

# Discourse Markers in an Online Community of Buhînën People

Marlon S. Pontillas\* and Francis Roi Rañada

Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

### Abstract

One of the language communication challenges is how it works as speakers use it. Some words may not change their semantic meaning, but when it is meant to say on speaker's intention, it impacts the context; these particles are discourse markers. It has been used in everyday interaction, face-to-face communication, writing, and an online environment. This compels the researcher to investigate further the occurrences of the discourse markers in Buhînën People in an online community. This study centralized how discourse markers maintain their status of cohesion and interpersonal in computer-mediated communication. This qualitative study was based on Gustilo and Palacio's (2016) study on discourse particles. Discourse markers were categorized into two: textual and relational categories. The corpus of 2,000 Facebook posts, primarily texts, was the data collected from the most numbered population on the Facebook online group of Buhînëns. Then, the survey was conducted to gather data about the pragmatic relation of relational discourse markers. The data revealed that the most hits were the discourse marker 'na' for the textual category, whereas 'po' for the relational category. It also revealed that more textual discourse markers were found. The functions proved the idea of metalingual function (Maschler & Schiffrin, 2015), as it has many functions in both categories, including the micro-function of relational discourse markers. Furthermore, the study also answered the importance of the discourse markers in pragmatics and computer-mediated communication, through which they served both their primary roles as structural and interpersonal.

**Keywords:** Buhînën Community, Computer-Mediated Communication, Corpus-based Study, Language Studies, Pragmatics

**DOI:** <http://doi.org/10.52631/jemds.v2i3.124>

**OPEN ACCESS**  
**CC BY-NC-SA 4.0**

\*Corresponding author  
arlpontillas@yahoo.com

Submitted 16 May 2022

Revised 5 July 2022

Accepted 28 July 2022

### Citation

Pontillas and Rañada (2022).  
Discourse Markers in an  
Online Community of Buhînën  
People. *Journal of Education,  
Management and  
Development Studies*. 2(3).  
8-23. doi:  
10.52631/jemds.v2i3.124

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Language is known as a complex structure that has been acquired in the different cultures people live in. It covers patterns of the semiotic process that affect a human's ability to understand the information sent through communication; in other words, language works through interaction with the other speaker. In the Discourse World, cohesion is an essential factor that helps unite the texts to become the subject broader, and this also impacts the relationship of composing words. Some words that are essential in managing the interaction other than using the most basic units of text, word class, were tangible enough to maintain the talks applicable to be comprehended. One of them is the Discourse Markers, which manage to integrate the relationship of words. These particles organize the segments of the discourse.

They can link words, phrases, or sentences to show how the two ideas relate. And they also express the attitude of the speaker. Discourse Markers are used in many studies from their early concepts

(definition), through which many studies have been performed on various languages. These markers are also used to disseminate information using the different platforms and communication that create a digital forum online.

Discourse markers/DMs covered many different concepts from different perspectives. Thus, its name is not only limited to only call it as Discourse Signalling Devices (Polanyi and Scha, 1983), Indicating Devices (Dascal and Katriel, 1984, 1977), Phatic Connectives (Bazzanella, 1990), Pragmatic Connectives (Van Dijk, 1979), Pragmatic Markers (Fraser, 1996; Brinton, 1990; Erman, 2001), Pragmatic Operators (Ariel, 1998), Pragmatic Particles (Östman, 1995), Discourse Markers (Blakemore, 2002; Iten, 2000; Schiffrin, 1987; Fraser, 1999, 2006; Mosegaard-Hansen, 2008; Lenk, 1998), Discourse Particles (Schourup, 1999; Abraham, 1991; Kroon, 1998; Fischer, 2006; Aijmer, 2002), and Semantic Conjuncts (Quirk et al., 1985) to name just a few. DMs' main feature is connecting the words as it is called to be connectives, which helps develop the communication and how it was formed throughout the interaction.

According to Halliday and Hassan (1976) and Schiffrin (1992), these markers hold between sentences as generalized linkages that perceive these links as textual rather than logical. It is optional because it does not alter the grammaticality of the sentences (Schiffrin, 1987). However, this does not rule out the possibility that they have a role in the utterances or text (Degand, 2010). Discourse markers play an essential function in establishing ties or linkages between words as they alter the flow of the context from beginning to conclusion. It can be seen in the quality of communication, especially when transitioning between ideas (Fung Carter, 2007; Sambrano, 2019). Meanwhile, coherence is the relationship cohesiveness creates between a document's semantic and pragmatic meanings (Reinhart 1980, 164). It reveals how these thoughts flow together as a whole concept and how these linguistic pieces' patterns are structured, providing continuity (Halliday & Hassan, 1976).

Discourse Markers were identified by Schiffrin (1987) as sequentially dependent elements. These markers are believed to enrich the speech or reflect on its semantic meaning. She also shows in her approach that any discourse marker that works on discourse can develop an operational definition before it can be used in a social setting. She also suggested that some word classes, such as adverbs (e.g., now, behind), interjections (e.g., oh, yeah), conjunctions (e.g., and, but, or), and lexical phrases, may be called linguistic expressions (e.g., you know, I see). For example, and alludes to Schiffrin's (1987) way of conceptualizing how this preset word functions based on the interaction or time of use in the talks. It has been revealed that it has various roles besides being employed as coordinate conjunction for adding or merging words. It contributes to language development by linking related units (Peterson and McCabe, 1991), utilized as a consultation preamble, and expressing the unsaid, resulting in a smooth continuation of the utterances (Halliday and Hasan, 1994). (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994; Turk, 2004; Bolden, 2010).

Fraser (1999) took an account centered on the speaker's intention than on text in metapragmatic function. He quoted that these markers are the type of pragmatic commentary marker through which it signals the speaker's intent on his message related to the discourse interaction. Pragmatic meaning relies on the speaker rather than text, which is how discourse markers work; thus, their content meaning has nothing to do with it. These DMs show phatic, cooperation, sharing, or intimacy between the interlocutors (Brinton, 1996; Bazzanella, 1990). Additionally, the need to teach the pragmatic function of DMs is essential rather than only focusing on their semantic meanings (Liu, 2009).

In a study that connects languaging (Becker, 1991) and the approach of Schiffrin (1987), Maschler (1994) claimed that discourse markers helped regulate discourse in the sense of metalanguage (1987). It can have a variety of purposes depending on how it is used in the interaction, and it looked at the standpoint of Schiffrin's (1987) point of metacommunication (Maschler, 1994; Bateson, 1972). Both of their ideas centered on giving the basic meaning of the words, for example, but's subordinate conjunction of opposition in their semantic meaning; however, in Schiffrin's (1987) idea, this conjunction manages the discourse as a connective device that connects two ideas primarily, which gave a meta-talk expression when it was used in the way it works in the flow of the discourse. Interjections, Hedges, and Fillers are words inserted to highlight assertions,

phrases, sentences, or other speech markers. Oh, which is one of the common DMs found in the English language (Schiffrin, 1987; Aijmer, 2002; Zarei, 2013), was said to have a lot of placement in the discourse mostly on utterances as these occurrences were named as "language games," some of the function of this marker is when noticing matters; the attention that caught you; remembrance (Heritage, 1984).

Many additional studies of speech in spoken genres have discovered discourse markers in every utterance. These were found in materials such as interviews, interactive dialogues, and lectures and were identified as support for transitioning into the following ideas to make sense in spoken communication (Crible and Cuenca, 2017; Bantawig, 2019; Hernandez, 2008, Heeman and Allen, 1999; Aşk and Cephe, 2013; Shimada, 2014). Some researchers evaluated students' academic writing in EFL and ESL settings (Aidinlou, 2012; Ghanbari et al., 2016; Martinez, 2002); thus, it contributes to the DMs' favorable effect on writing quality (Ghanbari et al., 2016; Martinez, 2002). Discourse markers are vital in digital writing, particularly in the CMC context.

DMs' frequency in corpus linguistics was done by textual analysis to find the result through the different Computer corpora available to organize these ideas, such as the Concordance, Wordsmith and Antconc. From the findings, the qualitative study method is the next to be applied to explain the discourse marker's function. Many studies on corpus were centered on getting the tasks of the DMs (Aijmer, 1987, 1996, 2002; Andersen, 1998, 2001; Blum-Kulka, 1997; Brinton, 1996; Carter & McCarthy, 2006; O'K'O'Keefeal., 2007; Strentrom, 1998). But their focus is only on English corpora. At the same time, corpus studies on the different languages are on their development (Gustilo and Palacio, 2016; Min, 2013).

There is a scant study on discourse markers in the Philippines' literature. Morales (2013) assessed the usage and function of Philippine English DMS in his study of written and spoken discourse. One study also recognized the purposes of discourse markers in eight northern Philippine languages. Some of the objectives of Filipino DMS, according to Walrod (2006), are to accentuate, downplay, refute, or hedge. One of the study findings of Filipino CMC and linguistic aspects defined English and Filipino DM's role highlights the statement before or after the DMS and helps readers create interpersonal relationships (Dino & Gustilo, 2015). Fung and Carter's (2007) Macro Discourse Level Particles were used in one study to determine the prevalence and roles of DMs.

The basis of the study in analyzing the Discourse Markers' occurrences is from Fung and Carter's framework (2007), Macro Level of Discourse Particles, which is a functionally-based account. It also deals with textual and interpersonal perspectives (Aijmer, 2002). The framework of the study classified discourse markers into four (4) categories: cognitive, interpersonal, referential, and structural. When saying cognitive category, these discourse markers distinguish the interlocutor's thought process of the speakers. Well, I mean, in other words, and you see, some of the examples that function thought processing. It also pertains to connecting the receiver's knowledge for formulating the following dialogue. An interpersonal category is a group of discourse markers used in managing attitudes, emotions, and interactions. These DMs tend to overlook discourse in the speaker's response that sends expression or reaction, okay, omg, yes and yeah, I see, and I mean are some of the most known DMs in some studies. Fillers are also in this category, like hahaha, hehehe, and hihi. The referential category shapes the connections of the conversation with the preceding one. The functions of these markers include signifying disjunction (or), comparison (like), coordination (and), contrasts, causal relationship (because, since), and consequence (so, as a result). Lastly, the structural category is markers that signal opening like before and firstly, closing with the use of finally or for now and summarizing like overall, transitioning between topics for example now, OK, right, so, and well, and continuing the current topic like, and, cos, so.

But, the Macro Function Level of Discourse Markers (Gustilo & Palacio, 2016) was adopted. Textual DMs are similar to Fung and Carter's Structural and Referential DMs in their suggested two-level macro functions because these two categories are primarily concerned with managing text structure and coherence. This category contains the various transition signals that convey the sequence or flow of thoughts, cause and effect, and other referential statements. On the other hand, relational DMs correspond to Fung and Carter's Interpersonal Category. The DMS in their data listed in Fung and Carter's Cognitive Category genuinely enhances ties with the

interlocutors. This second macro function addresses the users' interactional concerns with their audience in general cognitive, emotive, and interpersonal tasks in this category (Wang, 2011).

This paper identified the discourse markers in an online community of the Buhinën. It collected discourse markers' distribution frequency using Fung and Carter's Macro Level of Discourse Particles (2007). The pragmatic relation with the DMs was observed by defining the functions of every finding in the Relational Category; thus, it examined the true intentions of the native speakers with the help of the results from their exchanges of communication is, and how it impacts their identities separating the online community to the other. To investigate the occurrences of Discourse Markers in an Online Interaction of the Buhinëns on the Facebook platform, the following research questions are 1. What are the common DMs found in the online community of the Buhinëns: a. Textual, and b. Relational?; 2. What are the functions of these markers?

## 2 METHODS

The design incorporated in the research is a qualitative type of study. The research acquired qualitative data to determine the findings because this study was mainly based on analysis. Semiotic or Content analysis was applied to analyze DMs' occurrences. One analysis to explore is the t (E.J. Pratt Library, 2003; Chandler, 1999). In connection to the study, it examines the communication of messages about the text as the mode gathered from the Facebook platform. The corpus of two thousand (2 000) posts from the Facebook platform was collected. These posts also contained more self-written posts than shared posts, and these posts have comments, with few of them not having words. Antconc (2022) was used to gather the concordances; it analyzed the text in semiotic form. This freeware helped the researcher to get the frequency of words for a search strategy but needed to increase the precision of the research type. However, the Antconc interface is limited to use. It doesn't apply to trace variants such as the hahaha, which may have variants like haha (926), hahahahaha (180), and ahahaha (145), so to get the other variants, the use of traditional counting has been organized, with the help also of MS Excel, calculator, and papers to highlight of separating the DMs based on their function with textual and relational categories.

A survey through Google Form was conducted to confirm the results of their pragmatic functions. This survey was also based on the previous study. Fifteen (15) participants of Facebook users took the survey to gain validity among the findings on Relational Category that the author interpreted. It supported the metapragmatic relation of the study of the speaker's intended meaning while using those DMs (Gustilo and Palacio, 2016; Fraser, 1999). All of the participants were Buhinën natives, and to which majority of their first language is Boïnën language. The participants were also active users of the platform because most belonged from 17-64 years of age. They are multilingual, meaning they can use different languages on Facebook: Boïnën, Rinconada Bicol, Filipino, and English. The collected corpus was done by copying the text in Notepad.

To know which groups they belong to from the framework of Gustilo and Palacio's (2016) Macro Function Level of Discourse Particles, rereading the different materials or references to know their functions that fitted to the model's two (2) separate categories: relational and textual was done. Schifrin's approach (1987) on DMs was the basis of interpretation of results that says DMs have many meanings according to their use in communication.

The fifteen (15) most co-occurrences DMs in the textual category and the same for Relational Category were analyzed and interpreted on the first research question. Meanwhile, the (15) most commonly DMs in the textual category elaborated their functions. At the same time, there are thirty (30) DMs. Some samples of the Relational Category were taken from the study of Gustilo and Palacio (2016) and the site of Hamudyong (2017) to some common Bikol DMs like the *baga*, *baya*, *lugod*, *lang/sana*, and so on.

## 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 contains the Distribution of the DMs on Facebook posts and comments; it was revealed that there were 225 110 occurrences of DMs in the Textual Category, while Relational Category has 54 307 hits.

**Table 1. Distribution of DMs on Facebook Posts and Comments**  
 \*Word tokens: 1, 840,296 \*Word types: 86, 887

General Purpose of DMs	Frequency	Number of DMs
A. Textual Category	225, 110	565
B. Relational Category	54, 307	902

But beyond comparing their occurrences, the Relational Category unfolded with 902-word types, while the Textual Category gathered only 565 total. And it was revealed that Textual Category was the most used among the two (2) categories, while the Relational Category is dominant in the different semiotic forms or variants. Therefore, these results pointed out how DMs used cohesion and social interaction to manage the discourse in an online environment (Schiffrin, 1987; Fraser, 1999; Ajimer, 2002). Unlike the previous study involving Facebook users on Discourse Markers Distribution, it catered more relational category of DMs (Gustilo & Palacio 2016). Therefore, for the Buhinën people, cohesion was more critical in shaping the texts in their online environment. This means that the structuring and referencing of the particular ideas were more applied when interaction happens.

Table 2 presents the top fifteen (15) DMs in the Textual Category found in Buhi Online Community. It resulted in *na* being the most common DMs used in the Facebook group, for which it held the record of 46 516 co-occurrences in the corpora. Another finding of this word was its variants, like the shortened form of it, which is the letter n leaving the letter a, but it can be read as the word *na*; it is also mixed in words that are contracted, forming instead of *na lang* it became *nalang/nlng*, which is popular among the Filipino users. For the following DMs of the category with the most used, was the *pa* has the count of 9, 551 and then the *man* with 9, 717 hits. The DM *na* was also one of the common DMs from the previous study, and its equivalent is the *now* (Fung & Carter, 2007).

**Table 2. Top 15 Discourse Marker (DMs) in Textual Category which Buhinën People Commonly use.**

Discourse Markers	F	Rank
na	42, 516	1
pa	9, 551	2
man	9, 717	3
at	8, 040	4
lang	6, 391	5
sana	5, 641	6
para	5, 311	7
and	5, 227	8
kaya	5, 649	9
kung	5, 311	10
pero	5, 227	11
naman	5, 008	12
kin	4, 908	13
ba	4, 744	14
ag	3, 704	15

Table 3 organized the top fifteen DMs co-occurrences in Relational Category. *Po* has the most significant number of DMs in the said category with a 26 511-word count. The second one was the *di* which occurred 6, 401 in the corpora. Also, the transcription of laugh, *hahaha*, with 4 744 hits. Another was the *ay*, which scored 3, 730 at rank four (4). These DMs, *hahaha*, *eh*, *yes*, *oh*, *hehe*, and *ok*, were also commonly found in the student's corpus-based study of Gustilo and Palacio (2016).

**Table 3. Top 15 Discourse Marker (DMs) in Relational Category which Buhinën People Commonly use**

Discourse Markers	F	Rank
po	26, 511	1
di	6, 401	2
hahaha	4, 744	3
ay	3, 730	4
hindi	3, 704	5
amo	2, 719	6
nga	2, 559	7
tabi	2, 131	8
ngani	1, 713	9
no	1, 433	10
eh	1, 177	11
hehe	1, 112	12
yes	1, 067	13
ok	970	14
ha	719	15

These types of DMs have to say that the importance of interpersonal and thinking processes was also accomplished to manage discourse flows.

The revised framework of Gustilo and Palacio's approach (2016) on Discourse particles, the Macro level of Discourse particles of Fung and Carter (2007), was adopted to interpret the functions of the discourse markers in their textual and relational process. *Na* was the most commonly used DMs in the online community among the DMs which was analyzed; this means as now or already, and it appeared to have a topic shifts take (Ajimer, 2002) and mostly paired with the DM *sana* (just, only), which also has the same meaning as *to lang* in the corpora.

[1] "...ono ika magpa Angrob na sana sa mga ayam? he he he" (**Translation:** do you want just to get bitten by a dog now?)

[2] "... nkakapangirit po a mga comment nya lambang usad ag nkakauyam mn po minsan kaya po ako nkiki seen na lang sa mga comment ta baka po makaiba mn ako sa mga nkikiruro...". (**Translation:** I laugh at all of your comments and sometimes got upset, so I would only browse through the comments in order for me to not get involve in fights)

Statement [1] used the word *sana* while statement [2] used the *lang*, and this phrase both connects the verbs (*angrob* = "to bite" & *seen*) to the preposition (*sa*), which is one of the examples of why it is categorized as textual function. This DM also was preceded by the other common DMs, *like na po, na naman, na baga* etc.

[3] "nag pm na po ako sa messenger nyo po.. (I already sent you po a message in messenger.)

[4] "wahahaha pag gamer trashtalker na? Sablay na naman ika hahaha (**Translation:** wahahaha is being a gamer, a trash talker? you're wrong again hahaha)

[5] "Munadto na baga sa mga link na pinagpost mo..those are allegations lang at di pa napatunayan" (**Translation:** It's already there to the links that you had posted... Those are allegations and it is not yet proven)

The statement number [4] is an example of referential because *naman* (again) tends to connect the word to *ika* (you), which is referencing failing to answer again.

The other ten (10) most DMS in the corpora's textual category that exhibited the discourse's

coherence and structure include *pa, man, ta, para, kaya, kung, pero, kin, ba, o, or, nin*, etc.

[6] “Thank you so much! ?? I appreciate that!! Agko pa ngani nag onga kin related kuno ako sa DepEd ta a post mo ngay di an kyang isipon nia ordinarang citizen na tga buhi!” (**Translation:** Thank you so much! ?? I appreciate that!! There is someone pa ngani who asked me if i am related to DepEd, because they said ‘your post is not easy to be formulate by an ordinary buhinën citizen)

[7]” sa ngamin a maka basa niadeng post ko nakiki usip man po ako Kung puidi man po ana para omot Nia ngamin a ate dd sa samon a barangay” (**Translation:** to all who have read this post, I am asking for your concern if ever please those who throw garbages in our barangay)

[8] “Sana naisihan man basang namon ta agko man ako mga agen na maka avail man yana tabang pong adi..” (**Translation:** I am hoping to know what we should know, because I also have children through which they can also receive help from it..)

[9] “ono gibwon nira sari mag palista sa susunod para di na sira mag walk in..” (**Translation:** what should they do, where should they go on their next visit, so that they will not walk in)

[10] “uda po kaya ako idea kung isay ika maray pa po ika bistado mo ko .” ( **Translation:** It was because I had no idea who are you, but it’s good that you already know me)

[11] “Hayaan ang isang tao sa kanyang desisyon kung sino ang gusto nyang kandidato...” (**Translation:** Let the person decides, if he who likes from the candidates)

[12] “inda mga pereng ana mga mata nya iba pero di man aan maalin manay ta kanda man aan ta kanda man aan na pag disisyon” (**Translation:** I don’t know some of them have eyes closed, but it will not change because it is their own decision)

[13] “Uda, kin agko man ika sobrang pagsora paayat na sna ako?????” (**Translation:** Nothing, if you have too much food can you just give me?????)

[14] “May discount din po ba ang Bata ?” (**Translation:** Does the Child have a discount ba??)

[15] “Wala talagang sustansiya ang utak mo or baka momo lang mag browse ng mg sites kaya di alam” (**Translation:** Your brain doesn’t have any nutrients, or maybe you just browse sites, so you don’t know)

In statement [9] *para* (so that), [11] *kung*; [13] *kin* (if), [12] *pero* (but), and [15] *or* functions as all referential. *Para* was used as subordinate conjunction and function to have an assumption of something to implicate the request for the problem to be solved as it tackles the purpose. Both these markers, *kin* and *kung* used as subordinating conjunctions like the *para*. *Kin* as opener stands for a condition and request while getting the food with a condition if it was too much. In comparison, the *kung* connects the two near ideas to its theme about the decision. *Pero* and *or* are also conjunctions, and these markers also connect ideas.

The *ta* connects two ideas; the first; is about hoping for something and then stating their reason. In statements [8], the DM retained its because status as it is also implotive. While, *kaya* in the statement [10] was created to show the reason, for which it functions as usual of not familiar with the other. The English DMs were also evident in the discourse and its counterpart in Filipino and Boïnën languages, the *at* and the *ag*, for which they function as an additive, supplementing ideas same goes from the previous studies (Gustilo & Palacio, 2016, Schiffrin, 1987).

[16]” really? reveal mo san ka nagtapos and I will tell you kung paano babagsak ang mga schools na pinagtapusan ni LR” (**Translation:** really? You should reveal where did you graduate and I will tell you how the schools of LR will crumble)

[17] “sana ang Ni lista mo bakit Yang idol mo at mga accomplishments nya tulad ng educational background, mga ginawa at projects nya Nung nasa posisyon sya”,(I hope that you make a list – how about your idol and his/her accomplishments like his/her educational background and projects when s/he was on his position)

[18] "salamat po sa tabang mo sakon,,," ag sa mga advice mo,,," slmat po sa ngamin,,," (**Translation:** Thank you for all of your help to me... and to your advices... thank you for everything)

While in the relational category, these DMs are centered on interpersonal and cognitive. These are the results that were both interpreted by the author which were validated by the participants.

The twenty five (25) Relational DMs:

---

#### Discourse Markers Functions of DMs based on Members' response

---

1. po politeness marker; usually appears at the end -To show respect while communicating with others; To address elders respectfully.
2. hahaha transcription of laughter; it appears at the beginning and middle but mainly at the end -To react when something is funny; To express happiness.
3. ay No lexical meaning; Filler like "oh"; An exclamation at the beginning or end of an utterance, or can be found on both sides. -To express astonishment, amazement, and surprise; To express something wrong or mistake and then realize it.
4. okay An interjection; means to agree about something. -To express confirmation or affirmation;
5. no/hindi/di Negative marker; Opposite of yes; refusal to someone or something. -To deny, disagree, reject or refuse something or someone that is not into liking.
6. eh A filler; No lexical meaning, questioning confused; found at the end of the statement -To intensify; To express being uncertain about something
7. yes/oo Affirmative marker; Approval -To agree or give a positive/affirmative response
8. ha What; an interjection; a question mark sometimes; Use at the end of the question. -To pardon; To ask again for clarification
9. lol Short form of laugh out loud; It is used either to replace or to add to, hahaha -To express that it's super funny; To say of not believing on someone.
10. ah No lexical meaning; Curiously agreeing; It means "okay"; Getting the point; Understood -To express understanding approval; To show being enlightened about something.
11. ayaw An interjection for refusal; means "no" -To implicate or convey refusal, rejection, or denial of something
12. wow An interjection of surprised -When in a state of shock or surprise; To show amazement
13. hehe Transcription for a laugh; A shy laugh; or sometimes a fake laugh -Used when in an awkward situation or simply shy; To laugh even though it's not laughable; When something's wrong
14. oh An interjection; When you get the point; really or nice; to understand something is -To express little surprise at something interesting -To identify someone or a sign that someone is recognized; To tell not convinced; To show interest
15. sigé An interjection; Means okay; I agree -To confirm or approve something; It's an appropriate word to use whenever agreeing or wanting to join on something
16. hmm A filler; Thinking about something I-Still thinking and will get back to the other person later.
17. бага A hedge; To assert or negate something; An equivalent of "that is not true"; To give an example or conviction -To give a point when explaining for the other person to understand it more; To clarify a statement; To emphasize a point
- 2\*18. ngani 2\*A hedge; To agree using relating to someone's agreeing statement. -On agreement; To emphasize; To clarify a statement; Asking for validation; -To end the conversation
19. ngaya A hedge; To make sure of something; To give/express/explain ideas; Giving example; Retold from the other person -Means emphasizing a point; To make sure or point out something; when quoting another person's utterance
20. baya A hedge; To make sure; to end the conversation or afterword for emphasis. -To seek other's feelings or ideas; To clarify a statement; For the other speaker to reference how she

thinks; To emphasize my point

2\*21. *logod* 2\*A hedge; Approval in the sense of unassured; Sounds like Fine/Okay; Like “Tuloy” in Tagalog -To express that the person agrees but is not convinced or sure; To express that they understood; Used when someone approved but forced an argument

22. *amo* Affirmative; Approval or Yes -To respond yes; To express the truth to someone

23. *nga* To agree; Paired with the word “*amo/kaya*,”; Emphasizing. -To make sure of; to show that when agreeing at the end of the affirmative marker; To decide that someone is getting it right; To end a conversation

24. *tabi* Politeness marker; To show respect; Same as *po* -To mean yes with respect; To make an excuse; To show pleasing testimony; To pay respect

25. *kaya* To agree; used for reasoning; For emphasis -Used when persuading; To convey something is okay; To understand the other; To emphasize

---

Table 3 presents the results of relational DMs gathered through the survey. The micro functions of relational DMs were evident depending on what the FB users tried to mean and how they applied the message to add interpersonal and cognitive processes (Fung & Carter, 2007). In the same table, with several functions from every user listed, it can be discerned that one Relational DMS can function depending on how it works for coherence (Schiffrin, 1984). For example, the DM *po* is one of the politeness markers used for those older than a person, characterized by positive attitudes towards the other person. Its primary function is to say respect when communicating based on the participants; it is usually placed at the end of the word.

[20] “Hm *po*?” (**Translation:** How much *po*?)

[21] “Condolence *po*” (**Translation:** Condolence *po*)

[22] “Happy bday *po*” (**Translation:** Happy Birthday *po*)

The *hahaha* is a transcription of laughter, which means positive feeling, exact with *lol*, which is an initialism form of laughing out loud that tends to associate happiness or joy. But some posts and comments also added expressions *hahaha* or *lol* in a negative way with these ideas in the group like it is also used to poke fun of someone/mock and to laugh it out in a sarcastic manner, which was also studied on the previous study (Gustilo & Palacio, 2016).

[23] “*ika amung grade one ten.gusto mu pa iskwelahon kopa ika puon kinder HAHAHA*” (you’re the one who’s grade i-10, if you want to i will be the one to sent you in school from the start/kinder HAHAHA)

**GLOSS:** the commenter used the *hahaha* to make a funny statement about someone.

[24] “*Dawa ngane ababow nitalon haha*” (**Translation:** Even though it was shallow others jumped *haha*)

**GLOSS:** the commenter’s response to another comment the text contains humor/joke.

[25] “*Mas lalo kayong dadami nyan hahahahaha??????*” (**Translation:** Your number will increase, *hahahahaha??????*)

**GLOSS:** the commenter uses irony in the text with the use of the expression sarcastic meaning was used.

[26] “*basta LBM AKO2022 PARA walNg away lol*” (**Translation:** I support LBM 2022 so that there will be no fights *lol*)

**GLOSS:** the commenter uses a punchline on his comment with the expression *LOL* in a sarcastic or joking manner.

The DMs ay [27] can be found on each side depending on the speakers' use; they can also be used on both sides. This exclamation was the equivalent of oh trying to emphasize primarily another DM, and also, on the last, the complete statement was to highlight the entire message. Oh, usually used in English as an expression of shock [8], plus the participants also manage the discourse by expressing the idea or point that has been understood [29]. It is always put at the beginning of a sentence.

[27] "Ay boras Uno daw talaga Ay" (**Translation:** Oh gosh, what is it all about? Oh my) **GLOSS:** the user implied how s/he reacted, emphasizing in a state of shock and interacting with the others in the post.

[28] "Oh my goodness????? masakit kayo sa ulo?????" (**Translation:** Oh my goodness????? You give me a headache ?????)

**GLOSS:** the commenter uses the oh to express disappointment.

[29] "oh i see, nagets ko na ika." (**Translation:** Oh, I got it)

**GLOSS:** the user used the oh to imply that s/he had understood the said idea.

Wow, an exclamation is how it was perceived from the previous studies stands for amazement or astonishment about every different thing; they show positive reaction towards it mainly in the context of Buhinën people.

[30] "wow, sana all my pa cake? (**Translation:** wow, nice cake? )

**GLOSS:** the user commented how s/he was amazed at having cake given to the interlocutor.

Okay, yes, sige, and oo are altogether showed an affirmation. These DMs usually appear at the beginning of the statement. According to the table, okay and sige are those DMs that establish an informal way of agreeing. In contrast, yes and oo are equivalent and usually used for either formality or informality. Another one is the opo is also a politeness marker traditionally used in a respectful manner.

[31] "okay lang naman dawa di an masunod. Ako ngani da pa narereceive text pero nagpunta na ako, okay na nainterview na ako" (**Translation:** It's okay even it noted bro, it)

**GLOSS:**the user commented the way s/he agreed with the user ironically.

[32] "Yes sa Bicol, of course, she will win, baluarte niya " (**Translation:** Yes, of course, she will win in bicol, it is her origin)

**GLOSS:** the user implied yes as an assurance of the specific person in winning because it is where she came from.

[33] "sige po. Right mo po aan. Salamat sa diskurso.( **Translation:** sure po. It is your right. Thank you for our talk )

**GLOSS:** the user used sige to agree to the talk

[34] "oo nga buti pa yung iba probensya nagkakaisa pag may tumakbo kbbayan nila todo suporta (**Translation:** I agree, the other provinces are better because they are united in support if ever there will have their own people running for candidacy? )

**GLOSS:**the user agreed with the statement and gave a perspective on the message.

On the other hand, no, di/hindi, and ayaw are all negative markers; these express the disagreement of something or opposition to the ideas. According to the participants, their main functions were to deny, disagree, reject, or refuse something or someone that is not into liking. It means refusal to someone or something.

[31] "No way ! Ayaw namin sa magnanakaw!" (**Translation:** No way, we don't want a thief!)

**GLOSS:** the user used the no to refuse interlocutor because of an allegation of someone as a thief.

**COMMENT:** Trbhng kalabaw yan ah.

[32] “di man po sir kc bihira man pong mag pa drive kc matatanda na, puntang doctor, pamamalengke lang idadrive” (**Translation:** no sir, it is seldom, because driving is done only when visiting doctor, buying groceries) **GLOSS:** the user used di to negate the idea of the interlocutor that it is not that tiring.

[33] “hindi po ibig sabihin kapag alumni, graduated na kaagad.” (**Translation:** it doesn't mean to if someone's alumni, you are graduated) **GLOSS:** the user used the hindi to negate The similar two ideas in an argument.

[34] “ayaw ko ng dalawang nyan kasi baliktad ang ipinagtanggol ng mga yan (**Translation:** I don't like the two of them, because they fight for wrong)

**GLOSS:** rejection was delivered indirectly to the subject.

The eh was used to add intensity to the sentence and express being uncertain about something or lacking understanding about something. Ah was used to express that someone understood, getting the point/enlightening. Hehe was used in awkward situations, showing interest and a polite expression.

[35] “isauli nyo na kasi nasa balita na eh” (**Translation:** you should return it now because it's on the news, eh )

**GLOSS:** the filler eh was used in this comment to emphasize the explanation to the other speaker.

[36] “ah ok, sabot ko maurag...” (ah ok, i thought it was great)

**GLOSS:** the user used the filler to emphasize understanding.

[37] “amo po baga kaya nienjoy kaming mga parapost hehe. (**Translation:** I agree that we all enjoy posting here, hehe )

**GLOSS:** the hehe was used to express an awkward situation.

Both *naku* and *omg* are interjections to express shock or disappointment, but *omg* also has another function: to express surprise or excitement.

[38] “Ay naku grabi mong satsat..bakit di ka tumakbong VP” (**Translation:** omg, you talk so loud.. maybe you should be the one to run for VP)

**GLOSS:** the user used naku as an expression complaining about the words that

[39] “kaya nga proof kase may basehan omg” (**Translation:** the proof is served so that it became evidence omg)

**GLOSS:** the feeling of disappointment is emphasized using the omg in the statement.

Some of the most known Bicol DMs were also evident in the posts and comments. There's the *baga*, and this word is usually placed at the end of the term. Like:

[40] “ka mga kisil a payo bagaan baga dd.” (**Translation:** hardheaded people are many in here baga.)

**GLOSS:** the user's baga asserts/assumes users as hardheaded people

[41] “Kaya di ako nagkakaon balot ta kin arog kiton inay ko baga” (**Translation:** This is why I don't want to eat balot (a boiled fertilized duck egg delicacy) because if it looks like that, Geez baga!)

**GLOSS:** the user expressed that baga made the statement emphasizing disliking the food.

As for *ngani*, this DM is usually found after the word, which is it expresses fate, which applies to the situation that requires a solution. Still, it can also be used in emphasizing the words of affirmation and negation. The Filipino counterpart, *nga*, was also one of the most used DMs to emphasize agreement.

[42] “Ipadakuwo ana hospital ..ana oxygen ngani sa buhi community hospital minsan oda loog!!!” (**Translation:** Expansion for hospital .. Sometimes, there are no oxygen ngani found inside Buhi Community Hospital!!!)

**GLOSS:** the ngani was used to signify the statement to emphasize the problem.

[43] “Well amo ngani aan pisabi ta ni reflect sasatun and ugali niya taong pisuportahan ta.” (Well yes ngani, this is what it means that it is the reflection of us to whose persons we are supporting)

**GLOSS:** the user manages the affirmation to become more emphasized in her quotation.

[44] “un nga po ang hirap sa mga pulitiko na dapat malinis ang record nila walang bahid corruption kasi nagiging marka napo yan hanggang sa mga anak .. (**Translation:** That’s it nga po, it is difficult )

**GLOSS:** the user manages the affirmation to be more accentuated to her will of explaining.

While the *ngaya* is used to express or explain ideas in a statement or question, it is also a politeness marker used in requesting an idea. At the same time, *baya* used to ask for thoughts while waiting for an answer, exceptionally well used in planning for walks. The *logod*, on the other hand, participants gave their meaning as being uninsured of the decision s/he will make. Together with *baya*, these three DMs were used to hedge because they portrayed indecisiveness, confidence, uninsured, and probability about the feedback they were implying (Lakoff, 1972).

[45] “Ana pinaka worst, ana ibang tawo na nisabi, lipatan ta na ngaya ta ugoy na ngayang panahon ung pag unas.” (**Translation:** The worst is, some people speaks, let us forget na ngaya because the theft was happened long ago)

**GLOSS:** the user manages ngaya to explain to the other speakers through his uncertain events that need to be unforgotten.

[46] “natural na isabi man tabi an ika kin agko ika concern sa mga buhinon dapat ic mu kin uno man ngaya ana maisuhestyon mu sa kanda...” (**Translation:** it is natural to speak tabi if you have concern to all of Buhinens, you know man ngaya if what you want to suggest to them...)

**GLOSS:** the user used the ngaya to ask for a request and hedged the statement because it gives off probability.

[47] “Di muya magpakaon ni manok ta fiesta baya??” (**Translation:** The chicken doesn’t want to feed because it was fiesta baya??)

**GLOSS:** the user used the baya to insist on the idea of why chicken doesn’t want to eat.

[48] “Muna post ko kaya di inaprobahan ta k3 gayod pabor kaya amo na ading pinag post ko yo pabor na lugod.” (**Translation:** My first post was not approved, due to maybe they are not in favor of it, so I made a post lugod that is in favor for them)

**GLOSS:** the user managed the lugod in a manner of surrendering as he created the post, but it turned out it wasn’t approved, so s/he made another post.

The *amo*, a counterpart of the yes in their language, was also observed in the talks. And it is always used in agreement and is also used to emphasize the blame. Like with the *amo*, *kaya* was also mainly used with the speaker’s agreement; it helps convey the feeling of feeling acceptable with the idea, and thus it is used in persuading in many contexts.

[49] “Amo po an ana pisabing BULOK na sistema.” (**Translation:** That is what we call a rotten system)

[50] “amo po an ana pisabing “PASAFE” para lusot??” (**Translation:** That is what we called “PASAFE” so that s/he can get in)

**GLOSS:** the users made the amo to emphasize both negative ideas as a reason for criticizing.

[51] “kaya nga nasa pinaka mataas na parte ng katawan natin nakalagay ang utak para sya ang manguna. Pangalawa lng ang puso.” (**Translation:** kaya nga brain is found in our uppermost part of the body, so it is the central processing that will work first. Then followed by the heart)

**GLOSS:** the users persuade the kaya that the brain comes first before the heart.

The DM, *tabi*, also occurs in many texts; it functions as a politeness marker like *po*. It supports the testimony pleasingly.

[52] "Pa shout out po ky jun jan sa buraburan *tabi*.. pa kumusta na sana *tabi*" (**Translation:** Can you please mention me to Jun in Buraburan *tabi*.. say hi n asana *tabi* for me. )

**GLOSS:** the users used *tabi* to express respect in a way that s/he requested to be recognized and to send greetings.

Unlike the previous study, the example of the cognitive marker was seen as the function for *hmmm*. Exact to how I see it was used in a statement [29], it was used in the thinking process, implying that he already understood. Many participants used this for the thinking process or reflection on the other ideas.

[53] "hmmm agko po usad na gurang sa iraya parabolong alam ko matatabangan Ann ning maray punta na Lang po kamo sa iraya agko po adto ni bulong about sa mga ganyan mga sir mom" (**Translation:** hmmm there is an old person in Iraya, I know this person will be a very great help Ann I think it is better that you should go to Iraya because this will help about the sickness mam and sir)

**GLOSS:** The use of *hmmm* in the statement clarified that s/he knows about a specific person who will help them with their sickness.

[54] "Hmmm..ki isay daw ako maka ayat..da pa kami pagsura...omoy pa sana.???" (**Translation:** Hmmm.. to whom do I get food.. We don't have meals yet.. we only have rice.???)

**GLOSS:** the *hmmm* manage to think who will he get the food.

The Relational Category displays different expressive functions that overview the world of interpersonal communication, and the markers also found out about the cognitive particles used as it manages to reflect about some pieces of knowledge that involves. At the same time, the Textual Category helps to control the structure for connecting ideas and cohesion. The concordance of the DMs used was observed that they were used more than once in the sentences:

[55] "Ana mga bagay po kaya sa pgkaka isi ko lalo kin kuryente man o gamit uda man feelings pero kin sa usad na individual mo pi address a muda amo po aan isi ko na below the belt na." (Things what I think especially if it is electricity or nonliving things but if cursed words was address to the certain individual, that is what I know is inappropriate)

## 4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study found that the group of discourse markers the most used in the Buhinën community is the textual category; thus, cohesion is essential in CMC. The relational type has a maximum number enough to manage the social interaction of the Buhinën people; therefore, the emotive, cognitive, and expressive functions also played essential roles in the CMC (Wang, 2011). The difference in the number of DMs is not that important. Buhinën's interpersonal skills were lower than in the previous study (Gustilo and Palacio, 2016); thus, the data explored has more corpus centered on Buhi Online Community. The most prevalent textual category is *na* (now), the boundary of the talk's primary role in managing the conversation (Ajimer, 2002). While the relational category grasped how the Buhi Community's people were identified, the politeness marker *po* was the most used in this category. As speaker's use of the *po* and the other politeness markers such as *opo*, *tabi*, *ngaya*, etc. mean that the flow of the interaction in the discourse of Buhinën has been described that respect for others instilled, and their identity partakes why Buhinën organized the text in the way of sounds appropriate especially to the older demographics.

These two common discourse markers in each category manage the discourse to function to the different ideas, as it maintains its relevance in pedagogic contexts (Heidar & Biria, 2011). The primary function of *na* is in its structural form of topic shifting after it has closed the other side of an idea and then creates linkages to another, making it cohesive and bringing sense to the speaker.

It is also paired with the other discourse markers like the sana, which ensures the most common pattern in them' verb + na + sana + sa/ sa mga'. On the other hand, po is used to support the importance of respect. It delivered the context on phatic bringing the interpersonal relations with age. This is called hedge as it tones down the level it commonly applies to the older people in the community. Some common Relational Discourse Markers have also been discussed to support the pragmatic function of these DMs. It helps to validate the results of multifunction of the different relational discourse markers to know the speakers' intention. The local discourse markers are more prevalent than the Filipino and English. The discourse markers played an essential role in computer-mediated communication for cohesion and interaction because of the number of results and the series of code-switching in some parts of the exchange. It helps to manage the discourse flows of text by text.

The discourse marker is used to connect the words, but what makes it unique is its many possibilities of usage in communication. It appears everywhere in the day-to-day basis of different contact with so much placement it can reflect its semantic meaning or add. The variants of some discourse markers to be found in the posts like the kuno and kono, the gayud, gayod, and gayed, and the fillers hahaha, haha, bwahahaha, nyahahaha; hehehehe, hehehe, hehehe; wow, wowwww. These metalinguistic functions (Machler & Schiffrin, 2015) manage to let it be defined according to how it was used in different contexts. Discourse markers may not be necessary for discourse because some DMs can be removed.

Still, in pragmatics and Computer-mediated Communication, they manage to let the ideas be understood more and express what should be implied. They also create tone and voices as evidence of the transcription of feelings, it manages imagery of the objects, and the variants help establish the level of emotive function. And unlike in the previous study (Gustilo and Palacio, 2016), cognitive function was applied in hmmm, бага, baya, etc. This present study tackled an approach in discourse markers with a different take and perspective, which will help future researchers to find new ideas in the underexplored field. The need for the keyboard with a Boïnën language alphabet, element especially the rare sound produced in this town which has a symbol in the form of *g* and also the stops sometimes is helpful to clarify the word sometimes used in two variants one is utilizing the *â*, *î*, and *ô*; sometimes instead of bayâ, it can be baya or baya'. And also, the variants in spelling, except for fillers, the gayud, good, and gayed, will soon the Boïnën to make it as gayëd formally or in communication, because most are adults, for which many have no ideas usually, and they spell it on their way of writing, and the mother tongue languages course should also be applied in CMC with the hands-on computer. The research suggests the need to study more about the different languages of the Philippines to clearly emphasize the generality and comparison of each language. Like delving into different materials available, such as news articles, periodicals, poems, instant messages, or other social media platforms. This study also suggests gathering more participants, different methods, especially FGD, and other approaches that will impact, improve and influence many other studies, maximizing the conclusion visibility of the various studies.

## REFERENCES

- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particles: Evidence from a corpus* (Vol. 10). John Benjamins Publishing.
- 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.
- Banguis-Bantawig, R. (2019). The role of discourse markers in the speeches of selected Asian Presidents. *Heliyon*, 5(3), e01298.
- Blommaert, J. (2007). Sociolinguistics and discourse analysis: Orders of indexicality and polycentricity. *Journal of multicultural discourses*, 2(2), 115–130.
- Chandler, D. (1999). *Semiotics for Beginners* by Daniel Chandler. *Semiotics for Beginners*.
- Crible, L., & Cuenca, M.-J. (2017). Discourse markers in speech: characteristics and challenges for corpus annotation. *Dialogue and Discourse*, 8(2), 149–166.

- Dan. (2019). Social media statistics in the Philippines. Retrieved from Talkwalker .<https://www.talkwalker.com/blog/social-media-statistics-philippines>
- December, J. (1996). What is computer-mediated communication. *Website: http://www.december.com/john/study/cmc/what.html (last access: 15.12. 2003).*
- E.J.Pratt Library. (2003). Semiotics encyclopedia online - Welcome. Semioticon | Open Semiotics Resource Center. Retrieved from <https://www.semioticon.com/seo/index.html>
- Ghanbari, N., Dehghani, T., & Shamsaddini, M. R. (2016). Discourse markers in academic and non-academic writing of Iranian EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(7), 1451.
- Heeman, P. A., & Allen, J. (1999). Speech repairs, intonational phrases, and discourse markers: modeling speakers' utterances in spoken dialogue. *Computational Linguistics*, 25(4), 527–572.
- Hernández, T. (2008). The effect of explicit instruction and input flood on students' use of Spanish discourse markers on a simulated oral proficiency interview. *Hispania*, 665–675.
- Jones, S. (1995). Understanding community in the information age. *Sage, California*.
- Kapranov, O. (2019). Discourse markers in writing on Facebook by early balanced English/Italian bilinguals.
- Kübler, S., & Zinsmeister, H. (2015). *Corpus linguistics and linguistically annotated corpora*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Lakoff, G. (1975). Hedges: A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts. In *Contemporary research in philosophical logic and linguistic semantics* (pp. 221–271). Springer.
- Leech, G., Hundt, M., Mair, C., & Smith, N. (2009). *Change in contemporary English: A grammatical study*. Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, B., & Xiao, E. (2009). Chinese discourse markers in oral speech of mainland Mandarin speakers. In *Proceedings of the 21st North American conference on Chinese linguistics (NACCL-21)* (Vol. 2, pp. 358–374). Bryant University Smithfield, Rhode Island.
- Martinovic-Zic, A., & Moder, C. L. (2004). Discourse across languages and cultures. *Discourse Across Languages and Cultures*, 1–369.
- Martínez, A. C. L. (2004). Discourse markers in the expository writing of Spanish university students. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*(8), 63–80.
- McENERY, T.-W., & Wilson, A. (2001). *A.(1996) Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Min, S. (2011). A Corpus-based Analysis of EFL Learners' Use of Discourse Markers in Cross-cultural Communication. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 17(3), 177–194.
- Nasir, S. H. (2017). The Interpretation of Discourse markers ya'yes' and nggak'no'in Indonesian.
- Palacio, M. A., & Gustilo, L. (2016). A Pragmatic Analysis of Discourse Particles in Filipino Computer Mediated Communication. *Online Submission*, 16(3), 1–19.
- Polanyi, L., & Scha, R. J. (1983). The syntax of discourse. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 3(3), 261–270.
- Sani, I. (2020). Functions of English Discourse Markers on Facebook Among Umaru Musa Yar'adua University Members of Academic Staff. In *Papers of the 7th International Conference on Language, Literature, Linguistics & Communication 2020*, 27.
- Shimada, K. . (2014). Japanese EFL Learners' Acquisition of Discourse Markers: A Comparative Analysis of Spoken Corpora and English Textbooks (Doctoral dissertation, (University of Tsukuba)).
- Statista Research Department. (2020, January). Philippines: Share of e-Commerce activities of internet users. Retrieved from Statista.<https://www.statista.com/statistics/1125430/philippines-e-commerce-activities-internet-users/>

- Statista Research Department. (2021, June). Philippines: Major B2C e-Commerce sites by monthly visits 2021. Retrieved from Statista.<https://www.statista.com/statistics/993273/philippines-major-b2c-ecommerce-sites/>
- Tan-de Ramos, J. (2010). A Comparative Study of the Discourse Marker Types in the Body Section of the. *TESOL Journal*, 2, 62–73.
- Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tree, J. E. F., & Schrock, J. C. (1999). Discourse markers in spontaneous speech: Oh what a difference an oh makes. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 40(2), 280–295.
- Walrod, M. (2006). The marker is the message: The influence of discourse markers and particles on textual meaning. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 37(2), 100–119.
- Wang, Y. (2011). A Discourse-Pragmatic Functional Study of the Discourse Markers Japanese Ano and Chinese Nage. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 20(2).
- Yunus, M. M., Salehi, H., & Nordin, N. (2012). ESL pre-service teachers' perceptions on the use of paragraph punch in teaching writing. *English Language Teaching*, 5(10), 138.
- Yunus, M. M., Salehi, H., & Nordin, N. . (2012). ESL pre-service teachers' perceptions on the use of paragraph punch in teaching writing. *English Language Teaching* , 5(10), 138.