Pragmatic Markers in Political Discourse in Trudea's Speech

Prof. Dr. Qasim Obayes Al-Azzawi[1*], Assistant Lect. Ina'am Abdul-Jabbar Abdul-Kadhim[2]

[1,2]The University of Babylon\ English Department, Iraq.*

Email: [2]inaam.a@utq.edu.iq
Corresponding Email: [1]Dr.qasim_tofel@uobabylon.edu.iq*

Abstract : The employment of pragmatic markers can be used to convey politeness, emphasis, contrast, hesitancy, uncertainty, or assurance. In the realm of political discourse, pragmatic markers can be employed for manipulative goals, such as altering the perception of the audience, concealing or distorting information, constructing an advantageous or unfavourable image of oneself or others, or evading duty or accountability.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Pragmatic Markers, Political Discourse, Political Environment, Pragmatic Indicators.

1. INTRODUCTION

The use of pragmatic markers is an intriguing component of language, particularly when it comes to the discussion of political issues. Linguistic signals known as pragmatic markers assist in the organization and framework of conversation, indicate the speaker's mindset, and make it easier to draw pragmatic inferences. In most cases, they do not affect the truth-conditional meaning of an utterance; but, depending on the context, they can have a variety of purposes and effects. This study hypothesizes that Pragmatic indicators can pose challenges and provoke controversy in political speech. They could be expressed in a manner that diverges from their potential interpretations. This study examines the primary role of pragmatic indicators in political speech. The primary contentious issues being debated are:

1- What are the main pragmatic markers utilized in political discourse especially those of Trudea?
2- How could pragmatic markers aid in the structuring, controlling and communicating the oral attitudes of political speakers?

The analysis of the pragmatic marker includes selected pieces of Ttudea's speech on different occasions. It is limited to the use of pragmatic markers in specific types of political discourse.

Political Discourse: What is it all About?

Most studies commonly define political discourse as examining written and spoken communication by professional politicians and political institutions. This includes presidents, prime ministers, government officials, parliament members, and political party representatives, at different levels of governance, such as local, national, or international. Examining politicians in specific studies employs a discourse analysis technique (Carbó 1984; Dillon et al. 1990; Harris 1991; Holly 1990; Maynard 1994; Seidel 1988b). Multiple studies have been conducted on presidential speech in the United States, with a specific focus on topics discussed by Campbell & Jamieson (1990), Hart (1984), Snyder & Higgins (1990), Stuckey (1989), Thompson (1987), Windt (1983, 1990), as cited in Van Dijk (2000: 12-13).

In the context of political discourse, elected representatives are remunerated for their political efforts and are selected or designated (via election, appointment, or self-declaration) as the main players in the governing body. The process of delineating political discourse is fundamentally analogous to how speech about medicine, law, or education is associated with the individuals involved in the corresponding areas of medicine, law, or education. This component is rather basic if we can get a consensus on the meaning of 'politics'. Although politicians are crucial in the field of political science and the examination of political communication, they are not the exclusive actors in the domain of politics.

It is crucial to take into account the many beneficiaries of political communication events, such as the general public, citizens, the masses, and other particular groups or categories while analyzing discourse from an interactional perspective. It might be located inside the world of politics and its public conversations, with many other individuals engaged in political communication. Similarly, the field of media discourse must give priority to its audiences when establishing its identity. Furthermore, this applies to conversations within the domains of medicine, law, and education that involve experts such as physicians, attorneys, and educators, as well as individuals such as patients, defendants, and students. Hence, the current restriction on political discourse imposed by its primary participants is insufficient and should be broadened to encompass a more comprehensive portrayal of all pertinent individuals, irrespective of their level of involvement in political dialogue or their role as passive recipients of one-sided communication.

The precise definition of the political sphere gives rise to another problem. Participation in the political system goes beyond the realm of formal or career-based politics and politicians. Individuals can play a variety of roles in political activity and the political process, including citizens, voters, members of issue and pressure organizations, protestors, and dissidents (Verba et al., 1993). People from all walks of life and all corners of society can have a say in government, and many of these groups and individuals are already doing so. To clarify, a comprehensive defamation of politics would need a substantial broadening of the concept of 'political discourse' when taking into account all participants in the political process.

2. RELATED WORKS

2-1. Political Discourse and Pragmatics

Pragmatics is concerned with the mechanisms that produce meanings within a given situation. Pragmatics seeks to describe the mechanisms of political discourse by examining how they

manipulate interpretations and create a controlled cognitive environment for the listener. It focuses on the relationship between these mechanisms and the participants in the act of communication. In addition to conveying political reality, the political issuer seeks to influence the recipient, motivating them to think and act in a specific manner (Mocanu, 2015: 8).

Pragmatics is a field of study that focuses on studying the meaning of language in context. It examines not only what is explicitly stated, but also what is implied, and how language can be used to manipulate discourse and produce certain consequences. The political discourse shapes the speaker's viewpoint on the world, guided by inherent intentionality. The pragmatic approach examines how the political speaker utilizes language to convey more than what is explicitly stated, thereby influencing the recipient's political stance.

 A pragmatic examination of political language unveils three fundamental facets when viewed from this particular vantage point:

a) The issuer of political discourse is examined through a tripartite lens: firstly, s/he represents a group by articulating a discourse that the group can identify with; secondly, s/he addresses an audience that s/he hopes will support his/her position by adopting the ideas s/he presents; and thirdly, s/he bears the legitimacy of the expression. The individual possesses the capacity and social standing to engage in political discourse, and the audience acknowledges and appreciates this quality.

b) The recipients, in contrast, possess representations and engage in active knowledge. From this standpoint, the speaker needs to have a thorough understanding of the realm of representations and the audience's stance on the topics being discussed. The speaker should then adjust their speech to align with the audience's expectations. Furthermore, the speaker must possess the knowledge and the ability to understand the discourses of their adversaries and should be capable of assessing the influence these discourses have on the audience.

c) The media compels politicians to receive extensive coverage, guaranteeing more exposure to political actions and events. Simultaneously, it adheres to editing policies and other business concerns.

d) Communications is considered a contractual agreement when it involves a vested interest, and it is regulated by the principle of influence and certain rules of engagement. Every communication scenario is governed by a distinct communication agreement, which all participants must adhere to.

2-2- Overview of Pragmatic Markers in Linguistics

Pragmatic markers, as described by Fraser in 1990, are indicators that correlate to the various types of potential direct signals that a word or phrase can send. Pragmatic markers, seen as different from the main meaning of the sentence, are linguistic cues that indicate the speaker's possible communication objectives (Fraser, 1996, p.323).

Messages, along with their corresponding pragmatic identifiers, can be categorized:

A-	There is a singular, fundamental message that utilizes the sentence proposition as its content. Primary indicators, which particularly indicate the intensity or strength of the primary message (the type of communication as opposed to its substance), consist of sentence mood and lexical phrases. The examples in (1) exhibit these markers, with the pragmatic marker highlighted in bold. The number 2 is represented as (1).

a)	I am displeased that he is still present.

b)   Admittedly, I was deceived.
c)   The cat is severely ill.
B-   Commentary messages serve the purpose of providing comments on the underlying message. Commentary messages are not required in a sentence, and hence, the use of commentary markers is also optional. When these occurrences happen, their communication is usually extraordinarily broad, with a solitary word often indicating both the intensity and substance of the message. They are practical idioms. The sentences in (A) exemplify this particular form of indicator.
(A)   Regrettably, Sara failed to submit the accurate paperwork promptly.
-Frankly, we should have arrived at our destination by this point.
C-   Optional parallel messages can be used to provide a separate message that is distinct from the core message and any accompanying commentary. The sentences provided serve as examples of parallel markers.
-       John, you are very noisy.
-        In God's name, what are you doing now?
D-   Additionally, there are discourse messages, which are not required, that indicate how the fundamental message is connected to the previous discourse.
-        Martha's party is tomorrow. Incidentally, when is your party?
In summary, a basic marker indicates the intensity of the fundamental message, a commentary marker indicates a message that provides commentary on the fundamental message, a parallel marker indicates a message that is supplementary to the fundamental message, and a discourse marker indicates the relationship between the fundamental message and the preceding context Conversation.

Pragmatic Markers in Political Discourse

Pragmatic markers (PrMs) are a group of linguistic elements that do not usually alter the main meaning of a statement but are crucial for organizing and structuring discourse. They also indicate the speaker's attitudes towards the proposition being expressed and help with making pragmatic inferences. Various methodologies and interpretations have been proposed, each influenced by a specific theoretical framework such as Conversation Analysis, Interactional Sociolinguistics, Rhetorical Structure Theory, and Relevance Theory (for a summary, see Fischer, 2006; Furkó, 2007).
Pragmatic markers (PrMs) are a collection of linguistically varied elements (such as "of course," "surely," "I think," "well," and so on) that serve various purposes related to attitude and meta-communication. They do not have specific meanings and are characterized by their ability to indicate context, dependence on the situation, and multiple functions. The term PrM will be employed as a comprehensive word encompassing elements that serve primarily as textual discourse connectors and also as interpersonal attitude markers that are primarily non-connective. The textual markers are also known as discourse markers, connectives, or connectors, whereas the interpersonal markers are also known as pragmatic particles. Connectives, which are a subgroup of PrMs (Pragmatic Markers), are often discussed in written discourse. They have been thoroughly described as enunciative markers, as seen in Ducrot's work from 1984. Additionally, various PrMs that indicate stance have also been linked to enunciation and the identification of discourse that is not directly related. According to

Angermuller (2014), enunciative markers are formal indications of how a discourse was said, guiding the reader. Angermuller (2014: 141) cites the phrases "I think" in English and "Je crois que" in French as examples of positioning practices that establish points of reference. Authier-Revuz categorizes several instances of the phrase "I mean" as indicators of something distinct or as elements of diversity, representing an alternative concept or idea, in the context of confirming the preceding conversation (Authier-Revuz, 2014: 161).

In terms of manipulative usage, the inclusion of denunciative markers, especially PrMs, significantly enhances the potential for manipulation. This is because, unlike conceptual linguistic elements, denunciative markers are not subject to interpretation but are instead "spontaneously recognized" (Angermuller, 2014: 60). They direct the intended audience to pay attention to how the discourse was delivered, rather than the content of the discourse itself. This is supported by the fact that meta-linguistic follow-ups consistently focus on clarifying conceptual aspects of the data rather than procedural details. Common examples of such statements include "Could you please clarify the definition of [X], which, in the current dataset, can refer to [restricted range / this type of examination / rotating hosts], or Are you referring to [X]? For instance, are you referring to the act of executing him or the fact that he walked home?

The Analysis: Trudeau's Speech
Justin Trudeau, the Prime Minister of Canada, is renowned for his captivating oratory skills and his adeptness in establishing a rapport with his listeners. He frequently addresses topics related to diversity, inclusiveness, and equality in his talks, and he is recognized for his progressive stance and advocacy for social justice causes. Trudeau delivered a renowned eulogy 2000 to honour his father, former Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau. During his speech, Trudeau honoured his father's enduring influence and emphasized the fundamental principle of politics: collaborating with individuals who hold differing viewpoints. This statement epitomizes Trudeau's political strategy, highlighting the importance of teamwork and consensus-building.   In his remarks, Trudeau frequently addresses his dedication to safeguarding the environment and his conviction regarding the significance of combating climate change. During his address to the United Nations General Assembly in 2019, Trudeau underscored the imperative of international collaboration in tackling climate change, asserting that we cannot afford to remain passive observers in the face of this imminent danger. We must collaborate.

Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has formally unveiled his government's legislative agenda for the coming parliamentary session - an early test for his minority government.
 Despite being re-elected in October, Mr. Trudeau's Liberal party now lacks a majority in the House of Commons by 13 seats. This implies that they will need to depend on the cooperation of other political parties to implement their program and maintain their hold on power.
The agenda was delineated on Thursday by Governor General Julie Payette, who serves as the Queen's representative in Canada, during the speech from the throne. "During the autumn season, Canadian citizens participated in the electoral process." "And they elected a Parliament with a minority," she said in the speech. "This represents the collective desire of the population, and you have been selected to carry out its implementation." The 43rd Parliament commences with a plea for harmony in the pursuit of shared objectives and ambitions.

Following an extended period of discussion, Canadian lawmakers will cast their votes on whether to approve the government's proposed policies. In the event of their rejection, it might perhaps precipitate another election, but the probability of such a scenario occurring is low. The Trudeau Liberals pledged to advocate for the middle class throughout the election campaign, and their initial priority will be implementing a tax reduction for Canadian families, excluding only the most affluent. In addition, the government pledged to enhance affordability by reducing cellular and wireless expenses by 25% and raising the federal minimum wage.

Environment
The Liberals have pledged Canada will not only meet its 2030 targets but exceed them - a tall order given that many analysts say Canada is currently not on track to meet what it promised under the Paris Agreement. Canada committed to reducing its greenhouse gas emissions by 30% below 2005 levels by 2030.
Calling climate change the "defining issue of the generation", the government promised to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050."This goal is ambitious but necessary," the Liberals say. The government said they would accomplish this by continuing with their carbon tax, which they implemented in 2018, planting two billion trees by 2040, and investing in green technology and transportation.

Healthcare
Canadians have a longstanding worry about healthcare, and Mr. Trudeau made numerous commitments in that regard. The government has committed to providing further assistance to Canadians who are facing challenges related to opioid consumption. This includes enhancing the availability of mental health services and family physicians, as well as implementing a nationwide prescription medication program. The federal government does not currently require prescription drug coverage, but many provinces have established their systems. "Pharmacare is the crucial component that is currently absent in our country's universal healthcare system," Ms. Payette recited.

Gun Control
In response to many reports highlighting an increase in gun-related incidents in Canadian urban areas, the government has pledged to enforce more stringent regulations on firearms by prohibiting the possession of military-style weapons and introducing a program to repurchase firearms from the public."Consistently, Canadians have directly witnessed the destructive consequences of gun violence, as demonstrated by the recurring news stories." There has been an excessive loss of lives and numerous families have been devastated. "In the Throne Speech, Payette expressed the need to demonstrate bravery and enhance gun control," stated. (https://janolaostman.net/publications/pragmatics/pragmatic%20particles.html).

3. METHODOLOGY

A strategy integrating descriptive and critical viewpoints is required to analyze pragmatic signals in political speech. Without changing the propositional content of an utterance, pragmatic markers assist, organize and structure language, communicate the speaker's mood,

and permit pragmatic conclusions. Methodologically, the researcher should start by collecting all of the pragmatic markers that appear in a database of political speeches. Finding patterns of co-occurrence and sequentiality of these markers could be achieved by examining speeches, debates, or interviews. Direct the descriptive results of the critical discourse analysis (CDA) toward larger social-institutional standards and societal issues. Through the application of CDA, pragmatic markers can be better understood as tools for discourse manipulation, including suppression, polarization, and purposeful ambiguity.

Typically, the study of political speeches is qualitative (subjective) and relies on the researcher's interpretation of the content. Pragmatic indicators in political speeches have been studied under different labels, making it challenging to establish a universally accepted definition. Within such types of discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is seen as a suitable approach to analysis where the focus is on how discourse reflects and reproduces social power dynamics, ideologies, and inequalities. The examination of the roles of language in sociopolitical contexts reveals how this language contributes to the status quo or social change. This study adopts Jucker & Ziv's (1998) and Brinton's (1996) conceptualization of pragmatic markers, which are characterized by the following prototypical conditions:

(1) They are phonologically reduced elements in a sentence.
(2) They do not convey any propositional meaning.
(3) They express procedural meaning, as defined in relevance theory.
(4) They have multiple functions.
(5) They are not essential for determining the grammaticality of a sentence.

While pragmatic markers may not be essential for the grammatical structure of a sentence, they play a crucial role in ensuring the appropriateness of an utterance in a conversation. They help to indicate different aspects of the conversation and contribute to the overall coherence of the discourse. One can assess if candidates meet the criteria to be considered a pragmatic marker by doing the following tests. If all five prototypical conditions are met, the pragmatic marker in question is assigned to the core of the prototype, making it an exemplary pragmatic marker. This is the case with English markers such as "well" and "but," as well as the syntagmatic configurations "I think" and "I mean" based on cognitive verbs.

If most of the typical conditions are met, the linguistic device in question is still considered a pragmatic marker. This is the case, for example, with words like "absolutely," "I guess," or "I believe." However, it functions more as a potential pragmatic marker that may develop into a fully established pragmatic marker in the future stages of the English language. Suppose only a small number or none of the normal prerequisites are met. In that case, the linguistic device in issue cannot be considered a pragmatic marker, such as the adverb "really" or the syntactic configuration "I assume" based on a cognitive verb. Although there has been some debate regarding describing pragmatic markers based on their form, there is consensus regarding their role as versatile tools.

4. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

To accommodate multifunctionality, a pragmatic marker must be described as an indexical statement that indexes different forms of context, such as local linguistic context or co-text,

cognitive context, and social context. The expansion of the domain of reference from the linguistic context (or co-text) to the social context, including the speaker, hearer, and other participants, as well as their attitudes towards each other and their propositions, is also mentioned by Aijmer (1996) in her distinction between grammaticalization and grammaticalization. The former term pertains to transforming a lexical form into a grammatical structure, exemplified by the usage of "going to". The latter term refers to transforming a lexical form into a pragmatic marker, exemplified by the usage of "I think". The purpose of the cognitive-verb-based parentheticals will be discussed in the following.

Trudeau employs various pragmatic signals in his speech to effectively communicate his point and actively involve his audience, he states:

- "Well, my friends, this is Canada, and in Canada, better is always possible." (Indicating a change in subject and highlighting importance).
- "I mean, think about it: what small business owner needs a tax break more?" (Providing an introduction and posing a rhetorical question).
- "Just watch me." (Highlighting his resolute determination and unwavering confidence).
- "We're sort of in a hurry here." (Employing cautious language and conveying a sense of immediacy).
- "Like I said, we're not perfect." (With regards to a previous statement and recognizing its limits).
- "You know, when I was a kid, I remember watching my dad…" (Sharing a personal narrative to establish a connection and build rapport).

These pragmatic signals assist Trudeau in organizing his speech, conveying his position, and establishing a connection with his audience. Furthermore, they serve as a manifestation of his style and individuality as a public speaker. They could be graphically represented as:

Figure (1)- The Functions of Pragmatic Markers in Political Discourse

Markers that serve as evidence are showing where the information came from or how trustworthy it is. Pronouns that are used to lengthen sentences to affect how others perceive them are called general extenders. Markers for quotations are presenting indirect discourse or reported speech. Signs of (un)certainty: Making a confident or doubtful statement. The makers for organizing speech are usually expressed through using sequential intervals and stating factual information.

5. CONCLUSION

Pragmatic markers in political discourse can be compared to concealed chess moves—subtle, planned, and influential. They influence our perception and understanding of political communications. The pragmatic signals aid Trudeau in structuring his discourse, expressing his stance, and developing rapport with his audience. Moreover, they function as a tangible representation of his distinctive style and personal identity as a public speaker.
Pragmatic markers are frequently employed in political discourse, particularly in interviews, speeches, and debates. Politicians employ them to accomplish diverse objectives, such as: Organizing their speech and indicating changes in topic, transitions, or conclusions. For instance, the word "well" can be employed to introduce a fresh point or a concise summary, as exemplified by the phrase "Well, my acquaintances, this is Canada, and in Canada, continual improvement is always attainable." Conveying their position, disposition, or assessment of the proposition or the person they are speaking to. For instance, the term "I mean" can be employed to accentuate or elucidate a point, as demonstrated in the following phrase: "I mean, consider this: which small business proprietor requires a tax reduction more?"

6. REFERENCES

1. Aijmer, K. (1996) Conversational Routines in English. Convention and Creativity. London/New York: Longman.
2. Angermuller, J. (2014) Post-structuralist Discourse Analysis - Subjectivity in Enunciative Pragmatics. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, Houndmills, UK.
3. Authier-Revuz, J. (1984/2014) Hétérogénéité(s) énonciative(s). (Enunciative heterogeneities) Languages 73: 98–111. In: Angermuller J, Maingueneau D and Wodak R (eds). The Discourse Studies Reader – Main Currents in Theory and Analysis. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, The Netherlands/Philadelphia, PA, pp 155–165.
4. Brinton, L. J. (1996) Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions. Topics in English Linguistics 19. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
5. Fischer, K. (ed.) (2006) Approaches to Discourse Particles. Elsevier: Oxford.
6. Fraser, B. (1996) 'Pragmatic Makers" In Pragmatics, vol. 6, no. 1, 1996, pp. 167–190.
7. Jucker, A. H., Ziv, Y. (1998) 'Discourse markers: Introduction.' In: Jucker, A. H., Ziv, Y. (eds) Discourse Markers. Description and Theory. Pragmatics & Beyond. New Series. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 1-12.
8. Mocanu, M. (2015)." ELEMENTS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE PRAGMATICS" Annals of the „Constantin Brâncuși" University of Târgu Jiu, Letter and Social Science Series, 4/2015.

9.   Van Dijk, T. (2000)." What is Political Discourse Analysis?" University van Amsterdam.
10.   Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., Brady, H., & Nie, N. H. (1993). "Citizen Activity: Who Participates: What Do They Say". American Political Science Review 87(2): 303-318.
11.   https://janolaostman.net/publications/pragmatics/pragmatic%20particles.html.