.g., I, we, my). On the whole, the interactive markers help to guide the reader/listener through the text, whereas the interactional markers involve the reader/listener in the text.

To conclude, the above mentioned interpersonal functions of DMs suggest that these expressions are related to the reactions, responses and relations built by the participants during interaction, that is, to the role of the writer/speaker and reader/listener during the social and communicative exchange (Castro 2009, 710). The inventory subcategories (Brinton, 1996;
Aijmer 2002; Kopple 1985; Hyland 2005) of the interpersonal mode provide more specific functions which can be employed in analyzing DMs within any communication, whether spoken or written. The most explicit taxonomy of the interpersonal functions is presented by Hyland (2005, 2010, 2013) due to the fact that all metadiscourse markers are regarded by Hyland as interpersonal. The scholar claims that the so-called textual metadiscourse is actually another aspect of the interpersonal features of a text.

Owing to the exhaustive categorization of textual and interpersonal functions of discourse markers in spoken (Brinton, 1996; Aijmer, 2002) and written discourse (Hyland, 2013) the present study depends on the classification of discourse markers into textual and interpersonal developed by the scholars (Brinton, 1996; Aijmer, 2002; Hyland, 2013).
3. DISCOURSE MARKERS ACROSS GENRES

The aim of the study was to investigate the use of discourse markers in legal and media discourses in the written and spoken genres. To achieve the above mentioned objectives, the occurrences of discourse markers were explored and described both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative side of the analysis was performed by the use of descriptive statistics which consisted of statistical analysis such as frequency calculations in order to show the occurrences and distribution of discourse markers in each genre. The statistical analysis was taken as a starting point for a qualitative analysis of the functions served by DMs in these particular genres. The qualitative analysis of the study was based on DM studies of Brinton (1996), Ajimer (2002), Castro (2009), Hyland (2013). DMs were analyzed for both textual and interpersonal functions in each genre. The final step in the analysis was to compare the characteristic patterns and functions of discourse markers in each genre.

3.1 Discourse markers in the editorials

The editorials are the part of the written media discourse. According to Cambridge Dictionaries Online (CD), an editorial is an article in a newspaper that expresses the editor's opinion on a subject of particular interest at the present time. As pointed out by Dijk (VD) editorials are argumentative in language and structure, and therefore they can be characterized by the categories of summary, evaluation and conclusion. Indeed, an editorial is a type of argumentative journalistic essay which include such characteristics as to be highly persuasive and logical. Discourse markers, which bind together a piece of writing, can fulfill such functions as to summarize, to conclude or to indicate an attitude which can be helpful in writing an editorial. Moreover, logical markers can serve as transitions from one discourse unit to another and interactional discourse markers can involve the reader in the argument.

The corpus used in this part of the study consisted of 25 editorials downloaded from The Guardian website. Editorials were collected over a four-month period (December, 2014- March, 2015). The subject of the editorials focused on political, social, economic and religious issues. Total word count of the editorials was 20,098, which was taken as the basis for calculating the frequency of each DM. Within 20,098 words 66 different DMs were identified, but the number
of occurrences of each DM was quite different. Total number of all DMs occurrences was 357 which composed 1.78% of the total word count. Taking into consideration functions of DMs, there were found 325 occurrences of DMs fulfilling textual functions and 32 occurrences of DMs in interpersonal functions (see Fig. 1).

![Figure 1. General distribution of DMs in the editorials](attachment:image.png)

As it can be seen from Figure 1, DMs in textual functions compose 91.04% of the total DMs count, whereas DMs in interpersonal functions compose only 8.96%. The textual functions of DMs in the editorials are apparently dominant over the interpersonal. This leads to a conclusion that DMs which bind together a piece of writing are highly useful in the editorials.

To start with the textual functions of DMs in the editorials, there were found 51 different forms of DMs. However, the number of occurrences of each DM was considerably different. The five most frequent DMs compose 58.18% of all textual DMs (see Table 2).
### Table 2. Frequency and distribution of DMs in textual functions in the editorials

Table 2 displays the occurrences of each DM and their percental representation within the total DM count in the textual functions. DMs which have the same number of occurrence in the corpus are displayed together: their number of occurrences and percentages are demonstrated as per each DM. Table 2 presents that the most frequent DM is *but*, occurring 96 times and having 29.53% within the total number of occurrences of DMs. Among other frequent DMs we have *and* (48 occurrences with 14.8%), *yet* (16 occurrences with 4.92%) and *so* (15 occurrences with 4.62%). Furthermore, *however, also, because, then, nevertheless* and *nor* compose a visible part of DM representation within the corpus. It can be seen the tendency to use such DMs as *at least, therefore, after all, indeed, meanwhile, though, on spite of* in the editorials. Some discourse markers occur only twice (*according to, although, finally, for example, just as, to be clear, unlike*) or once (*albeit, as for, as a result, by contrast, even so, first, for instance, etc.*).
As it was mentioned above, *but* is the most frequent DM in the editorials. The function of DM *but* in these articles is to signal contrastive relationships between discourse stretches. In other words, *but* fulfills a function of contrastive marker, indicating that the given utterance is either a denial or a contrast of some propositions from the preceding discourse. For example:

- (1) Right now, however, we continue to inhabit a less perfect world. *But* that system is not so imperfect that the self-interest of one party can be permitted to kill off the debates altogether. (TED)
- (2) The war in Afghanistan, once constantly in the headlines, has slipped down the agenda since the American-led coalition forces formally ended combat operations in December last year. *But* it goes on, and it goes on pretty ferociously. (AW)

*And* is the second most frequently used discourse marker in the editorials. This marker, often called an additive marker or elaborative marker, signal that the utterance following constitutes additional information to the preceding discourse. Simultaneously, *and* is used to indicate the writer’s continuation. For example:

- (3) If its new prime minister is now to be allowed to wriggle free of commitments given by his country, then what reason will it ever have to learn to live without the begging bowl? *And* why should other indebted states do anything other than demand similar favourable terms, or themselves elect populists promising to make unpleasant obligations go away? (GDR)
- (4) Mr Grieve was, as a government minister, seeking to overrule the tribunal’s meticulous verdict reached after hearing extensive argument. *And* in doing that, he trampled on two aspects of the rule of law: first, that the ruling of the courts is binding; second, that it is for the courts to review executive actions, not the other way round. (BSM)

*Yet* is the third most frequently used discourse marker in the editorials. The function of the DM *yet* is similar to *but*. *Yet* expresses an adversative relationship between discourse units and is used to contrast with what came before. For example:
• (5) The 13-year war in Afghanistan, in which 453 UK servicemen and women died, took the lives of more British troops than any overseas military commitment by this country in the past half century. Yet Britain’s fourth Afghan war in 180 years has been in some respects a less endurably divisive national experience than either the Iraq war or the Falklands war a generation previously. (WIA)

So is the fourth most frequently used discourse marker in the editorials. The DM so, often called as a causative or an inferential marker, signals that the given utterance is a conclusion which follows from the previous discourse. To put it differently, so is a transition which marks consequential steps in the discourse. For example:

• (6) The Paris killers had links with networks across the Middle East, including in Yemen. So the need to share intelligence to counter groups that themselves operate and communicate easily across borders cannot be disputed. (CTC)

The fifth most frequently used DM however marks contrastive steps in the discourse of editorials and is equal in its function with but and yet. For example:

• (7) There are several reasons for this. One stands out, however. (SPO)

As the analysis reveals, the textual DMs in the editorials can be subdivided into five sub-categories: transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials and code glosses. Among the most frequent DMs, the transitions, which signal additive and contrastive relationships, are prevailing. Beside this, the consequential transitions are quite common in the editorials, too. A visible part of DMs in the editorials compose frame markers which signal text boundaries including such functions of DMs as to sequence, to label text stages and to indicate topic shifts; and code glosses, which signal the restatement of ideational information in other ways. There are found some cases of evidentials, which specify information from other sources, and endophoric markers, which refer to other parts of the text. All DMs, mentioned above, represent the textual macro-function, which help to guide readers through the text. Table 3 provides the categorization of the textual functions in the editorials, the forms of DMs which represent each category, and exemplification of the functions.
### Table 3. Sample instances of DMs textual functions in the editorials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To express semantic relations in the discourse (transitions):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additive</td>
<td>• Also, and, nor, or</td>
<td>(8) They are speaking now because soon they will not be able to speak. They are speaking, also, to a Europe where minorities (…). (ALA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contrastive</td>
<td>• Albeit, although, at least, but, by contrast, even so, however, in spite of, instead, in opposition, nevertheless, nonetheless, though, on the contrary, yet</td>
<td>(9) This belief explains why, in most modern democracies, politicians conventionally devote so much time and sweat to their big set-piece orations. Nevertheless, many observers these days are more sceptical. (SUA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consequential</td>
<td>• After all, as a result, as, because, in effect, then, therefore, thus</td>
<td>(10) All these things have happened in recent years. This time, therefore, Europe must rigorously uphold its standards (…). (CTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To refer to discourse acts, sequences, or text stages (frame markers)</strong></td>
<td>Finally, first, in sum, in the end, meanwhile, put it all together, second, then, to cap it all, ultimately</td>
<td>(11)…A quarter of the economy has disappeared and half of young citizens are workless. To cap it all, the debt burden itself did not fall but instead grew to reach 175% of GDP. (GDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To help readers grasp functions of ideational material (code glosses)</strong></td>
<td>As, At least, to be clear, for example, for instance, in one sense, in other words, in particular, just as, unlike</td>
<td>(12) He moved just (…), widening consultation slightly and introducing elections to municipal councils. He was, in other words, not a bad man. (SAKA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To refer to source of information from other texts (evidentials)</strong></td>
<td>According to, as, in spite of</td>
<td>(13) According to experienced political scientists writing after the 2010 election, “there is little evidence to support the content (…)”. (TED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To refer to information in other parts of the text (endophoric markers)</strong></td>
<td>As for</td>
<td>(14) As for scrambling together a deposit for a first flat, some calculations suggest that young families are (…). (GG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high use of DMs, representing the textual functions, is clearly an important feature of the editorials. However, the interpersonal DMs compose an important part in the articles, too, due to the fact that they involve readers in the argument.

To continue with the interpersonal functions of DMs in the editorials, there were found 32 occurrences of DMs. Among the all occurrences there were found 15 different forms of DMs (see Table 4).

Table 4. Frequency and distribution of DMs in interpersonal functions in the editorials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Distribution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of course</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps, true</td>
<td>3 (*2)</td>
<td>9.38 (=18.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At best, in fact, sadly, undoubtedly,</td>
<td>2 (*4)</td>
<td>6.25 (=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actually, hopefully, it is clear, in principal, say, unfortunately, unhappily</td>
<td>1 (*7)</td>
<td>3.13 (=21.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total DM (in interpersonal functions) count: 32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4 shows the most frequent DM is of course (6 occurrences with 18.75% distribution), next is indeed (5 occurrences with 15.62%) and then perhaps and true (3 occurrences with 9.38% each). Some DMs occur only twice (at best, in fact, sadly, undoubtedly), the others only once (actually, hopefully, it is clear, etc.) The three most frequent DMs of course, indeed and true imply writer’s certainty to present information and emphasize the force of propositions. For example:

- (15) Of course, Russia has been playing politics with its charges that neo-fascists are on the march in Ukraine. (ALA)
- (16) Indeed, the very conduct of the “war on terror” started taking on an increasingly mercenary dimension. (CIATR)
- (17) True, the ISC has some enhanced powers and its report into the Lee Rigby case showed a new awareness of the need for transparency. (BAT)
With reference to the research results, the interpersonal functions of DMs in the editorials can be subdivided into four sub-functions. Table 5 provides the categorization of interpersonal functions in the editorials, the forms of DMs which represent each category and exemplification of the functions.

**Table 5. Sample instances of DMs interpersonal functions in the editorials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal functions (interactional)</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To emphasize writer’s certainty in proposition (boosters)</td>
<td>Indeed, in fact, in principal, it is clear, of course, true, undoubtedly</td>
<td>(18) <em>Many had come to feel, in fact, that the often wet, uncomfortable, and occasionally dangerous streets of the Admiralty district, where they made common cause with other young people (...).</em> (FDHGP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express writer’s attitude to proposition (attitude markers)</td>
<td>Actually, at best sadly, hopefully, unfortunately, unhappily</td>
<td>(19) <em>Sadly, reflective sorts are not getting much of a look-in during the election campaign.</em> (GG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build relationship with readers (engagement markers)</td>
<td>say</td>
<td>(20) <em>Why did this past year become the moment when, say, American footballers and British soccer players and, more importantly, their clubs, found themselves pilloried for conduct that had previously been ignored?</em> (YIF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express writer’s reluctance to information (hedges)</td>
<td>perhaps</td>
<td>(21) <em>Perhaps that is a discussion for another day.</em> (BSM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen from Table 5, among the DMs which represent the interpersonal functions there are boosters which indicate the writer’s confidence in a particular position, attitude markers, engagement markers, and hedges which withhold writer’s full commitment to a proposition.

To sum up, the DMs in the editorials fulfil a number of textual and interpersonal functions which contribute to the management of the discourse and engagement of the readers by noticing and evaluating the text material. Taking into consideration the use of DMs in this genre, the most frequent of them fulfil textual functions. However, the interpersonal functions are of the considerable importance owing to their influence on the readers.
3.2 Discourse markers in the interviews

The interviews are the part of the spoken media discourse. The most evident characteristics of this genre questioning and answering are also present in any broadcast talks. But unlike talk shows, panel discussions or press conferences, interviews involve only two participants and the absence of audience. The interview genre serves to show an opinion of the respondents which is very similar to an editorial genre, the part of the written media discourse. In both genres discourse markers are seen as helpful linguistic clues that text producers use in order to achieve a successful communicative acts.

The corpus used in this part of the study consisted of transcripts of 5 interviews downloaded from The Guardian website. The interviewees were chosen from among famous people, such as an actress Mae West, an art critic David Sylvester, a dramatist Dennis Potter, the Princess of Wales Diana and the President of the US Richard Nixon. The subject of the interviews was the professional and private life of the interviewees. Total word count of the transcripts was 21,617, which was taken as the basis for calculating the frequency of each DM. Within 21,617 words 97 different DMs were identified, but the number of occurrences of each DM differed considerably. Total number of all DMs occurrences was 1059 which composed 4.9 % of the total word count. Taking into consideration functions of DMs, there were found 710 occurrences of DMs fulfilling textual functions and 349 occurrences of DMs in interpersonal functions (see Fig. 6).

![The interviews](image)

**Figure 6.** General distribution of DMs in the interview

As it can be seen from Figure 6, DMs in textual functions compose 67.04 % of the total DMs count, whereas DMs in interpersonal functions compose 32.96 %. However the textual functions
of DMs in the editorials are prevailing, the interpersonal functions compose also a great deal in this genre.

To begin with the textual functions of DMs in the interviews, there were found 48 different forms of DMs, but the number of occurrences of each DM was considerably different. The five most frequent DMs compose 58.18% of all DMs in textual functions (see Table 7).

Table 7. Frequency and distribution of DMs in textual functions in the interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Distribution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>37.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>22.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean, or</td>
<td>14 (+2)</td>
<td>1.97 (=3.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After all, for example, for instance</td>
<td>6 (+3)</td>
<td>0.85 (=2.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albeit, again, also</td>
<td>5 (+3)</td>
<td>0.7 (=2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although, and yet, though</td>
<td>4 (+3)</td>
<td>0.56 (=1.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As you say/ as you said, as, instead, on the other hand, yet</td>
<td>3 (+5)</td>
<td>0.42 (=2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>according to, however</td>
<td>2 (+2)</td>
<td>0.28 (=0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as I pointed out, as I say, as I said previously, at least, before that, before then, by the end, by then, coming back to the whole point, consequently, even so, even though, finally, first, let’s leave that, looking back, nevertheless, one, on the whole, second, therefore, third, to this end, under these circumstances</td>
<td>1 (+24)</td>
<td>0.14 (=3.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 displays the occurrences of each DM and their percental representation within the total DM count in textual functions. DMs which have the same number of occurrence in the corpus are displayed together: their number of occurrences and percentages are demonstrated as per each DM. Moreover, some markers, which have only slight changes in their word forms (e.g., as you say/ as you said), are displayed together as the same DMs. Table 7 clearly shows that
the most frequent DM is *and*, occurring 269 times and having 37.89% within the total number of occurrences of DMs. Among other very frequent DMs we have *but* (163 occurrences with 22.96%), and *because* (71 occurrences with 10%). Furthermore, *so, then, now, I mean* and *or* compose a great deal of DM representation within the textual functions of DMs. It can be seen that representatives of interviews also tend to use such DMs as *after all, for example, for instance, albeit, again* and *also*. Such markers as *although, and yet, though* are less frequent. Some discourse markers occur only three times (*as you say, instead, on the other hand, yet*), twice (*according to, however*) and once (*as I say, at least, consequently, finally, first, etc.*).

As it was mentioned above *and* is the most frequent DM in the interviews. The function of DM *and* is not only of discourse continuative, but also of turn giver, topic switcher, sequence marker, information indicator and filler.

Most of the uses of the DM *and* are related to the textual functions of discourse that of showing continuity and adding new information. For example:

- (22) DIANA: *I said to my husband: ‘What do I do now?’*
  
  *And* he said, *‘Go over to the other side and speak to them.’* (PW)

However, *and*, as in case 23, is used not only to mark continuity but also as a turn giver to aid the speaker in acquiring the floor. For example:

- (23) BASHIR: *And what did you do?*
  
  DIANA: *I swam.* (PW)

The use of *and* in the example (24) displays the marker simultaneously as an additive marker, and as a topic switcher. The interviewee indicates a partial shift in a topic:

- (24) MAE WEST: *There was a lot of serious reflection in what I said. And I was always writing.* (MW)

The (25) example illustrates *and* as a sequence marker, which indicates the sequential dependence of the utterances:
• (25) DAVID SYLVESTER: But of course so many things have happened since Velasquez that the situation has become much more involved and much more difficult, for very many reasons. And one of them, of course, which has never actually been worked out, is why photography has altered completely this whole thing of figurative painting, and totally altered it. (DS)

In addition, and can serve the function of information indicator, explaining either new or old information. In case 26 and denotes old information which is expressed in the previous utterance:

• (26) NIXON: And in any event, for six months the country couldn't afford having the president in the dock in the United States Senate. And there can never be an impeachment in the future in this country without a president voluntarily impeaching himself. (RN)

The frequent function of the DM and in the interviews is that of filler. And serves as a filler or delaying tactics used to sustain discourse or hold the floor. For example:

• (27) DENNIS POTTER: Goodnight Vienna, as they say in football nowadays. [laughs] And I've been working since then, flat out at strange hours, 'cause I'm done in the evenings, because of the morphine. (DP)

But is the second most frequently used discourse marker in the interviews. The functions of the DM but are also diverse. Apart from the main function of contrast, the DM is used as a closing or opening frame marker, repair marker, turn taker, sequence marker and topic switcher.

The main function of the DM is to denote a contrastive state of affairs. In other words but encodes a denial of expectation between the two utterances. For example:

• (28) MAE WEST: I wish I could've shown you my beach house. But I sold it.

But in the example (28) involves the contrastive relation between the two discourse units. On the basis of the DM, the hearer might be led to expect something which is then denied.

But can also be used as a closing frame marker, offering its recipient a chance to close the discourse. For example:
• (29) DAVID FROST: I would say that you endorsed or ratified it. But let's leave that on one side (...). (RN)

The example above (29) shows that David Frost wants to close the topic with the help of the DM but.

Apart from closing discourse, but fulfils the function of initiating discourse, including claiming the attention of the hearer. For example:

• (30) FRANCIS BACON: But why was it you chose the Pope? (FB)

Furthermore, but can signal the speaker's desire to repair the previous discourse. For example:

• (31) DAVID SYLVESTER: Most of them. But not all. (DS)

This use of but (31) is the correction use, where the clause introduced by but provides a correct replacement for the assumption given in the first clause.

Speakers take turns while speaking and the beginning of a speaker's new turn may be begun with but. For example:

• (32) DIANA: And in a way by being out in public they supported me, although they weren't aware just how much healing they were giving me, and it carried me through. BASHIR: But did you feel that you had to maintain the public image of a successful Princess of Wales? (PW)

Bashir, in case 32, uses but to aid the interviewee in acquiring the floor.

There is also a use of the DM but, which can be called sequential. For example:

• (33) DAVID FROST: You have explained how you have got caught up in this thing, you've explained your motives: I don't want to quibble about any of that. But just coming to the substance: would you go further than "mistakes" - the word that seems not enough for people? (RN)

This use of but (33) signals a return to the main topic of discourse.
When speakers shift to a new topic or to different aspect of topic, they can begin with *but* to indicate such transitions. For example:

- (34) NIXON: *I couldn’t do that because I said clemency was wrong. But now we come down to the key point and let me answer it in my own way about how I feel about the American people.*

*But* used by Nixon (34) fulfils a function of topic switcher.

*Because* is the third most frequent DM. Generally, *because* signals a conclusion which follows from the preceding discourse:

- (35) NIXON: *If they want me to get down and grovel on the floor; no, never. Because I don’t believe I should.* (RN)

But the same DMs *because* can mark the beginning of a speaker’s new turn:

- (36) FROST: *Why didn’t you stop it?*

  NIXON: *Because at that point I had no knowledge of the fact that it was going to be paid.* (RN)

Table 8 summarizes the functions of DMs, together with their instances, used by the interviewers and interviewees.

**Table 8. Sample instances of DMs textual functions in the interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual functions</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To initiate discourse</td>
<td>And, but, so, now</td>
<td>(37) BASHIR: <em>So you very much created the role that you would pursue for yourself really? That was what you did?</em> (PW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To close discourse</td>
<td>And, let’s leave that, so, now, so, then, therefore</td>
<td>(38) DAVID FROST: <em>I would say that you endorsed or ratified it. But let’s leave that on one side (...).</em> (RN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take or to give a turn</td>
<td>And, because, but, now, so</td>
<td>(39) DIANA: <em>(...)and I hoped I was able to</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual Function</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To indicate a new topic or a partial shift in topic</td>
<td>And, but, so, now, then</td>
<td>(40) DENNIS POTTER: <em>He was full of a witty despair and cynicism. Now, I have never been like that, (…).</em> (DP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To repair one’s own or other’s discourse</td>
<td>At least, but, however, I mean</td>
<td>(41) DENNIS POTTER: <em>(…) I tried it with myself in a mirror, and that was fun, I mean, I was pre-karaoke and I wasn’t breaking a mould as such.</em> (DP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To mark sequential dependence</td>
<td>After all, again, and, before then, before that, but, by the end, by then, finally, first, one, on the whole, second, so, then, third, to this end</td>
<td>(42) DAVID SYLVESTER: <em>I stopped; I thought for a moment I’d got something much nearer to what I want. Then the next day I tried to take it further and tried to make it more poignant, more near- and I lost the image completely.</em> (DS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To mark logical transitions in the discourse</td>
<td>Albeit, also, although, and, and yet, because, but, consequently, even so, even though, however, instead, nevertheless, on the other hand, or, therefore, though, yet, under these circumstances</td>
<td>(43) NIXON: <em>Because I don’t believe I should. On the other hand, there are some friends who say, ”just face ’em down.</em> (RN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To refer to source of information in other parts of the text</td>
<td>Again, coming back to the whole point, as I pointed out, as I say, as I said previously,</td>
<td>(44) NIXON: <em>(…) but at least not war - in the Middle East. And, coming back to the whole point of whether I should have resigned then and how I feel now (…).</em> (RN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To refer to information in other sources</td>
<td>According to</td>
<td>(45) BASHIR: <em>According to press reports, it was suggested that it was around this time (…).</em> (PW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help hearers to grasp the proposition</td>
<td>As, for example, for instance, I mean</td>
<td>(46) DIANA: <em>When no one listens to you, or you feel no one’s listening to you, all sorts of things start to happen. For instance, you have so much pain inside yourself (…)</em> (PW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The textual functions of DMs (see table 8), identified in the interviews are related to the discourse coherence and are used to open or close discourse, to sustain discourse or hold the floor, to mark sequence or to repair the discourse, to refer to information in other sources or in other parts of text, to help hearers to grasp the proposition.
With reference to the interpersonal functions of DMs in the interviews, there were identified 49 different forms of DMs. The total count of all occurrences was 349. The frequency of occurrences of each DM was different. The five most frequent DMs compose 57.02% of all DMs in interpersonal functions (see Table 9).

Table 9. Frequency and distribution of DMs in interpersonal functions in the interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Distribution(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah/yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know/you must know/as you know</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of course</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uh, uh</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obviously</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actually, you could say/you may say/you might say/say</td>
<td>11 (*2)</td>
<td>3.15 (=6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think, no</td>
<td>8 (*2)</td>
<td>2.29 (=4.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In fact, maybe, perhaps</td>
<td>6 (*3)</td>
<td>1.72 (=5.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let me say, you see, who knows</td>
<td>4 (*3)</td>
<td>1.15 (=3.45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I suppose, I will admit/I will have to admit, I would say/I’d say, I’m sure, yep/yup | 3 (*5) | 0.86 (=4.3)
| Absolutely, exactly, frankly, I must say, it’s clear, mmm, my goodness, so to speak, unfortunately | 2 (*9) | 0.57 (=5.13)
| As far as I’m concerned, believe me, certainly, don’t forget, oh, I assume, I believe, I know, I suppose, I would have to say, in my view, let me answer, my God, my goodness, really, specially, stupidly, thanks God | 1 (*18) | 0.29 (=5.22)
| 49                                                     | 349        | 100             |

Table 9 presents the occurrences of each DM and their percental representation within the total DM count in interpersonal functions. DMs which have the same number of occurrence in the corpus are displayed together: their number of occurrences and percentages are demonstrated as per each DM. What is more, some markers, which have slight changes in their forms (e.g., yeah/yes), are displayed together as the same DMs. Table 9 displays that the most frequent DM is well, occurring 73 times and having 20.92% within the total number of occurrences of DMs.
Among other very frequent DMs there are *I think* (46 occurrences with 13.18%), and *yeah/yes* (32 occurrences with 9.17%). Moreover, *you know, of course, uh, uh* and *obviously* compose a great part of all DMs within the interpersonal functions of DMs. It can be seen the tendency to use such DMs as *I don’t think, no, in fact, maybe,* and *perhaps.* Such markers as *let me say, you see, who knows* are less frequent. Some discourse markers occur only three times (*I suppose, I will admit, I would say, I’m sure, yep*), twice (*absolutely, exactly, frankly, etc.*) and once (*As far as I’m concerned, believe me, certainly, etc.*).

As Table 9 shows, *well* is the most frequently used discourse marker in the interpersonal functions. It has several distinct uses such as a response/reaction marker, hesitation marker, an attitude marker, a cooperation marker and face-saver. This marker fulfils also some textual functions such as to indicate a new topic, hold the floor or to take turn, but its primary functions are rather interpersonal. Taking into consideration such a fact, the functions of *well* in this study come under the heading of interpersonal.

The first use of *well* is as a response or reaction marker to the preceding discourse. In such contexts *well* indicates an interaction between the speakers. For example:

- (47) BASHIR: *How did the rest of the Royal Family react when they learnt that the child that you were to have was going to be a boy?*
  
  DIANA: *Well, everybody was thrilled to bits.* (PW)

In the utterances presented above (47) we can find *well* not only as a reaction marker, but also as an attitude marker. The DM performs a double function in the talk. The primary function is to express a reaction to the preceding content, whereas the secondary function is to express the speaker’s affective value to the same content.

The next use of *well* is as a hesitation marker, when the speaker is not immediately ready to give the response or to some degree reluctant to tell the truth. For example:

- (48) BASHIR: *How did you handle the transition from being Lady Diana Spencer to the most photographed, the most talked-about, woman in the world?*
DIANA: *Well, it took a long time to understand why people were so interested in me, but I assumed it was because my husband had done a lot of wonderful work leading up to our marriage and our relationship.* (PW)

The Princess Diana, in case 48, needs some time to organize what she wants to say or maybe she is not sure about how to state what she wants to say. In order to bridge interactional silence she uses the marker.

Sometimes, *well* is used in situations in which interviewees know that they are not providing directly information the interviewer asked for. In other words, it indicates a response that the speaker knows may be an insufficient answer. For example:

- (49) MELVYN BRAGG: *Why should I mind?*
  DENNIS POTTER: *Well, people do nowadays.* (DP)

The talk above (49) shows us that Melvyn Bragg asks a question that is difficult to answer. Therefore, Dennis Potter prefaces his reply with *well*. This sort of *well* presents a problem between the interviewer and the interviewee.

*Well* is also used as an agreement or cooperation marker. The purpose of its use is to effect cooperation or sharing the same points of view. For example:

- (50) FRANCIS BACON: *The tragic hero is necessarily somebody who is elevated above other men to begin with.*
  DAVID SYLVESTER: *Well, I'd never thought of it in that way, but when you suggest it to me, I think it may be so.* (DS)

David Sylvester uses *well* (50) to agree with a preceding utterance.

*Well* is often used as a mitigation marker to save face. The use of *well* in such contexts normally expresses denials, refusals, and objections to a given utterance. For example:

- (51) BASHIR: *Do you think Mrs Parker-Bowles was a factor in the breakdown of your marriage?*
  DIANA: *Well, there were three of us in this marriage, so it was a bit crowded.* (PW)
By using *well* (51) Diana partially expresses difference that to indicate politeness and to save face.

The next most frequent DM in interpersonal functions is *I think*. Generally, this marker shows speakers’ attitude to what they are saying:

- (52) NIXON: *I think* it will be very useful to you to know what I was going through. (RN)

But sometimes this marker can be also used to express speakers’ hesitation:

- (53) DIANA: *I was desperate.* *I think* I was so fed up with being seen as someone who was a basket-case (...). (PW)

The third most frequent discourse marker is *yes/yeah*. This marker can fulfill the functions of back-channel signal, agreement marker, response or reaction marker, and confirmation-seeker or face-saver.

The example (54) shows how *yes* effects sharing, but at the same time expresses signals of difference. By using *yes* Diana does not only confirm shared assumptions, but also indicates politeness expressing difference and saves face.

- (54) BASHIR: *It would provide the clarity that you talk about, it would resolve matters as far as the public are concerned perhaps.*
  DIANA: *Yes, but what about the children?* (PW)

The example (55) displays the function of *yes* not only as an agreement marker, but also as a response or reaction marker:

- (55) BASHIR: *Had you made any of those calls at all?*
  DIANA: *I used to, yes, I had rung up, yes.* (PW)

In case 56 *yeah* fulfills the function of back-channel signal to show the understanding and attention while another speaker is having her turn:
• (56) CHARLOTTE CHANDLER: In reverse order of importance.
MAE WEST: Yeah. If I had to choose between sex and work, it was always my work I'd choose. (MW)

The results of the study showed that the interpersonal functions of DMs in the interviews can be subdivided into six sub-functions. Table 10 provides the categorization of the interpersonal functions in the interviews, the forms of DMs which represent each category and exemplification of the functions.

Table 10. Sample instances of DMs interpersonal functions in the interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal functions</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To express a response or a reaction</td>
<td>Absolutely, mmm, my God, my goodness, no, of course, oh, really, thanks God, uh, uh, well, yeah/yes, yep/yup</td>
<td>(57) DIANA: Oh, come on, Di, look up. (PW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express speakers’ attitude</td>
<td>Actually, frankly, I assume, I believe, I don’t think, I’d say, in my view, I suppose, I think, specially, stupidly, unfortunately, well</td>
<td>(58) DIANA: Unfortunately, that seems to have stuck on and off over the years. (PW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express sharing or cooperation</td>
<td>Don’t forget, exactly, I know, I will admit, let me answer, let me say, no, of course, you could say, yeah/yes, yep/yup, you know, you see, well</td>
<td>(59) MAE WEST: Honey, there’s something I want to tell you before you go. You know, my diamonds I told you all those men gave me? (MW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To save face or to seek confirmation</td>
<td>I would have to say, you know, well, yes</td>
<td>(60) BASHIR: (...) you began to experience difficulties in your marriage, in your relationship to the Prince of Wales. Is that true? DIANA: Well, we were a newly-married couple, so obviously we had those pressures, (...). (PW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To express speakers’ hesitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To express speakers’ hesitation</td>
<td>As far as I’m concerned, I think, maybe, perhaps, well, who knows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61) DIANA: I don’t know. Maybe people have a better understanding (...)</td>
<td>(PW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express speakers’ certainty</td>
<td>Absolutely, actually, believe me, certainly, I’m sure, I must say, in fact, it’s clear, obviously, of course, you know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(62) FRANCIS BACON: It’s clear that much of your obsession with painting meat has to do with matters of form and colour. (DS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, the functions identified in the interviews are both textual and interpersonal, although the frequency of DMs in textual functions is prevailing. The textual functions of DMs are more related to the discourse coherence and are used to open or close discourse, to sustain discourse or hold the floor, to mark sequence or to repair the discourse while the interpersonal functions of DMs are more related to the reactions, responses and relations between the participants. The analysis also reveals that DMs fulfil more than one function in the interviews, i.e. they are multifunctional. What is more, only forms of DMs do not display their functions, DMs gain their function in the context.

### 3.3 Discourse markers in the conventions

The conventions are the part of written legal discourse. Legal discourse is a highly specialized use of language requiring a special set of words, structures and other linguistic patterns. Therefore, DMs used in legal discourse can differ on their forms and functions from DMs in other genres.

The corpus used in this part of the study consisted of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, Convention on the Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and United Nation Convention against Corruption. The total word count of the legal documents was 20,440 which was taken as the basis for calculating the frequency of each DM. Within 20,440 words 21 different DMs were identified. The total number of all DMs occurrences was 155 which composed 0.76 % of the total word count. Taking into account functions of DMs, there were found only DMs fulfilling textual functions. The interpersonal functions of DMs were absent.
in the conventions. The number of occurrences of each DM was apparently different. The two most frequent DMs compose 50.97% of all DMs in textual functions (see Table 11).

**Table 11.** Frequency and distribution of DMs in textual functions in the conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Distribution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In accordance</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the purposes/for purposes/for this purposes, for the purpose</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to/in order that, in particular</td>
<td>14 (*2)</td>
<td>9.03 (=18.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearing in mind</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To this end/to that end</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, taking into account</td>
<td>4 (*2)</td>
<td>2.58 (=5.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this regard, with regard to, with due regard to</td>
<td>3 (*3)</td>
<td>1.94 (=5.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the other hand, that is</td>
<td>2 (*2)</td>
<td>1.29 (=2.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to, as stated, as indicated, in addition, so, taking into consideration, thereafter, with special reference</td>
<td>1 (*8)</td>
<td>0.65 (=5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the occurrences of each DM and their distribution within the total DM count in the textual functions. The most frequent DM is *in accordance*, occurring 54 times and having 34.84% within the total number of all DMs. *For the purpose* occurs 25 times and represents 16.13% of all occurrences. *In order to* and *in particular* (14 occurrences with 9.03 % each) are the next most frequent DMs. There is tendency to use such DMs as *bearing in mind* and *to this end*. *However, taking into account* and *in this regard* are less frequent in the discourse. Some DMs occur only twice (*on the other hand, or*) or once (*according to, as stated, as indicated, etc.*).

The most frequent DM *in accordance* performs the textual function of an evidential by indicating the source of textual information which originates outside the following text:

- (63) *In accordance with the obligation of States Parties under article 9, paragraph 1, applications by a child or his or her parents to enter or to leave a State Party for the purpose of family reunification shall be dealt with by States Parties in a positive, humane and expeditious manner.* (CRC)
The second most frequent DM *for the purpose* performs a role of frame marker and helps to announce the discourse goal:

- (64) *For the purpose* of examining the progress made by States Parties in achieving the realization of the obligations undertaken in the present Convention, there shall be established a Committee on the Rights of the Child, which shall carry out the functions hereinafter provided. (CRC)

The function of DM *in order to* is the same as the function of DM *for the purpose* and it helps to express the purpose of the discourse. The DM *in particular* signals the restatement of state of affairs in other ways:

- (65) *Every child deprived of liberty shall be treated with humanity and respect (...). In particular, every child deprived of liberty shall be separated from adults (...).* (CRC)

The textual functions of DMs, identified in the conventions are related to the discourse management and are used: to mark additive, contrastive and consequential steps in the discourse; to mark sequence or goals of the discourse; to refer to information in other sources or in other parts of text; to help hearers to grasp the proposition. Table 12 summarizes the functions of DMs, together with their instances, used in the legal written discourse.

**Table 12. Sample instances of DMs textual functions in the conventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual functions (interactive)</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To express semantic relations in the discourse: (transitions)</td>
<td>However, in addition, on the other hand, so</td>
<td>(66) <em>The members of the Committee shall be elected for a term of four years. However, the terms of nine of the members elected at the first election shall expire at the end of two year (...)</em> (CEDW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To refer to discourse acts, sequences, or text stages (frame markers)</td>
<td>For the purpose, in order to, thereafter, to that end, to this end</td>
<td>(67) <em>To this end, States Parties shall promote the conclusion of bilateral or multilateral agreements or accession to existing agreements.</em> (CRC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help readers grasp functions of ideational material (code glosses)</td>
<td>In particular, that is</td>
<td>(68) <strong>In particular</strong>, each State Party shall endeavour to apply, within its own institutional and legal systems, (...). (UNC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To refer to source of information from other texts (evidentials)</td>
<td>According to, as indicated, as stated, in accordance, bearing in mind, with special reference to, taking into account</td>
<td>(69) <strong>As indicated</strong> in the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, “the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care (...).” (CRC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To refer to information in other parts of the text (endophoric markers)</td>
<td>In this regard, with regard to, taking into account, taking into consideration</td>
<td>(70) <strong>In this regard</strong>, particular account shall be taken of the needs of developing countries. (CRC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it was mentioned above, the legal discourse is a highly specialized and its distinction is also visible by the use of DMs. The minimum number of DM occurrences has been found throughout the genre of convention. The variety of DM forms is not considerable, too. The identified functions of DMs only help to guide the reader through the text, i.e. they implement the textual functions. The functions, that involve the reader in the argument, i.e. interpersonal functions, do not exist.

### 3.4 Discourse markers in the trials

The trials are the part of spoken legal discourse. The most evident characteristics of this genre, questioning and answering, are also present in interviews. But unlike interviews which involve only two participants, the trials involve more participants such as victims, defendants, prosecutors, judges, etc. And unlike the written legal discourse, the trial involves people from different communities. This leads to a conclusion that the spoken legal discourse is not homogeneous in its set, but rather multiple. Therefore, DMs, representing this genre, can be also diverse taking into account their forms and functions.

The corpus used in this part of the study consisted of the criminal transcript which was available in *The Simpson Trial Transcripts* website. Total word count of the transcript was 19,993, which was taken as the basis for calculating the frequency of each DM. Within 19,993 words 79 different DMs were identified. Total number of all DMs occurrences was 732 which
composed 3.66 % of the total word count. Bearing in mind the functions of DMs, there were found 403 occurrences of DMs fulfilling textual functions and 329 occurrences of DMs in interpersonal functions (see Fig. 13).

![Figure 13. General distribution of DMs in the trial](image)

As it can be seen from Figure 13, DMs in textual functions compose 55.05 % of the total DMs count, whereas DMs in interpersonal functions compose 44.95 %. The usage of DMs in both functions is not so distinct. This leads to a conclusion that textual and interpersonal functions of DMs are of the similar importance in the trials.

To begin with the textual functions of DMs in the trials, there were found 27 different forms of DMs. The number of occurrences of each DM was apparently different. The two most frequent DMs compose 56.03 % of all DMs in textual functions (see Table 14).

Table 14. Frequency and distribution of DMs in textual functions in the trial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Distribution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>39.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As to, because</td>
<td>24 (*2)</td>
<td>5.96 (=11.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean, then</td>
<td>15 (*2)</td>
<td>3.72 (=7.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total DM (in textual functions) count: 401
Also, now 8 (*2) 1.99 (=3.98)
Finally, first of all, in addition, 4 (*3) 0.99 (=2.97)
Again, as I indicated, with regard to 3 (*3) 0.74 (=2.22)
As a result 2 0.5 (=1)
Accordingly, although, as I said, as …noted, by the way, lastly, secondly, the next, or, therefore, though 1 (*11) 0.25 (2.75)

Table 14 shows the occurrences of each DM and their distribution within the total DM count in the textual functions. The most frequent DM is and, occurring 161 times and composing 45.35% of all DMs. But occurs 66 times and represents 18.59% of all occurrences. So is the third most frequent DM (48 occurrences with 13.52%). Among other frequent DMs we have because and as to (24 occurrences with 6.76%), I mean and then (15 occurrences with 4.23%). It can be seen the tendency to use such DMs as also, now, finally, first of all, in addition in the trial. Some discourse markers occur only three times (again, as I indicated), the others twice (as a result) or once (accordingly, although, as I said, etc.).

To continue with the most frequent used DMs in the trials, they are very similar to the DMs in the interviews. Among the four most frequent DMs in both genres are and, but, so and because. The functions fulfilled by these markers are also the same. Table 15 summarizes the functions of DMs, together with their instances, used by the participants of the trial.

Table 15. Sample instances of DMs textual functions in the trial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual functions</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To initiate discourse</td>
<td>And, but, now, so</td>
<td>(71) THE COURT: And when did you request that report from Mr. Popovich? (CT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take or to give a turn</td>
<td>And, because, but, now, so</td>
<td>(72) MR. HODGMAN: Bodziak will be testifying within some perimeters as yet completely defined, as yet completely undefined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As to the interpersonal functions of DMs in the trials, there were identified 52 different forms of DMs. The total count of all occurrences was 329. The frequency of occurrences of each DM was different. The five most frequent DMs compose 60.48% of all DMs in interpersonal functions (see Table 16).

**Table 16. Frequency and distribution of DMs in interpersonal functions in the trial**

<p>| Total DM (in interpersonal function) count: 329 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Distribution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All right</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah/yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 presents the distribution of DMs within the total DM count in interpersonal functions. DMs which have the same number of occurrence in the corpus are displayed together: their number of occurrences and percentages are demonstrated as per each DM. Some DMs, which have slight changes in their forms (e.g., yeah/yes), are displayed together as the same DMs. Table 16 shows that the most frequent DM is all right, occurring 64 times and having 19.45% within the total number of occurrences of DMs. The next most frequent DMs is well (59 occurrences with 17.93%), and the third is yeah/yes (30 occurrences with 9.12%). Beside this, I think, no, we think, you know I believe, of course, okay are also typical in the trials. There are many other forms of DMs (perhaps, apparently, as you know, etc.) which occur more rarely.

As Table 16 shows, all right is the most frequently used discourse marker in the interpersonal functions. It has several distinct uses such as a response/reaction marker, confirmation-seeker, and an agreement marker.

To begin with one of the functions of DM all right, the DM expresses a response or reaction including also back-channels signals of understanding and continued attention while another speaker is having his/her turn:

- (79) MR. HODGMAN: So we’ll handle it item by item.
THE COURT: *All right.*

MR. SCHECK: *But the major point here is that we've been asking these for a long time and they told us they didn't exist and they couldn't be made* (CT)

The next function of DM *all right* is to request confirmation, expressing also difference:

- (80) MR. SCHECK: *Your Honor, I--*
  
  THE COURT: *All right. And that's both videotapes and photos, correct?*

  MR. HODGMAN: *Correct.* (CT)

The third function of *all right* is to effect cooperation or sharing:

- (81) MR. HODGMAN: *We indicated we were going to submit those to the count under 1054.7. I have a package prepared to the--for the court, and a cover letter was being attached to the package, and that will be submitted this morning.*
  
  THE COURT: *All right. Then we'll hold the 1054.7 hearing at 2:00 P.M.* (CT)

The other most frequent DMs (*well, yes*) in the trials are the same as in the interviews. The functions of *well* and *yes* in the trials correspond to the functions in the interviews. *Well* functions in both genres subjectively and interactively, while *yes* functions interactively.

In addition, the interpersonal functions of the other DMs in the trials also correspond to those in the interviews. Table 17 provides the categorization of the interpersonal functions in the trials, the forms of DMs which represent each category and exemplification of the functions.

**Table 17.** Sample instances of DMs interpersonal functions in the trials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal functions</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To express a response or a reaction</td>
<td>All right, no, of course, oh, okay, well, yeah/yes,</td>
<td>(82) THE COURT: <em>So that's where we are.</em> MR. DARDEN: <em>Okay. And so that's where I am as well, your Honor, (…)</em> (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(83) MR. DARDEN: <em>Am I ready? No, I'm not ready. Frankly, I don't feel I'm competent to represent the People of the State of California</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express sharing or cooperation</td>
<td>All right, as you know, maybe, let me ask, let me continue, let me direct you, let me get back, let me make clear, let me quote, let me respond, let me see, let me say, let me tell, of course, okay, see, well, yes/yeah, you may think, you say</td>
<td>(84) MR. COCHRAN: <em>What we got left--because, let me tell you, in talking to Miss Coleman, the redacted version was something she could hardly recognize.</em> (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To save face or to seek confirmation</td>
<td>All right, well</td>
<td>(85) THE COURT: <em>That's not correct, Mr. Cochran.</em> MR. COCHRAN: <em>Well, I read your order, your Honor, and with all due respect, that order, there are some parts that are incoherent (...).</em> (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express speakers’ hesitation</td>
<td>As far as...concerned, I guess, I think, maybe, perhaps, well, we think</td>
<td>(86) MR. COCHRAN: <em>Not to us, your Honor.</em> THE COURT: <em>Well, maybe it's--well—</em>(CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To express speakers’ certainty</td>
<td>Apparently, certainly, I'm sure, indeed, in fact, it's clear, obviously, of course, surely</td>
<td>(87) MR. HODGMAN: <em>But the Defense has had these materials. Apparently, they've had tapes, they've had redacted reports that the court provided to them.</em> (CT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the whole, the functions of DMs identified in the trial are both textual and interpersonal. In addition, they are very similar to the functions in the interviews. The frequency of DMs in textual functions is only slightly dominant over the interpersonal. Beside this, the interpersonal DMs in this genre have the greatest distribution in comparison with the other genres.
4. COMPARISON OF FORMS AND FUNCTIONS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS

The total number of discourse markers collected and subjected to analysis was 2303, of which 357 were found in the editorials, 1055 in the interviews, 155 in the conventions, and 732 in the trials. Even though the discourse markers exist in all genres, the research showed that the general distribution of DMs in the four genres is quite different (see Fig. 18).

Figure 18. General distribution of DMs in the four genres

As it can be seen from Figure 18, the distribution of DMs is the highest in the interviews, whereas the frequency of DMs in the trial is in the second place. The two genres represent spoken discourse. The higher frequency of DMs in speech than in writing proves the feature of orality which is based on claims that DMs occur primarily in speech. If to compare legal and media discourse, the more frequent occurrence of DMs is in the media discourse, both in spoken and written genres. Due to the fact, that the legal discourse is more strict and formal than media discourse, it can be claimed that DMs are less frequent in restricted genres.

Considering the variety of forms of DMs, there were found many different forms of DMs in the analysed genres. The variety of forms differed according to the principle: the more occurrences of DMs, the more diverse their forms (see Fig. 19)
Figure 19 shows that the most diverse forms of DMs were found in the interviews (97 different forms), then in the trials (79 forms), next in the editorials (66 forms), and finally in the conventions (21 forms).

As discourse markers can be divided into two main groups, textual and interpersonal, according to the functions they perform, the research showed that texts in the four genres demonstrate a different picture concerning the usage of discourse markers in textual and interpersonal functions (see Fig. 20)

Figure 20. Distribution of DMs in textual and interpersonal functions
Figure 20 displays that DMs are more frequent in textual functions in all genres, in particular in the written ones. The only functions of DMs that exist in the conventions are textual. Moreover, the distribution of DMs in the editorials is 91.04% which composes a great deal in general distribution. However, the distinction between the usage of DMs in both functions in the spoken genres is not so considerable, particularly in the trials. The textual functions of DMs in the trials compose 55.05% of all functions, whereas the interpersonal 44.05%. The bigger difference between the textual functions of DMs (67.04 %) and interpersonal (32.96 %) can be seen in the interviews.

Despite the fact that textual functions of DMs are prevailing in all genres, the variety of forms is more diverse in interpersonal functions in some genres (see Fig. 21)

![The variety of forms across functions](image)

**Figure 21.** The variety of forms of DMs across functions

As it can be seen from Figure 21, there were found 52 forms of interpersonal DMs in the trials and despite their dominant position, only 27 forms of textual DMs. The similar picture can be seen in the interviews: the variety of forms of DMs is more considerable in the interpersonal functions. This leads to a conclusion that diversity of forms is more numerous in the interpersonal functions in the spoken genres.
4.1 Discourse markers in textual functions

In the previous section the distribution of DMs in their textual and interpersonal functions were discussed. Textual DMs are more frequent than interpersonal in the four genres. In total, there were identified 1593 textual DMs (325 in the editorials, 710 in the interviews, 155 in the conventions, 403 in the trials) which compose 69% of all DMs. In this section, textual DMs are compared between genres. The correspondence of the forms and functions of DMs in the four genres is presented.

The most often used DMs in textual functions correspond in the three genres (see Fig. 22):

![Figure 22. The identical forms of DMs and their distribution across genres (%)](image)

Figure 22 shows correspondence of the five DMs (but, and, so, because, then) which are prevailing in the editorials, interviews and trials. So is also found in the conventions, but only once, which composes 0.65% of all DMs in the genre. And is the most frequent DM in the interviews and trials, whereas but is in the editorials. The second most frequent DM in the interviews and trials is but, whereas in the editorials is and. So, because and then compose a great deal in the three genres, too.
The DMs displayed above contribute to coherence and textuilarity in discourse. But apart from these main functions, they fulfill also other textual sub-functions, in particular in the spoken genres. In the interviews and trials the DMs help to open or close discourse, to take or give a turn, to indicate a new topic or a partial shift in a topic, to repair one’s own or other’s discourse, to mark sequential dependence or logical transitions. In the written genre (in the editorials) the DMs serves as transitions to express semantic relations in the discourse and as frame markers to signal the sequence.

The most frequent DMs in the conventions are *in accordance, for the purpose, in order to, in particular* and *bearing in mind*. Only two of them find their correspondence in the other genres (see Fig. 23)

![Figure 23](image.png)

**Figure 23.** The correspondence of DMs in the conventions with DMs in other genres (%)

As it can be seen from Figure 23, *in accordance* finds its correspondence, in a very low percentage, in the all other genres. However, there is no an identical form of *in accordance* in other genres. *In accordance, accordingly* and *according to* are regarded as the same DMs. The DM *in particular*, which is among the most frequent DMs in the conventions, finds its equivalent only in the editorials. There are also other three DMs in the conventions (*however, to this end, in addition*) which have their equivalents in the other genres. *However* finds its use in the editorials, *to this end* in the interviews and *in addition* in the trials. The tendency to use the same discourse
markers in the conventions and in the other three genres is rather inconsiderable. The textual functions, which are the only functions in the conventions, are also different. The most frequent DMs help to refer to source of information from other texts or to discourse acts. They also help readers grasp functions of ideational material. The logical transitions, which are prevailing in the other written discourse (in the editorials), are rather rare in the conventions.

The study also revealed that there are DMs which are only typical of spoken discourse (see Fig. 24).

![Figure 24. The correspondence in the interviews and trials (%)](image)

The Figure 24 shows that *I mean* (14 occurrences in the interviews, 15 occurrences in the trials) and *now* (18 occurrences in the interviews, 8 occurrences in the trials) are present in the editorials and interviews. The function of *I mean* in both genres is to repair one’s own or other’s discourse, or to help hearers to grasp the proposition. The function of *now* in both genres is to initiate discourse or to indicate a new topic, to take or to give a turn. *Now* and *well* do not find their equivalents in the written genres.

To sum up, the most considerable correspondence of forms and functions was found in the two spoken genres. Not only the forms of DMs, but also the textual sub-functions correspond in the trials and in the interviews. Such DMs as *I mean* and *now*, which are typical of the spoken discourse, are absent in the written discourse. Despite the fact that the editorials have the same forms among the most frequent DMs as the interviews and trials, the textual sub-functions in the written discourse are slightly different. The same DMs in the spoken genres fulfill much more
functions than in written ones. The correspondence of DMs in the conventions and the other genres is almost invisible.

### 4.3 Discourse markers in interpersonal functions

As it was mentioned in the previous chapters, the interpersonal functions of DMs in the discussed genres are less frequent than textual. Totally, there were identified 710 interpersonal DMs (32 in the editorials, 349 in the interviews, 329 in the trials) which compose 31% of all DMs. This fact, however, does not reduce the significance of interpersonal functions in the texts. Interpersonal DMs are different in their nature from textual, therefore, they may occur less frequently. With regard to the role in discourse, textual DMs guide the reader or hearer through the text, while interpersonal DMs help to express speaker or writer’s attitude, or to achieve the intimacy between the addressee and addressee. The interpersonal functions are more frequent in the spoken genres, especially in the interviews.

In this section interpersonal DMs are compared between genres. The interpersonal DMs are absent in the genre of convention, therefore, this genre is omitted in the following comparison. The correspondence of the forms and functions of DMs is presented in the three genres (see Fig.25).

![Figure 25. The identical forms of DMs and their distribution across genres (%)](image-url)
Figure 25 displays correspondence of the five DMs (well, I think, yes, you know, of course) which are prevailing in the interviews and trials. Of course is also found in the editorials. Well is the most frequent DM in the interviews, whereas in the trials well is the second most frequent DM. The most frequent item in the trial all right (19.45%) is not presented in Figure 25, because it does not have its equivalents in the other genres. The second most frequent DM in the interviews is I think, whereas in the trials I think is in the third place. I think and we think are regarded as the same DMs in the trials. Yes and you know compose a great deal in the interviews and trials. Moreover, of course is the most frequent DM in the editorials and quite frequent DM in the interviews and trials. Among the other frequent DMs, which are not presented in Figure 25, there are uh, uh (4.58%) in the interviews, indeed (15.62%), true (9.38%), at best (6.25%) in the editorials and no (5.47%), I believe (2.43%) okay (2.43%) in the trials.

Furthermore, there is some correspondence among less frequent DMs. For instance, we can found obviously in the interviews (4.29%) and in the trials (0.61%); actually (3.13%) in the editorials and in the interviews (3.15%); in fact in the editorials (6.25%) and in the trials (0.61 %); and perhaps in the editorials (9.38%), in the interviews (1.72%) and in the trials (1.52%).

To continue with the functions of DMs, the interpersonal DMs contribute to involvement the reader or hearer in the argument. But aside from this main function, they fulfil many other sub-functions. The prevailing functions of DMs on the interpersonal level in the written discourse (editorials) are to express, subjectively, addresser’s attitude, certainty or reluctance to the proposition. There was identified also the function: to build, interactively, relationship with readers. The functions identified in both spoken genres were more diverse than in the written discourse. They were following: subjectively, to express speaker’s attitude, hesitation and certainty; and interactively, to express a response or reaction, to express sharing or cooperation, to save face or to seek confirmation.

On the whole, the most visible correspondence of forms and functions was found in the two spoken genres. Not only the forms of the most frequent DMs are the same, but also the interpersonal sub-functions correspond in the trials and in the interviews. The functions recognized in the spoken discourse are expressed subjectively and interactively, whereas in the written discourse the prevailing functions are expressed subjectively. What is more, the
frequency of occurrences of DMs is similar in the interviews and the trials, whereas in the editorials the frequency is considerably lower.
CONCLUSIONS

This study has aimed at investigating the use of discourse markers in media and legal discourse in the spoken and written genres. In order to achieve the aim of the study, first, the frequency and the functions of discourse markers were analysed in the four genres (editorials and interviews; conventions and trials), and then, the characteristic patterns of forms and functions were compared in each genre.

The results of this study revealed that the general distribution of DMs in the four genres is quite different. The frequency of occurrences of DMs is higher in the spoken genres than in the written ones. The highest distribution of DMs is in the interviews, whereas the lowest in the conventions. Considering the variety of forms of DMs, there were found many different forms of DMs in the analysed genres. The most diverse forms of DMs were found in the interviews (97 different forms), and the least diverse in the conventions (21 forms).

With reference to the functions of DMs, the textual discourse markers are more frequent than interpersonal in the four genres. Indeed, the distribution of textual discourse markers in the conventions is 100%, and in the editorials 91.04% of the general distribution of discourse markers. The most frequent textual discourse markers in the editorials, interviews, and trials are but, and, so, because and then. The most frequent textual DMs in the conventions are in accordance, for the purpose, in order to, in particular and bearing in mind. The tendency to use the same discourse markers in the conventions and in the other three genres is rather inconsiderable. The study also revealed that there are textual DMs which are only typical of spoken discourse (now, I mean). The most considerable correspondence of forms and functions was found in the two spoken genres. Not only the forms of DMs, but also the textual sub-functions correspond in the trials and in the interviews. The textual DMs in the spoken genres help to open or close discourse, to take or give a turn, to indicate a new topic or a partial shift in a topic, to repair one’s own or other’s discourse, to mark sequential dependence or logical transitions, whereas the same DMs in the editorials serve only as transitions to express semantic relations in the discourse and as frame markers to signal the sequence.

Despite the fact that textual functions of DMs are prevailing in the analysed genres, the interpersonal functions of discourse markers also fulfil significant role in the texts. The
interpersonal discourse markers are more frequent in the spoken genres than in the written, especially in the interviews. The correspondence of forms is found in the interviews and trials. The frequent discourse markers in both genres are well, I think, yes, you know and of course. The most frequent DM in the trial is all right, but it does not have its equivalents in the other genres. Moreover, the interpersonal sub-functions of DMs differ in the spoken and written discourse. The sub-functions in the spoken discourse are expressed subjectively (to express attitude, certainty or reluctance to proposition) and interactively (to express a response or reaction; sharing or cooperation; to save face or seek confirmation), whereas in the written discourse (editorials) the prevailing sub-functions are expressed subjectively.

On the whole, the results of the analysis showed that the frequency of DMs in the texts and their functions can be influenced by the genre. Due to the fact that DMs find their use in every genre, they may serve as indicators of genre differences. Moreover, the forms and functions of DMs which correspond in the interviews and trials indicate the similar communicative purposes of the two genres.

The importance of genre in the use of DMs implies that writers or speakers should be aware of the patterns of language use characteristic of specific genres. Further analyses should indicate the various patterns on the basis of large scale genre research. This study is an attempt to contribute to such research, but due to the limitations imposed upon the present data, the present study also suggests that further research with larger and more varied samples can be done to arrive at more conclusive results or generalizations.
SUMMARY

Šiame tyrime aptariami diskurso žymeklių funkcijos ir jų pasiskirstymas laikraštiniam ir teisiniam diskurse. Kadangi diskurso žymekliai yra vartojami įvairiuose žanruose, jie atlieka skirtingas funkcijas ir nurodo skiriamąsias kiekvieno žanro ypatybes. Taigi, žanras galiai įtakoti jų vartojimo dažnumą ir funkcijas. Remiantis šiuo faktu, darbe išskeltas tyrimo klausimas: kokie yra būdingiausi diskurso žymeklių modeliai ir jų atliekamos funkcijos teisinio diskurso žanruose (konvencijose ir teismo procesuose) ir laikraštinio diskurso žanruose (redakcijose straipsniuose ir interviu).

Ankščiau minėtas tyrimo klausimas padėjo nustatyti šio darbo tikslą, kuris yra: išverti diskurso žymeklių vartojimą laikraštinio ir teisinio diskurso rašytinėje ir sakytinėje kalboje. Siekiant užsibrėžto tikslo, išskelti toki darbo uždaviniai: išverti diskurso žymeklių modelius ir jų atliekamas funkcijas keturiuose žanruose: redakcijos straipsniuose ir interviu, konvencijose ir teismo procesuose; palyginti jų tipiškus modelius ir funkcijas kiekviename žanre.


Pagal tyrimo išvadas nustatyta, kad diskurso žymeklių tipiškos formos ir jų atliekamos funkcijos vyrauja abiejose sakytinės kalbos žanruose. Ne tik dažniausiai vartojamų diskurso žymeklių modeliai yra vienodai, bet ir jų tekstinė ir interakcinė sub-funkcijos sutampa teismo procesų ir pokalbių tekstuose. Galima daryti išvadą, kad diskurso žymeklių dažnis ir funkcijos priklauso nuo žanro skiriamųjų savybių. Kadangi abu sakytinės kalbos žanrai perteikia panašius diskurso žymeklių komunikacinius tikslius, jų modeliai ir funkcijos interviu ir teismo procesuose dažniausiai susilieja.
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**Editorials:**


- The Guardian view on the CIA torture report: there is a second scandal here; published 10 December 2014 (CIATR)
- The Guardian view on the final dispersal of the Honk Kong protest; published 12 December 2014 (FDHGP)
• The Guardian view on Britain and torture: tell the truth; published 15 December 2014 (BAT)
• The Guardian view on falling oil prices: mixed blessing; published 21 December 2014 (FOP)
• The Guardian view on religious intolerance: the burden of the cross; published 25 December 2014 (RI)
• The Guardian view on Scottish public opinion: Labour on the edge; published 26 December 2014 (SPO)
• The Guardian view on a year in feminism: 2014 was a watershed; published 31 December 2014 (YIF)
• The Guardian view on talks between Angela Merkel and David Cameron; published 6 January 2015 (AMDC)
• The Guardian view on Charlie Hebdo: those guns were trained on free speech; published 6 January 2015 (CH)
• The Guardian view on mass surveillance: missing the target; published 12 January 2015 (MS)
• The Guardian view on televised election debates: shine the light; published 14 January 2015 (TED)
• The Guardian view on spending cuts without inflation: harder times; published 15 January 2015 (SCI)
• The Guardian view on Nigeria’s potentially explosive election; published 18 January 2015 (NPEE)
• The Guardian view on THE State of the Union address: talk big; published 19 January 2015 (SUA)
• The Guardian view on counter-terror cooperation: walking the line; published 20 January 2015 (CTC)
• The Guardian view on Saudi Arabia after King Abdullah’s death; published 23 January 2015 (SAKA)
• The Guardian view on Libby Lane’s consecration as bishop of Stockport: a hands-on approach; published 25 January 2015 (LLCBS)
• The Guardian view on the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz; published 26 January 2015 (ALA)
• The Guardian view on Greece’s debt relief: compromise is the way to go; published 28 January 2015 (GDR)
• The Guardian view on Afganistan: war quickens as politician falter; published 30 January 2015 (AW)
• The Guardian view on British military trainers in Ukraine: a strong signal; published 25 February 2015 (BMTU)
• The Guardian view on the killing of Boris Nemtsov: a watershed for Russia; published 1 March 2015 (KBN)
• The Guardian view on the generation gap: youth clubbed; published 6 March 2015 (GG)
• The Guardian view on war in Afghanistan: not mission accomplished, only mission over; published 13 March 2015 (WIA)
• The Guardian view on the black spider memos: a victory for the rule of law, a warning to Prince Charles; published 26 March 2015 (BSM)

Interviews:
Great Interviews of the 20th century, accessed 15 November 2014, available from:
http://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/series/greatinterviews:
• Mae West, interviewed by Charlotte Chandlers, in 1979. (MW)
• Richard Nixon, interviewed by David Frost, in 1977. (RN)
• David Sylvester, interviewed by Francis Bacon, in 1963, 1966, 1979. (DS)
• The Princess of Wales, interviewed by Martin Bashir, in 1995. (PW)
• Dennis Potter, interviewed by Melvyn Bragg, in 1994. (DP)

Conventions:
• United Nations Convention against corruption, accessed 2 February, available from:
• Convention on the Rights of the Child, accessed 2 February, available from:
• *Convention on the Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women*, accessed 2 February, available from:
  
  http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/ProfessionalInterest/cedaw.pdf  (CEDW)

**Criminal Trial:**

*Jack Walraven's Simpson Trial*, accessed 15 November 2014, available from:
  
  http://simpson.walraven.org/sep01.html:

  • Los Angeles, California; Friday, September 1, 1995 9:07 a. m. (CT)