

A Semantic Study of Pragmatic Markers

Nagamurali Eragamreddy *

University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Salalah, Sultanate of Oman

Abstract

According to pragmatics, the method by which a language user interprets a sentence representation offered by grammar based on the surrounding context to ascertain the messages and affects the speaker intended to express. The goal in this paper is with a particular aspect of that procedure, namely, the aspects in which the syntactically coded meaning of a sentence serves as a clue as to the straightforward, literal signals that the speaker wanted to convey. Pragmatic markers answer to the impulsive, interactive, communal, cordial, and courteous components of speaking and are a crucial part of verbal competency. Since pragmatic markers play a variety of roles in distinct spoken language interpersonal settings, a variety of conceptual frameworks have been taken into account in describing and constraining their multi-functionality. Pragmatic markers are chiefly categorized into four types. Basic markers provide additional conceptual information beyond the hypothetical sense. Commentary pragmatic markers contain procedural definition that signals the communication as a remark and propositional meaning that covers the full message. Parallel markers add a full message to the basic message when signaling. Discourse markers that indicate how the fundamental message relates to the previous conversation and give the addressee guidelines for how to understand the speech to which the discourse marker is connected.

Keywords: Pragmatic markers, verbal competency, interactional contexts, conceptual frameworks

INTRODUCTION

It is obvious that language serves as a tool of inter-person communication. Information can be shared or the world can be described using language. For example, a speaker is able to encode utterances that convey his or her ideas, feelings, and attitudes as well as characterize the surrounding locations, activities, and objects. A speaker can also indicate his intentions in a variety of situational and social circumstances by using the same language, such as when they are disputing, inculcating, punishing, appealing, welcoming, confessing, or grumbling, to name a few. The presenter employs semantic components in his utterances which offer a clue as to the projected interpretation of the hypothesis subject matter and the power of the created utterances in order to achieve his communication goals. Pragmatics and pragmatic branches of language studies are primarily concerned with the utilization of these linguistic components and their roles in certain situations. Discourse analysis and pragmatics, which both concentrate on the characterization of semantic parts, their goals, as well as roles in a part of verbal

conversation, are focused on the evaluation of language in use, as per Brown and Yule (1983). Speakers typically employ linguistic components in their speech during interlinked communication that serve purposes other than encoding semantic meaning or force. Really, these non-propositional utterance-meaning components (such as topic or power) are examined as various signal sorts; these are known as pragmatic indicators or markers (Fraser, 1996).

The use of pragmatic indicators or markers, also known as discourse markers, enables authors and presenters to express their opinions or attitudes on the information being communicated. They allow for the negotiation of propositions' clarity and serve to "semantically contextualize the author's aim while prepping the reader/listener to agree with this purpose." (Ran 2003). Such types of markers are frequently employed to analyze a claim's plausibility while obfuscating the writer's perspective as the source of evaluation, making the claims appear unbiased and impartial (Biber 2006; Ran 2003). Pragmatic indicators can also serve as an impoliteness tactic in the academic setting. By treating it as impartial or unbiased, they may help to lessen the impact of the study information (like the assumptions, the theoretical contributions, and the outcomes) on the reader or listener. According to Goffman (1967), pragmatic markers function as evasive etiquette tactics, helping the presenter or writer avoid violating the reader's or interlocutor's space.

The various study pathways and ideas that have been developed to date in pragmatic marker studies define the state of the art. Fischer (2006) identified a few pragmatic marker-related problem areas and enlisted the assistance of subject-matter specialists to provide additional insight. The objective was to establish a standard framework for the investigation of pragmatic markers. The contributions revealed a wide range of pragmatic marker techniques and numerous discrepancies with regard to fundamental concerns. For instance, pragmatic markers are challenging to define, have a wide range of purposes, lack a common linguistic paradigm for their description, and have a complicated link between form and function. The Grice's Cooperative Concept and its maxims, the politeness rules, and processing restrictions are examples of general conversational rules. The usage of pragmatic markers by communicators can likewise be explained by these ideas. It's vital for the presenter to be cordial in a discourse, but not in a discussion. There are further, more particular concepts that are connected to the structure and objective of the communication encounter (Grice 1975).

The character of pragmatic signals is changeable and dependent on context. Since their meaning is not as constant as that of lexical items, it cannot be explained in a similar way. According to Norén and Linell (2007), pragmatic indicators or markers acquire their definition from "dynamic sense-making" in specific, contextual settings. This is explained by the notion of meaning potentials. The concept of meaning possibilities is suited to define the many ways pragmatic markers are used in latest message categories in the corpora; it should be noted as a last point. It can be used to explain both traditional or conventionalized meanings as well as creative or ad hoc meanings specific to certain activity.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Definitions and functions

The phrase "pragmatic marker" is a catchall phrase for a number of ostensibly divergent types. Any indication that affects at the communicative phase as opposed to the firmly propositional level might be regarded as a pragmatic marker, as per Fraser (1996: 168). He distinguishes a number of subcategories among these indicators, one of them is a discourse marker. These latter are specialists at indicating intra-discursive relationships; in other words, they explain how the core message relates to the discourse before it.

There is limited agreement on a particular title to describe the linguistic markers that accompany conceptual and interpersonal utterances in spoken discourse, and the word "PMs" has no defined definition (Aijmer & Vandenberg, 2011, p. 224). Therefore, certain terminology were employed in the literature due to the different roles and traits of the markers. The maximum of these definitions are pragmatic indicators or markers (employed, for example, by Brinton, 1996), discourse signs or markers (employed, for example, by Jucker and Ziv, 1998 and Schiffrin, 1987), discourse fragments (Aijmer 2002; Hansen 1998), as well as pragmatic fragments (Ostman, 1995), as per Vandenberg and Aijmer (2011, p. 226). Researchers interested in their unique roles in spoken and written discourse most usually refer to these two concepts as "pragmatics markers" and "discourse markers" (as of now DMs). When examining the functionality of the two words, it can be seen that PMs have a lot of social interactions that are primarily focused on spoken discourse, while DMs have limited functionality that are primarily focused on composed discourse (Azi, 2018, p. 51). Pragmatic marker is the maximum frequently employed as an umbrella word casing expressions with a variety of uses together on the social and written phases, as per Vandenberg and Aijmer (2011, p. 227). The scholars contend that pragmatic marker is preferable than discourse maker whenever the indicators have a pragmatic rather than a discourse-marking role. This occurs when the markers have an interactive purpose or are used to denote illocutionary force. Regarding the difference betwixt the concepts "marker" as well as "particle," the expression "marker" encapsulates the idea that a component serves as a sign informing the reader in what way the communication should be elucidated, while the word "particle" connotes an official limitation of an entrenched syntactical tag for a component of communication (Anderson & Fretheim, 2000, p. 1).

Furko (2017, p. 2) describes pragmatic markers as "a set of syntactically diverse linguistic items that are used for a variety of attitudinal and meta-communicative functions, lack conceptual meaning, and whose distinctive properties include indexicality, context-dependence, and multifunctionality" in light of the literature on the meaning and purposes of PMs. The scholar contends that pragmatic markers are a practical category of language elements which are crucial for the structure and shaping of discourse, for indicating the speaker's perceptions toward the proposition being conveyed, and for enabling operations of pragmatic deductions. PMs generally do not alter the hypothesis meaning in an utterance. PMs possess little or no sense in

themselves as well as can only be comprehended by obtaining a representational pragmatic meaning projected onto them, or else through cues in the context and/or circumstance, according to Erman (2001, p. 1339). Erman (2001), reviewing PMs with an emphasis on the specific marker, suggests three broad functional areas, such as the textual, social, and metalinguistic areas, in which markers are utilized as observers in communication. He claims that speakers utilize PMs acting as textual monitors to make disjointed parts of talk into coherent texts. The purpose of PMs who serve as community monitors is to govern speech, negotiate its meaning, and make sure that interlocutors can communicate with one another. Instead of commenting on the propositional content of the communication, PMs acting as metalinguistic monitors focus on its implications and the speaker's desired result (Erman (2001, 1339p).

According to Aijmer et al. (2006), pragmatic markers provide an interactive and contentious purpose in speech by indicating the speaker's stance in relation to the hearer's expectations or contextual presumptions. Fraser (1996) splitted sentence meaning into 2 components in his debate of the data contained by semantic expression in a statement: the statement's propositional content, which reflects a condition of the domain that the speaker wishes to express to the intended recipient; as well as the non-propositional component of sentence implication that relates to the various possible straight messages a statement may express. The non-propositional component of a statement's meaning is broken down into various sorts of signs, or pragmatic markers. According to Fraser (1996, p. 167), these PMs are the semantically ciphered indications that signify the speaker's possible communicative intents, regarded to be distinct and independent from the propositional substance of the sentence. Fraser (1996, p. 168) divided messages and the PMs that go with them into the following four categories: A basic marker denotes the importance of the primary communication, a commentary marker denotes a communication which elaborates on the primary message, a parallel marker denotes a message besides primary message, and a discourse marker denotes how the primary message relates to the discourse that came before it. Beeching (2016, p. 5) uses the name pragmatic markers in place of discourse markers to emphasize their social meaning, which is consistent with definitions of PMs that place more emphasis on their sociolinguistic, interactional, as well as extralinguistic components than on their rational linking properties. PMs are an essential component of verbal proficiency and react to the impulsive, communal, sociable, interactional, as well as courteous aspects of speech, the author claims (p. 4).

Theoretical Frameworks to the Study of Pragmatic Markers

A variety of theoretical frameworks have indeed been taken into consideration in characterizing and limiting the multi functionality of PMs since they serve a variety of roles in various communicative situations of verbal discourse. PMs were viewed by "Brown and Levinson (1987) as indicators of illocutionary force (Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices [IFIDs])." Illocutionary speech force was divided into five categories by Searle (1976): representatives, directions, commissives, expressives, as well as declaratives. The role of PMs is not limited to the circumstances mentioned above. In actuality, some underpinning social and cultural functions can be included in PMs.

According to Ostman (1995), PMs may serve purposes that are connected to social and cultural norms like courtesy, discourse coherence, or engagement. In this respect, the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) is shown to be pertinent in explaining how speakers deploy PMs in social and cultural interactions. The idea of "face" serves as the established of the politeness paradigm.

In order to lessen the face threat it creates, Brown and Levinson (1987) shape three schemes: indirectness, which can offer the speaker feasible refusal in the event the addressee opposes to the request, adverse courteousness, that recognizes as well as lessens the severity of the imposition to indicate veneration for the recipient's masquerade. The "Functional Systemic Linguistics" (FSL) concept by Halliday in 1994 offers an effective framework for accounting for the roles of PMs. Three types of meta functions— 'experiential, textual, and interpersonal'—are used to characterize the sample. Pragmatic markers are classified as 'textual or interpersonal' in Halliday's concept. Brinton (2008) divided the two groups of PM operations into 'textual and interpersonal' functions. Textual PMs are those that relate to the textual organization of conversation, while interpersonal PMs are those that connect to the expression of the speaker's opinions. The idea of relevance developed by Sperber and Wilson in 1986 provides a helpful foundation for studying PMs. This theory regards pragmatic markers as cues that direct the hearer's explanation of a statement. In fact, the employment of such pragmatic markers lessens the difficulty for the listener in deciphering the speaker's intended meaning. Ifantidou (2000), Blakemore (1987), Anderson (2001), Watts (1988), and Bidaoui (2015) are some of the researchers that employed relevance theory as a foundation for studying pragmatic markers.

Previous Related Studies

Of all the languages, pragmatic indicators or markers in English have drawn the most attention. Similar to this, the majority of earlier studies on pragmatic markers in SLA have focused on L2 English written by speakers of other L1 languages. Romero Trillo (2002) examined the data of Spanish EFL learners for six pragmatic indicators or markers "look, listen, you know, I mean, well, and you see". Adults and youngsters make up together native speaker plus non-native speaker information sources. The information from native speakers demonstrates that there is a surge in the demand of pragmatic indicators or markers in grown-ups as compared to children. The presence of such indicators in non-native grownups is much added restricted compared to the innate kids grammatical constructions, despite the fact that British kids plus Spanish EFL young learners exhibit a close similarity in their usage of the indicators. As a result, the grown-up non-native speakers fall short of their native speaker equivalents (Romero Trillo, 2002: 779).

Chinese EFL students' usage of discourse markers in the setting of the lecture hall is linked to native speakers in Fung & Carter's (2007) study. The discourse signs or markers found in their information are divided into four groups based on the primary purposes of discourse markers: "interpersonal category, referential category, structural category, and cognitive category". According to their research, Chinese EFL students frequently use discourse markers that are contextually operational ("like and, but, because, ok, so",

etc.), but they employ other markers (“like yeah, really, say, sort of, I see, you see, well, right, actually, cos, you know”) less frequently than native speakers do.

The discourse indicators or markers employed by the Japanese EFL learners are documented by Hays (1992). The most prevalent markers, which have more referential significance, are and, but, and so, according to the frequency of the employed markers. He contends that the choices displayed by the Japanese students possibly indicate that markers with greater contextual significance may be relatively simple to learn.

The incorporation of pragmatic markers in L2 discourse by advanced Finnish EFL learners is examined by Nikula (1996). She observes that learners demonstrated advanced recurrences in those indicators (such as “I think, I suppose, I don't know, maybe, really”) that had a near translational counterpart in Finnish when compared to native speakers. She makes the case that this preference is evidence of positive transfer, meaning that the learners' L1 helped them apply these markers more easily by analyzing the speakers' L2 English and L1 Finnish.

The adoption of pragmatic markers by Turkish learners that L1 has certain features, according to Demirci & Kleiner's (1997) argument. According to their observations, Turkish learners applied additional markers that have Turkish equivalents. For instance, they utilized 'but, because, and so but less 'well, oh and anyway'. They also point out that in the native speaker statistics, but served both distinct and restartable purposes, whereas in the non-native speaker statistics, only contrastive job was employed. They contend that the lack of the restartable usage but in the data from non-native speakers is due to the fact that the Turkish word for but in L1 Turkish does not function in resumption.

Müller (2005) decides to compare German EFL students and innate speakers of English at the stage of separate roles since she believes that "a sound comparison between native speaker and non-native speaker discourse markers use has to be carried out" given that the majority of researches on labelling properties of students' employment of pragmatic indicators or markers in the literature matching up innate speaker and non-innate speaker achievement at an extreme common stage.

Müller (2005) compares the use of the four pragmatic markers “well, you know, like, and so” in the speech of German EFL pupils to that of English native speakers. The majority of her study is dedicated to a thorough explanation of what particular roles certain indicators or markers perform in her beginners' information, in addition to data results. As a result, not only are the frequencies and distributions used to illustrate the similarities and differences between native and non-native speakers, but also the specific roles played by every pragmatic indicator. Unquestionably, such an elucidation advances our knowledge in what way non-native speakers employ pragmatic markers. Müller does, however, note that she has not been able to pinpoint the causes of the disparity in frequency between the two categories. She acknowledges that some functions are unique to native speaker data, but she makes no attempt to explain why they are absent from data from non-native speakers. For instance, she explains that the

Germans don't seem to be familiar with this sub function as the reason for the lack of the excerpt "you know" (i.e. when 'you know' is employed to begin a quote).

FEATURES OF PRAGMATIC MARKERS

The description of pragmatic marker qualities includes contributions from a variety of researchers. The characteristics of 'well' as a pragmatic indicator or marker are associated to those of "well as a manner adverb or as a degree word" by Svartvik (1980). The pragmatic features are classified into two types.

Formal features

It is possible to think of pragmatic markers as lexical features with "a meaning potential." Additionally, they possess approved characteristics that are described in the context of their use. There are various types of these: "The more one studies discourse particles, the more conventions one learns with regard to their use." The characteristics are linguistic (for example, place, prosodic, lexical, (for example, collocations), as well as stylistic (for example, writing sort) (Aijmer 2002: 28). Limited researches, though, examine formal aspects in-depth, likely due to the difficulty in drawing a direct connection between structure and the roles of pragmatic markers in discourse.

For instance, there are no pragmatic signs whatsoever in the utterance or turn., but there are regulations for where they should be placed that are also related to how they should be used. Sequential information is also significant. To project a new turn, Pragmatic signals can be used to signify both directions. They can also have a larger textual purpose by pointing to a story, defense, or illustration. Whether they are used in queries or responses, they can have various purposes and take place in a variety of language settings.

There has been discussion of prosodic (as well as other formal) qualities as indicators of pragmatic marker position and as parameter for their function. For instance, pragmatic indicators have been referred to as "cue phrases" in the field of speech identification and comprehension, which, along with prosodic plus syntactical usages (like place in the utterance), provide crucial data for comprehending in what way the expression is fragmented or to rephrase its various implications or jobs (Hirschberg and Litman 1993; Horne et al. 2001).

If a pragmatic marker has multiple functions, the link betwixt structure, performance, and prosody is much more difficult to understand. We at least occasionally discover intriguing connections betwixt shape and role. In this regard, Ferrara's (1997) research on anyhow is particularly intriguing. On the criteria of syntactic placement and prosody, Ferrara identified three distinct meanings or subcategories of the word anyway.

Ferrara's theory is in line with the idea of using prosody as a "cue" to help the hearer understand the purpose of a given pragmatic marker in relation to other qualities. Contrary to popular belief, not all prosodic choices are conventionalized: "[...] prosodic options [...] are partially motivated by convention, but mostly by the frequently conflicting demands and restrictions of the semantic, pragmatic, and discursal roles that discourse markers fulfil" (Wichmann et al. 2010: 150). It is clear that there is no

straightforward connection between formal features and function. Thus, a pragmatic indicator in beginning place (together with specific prosody) can serve as a signal to a discourse role, for instance (e.g. the usage of a practical sign to establish a latest subject). Furthermore, additional pragmatic indicators that are positioned early and possess a specific prosody may be able to fulfill the same purpose (what Bazzanella 2006: 454 relates to as their (incomplete) interexchangeability). Fischer (2006: 443) provides instances in what way the words "how okay, hmm, oh, or well" can all be used to "signal good observation, comprehension, besides subject consistency" even though they do so in various ways. Interreplaceability and instances when it fails must both be taken into consideration. Here, it is hypothesized that a variety of circumstances contribute to the employment of a particular pragmatic marker. These variables could be, for instance, the narrator's awareness that a pragmatic indicator or marker is connected to a particular script type, is employed by a speaker in authority, etc.

Functional features

Many functional models make a distinction between two or more fundamental pragmatic marker roles. How many factors (domains, fundamental functions) we should differentiate is a contentious matter. According to Fischer (2006: 430), pragmatic markers, or Fischer's discourse elements, can serve a variety of purposes: Despite the fact that there is considerable disagreement among scholars regarding the roles of discourse elements, a variety of functions are frequently and frequently cumulatively assigned to them. This range of capabilities includes those related to the turn-taking process, discourse structure, the control of interpersonal interactions, speech control, or civility.

The "integrative" idea by Schifferin, which involved five various discourse levels. Many suggestions, however, only identify a few levels. Brinton (1996 and 2008) differentiates two significant roles as opposed to three. A textual role of pragmatic markers is connected to the textual arrangement of speech, and an interpersonal function is connected to the countenance of speaker's deportment plus the management of communal interaction (Brinton 2008).

Ostman (1995: 104) identifies three factors "with respect to which study into implicit pragmatics is feasible" and "in accordance with which communication takes place" Consequently, "For me, discourse marking or discourse organizing is one important role that pragmatic elements have; a strong contender for another key function would be interaction- signaling; and yet another would be attitude/involvement signaling" (Ostman 1995: 99).

TYPES OF PRAGMATIC MARKERS

When it comes to theoretical study considerations of pragmatic indicators, including how to define, categorize, plus address pragmatic indicators, Bruce Fraser (1988, 1990, 1996, 1998, and 1999) has made significant contributions. Fraser (1996) provides a fairly thorough explanation of how he classifies pragmatic markers. Before going into the specifics of his classification, it is important to note that, in his method, the terms "pragmatic marker" as well as "discourse marker" are hyponymous, meaning that

discourse indicator is a particular kind of pragmatic indicator, whereas several additional scholars consider these two phrases as synonyms. The notion of "pragmatic marker" in Fraser's approach, which is predicated on the notion that statement implication can be separated into two independent and different elements: "propositional meaning and non-propositional meaning", reflects the broadness of the term.

The non-propositional portion of a statement's meaning is referred to as pragmatic markers by Fraser (1996:167). The classification of pragmatic markers proposed by Fraser (1996) is summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Classification of Fraser's (1996) Pragmatic Markers

Main categories	Subcategories
<p>Basic Markers: These markers add theoretical data in addition to the propositional meaning.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structural basic markers 2. Lexical basic markers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Performative expressions ▪ Pragmatic idioms 3. Hybrid basic markers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Declarative-based hybrids ▪ Interrogative-based hybrids ▪ Imperative-based hybrids
<p>Commentary Pragmatic Markers: This sort of markers possess procedural content that signals the message as a remark and propositional meaning that covers the full text.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessment markers 2. Manner-of-speaking markers 3. Evidential markers 4. Consequent effect markers 5. Hearsay markers 6. Mitigation markers 7. Emphasis markers
<p>Parallel Markers: This type of markers adds a full message to the basic message when signaling.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vocative markers 2. Speaker displeasure markers 3. Solidarity markers
<p>Discourse Markers: These markers indicate how the basic note relates to the previous conversation and give the recipient guidance in what way to understand the speech to which the discourse marker is connected.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Topic change markers 2. Contrastive markers 3. Elaborative markers 4. Inferential markers

(Fraser, 1996)

Given that most of Fraser's publication center on discourse indicators, such as in what way to label discourse pointers (Fraser, 1999), in what way to address discourse indicators (Fraser, 1990), also in what way to categorize English discourse indicators or markers, it is clear that discourse indicator is an extremely essential factor amongst the four sorts of pragmatic indicators in Fraser's categorization (Fraser, 1998). The main characteristics of Fraser's discourse markers as well as the pragmatic makers or discourse markers have a significant overlap, despite the fact that pragmatic markers, discourse markers, or a wide range of terms are viewed as challenging applicants for the similar section of linguistic terms.

Ariel (1994: 3251) and Fraser (1990) both base their categorization on the relationship between structure and role. The former group is known as "transparent operators" (Ariel prefers "pragmatic operator" over "pragmatic marker") since their pragmatic sense may be derived simply from their semantic implication. This section covers words like *but*, *or*, *so*, and *because*. Because their job can be connected to its semantic implication but cannot be deduced mechanically, the second group is known as "intermediate operators." This category includes pragmatic markers like "you know, I mean, of course, and/or something". The final group is known as "opaque operators" since there is seldom any correlation between their semantic meaning and function. *Oh* and *well* are examples of pragmatic markers that belong to this category. The majority of pragmatic indicators, according to Ariel (1994), are "somewhere on a continuous scale from plain linguistic statements to entirely opaque utterances interpreted by reference to their distinctive norms of usage" (Ariel 1994: 3251).

It has been discovered that Ariel's (1994) grouping is particularly useful for explaining the acquisition of pragmatic markers. According to Hays (1992), *and*, *but*, and *so* pragmatic markers, which are on the clear end of the continuum, are the most often employed pragmatic markers by Japanese EFL learners. Advanced Finnish EFL learners and British speakers were compared by Nikula (1996: 89), who found that the non-native spokespersons found it simpler to use accurate markers, that possess fairly clear implications.

CONCLUSION

According to one definition, pragmatic markers are metalinguistic indications that pay close attention to what is happening during a communication scenario and make explicit comments about specific parts of the continuing discourse occurrence. These are employed to control the speaker's fluid transition from one turn to the next. This analysis is not adequate to explain how they are employed in various contexts. These can even be employed as contextualization signals cataloging a structure for the explanation of a pragmatic marker, like when it has specific purposes, it has been proposed (discourse tasks). Additionally, speakers utilize "stance" to adopt various stances in relation to the hearer or the text during the communication. The linguistic setting in which the pragmatic markers are utilized has traditionally been taken to be the context being discussed. Moreover, relying on the speaker or the communal context in which they are used, pragmatic indicators can also possess a variety of creative or ad hoc interpretations. 'Indexically rich' sociolinguistic or contextual meanings are associated with pragmatic markers. We might need to go above the limitations set by the requirement to be intelligible, courteous, or to communicate emotions and feelings in order to explain them.

It becomes challenging to claim that pragmatic markers possess a fixed meaning when we take into account how they are used in various text forms. According to one theory, pragmatic indicators or markers "build" meaning abilities based on the various variations in which they are used. The meaning prospective is dynamic plus is applied imaginatively in various circumstances. In the real communication scenario, the implication prospective is employed carefully and sometimes with ad-hoc or creative jobs (Aijmer, 2013, 17-18).

REFERENCES

- Aijmer, K. (2002). English discourse particles. Evidence from a corpus. John Benjamins.
- Aijmer, K., Foolen, A. P., & SimonVandenberg, A. M. (2006). Pragmatic markers in translation: A methodological proposal. In Fischer (Ed.): Approaches to discourse particles, Brill.
- Aijmer, K., & Vandenberg, A. M. (2011). Pragmatic markers. In Zienkowski J, Östman, & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Discursive pragmatics*, 8, 223–247. John Benjamins.
- Aijmer, K. (2013). *Understanding pragmatic markers: A variational pragmatic approach*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Andersen, G. & Fretheim, T. (Eds.). (2000). *Pragmatic markers and propositional attitude*. John Benjamins.
- Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation*. John Benjamins.
- Azi, Y. (2018). Investigating Arabic pragmatic markers in spoken discourse: A literature review. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 10(2), 48-72.
- Beeching, K. (2016). *Pragmatic markers in British English: Meaning in social interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D. (2006). Stance in spoken and written university registers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(2), 97–116.
- Bidaoui, A. (2015). *Discourse markers of clarification and causality in Maghrebi and Egyptian dialects: A sociopragmatic perspective*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Blakemore, D. (1987). *Semantics constraints on relevance*. Blackwell.
- Brinton, L. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brinton, L. (2008). *The comments clause in English: Syntactic origins and pragmatic development*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some language universals in language use*. Cambridge University Press.
- Demirci, M., & Kleiner, B. (1997). Discourse markers in second language research. *Journal of Intensive English Studies*, 11, 131-142.
- Erman, B. (2001). Pragmatic markers revisited with a focus on 'you know' in adult and adolescent talk. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(9), 1337-1359.
- Fischer, K. (2006). Towards an understanding of the spectrum of approaches to discourse particles: Introduction to the volume. In K. Fischer (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, pp. 1–20. Elsevier.
- Fraser, B. (1988). Types of English discourse markers. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 38, 19-33.
- Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 383-395.
- Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics*, 6(2), 167-190.
- Fraser, B. (1998). Contrastive Discourse Markers in English. In A. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory* (pp. 301-326). John Benjamins.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers in English? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 931-952.

- Fung, L., & Carter, R. (2007). Discourse markers and spoken English: native and learner use in pedagogic settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 410-439.
- Furko, P. (2017). Manipulative uses of pragmatic markers in political discourse. Palgrave.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face interaction*. Anchor Books.
- Grice, H. P. (1957). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: Speech Acts (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
- Halliday, M. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.
- Hansen, M. (1998). *The function of discourse particles: A study with special reference to spoken standard French*. John Benjamins.
- Hays, P. R. (1992). Discourse markers and L2 acquisition. *Papers in Applied Linguistics-Michigan*, 7, 24-34.
- Ifantidou, E. (2000). Procedural encoding of explicators by the Modern Greek particle *taha*. *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*, 79, 119-144.
- Jucker, A., & Ziv, Y. (Eds.). (1998). *Discourse markers: Description and theory*. John Benjamins.
- Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse*. John Benjamins.
- Nikula, T. (1996). *Pragmatic force modifiers: A study in interlanguage pragmatics*. University of Jyväskylä.
- Norén, K., & Linell, P. (2007). Meaning potentials and the interaction between lexis and contexts: An empirical substantiation. *Pragmatics*, 17(3), 387-416.
- Östman, J. (1995). Pragmatic particles twenty years after. *Anglicana Turkuensia*, 14, 95-108.
- Ran, Y. (2003). A pragmatic account of the discourse marker WELL. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 3, 58-64.
- Romero Trillo, J. (2002). The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 769-784.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1-23.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- Svartvik, J. (1980). Well in conversation. In S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, & J. Svartvik (Eds.), *Studies in English linguistics for Randolph Quirk* (pp. 167-177). Longman.
- Watts, R. (1988). A relevance-theory approach to commentary pragmatic markers: The case of actually, really, and basically. *Acta linguistica Hungarica*, 38 (1/4), 235-260.