

AN ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN PAKISTANI PUNJABI NEWSPAPERS

¹FaizaLatif, ²Maleeha Nazim ³, Muhammad Tahir Rasheed, ⁴Summaira Sarfraz

Department of Sciences and Humanities, FAST National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences Lahore, Pakistan.

⁴Professor at Department of Sciences and Humanities, FAST National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences Lahore, Pakistan.

*corresponding author: nazim_maleeha@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: *The study aims to explore the different types of discourse markers used in Punjabi newspaper Bhulaikha published in Pakistan. The main function of discourse markers is to increase the cohesive connections between the units of talk and text. DMs act as fillers and are syntactically independent. The Punjabi language belongs to the Outer Circle of Indo-Aryan and there are also other Indo-Iranian languages surrounding such as Pashto, Lahanda, Sindhi, Hindi-Urdu, and Kashmiri. The control of language is significant and this goes to be troublesome particularly in the newspaper. The use of discourse markers helps greatly in the resolution of the intended meaning in newspaper writing. Purposive sampling technique was used and 50 headlines from Punjabi newspaper Bhulaikha were selected. The research is a corpus-based study that adopted a descriptive design. Fraser [2009] taxonomy was used as a tool to represent the targeted DMs. The results of the quantitative analysis demonstrate that 33 DMs were used and two types of DMs were employed in the Punjabi newspaper i.e. temporal and elaborative.*

Keywords: Discourse Markers, Cohesive Connections, Fillers, Purposive sampling, Print Media

INTRODUCTION

Language is a complicated tool that encourages us to set our considerations and thoughts up with the world. We have to sort out these thoughts and perceptions to make them understood and, all the time; we do it simultaneously at this very moment when we make a speech. At the time, we discuss and convey what we say also; we use language to describe it. For the researcher, the utilization of language is the instrument that depicts what is on our minds. With the ascend and unification of technology, language expects a primary activity across social surroundings and transforms into a standard discussion in various endeavours of linguistics. Therefore, various researchers [1, 2, 3] expressed that examining the assignments of DMs in a spoken and written composition, it is an appropriate and profitable insightful undertaking. Analysis of DMs in linguistics point of view is the investigation of rules or examples associated with the written or spoken sentence [1; 4; 5. 6].

In short, DMs are known as connecting phrases or words or sentences. They might be portrayed as the adhesive that ties together units of written texts, combining various pieces of the content that glue it together. Another author [7] characterized DM as a word or articulation, which shows the association between what is said and the more extensive setting. These are basically, words or chunks of a language that helps, with the arrangement of the discourse and let the viewers determine what type of ability the individual will execute with the use of language, that is, it might introduce a point of view (evidently), question what has been said (really), summarize an idea (in general), or desire to appear less prompt (clearly). Also, an author [8] defined nine clauses of DMs:

1. To give a feeling of where something is according to something different.
2. To provide a feeling of when something is going on.
3. To look at two thoughts and express likenesses.
4. To compare thoughts, English gives numerous guides to flag the idea of contrast.
5. To introduce extra or strengthening thoughts.
6. To demonstrate that a point in a conversation has been yielded or adequately considered.

7. To show a feeling of a sensible arrangement.

8. To offer a delineation or a model.

9. To convey a synopsis of the thoughts examined.

The deception of DMs is highlighted in two unique ways in a speech. The primary is to add to talk rationality portrayed by [9]; [10] and [11]. Second, to advise the listener or peruser, an assignment that needs to be understood, what is planned by discourse in the setting, which is expressed by [12; 13] and [14]. Thus, DMs are crucial linguistic elements in the text that require particular attention from researchers to provide a clearer and more comprehensive picture in the light of modern linguistic approaches and methodologies. According to Widdowson [15], it is important that discourse should be both coherent and cohesive. Therefore, the present study intends to shed some light on DMs in one Punjabi newspaper. A discourse marker is considered a tool of interaction in the spoken and written mode of communication. Halliday's [1976] viewpoint was that the medium of communication must be comprehended from a broad perspective: mode is not just the medium; in fact, it is an appropriate segment joined to it. It is a significant factor to represent the frequency and type of DMs, which must be considered. Researchers of the past studies mentioned an alternate name of DMs indicated by their knowledge, understanding or use, for example, sentence connectors mentioned by [9], speech connection by [16] and definition of text are characterized by [17; 18], which indicates DMs are procedural and contains conceptual meanings.

For this purpose researcher used Fraser's Taxonomy [2009], to explore the different types of discourse markers used in Punjabi newspaper *Bhulaikha* published in Pakistan. As indicated by [19], Fraser's expanded the best work in this field. He clarified DMs extensively as sort of PM (Phrase Marker), which [indicate] an association between the section of the speech that introduces them and the part of the background speech. Fraser [1996] said that DMs saved in written texts give as an articulation that demonstrates the association between the original message and the past speech. For example, unfavourable (consequently, likewise), subordinate and coordinate conjunctions (or, yet), and prepositional expressions (after all). Fraser also, in

[1999] characterized that DMs as connecting words which require a connection between specific parts of the speech, which they are part of, calling it as S2 and some part of an earlier speech section and calling it as S1. In another manner, they continue as a second-place relationship; one explanation in the section is the difference exists in the earlier talk. Fraser announces that DMs are considered as functional instead of syntactic. He separates the markers of discussion into two significant sections:

1. DMs that interface texts or messages into four subsets:
 - a. Elaborative DMs (S2 is explaining the S1 message)
 - b. Contrastive DMs (unequivocal complexity between S1 and S2)
 - c. Inferential DMs (S2 is an end and consequence of S1)
2. Reasoning DMs (the material gave in S1, S2 offers an explanation behind gave material).

DMs relate to discussions or discussions relate to DMs (includes a piece of the discussion that administrators at this stage). Fraser [21] presented another group where elaborated classification has been discarded. Fraser [2006] pinpointed three angles appended to DMs :

1. Discourse markers are lexical articulations, not non-verbal motions.
2. S1 and S2 are mutually associated. For example, they follow one another.
3. S1 and S2 encode a total message.

According to Fraser [18], DMs, in theory, are both applied and handy, yet not in the corresponding range. Fraser [2006] characterized PM as a class of temporal a subset of DMs, and a short time later excluded this class in the Fraser model [2009] and advocated the prohibition by contending that DMs establish only semantic associations between parts of the talk. Fraser [2009] characterized three functional groups of DMs. Contrastive DMs is the primary classification which shows that the data passed on by the talk sections seriously or verifiably add differences to the prior portions. Addition DMs elaborate the data gave by preceding sections to the data contained in the portions of the talk which have them. Inferential DMs, give the outcomes and finish of S1 on S2 of the sentence. This article depended on Fraser taxonomy [2009] to speak about the targeted DMs. He categorized [2009] this choice was prefaced on the possibility that the arrangement is reliable with the discourse of writing and gives an impression of being the complete discourse of writing [22].

Pakistan is a nation where various dialects are being spoken by its community, more than 72 dialects. Punjabi is an Indo-Aryan language which is spoken in South Asia of Punjab area mostly [5]. According to an author [23], this language is spoken by 88 million individuals around the world and is nearly viewed as the 13TH most regularly communicated language on the planet. A total of 110 million individuals (66 million) have Punjabi as their native language in Pakistan, (44 million) in India and a considerable number in Europe, America, and Canada. Shahmukhi Punjabi is spoken by a community of 46%. It has its critical art history, region, and

culture. The Punjabi language is generally written in two contents: Shahmukhi is a Punjabi Urdu content that is utilized in Pakistan's western Punjab while Gurumukhi is a Hindi Punjabi content spoken in eastern Punjab, India. A group of researchers [24] created a striking work at Gurumukhi Punjabi in India. They built up a Gurumukhi ocular character acknowledgment framework that fills in as a gadget for identifying Gurumukhi's transcribed characters. This work was further refined by [25], accepting the writing in northern Hindustan as approval of Gurumukhi script.

To summarize, DMs play a critical role in the consistency and unit, and along these lines to convey the arranged significance of the speaker/author. They assume the job of scaffolds filling the correspondence holes and guiding the listener to decipher the progression of the data. There are immense complexities, and resemblances between the repeat and usage of DMs applied by native and non-native speakers, to the extent that the written investigation shows up. The goal of this article is to explore the different types of discourse markers used in Punjabi newspaper *Bhulaikha* published in Pakistan. DMs are crucial linguistic elements in the text that require particular attention from researchers to provide a clearer and more comprehensive picture in the light of modern linguistic approaches and methodologies. Therefore, the present study intends to shed some light on DMs in one Punjabi newspaper.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. What are the frequencies of discourse markers in Pakistani Punjabi newspaper *Bhulaikha*
2. What are the types of discourse markers in Pakistani Punjabi newspaper *Bhulaikha*

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES:

1. To find out the frequencies of discourse markers in Pakistani Punjabi newspaper
2. To find out the types of discourse markers in Pakistani Punjabi newspaper

LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature covers the employment of discourse markers in different newspapers along with various fields and disciplines.

A group of researchers [26] investigated the use of discourse markers in Nigerian Newspapers. It was a corpus-based study. A purposive sampling technique was used in the collection of data. The analysis revealed that additive, adversative, causal, and temporal discourse markers are used in Nigeria Newspapers by news writers to relay information to their readers.

Another group of authors [27] investigated Arabic discourse markers in sports news journalistic discourse. A corpus of 80 articles was compiled from two prominent Arab news websites. Qualitative and quantitative analyses were conducted based on Fraser's model [2005]. Four issues were addressed in the present analysis: identification, classification, frequency, syntactic classes, and position. The study identified a set of 73 DMs and classified them into four classes: elaborative, contrastive, inferential, and temporal.

An author [28] examined the role of DMs in English writing of Chinese students. The study highlighted and evaluated the inappropriateness and misuse of DMs in the writing of Chinese students. The findings showed that the use of DMs

had been neglected in the writings of Chinese students. Hence, the study recommended that DMs should be given more importance in the writing of Chinese students, as it is an essential part of linguistics.

A group of scholars [29] examined the recurrence of eight DMs (I mean, you know, I think, sort of, kind of, well so) in Pakistani and British discourse. ICLE-GB and a corpus of Pakistani Spoken English were utilized. The information was broke down utilizing AntConc programming. The outcomes approved that native speakers utilize more DMs than non-native speakers.

The utilization of IDMs (inferential discourse markers) was investigated by [30]. The study adopted Halliday and Hasan's (1976) and Fraser (1999) taxonomies for the analysis of inferential discourse markers in the discussion. Chi-square was used to examine the type and frequency of markers. The results showed there was a significant difference at the micro-level and insignificant differences at the macro level of inferential discourse markers.

Another group of researchers [31] explored the creation of DMs by non-native speakers of English and their events in their speech in English by contrasting them and those utilized in native speakers' verbally expressed discourse of speech. In this way, the examination depended on two explicit corpora. Transcripts of learners' introductions of native speakers were achieved with the assistance of MICASE Corpus for comparison. The findings of the DMs in the two corpora were resolved with a recurrence examination. The outcomes showed that non-native speakers of English utilize a predetermined number and less assortment of DMs in their speech in English.

The acquisition of DMs by Chinese learners of English concerning singular character, sex, and style analyzed by [32]. Data is collected using audio recordings of classroom discussions and interviews. The author analyzed a sum of 1292 DMs. The findings showed that: the female subjects use DMs more as often as possible than the male subjects, the rate is higher in discussion than the interview in the use of DMs, the individual character has consequences for their utilization of DMs and the subjects show their individual varieties in their frequencies of DMs in the discussions and interviews separately.

The utilization of DMs in the Nigerian newspaper was investigated by [33]. The study was corpus-based for which descriptive design was adopted. To collect data, purposive sampling was used. The findings showed that in a Nigerian newspaper, authors transmit data for their readers using causal, additive, temporal, and additive DMs to intensify the cohesive connection amid the groups of speech in which text has been analysed. Hence, it is suggested that authors of the Nigerian newspaper should use persuasive DMs for data communication in the school of art.

A researcher [34] investigated the stylistic variability, choice, and frequency of DM in the English of Nigeria. An International English-Nigeria corpus was used. The variation pragmatic approach, this study highlighted three types of DMs: inferential, elaborative, and contrastive, this was to be investigated in the Nigerian corpus and compared with the English corpus. The findings showed that there was a significant difference in the stylistic variability approach also,

in both the frequencies of English and Nigerian corpus. Hence, the results also indicated that Nigerian speakers used fewer DMs as compare to English speakers.

The group of researchers[35] investigated the utilization of additive DMs, written by the scholars of Kurdish, and compared them with native speakers of English. Five DMs (and, or, for example, for instance, thus) were analysed in this study. The aim was to evaluate their sentence position, function, and frequency. The authors of this study used a corpus of 34 articles of two languages that were published by the scholars of Kurdish compared with a corpus of 27 articles published by English scholars. A mixed-method was used for this study. The findings revealed that scholars of Kurdish repeatedly used "and" and "for instance" as compare to "or, for example, and thus" in their writings. Also, the position of additive DMs was in the middle in both types of writings.

METHODOLOGY

It is a corpus-based study. First of all, Punjabi newspaper *Bhlaikhaw* read and headlines were focused. Then a corpus was formed selecting 50 headlines. Discourse markers as per Fraser's taxonomy were found in these headlines manually. The discourse markers that were found highlighted and a table was formed along with frequencies and types of these discourse markers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

English Discourse Markers	Type of Discourse Marker	Punjabi Discourse Marker	Frequency
And	Elaborative	تے	16
Moreover	Elaborative	پور	4
Also	Elaborative	وی	6
Second	Temporal	دوچے	2
After	Temporal	بعد	2
After	Temporal	بعدازاں	1

The findings reveal that total 33 discourse markers were used in the 50 headlines of the Punjabi newspaper. Moreover, the results of the study show that the Punjabi newspaper writers have used only two types of discourse markers that are elaborative and temporal but from among these two, elaborative discourse markers were more in number as compared to temporal discourse markers. The most commonly used discourse marker is 'and' which is تے in Punjabi. The use of discourse markers in the text eased or helped in the understanding of information relayed in Punjabi newspapers.

The results of the study corroborate with the study conducted by JAURO et al.[2014] in which the researchers highlighted the use of discourse markers in the Nigerian newspaper and concluded that additive, adversative, causal, and temporal discourse markers were used in the newspapers investigated.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is important to conclude that Punjabi newspaper writers created cohesive links between the units of talk in the text of the newspaper. The writers used elaborative discourse markers to explain their idea or discourse and also used temporal discourse markers to provide time and position. It is

required in this context that media practitioners should learn the appropriate use of discourse markers in order to communicate effectively to their target readers.

For further recommendation, it is to assert that the functions of discourse markers can be analyzed in further researches. Moreover, regional languages other than Punjabi like Saraiki can be researched in this particular context.

REFERENCES

- [1] Nordquist, R. (2020, January 30). Definition and Examples of Discourse. Retrieved from ThoughtCo:https://www.thoughtco.com/discourse-language-term-1690464
- [2] Van Dijk, T. A. (n.d.). Introduction: The study of discourse. *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, 1-7. doi:10.4135/9781446289068.n1
- [3] Cynthia B. Roy. (2000). *Interpreting as a Discourse Process*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- [4] Crane, P. A. (2016). Texture in text: A discourse analysis of a news article using Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion. 131-156.
- [5] Alghamdi, E. A. (2014). Discourse Markers in ESL Personal Narrative and Argumentative Papers: A Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(4), 294-305.
- [6] Gang, W. A. N. G., & Qiao, L. I. U. (2014). On the theoretical framework of the study of discourse cohesion and coherence. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 8(2), 32-37.
- [7] Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [8] McCormick, I. (2013). *The Art of Connection: the Social Life of Sentences*. Quibble Academic.
- [9] Halliday, M. A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- [10] De Beaugrande, R. A., & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*, 1. London: Longman.
- [11] Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and linguistic meaning: The semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers*, 99. Cambridge university press.
- [13] Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse*, 138. John Benjamin's Publishing.
- [14] Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [15] Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse analysis (Vol. 133)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [16] Blackmore, D. L. (1987). *Constraints on interpretations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [17] Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers?. *Journal of pragmatics*, 31(7), 931-952.
- [18] Fraser, B. (2009). An account of discourse markers. *International review of Pragmatics*, 1(2), 293-320.
- [19] Delahunty, G. P. (2012). An analysis of the thing is that S sentences. *Pragmatics*, 22(1), 41-78.
- [20] Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers?. *Journal of pragmatics*, 31(7), 931-952.
- [21] Fraser, B. (2006). Towards a theory of discourse markers. *Approaches to discourse particles*, 1, 189-204.
- [22] Jalilifar, A. (2008). Discourse Markers in Composition Writings: The Case of Iranian Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *English Language Teaching*, 1(2), 114-122.
- [23] Lewis, A. P. (2009). Discourses of change: Policing, sexuality, and organizational culture. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*.
- [24] Lehal, A., & Singh, D. (2016). Written Discourse Analysis and its Application in English Language Teaching. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(2), 244-254.
- [25] Verma, S. (2017). *Discourse of silence in multilingual and multicultural classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation).
- [26] Barnabas & Adamu, (2014). Discourse Markers in Nigerian Television News Broadcast. *British Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 44 December, 2012, Vol. 8). (n.d.).
- [27] Naji Al-Khawaldeh, N., Khawaldeh, I., Bani-Khair, B., & Al-Khawaldeh, A. (2017). AN EXPLORATION OF GRAFFITI ON UNIVERSITY'S WALLS: A CORPUS-BASED DISCOURSE ANALYSIS STUDY. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 29-42.
- [28] Xiu-feng, Z. H. A. O. (2010). Constructing Mental Space Network for the SOC Discourse: A Perspective of Cognitive Poetics. *Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages*, 5(6) 1-25.
- [29] Jabeen, F., Rai, M. A., & Arif, S. (2011). A corpus based study of discourse markers in British and Pakistani speech. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 5(4), 69-86.
- [30] Kaveifard, E., & Allami, H. (2011). Inferential Discourse Markers in Discussion Section of Psychology Research Articles across English and Persian. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 1(12).
- [31] Asik, A., & Cephe, P. T. (2013). Discourse Markers and Spoken English: Nonnative Use in the Turkish EFL Setting. *English Language Teaching*, 6(12), 144-155.
- [32] Bu, J. (2013). A study of the acquisition of discourse markers by Chinese learners of English. *International Journal of English Studies*, 13(1), 29-50.
- [33] JAURO, L. B., TENEKE, G. G., BITRUS, I., & MOSES, I. V. (2014). An Evaluation of the Use of Discourse Markers In Nigerian Newspapers. *New Media and Mass Communication*, 23, 25-29.
- [34] Unuabonah, F. O. (2019). Frequency and stylistic variability of discourse markers in Nigerian English. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 3(3), 249-271.
- [35] Suleiman, H. H., & Seyyedi, K. (2020). Additive Discourse Markers in English Journal Articles Written by Kurdish and English Native Speakers: A Corpus-Based Study. *Journal of Linguistics*, 8(2) 70-85.