

Exploration of discourse markers in Palembang Malay: Discourse analysis based on Fraser's theory

Ayu Puspita Indah Sari^{1*}, Rachel Oberto², Hastari Mayrita³, Theodorus William Siahaan⁴, Muhammad Iqbal Ramdhani⁵, Shynta Amalia⁶

^{1,2,3,4}Universitas Bina Darma, Indonesia; ayupuspita.indahsari@binadarma.ac.id (A.P.I.S), rjoberto@uw.edu (R.O);

hastarimayrita@binadarma.ac.id (H.M); theo.siahaan@bahaso.net (T.S.);

⁵STIA Bala Putra Dewa, Indonesia: miqbalramdhani89@gmail.com (M.I.R.)

⁶Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang, Indonesia: shynta_amalia_uin@radenfatah.ac.id (S.A)

Abstract: Published research on Palembang Malay has been conducted at the phonetic, phonological, morphemic, syntactic, and semantic level, but there is not yet any research available at the discourse or pragmatics level. This research is offered as an initial step in the linguistic discourse analysis of Palembang Malay by applying Fraser's theory of discourse markers to a recording of oral conversational discourse. The research method used was qualitative descriptive. The data was gathered by recording and transcribing a conversation between two native speakers. The results of this transcription were examined for discourse markers meeting the requirements of Fraser's theory. The functional class of each marker was then identified as contrastive, elaborative, or inferential. The contrast discourse markers identified were *tapi* 'but' and *sebenarnya* 'the truth is'. The elaborative discourse markers identified were *suda tu* 'besides that', *suda tu jugo* 'besides that also', *umpamo* 'like', and *mala(han)* 'moreover'. The inferential discourse markers identified were *jadi* 'so', *mangkonyo* 'therefore', and *laju* 'so then'. If Fraser's theory is extended slightly to allow for self-interruption structural sequences, an additional elaborative discourse marker, *contonyo* 'for example', can be identified as well.

Keywords: Discourse analysis, Discourse marker, Linguistic, Palembang Malay.

1. Introduction

According to the *Ethnologue* [21], there are 715 spoken languages in the world, and 715 languages in Indonesia, each with their own vocabulary and linguistic features. One of the languages in Indonesia is Palembang Malay, which is found in province of South Sumatra. The population of this language group is 3,105,000 (2020 census), with an EGIDS level of 3, which means that it is a language of wider communication.

Historically speaking, Palembang Malay has two registers, high or "smooth", and low or "everyday" [1]. The high form of Palembang Malay is rarely used today, but the low form remains as the primary language of Palembang City and the language of wider communication for the surrounding areas.

Significant language documentation has been done for Palembang Malay. [2] documented the use of Palembang Malay and its sociolinguistic status within the city. The results of this research revealed that the use of Palembang Malay was still very strong in oral communication for informal situations, but for formal and written communication, Palembang residents more frequently used Indonesian. This research did not distinguish between the high and low registers of the Palembang Malay, and it included all residents of the city, regardless of whether they were ethnically Palembangese or not. More recently, [3] found the language to still be broadly used and highly valued forty years later.

[4] published a summary of the phonetics, phonology, and morphology of the language. [5] extended this work with further research on morphology and the addition of syntax. These two works together provide a solid overview of the Palembang Malay language at these four linguistic levels (phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax). The work was carried on to the next step in the work

of [1], in the form of a guidebook on Palembang Malay that included both its high and low forms. The book covers background information, an explanation of the phonetic, morphological, semantic, and syntactic systems, along with a substantial dictionary that includes notations about the register of the entries (high or low). Nevertheless, by far the most extensive work on Palembang Malay semantics is the 602-page dictionary by [6], which was published by the Indonesian Ministry of Language.

With all the aforementioned research, the linguistic profile of the Palembang Malay language is already well-developed at the phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic levels. However, research on the language above the sentence level has yet to be developed. That is, the language is still lacking in research on the pragmatic and discourse levels. The research presented in this paper is offered as an initial step in opening that discussion.

One of the most basic language features of language above the sentence level is the discourse marker. There are many theories and definitions of discourse markers, with each depending on the focus of the theorist or researcher. Many focus on subtle features, which is appropriate for extensively documented world languages where a lot of research has already been done on the pragmatic and discourse levels. For languages such as Palembang Malay, where the initial steps in documentation above the sentence level are being taken, Bruce Fraser offers a more basic first step in identifying markers of interest for research in discourse and pragmatics. Besides English, his theory has been applied to many other languages, including Arabic ([7]; [8]), ancient greek [9], Spanish [10], Persian [11], and Lithuanian [12].

According to Fraser's definition, discourse markers are words which do not affect the semantic meaning of the segments that contain them, but rather which indicate a relationship between the message of the segment that contains it and the message of the segment that precedes it. Fraser groups his discourse markers into three categories: contrastive, elaborative, and inferential. A contrastive discourse marker "signals a direct or indirect contrast between S1 and S2" [12]. Since the discourse marker always appears in the second segment in Fraser's theory, this means that the contrastive discourse markers signal a contrast between the message of the segment that contains it and the message of the segment that precedes it. English examples include *but, alternatively, although, conversely, even so, however, in comparison, in contrast, instead, nevertheless, on the other hand, on the contrary, still, and yet*. An elaborative discourse marker "signals an elaboration in S2 to the information contained in S1" [12]. In other words, elaborative discourse markers signal that the message of the segment that contains it is intended to expand on some aspect of the message of the preceding segment. English examples include *and, above all, in other words, in addition, more to the point, and that is to say*. An inferential discourse marker "signals that S1 provides a basis for inferring S2" [12]. This means that inferential discourse markers signal that the message of the segment that contains it is in some way an implication of the message of the segment the precedes it. English examples include *all things considered, as a result, consequently, for that reason, hence, therefore, and thus*.

The goal of this study was to identify contrastive, elaborative, and inferential discourse markers in Palembang Malay. This contributes to language documentation leading to increased language prestige and opens the door for more advanced study of the language.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Relationship between Discourse Analysis and Linguistics

Discourse analysis was a vast field, used not only in linguistics but also in sociology. From diverse researchers' perspectives, many definitions, theories, and methods of discourse analysis had emerged, corresponding to each researcher's academic discipline. This issue was summarized by Titscher et al. [13] as follows: "The concept of discourse, in the popular as well as philosophical usage of this term, combined various distinct meanings that often seemed contradictory or unrelated to one another."

[14] explained that there were two main paradigms in linguistic discourse analysis, namely the formalist paradigm and the functionalist paradigm. The formalist (or structuralist) paradigm viewed discourse as "language above the sentence or above the clause". According to [14], "a structure-based definition of discourse leads to analyses of constituents (smaller units) that have specific relationships to one another in a text." Conversely, the functionalist paradigm viewed discourse as "language use" [14]

stated, "The study of discourse is the study of all aspects of language use." According to ([14]; [20]), defining discourse as language use depended on broader assumptions regarding the relevance of language to meaning, activities, and systems outside of language itself. Approaches based on function viewed discourse as a way of speaking governed by social and cultural factors. Thus, the formalist paradigm approached a discourse text with a focus on the structure and arrangement of its elements, whereas the functionalist paradigm approached a discourse text with a focus on the function of the text within its social context.

In the field of linguistics, discourse analysis tended to align with the formalist paradigm. Miller (no date) explained the relationship between discourse analysis and linguistics:

"The study of text-structure—of discourse as structure and process—bears directly on central topics in theoretical linguistics. Writers produce texts larger than clauses and sentences; such texts illuminate the combination of clauses into sentences, regularly yielding examples which are not accounted for by any theories of syntax."

Therefore, linguistic discourse analysis was necessary for a complete understanding of a language. One important topic in linguistic discourse analysis was the use of discourse markers, which would be discussed in the next section.

2.2. Definition of Marker According to Fraser

Just as there were many definitions and approaches to discourse analysis, there were also various definitions and approaches to discourse markers. Even the terminology used was inconsistent. [15] listed no fewer than fourteen terms used in research for nearly the same concept. These included *discourse markers*, *discourse connectives*, *discourse particles*, *pragmatic connectives*, and *cue phrases*. The terms and approaches used depended on the researcher's goals.

Fraser's aim in studying discourse markers was to interpret pragmatic messages. He studied "the pragmatic role played by terms expressing a semantic relationship between messages" [15], which means "the pragmatic role played by terms that express a semantic relationship between messages." In other words, Fraser examined how discourse markers were used to signal the relationship between the meaning of one segment (usually a sentence or clause) and the preceding segment, so that the utterance could be interpreted according to the speaker's intent.

In Fraser's theory, discourse markers were one of four types of pragmatic markers. The first type was *basic pragmatic markers*, which functioned to "signal the type of message ... the speaker intends to convey in the utterance of the segment" [15]. This meant "to signal the type of message ... the speaker intends to convey with the utterance of the segment." Examples of this type were expressions like *I promise* or *please*, which were studied by [16] in speech act theory (or *illocutionary act theory*, as Austin called it), and differed from Fraser's discourse markers. The second type was *commentary pragmatic markers*, which functioned to "signal a comment on the basic message" [15]. These included evaluative markers like *fortunately* or *unfortunately*; evidential markers like *allegedly*, *possibly*, or *apparently*; etc., which were also different from Fraser's discourse markers.

The markers that were the focus of this study were those that signaled the relationship between the messages of two consecutive segments in a discourse, such as *on the other hand*, *nevertheless*, *therefore*, *thus*, and *furthermore*. This differed from the fourth type of pragmatic markers, called *discourse structure markers*, which served to "signal an aspect of the organization of the ongoing discourse" [15]. These included markers like *to summarize*, *returning to the previous topic*, and *note that*. Thus, discourse structure markers signaled the relationship between a part of discourse and the structure of the discourse that contained it, whereas ordinary discourse markers (as studied here) only signaled the relationship between two consecutive segments (sentences or clauses). Fraser [10] defined discourse markers as a subtype of pragmatic markers that indicated a relationship between the message of the segment containing the marker and the message of the preceding segment. According to him [15], there were three characteristics that a discourse marker must have: (1) it was a lexical expression, (2) it signaled a relationship between the message of the segment containing it and the message of the previous segment, not the following segment, and (3) it did not affect the semantic meaning of its segment. Other characteristics were often present in discourse markers, but in Fraser's 2009 theory, only these three

were necessary conditions for being a discourse marker. These three requirements were explained below.

[15] gave the first requirement for a discourse marker as follows: "A DM [discourse marker] is a lexical expression." In Indonesian, "*Pemarkah wacana adalah ekspresi leksikal.*" This meant, briefly, that a discourse marker was a word, not intonation, pause, syntactic structure, or non-verbal expression. The second requirement for a discourse marker was given as follows: "In a sequence of discourse segments S1-S2, a DM [discourse marker] must occur as a part of the second segment, S2" [15]. In Indonesian, this meant "*Pada rangkaian segmen wacana S1-S2, pemarkah wacana harus hadir sebagai bagian dari segmen kedua, S2.*" A discourse segment was a segment that contained a message with an illocutionary force. Typically, this was a sentence or clause.

The function of a discourse marker was to indicate the relationship between the messages of two segments. This meant that a discourse marker always indicated the relationship between the segment containing it and the preceding segment, not the following segment. For example, in the sentence "I'm tired, but I still went," S1 was the segment "I'm tired" and S2 was "but I still went." The word *but* was the discourse marker here and indicated the relationship between the message of the segment containing it (S2) and the message of the preceding segment (S1). It would be impossible for the word *but* there to indicate a relationship between S2 and a following segment, S3. The third requirement for a discourse marker in Fraser's theory [15] was: "A DM [discourse marker] does not contribute to the semantic meaning of the segment but signals a specific semantic relationship which holds between the interpretation of the two Illocutionary Force segments, S1 and S2." In Indonesian, this meant "*Pemarkah wacana tidak berkontribusi ke makna semantik dari segmennya tetapi menandai suatu hubungan semantik tertentu antara penafsiran dari kedua segmen daya ilokusi, S1 dan S2.*" This meant that a discourse marker could be removed from the segment containing it without changing the basic meaning of that segment. For example, the basic meaning of the sentence "But I still went" was the same as the basic meaning of the sentence "I still went."

2.3. Types of Discourse Markers According to Markers

Fraser's theory developed from initial research published in 1993 until its publication in 2009. Fraser's approach and understanding of the definition and nature of discourse markers is almost the same in all of his publications, but the grouping of types of discourse markers is evolving. The following is a summary of the types of discourse markers described in Fraser's Theory. In this publication, Fraser identifies three types of discourse markers, namely contrastive discourse markers, elaborative discourse markers, and inferential discourse markers. Each type has the most extensive main marker and can usually replace others of the same type [15]. These three types of discourse markers are explained as follows.

2.3.1. Contrasting Discourse Markers

According to Fraser [15], "A CDM [contrastive discourse marker] signals a direct or indirect contrast between S1 and S2". In Indonesian, "Contrastive discourse markers mark the contrast between the first segment (S1) and the second segment (S2)." Because discourse markers are always present in the second segment in Fraser's theory (2009:6), this means that these markers indicate that there is a contrast between the message from the segment containing the marker (S2) and the message from the previous segment (S1). For example, [15] offers the following example from English.

(1) I was tired. But I went anyway.
Saya capek. Tetapi saya tetap pergi.

In this example, the word *but* ('*tetapi*') signifies a contrast between what is expected from the message in the first segment [(was tired) 'saya capek'] dan apa yang sebenarnya terjadi di segmen kedua [(*I went anyway*) 'saya masih pergi']. Thus, the word ('*tetapi*') is used as a contrastive discourse marker in this example. Additionally, it can be observed that *tetapi* also functions as a contrastive discourse marker in Indonesian in the sentence *Saya capek. Tetapi saya tetap pergi*. The word *but* is a primary

marker in the category of contrastive discourse markers in English, but [15] provides many other examples in this category as well, including *alternatively, although, conversely, even so, however, in comparison, in contrast, instead, nevertheless, on the other hand, on the contrary, still, and yet*, among others. Based on this list, it is not difficult to imagine other words in Indonesian commonly used to signal contrast as well. In addition to *tetapi*, there are words like *namun, walaupun begitu, sedangkan, di sisi lain, and sebaliknya*, among others. In everyday Palembang Malay, the sentence "Saya capek, tetapi saya masih pergi," becomes "Aku capek, tapi aku tetep pergi." Therefore, it can be assumed that the word *tapi* will be identified as one of the contrastive discourse markers in everyday Palembang Malay.

2.3.2. Elaboration Discourse Markers

According to [15], "An EDM [elaborative discourse marker] signals an elaboration in S2 to the information contained in S1." In Indonesian, "Pemarkah wacana elaborasi menandai adanya elaborasi dalam segmen kedua (S2) dari informasi yang terkandung dalam segmen pertama (S1)." This means that this type of marker indicates that something from the message in the previous segment (S1) will be further expanded upon by the message in the segment containing the marker (S2). [15] provides the following examples of elaborative discourse markers.

- (2) He was very enthusiastic of the project. And he had money to fund it.
Dia sangat antusias tentang proyek itu. Dan dia punya dana untuk membiayainya.

In this sentence, the word *and* functions as an elaborative discourse marker. The word *and* indicates that the message in the second segment (*he had money to fund it*) elaborates on the message in the previous segment (*He was very enthusiastic of the project*). The same applies to the word *dan* in Indonesian in this example, so *dan* is one of the elaborative discourse markers in Indonesian. In addition to *and*, which is the primary marker for the elaborative discourse marker category in English, [15] provides other examples, including *above all, after all, also, alternatively, besides, by the same token, for example, furthermore, moreover, similarly, and that is to say*. Based on this list, it is not difficult to imagine other examples in Indonesian as well. Besides the word *dan*, there are words like *apalagi, selain itu, misalnya, sama seperti itu, pendek kata*, etc. In everyday Palembang Malay, the sentence "Dia sangat antusias tentang proyek itu. Dan dia punya dana untuk membiayainya," becomes "Dia seneng nian pasal proyek tu. Trós dio punyo dóét óntók mbiayainyo." Therefore, it can be assumed that the word *trós* will be found as one of the elaborative discourse markers in everyday Palembang Malay.

2.3.3. Inferential Discourse Markers

According to [15], "An IDM [inferential discourse marker] signals that S1 provides a basis for inferring S2". In Indonesian, "Inferential discourse markers indicate that the first segment (S1) is the basis for drawing inferences [which are] the second segment (S2)." That is, this type of marker indicates that the message in the segment (S2) can be concluded as an implication of the previous segment (S1). An example given by [15] for inferential discourse markers is as follows.

- (3) The water won't boil. So we can't make tea.
Airnya tidak mau mendidih. Jadi kita tidak bisa membuat teh.

In this example, the word *so* indicates that the second segment (*we can't make tea*) is a consequence of the first segment (*the water won't boil*). Thus, the conclusion in the second segment is an inference from the first segment; therefore, the word *so* in this sentence functions as an inferential discourse marker. The word *jadi* has the same function in Indonesian in the sentence, "Airnya tidak mau mendidih. Jadi kita tidak bisa membuat teh." Therefore, the word *jadi* can be considered one of the inferential discourse markers in Indonesian. [15] provides many more examples of inferential discourse markers in English, besides the primary marker *so*, including *all things considered, as a result, consequently, for that reason, hence, therefore, and thus*. Based on this list, it is easy to imagine other examples in Indonesian as well. In addition to *jadi*, there are *maka, hasilnya, oleh karena itu, oleh sebab itu, and sebagai akibat*, among others. In

everyday Palembang Malay, the sentence “*Airnya tidak mau mendidih. Jadi kita tidak bisa membuat teh,*” becomes “*Banyuno dak galak ndédé. Jadi kito dak pacak békén teh.*” Thus, it can be assumed that the word *jadi* will also be identified as one of the inferential discourse markers in everyday Palembang Malay.

3. Methodology

3.1. Pendekatan Penelitian

Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan fokus pada analisis wacana. Mengingat tujuan penelitian adalah untuk mengidentifikasi penggunaan penanda wacana dalam dialog natural [19], pendekatan ini memungkinkan peneliti mengkaji nuansa interaksi yang tidak dapat diukur secara numerik. Metode ini akan membantu memahami struktur, fungsi, dan peran penanda wacana dalam percakapan yang terjadi secara alami antara penutur asli.

The research employs a qualitative case study. The qualitative design is chosen to explore and identify phenomena ([17]; [18]) to identify the discourse markers for Palembang Malay, samples of natural oral discourse had to be collected. In order to ensure a representative data set, candidate speakers were identified who met the following qualifications: (1) are considered to be native to Palembang (along with their spouse, if married), (2) speak Palembang Malay as their primary language in the home, (3) have not been educated beyond the high school level, (4) are at least 40 years of age, and (5) live in the 7 Ulu section of Palembang city, where the language is generally recognized as being the purest. While ordinarily speakers with a lower education level would be preferred, education within the city tends to be higher than it is in the village, and it is difficult these days to find adult native speakers of the city language with less than a high school education. Two native speakers meeting the above criteria were selected and agreed to participate in the research. The first was 52-year-old man with a high-school level education. The second was a 56-year-old woman, also with a high-school level education. The two speakers were neighbors and knew each other well.

3.2. Teknik Pengumpulan Data

The data collected was that of natural dialogue between the two native speakers. The facilitator who was present to record the conversation was also a native speaker, in order to ensure that the participants did not alter their speech in order to accommodate him. The facilitator occasionally asked questions to prompt storytelling and conversation between the two speakers as needed. An hour of natural dialogue was recorded, all in a single session. However, upon transcription, the data was trimmed down to a 40-minute segment for analysis because the first part of the recording was drowned out by wind, and the last part of the dialogue was dominated by the bystanders who did not necessarily meet the qualifications above. To ensure accuracy, the transcription and back translation were verified by the native speaker who facilitated the data collection and made the recording. Fraser's theory of discourse markers was then applied to the transcribed data by identifying markers that fulfilled the criteria, and identifying the segments S1 and S2, together with the relationship between them. The markers were then classified as contrastive, elaborative, or inferential based on the relationship between the segments.

Data utama dalam penelitian ini adalah dialog natural antara dua penutur asli dengan kehadiran seorang fasilitator sebagai pihak ketiga. Proses pengumpulan data berlangsung sebagai berikut:

- i) Partisipan: Dua penutur asli berpartisipasi dalam sesi percakapan, didampingi oleh seorang fasilitator yang juga penutur asli. Kehadiran fasilitator bertujuan agar partisipan merasa nyaman berbicara dengan gaya bahasa natural mereka.
- ii) Metode Rekaman: Percakapan direkam secara audio selama satu jam dalam satu sesi. Peran fasilitator minimal, hanya sesekali mengajukan pertanyaan untuk mendorong kelancaran percakapan tanpa mempengaruhi cara berbicara natural partisipan.
- iii) Seleksi Data: Setelah transkripsi, data diseleksi untuk menghilangkan segmen yang terganggu oleh faktor eksternal (misalnya, suara angin di awal rekaman) dan dialog yang didominasi oleh pihak lain di luar kualifikasi penelitian. Hasilnya adalah segmen berdurasi 40 menit yang dianalisis.
- iv) Proses Transkripsi dan Verifikasi

- a) Transkripsi: Percakapan direkam secara verbatim, mencakup segala bentuk penanda wacana, ekspresi emosional, dan variasi nada yang penting untuk analisis.
- b) Verifikasi Transkripsi: Transkrip diperiksa kembali oleh fasilitator untuk memastikan akurasi dalam penerjemahan dan pengenalan konteks percakapan.
- c) Terjemahan Balik (Back Translation): Untuk menjamin akurasi terjemahan, data yang sudah ditranskripsi juga diterjemahkan balik oleh fasilitator.

3.3. Analisis Data dengan Teori Penanda Wacana Fraser

Teori Penanda Wacana yang dikembangkan oleh Bruce Fraser digunakan sebagai kerangka analisis data dengan tahapan sebagai berikut:

- i) Identifikasi Penanda Wacana: Penanda wacana dalam data yang ditranskripsi diidentifikasi berdasarkan kriteria teori Fraser. Fokus utama adalah pada penanda wacana yang membentuk hubungan antar segmen, yaitu penanda kontradiktif, elaboratif, dan inferensial.
- ii) Segmen S1 dan S2: Setiap penanda wacana yang memenuhi kriteria Fraser kemudian dihubungkan dengan segmen sebelumnya (S1) dan segmen sesudahnya (S2). Analisis ini bertujuan memahami konteks dialog serta relasi logis dan struktural antar segmen.
- iii) Klasifikasi Penanda Wacana: Berdasarkan hubungan antara segmen S1 dan S2, penanda wacana diklasifikasikan ke dalam kategori kontradiktif, elaboratif, atau inferensial. Penanda kontradiktif menunjukkan hubungan yang bertolak belakang, elaboratif menunjukkan penjelasan tambahan, dan inferensial mengindikasikan hubungan logis atau sebab akibat.

3.4. Interpretasi dan Penyimpulan

Setelah penanda wacana diklasifikasikan, analisis dilakukan untuk memahami peran setiap jenis penanda dalam menciptakan kohesi dan koherensi dalam percakapan. Temuan dari setiap kategori penanda wacana kemudian diinterpretasikan secara kualitatif untuk menyimpulkan pola penggunaan penanda wacana oleh penutur asli.

3.5. Keabsahan Data Penelitian

Untuk memastikan keabsahan data, peneliti melakukan sebagai berikut,

- i) Triangulasi Peneliti: Fasilitator yang mengumpulkan data juga berperan dalam memvalidasi transkripsi, terjemahan, dan klasifikasi penanda wacana, memastikan interpretasi yang akurat.
- ii) Umpan Balik Ahli: Hasil analisis dapat ditinjau oleh ahli dalam bidang analisis wacana untuk memvalidasi ketepatan penerapan teori Fraser.

4. Results

The following table lists the discourse markers that were identified in the dataset.

Table 1.

Discourse markers identified in the dataset.

DM type	Marker	Count	Gloss	Note
Contrastive	<i>Tapi</i>	24	'but'	
	<i>sebenernyo</i>	5	'the truth is'	
Elaborative	<i>suda tu</i> / <i>suda itu</i> / <i>da tu</i>	7	'besides that'	These are three different forms of the same discourse marker.
	<i>suda tu jugo</i>	1	'besides that also'	
	<i>Umpamo</i>	3	'like'	
	<i>Apolagi</i>	1	'what is more'	
	<i>Malahan</i>	1	'moreover'	This form of the word is more Indonesian than Palembang Malay. The form <i>mala</i> is probably preferred for Palembang Malay but did not occur in the data.
	<i>Bahkan</i>	1	'even'	Indonesian code switch; the expected word for Palembang Malay is <i>mala</i>
	<i>Dan</i>	1	'and';	Indonesian code switch
	<i>dan jugo</i>	2	'and also'	<i>Dan</i> is an Indonesian code switch.
Inferential	<i>Jadi</i>	9	'so'	
	<i>mangkonyo</i>	1	'therefore'	
	<i>Laju</i>	1	'so then'	

There were two contrastive discourse markers, *tapi* and *sebenernyo*; eight elaborative discourse markers, *suda tu* (together with the alternate forms *suda itu* and *da tu*), *suda tu jugo*, *umpamo*, *apolagi*, *dan*, *dan jugo*, *malahan*, and *bahkan*; and three inferential discourse markers, *jadi*, *mangkonyo*, and *laju*. However, discussion of these results with native speakers casts some doubt on *dan*, *bahkan*, and *malahan*, all of which appeared only in very low frequency. The native speaker intuition is that the uses of *dan* and *bahkan* were not Palembang Malay, but code switches to Indonesian. Similarly, *mala* would be expected in Palembang Malay, rather than the Indonesian *malahan*. In fact, *mala* is what would have been expected in place of *bahkan* in sentence 962 as well. This is especially interesting since *mala* does not occur anywhere in the collected data. These considerations knock the count of elaborative discourse markers down to four. While there are other Indonesian cognates in this list of discourse markers, the others are considered natural Palembang Malay. Below is a sample analysis demonstrating the validity of each of the nine identified discourse markers that were not considered code switches to Indonesian.

4.1. Contrastive Discourse Markers

The word *tapi*, 'but', was used as a contrastive discourse marker in the following sample from the dataset.

Table 2.

Dataset number 1.

Woman:	<i>Dio</i>	<i>dak</i>	<i>bole</i>	<i>ayep</i>	<i>tu</i>	<i>kawin</i>	<i>dengen</i>	<i>Wong..</i>
	3.s	not	Permitted	Arab descent	TOP	marry	with	Person
A person of Arab descent is not permitted to marry a person who ... (is not.)								
Man:	<i>Iyo.</i>	<i>Tapi</i>	<i>Baru-baru</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>ado</i>	<i>banyak</i>	<i>kami</i>	
	Yes.	But	New-new	DEM	There-are	many	1.P.EXCL	
	Yes. But recently there have been many of us (with mixed marriages.)							

In this instance, Fraser's S1-DM+S2 structure can be identified as follows.

S1: *Iyo.*

Yes. (He agrees that the customs among those of Arab descent do not allow marriage to outsiders.)

S2: *Tapi (DM) baru-baru ni ado banyak kami.*

But (DM) recently there have been many of us (with mixed marriages).

As required by Fraser's theory, the word *tapi* here is a lexical expression that does not affect the meaning of the sentence that contains it. If the word were removed from its sentence, the message of the segment would not change. The relationship between these two segments is one of contrast: Although mixed marriages are prohibited by the cultural rules, nevertheless there are many who are doing it anyway these days. The use of the word *tapi* in this sentence signals the interlocutor to anticipate this contrast and makes clear the speaker's intent for how the information is to be understood, without contributing any additional meaning to the information itself. Thus, the word *tapi* here is functioning as a contrastive discourse marker.

The word *sebenernyo*, 'the truth is', was used as a contrastive discourse marker in the following sample from the dataset, where the participants are discussing the merits of mixed marriage as opposed to the traditional practice of cousin marriages.

Table 3.

Dataset number 2.

<i>Lolo,</i>	<i>yang</i>	<i>jelas</i>	<i>Lolo.</i>	<i>Sebenernyo</i>	<i>pekawenan</i>	<i>camporan</i>	<i>memang</i>	<i>membuat</i>
Stupid	REL	Clear	Stupid	The truth is	marriage	mixed	really	makes
otak	<i>Anak</i>	<i>tu</i>	<i>bagus,</i>	<i>pekawenan</i>	<i>camporan</i>			
brain	child	DEM	good,	marriage	mixed			
Stupid, what's clear is that it (the child of a cousin marriage) will be stupid. The								
Truth is, mixed marriage really makes the brain of the child good, mix marriage does								

In this instance, Fraser's S1-DM+S2 structure can be identified as follows.

S1: *Lolo, yang jelas lolo.*

Stupid, what's clear is that it (the child of a cousin marriage) will be stupid.

S2: *Sebenernyo (DM) pekawenan camporan memang membuat otak anak tu bagus, pekawenan camporan.*

The truth is (DM), mixed marriage really makes the brain of the child good, mixed marriage does.

The relationship between these segments is one of contrast: Cousin marriage results in children with decreased brain function, whereas mixed marriage is good for the brain of the child. The word *sebenernyo* here does not contribute to the meaning of S2, but rather signals to the listener that the information that follows it will contrast in some way with what was communicated in the previous segment. Therefore, *sebenernyo* is functioning as a contrastive discourse marker in this sample.

4.2. Elaborative Discourse Markers

The phrase *suda tu*, 'besides that', was used as an elaborative discourse marker in the following sample from the dataset. The context for this portion of the dialogue is a discussion of the cultural tradition of cousin marriage and whether it is still commonly practiced.

Table 4.
Dataset number 3.

<i>Iyo,</i>	<i>mase,</i>	<i>Tanggo Bontong.</i>	<i>Suda tu</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>Belakang</i>	<i>Mesjed</i>	<i>Agung</i>	<i>di</i>
Yes,	still,	Tanggo Bontong	Besides.that,	LOC	behind	mosque	Great	LOC
daera	<i>du-</i> ,	<i>Duo-Duo</i>	<i>mase.</i>					
area	Tw-,	Two-Two	still.					
= Yes, (This tradition is) still (practiced), (in) Tanggo Buntung. Besides that, behind Great Mosque in Area 22 (it is also) still (practiced).								

In this instance, Fraser's S1-DM+S2 structure can be identified as follows.

S1: *Iyo, mase, Tanggo Bontong.*

Yes, (this tradition is) still (practiced), (in) Tanggo Buntung.

S2: ***Suda tu (DM), di belakang Mesjed Agung di daera du-, Duo-Duo mase.***

Besides that (DM), behind the Great Mosque in Area 22 (it is also) still (practiced).

Here, the phrase *suda tu* does not affect the meaning of the sentence that contains it. The meaning would still be the same if the word were dropped. The relationship between the messages of these two sentences is one of elaboration: Besides Tangga Buntung, the traditional Palembang customs are also still followed in the area behind the Great Mosque. This relationship is signaled and reinforced by phrase *suda tu*, which means that *suda tu* is an elaborative discourse marker.

The phrase *suda tu jugo*, 'besides that also', was used as an elaborative discourse marker in the following sample from the dataset.

Table 5.
Dataset number 4.

Bystander:	<i>Kalo</i>	<i>Sekarang</i>	<i>kan</i>	<i>wak-wek</i>			
	If	now	right	each alone			
=Nowadays, right, each one is by themselves.							
Woman:	<i>Sudah tu jugo,</i>	<i>Kan,</i>	<i>Sekarang</i>	<i>ini</i>	<i>Kan,</i>	<i>kadang</i>	<i>dio</i>
	Besides.that.also	right,	now	DEM,	Right,	when	3.s
	<i>musyawarah,</i>	<i>cokop</i>	<i>dio</i>	<i>satu keluarga</i>	<i>dalem</i>	<i>rumah</i>	
	group decision	enough	3.s	one family	in	house	
=What is more, right, nowadays, right, when there is a formal group decision making discussion (e.g. a wedding proposal), it is sufficient to involve just the one household.							

In this instance, Fraser's S1-DM+S2 structure can be identified as follows.

S1: *Kalo sekarang kan wak-wek.*

Nowadays, right, each one is by themselves.

S2: ***Suda tu jugo (DM), kan, sekarang ini, kan, kadang dio musyawarah, cokop dio satu keluarga dalem rumah.***

What is more (DM), right, nowadays, right, when there is a formal group decision-making discussion, it is sufficient to involve just the one household.

The relationship between the messages of these two segments is one of elaboration: Life today is more individualized than it used to be, with each person doing their own thing and making their own decisions. In fact, even the biggest decisions which would formerly have involved the entire extended family are often now decided by a single household without further consultation. Once again, the candidate discourse marker does not affect the message of the segment. Rather, the phrase *suda tu jugo* functions as an elaborative discourse marker, signaling that the statement that follows will elaborate on the statement that preceded it.

The word *umpamo*, 'like', was used as an elaborative discourse marker in the following sample from the dataset.

Table 6.

Dataset number 5.

Dataset number 3:							
Interviewer:	<i>Cakmano,</i>	<i>Buk,</i>	<i>tandonyo?</i>				
	How,	ma'am	Sign.3S?				
What is it like, ma'am, the sign?							
Woman:	<i>Umpamo...</i>	perna	lupo samo	Pak	Mul	sedeka	kampong.
	<i>Like...</i>	once	forgot by	Mr.	Mul	offering	neighborhood
<i>Like...</i> once... Mr. Mul forgot to do the neighborhood offering.							

In this instance, Fraser's S1-DM+S2 structure can be identified as follows.

S1: *Cakmano, Buk, tandonyo?*

What is it like, ma'am, the sign?

S2: *Umpamo (DM)...* perna... lupo samo Pak Mul sedeka kampong.

Like (DM)... once... Mr. Mul forgot to do the neighborhood offering.

The relationship between these two segments is one of elaboration: The interviewer asks for an example of the warning sign that the speaker mentioned previously, and the speaker gives the example of the story of Pak Mul (at the end of which the warning sign will appear). The word *umpamo* here does not affect the meaning of the segment, but signals that what follows will provide an elaborative description of what preceded, thus functioning as an elaborative discourse marker.

The word *apolagi*, 'what is more', was used as an elaborative discourse marker in the following sample from the dataset. Here the speaker is sharing about how he recently learned that he has some Chinese blood in his family, which he was previously unaware of. Upon hearing this, a bystander has just observed that indeed she can see it in the shape of his eyes. The speaker responds as follows.

Table 7.

Dataset number 6.

<i>Iyo,</i>	<i>yo.</i>	<i>Apolagi</i>	<i>kakak</i>	<i>aku</i>	<i>yang</i>	<i>tuo</i>	<i>itu</i>	<i>cak</i>	<i>Cino</i>	<i>nian jadi</i>
Yes,	yes.	What.is.more	Older.sibling	1.S	REL	older	DEM	like	Chinese	very is
= Yes, yes (my eyes look Chinese.) What is more, my oldest sibling looks really Chinese.										

In this instance, Fraser's S1-DM+S2 structure can be identified as follows.

S1: *Iyo,*

yo.

Yes, yes (my eyes look Chinese).

S2: *Apolagi (DM) kakak aku yang tuo itu cak Cino nian jadi.*

What is more (DM), my oldest sibling looks really Chinese.

The relationship between these two segments is one of elaboration: The speaker has some Chinese heritage in his lineage. This can be seen in the shape of his eyes, and it can be seen even more clearly in his oldest sibling. Here again the word *apolagi* does not contribute to the semantic meaning of its segment, but signals that the segment will continue along the same lines of the previous segment. This makes it an elaborative discourse marker.

4.3. Inferential Discourse Markers

The word *jadi*, 'so', was used as an inferential discourse marker in the following sample from the dataset. The context for this discussion is the fate of Chan, a member of the male speaker's family who married someone of Arab descent. Here the female speaker explains that a person who enters a mixed marriage will be disowned by the family, and should therefore be mindful of who is invited to the wedding.

Table 8.

Dataset number 7.

Tebuang	di	Keluargo.	Jadi,	kalo	nak	kawen,	cak	wong	Ayeb,	jangan
Disowened	LOC	family.	So,	if	want	marry,	like	person	Arab.descent,	do.not
<i>Diundang</i>		<i>keluargo</i>	<i>dio</i>		<i>kecuali</i>		<i>memang</i>		<i>yang</i>	<i>netral</i>
be-invited		family	3.s		except		truly		REL	neutral

Those who marry outside the ethic group are) disowned by the family. **So**, if you want to marry (outside the ethnic group), like someone of Arab descent (for instance), don't invite the family except for those members who are truly neutral on the matter.

In this instance, Fraser's S1-DM+S2 structure can be identified as follows.

S1: *Tebuang di keluarga.*

(Those who marry outside the ethic group are) disowned by the family.

S2: *Jadi (DM) kalo nak kawen, cak wong Ayet, jangan diundang keluargo dio kecuali memang yang netral.*

So (DM), if you want to marry (outside the ethnic group), like someone of Arab descent (for instance), don't invite the family except for those members who are truly neutral on the matter.

The meaning of S2 would be unaffected by the deletion of the word *jadi* here, and the relationship that it signals between the two segments is one of inference: Those who enter a mixed marriage are disowned by their family, so if you want to marry outside the people group, be careful which family members you invite. The word *jadi* signals that the information communicated in segment S2 is in some way a consequence of what was communicated in S1, therefore the word *jadi* functions as an inferential discourse marker in this sentence.

The word *mangkonyo*, 'therefore', was used as an inferential discourse marker in the following sample from the dataset.

Table 9.

Dataset number 8.

Dendem	Pak	Naser	Tu.	Mangkonyo,	dio	Dapet.
Grudge	Mr.	Naser	TOP.	Therefore,	3.s	Got.
Mr. Naser had a grudge. Therefore, he caught the criminal)						

In this instance, Fraser's S1-DM-+ structure can be identified as follows.

S1: *Dendem Pak Naser tu.*

Mr. Naser had a grudge.

S2: *Mangkonyo (DM), dio dapet.*

Therefore (DM), he caught (the criminal).

Once again, the candidate discourse marker does not affect the message of its segment. The relationship between the two segments is one of inference: Mr. Naser's grudge led him to catch the criminal. The word *mangkonyo* here signals that the information communicated by the segment S2 is in some way a consequence of the information communicated in S1, helping ensure that the listener interprets the information in the way the speaker intends. Thus, *mangkonyo* is functioning here as an inferential discourse marker.

The word *laju*, 'so then', was used as an inferential discourse marker in the following sample from the dataset. Songket is a special type of traditional woven cloth, and Kiagos is a traditional title from the old Palembang caste system.

Table 10.
Dataset number 9.

Dataset number 9.

<i>Adek</i>	<i>Jujun</i>	<i>tu</i>	<i>baru</i>	<i>dipake</i>	<i>ole</i>	<i>karno</i>	<i>kawennyyo</i>	<i>Samo...</i>	<i>Ini...</i>	
Younger sibling	Jujun	TOP	new	used	by	because	married.3s	With...	DEM	
<i>apo...</i>	<i>yang</i>	<i>Bos</i>	<i>songket</i>	<i>Tu,</i>	<i>Cek</i>	<i>Ipa,</i>	<i>ponakan aku,</i>	<i>kan.</i>	<i>Laju</i>	<i>dipake</i>
What...	REL	Boss	songket	DEM,	Miss	Ipa,	My niece,	right.	So.then	used
<i>Kiagos</i>	<i>Tu</i>									
Kiagos	DEM									

Little Brother Jujun only started using [his traditional title] because he married... that [person]... what[’s her name]... the songket boss, Miss Ipa, my niece, you know. **So then** (his title) Kiagos was used

In this instance, Fraser’s S1-DM+S2 structure can be identified as follows.

S1: *Adek Jujun tu baru dipake ole kareno kawenno samo... ini... apo... yang bos songket tu, Cek Ipa, ponakan aku, kan.*

Little Brother Jujun only started using [his traditional title] because he married... that [person]... what[’s her name]... the songket boss, Miss Ipa, my niece, you know.

S2: *Laju (DM) dipake Kiagos tu.*

So then (DM) (his title) Kiagos was used.

The message of S2 would be the same with or without the use of the word *laju*, and here it signals an inferential relationship between segments 1 and 2: Jujun began to use his traditional Palembangse title as a consequence of marrying a Palembangse woman. Therefore, the word *laju* functions here as an inferential discourse marker.

5. Discussions

The primary purpose of this research was the identification of discourse markers in Palembang Malay, which has already been presented above. Nevertheless, there are a few additional points of interest that arose through the process of data analysis and are worth discussing. The first is the need for follow-up research on discourse structure markers, and the second is a question of the rigidity of Fraser’s requirement for an utterance to follow the S1-DM+S2 structure, particularly in the case of self-interruption.

For the first point of interest, one thing that must be remembered in Fraser’s theory is that the words which are used as discourse markers usually have other functions as well, with the result that the words do not necessarily function as discourse markers in every sentence where they appear. There were some places in the data which used words that have been identified above as discourse markers, but which were not being used as discourse markers in those contexts. These sentences were not counted in Table 1 above because they failed to meet Fraser’s criteria for discourse markers. These occurrences included *tapi* (2x), *suda tu* (2x), and *jadi* (3x). All of these cases failed to meet the criteria because they did not signal a semantic relationship between the segment that contained it and the segment that preceded it. Rather, in all of these instances the words were being used to signal developments in the larger discourse structure, which in Fraser’s theory is a different type of marker altogether, which he calls *discourse structure markers* [11]; [12].

For example, the word *tapi* is used twice to open a new story rather than to contrast with the sentence that precede it. The phrase *suda tu* is also used twice to open a new story, though one that continues along the same idea, theme, or line of thinking as the previous story. The word *jadi* is used once to return to the main line of a story after getting sidetracked down a rabbit trail. It is also used twice more to close a story. In addition to these, the words *ahernyo*, ‘finally’, and *tros*, ‘and then’, were used once each to signal plot developments. All of these observations beg for a follow-up study of discourse structure markers.

On this subject of discourse markers vs. discourse structure markers, the elaborative discourse marker *suda tu*, ‘besides that’, is a most interesting case because it functions quite differently from its Indonesian cognate phrase, *sesudah itu*. In Indonesian, *sesudah itu* signals temporal progression, not a semantic relationship, and would be back translated ‘after that’. This makes it a discourse structure marker in Indonesian, rather than a discourse marker. Nevertheless, based on the data collected in this

research, *suda tu* appears to have a different meaning and function in Palembang Malay, making it an elaborative discourse marker, as shown in the Results section above. This is a notable observation for language documentation of Palembang Malay.

For the second point of interest, in addition to the data presented in the Results section, there were two interesting cases that it is unclear how to analyze within Fraser's theory. The difficulty is that the speaker has interrupted himself and slipped S2 into the middle of S1, thus breaking the S1-DM+S2 pattern. This can be seen in the following sentence, where the word *misalnya*, 'for example', would have been classified as an elaborative discourse marker in the analysis above if it weren't for the difficulty of segment structure.

Table 11.
Dataset Number 10.

<i>Suda tu</i>	<i>Yang</i>	<i>mano</i>	<i>kalo</i>	<i>dio</i>	<i>ngelangkai</i>	<i>misalnya</i>	<i>ayuk</i>	<i>nge-...</i>
Besides that,	REL	which	if	3.s	Skips.over	for.example	older.sister	sk-...
<i>Adek</i>	<i>ngelangkai</i>	<i>ayuk</i> ,	<i>arus</i>	<i>ado</i>	<i>hadiahnyo</i> ,	<i>pelangkanyo</i> .		
younger.sibling	skips.over	older.sister	must	be	gift,	the.one.who.skipped.		

Besides that, in the case that s/he skips, **for example** an older sister sk-... a younger sibling skips over an older sister, there must be a gift, (from) the one who skipped. (That is, if a younger sibling marries before an older sibling, the younger sibling must give the older sibling a gift.)

If this sentence is analyzed with the word *misalnya* as a candidate discourse marker, the segments could potentially be analyzed as follows.

S1: *Suda tu, yang mano kalo dio ngelangkai... arus ado hadianyo, pelangkanyo.*

Besides that, in the case that s/he skips... there must be a gift, (from) the one who skipped.

S2: *Misalnya (DM) ayuk nge- ... adek ngelangkai ayuk.*

For example (DM) an older sister sk-... a younger sibling skips over an older sister.

The problem is, in the utterance of the speaker, S2 is actually slipped into the midst of S1, as a sort of self-interruption where the speaker clarifies himself mid-sentence. As a result, the utterance does not conform to the S1-DM+S2 pattern of Fraser. However, one could argue that the segment analysis above is what was intended by the speaker, though it didn't come out that way in practice. If the theory were to allow for this type of occurrence, then the word *misalnya* would be included in the list of elaborative discourse markers identified in this study. In any case, it is at least a word to watch for as a potential elaborative discourse marker in future research.

In fact, the same thing happened with the word *umpamo* in another instance, as shown below.

Table 12.
Dataset Number 11.

<i>Dio</i> ,	<i>kalo</i>	<i>Ado</i>	<i>yang</i>	<i>suda ngenjok...</i>	<i>Umpamo</i>	<i>kau</i>	<i>yang</i>	<i>Ngenjok</i> ,	<i>yo</i> ,
3.s	If	There.is	REL	already give...	Like	you	REL	give,	yes,
<i>Suda</i>	<i>dak</i>	<i>perlu</i>	<i>lagi</i>	<i>dio</i>	<i>mintak</i>	<i>dengen...</i>			
Already	not	need	again	3.s	ask	with...			

He, if there is someone who already gave... **Like**, suppose you gave, ... yes, he doesn't need to ask of ... (others).

Here, as above, the segment analysis could potentially be analyzed as follows.

S1: *Dio, kalo ado yang suda ngenjok ... yo, suda dak perlu lagi dio mintak dengan ...*

He, if there is someone who already gave... yes, he doesn't need to ask of ... (others).

S2: *Umpamo* *kau* *yang* *ngenjok*.

Like, suppose you gave.

Just like in the previous example, S2 was slipped into the middle of S1 mid-utterance. If this structure were to be accepted, this would be another instance of *umpamo* functioning as an elaborative

discourse marker [8]. However, it is unclear whether these instances are admissible within Fraser's theory.

6. Conclusion

By applying Fraser's theory to Palembang Malay, this research has identified several discourse markers for each of the three types. Within the data collected, there were two contrastive discourse markers (*tapi* and *sebenarnya*), with *tapi* as the most common; four clear elaborative discourse markers (*suda tu*, *suda tu jugo*, *umpamo*, and *malah(an)*), with *suda tu* as the most common; and three inferential discourse markers (*jadi*, *mangkonyo*, and *laju*), with *jadi* as the most common. It is unclear from this data whether the form *malahan* or *mala* is the proper form of the marker for Palembang Malay. In addition, the markers *dan*, *dan jugo*, and *bahkan* also appeared in the data as elaborative discourse markers, but these were considered to be code switches to Indonesian rather than true Palembang Malay. Furthermore, the marker *misalnya* also presented itself as a candidate for an elaborative discourse marker, but the structure of the sentence in which it occurred did not conform to the standards of the theory, so it was not included in the list of identified markers above. Nevertheless, it is a potential marker that should be watched for in future analyses of this type. Finally, several candidate structural discourse markers were noted in the course of this analysis, and a follow-up study to investigate that type of marker would be of great interest. These include *tapi*, *suda tu*, *jadi*, *aherlyo*, and *tros*.

Funding:

This research is supported by The Universitas Bina Darma, DRPM Universitas Bina Darma, the Faculty of Science and Technology UBD, the Faculty of Social Humanities UBD, and all other individuals and organizations that helped with this research.

Copyright:

© 2024 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

References

- [1] Amin, B. M., Amin, A. A., Amin, M., & Tadjuddin, A. A. M. (2010). *TataBahasa dan Kamus Baso Palembang*. Yayasan Madrasah Najahiyah.
- [2] Arif, R.M., Harifin, S., Usman, M.Y., Ayub, D.M., & Ratnawati, L. 1981. *Kedudukan dan Fungsi Bahasa Palembang*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- [3] Nasution, R.F. 2021. The Sociolinguistic Position of Palembang Religious Poetry. *Thesis*. Chiang Mai: Payap University.
- [4] Dunggio, P.D., Suwarni N., Asnah S., & Indones, N. 1983. *Struktur Bahasa Melayu Palembang*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- [5] Aliana, S.A., Nursato, S., Arifin, S.S., Soetopo, S., & Waif, M. 1987. *Morfologi dan Sintaksis Bahasa Melayu Palembang*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- [6] Susilastri, D., Afrita, Y., Astuti, Y., Edi, A.S., Sartika, D., & Sudarmanto, B.A. 2013. *Kamus Palembang-Indonesia* (2nd edition). Palembang: Balai Bahasa Provinsi Sumatera Selatan.
- [7] Alkhalwaldeh, A., Mat Awal, N., Intan, A., & Zainudin, I. (2014). *A Corpus-Based Description of Discourse Markers in Arabic Sport Journalistic Texts*.
- [8] Alsager, H. N., Afzal, N., & Aldawood, A. (2020). Discourse Markers in Arabic and English Newspaper Articles: The Case of the Arabic Lakin and its English equivalent But. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(1), 154–165. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no1.13>.
- [9] Bentein, K. (2016). ἔγραψέ μοι γάρ ... τὰ νῦν οὖν γράφω σοι οὖν and γάρ as inferential and elaborative discourse markers in Greek papyrus letters (I – IV AD). *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'histoire*, 94(1), 67–104. <https://doi.org/10.3406/rbph.2016.8875>
- [10] Fraser, B., & Malamud-Makowski, M. (1996). English and Spanish contrastive discourse markers. *Language Sciences*, 18(3–4), 863–881. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001\(96\)00052-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001(96)00052-6).
- [11] Kassaei, G., & Amouzadeh, M. (2020). The combination of Discourse Markers in Persian. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 12, 135–163. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18773109-01201102>
- [12] Maslauskienė, G. (2020). Combinatory potential of contrastive discourse markers in English and Lithuanian: a semantic functional analysis. *Lietuvių Kalba*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.15388/LK.2020.22464>

- [13] Titscher, Stefan, Michael Mayer, Ruth Wodak, dan Eva Vetter. 2009. *Metode Analisis Teks & Wacana*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka
- [14] Schiffirin, Deborah. 2007. *Ancangan Kajian Wacana*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. Pelajar.
- [15] Fraser, B. 2009. An Account of Discourse Markers. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 1, 1—28.
- [16] Searle, John. 1967. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Mayrita, H. ., Fitrah, Y. ., Mukminin, A., Ariana , S. ., Hidayat , M. ., & Fortunasari, F. (2024). Verbal and Nonverbal Languages in Online Thesis Examinations: An Illocutionary Act Study . *Qubahan Academic Journal*, 4(1), 167–176. <https://doi.org/10.48161/qaj.v4n1a188>
- [18] Mayrita , H. ., Sahfitri, V. ., Aprilia, F. ., A. Abdillah, L. ., & Saputra, H. . (2024). Design of an interactive digital encyclopedia of Palembang urban culture on a web-based HTML5 platform as an implication for BIPA learning. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 8(5), 633–647. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i5.1728>
- [19] Alejandro, A., & Zhao, L. (2024). Multi-Method Qualitative Text and Discourse Analysis: A Methodological Framework. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 30(6), 461–473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004231184421>
- [20] D. Wang and G. Chen, "Making AI Accessible for STEM Teachers: Using Explainable AI for Unpacking Classroom Discourse Analysis," in *IEEE Transactions on Education*, doi: 10.1109/TE.2024.3421606.
- [21] Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G.F., & Fennig, C.D. (eds.). 2022. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (25th edition). Dallas, Texas: SIL International. <http://www.ethnologue.com>