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**Chapter One**

**1.1 Introduction**

 Discourse markers are linguistic devices used to signal relationships between different parts of a conversation or text. They serve as a way to connect ideas, indicate transitions, express attitude or emotion, and manage turn-taking in a conversation. Discourse markers can be single words, phrases, or even gestures that help to organize and structure communication. They are essential for effective communication and play a significant role in facilitating understanding between speakers(Schiffrin,1987:48).

 One of the primary functions of discourse markers is to help structure conversations and texts by indicating the relationship between different parts of the discourse. For example, in an oral conversation, a speaker may use markers like “well,” “so,” or “you know” to introduce a new topic, signal agreement or disagreement, or transition to a different point. These markers help to guide the listener through the conversation and make the speaker’s intentions clear(Reppen,2010:87).

 Discourse markers can also be used to express attitude or emotion. For example, a speaker may use markers like “oh,” “wow,” or “uh-oh” to convey surprise, excitement, or concern. These markers add a layer of emotion to the conversation and help the speaker express their feelings more effectively. In written texts, markers like “unfortunately,” “fortunately,” or “sadly” can also indicate the author’s attitude towards a particular topic or event.Discourse markers play a crucial role in managing turn-taking in a conversation(Fraser,1999:65).

**1.2. Definition of Discourse Markers**

 Discourse markers are linguistic tools that serve various purposes in spoken and written communication. They are words or phrases that help to manage the flow of conversation, organize information, and guide the listener or reader through the text. Discourse markers are not typically essential to the core meaning of a sentence; rather, they provide context and help structure the discourse, making it more coherent and comprehensible) Lee,2021:38).

 One of the primary functions of discourse markers is to signal relationships between ideas. For example, words like “however,” “therefore,” and “moreover” indicate contrast, cause and effect, and addition, respectively. These markers assist in clarifying the connections between statements, ensuring that the audience can follow the argument or narrative effectively. Additionally, markers such as “well” or “you know” often serve to manage conversational dynamics, allowing speakers to hold the floor while organizing their thoughts(Jang,2020:170).

 Recent studies have shown that discourse markers are prevalent in various languages and significantly contribute to effective communication. They are particularly important in academic and professional settings, where clarity and organization are essential. For instance, in academic writing, markers can help present arguments systematically, indicating shifts in focus or the introduction of counterarguments. This structured approach not only aids comprehension but also enhances the persuasiveness of the written work(Thompson,2007:60).

 Moreover, discourse markers play a crucial role in spoken interactions. In casual conversations, phrases like “like,” “you know,” and “actually” provide the speaker with time to think while maintaining the listener’s interest. They create a more informal atmosphere, making the interaction feel more personal and relatable. In recent years, research has increasingly focused on the role of discourse markers in digital communication, such as in social media and text messaging. This shift highlights their adaptability to various communication modes, demonstrating their integral role in modern discourse(Schiffrin,1987:64).

**1.3 Types of Discourse Markers**

Discourse markers are linguistic elements that help to organize and structure discourse by signaling various relationships between ideas. They play a crucial role in guiding the listener or reader through the flow of information in a text or conversation. Different types of discourse markers serve different functions, such as indicating contrast, addition, cause and effect, or sequencing(Heritage,1984:200).

**1.3.1. Contrastive Markers**

 Contrastive markers introduce a shift in the information being presented, signaling a difference or contrast between two ideas or elements. They help to highlight differences or contradictions in the discourse. Some common contrastive markers include “however,” “on the other hand,” “but,” “yet,” and “instead(Schourup,1999:24).

**1.3.2. Additive Markers**

 Additive markers, on the other hand, serve to connect ideas that are related or similar to each other. They indicate an addition or extension of information without introducing a clear shift in the discourse. Examples of additive markers include “and,” “also,” “moreover,” “furthermore,” and “in addition(Fillmore,1997:69).

**1.3.3. Causal Markers**

 Causal markers signal a cause-and-effect relationship between two ideas or events in the discourse. They indicate why something has happened or what has led to a particular outcome. Common causal markers include “because,” “since,” “as a result,” “due to,” and “therefore(Levinson,2013:42).

**1.3.4. Sequential Markers**

 Sequential markers help to organize information in a chronological or sequential order. They indicate the order in which events or ideas unfold in the discourse. Examples of sequential markers include “firstly,” “secondly,” “then,” “subsequently,” “finally,” and “in conclusion(Yule,1996:54).

**1.4 Importance of Discourse Markers in Language**

 Discourse markers are linguistic elements that play an essential role in communication, helping to organize speech and writing, convey relationships between ideas, and guide listeners or readers through a text. They are typically short phrases or words that, while not always carrying substantial semantic content, serve as cognitive signposts in discourse. Their importance in language cannot be overstated, as they facilitate comprehension, coherence, and interaction in communication) Blakemore,1992:26).

 One of the primary functions of discourse markers is to signal the structure of discourse. They indicate shifts in the speaker’s thought process, such as transitions between ideas, the introduction of contrasting viewpoints, or the addition of information. For instance, words like “however,” “furthermore,” and “on the other hand” alert the audience to how the current information relates to what has already been presented. This structural signaling aids listeners and readers in following along, making it easier to understand complex discussions and arguments(Fraser,1996:34).

 Discourse markers help manage the flow of conversation, especially in spoken language. When a speaker uses markers like “you know,” “like,” or “I mean,” they create a space for interaction and engagement with their audience. These expressions can invite feedback, elicit agreement, or hold the floor in casual dialogues. This interactive function is particularly significant in contemporary communication, where discourse is often collaborative, as seen in social media platforms and peer discussions in educational settings(Holmes,2013:47).

 In addition to managing structure and interaction, discourse markers also contribute to the cohesion of text. They help connect clauses and sentences, ensuring that the discourse flows logically from one point to the next. For example, the use of “therefore” or “as a result” links cause and effect, strengthening the relationship between arguments in academic and professional writing.Another critical aspect of discourse markers is their role in expressing attitudes and emotions. Phrases such as “to be honest” or “surprisingly” convey the speaker’s stance or emotional response concerning the subject matter. This aspect adds depth to communication, allowing for the expression of nuances that pure content words may not convey(Kutuzov,2022:104).

**1.5 Historical Perspective on Discourse Markers**

 Discourse markers are linguistic elements that play a crucial role in the organization and understanding of spoken and written language. Historically, the study of discourse markers has evolved, revealing their significance in communication..Discourse markers can be defined as words or phrases that guide the flow of conversation or text. They serve various functions, such as indicating a shift in topic, signaling agreement or disagreement, emphasizing a point, or organizing information. Examples include “well,” “you know,” “however,” and “on the other hand.” They are subtle yet powerful tools that contribute to the coherence and cohesion of discourse(Swales,1990:76).

 The exploration of discourse markers dates back to the mid-20th century when linguists began to recognize their role beyond mere fillers. Early studies focused primarily on spoken language, particularly casual conversation, revealing how speakers use markers to manage turn-taking and maintain the flow of dialogue. Scholars such as Schiffrin in 1987 emphasized the social and pragmatic functions of these markers, arguing that they are essential for understanding how people negotiate meaning in communication(Biber,1998:32).

 BThe late 20th century saw a shift towards studying discourse markers in written texts. Researchers began to analyze their presence in academic writing, journalism, and literature. This expansion highlighted how discourse markers serve to guide readers, clarify arguments, and structure information. For instance, words like “therefore” and “furthermore” link ideas, ensuring that the reader can follow the reasoning. This period marked a significant advancement in recognizing the importance of discourse markers forms of communication(Bolden,1991:59).

 The study of discourse markers has gained momentum with the rise of digital communication. The informal style of online conversations has led to the emergence of new discourse markers, such as “lol,” “brb,” and “idk.” These markers have transformed the way people engage in written discourse, particularly in social media and messaging applications. Researchers are now examining how these new markers affect language use and interpersonal relationships in the digital age. Furthermore, interdisciplinary approaches have enriched the study of discourse markers. Insights from psychology and sociolinguistics have deepened our understanding of how markers function in relation to context, speaker identity, and audience. The interplay of discourse markers with cultural factors is also being explored, as different languages and cultures employ unique markers that reveal social norms and values(Meyer,2016:48).

**Chapter Two**

**2.1. Connecting Ideas in Discourse**

 Connecting ideas in discourse is a crucial aspect of effective communication, as it enhances the coherence and flow of thoughts, making it easier for the audience to follow and understand the message. Cohesion refers to the linguistic means of connecting sentences and clauses, while coherence involves the overall structuring of ideas in a logical manner. Together, these elements help create a cohesive discourse that guides the listener or reader through the narrative or argument presented (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, 3).

 Transitions, conjunctions, and lexical ties are key tools in connecting ideas. Transitional words like “however,” “furthermore,” and “in contrast” signal shifts or continuations in thought, helping to clarify relationships between different parts of the discourse . Similarly, repeating key terms or using synonyms can create lexical cohesion, enabling the audience to see connections between concepts. This not only aids comprehension but also reinforces the main points being communicated (Brown & Yule, 1983, 112).

 Another critical factor is the contextual framework within which ideas are presented. The background knowledge, expectations, and experiences of the audience play a significant role in how effectively ideas are connected and understood. Discourse that is tailored to the audience’s knowledge and interests can create a more engaging and persuasive narrative(Gee, 2014, 45).

 The ability to connect ideas in discourse is vital for clarity and engagement. By utilizing linguistic tools and considering the audience’s context, communicators can enhance the effectiveness of their messages and promote better understanding (Van Dijk, 1985, 102).

**2.2. Organizing Information in Texts**

 Organizing information in texts is essential for clarity and comprehension. Effective organization allows readers to navigate through ideas smoothly, facilitating understanding and retention. A well-structured text employs various strategies, including logical arrangement, paragraphing, and the use of headings and subheadings, to present information in a coherent manner (Hyland, 2000, 74).

 One common method of organizing information is the chronological approach, which arranges events or ideas in the order they occur. This technique is especially useful in narratives and historical accounts, as it helps readers follow a sequence of events clearly . Conversely, a topical organization groups related ideas or themes together, which is effective for analytical or argumentative texts. By presenting information in related clusters, the author can emphasize connections and contrasts among concepts (Connor, 1996, 23).

 Another important aspect of organizing information is the use of paragraph structure. Each paragraph should focus on a single idea or theme, starting with a topic sentence that introduces the main point. Supporting sentences should provide evidence or examples, while concluding or transitional sentences can guide the reader to the next paragraph. This structure not only aids comprehension but also enhances the overall flow of the text(Kellogg, 2008, 58).

 Visual aids, such as charts, graphs, and lists, can further assist in organizing information by breaking up dense blocks of text and highlighting key details. These tools make complex information more accessible and engaging for readers, allowing for quicker comprehension of main ideas and data relationships(Meyer, 2014, 62).

**2.3. Signaling Relationships Between Sentences**

 Signaling relationships between sentences is a vital aspect of writing that enhances coherence and helps readers follow the logical flow of ideas. Effective signaling uses various linguistic tools, such as transition words and phrases, to indicate how one sentence relates to another. These signals can show relationships such as addition, contrast, cause and effect, and exemplification, providing clear pathways for readers to navigate complex arguments or narratives (Meyer, 2014, 102).

 For instance, transition words like “furthermore,” “however,” and “therefore” clarify connections between ideas. When a writer introduces a new point that adds to a previous argument, “furthermore” effectively signals this addition, while “however” indicates contrast or a shift in perspective. Such language cues are crucial in academic writing, as they guide readers in understanding the writer’s intent and the relationships among various parts of the text (Hyland, 2000, 78).

 Moreover, signposting is not limited to single sentences but extends to paragraph transitions as well. Clear topic sentences and concluding sentences within paragraphs can act as signposts, summarizing the main idea and linking it to the subsequent paragraph, thereby maintaining a coherent narrative thread. This approach helps readers anticipate what is coming next and reinforces the overall structure of the text (Connor, 1996, 42).

 Additionally, visual signals can complement textual signals. Bullet points, numbered lists, and headings can visually represent relationships and hierarchies among ideas, enhancing reader engagement and comprehension (Kellogg, 2008, 53).

**2.4. Enhancing Cohesion and Coherence**

 Enhancing cohesion and coherence in writing is essential for creating a clear and organized piece of work. Cohesion refers to how the different parts of a text are connected, while coherence refers to how well the ideas in a text flow together to form a unified whole. By improving cohesion and coherence, writers can make their writing more understandable and engaging for their audience.One way to enhance cohesion in writing is by using transition words and phrases. These words help to connect different ideas and show the relationship between them. For example, words like “however,” “in addition,” and “as a result” can help to signal shifts in thought or emphasize important points. By using these transition words effectively, writers can create a smoother and more logical flow in their writing (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:34).

 Another way to improve cohesion is by using pronouns and lexical cohesion. Pronouns like “it,” “they,” and “this” can help to refer back to previously mentioned ideas and connect different parts of a text. Additionally, using consistent lexical choices throughout a text can help to create unity and coherence by reinforcing key themes and ideas (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 57).

 In addition to using transition words, pronouns, and lexical cohesion, writers can also enhance cohesion by structuring their writing effectively. This includes organizing ideas in a logical order, using headings and subheadings to guide the reader, and using formatting tools like bullet points or numbered lists to highlight important information (Williams, 2006: 112).

**Chapter Three**

**3.1. Characteristics of Spoken Discourse**

 Spoken discourse, as a fundamental aspect of human communication, possesses distinct characteristics that differentiate it from written discourse. One of the most significant features of spoken discourse is its spontaneous nature. Unlike written texts, which can be edited and revised, spoken communication often occurs in real-time, resulting in a more fluid and dynamic interaction. This spontaneity can lead to the use of incomplete sentences, false starts, and interruptions, allowing speakers to convey thoughts and emotions rapidly. As such, effective communication in spoken discourse often relies heavily on the context, shared knowledge, and non-verbal cues, such as tone and body language, to ensure clarity and understanding(Brown, 2000:120).

 Another characteristic of spoken discourse is its interactive quality. Conversations are not merely exchanges of information; they involve turn-taking, pauses, and feedback mechanisms that enhance engagement between speakers. Participants in a dialogue can ask questions, provide responses, and clarify meanings, fostering a sense of connection. This interplay is facilitated by backchannel responses, such as “uh-huh” or nodding, which signal attentiveness and encourage the speaker to continue, reinforcing the collaborative nature of spoken communication(Gee, 2014: 76).

 Furthermore, spoken discourse is often characterized by informal language and colloquial expressions. This informality contributes to a more personal and relatable exchange, allowing speakers to express identity and social relationships. The use of idioms, slang, and regional expressions reflects the cultural and social contexts of the communicators, enriching the dialogue and enhancing mutual understanding. Such informal language stands in contrast to the formal syntax and vocabulary commonly found in written texts(Cameron, 2001:142).

 Additionally, spoken discourse frequently exhibits features of repetition and redundancy. Speakers often repeat ideas or phrases for emphasis or to aid comprehension, particularly in complex discussions. This repetition can serve as a rhetorical device, reinforcing key points and making them more memorable for listeners. Moreover, the use of fillers, such as “you know” or “like,” though sometimes viewed as hesitation, can also function to give the speaker time to formulate thoughts and maintain the flow of conversation(Sacks, 1974: 25).

 Prosody plays a crucial role in spoken discourse, influencing the meaning and emotional tone of what is being communicated. Variations in pitch, intonation, and stress can alter the interpretation of sentences and convey nuanced emotions that are often absent in written forms. For instance, a statement can be perceived as a question based on its intonation, showing how spoken language relies on auditory cues to enhance meaning(Gilbert, 2008:59).

**3.2. Characteristics of Written Discourse**

 Written discourse exhibits several characteristics that differentiate it from spoken discourse, primarily due to its static and enduring nature. One of the defining features of written discourse is its structure and organization. Written texts are typically organized into clear sections, including introductions, body paragraphs, and conclusions, which provide a logical flow of ideas. This structure helps readers to anticipate content and navigate complex arguments effectively, promoting comprehension. Additionally, the use of headings, bullet points, and numbered lists further aids in the organization of information, allowing readers to easily identify key points (Swales, 1990: 40).

 Another crucial characteristic of written discourse is the use of formal language and a more extensive vocabulary. Writers often employ precise word choices and adhere to grammatical norms to convey meaning clearly and effectively. This formality is especially prevalent in academic, professional, and literary writing, where nuanced expression and clarity are paramount. The careful selection of words helps in creating a tone that matches the intended audience and purpose of the text, showcasing the writer’s intent and authority(Hyland, 2005:89).

 In contrast to spoken discourse, written language allows for extensive revision and editing. Writers can refine their arguments, enhance clarity, and eliminate ambiguity before publication. This transformative process is essential for producing coherent and polished texts. Readers benefit from this constructed quality, as the text often emerges as a well-thought-out product of deliberate crafting. This deliberation lends a sense of permanence to written discourse, as opposed to the fleeting nature of spoken exchanges(Kellermann, 1993:77).

 Intertextuality is a prominent feature in written discourse. Writers frequently reference other texts, integrating quotes, citations, and allusions that enrich their work and connect it to broader conversations within a field. This practice not only strengthens their arguments but also situates their writing within a wider intellectual framework, enhancing its credibility and depth(Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981:153).

**3.3. Differences in the Use of Discourse Markers**

 Discourse markers (DMs) play a critical role in organizing spoken and written language, guiding listeners and readers through the speaker’s or writer’s intended message. However, their usage often differs significantly between spoken and written discourse due to the inherent characteristics of each mode. Understanding these differences illuminates how effectively language conveys meaning and maintains coherence throughout communication.In spoken discourse, DMs function as essential tools for managing conversation flow and maintaining interaction. They often mark a speaker’s thought processes and signal transitions, such as shifts in topic or opinion. Common spoken DMs include “well,” “you know,” and “like.” These markers help speakers pause for thought, engage listeners, and encourage feedback, thereby fostering an interactive environment. The informal nature of spoken conversation allows for frequent use of DMs, making dialogue more relatable and conversational (Schiffrin, 1987: 56).

 Conversely, in written discourse, the use of DMs is typically more restrained and formal. In written texts, coherence is established through structured formatting, such as paragraphs and headings, which reduces the need for frequent DMs. Writers often prefer more formal markers like “furthermore,” “however,” or “in addition” to signal shifts or elaborations. These choices reflect a more careful consideration of audience and context, where clarity and precision are prioritized. As a result, written DMs tend to have a more explicit function in delivering cohesive arguments rather than the conversational cues found in spoken language (Graham, 2006:112).

 Moreover, the function of DMs can vary significantly across cultural contexts. Certain societies may favor specific DMs that align with their communication style. For instance, in some cultures, direct discourse is valued over indirectness, which can influence the prevalence and types of DMs used. Understanding this aspect is crucial for cross-cultural communication, as using the appropriate markers enhances comprehension and fosters positive interactions (Gumperz, 1982: 56).

 DMs serve as markers of pragmatic meaning, indicating the speaker’s attitude or stance toward the shared information. In spoken discourse, markers like “I mean” or “you see” convey a speaker’s attempt to clarify or emphasize their statements. In contrast, in written discourse, the writer may employ DMs to position themselves within academic arguments, guiding readers through their reasoning consistently. This strategic use allows writers to manage interpretations and clarify arguments without engaging in direct interaction with the audience (Fraser, 1999:936).

**Conclusion**

Discourse markers are essential linguistic tools that facilitate coherence and fluency in both spoken and written communication. These markers, which include words and phrases such as "however," "therefore," "on the other hand," and "for example," help organize discourse by indicating relationships between ideas, signaling transitions, and managing the flow of conversation. They serve various functions, such as guiding listeners through the speaker's reasoning, highlighting contrast or emphasis, and providing clarification or elaboration. Furthermore, their use enhances interaction by allowing speakers to navigate turn-taking and indicate comprehension or agreement in dialogue. While discourse markers may not carry substantial lexical meaning on their own, their role in shaping the structure and clarity of communication is invaluable.

**References**

A. Bolden, “Discourse Markers in Interaction,” Journal of Pragmatics, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 573-596, 2001.

Beaugrande, R. de, & Dressler, W. U. (1981). Introduction to Text Linguistics. London: Longman

 Blakemore, D. Semantic Constraints on Relevance. Oxford University Press, 1992.

Brown, G. (2000). Listening to Spoken English. London: Longman.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, D. (2001). Working With Spoken Discourse. London: Sage Publications.

Connor, U. (1996). Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-cultural Aspects of Second-language Writing. Cambridge University Press.

Connor, U. (1996). Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-cultural Aspects of Second-language Writing. Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, C. J. (1997). Lectures on deixis. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are Discourse Markers? Journal of Pragmatics, 31(7), 933-952.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers?. Journal of Pragmatics, 31(7), 931-952.

Fraser, B. “An Approach to Discourse Markers.” Journal of Pragmatics, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 313-332, 1996.

G. G. Meyer, “Discourse Markers in Digital Communication,” Journal of Language and Social Psychology, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 438-454, 2016.

Gee, J. P. (2014). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method. Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2014). How to Do Discourse Analysis: A Toolkit. New York: Routledge.

Gilbert, H. (2008). Prosody in Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, S. (2006). The Role of Discourse Markers in Academic Writing. Journal of Linguistics, 54(1), 112.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Discourse Strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

H. M. Lee and E. S. Jang, “Cultural Variation in the Use of Discourse Markers,” Intercultural Communication Studies, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 1-15, 2020.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. Longman.

Heritage, J. (1984). Garfinkel and ethnomethodology. Polity Press.

Holmes, J. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Routledge, 2013.

Hyland, K. (2000). Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing. Pearson.

Hyland, K. (2000). Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing. Pearson.

Hyland, K. (2005). Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

J. A. Thompson, “The Role of Discourse Markers in Discourse Structure,” Journal of Pragmatics, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 1456-1471, 2007.

J. Swales, “Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings,” Cambridge University Press, 1990.

K. Biber, “Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use,” Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Kellermann, T. (1993). Written Discourse: A Psycholinguistic Approach to the Study of Written Language. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training Writing Skills with Writing Strategy Instruction. In The Psychology of Writing ( pp. 48-64). Oxford University Press.

Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training Writing Skills with Writing Strategy Instruction. In The Psychology of Writing (pp. 50-60). Oxford University Press.

Kutuzov, R. “Discourse Markers in Political Discourse.” Current Issues in Language and Society, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 64-81, 2022.

Levinson, S. C. (2013). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meyer, B. J. F. (2014). Text Structure and Learning from Texts. In Handbook of Research on Learning and Instruction (pp. 60-78). Routledge.

Meyer, B. J. F. (2014). Text Structure and Learning from Texts. In Handbook of Research on Learning and Instruction (pp. 101-120). Routledge.

Reppen, R., & Norrick, N. R. (2010). From discourse markers to discourse management: An overview. In Discourse markers (pp. 31-49). John Benjamins Publishing.

S. Schiffrin, Discourse Markers, Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Sacks, H. (1974). An Analysis of the Course of a Laugh Track. New York: The Academic Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers. Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse Markers. Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse Markers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, L. C. (1999). Discourse markers. Lingua, 107(3-4), 227-265.

Swales, J. (1990). Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills. University of Michigan Press.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills. University of Michigan Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1985). Structure of Discourse. Advances in Discourse Processes Series. Ablex Publishing

Williams, J.M. (2006). Style: Lessons in Clarity and Grace. Pearson.

Y. P. Lee, “Discourse Markers in Digital Communication,” Language and Linguistics, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 491-511, 2021.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.