

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

DISTRIBUTION OF DISCOURSE MARKERS ELEMENTS OR DISCOURSE PARTICLE AS AN ENTITY RELATIONSHIP IN DISCOURSE

Sufian Ismail¹, Anida Sarudin^{2*}, Zulkifli Osman³,
Husna Faredza Mohamed Redzwan⁴, Wan Mazlini Othman⁵

¹Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris

^{2,3,4,5}Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris

¹piye_cs@yahoo.com, ²*anida@fbk.upsi.edu.my, ³zulkifli@fbk.upsi.edu.my,
⁴husna.faredza@fbk.upsi.edu.my, ⁵wan.mazlini@fbk.upsi.edu.my

Sufian Ismail, Anida Sarudin*, Zulkifli Osman, Husna Faredza Mohamed Redzwan, Wan Mazlini Othman: Distribution Of Discourse Markers Elements or Discourse Particle As An Entity Relationship In Discourse-- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(6), ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Discourse Markers, Discourse Particles, Entity Relationship, Communication, Pragmatic

ABSTRACT

The process of determining groups, features and functions of discourse markers or discourse particle are debateable among language researchers. Various definitions and classification of elements have developed confusion of its status. The efforts to rearrange various opinions related to discourse markers or discourse particles according to certain functions are able to create systematic categories and expose its functions clearly. This article aimed to examine a number of discourse markers concepts or discourse particles and its functions according to the context of grammar and pragmatics as well as the features and domains of discourse markers or discourse particles from views from past studies. The methodology used was the examination of discourse markers or discourse particles into a theory, a model which explained the functions of discourse markers or discourse particles. This explained the research findings which listed the inventory concept of discourse markers or discourse particles, the functions, features and domain of discourse markers or discourse particles in detailed. Distribution of concepts, functions and domain of discourse markers or discourse particles from the views from past studies indicated that discourse markers or discourse particles is a meaningful entity in communication.

INTRODUCTION

Discourse markers is an important feature and as a medium of interaction through conversation. Its use is able to determine the attitudes of a speaker in terms of assumption, purpose and emotion. Discourse markers (also known as discourse particle) have become unimportant features and functions as a sign in communication which simply facilitate listeners' interpretations of speech based on various contextual clues. (Aijmer, 2002). In addition, this is also assumed by Dwight Bolinger as *lunacy ward theory of language* (in Hansen, 1998). Although the features of markers are small, they give a big impact in the context of listeners' receptions. Mohamed Redzwan, Bahari and Sarudin (2019) used pragmatic marker, and discovered that diminutive linguistic unit had the function as a language politeness tool which should not be ignored. This indicates that not only grammar skills and thinking skills need to be stressed on (Sarudin, Mohamed Redzwan, Osman, Raja Ma'amor Shah, & Mohd Ariff Albakri, Othman 2019a; Sarudin, Mohamed Redzwan, Osman, Raja Ma'amor Shah, & Mohd Ariff Albakri, 2019b; Sarudin, Mohamed Redzwan, Mohd Ariff Albakri, & Osman, 2019c) but higher skills of speaking the Malay language and being cultured through language politeness should not be ignored (Mohamed Redzwan, Bahari, Sarudin & Osman, 2020) among the community of speakers. This shows that a small pragmatic marker such as *yes*, also has its function as language politeness (Mohamed Redzwan et al., 2019). Obviously, pragmatic markers have their own important functions.

The stress related to functions and effects of discourse markers is focused specifically in al-Quran. The biggest impact can be seen in surah al-Israa verses 23 to 24 which is an evidence that Allah S.W.T has stressed on the use of discourse markers though just a word *ah*.

“And Your Lord has instructed you not to worship other than Him and do good things to parents. If one of your parent or both parents are at their old age in your care, don't you ever say “ah” and don't you scold both of them and say good words to them. And bend yourself to them with love and say ‘My Lord, love both my parents just like how they have educated me when I was a child.’”

Based on the translation of this al-Quran verse, it is obvious that the use of language though only the marker of 'ah', it gives an effect on the charity scales of a person. The use of this marker is able to give an emotional effect to listeners and give an idea of the attitude of a person who says this.

Wierzbicka (1991) stated that discourse markers (in his study is it known as discourse particle) are important features and are the intermediary in interaction through conversation (in Aijmer, 2002). Its use is able to determine the behaviour of a speaker in terms of assumption, purpose and emotion.

OBJECTIVE

The categorization function for discourse markers or discourse particle is relevant to be implemented because its definition and explanation about related past literature are easy to understand based on discipline of knowledge and studies focusing on their own researches. This is in line with the opinion of Azri (2018) who stated that the theory approach for this specific phenomenon remains a controversial topic in the previous studies because of different theories used based on definitions, research methodology and significant of the studies. The uncertainty of its category in linguistics can be reduced in the effort to rearrange its functions based on past studies.

METHODOLOGY

Past studies related to discourse markers or discourse particles were conducted by detailed analysis of certain theories, models and frameworks. This detailed analysis has moved to the efforts to publish and connect the features of discourse markers to theories, models or frameworks so that it can be translated in a real form. Hansen (1998) stated that some theories, models and frameworks were always related to studies on discourse markers: *Relevance Theory* by Blakemore, *Integrated Pragmatic Theory* by Anscombe and Ducrot, *Interactional Sociolinguistics Model* by Deborah Schiffrin, *Discourse-Structural Framework* by Goffman's, and others. In addition, there are theories developed from the breakdown of other theories. For example, *Theory of Enunciative and Predicative Operations* by Culioli's (1983–1984 in Ranger, 2018) is related to *Integrated Pragmatic Theory*. Studies which were conducted based on various approaches definitely had instilled certain understanding related to discourse markers features. Detailed analysis of previous studies related to discourse markers in finding suitable understanding of their studies were also conducted by some researchers (see Azi, 2018; Hoogervorst, 2018; Dror, 2018; Alami, 2015; Banguis-Bantawig, 2019). In addition, most of these approaches were also paired with data analysis based on corpus to obtain the amount of the distributions.

VARIOUS DISCOURSE MARKERS/DISCOURSE PARTICLES BASED ON COMMUNICATION FUNCTIONS

Communication activities function to complete human life in the social system. Specifically, these activities have the role to create understanding, enrich one's life in terms of physical and emotion, influence someone, advice or provide entertainment to someone (Nordin, 2012). Communication can happen in various ways. Thus, basic human communication is revealed in forms of language activities. The use of language in communication has caused the thought of connecting language symbols and abstract ideas in the minds of speakers or listeners. In this case, discourse markers or discourse particles are seen as providing a framework of understanding through communication.

Fraser (1990) in Hansen (1998) stated that sentences and speeches were encoded in two sections: propositional and pragmatics. The meaning of pragmatics is divided into three: basic pragmatic markers, commentary markers, and parallel marker. Basic markers only determine the power to basic messages. Commentary markers and parallel markers consist of two elements: force and content. Redeker (1991) in Hansen (1998) suggested the discourse coherence model which is the same as Schiffrin. This model consists of three ideas: ideational structure, rhetorical structure and sequential structure. Redeker (1991) named it as discourse operator, referring to spoken words or phrases with the main function to attract listeners' attention especially related to the connection between what is to be said and the content of the current discourse itself. The explanation from each definition has shown that basically, discourse markers are the elements of connection.

Discourse markers or discourse particles have various names due to various research focus conducted. Various areas of studies which implemented linguistics approach had created various functions representing these elements. At the same time, various terminologies exist for these elements. The following are some names for discourse markers (Jucker & Ziv, 1998).

1. Discourse Markers: Schiffrin (1987)
2. Pragmatic Markers: Fraser (1996) and Brinton (1996)
3. Discourse particle: Schourup (1985), Abraham (1991), Kroon (1995).
4. Pragmatic Particle: Ostman (1981)
5. Pragmatic Expression: Erman (1987)
6. Pragmatic Connective: Blakemore (1987,1988)

Other than the term markers, particles are also used as a term referring to the same thing. Thus, the term particle has been used before the term meaning exists from any theory and also known as *uninflected word* (Hansen, 1998). Its existence in various categories, functions and positions in sentences has made it as a language element which receives many studies in discourse. Based on past studies, statements which had elements of feelings were often classified in the particle category. In this case there are various language categories which consist of particles, among them are *adposition, interjection, coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, focus particles, modal particles, adverbs and discourse markers*.

VARIOUS MARKERS OR DISCOURSE PARTICLES FUNCTION AS GRAMMAR

Grammar is an area which analyse language rules. In this case, rules published are not the result from the formula built before language activities happen, rather the arrangement of the formula is based on the frequency of certain language use itself. Arrangement or known as coding has resulted in

one perfect and uniformed standard language variation in terms of grammar for formal use (Karim, Onn, Musa, 2011:23). This formal arrangement more or less has influenced its arrangement which has prioritized formal language form or written form. This has caused some language functions only focus on important forms. For an example, grammar has divided its explanation into two sections: morphology and syntax.

The functions of discourse markers or discourse particles are not clear from the angle of sentence structures. The sentence structures referring to the knowledge of grammar which is limited only to syntax or in a form of formal language. On the other hand, research on these elements need to be conducted into broader studies, which is discourse. This is said because its features can be related to language treatment or language practiced. The difference between these studies is distinguished by Chomsky's flow researchers, who separated the term of language proficiency and language arts (Hansen, 1998).

In the latest studies, discourse markers or discourse particles still have overlapping definitions because its functions depend on contexts, certain languages as well as purposes of certain discourse particles studies conducted. The different definitions are acknowledged by Nordquist (2019), in which it is stated that discourse markers (DM) is also known as discourse particles, connecting discourse, pragmatic markers, or pragmatic particles. Discourse markers cannot be fully generalized to other languages because its nature which is related to habits and culture of certain language speakers. This is in line with a statement by Mai (2016) that the different in use is influenced by the society's cultural factors.

An interesting point to make this study complete, is focusing its meaning involving outside meanings than the content of sentences. For an example, the use of discourse markers or particles *now* which functions as topic change:

1. DS: I saw before I want to answer just *now* Syaril, Syahir... Syahir because he is too strategic, many things that I want to talk about. As if he has read what I will say. So it is good to say it. So aaa. Dato' Dr Mujahidlah will have to answer it later ya.

DM: Ok. (Laugh)

DS: So aaa the question *now* we are talking about.

(Taken from *Wawancara Sinar* 55th entitled *Three Angles: Who Get the Benefits*)

From the sample excerpts of the interview, it clearly demonstrates the existence of topic-switching function on the use of discourse marker *now*. Listed are some functions of discourse markers according to Jucker & Ziv (1998):

1. discourse connectors

2. turn-takers
3. confirmation-seekers
4. intimacy signals
5. topic swichers
6. hesitation markers
7. boundary markers
8. fillers
9. prompters
10. repair markers.
11. attitude markers
12. hedging markers

Three definitions of discourse markers can be related to theories in studies by Schiffrin (1987), Fraser (1990, 1996), and Redeker (1991). Schiffrin (1987) defined discourse markers and features which its operation depends on the order and bracket in spoken units (Hansen, 1998).

In reality, different terms exist referring to the use, meaning and functions of discourse markers. Among the names referring to this elements are listed by Hansen (1998) which are *Discourse Markers* (Schiffrin 1987), *Pragmatic Markers* (Fraser 1996 and Brinton 1996), *Discourse particle* (Schourup 1985, Abraham 1991 and Kroon 1995), *Pragmatic Particle* (Ostman 1981), *Pragmatic Expression* (Erman 1987), and *Pragmatic Connective*: (Blakemore 1987, 1988).

The use of *discourse markers* term is seen suitable with its functions as markers to symbolize the existence of connection among elements in discourse. This can be seen based on examples given by Hansen (1998) which show the use from various classes such as exclamation words, conjunctions, adverbs, particle modals, particle focus and others which are defined as discourse markers function as markers. Listed are exclamation words function as discourse markers in its study:

1. *Bon*, on va aller a l'abri
DM, we'll take shelter.

The word *bon* acts as an exclamation when it exists at the beginning of a clause. In this example, the use of word *bon* is not related to the phenomena in the sentence, thus with something unexpected which is elements outside the interaction itself.

In addition, the use of discourse particles term is seen wider and can limit the various terms used for this term (Jucker & Ziv, 1998). Among past studies which used the term discourse markers and chose more open words including studies by Furko (2020), Cuenca and Crible (2019), Chmiel et al (2018), Hajimia (2018), Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton (2015) and others.

The use of discourse particles term is related to the effort in creating one name for words which have no meaning in sentences and have been included as dual functions words. For examples, exclamation words, conjunctions, adverbs, modals particle and focused particles which function as semantics and pragmatics. Meanings of pragmatics for words are not the same as their meanings semantically. In this case, the term particles existed to name the elements which have no meaning in sentences. However, its meaning exists when it is viewed from pragmatic point of view. Listed are examples of semantic and pragmatic meanings for the use of word *bon*:

2. Ce repas etait vraiment tres *bon*

This meal was very *good*

2a. *Bon*, on va aller a l'abri

DM, we'll take shelter.

(Hansen, 1998)

In example 3, the use of word *bon* has semantic meaning, however, in Example 2a, the word *bon* does not affect any meanings unless it is viewed from pragmatic point of view.

In the past studies, the term discourse particles was more likely towards studies related to German language by Dörre et al. (2018), Rüsenberg et al. (2018), Pistor (2017), Döring (2016), Bross, F. (2014), Bayer, J. (2009), Fischer, K (2007), Abraham, W. (1991). Its use is closer to another term which is modal particles. Some German words can also be translated in other languages. For an example, a study by Marijana Kresic, MIA Batinic Angster and Gabriele Diewald in Zhang & Redeker, (2018) related to modal particle *bloß* which was analysed in three languages: German, Croatian and English, has shown different position for each language, however, it did not represent English.

Thus, there are studies which use the term discourse particles in other languages except German language. Overall studies have shown selected language items are more likely to use elements of morpheme. As examples, studies about English discourse particles have focused on the analysis of non-free morpheme by Tay et al. (2016), Yap et al. (2016) and Hei (2015).

VARIOUS DISCOURSE MARKERS/DISCOURSE PARTICLES BASED ON FUNCTIONS OF PRAGMATICS

Pragmatics make meanings of certain words become broader. This is as such because meanings given are not based on only semantic meanings or only dictionary meanings, thus meanings are interpreted based on their use in certain situations. Pragmatic approach also emphasises on how to align certain interpretations of discourse markers. This field also provide procedures of markers which contribute to underlying interpretations (Ranger, 2018). In this case, pragmatics give a guideline so meanings of words are understood based on a number of interpretation forms: Implicit, Presupposition dan Speech-Act.

Furko (2020) in his writing related to discourse particles had arranged the use of terms for pragmatic markers category according to clear arrangements based on past studies. The arrangement revealed that discourse markers terms are more acceptable options by academicians and more flexible in its use.

Table 1 The Use of Pragmatic Markers Terms in English

Word Classes	<i>well</i>	<i>Of course</i>	<i>oh</i>	<i>ah</i>	<i>now</i>	<i>I mean</i>	<i>but</i>	<i>you know</i>
No	Academicians							
1	Schourup (1985)	DP	-	DP	DP	DP	-	DP
2	Schiffrin (1987)	DM	-	DM	-	DM	DM	DM
3	Erman (1987)	PE	-	-	-	PE	-	PE
4	Fraser and James (1990, 1974, 1990)	DM/ PK/ int	DM	PK/int	PK /int	DM	PM/ DM	DM PM
5	Wierzberg (1991)	-	-	int	int	-	-	-
	Hirschberg and Litman (1993)	cue	-	-	-	cue	-	cue
6	Stenstrom (1994)	DM/ IS	-	IS	-	DM/ IS	ID	- DM/ IS
7	Holmes (1995)	PP	PP	-	-	-	PP	- PP
8	Kroon (1995)	DP	-	-	-	-	DP	DP DP
9	Nikula (1996)	PFM	PFM	-	-	-	PFM	- PFM
10	Fuller (2003)	DM	DM	DM	-	-	DM	- DM
11	Beeching (2016)	PM	B	-	-	-	PM	- PM
12	Crible (2017)	DM	-	DM	int	DM	DM	DM DM

Explanation

DP -Discourse Particles

DM -Discourse markers

PE -Pragmatic expression

PM -Pragmatic marker

int -Interjection

cue -cue word/cue phrase

IS -Interactional signal

PP -Pragmatic particle

PFM -Pragmatic force modifier

PK -Pause marker

B -Booster

Based on the discussion, the use of discourse particles terms provided more confidence to the effort to conduct studies of these elements in the Malay language.

ELEMENTS OF DISCOURSE PARTICLES

Various word classes by discourse particles have put a need for these features to be known because of its elements. In past studies, various features were identified as the nature which needs to be included to certain elements of discourse particles. Holker (1991:78-79) in Hansen, (1998) listed 4 features of discourse markers (known as pragmatic markers).

1. **Discourse Particles** did not affect real situations or contents of certain speeches.
2. **Discourse Particles** did not add any explanation to contents of certain speeches.
3. Discourse markers were related to current situations while speaking and not to matters discussed.
4. **Discourse Particles** had a connection to emotional and expression functions but not related to functions of reference, denotation (accurate meaning for words) or cognitive functions.

Based on the features stated, it can be classified that features 1 and 2 are semantic in nature. Feature 3 is pragmatic in nature and Feature 4 is functional in nature.

Brinton (1996) in Hansen (1998) had more detailed list related to features represented by discourse markers. These features were arranged according to a combination of similar levels for linguistics descriptions.

Table 2 Features of Discourse **Particles** based on Linguistics Levels

No	Linguistics Descriptions	Features
	Phonology and lexical levels	Short and phonology is short. Form different groups of tones. Less in forms and difficult to put in the traditional words class.
	Syntactic Level	Limited at the beginning of sentences. Happens outside structure of syntax or only has loose connection to sentences. Has the nature of choice.
	Semantic Level	Non- propositional
	Functional Level	Various functions and able to operate in a number of linguistics levels concurrently.
	Sociolinguistics and language style levels	Oral discourse in nature, not written or related to non-formal situation either orally or written. Emerge with high frequency. Have stigmatised language style. Certain genders and evident more in female conversations

He also stated that the features of first level to third levels, which are phonology, lexical, syntax/textual and semantic are important features to identify discourse markers. The features stated at the functional level and sociolinguistics/language style level are descriptive in nature.

Alami (2015) stated that discourse particles consist of various different word classes. One of these elements share the same features. Table 3 illustrates a number of discourse markers features listed by Alami based on some past studies.

Table 3 Features of discourse Particles based on Academicians Views

No	Academicians	Features
1.	(Lenk, 1998; Yilmaz, 2004).	Generally, discourse markers were used in all languages
2.	(Schiffrin, 1987).	Free syntax
3.	(Futji, 2001).	Discourse markers existed as flexible syntax, existed at the beginning, middle or end of speech. This flexibility contributed to a large use and high frequency in discourse.
4.	(Brinton, 1996; Schiffrin, 1987).	Discourse markers did not affect prepositional meanings
5.		Discourse markers did not contribute to information in discourse contents
6.	(Andersen, 2001; Fraser, 1990; Yilmaz, 2004).	Discourse markers dealt with aspects of pragmatics discourse
7.	(Lenk, 1997).	Morphology was short, consisting of one to two syllables

The properties of discourse particles is explained briefly by Furko, (2020) based on Table 4 as follows:

Table 4 Properties of discourse particles

No	Properties Academicians	seq	cont	ora l	syn t	pro c	Poly - func	att	scop e	Non - pro p	in v
1.	Schiffrin (1987)	x	x	X	x			(x)			
2.	Fraser (1990,1999)	x	x		x	x				x	
3.	Redeker (1990,1991)	x	x					(x)			
4.	Stenstrom (1994)	x		(x)							
5.	Kroon (1995)	x	x								x
6.	Knott and sanders (1998)	x									

7.	Andersen (1998)	x	X	x		
8.	Hansen (1998)	x	(x)	(x)	x	x
9.	Risselada and Spooren (1998)	x	x			
10.	Romaine and Lange (1998)	x	(x)	(x)		
11.	Blakemore (1987, 2002)		x			
12.	Gonzalez (2004)		x	x	x	
13.	Crible (2017)		x	x	x	

Explanation

Seq	- sequentiality, coherence, connectivity
Cont	- context-dependence - context-coordination
Oral	- orality
Synt	- syntactic criteria, diversity, non-integration
Proc	- procedural meaning
Poly-func	- poly-functionality
Att	- marking attitudes
Scope	- various scope, functional scope
Non-prop	- non-Propositional content
Inv	- invariable form

Discourse Markers Domain

Hansen (1998) had divided discourse markers into certain domains at the parameter.

Table 5 Domains based on discourse markers functions

No	Domain	Functions
1.	Textual	Texts structure tool (opening and closing discourse unit or transition between discourse)
2.	Attitudes	modality indicator (style/way) or attitudes indicator
3.	Cognitive	Indicator of speakers' and listeners' intentions or indicator to the relationship of speakers and listeners
4.	Interaction	Procedures on how speeches delivered are processed.

Functions of Markers or Discourse Particles

Discourse markers or discourse particles are depicted to have various functions. Various functions are related to differences in terms of language, theory used and focused research field. The functions of discourse markers or discourse particles in the focused research on written language or formal language can be seen as elements which connect sentences to phrases in certain discourses (Karim, Onn, Musa and Mahmood, 2011:525). In this case,

discourse markers or particles are classified into five types: connection markers, reference markers, replacement markers, lexical markers and ellipsis markers or omission markers. Based on examples provided for each marker, obviously the explanation related to discourse markers according to this belief has covered discussion at sentence levels. Following is an example of explanation at sentence levels for additional markers type.

Power through the process of law is acknowledged by the court. Laws do not only determine the validity of the power, but also determine the power is used reasonably, fairly, honestly and equally.

The role of additional markers has the function of providing additional information to matters which are sure to bring confusions between word classes categorized as discourse markers connectors.

Additionally, a study at this stage was conducted by Alias (2019) which indicated same functions as paraphrase restatement between the use of discourse markers *which* with *esto es* in Spanish. Although he stressed that this study was conducted from semantic and pragmatics point of views, the analysis which was only done at sentence levels obviously indicated that the explanation related to pragmatics in the use of *which* was unclear.

The functions of discourse markers or discourse particles in other studies indicated broader roles. In this case, the functions of discourse markers or particles are seen as elements which are connected to language studies in a form of oral or informal studies. Among them are functions introduced by Jucker & Ziv (1998): discourse connectors, turn-takers, confirmation-seekers, intimacy signals, topic switchers, hesitation markers, Boundary markers, fillers, prompters, repair markers, attitude markers, hedging markers.

Maschler, Shloush and Hakulinen in Jucker & Ziv (1998) which focused their study related to sentence structure signals had discovered a number of discourse markers functions which are apposition markers happening mostly in interclausally, markers to conclusions and markers to topic switching which happened in the middle of clauses. Rouchota, Stenstrom, Andersen, Jucker and Smith, Ziv and Ariel, focused their study on cognitive aspect while Suzuki, Park, Fraser and Takahara analysed markers differences, displayed various attitudes features, cognitive features and interaction features of discourse markers (Jucker & Ziv, 1998).

Many studies on oral language have been conducted (see Banguis-Bantawig, (2019). A study conducted on speeches by Asean leaders indicated the functions of discourse markers not only to smooth the process of delivery, but also as indication of the speakers' attitudes towards the information delivered. In this case, speakers must be careful with the use of discourse markers so that the information delivered are fully understood. This can be described as an analogy of a vehicle which triggers a relationship between readers and listeners in a form of *phatic* (Alami, 2015; Buyukkarci & Genc, 2009 in Banguis-Bantawig, 2019).

Various functions of discourse markers or particles can also be seen at interpersonal and textual levels. Textual functions or discoursal functions referring to markers which connect speakers' or writers' thoughts in the process of connecting discourse units further (Aijmer, 1996 dalam Dylgjeri, 1994). Interpersonal functions help in stating speakers' attitudes or opinions (Dylgjeri, 1994). Blakemore (1988) in Dylgjeri, (1994) stated that discourse markers produced a relationship coherently and in cohesion which connect texts at different levels. Discourse markers are important to provide clear understanding about certain messages and understand the organization of human thoughts (Yung et al., 2016 in Banguis-Bantawig, 2018).

Discourse markers functions as meta-discourse intended to create cohesive discourse or unity discourse to encourage readers or listeners to respond or be involved in the discourse process (Mai, 2016; Lim, 2016; Hyland and Tse, 2004; Vande, 1985, Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015 in Banguis-Bantawig, 2018). Meta-discourse functions to influence persuasiveness listeners towards certain speeches (Mai, 2016).

Muller (2005) in Alami (2015) had detailed discourse markers functions as elements which started discourse markers, marked territory in discourse (switchover/shift parts in topics), initiated answers and responses, had the role as fillers or delayed tactic, helped speakers to have stage control, gave impact to interactions or sharing between speakers and listeners, discourse brackers either as cataphorucally or anaphorically, marked either the information is based on foregrown or background, and as propositional relationship index.

Based on a discussion related to discourse markers explained, all functions of discourse markers can be summarized in the table below:

Table 6 Functions of Discourse Markers or Discourse Particles

No	Academicians	Functions of Discourse Markers or Discourse Particles
1.	Nik Safiah Karim et al. (2008)	Functions as elements which connect sentences with phrases in certain discourses.
2.	Alias (2019)	Functions as restatement paraphrase
3.	Jucker and Ziv (1998)	Functions as discourse connectors, turn-takers, confirmation-seekers, intimacy signals, topic swichers, hesitation markers, Boundary markers, fillers, prompters, repair markers, attitude markers, hedging markers.
4.	Maschler (2000), Shloush (1998) and Hakulinen (1998)	Functions as apposition markers
5.	Banguis-Bantawig, (2019)	Functions to make the information delivery process smooth Functions to indicate speakers' attitudes towards information delivered
6.	Aijmer, (1996)	Functions to connect speakers' or writers' thoughts in the process of

		connecting discourse units further
7.	Dylgjeri, (1994).	Functions to assist in stating speakers' or writers' attitudes or opinions
8.	Blakemore (1988)	Functions to create a connection of discourse coherently or cohesively for texts continuation at different levels
9.	Yung et al., 2016	Functions to give clear understanding about certain messages and understand the organization of human thoughts
10.	Mai 2016; Lim, 2016; Hyland and Tse, 2004; Vande Kopple, 1985	Functions as meta-discourse markers intended to create cohesive discourse or discourse unity to encourage readers or listeners to respond or involve in the discourse process
11.	Mai (2016)	Functions as meta-discourse markers to influence persuasiveness of listeners towards certain speeches
12.	Muller (2005)	Functions as elements which starts discourse markers, marks territory in discourse (switchover/shift parts in topics), initiate answers and responses, has the role as fillers or delayed tactic, help speakers to have stage control, gives impact to interactions or sharing between speakers and listeners, discourse brackers either as cataphorucally or anaphorically, marks either the information is based on foregrown or background, and as propositional relationship index.

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion, discussion on features and functions of discourse markers obviously shows that these elements are categorized based on functions of communication, grammar and pragmatics. Other than that, an obvious function is as an entity which connects discourse. Exposure towards the existence of the elements is updated in learning contemporary languages so that language activities can be used wisely. This understanding is able to make language learning more reality and not only producing empty principles of language learning: language learned without implementing its use in real life (Zaini, Sarudin, Muhammad, Abu Bakar (2020). This development surely contributes toward the harmony and unity of a country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, W. (1991). Discourse Particles. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/discourse-particles-descriptive-and-theoretical-investigations-on-the-logical-syntactic-and-pragmatic-properties-of-discourse-particles-in-german-e165972297.html>
- Aijmer, K. (1996). CONVERSATIONAL ROUTINES IN ENGLISH: Convention and Creativity (K. Aijmer (ed.); 1996th ed.). London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

<https://booksc.xyz/book/64353942/07931e>

- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/english-discourse-particles-evidence-from-a-corpus-studies-in-corpus-linguistics-e156645994.html>
- Alami, M. (2015). Pragmatic functions of discourse markers: a review of related literature. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 2347–3126. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3034.3121>
- Alias, N. (2019). Analisis perbandingan penanda wacana pernyataan semula bahasa Melayu Iaitu dan bahasa Sepanyol Esto es (A Comparative Analysis of Malay Reformulation Marker Iaitu and Spanish Reformulation Marker Esto es). *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 363–378. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2019-1904-19>
- Azi, Y. (2018). Investigating Arabic pragmatic markers in spoken discourse: a literature review. *International Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 48. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v10i2.12963>
- Banguis-Bantawig, R. (2019). The role of discourse markers in the speeches of selected Asian Presidents. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019>
- Bayer, J. (2009). *Discourse Particles in Questions* (Issue February). <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bsz:352-144735>
- Bross, F. (2014). German modal particles and the common ground. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230881580>
- Chmiel, A., Lijewska, A., Szarkowska, A., & Dutka, Ł. (2018). Paraphrasing in respeaking—comparing linguistic competence of interpreters, translators and bilinguals. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 725–744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1394331>
- Cuenca, M. J., & Crible, L. (2019). Co-occurrence of discourse markers in English: From juxtaposition to composition. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 140, pp. 171–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.12.001>
- Döring, S. (2016). *Modal Particles, Discourse Structure and Common Ground Management: Theoretical and Empirical Aspects*. Ph.D Thesis, Faculty of Language and Literature, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. Retrieved from https://edoc.hu-berlin.de/bitstream/handle/18452/20218/dissertation_doering_sophia.pdf?sequence=7&isAllowed=y

- Dörre, L., Czypionka, A., Trotzke, A., & Bayer, J. (2018). The processing of German modal particles and their counterparts. *Linguistische Berichte*, 255, 58–91. Retrieved from. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321385092>
- Dror, Y. (2018). The discourse particle 'ammā in the Qur'ān. In *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* (Vol. 55, pp. 51–75). <https://doi.org/10.2143/ANES.55.0.3284683>
- Dylgjeri, A. (2014). The function and importance of discourse markers in political discourse. Retrieved from. <http://bjes.beder.edu.al/uploads/arch-201405071008533025.pdf>
- Fischer, K. (2007). Grounding and Common Ground: Modal Particles and their Translation equivalents. In *Lexical Markers of Common Ground*. September, 47–66. Retrieved from. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/253810787>.
- Furko, P. B. (2020). Discourse markers and beyond: descriptive and critical perspectives on discourse-pragmatic devices across genre and languages. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37763-2> ©
- Hajimia, H. (2018). A Corpus-Based Analysis on the Functions of Discourse Markers used in Malaysian Online Newspaper Articles. In *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies* (Vol. 5, Issue 1). Retrieved from. <https://www.ijrhss.org/papers/v5-il/4.pdf>
- Hansen, M. B. M. (1998). *The Function of Discourse Particles: A Study with Special Reference to Spoken Standard French*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hei, K. C. (2015). The Implications of lah, ah, and hah as Used by Some Speakers in Malaysia. *Journal of Modern Languages*, Volume 14(Issue 1), 133–151. Retrieved from. <https://jml.um.edu.my/article/view/3801/1706>
- Hoogervorst, T. G. (2018). Utterance-final particles in Klang Valley Malay. In *Wacana*, Vol. 19, Issue 2, pp. 291–326). Brill Academic Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.17510/wacana.v19i2.704>
- Jucker, A. H., & Ziv, Y. (1998). *Discourse markers: Descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Karim, N. S., Onn, F. M., Musa, H. & Mahmood, A. H. (2011). *Tatabahasa Dewan Edisi Ketiga*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Mai, H. (2016). *An Intercultural Analysis of Meta-discourse Markers as Persuasive Power in Chinese and American Political Speeches*.

International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 4(6), 207.
<https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20160406.13>

Mohamed Redzwan, H. F., Bahari, K. A. & Sarudin, A. (2019). Penanda pragmatik sebagai alat kesantunan berbahasa dalam genre ceramah agama. In Nurul Fadly Habidin, Nursyazwani Mohd Fuzi, Sharon Yong Yee Ong, Tuan Waheda Tuan Chik, Ummu Aiman Muhamad (Eds.), *Pembangunan Pengetahuan dalam Pengurusan, Pendidikan, dan Sains Sosial: Idea dan Penyelidikan Awal* (pp. 32-41). Tanjong Malim: Kaizentrenovation Sdn Bhd.

Mohamed Redzwan, H. F., Bahari, K. A., Sarudin, A., & Osman, Z. (2020). Strategi pengukuran upaya berbahasa menerusi kesantunan berbahasa sebagai indikator profesionalisme guru pelatih berasaskan skala morfofonetik, sosiolinguistik dan sosiopragmatik. *Malaysian Journal of Learning & Instruction*, 17 (1), 187-228.

Karim, N. S., Onn, F. M., Musa, H. & Mahmood, A. H. (2011). *Tatabahasa Dewan Edisi Ketiga*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Nordin, M. Z., Ariffin, M. T. (2012). *Kemahiran Komunikasi*. Tanjong Malim, Perak: Emeritus Publications.

Nordquist, R. (2019). Discourse Marker (DM) In English Grammar. <https://www.thoughtco.com/discourse-marker-or-dm-1690463>

Pistor, T. (2017). Prosodic universals in discourse particles. *Zeitschrift Fur Dialektologie Und Linguistik*, Vol. 84, No. 1, pp. 46–76.
<https://doi.org/10.21437/speechprosody.2016-178>

Ranger, G. (2018). Discourse markers: An enunciative approach. In *Discourse Markers: An Enunciative Approach*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70905-5>

Rüsenberg, F., Hampton, A. J., Shalin, V. L., & Feufel, M. A. (2018). Stop words are not “Nothing”: German modal particles and public engagement in social media. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 10899 LNCS, 89–96.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93372-6_11

Sarudin, A., Raja Ma’amor Shah, R.N.F.A., Mohamed Redzwan, H.F., Osman, Z., Othman, W. M., Mohd Ariff Albakri, I.S. (2019a). Lexical approach: Overcoming vague skills procedure and early mathematical terminology based on the prosodic semantic theory. *Journal Of Mechanics Of Continua And Mathematical Sciences*. pp 94-11.
doi.org/10.26782/jmcms.2019.06.00008.

Sarudin, A., Mohamed Redzwan, H. F., Osman, Z., Raja Ma’amor Shah, R. N.

- F. A., & Mohd Ariff Albakri, I. S. (2019b). Menangani kekaburan kemahiran prosedur dan terminologi awal Matematik: Pendekatan leksis berdasarkan teori prosodi semantik. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 16 (2), 255-294.
- Sarudin, A., Mohamed Redzwan, H. F., Mohd Ariff Al-Bakri, I. S., & Osman, Z. (2019c). Using the Cognitive Research Trust Scale to assess the implementation of the elements of Higher-Order Thinking Skills in Malay language teaching and learning. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE)*, 8 (2S2), 392-398.
- Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E. & Schriffin, D. (2015). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. In Wiley Blackwell: Vol. I. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511621079.011>
- Tay, L. C., Chan, M. Y., Yap, N. T., & Wong, B. E. (2016). Discourse Particles in Malaysian English: What Do They Mean? *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde*, Vol. 172, No. 4, pp. 479–509. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-17204002>
- Yap, N. T., Chan, M. Y., Wong, B. E., & Tay, L. C. (2016). Discourse Particles in Malaysian English. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde / Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia*, Vol. 172, No. (4), pp. 479–509. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-17204002>
- Zaini, M.F., Sarudin, A., Muhammad, M. M., Abu Bakar, S.S. (2020). Representatif Leksikal Ukuran sebagai Metafora Linguistik berdasarkan Teks Klasik Melayu. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, Volume 20(2), May 2020, 168-187. <http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2020-2002->.
- Zand-Moghadam, A., & Bikineh, L. (2015). Discourse markers in political interviews: a contrastive study of Persian and English. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 47–61.
- Zhang, G., & Redeker, G. (2018). Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and modal particles: New perspectives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 136, pp. 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.08.010>