Heliyon

The role of discourse markers in the speeches of selected Asian Presidents

Renalyn Banguis-Bantawig[*]

Siquijor State College, Philippines

[*] Corresponding author.

E-mail address: Renalynbantawig76@gmail.com (R. Banguis-Bantawig).

Abstract

Adapting the *Discourse Theory* of Halliday and Hasan (1976) and de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981b), the study linguistically delves into the forms and functions and categories of discourse cohesion markers employed in the 54 speeches of the selected Asian Presidents which are written in English. The results reveal that DM, *Adding Something* and DM cohesion, *Substitution* are popular in the selected Asian presidential speeches. Thus, the presidents' speeches loaded with substantial information are organized using elaboration as one of the discourse markers. And with significant utilization of substitution (personal pronouns), the presidents have established connection with their audience.

Keywords: Linguistics, Political science

1. Introduction

With the emergence of globalization, language plays a vital role across cultures and becomes popular subject in various linguistic ventures. Hence, looking into the roles (functions) of discourse markers in spoken and written text or thought which becomes an interesting research topic of discourse analysts (Ali, 2016; Nordquist, 2017; van Dijk, 1997; Roy, 2000 in Lugovaya, 2011), is a relevant and productive academic attempt. In this paper, the researcher explores the forms and functions of discourse markers as well as the categories of discourse cohesion employing the

Discourse Theory of Halliday and Hasan (1976a,b,c,d) and de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981b) in the speeches of selected Asian Presidents. They were chosen based on the presence of the English-speaking communities as well as the economic and tourism contribution of their respective countries in the global arena and their availability on the official websites. The writer is convinced that utterances of diplomats may influence either the listeners or readers, thus, be taken into consideration in the field of pragmatic studies. According to Gee and Handford as mentioned by Ali (2016), the importance of language "lies in the fact that, through speaking and writing, we make the world meaningful in certain ways and not in others."

1.1. Discourse analysis: literature and studies

Linguistically, discourse analysis is the study of rules or patterns of connected speech or writing longer than a sentence (Nordquist, 2017; Ali, 2016; Crane, 2016; Alghamdi, 2014; Gang and Qiao, 2014; Tannen, 2012; Slembrouck, 2014). The two of the specific theoretical perspectives and analytical approaches employed in linguistic discourse analysis are cohesion and relevance theory, as well as functional grammar (Sharif, 2015; Crane, 2016), which investigate the relationship between form and function in verbal communication such as the relationships between language forms (grammatical, lexical, and phonological ones) and discourse functions (Renkema, J. in Nordquist, 2017; Tayao, Ignacio & Gonzales, 1998). However, Bloor and Bloor (2013) explicates that 'discourse is sometimes used in contrast with 'text' where 'text' refers to actual written or spoken data, and 'discourse' refers to the whole act of communication involving production and comprehension, not necessarily entirely verbal… The study of discourse, then, can involve matters like context, background information or knowledge shared between a speaker and hearer' (in Nordquist, 2017).

In a sociolinguistic sense, Henry & Tator (2002) stresses that *discourse* shows the manner in which language is utilized socially to express wide-ranging historical meanings. Language unlikely becomes 'neutral' since it bridges personal and social worlds (in Nordquist, 2017). Discourse produces truth and is evident in a field of productive power relationships (Simburger, 2017; Foucualt, 1972 cited in Lugovaya, 2011). Thus, it manifests a society's state of hegemonic relationships (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985 in Lugovaya, 2011). In other words, *discourse* refers to 'any aspect of language use' and 'the study of language use' or as a course of using the language to accomplish goals or activities in people's lives (Dylgjeri, 2014; Rahimi and Riasati, 2012; Fasold, 1990; Schiffrin, 1994 in Lugovaya, 2011). With such perspective, language forms/structures are inseparable from the way people use language in their daily lives to accomplish a purpose or function (Brown and Yule, 1998 in Lugovaya, 2011 & Johnson and Johnson, 1999; Zand-Moghadam and Bikineh, 2014; Goertel, 2011).

Discourse analysis Discourse Analysis centered on linguistics, philosophy, sociology, psychology, anthropology, cognitive science at the end of 1960s and early of 1970s Attempts on discourse analysis have seen a considerable growth over the past three decades. Theories of discourse analysis like cohesion, coherence, relevance and the like, are utilized to foreign language teaching and become salient elements in refining language interpretation, particularly in the aspects of writing, reading and listening comprehension. Discourse analysis ventures on the relationship between language and its context. Moreover, it is linked with diverse disciplines, including linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology and sociology (Yinxiu, 2014). This is justified with an assertion of Sharififar and Rahimi (2015) when he states that *Discourse Analysis* is a wide-ranging field which is concerned to language use in specific context. According to Titscher et al. (2000 in Sharififar and Rahimi (2015), "discourse is a broad term with different definitions, which 'integrate a whole palette of meanings." Discourse analysis takes into consideration a number of theoretical and methodological approaches - linguistic, anthropology, philosophy, psychology and sociology.

Below are the scholars who advanced discourse analysis in various disciplines as enumerated by (Yinxiu, 2014):

- *American linguist Zelling Harris* — "the first linguist to bring forward discourse analysis and who tried to use structural methods to analyze coherent spoken and written discourse beyond sentence and link language study with culture in 1952."
- *Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson, et al* - the sociologists who "raised to a new level the studies of discourse analysis in 1960s. They tried to reveal the role of human beings and the influence of language use with discourse analysis in social communication and context as well as to explore the principles in communication."
- *West German linguist H. Weinrich* - the first to put forward Text linguistics in 1967. He mentioned that "all of the language study should between discourse framework, otherwise there is no linguistics."
- *T. A. Van Dijk, Leech, Grice, Brown, Levinson, Sacks, Schegloff* - the renowned scholars made a great contribution in 1970s. "They created turn-taking theory on the basis of conversational analysis. During this period the famous book *cohesion in English* was published by Halliday and Hasan (1972). They defined text as any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole. In 1980s, the discourse analysis got full development as an independent discipline."

1.2. Discourse markers: forms and functions and significance

In this present study, it is evident that English language becomes the double-edged tool of the Asian Presidents not only in presenting and carrying out their national

thrusts and priorities but also in unfolding their personal attitude toward certain social, economic and spiritual issues as revealed in their delivered speeches. Hence, it is tantamount to say that the selected Asian president have to properly utilize the discourse markers in their speeches. This is to ensure that their messages are fully understood and digested by the public. *Discourse Markers* (DMs) refers to words or phrases that help readers and listeners comprehend a text of the speaker or writer. Hence, DMs serve as vehicles in establishing relationships between speaker and listener phatic purposes (Alami, 2015; Buyukkarci and Genc, 2009). However, discourse markers perform a wide array of functions in discourse both in interpersonal and textual levels (Alami, 2015; Dylgjeri, 2014; Liu, 2009). *Interpersonal function* of DMS conveys the speaker or writer's attitude or standpoint while *textual or discoursal function* signals connections between spoken or written thoughts and "linking discourse units further apart" (Dylgjeri, 2014; Aijmer, 1996). Blakemore (1988) explicates that discourse markers establish connectivity in discourse either in coherence or cohesion which indicate text connections at different levels (in Dylgjeri, 2014). According to Yurng et al. (2016), discourse markers are significant not only for clear cut understanding of human messages but also for the organization of human thoughts. Thus, studying the role of DMs is essential in understanding the manner discourse is structured (Flores, 2016).

DMs function as meta-discourse markers intend at making a cohesive or unified discourse that entice readers or hearers to react or engage (Hongyu, 2016; Lim, 2016; Hyland and Tse, 2004; Vande, 1985 in Zand-Moghadam and Bikineh, 2014). In the study of Hongyu (2016), the disparity on the use of meta-discourse markers is influenced by cultural factors. Such claim is supported by Fuller (2003) when s/he found out that discourse marker usage depends on context (in Lim, 2016; Rohde and Frank, 2011).

According to Alami (2015), discourse markers embody a wide variety of items of grammatical classes. She enumerated the shared features of DMs from a number of experts such as:

1. They are almost used in all languages (Lenk, 1998; Yilmaz, 2004).
2. They are syntactically independent (Schiffrin, 1987).
3. They are syntactically flexible, i.e. They may appear at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of an utterance. This flexibility contributes to their enormous usefulness and high frequency in discourse (Futji, 2001).
4. They do not affect the propositional meaning of utterance (Brinton, 1996; Schiffrin, 1987).
5. They make no contribution to the informational content of discourse.
6. They deal with the pragmatic aspects of discourse (Andersen, 2001; Fraser, 1990; Yilmaz, 2004).

7. They are multifunctional (Fraser, 1990; Schiffrin, 1987; Yilmaz, 2004).

8. They are short, consisting of one to three syllables (Lenk, 1997).

Additionally, Brinton (1996) refers to DMs as lexical items with the following features: they are optional, difficult to translate, marginal in respect to word class, syntactically quite free, empty of lexical meanings and they do not have propositional meanings or grammatical functions. However, difficulty in translation is not a problem in the present study since the delivered speeches are in English. The said expert clarifies that DMs need integration in accomplishing discourse coherence which she furthermore attributes to the multi-functionality aspect of DMs.

The aforementioned expert likewise enumerates the prevalent functions of DMs according to the results of the studies of a number of researchers. Like Muller (2005), who provides the most widespread functions of DMs as:

1. DMs initiate discourse.

2. DMs mark a boundary in discourse (shift/partial shift in topic).

3. DMs preface a response or a reaction.

4. DMs serve as fillers or delaying tactics.

5. DMs aid the speaker in holding the floor.

6. DMs affect an interaction or sharing between speaker-hearer.

7. DMs bracket the discourse either cataphorically or anaphorically.

8. DMs mark either fore grounded or back grounded information.

9. DMs index propositional relations (Schiffrin et al., 2003).

Nevertheless, among these results of other researches, only the fifth and sixth functions are not relevant to the presidential speeches under study because they are delivered by the chief executive of certain republics whose crowd are expected to be attentive and where personal interaction is not evident.

1.3. Discourse cohesion markers vs. text

Forms and functions of discourse markers and categories of discourse cohesion markers are certainly essential in a discourse as effective linguistic devices. Andersen (1998, in Alami, 2015) proposes that DMs are utilized to emphasize coherence relations within the text, provide the hearer with opportunity to process instructions regarding possible interpretations, stress propositional/illocutionary force and stress interpersonal relations. He added that in order to smoothly sustain the flow of talk, interlocutors likely apply various strategies and provide diverse kinds of clues to establish mutual understanding at both interpersonal and textual levels. Linguistic items such as *conjunctions*, *adverbs*, *verbal phrases* from different class of words could function as DMs, which are semantically characterized in traditional

grammar (Eckle-Kohler et al., 2015).This is reinforced by Fraser (1999) when he defines DMs as 'lexical expressions drawn from the syntactic properties associated with their class membership, which meaning is procedural, and have co-occurrence restrictions which are in complementary distribution with their conceptual counterparts (in Zand-Moghadam and Bikineh, 2014; Lim, 2016; Flores, 2016).

Considering intercultural encounters, written speeches of presidents are expected to be well-thought off and perfectly organized. Halliday and Hasan (1976a,b,c,d), Halliday (1985) and Hasan (1984) stress that the contribution of the cohesive devices in the cohesiveness of a text depends on their type, number, and degree of utilization. McCArthy (1991) also points out that grammatical connections linked semantically individual clauses and utterances to make a text cohesive (in Agham and Hadidi, 2015; Alyousef and Alnasser, 2015; Sharif, 2015; Aldera, 2016; Ulfa, 2016)).

Halliday and Hasan mention that discourse cohesion can be divided into grammatical and lexical cohesion. *Grammatical cohesion* consists of devices like reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction, while *lexical cohesion* is categorized into reiteration (repetition, synonymy etc.) and collocation (co-occurrence of lexical items) (in Agham and Hadidi, 2015; Fan and Zhang, 2016; Khodareza and Ashouri, 2016; Rasheed and Abid, 2016; Sharif, 2015; Ali, 2016 (Gang and Qiao, 2014); Jin, 2008). *Reference* is of three types: personal, demonstrative and comparative. "Endophoric reference, unlike homophoric and exophoric reference, is retrieval from within text" (Eggins, 2007). It has three kinds: anaphoric, cataphoric, or esphoric. Anaphoric reference happens when the referent comes first the cohesive device. In cataphoric reference, the referent comes after the cohesive device within the same nominal group/noun phrase (Alyousef and Alnasser, 2015).

Like *cohesion*, *coherence* has a substantial share of discourse analysis in a significant wide array of research. With regard to the relationship between *cohesion* and *coherence*, *cohesion* refers to the grammatical and lexical features which form connections between parts of the text. Intellectuals or specialists who conducted the thorough research on discourse analysis particularly on how to realize discourse coherence, come to an agreement that cohesive discourse might not be coherent (Ali, 2016; Yang, 2004 cited in Fan and Zhang, 2016). Farghal (2017) emphasizes that, "while *cohesion* is a linguistic manifestation in a text including reference, conjunctions, repetition, ellipsis, etc., *coherence* is a psychological concept that connects the linguistic user's encyclopaedic knowledge with the content of the text and, subsequently, it determines the global comprehensibility of the text". With this, he claims that the socio-cultural experiences, values systems, cognitive structures, etc. may influence his/her ways of processing a text/discourse. This is supported by McCarthy (1991) when the expert stresses that discourse analysis has reached into an extensive and heterogeneous discipline which pertains with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is employed as

well as the cultural influences which impact language in use (Sharif, 2015; Yinxiu, 2014). He (2017) "claims that the study of discourse analysis is a flourishing area of linguistic study and is recognized as making a valuable contribution to our understanding of how language works."

2. Materials and methods

This qualitative and quantitative data of this paper were analyzed through documentary/content analysis and interpreted using interpretive and statistical analysis respectively. *Forms and functions* as well as *categories of discourse cohesion markers* were likewise ascertained as units of analysis based on the classification and definition of Halliday and Hasan (1976a,b,c,d) and de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981b). The sources of data were the speeches of selected Asian Presidents: the presidents of *Philippines*, *India*, *China*, *Singapore*, *Malaysia*, *South Korea, Philippines* and *Thailand*. The criteria for the selection of countries are the presence of the English speaking communities as well as their economic and tourism contributions in the global arena. They also belong to World Englishes in which English language is used for education, communication and official purposes.

One hundred sixty thousand five hundred eighty (160,580) words from 54 speeches were analyzed. They were written in English language and delivered by the Asian presidents during national and international gatherings. They were lifted verbatim from their respective official website sources. Historical as well as political aspects of the chosen countries are not included in the investigation. Although the presidential speeches are not of equal number, the total number of words on the gathered corpora are sufficient enough for the purpose of linguistic discourse analysis.

2.1. Construction of equivalent sub-corpora/materials

Discourse Markers are prominently evident in political speeches. According to Hongyo (2016), "Political discourse usually covers election speech, inaugural, conference debate, assembly speech and diplomatic speech and so on." This study focused on State−of−the−Nation Address (SONA), inaugural speeches, general assembly of the nations, and ceremonies to arrive at parallel sub-corpora. The determination and selection of the speeches was based on the available speeches in different official websites such as http://www.officialgazette.gov.ph, (http://www.gov.ph), https://propinoy.net, http://news.abs.cbn.com, https://www.rappler.com (for Filipino Presidents); http://www.Korea.net/Goverment; http://english.hani.co.kr, http://asean.org, http://news.bbc.co.uk, http://www.Koreaherald.com, (for South Korean Presidents); http://asean.org, http://www.philstar.com, https://wief.org (for Malaysian Presidents); https://www.straitstimes.com, http://www.istana.gov.sg, National Archives of Singapore and Archives of Oral History Department of Singapore (for Singapore Presidents); https://www.ndtv.com,

Table 1. (*Continued*)

● Chun Doo-hwan	Internationalizing Peace for Olympic Movement, July 1, 1987
● Roh Tae-woo	Occasion of the Award of the First Seoul Peace Prize, Sept. 25, 1990
● Kim Dae-jung	Republic of Korea ASEAN 3 Summit, Nov. 27–28, 1999
● Roh Moo-hyun	Inauguration as Leader, Feb. 25, 2003
● Lee Myung-bak	Inaugural Speech, Feb. 25, 2008
● Park Geun-hye	In his visit in the former East German City of Dresden), March 27, 2014
● Moo Jae-in	72nd Session of the United Nation General Assembly, Sept. 21, 2017
Malaysia	**Total English Speakers: 15, 580, 000** Source: EF English Proficiency Index[20]
● Tunku Abdul Rahman	Malaysia Day Speech, Sept. 16, 1963
● Mohd Najib Tun Abdul Razak	48th ASEAN Day Celebration, Aug. 8. 2015
● Mahathir Mohamad	Lariba Dinner/Award Ceremony, Sept. 1, 2000
● Abdullah Haji Ahmad Badawi	5th World Islamic Economic Forum, March 2, 2009
● Najib Razak	Prosperity for All Summit 2017
Singapore	**Total English Speakers: 4, 218, 737** Source: 2015 Census
● Inch Yusof Bin Ishak	Foundation-Laying Ceremony of the Memorial, Jan. 18, 1970
● Dr. B. H. Sheares Benjamin	Launching of the Red Cross Donation Draw, Aug. 2, 1972
● Devan Nair	Buddhist Vesak Day Celebration, May 8, 1982
● Wee Kim Wee	Opening Ceremony of the XII World Congress on Fertility and Sterility, Oct. 26, 198
● Ong Teng Cheong	Opening of Singapore Art '95, Aug. 11, 1995
● S R Nathan	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) Diplomatic Academy's Inaugural & Rjaratnam Lecture, March 10, 2008
● Tony Tan	Swearing-In Ceremony of the Seventh President, 2011
● Halimah Yacob	Swearing-In Ceremony at the Istana, Sept. 14, 2017
Thailand	**Total English Speakers: 8,520** Source: Crystal (2003)
● Thaksin Shinawatra	Policy for Prevention and Suppression of Drugs, Jan. 14, 2003
● Surayud Chulanont	Third International Conference on Gross National Happiness, Nov. 26, 2007
● Abhisit Vejjajiva	CNBC "Squawk on the Road" Power Breakfast, Sept. 20, 2010
● Yingluck Shinawatra	Speech on the Amnesty Bill, Nov. 5, 2013
● Prayut Chan-o-cha	Joined Foreign Chambers of Commerce in Thailand, Nov. 25, 2016

Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List__of_countries_by_English-speaking_population.

Heliyon

Table 2. Description of corpora.

	Philippine Sub-Corpora	Chinese Sub-Corpora	Indian Sub-Corpora	South Korean Sub-Corpora	Malaysian Sub-Corpora	Singaporean Sub-Corpora	Thai Sub-Corpora
No. of Speeches	16	4	9	7	5	8	5
Length of Text (range) In terms of the highest & lowest total no. words of all the speeches in every country	602−12531	609−1894	770−5133	309−3172	775−2018	335−8154	767−7853
Average Length of Speeches (the average of the total no. of words of the presidential speeches)	5658.3125	1222	1608.89	2029.71	1255.4	1715.75	3,294.2
Total number of Tokens/Words	90,533	4,888	14,480	14,208	6,277	13,723	16,471

http://www.youthconnect.in, http://pib.nic.in/newsite, http://pratibhapatil.nic.in, http://www.india.simenar.com, http://www.indiana.com, The Times of India (for Indian Presidents); and https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/ljzg_665465/3566_665531/t25959.shtml, http://english.cri.cn/6909/2012/12/31/195s741432.htm, http://english.cri.cn/12394/2015/12/31/4182s910894.hm (for Chinese Presidents).

Below is a list of selected Presidents in Asia whose single speech was considered in the study. The basis for the selection of countries is their number of English speakers as well as their economic and tourism contribution in the global arena. Table 1 presents the names of selected Asian presidents and their speeches while Table 2 shows the description of corpora. And for classification and definition of discourse markers, Table 3 displays the forms and functions of DMs whereas Table 4 depicts the discourse markers cohesion category.

2.2. Classification and definition of discourse markers

Table 3. Forms and functions of DMs.

Numbering and Ordering Points − use to number and order the points in a text.				
first	second	third	fourth	fifth
firstly	secondly	thirdly	fourthly	fifthly
"first of all"	"in the first place"			
then	next	afterwards		
finally	last	lastly	"last of all"	
Adding Something − use to indicate additional information				
also	moreover	furthermore	further	
in addition	additionally	also	"too"	"what is more"
"besides"	alternatively	instead	"on top of this/that"	

besides − use when we are persuading, giving advice or arguing.
'alternatively' or 'instead' − use to mark that something is a different possibility i.e. an alternative.
Linking Similar Things Together
'similarly' and 'likewise' − use to show that something is similar to something else that has already been
    mentioned.
e.i. You might hear in a weather forecast: "Rain is expected today in all parts of the country and *likewise*
    tomorrow."
Introducing Contrasting Information
Discourse markers are used to introduce information or points of view which contrast with

- What we have already said or written
- What is normally expected

DMs are used to draw attention to (apparent) inconsistency. We often use them with 'but' e.g. 'but actually', 'but nevertheless'

however	in fact	on the other hand	in contrast	"actually"
nevertheless	still	on the contrary	"though"	"as a matter of fact"
"all the same"	yet	nonetheless	"anyway"	"at the same time"

Table 3. (*Continued*)

Giving Causes and Results − **use to show that something is caused by, or results from, something else.**

so	then	therefore	hence	Thus
consequently	"in that case"	"as a result"		

Generalizing − **use to make it clear that something is generally true and to point out that we are _not_ being specific.**

on the whole	in general	generally	"by and large"	

Giving Examples − **use to introduce examples.**

notably	for example	for instance	e.g. "say"	such as

Re-stating/Saying again − **use to show that the information is not new.**

in other words	that is	i.e.	in a sense	"I mean"

Preparing for bad news − **use to alert people that we are going to say something that they may not like.**

"I'm afraid"	"I'm sorry but"	"sorry"	"I'm sorry to say/tell you"	
unfortunately	regrettably			

Introducing Strong Points of View − **use to reinforce what we want to say.**

frankly	quite frankly	"honestly"		

Finishing and Concluding − **use to close a discussion, thesis, letter or article.**

in summary	to summarize	in conclusion	to conclude	to sum up finally

Table 4. Discourse markers cohesion category.

Grammatical

A. Reference
  Anaphoric − referring backwards (e.g. She sees a bird. It is singing).
  Cataphoric − referring forward (e.g. When they arrived at the venue the athletes were excited.
B. Substitution − pronoun is taking the place of a noun.
C. Ellipsis − omitting or concealing a phrase or clause in a sentence.

Lexico − Grammatical

A. Conjunction − transitional devices that connect sentences e.g. and, but, moreover

Lexical − relations to the words/vocabulary of a language.

3. Results and discussion

The first phase of the presentation of results and discussions focuses on the Discourse Markers Forms and Functions used in the presidential speeches of the selected Asian Presidents. They are presented in Tables 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. To substantiate the discussions, brief demographic backgrounds of their countries are provided.

3.1. The percentage of discourse markers Forms and functions of the selected Asian Presidents

3.1.1. Filipino Presidents

Filipino Presidents whose speeches are under considerations are the elected presidents of the Philippine Republic. Philippines is situated in the western edge of the

Pacific Ocean, along the Ring of Fire and the second-largest archipelago in the world, with over 7,100 islands. It has a population of 103,775,002. Its tourism industry was 8.6 percent of the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2016, compared to 8.2 percent in 2015 (Shead, 2017). Majority of the Filipinos speak English (Tan, 2015).

Below is the presentation of the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions evident in the presidential speeches of the Filipino presidents. Table 5 indicates the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Among the Filipino Presidents, **Quezon** has employed great number of forms and functions of discourse markers with a total of **eight (8)** which include *Adding Something, Giving Causes and Results, Introducing Contrasting Information, Numbering and Ordering Points, Re-stating/Saying Again, Linking Similar Things Together, Giving Examples* and *Preparing for Bad News*.

Of all the forms and functions of discourse markers, **Adding Something** is commonly applied by Filipino presidents with a total percentage of **6.8**% and the least used is **Preparing for Bad News** and **Finishing and Concluding** with a total percentage of **.02**%. This means that Filipino Presidents are fond of providing more elaborations and additional information in their speeches.

Alami (2015) posits that DMs performs multiplicity of functions in the discourse. DMs likely serve numerous communicative functions in diverse dimensions. They serve general-purpose communicative functions, such as informs, elaborations of various kinds, suggestions, warnings, disagreements, etc., as well as frequently used to establish or maintain the conditions for successful interaction (Petukhova and Bunt, 2009). Such claims are supported by Fuller (2003) who found that discourse marker utilization relies on context (Lim, 2016). In the present study, the various contexts of the presidential speeches center on social and political gatherings in which attendees are coming from different nationalities.

Goertel (2011) in his study finds out that linguistically, DMs add "pragmatic tone" (Beebe and Waring, 2002) to the utterance indicating the speaker's intention and attitude towards the hearer and is a vital tool for communicative competence. Schiffrin (2006) defines pragmatic in relation to discourse markers as the "recurrent use of a certain marker to convey communicative meaning. She also adds that pragmatic meaning is dependent upon the relational functions that markers develop in the respective text or context of use" (Dylgjeri, 2014). Hence discourse markers are used in the organization of the presidential speeches based on the purpose and attitude of the selected presidents toward the audience in particular situations or contexts.

H e l i y o n

Article No~e01298

Table 5. The percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Forms and Functions of DMs	Filipino Presidents																
	Aguinaldo	Quezon	Laurel	Osmeña	Roxas	Quirino	Magsaysay	Garcia	Macapagal	Marcos	Aquino	Ramos	Estrada	Arroyo	Aquino III	Duterte	Total Percentage
Numbering and Ordering	.33%	**.02%**	0%	.06%	.04%	.06%	.05%	.02%	.23%	.01%	.26%	.35%	.04%	.33%	.05%	.21%	**2.04%**
Adding Something	**.16%**	**.07%**	**.05%**	**.02%**	**.13%**	**1.22%**	**0%**	**.03%**	**1.19%**	**.08%**	**1.29%**	**.96%**	**0%**	**.87%**	**.03%**	**.70%**	**6.8%**
Linking Similar Thing Together	0%	**.02%**	0%	.06%	.01%	0%	0%	0%	.02%	.01%	0%	.01%	.01%	.01%	.03%	0%	**.16%**
Introducing Contrasting Information	.16%	**.12%**	.05%	.04%	.05%	.13%	.11%	.08	.10%	.01%	.29%	.07%	.02%	.08%	.03%	.12%	**1.34%**
Giving Causes and Effects	.49%	**.49%**	.32%	.15%	.02%	.46	.14	.04	.20%	.05%	.11%	.13%	.07%	.17	.06%	.31%	**2.72%**
Generalizing	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Giving Examples	0%	**.02%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	.02	.01%	.02%	.01%	0%	0%	.08%	.01%	**.15%**
Re-stating/Saying Again	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	.15	0%	0%	0%	0%	.01	0%	0%	.15	**.31%**
Preparing for Bad News	**0%**	**.02%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.02%**
Introducing Strong Points of View	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Number of Forms and Functions of DMs	**4**	**7**	**4**	**5**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**5**	**6**	**6**	**5**	**6**	**5**	**5**	**6**	**6**	

3.1.2. Chinese Presidents

The selected Presidents in the study are the elected leaders of the Republic of China whose presidential speeches are written and delivered in English. China is located in Southeast Asia along the coastline of the Pacific Ocean. It is the world's third largest country, after Russia and Canada. China is a major global exporter in terms of market liberalization (Hirst, 2015). Its rapid developing business environment helps its tourism industry prosper (Zhou, 2017). English language is used as one of the official languages (Sharma, 2008).

Below is the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions applied in the selected Chinese presidential speeches. Table 6 presents the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Therefore, **Ling** and **Jin Tao** have used greater number of forms and functions of DMs with a total **of four (4)** which include *Adding Something, Introducing Contrasting Information, Numbering and Ordering Points* and *Giving Causes and Results*.

It is also worth noticing that ***Adding Something*** with a total percentage of **.61%** is employed by most of the Chinese presidents while ***Numbering and Ordering Points*** is least applied with a total percentage of **.16%**. This goes to show that Chinese Presidents established meaningful communication with their audience by providing more amount of information. However, they are not particular of using discourse markers that stress out the order of information.

Table 6. The percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Forms and Functions of DMs	Chinese presidents				
	Soong Ching Ling	Hu Jin Tao	Xi Jinping	Jiang Zemin	Total Percentage
Numbering and Ordering	0%	.16%	0%	0%	.16%
Adding Something	.35%	.16%	.10%	0%	.61%
Linking Similar Thing Together	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Introducing Contrasting Information	.07%	.16%	0%	0%	.23%
Giving Causes and Effects	.14%	0%	0%	.10%	.24%
Generalizing	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Giving Examples	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Re-stating/Saying Again	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Preparing for Bad News	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Introducing Strong Points of View	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Number of Forms and Functions of DMs	3	3	1	1	

Here are the forms and functions of DMs evident in the speeches of Chinese presidents: *Adding Something* (that); *Giving Causes and Results* (thus, therefore); *Introducing Contrasting Information* (on the other hand, however) and; *Numbering and Ordering Points* (finally).

According to Levy and Jaeger (2007), if one of the ultimate functions of language is to establish necessary structure that allows meaningful communication, discourses would be structured in such a way they increase the amount of information a speaker conveys. This is to achieve communicative efficiency (in Rohde and Frank, 2011). In fact, DMs are words and phrases that develop, connect and relate ideas or sentences and paragraphs (Dylgjeri, 2014; Buyukkarci, Genc & Bilal, 2014).

Bu (2013) conducted a study on the acquisition of English discourse markers (*like, yeah, oh, you know, well, I mean, right, ok and actually*) by Chinese learners of English, comparing their use to a limited certain functions. They found out that DMs under study favor different functions from the native speakers (in Lim, 2016). This study is relevant to the present study since it likewise studies DMs used by Chinese who are also one of the respondents of the present study who at the same time are using English.

Discourse markers are popular in impromptu oral speech. In fact, various studies deal with definitions and functions of discourse markers by native speakers: Schiffrin, 1987 on English; Miracle 1991 on Mandarin Chinese; and Onodera 2004 on Japanese (Ostman, 1982 cited in Liu, 2009). However, it is not only popular in impromptu speech because in the present study such claim does not apply since the chosen presidential speeches were prepared in advance where DMs are also popular.

Discourse markers are significant to the study of language acquisition particularly pragmatic, semantic and syntactic features which show the subtle interplay between form and function (Yinxiu, 2014).

Zhang (2000 in Alghamdi, 2014) conducted a qualitative and quantitative study of the use of DMs of the expository compositions of Chinese undergraduates considering the Halliday and Hasan's taxonomy of cohesive devices and their framework. The findings show that students utilized more frequently some categories of ties; and the relationship between the frequency of cohesive ties employed and the quality of writing is not statistically significant. This has relevance to the study since both expository compositions and presidential speeches are organized using DMs and both express the intention of the writer or speaker in a certain context.

3.1.3. Indian Presidents

The Presidents whose presidential speeches under study are the leaders of the Republic of India. India is situated in South Asia and the seventh largest country in

the world (MapsofIndia.com. 2013). Its increasing foreign direct investment and expertise in information technology provides new jobs and increases domestic consumption (Gosal, 2013). English is used as provisional official sub-language (New World Encyclopedia, 2018). Travel and tourism industry of India is enormous which provides employment to millions of people in India (IloveIndia.com, 2017).

Below is the presentation of the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions that emerge in the presidential speeches of the Indian presidents. Table 7 displays the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

To sum up, **Narayanan** has employed significant number of forms and functions of DMs among the Indian Presidents with a total of **five (5)** which include *Introducing Contrasting Information, Adding Something, Linking Similar Things Together, Giving Causes and Results* and *Giving Examples*.

Interestingly, among the DMs, ***Giving Causes and Results*** is significantly used in the speeches of Indian presidents with a total percentage of **.564**% while ***Re-stating/Saying Again*** is least employed with a total percentage of **.064**%. This implies that Indian Presidents are service and result-oriented intellectuals. They are likewise cautious of redundancy which is evident in their speeches.

The forms and functions of DMs evident in the speeches of Indian presidents are: *Giving Causes and Results* (so long as, therefore, so that, thus); *Introducing Contrasting Information* (however, yet, though, although, however, yet, still); *Adding something* (also, instead, further); *Linking Similar Things Together* (like); *Giving Examples* (such, for example, such as); *Numbering and Ordering Points* (first, second, third); and; *Re-stating/Saying Again* (in other words).

It is stressed out by Ali (2016) & Aijmer (1996) that discourse markers (DMs) have two essential functions such as the *discoursal/textual function* and the *interpersonal function*. The former signals "relations between prior, present and subsequent discourse, making off one text unit from another or linking discourse units further apart." The latter facilitates in articulating speaker or writer stance (Dylgjeri, 2014). This is amplified by Hyland and Tse (2004) when they assert that DM categories are interpersonal and textual markers which ultimate purpose is to convince readers; to organize discourse and to reflect writer's stance towards both the content of the text and the prospective reader (Dylgjeri, 2014).

3.1.4. South Korean Presidents

The leaders whose presidential speeches are selected for the present study are the elected presidents of South Korea (Worldatlas, 2018a,b). South Korea is located in the continent of Asia with a population of 50.8 billion (as of 2016). Seoul is the country's capital city. Ranks the sixth leading global town in the world with

Heliyon

Article No~e01298

Table 7. The percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Forms and Functions of DMs	Indian Presidents									
	Prasad	Radhakrishnan	Singh	Sharma	Narayanan	Kalam	Patil	Mukherjer	Kovind	Total Percentage
Numbering and Ordering	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	.15%	0%	0%	0%	**.15%**
Adding Something	0%	0%	0%	.23%	**.11%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	**.34%**
Linking Similar Thing Together	0%	0%	0%	0%	**.11%**	0%	0%	0%	.13%	**.24%**
Introducing Contrasting Information	.18%	0%	.23%	.07%	**.21%**	.05%	0%	0%	0%	**.74%**
Giving Causes and Effects	**.37%**	**.064%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.03%**	**0%**	**.10%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.564%**
Generalizing	0%	0%	0%	0%		0%	0%	0%	0%	
Giving Examples	0%	0%	0%	0%	**.03%**	0%	0%	0%	.13%	**.16%**
Re-stating/Saying Again	**0%**	**.064%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.064%**
Preparing for Bad News	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Introducing Strong Points of View	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Number of Forms and Functions of DMs	**2**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**5**	**3**	**0%**	**0%**	**2**	

the fourth greatest economy (StudyCountry, 2018a,b). English is its major foreign language (Sharma, 2008).

Below is the presentation of the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions used in the selected south Korean presidential speeches. Table 8 depicts the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Hence, **Dae-jung** and **Moo-hyun** have utilized the biggest number of forms and functions of discourse markers with a total **of five (5)** which include *Numbering and Ordering Points, Adding Something, Giving Causes and Results, Giving Examples, and Introducing Strong Points of View*.

Like the Chinese presidents have employed ***Adding Something*** among the forms and functions of DMs with total percentage of **1.67**% while ***Introducing Strong Points of View*** is least employed with total percentage of **.08**%. Like with other Asian Preidents, South Korean Presidents also provide significant number of information in the form of concrete examples, relevant facts and experiences that elaborate their views on the issues they pointed out in their speeches.

The forms and functions of DMs evident in the speeches of South Korean presidents include: *Adding something* (furthermore, also, further, that); *Numbering and Ordering Points* (first of all, first, second, third, fourth, firstly, secondly, thirdly, then); *Giving Causes and Results* (as a result, thus, so that, then, therefore, so); *Introducing Contrasting Information* (yet, although, still, however); *Linking Similar*

Table 8. The percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Forms and Functions of DMs	South Korean Presidents							
	Doo-hwan	Tae-woo	Dae-jung	Moo-hyun	Myung-bak	Geun-hye	Jae-in	Total Percentage
Numbering and Ordering	0%	0%	**.89%**	**.21%**	0%	.09%	.03%	**1.22%**
Adding Something	0%	0%	**.35%**	**.76%**	0%	**.56%**	**0%**	**1.67%**
Linking Similar Things Together	**.32%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	.03%	**.35%**
Introducing Contrasting Information	0%	.33%	0%	**.17%**	.04%	0%	.03%	**.57%**
Giving Causes and Effects	0%	.16%	**.26%**	**.04%**	.07%	.06%	0%	**.59%**
Generalizing	0%	0%	**0%**	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%
Giving Examples	0%	0%	**.17%**	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	**.17%**
Re-stating/Saying Again	0%	0%	**0%**	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%
Preparing for Bad News	0%	0%	**0%**	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%
Introducing Strong Points of View	0%	0%	**.08%**	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	**.08%**
Total Number of Forms and Functions of DMs	1	2	4	4	2	3	3	

Things Together (like); *Giving Examples* (for example, such as, such) and; *Introducing Strong Points of View* (yet, although).

DMs have multi-faceted functions in a given context, hence, the application of discourse markers delimits a number of probable interpretations which the hearer can draw from the utterance (Petukhova and Bunt, 2009 & Alami, 2015; Crane, 2016). DMs may function at more than one structural levels of talk at once (Alami, 2015).

Rahimi (2011) delves into the frequency and type of DMs used by Iranian undergraduate EFL learners in argumentative and expository types. The findings show that elaborative DMs are the most frequently used compared with conclusive DMs. The same results were gathered in the study of Jalilifar (2008) who found out that elaborative and inferential DMs were popularly used in good writing (Alghamdi, 2014). The aforementioned studies reinforce the result of the study under survey since they also looked into the DMs functions on the compositions written by their respondents which like the presidential speeches express intention and attitude of the writer or speaker toward certain areas of concern and are organized using discourse markers.

A number of studies have attempted to provide a descriptive analysis of the functions of DMs in utterance of a discourse. Like, Schiffrin (1987) argues that DMs are 'sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk' (p.31). Similarly, Fraser (1988) claims that DMs are 'lexical expressions which are syntactically independent of the basic sentence and which have no general core meaning which signals the relationship of the current utterance to the prior discourse' (p.27). In rewriting or translating a composition, Fuller (2003) suggests "two criteria that a DM must meet: the semantic relationship between the elements connected by the marker must not change, and utterance must remain grammatical" (Flores, 2016). But this would not apply in the study under consideration since the presidential speeches are original and are not translated for they are written in English.

3.1.5. Malaysian Presidents

The presidential speeches evaluated in this study are written and delivered in English by the presidents of Malaysia Republic. Malaysia is one of the Southeast Asian Countries and is part of the island of Borneo. Tourism in Malaysia has become one main source of economy which made them one of the wealthiest and most developed countries in Southeast Asia (Essays, UK, 2013). English is being used fairly prevalently (AsianInfo.org, 2010).

Below is the presentation of the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions used in the chosen Malaysian presidential speeches. Table 9 shows the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Table 9. The percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Forms and Functions of DMs	Malaysian Presidents					
	Rahman	Abdul Razak	Mohamad	Badawi	Najib Razak	Total
Numbering and Ordering	0%	1.39%	.58%	.24%	.34%	2.55%
Adding Something	**.90%**	**1.74%**	**3.48%**	**.32%**	**2.27%**	**8.71%**
Linking Similar Thing Together	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	**0%**	0%
Introducing Contrasting Information	.25%	.34%	.65%	**.32%**	**.19%**	**1.75%**
Giving Causes and Effects	.25%	0%	.36%	**.16%**	**.24%**	**1.01%**
Generalizing	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	**0%**	0%
Giving Examples	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.16%**	**.19%**	**.35%**
Re-stating/Saying Again	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	**0%**	0%
Preparing for Bad News	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	**0%**	0%
Introducing Strong Points of View	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	**0%**	0%
Total Number of Forms and Functions of DMs	3	3	4	5	5	

Generally, among the presidents, **Badawi** and **Najib Rajak** have the significant number of forms and functions of DMs in their speeches with a total **of five (5)** compared with the other Malaysian Presidents which include *Adding Something, Introducing Contrasting Information, Numbering and Ordering Points, Giving Causes and Results,* and *Giving Examples*.

It is worth noticing that of all the forms and functions of DMs, ***Adding Something*** has the highest total percentage of **8.71**% which indicates that it is the most commonly used DMs in the speeches of Malaysian Presidents while ***Giving Examples*** is least utilized with a total percentage of .**35**%. These findings denote that Malaysian Presidents are giving more information on the issues they emphasized in their speeches. However, DMs used to signal examples are not significantly applied in the Malaysian presidential speeches.

The forms and functions of DMs evident in the speeches of Malaysian presidents are: *Adding Something* (also, further, more, that, too); *Numbering and Ordering Points* (first, firstly, third, then, next, last); *Introducing Contrasting Information* (however, still, at the same time, yet); *Giving Causes and Results* (so, as a result, hence, therefore, then) and; *Giving Examples* (for example, for instance, such as).

Brinton (1996) elucidates that "the need to initiate and close discourse, to mark topic shifts, to indicate new and old information and to constrain the relevance of adjoining utterances are part of the textual functions of DMs." Yilmaz (2004) posits that, to indicate topic change, to restrain the applicability of adjacent utterance, to

explicate or remark on a proceeding utterance, and self-correction are among the functions of DMs in textual domain (in Alami, 2015). Thus, determination of the meanings of discourse is plays a vital role in in comprehending the communicated message (Petukhova and Bunt, 2009).

3.1.6. Singaporean Presidents

The presidents whose presidential speeches are chosen for the present study are the elected leaders of the Republic of Singapore. Singapore is situated in the continent of Asia (Worldatlas.com, 2018a,b). The economy of Singapore is described by extreme financialization and a high degree of openness, with the country being highly dependent on international trade (Santander Trade Portal, 2018). Tourism is a significant pillar of Singapore's economy which contributes to Singapore's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Asia Pacific Visitor Forecast 2017-2021, 2017). One of its official languages is English. Table 10 depicts the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

So to speak, **Nathan** has used greatest number of DM forms and functions of DMs among the presidents with a total of **six (6)** which include *Adding Something, Numbering and Ordering Points, Introducing Contrasting Information, Giving Causes and Effects, Re-stating/Saying Again,* and *Giving Examples*.

Amazingly, the DM ***Adding Something*** is also popular among the Singaporean presidents like that of Filipino, Malaysian and South Korean presidents with a total

Table 10. The percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Forms and Functions of DMs	Singaporean Presidents								
	Ishak	Benjamin	Nair	Wee	Cheong	Nathan	Tan	Yacob	Total
Numbering and Ordering	0%	.59%	0%	0%	.45%	**.50%**	.17%	.20%	**1.91%**
Adding Something	**.56%**	**6.54%**	**1.19%**	**1.99%**	**1.21%**	**1.37%**	**.95%**	**.54%**	**14.35%**
Linking Similar Thing Together	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	.06%	**.06%**
Introducing Contrasting Information	0%	0%	.59%	.13%	.15%	**.11%**	.08%	.06%	**1.12%**
Giving Causes and Effects	.11%	0%	0%	.53%	.15%	**.04%**	.17%	.13%	**1.13%**
Generalizing	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%
Giving Examples	0%	.29%	0%	0%	0%	**.02%**	0%	0%	**.31%**
Re-stating/Saying Again	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.04%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.04%**
Preparing for Bad News	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%
Introducing Strong Points of View	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%
Total Number of Forms and Functions of DMs	**2**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**6**	**4**	**5**	

percentage of **14.35%** while ***Re-stating/Saying Again*** is least utilized with total percentage of **.04%**. This further imply that Singaporean presidents likewise expound their points/views for a number of issues by means of giving elaborations in the form of relevant experiences of their people, facts and descriptive narratives.

Here are the forms and functions of DMs evident in the speeches of Singaporean presidents: *Adding Something* (also, further, more, too, that, in addition); *Numbering and Ordering Points* (first, second, third, fourth, then, next, last, that); *Giving Causes and Results* (so, therefore, hence); *Introducing Contrasting Information* (however, in fact, actually, still, nonetheless, at the same time, in contrast, on the contrary); *Giving examples* (for example, such as); *Linking Similar Things Together* (like) and; *Re-stating/Saying Again* (that is).

Petukhova and Bunt (2009) claims that DMs are expectedly multifunctional in a given context/situation. As a matter of fact, Alami (2015) contest that DMs (*so, and, but, anyway, although, however and the like)* signal the relationship of the basic message and the previous discourse. DMs combine textual units for coherence (Schiffrin, 1987; Lenk, 1998; Schourup, 1999; Fraser, 1999). Blackmore (1987) likewise claims that DMs relate the "propositional content of the current utterances and that of a proceeding utterances (in Lim, 2016).

On the other hand, 'an expression with a procedural meaning specifies how the segment it introduces is to be interpreted relative to the prior' (Fraser, 1999). As discourse markers "do not carry propositional meaning and are optional (Fraser, 1990; Fracer, 1996; Fracer, 1999; Schourup, 1999), their absence does not affect the propositional content of either the foregoing segment or the following segment (although the removal of the discourse marker may obscure the relationship between the two segments (in Lim, 2016).

3.1.7. Thai Presidents

The presidents whose speeches under consideration are the officially elected leaders of Thailand Republic. Thailand is situated at the center of the Indochina Peninsula in Southeast Asia, and the 51st largest nation in the world (StudyCountry, 2018a,b; Worldatlas.com, 2018a,b). Thai economy enables the Thai people and their culture to flourish due to its growing rice enterprise and all other agricultural industries, including forestry and fisheries (Watkins, 2000). It has also its booming tourism industry as it constantly on the top of many travel recommendation websites (Kanthima, 2015). English is one of the languages used by its speaking communities (*List of Countries by English-speaking Population*, 2017).

Below is the presentation of the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions that are applied in the selected Thai presidential speeches. Table 11 indicates the percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Table 11. The percentage of discourse markers forms and functions.

Forms and Functions of DMs	Thai Presidents					
	Thaksin Shinawatra	Surayad Chulanont	Abhisit Vejajiva	Yingluck Shinawatra	Prayuth Chan-Ocha	Total
Numbering and Ordering	.14%	.60%	.22%	**2.74%**	0%	**3.7%**
Adding Something	**.69%**	**1.38%**	**1.41%**	**3.65%**	**0%**	**7.13%**
Linking Similar Thing Together	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%
Introducing Contrasting Information	.12%	.09%	0%	**1.69%**	.01%	**1.91%**
Giving Causes and Effects	.88%	.09%	.33%	**.78%**	0%	**2.08%**
Generalizing	0%	0%	0%	**.13%**	.01%	**.14%**
Giving Examples	.07%	.09%	0%	**1.17%**	.03%	**1.36%**
Re-stating/Saying Again	**10%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.10%**
Preparing for Bad News	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%
Introducing Strong Points of View	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%
Total Number of Forms and Functions of DMs	**5**	**5**	**3**	**6**	**3**	

In summary, **Shinawatra, Yingluck** has utilized a majority of the forms and functions of DMs compared with the other Thai presidents with a total of **six (6)** which include *Adding Something, Numbering and Ordering Points, Introducing Contrasting Information, Giving Examples, Giving Causes and Results* and *Generalizing*. This means that

Like other presidents in Asia namely; Singaporean, Malaysian, South Korean, Filipino, Chinese, Indian, and Thai, ***Adding Something*** is significantly used by Thai presidents with a total percentage of **7.13**% while ***Generalizing*** is least utilized with a total percentage of .**14**%. This means that Thai Presidents are presenting substantial information in their messages that somehow strengthen their connection with audience. Providing adequate information to the audience is one way of not only establishing public rapport between speaker and listeners but also winning the trust and confidence of the listeners.

The forms and functions of DMs evident in the speeches of Thai presidents include: *Adding Something* (too, that, instead, more, also, further, in addition, moreover, furthermore); *Numbering and Ordering Points* (first, second, third, fourth, fifth, firstly, secondly, last, next, while); *Giving Causes and Results* (therefore, so, thus, then, so that, in order to); *Introducing Contrasting Information* (still, however, nevertheless); *Giving Examples* (such as, for instance, for example); and *Generalizing* (in conclusion, finally).

Discourse Markers (DMs) are perceived as vehicles contributing to the establishment and maintenance of the speaker-hearer relationship (Alami, 2015). According

to the *Relevance Theory* which emphasizes that linguistic form of a sentence or an utterance (propositional representations) likely brings a lot of probable interpretations. Hence, the hearer's task is to come up with most relevant interpretations in the given scenario (Wilson and Sperber, 1986). With this, Blackmore (1992) stresses that discourse markers guide the hearer/listener to arrive at most defined interpretations (in Dylgjeri, 2014).

Fraser categorically enumerates four major categories of discourse markers: (a) DMs that signal that the following discourse is *a departure from the current topic* (by the way, incidentally); (b) *contrastive markers* which signal that the following sequence contrasts with the foregoing sequence (but, nevertheless, regardless, yet); (c) *elaborative markers* which signal that the following discourse expands on the proceeding discourse (besides, furthermore, moreover, indeed); (d) *inferential markers* which signal that the following segment is a conclusion from the foregoing segment (cited in Lim, 2016). This DMs categorization of Fraser farther provides insights to the readers of the present study. It shows that, although, experts have distinct classifications of DMs, they still arrive to the same intentions.

The second phase of the presentation of results and discussions focuses on the DMs in the Discourse Cohesion Category used in the presidential speeches of the selected Asian Presidents. They are presented in Tables 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18. To reinforce the discussions, brief backgrounds on the status of English language in their countries are provided.

3.2. The percentage of DMs in the discourse cohesion category of the selected Asian Presidents

3.2.1. Filipino Presidents

Although Philippines has thirteen (13) languages, most Filipinos speak English which is their second official language. Filipino-speaking communities use both Filipino and English; however, the former is considered less important than English in schools. Consequently, most Filipinos in urban areas can speak a decent English (Just Landed, 2018a,b).

Below is a table showing the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category utilized in the presidential speeches of Filipino presidents. Table 12 presents the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

To sum it all, **Osmeña** and **Arroyo** have utilized more number of categories of discourse cohesion markers of all the Filipino Presidents with a total of **five (5)** which include *Substitution, Conjunction, Lexical, Anaphoric and Cataphoric*, And for discourse markers, **Substitution** and **Conjunction** are widely utilized by the majority of the Filipino Presidents with the total percentages of **117.01%** and

Heliyon

Article No~e01298

Table 12. The percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

Categories of Discourse Cohesion	Filipino Presidents																
	Aguinaldo	Quezon	Laurel	Osmeña	Roxas	Quirino	Magsaysay	Garcia	Macapagal	Marcos	Aquino	Ramos	Estrada	Arroyo	Aquino III	Duterte	Total Percentage
Grammatical	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%
A. Reference	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%
Anaphoric	.16%	0%%		**.77%**	.06%	.23%	.18%	.16%	.10%	.14%	.12%	.16%	.10%	**.20%**	.07%	.14%	**2.59%**
Cataphoric	**0%**	**0%**		**.02%**										.02			**.02%**
B. Substitution	**7.30%**	**4.65%**	**7.91%**	**7.46%**	**7.71%**	**8.17%**	**8.84%**	**4.92%**	**4.57%**	**7.92%**	**7.44%**	**11.40**	**6.65%**	**5.85%**	**9.50%**	**6.72%**	**117.01%**
C. Ellipsis	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%
Lexico- Grammatical	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%
A. Conjunction	6.97%	3.82%	5.88%	**4.0%**	5.05%	5.74%	4.27%	3.70%	3.92%	5.14%	5.94%	9.79%	3.62%	**3.04%**	4.71%	4.37%	**79.96%**
Lexical	.33%	.23%	.42%	**.29%**	.41%	3.02%	.15%	.17%	.26%	.26%	.24%	.35%	.37%	**.20%**	.32%	.19%	**6.98%**
Total Number of Discourse Cohesion Categories	**4**	**3**	**3**	**5**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**5**	**4**	**4**	

79.96%, respectively. While, ***Cataphoric*** is least used with a total percentage of **.02**%. This implies that Substitution is evident in the speeches of Filipino Presidents. This minimizes the monotony of their messages. This means that using discourse markers is one of the rhetoric skills of Osmeña and Arroyo.

The DMs in cohesion category evidently found in their speeches include: *Substitution* (both, I, it, its, itself, he, her, him, his, me, my, myself, nobody, no one, one, oneself, our, ourselves, other, some, such, that, their, them, themselves, these, they, this, those, us, we, who, whom, you, your, yours, she, someone, but); *Conjunction* (and, because, both, and, both, but, either, or, if, neither, nor, not, not only, but also, or, that, what, when, where, which, while, who, whom, whose, why, whether, whoever, thus, therefore, more, first, however, at the same time, second, next, also, last, since, so that, finally, further, firstly, secondly, thirdly, fourthly, third, furthermore, in addition, still, moreover, in contrast, on the contrary, likewise, then, instead, nonetheless, too, yet, because, such as, in fact) *Lexical* (*Repetition*: I, our, we, you; *Synonymy*: …this day…this date..this moment; …free and independent… & ..justice and fair treatment…); *Anaphoric* (your, he, her, herself, him, his, it, itself, she, their, them, they, this, themselves, its, these, you, himself, my) and; *Cataphoric* (us).

Conjunction is a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before. It is somewhat different from the other cohesive relations. It can be used to realize the systematic relationship between sentences or paragraphs in a text (Gang and Qiao, 2014).

Halliday and Hasan (1976a,b,c), Halliday (1985) and Hasan (1984) stress that the contribution of the cohesive devices in the cohesiveness of a text depends on their type, number, and degree of utilization. McCArthy (1991) also points out that grammatical connections linked semantically individual clauses and utterances to make a text cohesive (in Agham and Hadidi, 2015; Alyousef and Alnasser, 2015; Sharif, 2015).

Cohesion manifests continuity of lexico-grammatical meaning and semantic connection with a previous text. Halliday and Hasan (1976a,b,c,d) claims that cohesion 'does not concern what a text means; it concerns how the text is constructed as a semantic edifice.' They mention five types of cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. *Conjunction* is grammatical in nature but with a lexical component (Nilopa et al., 2017; Ali, 2016; Alyousef and Alnasser, 2015). Meaning, it contains ties that are both grammatical and lexical (Halliday and Hasan, 1976a,b,c,d; Alyousef and Alnasser, 2015).

Conjunctions are words or phrases that mark correlation between one sentence and clause and another unit of an utterance. Additionally, they play a significant role in expressing organization of thoughts of a text (Cook, 1989 in Khodareza and Ashouri, 2016; Alghamdi, 2014). Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) claims that in

marking 'textual transitions' and 'textual statuses' structural and cohesive resources have to work together.

In the study of Chunmei (2017), she asserts that conjunction helps to achieve cohesion and coherence of the discourse since it serves as presuppositions of the information stated in the previous clauses. According to Ali (2016), some conducted studies in relation to conjunctions in written texts unveil that non-native learners tend to use conjunctions exhaustively.

3.2.2. Chinese Presidents

China has hundreds of dialects and variations which are most of the times not mutually intelligible. They include Mandarin Chinese, Wu language, Min language, and Cantonese (Giulia, 2016). On the other hand, English is their major foreign language and is taught and learned in schools (Sharma, 2008).

Below is a table showing the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category prevalent in the presidential speeches of Chinese presidents. Table 13 depicts the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

As a whole, **Ling** and **Zemin** have employed a great number of categories of discourse cohesion markers of all the Chinese Presidents with **four (4)** total Number of Discourse Cohesion Categories which include *Conjunction, Substitution, Lexical, and Anaphoric*.

Among the discourse cohesion categories, ***Conjunction*** is prevalently utilized by the Chinese Presidents with a total percentage of **24.44%** while ***Anaphoric*** is least used

Table 13. The percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

Categories of Discourse Cohesion	Chinese Presidents				
	Soong Ching Ling	Hu Jin Tao	Xi Jinping	Jiang Zemin	Total
Grammatical					
A. Reference					
Anaphoric	.14%	0%	0%	.58%	.72%
Cataphoric	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B. Substitution	8.46%	3.12%	5.35%	4.91%	21.84%
C. Ellipsis	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Lexico- grammatical	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
A. Conjunction	5.52%	8.37%	4.95%	5.60%	24.44%
Lexical	.29%	.33%	.61%	.58%	1.81%
Total Number of Categories of Discourse Cohesion	4	3	3	4	

with a total percentage of **.72%**. This generalizes that Conjunction is popular in the speeches of Chinese Presidents. This goes to show that conjunction is one of the effective linguistic DM devices in achieving unified and logical connection among the sentences of a discourse.

The evident DMs in their speeches comprise: *Conjunction* (and, because, both, and, both, but, either, or, if, neither, nor, not, not only, but also, or, that, what, when, where, which, while, who, whom, whose, why, whether, whoever, thus, therefore, more, first, however, at the same time, second, next, also, last, since, so that, finally, further, firstly, secondly, thirdly, fourthly, third, furthermore, in addition, still, moreover, in contrast, on the contrary, likewise, then, instead, nonetheless, too, yet, because, such as, in fact); *Substitution* (both, I, it, its, itself, he, her, him, his, me, my, myself, nobody, no one, one, oneself, our, ourselves, other, some, such, that, their, them, themselves, these, they, this, those, us, we, who, whom, you, your, yours, she, someone, but); *Lexical* (*Repetition* I, you, our, we, it; *Synonymy*: … done in haphazard way, unsystematic and very superficial; …countrymen should pull together and work hard as a team.. & seize the day, seize the hour, keep abreast of the times…); and *Anaphoric* (your, he, her, herself, him, his, it, itself, she, their, them, they, this, themselves, its, these, you, himself, my).

The aforementioned results are supported by the study of Nilopa et al. (2017) who reveal that the types of cohesive devices found in the students' essay are conjunction (43.25%), reference (33.73%), and lexical cohesion (23.01%). They concluded that even though, "there are a few devices to be used, the majority of the students' opinion essay fail to achieve cohesion." Such study on students' essay has relevance to the study under consideration since it similarly examines discourse markers. Both studies DMs and they are written in English.

However, in the study of Ayub and Wayan (2013) on the cohesion and coherence of students' English writings at the Second Grade of SMAN 1 Labuapi West Lombok, they found out that some problems in coherence of students' writings were reference, conjunction, lexical cohesion, tenses, auxiliary 'to be', passive voice, infinitive, gerund, subject-verb agreement, noun, preposition, and text structure (in Nilopa et al., 2017).

Swales (1990) explicates that different rhetorical functions require various linguistic resources to realize such functions (Fan and Zhang, 2016). One of the linguistic resources that emphasizes the relationship between the meanings of linguistic units is the discourse cohesion or cohesive devices (Wang and Qiao, 2014 cited by Sharif, 2015). In the study of Sharif (2015), she concludes that "the range of devices adds on to the vocabulary and also coherence to the text. The devices for one type of cohesion are used differently to layer and incorporate different kind of meanings to the text."

Grammatical cohesion comprises devices such as reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction, while *lexical cohesion* is divided into reiteration (repetition, synonymy etc.) and collocation (co-occurrence of lexical items) (in Nilopa et al., 2017; Agham and Hadidi, 2015; Fan and Zhang, 2016; Sharif, 2015; He (2017); Jin, 2008).

Wang and Qiao, 2014 emphasize that *conjunctions* are classified into three types of abstract logical-semantic relation: elaboration, extension and enhancement. *Elaboration* means one clause is discussed further by giving specific details and vivid descriptions. *Extension* means providing additional or new meaning of the given clause. *Enhancement* means enriching the meaning of the existing clause by qualifying it either in terms of manner, cause or condition, place and reference to time. This is further elaborated by Schiffrin et al. (2001) when they point out that 'Conjunction is concerned with resources for connecting messages, via addition, comparison, temporality, and causality. This system subsumes earlier work on linking between clauses in a framework which considers, in addition, the ways in which connections can be realized inside a clause through verbs, prepositions, and nouns.' (in by Sharif, 2015).

However, in the study of Ayub and Wayan (2013) on the cohesion and coherence of students' English writings at the Second Grade of SMAN 1 Labuapi West Lombok, they found out that some problems in coherence of students' writings were reference, conjunction, lexical cohesion, tenses, auxiliary 'to be', passive voice, infinitive, gerund, subject-verb agreement, noun, preposition, and text structure (in Nilopa et al., 2017).

3.2.3. Indian Presidents

People of India speak nearly a thousand language (New World Encyclopedia, 2018). Hindi is the official language of the central government in India while English as a provincial official sub-language. It is used for teaching and learning purposes as well as for real world tasks like conferences, national and international gatherings (Sharma, 2008). In the present study the communicative tasks are associated with SONA, inaugural speeches, ceremonies and the like.

Below is a table showing the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category used in the presidential speeches of Indian presidents. Table 14 indicates the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

Generally, **Mukherjee** has employed a large number of DMs in cohesion category among the Indian presidents with a total of **five (5)** that include *Substitution, Conjunction, Lexical, Anaphoric,* and *Cataphoric.*

Of all the discourse cohesion markers, ***Substitution*** is usually utilized by the Indian Presidents with a total percentage of **95.36%**; however, ***Cataphoric*** is least used with

Heliyon

Table 14. The percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

Categories of Discourse Cohesion	Indian Presidents									
	Prasad	**Radhakrishnan**	**Singh**	**Sharma**	**Narayanan**	**Kalam**	**Patil**	**Mukherjee**	**Kovind**	**Total**
Grammatical										
A. Reference										
Anaphoric	.37%	.38%		.31%	.29%	.62%	.43%	**.45%**	.52%	**3.37%**
Cataphoric	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.070%**	**0%**	**.07%**
B. Substitution	**9.18%**	**6.86%**	**12.18%**	**7.53%**	**5.28%**	**6.24%**	**8.96%**	**6.40%**	**32.73%**	**95.36%**
C. Ellipsis	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	**0%**
Lexico- grammatical	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	**0%**
A. Conjunction	8.91%	5.07%	4.83%	8.68%	5.47%	5.36%	4.59%	**5.96%**	6.88%	**55.75%**
Lexical	.19%	.58%	.23%	.84%	.37%	.16%	.21%	**.37%**	1.56%	**4.51%**
Total Number of Categories of Discourse Cohesion	**4**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**5**	**4**	

a total percentage of **.07**%. This further disclose that Substitution is prevalent in the speeches of Indian Presidents. This means that *substitution* is one of the linguistic DM resources that plays a vital role in achieving cohesion and coherence of a discourse.

Here are the evident DMs in cohesion category in their speeches: *Substitution* (all, anyone, everyone, I, it, its, itself, he, her, him, his, me, my, myself, our, ourselves, other, some, such, that, their, them, themselves, they, these, this, those, us, we, you, your); *Conjunction* (and, because, both, and, but, both, either, or, if, not only, but also, or, that, when, where, which, while, who, whose, what, why); *Lexical* (*Repetition*: I, it, we, our, you, their; *Synonymy:* …had a long and chequered history; parts of it were cloudy and parts bright and sunlit.; … are really members and parts of one federation and one administration.); *Anaphoric* (he, her, him, his, it, itself, she, their, them, they, this, themselves, its, you) and; *Cataphoric* (you).

In contrary, another scenario was revealed in the study of Mawardi (2014) on the cohesion and coherence of students' narrative writings in the English language education department of Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram University. The results showed that "*Substitution* and *ellipsis* were not used much in the essays because of the fact that the students overused the repetition of lexical items, or they were confused." The study indicated that *reference* was used predominantly (50, 22%), followed by *lexical cohesion* (30, 02%), *conjunction* (16, 93%), *ellipsis* (2, 73%), *substitution* (0, 10%). However, according to Halliday and Hasan, (1976a,b,c,d) Substitution and ellipsis are characteristically evident in spoken discourse dialogue (cited by (Nilopa et al., 2017).

Chunmei (2017) emphasizes that the cohesion of the discourse is realized through the application of substitution or ellipsis which serves as presupposition which summarizes the missing message of the previous clause.

Ali (2016) enumerates three types of *substitution*: nominal (*e.g. I have seen some exotic foods in my time. But this one was perhaps the oddest one of all*), verbal (*e.g. the songs did not come the same as they used to do*) and clausal (*e.g. Is there going to be a typhoon? − it says so.*).

Malgwi (2016) posits that *coherence* is another linguistic concept closely related to *cohesion*. Both are allied concepts focuses on text linguistics. McDonough (2002 in Malgwi (2016) explains that cohesion and coherence are two distinct ways of deliberating the features of a text. Chunmei (2017), Cohesion pertains to the surface structure which is visible in the discourse that includes the lexical and grammatical features; while coherence focuses on the logical and semantic relationships in a discourse which is also the claim of Van Dijk (1988). In the aspect of discourse analysis, *coherence* is generally defined as the outcome of mental processing and inferencing on the part of the receiver, who employs context and worldwide awareness to

create broad meaning (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981a; Bublitz, 1999 in Schubert and Vechta, 2016). On the other hand, *cohesion* refers to noticeable lexicogrammatical features that indicate semantic links between sentences (Schubert and Vechta, 2016; Ali, 2016).

Specifically, lexical cohesion, as explicated by Halliday and Hasan, pertains to the cohesive effect achieved by the repetition of a word or phrase from the preceding sentence (Malgwi (2016). This is justified in the study of He (2017) on English Public Speeches which reveals that "repetition of certain words or phrases makes the context connect more closely and coherently, thus the whole speech will be more compact and well-organized."

3.2.4. *South Korean Presidents*

Korean is the formal language of both the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea. Seoul Korea has a number of dialects and its main dialect is Hangkuk (StudyCountry, 2018a,b). On the other hand, English is the major foreign language and is used as medium of instruction in schools (Sharma, 2008).

Below is a table showing the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category evident in the presidential speeches of South Korean presidents. Table 15 tells the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

In summary, **Tae-woo** has utilized greater fraction of categories of discourse cohesion markers with a total of **five (5)** which include *Substitution, Conjunction, Lexical, Anaphoric and Cataphoric* among the South Korean Presidents.

Table 15. The percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

Categories of Discourse Cohesion	South Korean Presidents							
	Doo-hwan	Tae-woo	Dae-jung	Moo-hyun	Myung-bak	Geun-hye	Jae-in	Total
Grammatical								
A. Reference								
Anaphoric	.32%	**.34%**	0%	.04%	.07%	.19%	.19%	**1.15%**
Cataphoric	**0%**	**.51%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.51%**
B. Substitution	**6.80%**	**7.28%**	**5.44%**	**5.50%**	**3.60%**	**2.81%**	**6.42%**	**37.85%**
C. Ellipsis	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**
Lexico- grammatical	0%	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**
A. Conjunction	6.15%	**8.12%**	4.37%	4.0%	2.07%	4.54%	4.01%	**33.26%**
Lexical	0%	**1.35%**	.18%	.30%	.12%	.35%	.31%	**2.61%**
Total Number of Categories of Discourse Cohesion Markers	**3**	**5**	**3**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	

Remarkably, like Filipino and Indian Presidents, **Substitution** is usually utilized by South Korean Presidents with a total percentage of **37.85%**; however, **Cataphoric** is least used with a total percentage of **.51%**. The findings infer that Substitution is almost widespread in the speeches of Asian Presidents, which also means that this is one of the effective linguistic devices to be used in attaining a cohesive and coherent composition or discourse as well as in eradicating monotony in unit of utterances.

The evident cohesion DMs in their speeches comprise: *Substitution* (all, everyone, both, every day, anyone, I, it, itself, he, her, him, his, me, my, myself, nobody, no one, one, oneself, our, ourselves, other, some, such, that, their, them, themselves, these, they, this, those, us, we, who, whom, you, your, yours, she, someone); *Conjunction* (and, because, both, and, both, but, either, or, if, neither, nor, not, not only, but also, or, that, what, when, where, which, while, who, whom, whose, why, whether, whoever, furthermore, thus, also, however, therefore, finally, further, first, second, third, fourth, then, in order to, so, still); *Lexical* (*Repetition*: it, I, we; *Synonymy*: … political culture that solves problems through dialogue and compromise… I myself will pursue dialogue and compromise with the opposition parties.); see at first hand our country's political and social stability and our people's solid stance that enables them to face with intelligence and unshaken fortitude challenges and trials of whatever kind; *Anaphoric* (your, he, her, hers, herself, him, his, it, itself, she, their, them, they, this, themselves, its, these, you, himself) and; *Cataphoric* (he, his).

According to Karadeniz (2017), knowledge on text structure and determination of the elements of cohesion and coherence enable the reader(s) to understand better and interpret the text. Cohesion in a text is established to explain or interpret an element within the text. Tools of cohesion refers to the semantic relationships between or among the elements that play a vital role in the comprehension of the first element within the text. Aksan (1999) explains that cohesion describes the grammatical links between the sentences that build up the text while coherence signifies the semantic and logical links between those sentences. Additionally, Witte and Faigley (1981) defines cohesion as the tool that unify the text while coherence refers to the semantic relationships that develop a comprehensible and useful text (Karadeniz (2017).

The aforementioned explanations are amplified by Prayudha (2016) when s/he explicates that "cohesion is the use of language forms to indicate semantic relations between elements in a discourse." Bussman (1998) posits that cohesion refers to linguistic means (grammatical, lexical, and phonological) by which sentences joined together to form larger units of paragraphs, stanzas, and chapters. Halliday and Hasan (1976a,b,c,d) point out that cohesion befalls when the interpretation of a text lies on interdependent elements of a discourse. They categorize grammatical cohesion into reference, substitution, ellipses and conjunction. *Reference is* the

specific information that signals for retrieval, and which interpretation is divided into endophora (textual) and exophoric (situational) reference. *Substitution* is a relation between linguistic items (e.g. words or phrases or in the other word) which relation is on the lexico-grammatical level, the level of grammar and vocabulary, or linguistic form. It has three types, namely; nominal, verbal, and clausal. "*Ellipsis* is something that is present in the selection of underlying (systematic) option that omitted in the structure. *Conjunction* is rather different in nature from the other cohesive relation. Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are nor primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meaning which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse." According to Halliday (1985) in an *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, conjunction has three classifications: elaboration, extension, and enhancement. *Lexical cohesion* is a product of the selection of items that are related to those of the previous. Halliday and Hasan (1976a,b,c,d) categorize lexical cohesion into reiteration (repetition, synonymy or near-synonym, superordinate and general word) and collocation (Prayudha (2016).

In the study of Afianti & Sunardi (2016), they concluded that the journal article they have studied contains the elements of lexical cohesion that establish cohesiveness in the text that enable the readers comprehend easily the meaning of the entire text. This is supported by the study of Rasheed and Abid (2016) who found out that L1 speaker is a proficient user of cohesive devices such as, collocation and synonym that build up effective conversation while repetition is the most utilized category by L2 speaker. He (2017) claims that "lexical chains do not stop at sentence boundaries; they can connect the adjacent words even the entire text."

The study on journal article proves that discourse markers are linguistic rhetoric devices that are commonly used to build up cohesion and coherence of any forms of discourse presented in various media or avenues.

3.2.5. *Malaysian Presidents*

The national and official language of Malaysia is Mahasa Melayu (Malay). Malaysia has also many other languages (Asian) and dialects spoken, with English being used evidently (http://asianinfo.org/AsianInfo.org, 2010). English is used as one of the official languages which is taught and learned in schools of Malaysia.

Below is a table showing the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category applied in the presidential speeches of Malaysian presidents. Table 16 displays the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

As a whole, the data reveal that **Badawi** has used highest number of discourse cohesion markers with a total of **five (5)** which include *Substitution, Conjunction, Lexical, Anaphoric,* and *Cataphoric* of all the Malaysian Presidents.

Table 16. The percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

Categories of Discourse Cohesion	Malaysian Presidents					
	Rahenan	Abdul Razak	Mohamad	Badawi	Najib Razak	Total
Grammatical						
A. Reference						
Anaphoric	.26%	0%	.36%	**.24**%	0%	**0.86%**
Cataphoric	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.16%**	**0%**	**.16%**
B. Substitution	**6.71%**	**5.0%**	**7.33%**	**13.39%**	**1.24%**	**33.67%**
C. Ellipsis	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	**0%**
Lexico- grammatical	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	**0%**
A. Conjunction	5.81%	4.77%	6.97%	**12.67%**	1.44%	**31.66%**
Lexical	1.03%	0%	2.10%	**.16%**	0%	**3.29%**
Total Number of Categories of Discourse Cohesion	**4**	**2**	**4**	**5**	**2**	

Fascinatingly, like Filipino, Indian and South Korean Presidents, *Substitution* is the commonly employed discourse cohesion markers in the speeches of Malaysian Presidents with a total percentage of **33.67**% while *Cataphoric* is least applied with a total percentage of **.16**%. This suggests that a great number of Asian Presidents embrace the utilization of Substitution in organizing speeches, for it helps them in establishing connection with their listeners.

The evident cohesion DMs in their speeches are: *Substitution* (all, anyone, both, every day, everyone, I, it, its, itself, he, her, him, his, me, my, myself, nobody, no one, one, oneself, our, ourselves, other, some, such, that, their, them, themselves, these, they, this, those, us, we, who, whom, you, yours, she, someone); *Conjunction* (and, because, both, and, both, but, either, or, if, neither, or, not, not only, but also, or, that, what, when, where, which, while, who, whom, whose, why, whether, whoever, since, therefore, however, second, so, first, next, then, more, third, last, also, too, further, for example, so that, finally, at the same time, yet, in fact, unfortunately, as a result, hence, firstly, fourth, still, for instance); *Lexical* (*Repetition:* we, that, it, I; *Synonymy:* The road to nationhood has not been an easy journey. Surprises and disappointments tensions and crisis, have marred the way; For just as unity is vital at home – and here in Malaysia….it is not to divide but to put the national interest first – ASEAN must…build solidarity, unity and resilience.); *Anaphoric* (he, her, hers, herself, him, his, it, itself, she, their, them, they, this, themselves, its, these) and; *Cataphoric* (his).

The aforementioned findings are reinforced by the study of Sharififar and Rahimi (2015) on *Critical Discourse Analysis of Political Speeches*… which disclose that one of the prominent factors that signalize an addresser's speech is the use of

substitution (personal pronouns) that "make sense of intimacy with the audience as well as follow a common objective; and tense "that refers to present, past and future events as well as activities that demonstrate government's objectives and display worldwide situations that extend from political, cultural, and economical field at present.

However, in the study of Ali. (2016) on *Using Cohesive Devices During the Course of Lectures "The lectures' Role,"* she reveals that the lecturers utilize only some devices like reference and conjunction but they disregard employing ellipsis and substitution, except native speakers who employed all types of cohesion relations.

Grammatical cohesion includes reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction, while *lexical cohesion* is classified into reiteration (repetition, synonymy etc.) and collocation (co-occurrence of lexical items) (in Agham and Hadidi, 2015; Ali (2016); Fan and Zhang, 2016; Sharif, 2015; Jin, 2008).

3.2.6. *Singaporean Presidents*

The official languages of Singapore are English, Malay, Mandarin and Tamil. Once their children started to learn English in school, it became the common medium of communication for people of different linguistic backgrounds (Just Landed, 2018a,b).

Below is a table showing the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category prevalent in the presidential speeches of Singaporean presidents. Table 17 presents the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

Hence, **Wee**, **Ishak**, **Yacob**, **Tan** and **Nathan** have utilized a significant number of cohesion categories of DMs with a total of **four (4)** which include *Substitution, Conjunction, Anaphoric* and *Lexical* among the Singaporean Presidents.

Of all the discourse cohesion markers, ***Substitution*** is frequently utilized by Singaporean Presidents like that of Filipino, Indian, South Korean, Malaysian and Indian with a total percentage of **51.75**% while ***Lexical*** is least applied with a total percentage of **3.83**%. This connotes that Substitution plays a vital role in the speeches of Singaporean Presidents. *Substitution* is one of the DMs considered by the Singaporean presidents that helps build up systematic connection and unification of their utterances. It likewise breaks dullness to the presentation of their thoughts.

Here are the DMs broadly used by the Singaporean Presidents: *Substitution* (all, everyone, both, every day, anyone, I, it, its, itself, he, her, him, his, me, my, myself, nobody, no one, one, oneself, our, ourselves, other, some, such, that, their, them, themselves, these, they, this, those, us, we, who); *Conjunction* (and, because, both, and, both, but, either, or, if, neither, nor, not, not only, but also, or, that, what, when, where, which, while, who, whom, whose, why, whether, whoever);

Table 17. The percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

Categories of Discourse Cohesion	Singaporean Presidents								
	Ishak	Benjamin	Nair	Wee	Cheong	Nathan	Tan	Yacob	Total
Grammatical									
A. Reference									
Anaphoric	**.91%**	2.08%	0%	**.53%**	.61%	**.49%**	**.52%**	**.27%**	**5.41%**
Cataphoric	**0%**	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
B. Substitution	1.93%	7.44%	5.07%	5.86%	7.42%	.66%	9.33%	14.04%	51.75%
C. Ellipsis	**0%**	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
Lexico- grammatical	**0%**	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
A. Conjunction	5.11%	3.27%	10.14%	6.13%	4.09%	.63%	4.01%	5.21%	38.59%
Lexical	1.14%	0%	.89%	1.07%	0%	.22%	.17%	.34%	3.83%
Total Number of Categories of Discourse Cohesion	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	

Anaphoric (your, he, hers, herself, him, his, it, itself, she, their, them, they, this, themselves, its, these, you, himself) and; Lexical (*Repetition*: its, it, I, we; *Synonymy*: I am told that there are more than 3,000 delegates and that… the largest Congress that the federation has organized….by any standard, a very big meeting and for us in Singapore, the biggest medical Congress that has been hosted here; We,… bringing together eminent researchers at periodic intervals to share knowledge and to disseminate information with the overall objective…).

In the study of Fareh (1988) on Arabic and English expository discourse, an opposite results emerge when s/he reveals that lexical repetition were mostly applied by English. However, Baker (1992) juxtaposed such finding when s/he claims that "Arabic is as varied as English in semantic conjunctions, and it proves to be much more conjunctions-dense due to its syndetic discourse."

There are two categories of cohesive devices: grammatical cohesive devices comprising references, ellipsis, substitution and conjunction; and lexical cohesive devices together with reiteration and collocation (Gang and Qiao, 2014).

According to Azadnia et al. (2016), *cohesion* allows readers to make connections through the presence or absence of explicit cues in the text, whereas *coherence* refers to the reader's understanding of the text, which either be more or less coherent based on a number of factors, like prior knowledge, textual features, and reading skill (McNamara et al., 1996 in Azadnia et al. (2016).

Heaton (1998 in Aldera, 2016) enumerates the four categories of cohesion skills: *language use* (capability to write sentences correctly and appropriately), *mechanical skills* (capability to combine isolated sentences into an organic whole); *judgment*

skills (capability to write appropriately for a particular purpose considering as audience as well as capability to choose, organize orderly relevant information); and *stylistic skills*.

Khodareza and Ashouri (2016) point out that lexical cohesion happens when two words in a discourse are systematically or logically connected. Halliday and Hasan (1976a,b,c,d in Aldera, 2016) elucidates that "cohesion refers to the intratextual relations of the grammatical and lexical items that make the parts of the text together as a whole to convey the complete meaning of it."

However, Malgwi (2016) in her study on *Character of Lexical Cohesion in ESL texts*, concluded that lexical cohesion was significantly evident in the data. Her study likewise revealed that lexical repetition was employed as the main sub-category of reiteration. Aldera (2016) in her study on *Cohesion Written Discourse: A Case Study of Arab EFL Students*, posits that effective transitions between sentences or paragraphs in a composition likely solve the problems regarding cohesion and coherence utilization. She further asserts that teachers with limited discourse knowledge in teaching cohesion and coherence should prioritize professionalism over random selection. This is strengthened by Ulfa (2016) in her study when she claims that "the cohesive effect of lexical cohesion is achieved when two or more lexical items within a sentence or across sentence boundaries are associated with each other."

On contrary, the study of Azadnia et al. (2016) on *A Corpus-Based of Text Cohesion by COH Metrix:Contrastive Analysis of L1/L2 Ph. D. Dissertations* unveils that "intergroup homogeneity in the linguistic pattern of L2 writers in that four word-based indices (hypernymy, polysemy, lexical diversity, and stem overlap) demonstrated similar patterns of occurrence in the L2 writer populations sampled. However, significant differences were reported for these indices between L1 and L2 writers. The results of this study provide evidence that some aspects of L2 writing may not be cultural or independent, but rather based on the amount and type of linguistic knowledge available to L2 learners as a result of language experience and learner proficiency level." Such finding is reinforced by Carrell (1982 in Azadnia et al. (2016) when she elucidates that grammatical or lexical connective ties does not necessarily manifest a textual property to text cohesion, but rather cohesion is the result of readers' knowledge of the world and text schema which enable readers to connect their ideas to the text.

3.2.7. Thai Presidents

The lone official language of Thailand is Siamese Thai (StudyCountry, 2018a,b) used in education, government and the media. Nevertheless, English language is used in people of Thailand who belong to different linguistic backgrounds (Sharma, 2008) for utilitarian purposes. The utilization purposes referred in the study

means that English is used based on the intention and attitude of the speaker toward certain social issue or concern as reflected in their presidential speeches.

The official languages of Singapore are English, Malay, Mandarin and Tamil. Once their children started to learn English in school, it became the common medium of communication for people of different linguistic backgrounds (Just Landed, 2018a,b).

Below is a table showing the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category prevalent in the presidential speeches of Singaporean presidents. Table 18 shows the percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

Thus, **Shinawatra, Thaksin** has employed a great number of discourse cohesion markers with a total of **five (5)** which include *Conjunction, Substitution, Lexical, Anaphoric* and *Cataphoric,* of all the Thai Presidents.

Furthermore, among the cohesion DMs, ***Conjunction*** is regularly used in the speeches of Thai Presidents which is also apparent in the Chinese Presidents' speeches with a total percentage of **73.68**% while ***Cataphoric*** is least applied with a total percentage of **.02**%. Unlike with other Asian Presidents, Conjunction is common to the messages of the Thai Presidents. This goes to show that they consider Conjunction as effective linguistic tool that would carry out the development and achievement of cohesion and coherence in their speeches.

Here are the cohesion DMs palpable in their speeches: *Conjunction* (and, that, where, or, but, not only that, but also, because, while, since, which, when, who);

Table 18. The percentage of DMs in discourse cohesion category.

Categories of Discourse Cohesion	Thai Presidents					
	Thaksin Shinawatra	Surayad Chulanont	Abhisit Vejajiva	Yingluck Shinawatra	Prayuth Chan-Ocha	Total
Grammatical						
A. Reference						
Anaphoric	**.43%**	0%	0%	2.09%	0%	**2.52%**
Cataphoric	**.02%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**.02%**
B. Substitution	**6.75%**	8.09%	8.13%	13.30%	.57%	**36.84%**
C. Ellipsis	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**
Lexico- grammatical	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**
A. Conjunction	**4.91%**	**6.88%**	**8.56%**	**52.93%**	.40%	**73.68%**
Lexical	**.68%**	.52%	.43%	2.22%	.03%	**3.88%**
Total Number of Categories of Discourse Cohesion	5	3	3	4	3	

Substitution (we, it, both, I, him, its, my, you, your, this, us, all, those, their, his, anyone, me, everyone, our); *Lexical* (*Repetition*: we, drugs, rehab, leader, prevention, and the like; *Synonymy:* Thus, if our neighbors are peaceful, there will be no fighting and the drug affair will become a lot less severe; The provincial governor and police chief must determine clearly that drugs are an evil matter, a mater that must be dealt with severely, something that is unacceptable, intolerable); *Anaphoric* (you, them, he, his, their, they, its, it, this) and; *Cataphoric* (you).

Nurhayati and Pandiya conducted studies on the uses of cohesive devices which have centered on the categories and the frequency of cohesive devices and on the errors and uses of cohesive devices which are presented by Nilopa et al. (2017).

Nurhayati (2012) on her study on the error analysis on the use of cohesive device in English writing essay among the seventh semester students of English department of STAIN Salatiga in the academic year of 2011/2012, she found out that from each percentage of each types of errors on the use of cohesive devices, reference becomes the first dominant error (79.07%), conjunction as the second (17.26%), and lexical cohesion as the last dominant error (3.675). Same results are also disclosed in the study of Ali (2016) on the use of cohesive devices of the lecturers in Neelain University.

Pandiya (2012) conducted a study on the coherence and cohesion in the written English news text in programma II RRI Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia. S/he discovered that only "13.33% of the text can fulfill the cohesive devices. The item topic of 'economy" has more features of coherence than and cohesion than others, as it presents more detailed information, complete schematic structure of news item, logical order, good paragraph, and good appropriate choice of word or diction."

Halliday and Hasan (1976a,b,c,d) posit that cohesion connects 'elements that are structurally unrelated to one another' to construct a unified, coherent text. *Conjunctions* are discourse markers that are concerned with textual transitions that form logical relations. Conjunctive textual cohesion is centered to *expansion* and *projection* which are referred by (Alyousef and Alnasser, 2015; Sharif, 2015; Gang. and Qiao, 2014) as two types of logical-semantic relations that lead the rhetorical development of a text. However, their study finds out that conjunctions were minimally used to signal extension and enhancement relations. The same result is revealed in the studies of Abusharkh, 2012, Alharbi, 2011, Aljabr, 2011, Alshammari, 2011, etc. that they have mentioned.

Thus, it would be safe to interpret the system of cohesion as a "semantic network of choices realized in the lexicogrammar in lexical or grammatical guises which are categorized and visible in terms of their various kinds and occur in various

conceptual leaps (Agham and Hadidi, 2015; Alyousef and Alnasser, 2015; cited in Fan and Zhang, 2016; Ali, 2016).

4. Conclusion

Filipino, Chinese, Malaysian, South Korean, Singaporean and Thai presidents have prevalently utilized *Adding something*. The results reveal that six (6) out of seven (7) or 85.71% of the selected Asian presidents have employed the DM form and function, *Adding Something*. And among the least employed DMs include *Preparing Bad News, Finishing & Concluding, Numbering & Ordering Points, Re-stating/ Saying Again, Introducing Strong Points of View, Giving Examples and Generalizing*. These findings further explain that *Adding Something* is prominent in the speeches of the Asian Presidents under study which signal additional information. This likewise means that the said speeches are governed by elaboration. The same results revealed in the study of Jalilifar (2008 in Alghamdi, 2014) who found out that elaborative & inferential DMs were popularly used in various forms of writing; and the study of Alghamdi (2014) who disclose that there was an overuse of DMs at sentence-initial position by Asian ESL students.

With regard to cohesion discourse markers, five (5) out of seven (7) or 71.43% of the selected Asian Presidents have utilized *Substitution* in their respective speeches. The least employed DM cohesion is *Cataphoric.* This means that *substitution* is evident and significantly played a vital role in the speeches under survey. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976a,b,c,d) *Substitution* and ellipsis are characteristically evident in spoken discourse dialogue (cited by (Nilopa et al., 2017). This implies that DMs are likewise used in spoken discourse either in a form of speeches or dialogue. In the study under survey, it is a spoken discourse in a form of presidential speeches. This is reinforced by the study of Sharififar and Rahimi (2015) which discloses that one of the prominent factors that signalize an addresser's speech is the use of *substitution* (personal pronouns) that "make sense of intimacy with the audience as well as follow a common objective; and tense "that refers to present, past and future events as well as activities that demonstrate government's objectives and display worldwide situations that extend from political, cultural, and economical field at present."

Declarations

Author Contribution Statement

Renalyn Banguis-Bantawig: Conceived and designed the experiments; Performed the experiments; Analyzed and interpreted the data; Wrote the paper.

Funding statement

Competing interest statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Additional information

No additional information is available for this paper.

References

Abusharkh, B., 2012. Cohesion and coherence in the essay writing of Palestinian College students. In: Alyousef, H.S., Alnasser, S.M. (Eds.), A Study of Cohesion in International Postgraduate Students' Multimodal Management Accounting Texts, Arab World English Journal, 6(3), pp. 30−46. Retrieved from. http://fac. ksu.edu.sa/sites/default/files/alyousef_n_alnasser_2015.pdf.

Afiante, E., Sunardi, S.S., 2016. Lexical Cohesion of the Article what Is a Good Research Project? by Brian Paltridge. English Department Faculty of Humanities Dian Nuswantoro University Semarang, 2016. Retrieved from. http://mahasiswa. dinus.ac.id/docs/skripsi/jurnal/18763.pdf.

Cohesion and Coherence in Political Newspapers and Discussion Sections of Academic Articles. In: Aghdam, S.H., Hadidi, Y. (Eds.), Int. J. Stud. Engl. Lang. Lit. 3 (3), 11−22. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/2.pdf .

Aijmer, K., 1996. Conversational routines un English: convention and creativity. In: Dylgjeri, Ardita (Ed.), (2014). The Function and Importance of Discourse Markers in Political Discourse. Retrieved from. http://bjes.beder.edu.al/uploads/ arch-201405071008533025.pdf.

Aksan, 1999. In: Karadeniz, A. (Ed.), (2017). Cohesion and Coherence in Written Texts of Students of Faculty of Education. Journal of Education and Training Studies, 5(2).

Alami, M., 2015. Pragmatic functions of discourse markers: a review of related literature. Int. J. Stud. Engl. Lang. Lit. 3 (3), 1−10. Retrieved from. https://www. arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

Aldera, Abdullah Saad, 2016. Cohesion in written discourse: a case study of Arab EFL students. Arab World Engl. J. 7 (2), 328−341.

Alghamdi, E.A., 2014. Discourse Markers in ESL Personal Narrative and Argumentative Papers: A Quantitative Analysis. Retrieved from. http://www.ijscl.net/pdf_6756_b9e936095c164ee7e5d72a34218d5573,html.

Alharbi, A., 2011. An investigation into the English writing of two culturally and linguistically diverse student groups in the pre-enrolment English program (PEP) at Adelaide University. In: Alyousef, H.S., Alnasser, S.M. (Eds.), (2015). A Study of Cohesion in International Postgraduate Students' Multimodal Management Accounting Texts, Arab World English Journal, 6(3), pp. 30−46. Retrieved from. http://fac.ksu.edu.sa/sites/default/files/alyousef_n_alnasser_2015.pdf.

Ali, Alsaawi, 2016. Written discourse analysis and its application in English language teaching. Arab World Engl. J. 7 (2), 244−254.

Ali, M.E.E., 2016. Using cohesive devices during the course of lectures "the lectures' role". Int. Res. J. Soc. Sci. 5 (5), 33−36. Retrieved from. http://www.isca.in/IJSS/Archive//v5/i5/8.ISCA-IRJSS-2016-055.pdf.

Aljabr, F., 2011. An analysis of cohesion and thematic development in University assignments written by undergraduate English major students in one Saudi University. In: Alyousef, H.S., Alnasser, S.M. (Eds.), (2015). A Study of Cohesion in International Postgraduate Students' Multimodal Management Accounting Texts, Arab World English Journal, 6(3), pp. 30−46. Retrieved from. http://fac.ksu.edu.sa/sites/default/files/alyousef_n_alnasser_2015.pdf.

Alshammari, B., 2011. A cohesion analysis of scientific papers written by Saudi students in an Australian University. In: Alyousef, H.S., Alnasser, S.M. (Eds.), (2015). A Study of Cohesion in International Postgraduate Students' Multimodal Management Accounting Texts, Arab World English Journal, 6(3, pp. 30−46. Retrieved from. http://fac.ksu.edu.sa/sites/default/files/alyousef_n_alnasser_2015.pdf.

Alyousef, H.S., Alnasser, S.M., 2015. A study of cohesion in international postgraduate students' multimodal management accounting texts. Arab World Engl. J. 6 (3), 30−46. Retrieved from. http://fac.ksu.edu.sa/sites/default/files/alyousef_n_alnasser_2015.pdf.

Andersen, G., 1998. The pragmatic marker like from a Relevance- theoretic perspective.. In: Alami, M. (Ed.), (2015). Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: A Review of Related Literature. International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(3), pp. 1−10. Retrieved from https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

Andersen, G., 2001. Pragmatic markers of sociolinguistic variation: a relevance − theoretical approach to the language of adolescent. In: Alami, Manizheh (Ed.),

Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: A Review of Related Literature, International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(3), pp. 1–10. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf 8.

Asia Pacific Visitor Forecast, 2017. Recent Performance in Singapore's Tourism Industry and Tourism Yield. Retrieved from: https://www.mti.gov.sg/ResearchRoom/SiteAssets/Pages/Economic-Survey-of-Singapore-First-Quarter-2017/BA_1Q17.pdf.

AsianInfo.org, 2010. Languages of Malaysia. Retrieved from: http://www.asianinfo.org/asianinfo/malaysia/pro-languages.htm.

Ayub, Ketut S., Wayan, S., 2013. An analysis of the cohesion and coherence of students' English writings at the second grade of SMAN 1 Labuapi West Lombok. In: Nilopa, L.M., Miftah, M.Z., Sugianto, A. (Eds.), Cohesive (CDS) in Expository Essay Written by Indonesian Students of English as A Foreign Language (EFL), 6(2).

Azadnia, Masoud, Biria, Reza, Lotfi, Ahmad R., 2016. A corpus-based study of text cohesion by cometrix: contrastive analysis of L1/L2 PH.D. Dissertations. Mod. J. Lang. Teach Methods 6 (2). Retrieved from. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Reza_Biria/publication/30340124 1_A_Corpus-Based_Study_ of_Text_Cohesion_by_COH_ METRIX_ Contrastive_ Analysis_of_L1L2_PhD_Dissertations/links/57a354e508ae2f2c24bf34c3/A-Corpus-Based-Study-of-Text-Cohesion-by-COH-METRIX-Contrastive-Analysis-of-L1-L2-PhD-Dissertations.pdf.

Baker, M., 1992. In other words: a coursebook on translation. In: Mohammed, Farghal (Ed.), Textual Issues Relating to Cohesion and Coherence in Arabic/English Translation. Retrieved from. https://proceedings.icsai.org/6iclice/6iclice-061.pdf.

Beebe, Waring, 2002. In: Adams Goertel, Rachel (Ed.), "The Pragmatic Use of Discourse Markers in the Unplanned Speech of University English Language Learners" (2011). Theses and Dissertations (All), 1048. https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/1048.

de Beaugrande, Robert-Alain, Dressler, Wolfgang Ulrich, 1981b. (2016). A corpus-based study of text cohesion by cometrix: contrastive analysis of L1/L2 PH.D. dissertations. In: Azadnia, Masoud, Biria, Reza, Lotfi, Ahmad R. (Eds.), Mod. J. Lang. Teach. Meth. 6 (2). Retrieved from. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Reza_Biria/publication/303401241_A_Corpus-Based_Study_of_Text_Cohesion_by_COH_METRIX_Contrastive_Analysis_of_L1L2_PhD_Dissertations/links/57a354e508ae2f2c24bf34c3/A-Corpus-Based-Study-of-Text-Cohesion-by-COH-METRIX-Contrastive-Analysis-of-L1-L2-PhD-Dissertations.pdf.

Blakemore, D., 1992. Understanding Utterances. An Introduction to Pragmatics. In: Dylgjeri, Ardita (Ed.), (2014). The Function and Importance of Discourse Markers in Political Discourse. Retrieved from. http://bjes.beder.edu.al/uploads/arch-201405071008533025.pdf.

Blakemore, D., 1988. So as a constraint on relevance. In: Dylgjeri, Ardita (Ed.), (2014). The Function and Importance of Discourse Markers in Political Discourse. Retrieved from. http://bjes.beder.edu.al/uploads/arch-201405071008533025.pdf.

Bloor, T., Bloor, M., 2013. The practice of critical discourse analysis: an introduction. In: Nordquist, R. (Ed.), (2017). Discourse. Retrieved from. https://www.thoughtco.com/discourse-language-term-1690464.

Brinton, L., 1996. Pragmatic markers in English: grammaticalization and discourse functions. In: Alami, Manizheh (Ed.), Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: A Review of Related Literature, International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(3), pp. 1−10. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

Brown, Yule, 1988. Discourse analysis. In: Lugovaya, Nataliya (Ed.), (2011). Essay "Discourse analysis. The notion of speech event.". Retrieved from. http://www.rostov-language.ru/help-36.html.

Bussman, Hadumod, 1998. Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics. In: Prayudha (Ed.), The Cohesion and Coherence of the Editorials in Jakarta Post, 3(2).

Bu, 2013. In: Lim, Jessica Jiwou (Ed.), (2016). Discourse Marker So: A Comparison Between English Language Learners and English Dominant Speakers, 2016. Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Ontario Institute for Studies in Education University of Toronto. Retrieved from. https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitst ream/1807/72745/4/Lim_Jessica_201606_MA_thesis.pdf.

Bublitz, W., 1999. Introduction: view of coherence. In: Schubert, C., Vechta, U. (Eds.), (2016). Cohesion in Contrast: A case study of English and German user manuals. SKY Journal of Linguistics, 29(2016), pp. 95−117. Retrieved from. http://www.linguistics.fi/ julkaisut/SKY2016/SKYJoL 29_Schubert.pdf.

Buyukkarci, K., Genc, B., 2009. Discourse Markers: The Case of 'and' in the Speech of Turkish Speakers of English. Retrieved from. https://www.linguistics-journal.com/2014/01/07/discourse-markers-the-case-of-and-in-the-speech-of-turkish-speakers-of-english/.

Chunmie, Y., 2017. Realization of textual cohesion and coherence in business letters through presupposition. SSRG Int. J. Humanit. Soc. Sci. 4 (2). Retrieved from. http://www.internationaljournalssrg.org/IJHSS/2017/Volume4-Issue2/IJHSS-V4I2P101.pdf.

Cook, 1989. Discourse. In: Khodareza, Shabnam, Ashouri (Eds.), Analysis of Cohesive Divices and Collocations in English Text Books and Teachers' Attention to Them in Azad Univarsity of Foreign Languages in Iran, 2(2), pp. 17−22. Retrieved from. http://www.cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2016/02/03-JLS-S2-003-(JUNE) SHABNAM-ANALYSIS.pdf.

Crane, Paul A., nd 2016. Texture in Text: A Discourse Analysis of a News Article Using Halliday and Hasan's Model of Cohesion. Retrieved from. http:// lingueletteratureculturestraniere.uniroma3.it/bac heca/llopriore/wp-content/ uploads/sites/38/2016/12/CRANE-on-Cohesion.pdf.

de Beaugrande, Robert-Alain, Dressler, Wolfgang Ulrich, 1981a. Introduction to text linguistics. In: Schubert, C., Vechta, U. (Eds.), Cohesion in Contrast: A Case Study of English and German User Manuals, 29(2016), pp. 95−117. Retrieved from. http://www.linguistics.fi/julkaisut/SKY2016/SKYJoL 29_ Schubert.pdf.

Dylgjeri, Ardita, 2014. The Function and Importance of Discourse Markers in Political Discourse. Retrieved from. http://bjes.beder.edu.al/uploads/arch- 201405071008533025.pdf.

Eckle-Kohler, Judith, Kluge, Roland, Gurevych, Iryna, 2015. On the Role of Discourse Markers for Discriminating Claims and Premises in Argumentative Discourse. Retrieved from. https://www.ukp.tu-darmstadt.de/fileadmin/user_ upload/Group_UKP/publikationen/2015/emnlp15discourseMarkers_cameraReady. pdf.

Eggins, S., 2007. An introduction to systemic functional linguistics (2nd. Ed.). In: Alyousef, H.S., Alnasser, S.M. (Eds.), (2015). A Study of Cohesion in International Postgraduate Students' Multimodal Management Accounting Texts. Arab World English Journal, 6(3), pp. 30−46. Retrieved from http://fac.ksu.edu.sa/sites/ default/files/alyousef_n_alnasser_2015.pdf.

Essays, UK, 2013. Retrieved from. http://uk-dissertations-and-uk-essays.blogspot. com/2013/03/.

Fan, Jiafen, Zhang, Yi, 2016. A quantitative study on discourse coherence in linguistic research articles from perspective of thematic progression pattern. Int. J. Lib. Arts Soc. Sci. 4 (7). Retrieved from. http://ijlass.org/data/frontImages/ gallery/Vol._4_ No._7/8._61-74.pdf.

Fareh, S., 1988. Paragraph structure in Arabic and English expository discourse. In: Farghal, Mohammed (Ed.), Textual Issues Relating to Cohesion and Coherence in Arabic/English Translation. Retrieved from. https://proceedings.icsai.org/6iclice/ 6iclice-061.pdf.

Farghal, M., 2017. Textual Issues Relating to Cohesion and Coherence in Arabic/English Translation. Retrieved. https://proceedings.icsai.org/6iclice/6iclice-061.pdf.

Fasold, 1990. The sociolinguistics of Language. In: Lugovaya, Nataliya (Ed.), (2011). Essay "Discourse analysis. The notion of speech event.". Retrieved from. http://www.rostov-language.ru/help-36.html.

Flores, Abel Cruz, 2016. The Spanish discourse marker o sea in the speech of bilinguals from southern Arizona. Revista de estudios linguisticos y literarios 14 (1). Retrieved from. http://divergencias.arizona.edu/sites/divergencias.arizona.edu/files/articles/The%20Spanish%20Discourse%20Marker%20%27o%20sea%27%20in%20Southern%20Arizona%20Spanish_Divergencias.pdf.

Foucault, M., 1972. The archeology of knowledge. In: Lugovaya, Nataliya (Ed.), (2011). Essay "Discourse analysis. The notion of speech event.". Retrieved from. http://www.rostov-language.ru/help-36.html.

Fraser, B., 1990. An approach to discourse marker. In: Alami, Manizheh (Ed.), Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: A Review of Related Literature, International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(3), pp. 1−10. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

Fraser, B., 1988. Types of English discourse markers. In: Rahimi, F., Riasati, M.J. (Eds.), (2012). The Effect of Explicit Instruction of Discourse Markers on the Quality of Oral Output.

Fraser, 1999. What are discourse markers?. In: Zand-Moghadam, Amir, Bikineh, Leila (Eds.), Discourse Markers in Political Interviews: Contrastive Study of Persian and English, 3(1) Retrieved from. http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_4_Special_Issue_February _2014/34.pdf.

Fuller, J.M., 2003. Discourse marker use across speech contexts: a comparison of native and non-native speaker performance. In: Lim, Jessica Jiwou (Ed.), Discourse Marker So: A Comparison between English Language Learners and English Dominant Speakers. Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Ontario Institute for Studies in Education University of Toronto, 2016. Retrieved from. https://tspace.library. utoronto.ca/bitst ream/1807/72745/4/Lim_Jessica_201606_MA_thesis.pdf.

Futji, 2001. In: Alami, M. (Ed.), (2015). Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: A Review of Related Literature. International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(3), pp. 1−10. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

Gang, W., Qiao, L., 2014. On the theoretical framework of the study of discourse cohesion and coherence. Stud. Lit. Lang. 8 (2), 32−37.

Giulia, F., 2016. How many Languages Are Spoken in China? Retrieved from: http://linguese.com/blog/how-many-languages-are-spoken-in-china.

Goertel, Adams, R., 2011. The Pragmatic Use of Discourse Markers in the Unplanned Speech of University English Language Learners". Theses and Dissertations (All), 1048. https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/1048.

Gosal, Dushyant, 2013. History of Economic Growth in India. International Policy Digest. Retrieved from: https://intpolicydigest.org/2013/04/24/history-of-economic-growth-in-india/.

Halliday, M.A.K., 1985. An introduction to functional grammar. In: Aghdam, S.H., Hadidi, Y. (Eds.), Cohesion and Coherence in Political Newspapers and Discussion Sections of Academic Articles, 3(3), pp. 11−22. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/2.pdf.

Halliday, M.A.K., Hassan, Ruqaiya, 1976a. Cohesion in English. In: Prayudha (Ed.), The Cohesion and Coherence of the Editorials in Jakarta Post, 3(2). Retrieved from. https://file:///C:/Users/acer/Downloads/4987-10119-1-SM.pdf.

Halliday, M.A.K., Hasan, R., 1976b. Cohesion in English. In: Aghdam, S.H., Hadidi, Y. (Eds.), Cohesion and Coherence in Political Newspapers and Discussion Sections of Academic Articles, 3(3), pp. 11−22. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/2.pdf.

Halliday, M., Hasan, R., 1976c. Cohesion in English. In: Alyousef, H.S., Alnasser, S.M. (Eds.), A Study of Cohesion in International Postgraduate Students' Multimodal Management Accounting Texts, 6(3), pp. 30−46. Retrieved from. http://fac.ksu.edu.sa/sites/default/files/alyousef_n_alnasser_2015.pdf.

Halliday, M.A.K., Hassan, R., 1976d. Cohesion in English. In: Ji, Y. (Ed.), (2015). Discourse Analysis and Development of English Listening for Non-English Majors in China.

Halliday, M.A.K., Matthiessen, C., 2014. An introduction to functional grammar. In: Alyousef, H.S., Alnasser, S.M. (Eds.), (2015). A Study of Cohesion in International Postgraduate Students' Multimodal Management Accounting Texts. Arab World English Journal, 6(3), pp. 30−46. Retrieved from. http://fac.ksu.edu.sa/sites/default/files/alyousef_n_alnasser_2015.pdf.

Hasan, R., 1984a. Coherence and cohesive harmony. In: Aghdam, S.H., Hadidi, Y.

(Eds.), Cohesion and Coherence in Political Newspapers and Discussion Sections of Academic Articles, 3(3), pp. 11−22. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/2.pdf.

HE, Y., 2017. Lexical cohesion in English public speeches — taking the queen's christmas broadcast as example. Int. J. Arts Commer. 6 (3). Retrieved from. http://www.ijac.org.uk/im ages/frontImages/gallery/Vol._6_No._3/7._70-81.pdf.

Henry, F., Tator, C., 2002. Discourse of Domination. In: Nordquist, R. (Ed.), (2017). Discourse. Retrieved from. https://www.thoughtco.com/discourse-language-term-1690464.

Heaton, J.B., 1998. Writing English language tests. In: Aldera, Abdullah Saad (Ed.), (2016). Cohesion in Written Discourse: A Case Study of Arab EFL Students, 7(2), pp. 328—341.

Hirst, T., 2015. A Brief History of China's Economic Growth. World Economic Forum. Retrieved from: https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/07/brief-history-of-china-economic-growth/.

Hongyu, Mai, 2016. An intercultural analysis of meta-discourse markers as persuasive power in Chinese and American political speeches. Int. J. Lang. Linguist. 4 (6), 207—219.

Hyland, K., Tse, P., 2004. Metadiscourse in academic writing: a reappraisal. In: Zand-Moghadam, Amir, Bikineh, Leila (Eds.), Discourse Markers in Political Interviews: Contrastive Study of Persian and English, 3(1). Retrieved from. http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_4_Special_Issue _February _2014/34.pdf.

Jalilifar, A., 2008. Discourse markers in composition writings: the case of Iranian learners of English as a foreign language. In: Alghamdi., E.A. (Ed.), (2014). Discourse Markers in ESL Personal Narrative and Argumentative Papers: A Quantitative Analysis. Retrieved from. http://www.ijscl.net/pdf_6756_b9e936095c164ee7e5d72a34218d5573,html.

Jin, Kai, 2008. Lexical cohesion patterns in NS and NNS dissertation abstracts in applied linguistics: a comparative study. Ling. J. 3 (3). Retrieved from. https://www.linguistics-journal.com/2014/01/07/lexical-cohesion-pattersn-in-ns-and-nns-dissertation-abstracts-in-applied-linguistics-a-comparative-study/.

Johnson, K., Johnson, H., 1999. Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Lingistics. Retrieved from. http://blackwellreference.com/public/tocnode?id=g9780631214823_chunk_g97806312148238_ss1-13.

Just Landed, 2018a. The Official Languages of Singapore. Retrieved from. https://www.justlanded.com/english/Singapore/Singapore-Guide/Language/Language.

Just Landed, 2018b. Language in the Philippines. Retrieved from. https://www.justlanded.com/english/Philippines/Philippines-Guide/Language/Language-in-the-Philippines.

Kanthima, K., 2015. Sustainability of Thai Tourism Industry. Triple Pundit. Retrieved from. https://www.triplepundit.com/2015/03/sustainability-thai-tourism-industry/.

Karadeniz, A., 2017. Cohesion and coherence in written texts of students of faculty of education. J. Educ. Train. Stud. 5 (2).

Khodareza, Ashouri, Shabnam, 2016. Analysis of cohesive devices and collocations in English text books and teachers' attention to them in Azad University of foreign languages in Iran. Indian J. Fundam. Appl. Life Sci. 6 (2), 17–22. Retrieved from. http://www.cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2016/02/03-JLS-S2-003-(JUNE) SHABNAM-ANALYSIS.pdf.

Laclau, Mouffe, 1985. Hegemony and socialist strategy: towards a radical democratic politics. In: Lugovaya, Nataliya (Ed.), (2011). Essay "Discourse analysis. The notion of speech event.". Retrieved from. http://www.rostov-language.ru/help-36.html.

Lenk, U., 1997. Marking discourse coherence: functions of discourse markers in English. In: Alami, Manizheh (Ed.), Pragmatic Functions of Discourse markers: a Review of Related Literature, International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(3), pp. 1–10. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

Lenk, U., 1998. Discourse markers and global coherence in conversation. In: Alami, Manizheh (Ed.), Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: a Review of Related Literature, International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(3), pp. 1–10. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

Levy, R., Jaeger, T., 2007. Speakers optimize information density through syntactic reduction. In: Rohde, Hannah, Frank, Michael C. (Eds.), (2011). Markers Discourse Structure in Child-Directed Speech. Retrieved from. http://langcog.stanford.edu/papers/RF-cogsci2011.pdf.

Liu, B., 2009. Chinese Discourse Markers in Oral Speech of Mainland Mandarin Speakers. Retrieved from. https://naccl.osu.edu/sites/naccl.osu.edu/files/NACCL-21_Vol._2–Binmei_Liu–pp._358-374.pdf.

Lim, Jessica Jiwou, 2016. Discourse Marker So: A Comparison between English Language Learners and English Dominant Speakers. Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Ontario Institute for Studies in Education University of Toronto, 2016. Retrieved from. https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/72745/4/Lim_Jessica_201606_MA_thesis.pdf.

I Love India, 2007. Tourism Industry in India. Retrieved from. http://www.iloveindia.com/economy-of-india/tourism-industry.html.

Lugovaya, Nataliya, 2011. Essay "Discourse Analysis. The Notion of Speech event.". Retrieved from. http://www.rostov-language.ru/help-36.html.

Malgwi, G., 2016. A study of the character of lexical cohesion in ESL texts. Lit. Inform. Comp. Educ. J. (LICEJ) 7 (1). Retrieved from. http://infonomics-society.org/wp-content/uploads/licej/published-papers/volume-7-2016/A-Study-of-the-Character-of-Lexical-Cohesion-in-ESL-Texts.pdf.

MapsofIndia, 2013. Geographical Location of India. Retrieved from: https://www.mapsofindia.com/india-locations/.

Mawardi, 2014. An analysis of the cohesion and coherence of students' narrative writings ion the English language education department of Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram University. In: Nilopa, L.M., Miftah, M.Z., Sugianto, A. (Eds.), Cohesive (CDS) in Expository Essay Written by Indonesian Students of English as A Foreign Language (EFL), 6(2).

McCArthy, M., 1991. Discourse analysis for language teachers. In: Aghdam, S.H., Hadidi, Y. (Eds.), Cohesion and Coherence in Political Newspapers and Discussion Sections of Academic Articles, 3(3), pp. 11–22. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/2.pdf.

McDonough, 2002. Applied linguistics in language education. In: Malgwi, G. (Ed.), A Study of the Character of Lexical Cohesion in ESL Texts, 7(1). Retrieved from. http://infonomics-society.org/wp-content/uploads/licej/published-papers/volume-7-2016/A-Study-of-the-Character-of-Lexical-Cohesion-in-ESL-Texts.pdf.

McNamara, D.S., Kintsch, E., Butler-Songer, N., Kintsch, W., 1996. Are good texts always better? Interactions of text coherence, background knowledge, and levels of understanding in learning from text. In: Azadnia, Masoud, Biria, Reza, Lotfi, Ahmad R. (Eds.), (2016). A Corpus-Based Study of Text Cohesion by Cometrix: Contrastive Analysis of L1/L2 PH.D. Dissertations, 6(2). Retrieved from. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Reza_Biria/publication/30340124 1_A_Corpus-Based_Study_ of_Text_Cohesion_by_COH_ METRIX_ Contrastive_Analysis_of_L1L2_PhD_Dissertations/links/57a354e508ae2f2c24bf34c3/A-Corpus-Based-Study-of-Text-Cohesion-by-COH-METRIX-Contrastive-Analysis-of-L1-L2-PhD-Dissertations.pdf.

Muller, S., 2005. Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse. In: Alami, Manizheh (Ed.), Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: A Review of Related Literature, International Journal on Studies in English Language and

Literature, 3(3), pp. 1−10. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

New World Encyclopedia, 2018. Languages of India. Retrieved from: http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Languages_of_India.

Nilopa, L.M., Miftah, M.Z., Sugianto, A., 2017. Cohesive (CDS) in expository essay written by Indonesian students of English as A foreign language (EFL). Premise J. 6 (2).

Nordquist, Richard, 2017. Discourse. Retrieved from. https://www.thoughtco.com/discourse-language-term-1690464.

Nurhayati, Y., 2012. The error analysis on the Use of cohesive device in English writing essay among the seventh semester students of English department of STAIN Salatiga in the academic year of 2011/2012. In: Nilopa, L.M., Miftah, M.Z., Sugianto, A. (Eds.), Cohesive (CDS) in Expository Essay Written by Indonesian Students of English as A Foreign Language (EFL), 6(2).

Ostman, 1982. In: Liu, B. (Ed.), (2009). Chinese Discourse Markers in Oral Speech of Mainland Mandarin Speakers. Retrieved from. https://naccl.osu.edu/sites/naccl.osu.edu/files/NACCL-21_Vol._2−Binmei_Liu−pp._358-374.pdf.

Pandiya, 2012. Coherence and cohesion in the written English news text in programa II IRRi Samarang, central Java, Indonesia. In: Nilopa, L.M., Miftah, M.Z., Sugianto, A. (Eds.), Cohesive (CDS) in Expository Essay Written by Indonesian Students of English as A Foreign Language (EFL), 6(2).

Petukhova, V., Bunt, H., 2009. Towards a Multidimensional Semantics of Discourse Markers in Spoken Dialogue.

Prayudha, 2016. The cohesion and coherence of the editorials in jakarta post. Ahmad J. Engl. Stud. (ADJES). 3 (2). Retrieved from. https://file:///C:/Users/acer/Downloads/4987-10119-1-SM.pdf.

Rahimi, M., 2011. Discourse markers in argumentative and expository writing of Iranian EFL learners. In: Alghamdi, E.A. (Ed.), (2014). Discourse Markers in ESL Personal Narrative and Argumentative Papers: A Quantitative Analysis. Retrieved from. http://www.ijscl.net/pdf_6756_b9e936095c164ee7e5d72a34218d5573,html.

Rahimi, F., Riasati, M.J., 2012. The effect of explicit instruction of discourse markers on the quality of oral output.

Rasheed, Saadia, Abid, Faiza, 2016. A comparative study of lexical cohesive devices used by L1 and L2 Urdu speakers. Lang. India 16 (4). Retrieved from. http://www.languageinindia.com/april2016/saadiaaurdulexicalcohesion.pdf.

Roy, 2000. In: Lugovaya, Nataliya (Ed.), (2011). Essay "Discourse analysis. The notion of speech event.". Retrieved from. http://www.rostov-language.ru/help-36.html.

Rohde, Hannah, Frank, Michael C., 2011. Markers Discourse Structure in Child-Directed Speech. Retrieved from. http://langcog.stanford.edu/papers/RF-cogsci2011.pdf.

Santander Trade Portal, 2018. Singapore Economic and Political Outline. Retrieved from: https://en.portal.santandertrade.com/analyse-markets/singapore/economic-political-outline.

Schiffrin, Hamilton, Tannen, 2001. The handbook on discourse analysis. In: Sharif, A.M. (Ed.), (2015), the Analysis of Cohesive Devices in Psychology Research Papers Using Discourse Analysis Technique, 3(7). Retrieved from. http://ijellh.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/14.-Aysha-Mohd-Sharif-paper-final-Hardcopy.pdf.

Schriffin, D., 1987. Discourse markers. In: Alami, Manizheh (Ed.), Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: A Review of Related Literature, International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(3), pp. 1−10. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

Schiffrin, 2006. (2014). The Function and Importance of Discourse Markers in Political Discourse. In: Dylgjeri, Ardita (Ed.). Retrieved from. http://bjes.beder.edu.al/uploads/arch-201405071008533025.pdf.

Schiffrin, D., et al., 2003. The handbook of discourse analysis. In: Alami, M. (Ed.), (2015). Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: A Review of Related Literature. International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(3), pp. 1−10. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

Schourup, L., 1999. Discourse markers. Lingua. In: Lim, J.J. (Ed.), (2016). Discourse Marker So: A Comparison Between English Language Learners and English Dominant Speakers. Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Ontario Institute for Studies in Education University of Toronto. Retrieved from. https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitst ream/1807/72745/4/Lim_Jessica_201606_MA_thesis.pdf.

Schubert, C., Vechta, U., 2016. Cohesion in Contrast: a case study of English and German user manuals. SKY J. Linguist. 29 (2016), 95−117. Retrieved from. http://www.linguistics.fi/julkaisut/SKY2016/SKYJoL 29_Schubert.pdf.

Sharif, A.M., 2015. The analysis of cohesive devices in psychology research papers using discourse analysis technique. Int. J. Engl. Lang. Lit. Humanit. 3 (7). Retrieved

from. http://ijellh.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/14.-Aysha-Mohd-Sharif-paper-final-Hardcopy.pdf.

Sharififar, M., Rahimi, E., 2015. Critical discourse analysis of political speeches: a case study of Obama's and Rouhani's speeches at UN. Theor. Pract. Lang. Stud. 5 (2), 343–349.

Sharma, B.K., 2008. World Englishes, English as a Lingua Franca and English Pedagogy. Retrieved from. https://www.academia.edu/962236/World_Englishes_English_as_a_Lingua_Franca_and_English_Pedagogy.

Shead, B., 2017. Tourism Industry in the Philippines: Part I. *ASEAN Briefing*. Retrieved from: https://www.aseanbriefing.com/news/2017/07/26/tourism-industry-philippines-part.html.

Simburger, E., 2017. Discourse analysis.

Slembrouck, S., 2014. What is Meant by Discourse Analysis? Facultiet an Wijsbegeerte. Retrieved from. http://www.english.ugent.be/da.

StudyCountry, 2018a. Languages in South Korea. Retrieved from. http://www.studycountry.com/guide/KR-language.htm.

StudyCountry, 2018b. Languages in Thailand. Retrieved from. http://www.studycountry.com/guide/TH-language.htm.

Swales, J.M., 1990. Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. In: Fan, Jiafen, Yi, Zhang (Eds.), (2016). A Quantitative Study on Discourse Coherence in Linguistic Research Articles from Perspective of Thematic Progression Pattern. International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, 4(7). Retrieved from. http://ijlass.org/data/frontImages/gallery/Vol._4_No._7/8._61–74.pdf.

Tan, S.K., 2015. Politico-Diplomatico History of the Philippine National Commission for Culture and the Arts. Retrieved from. http://ncca.gov.ph/subcommissions/subcommission-on-cultural-heritagesch/historical-research/politico-diplomatic-history-of-the-philippines/.

Tayao, M.L.G., Ignacio, T.P., Gonzales, M.J., 1998. Applied Linguistics for Communication Arts. Office of Academic Report Support and Instructional Services. UP Open University.

Tannen, D., 2012. . Discourse Analysis—What Speakers Do in Conversation. Retrieved from. https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/discourse-analysis-what-speakers-do-conversation.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., W, R., Vetter, E., 2000. Methods of text and discourse analysis. London: Sage. In: Sharififar, M., Rahimi, E. (Eds.), (2015). Critical

Discourse Analysis of Political Speeches: A case Study of Obama's and Rouhani's Speeches at UN. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5(2), pp. 343−349.

Ulfa, Maria, 2016. An Analysis of Lexical Cohesion in Narrative Text Three Children Storybooks of "Oliver and Jumpy" by Werner Stejskal. English Language Teaching Department Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty Syekh Nurjati State Islamic Institute Cirebon, 2016. Retrieved from. http://repository.syekhnurjati.ac.id/2190/1/MARIA%20ULFA-min.pdf.

Van Dijk, T.A., 1988. News as discourse. In: Chunmie, Y. (Ed.), (2017). Realization of Textual Cohesion and Coherence in Business Letters through Presupposition. SSRG International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 4(2). Retrieved from. http://www.internationaljournalssrg.org/IJHSS/2017/Volume4-Issue2/IJHSS-V4I2P101.pdf.

Van Dijk, A. Teun, 1997. Discourse as structure and process. In: Prayudha (Ed.), (2016). The Cohesion and Coherence of the Editorials in Jakarta Post, 3(2). Retrieved from. https://file:///C:/Users/acer/Downloads/4987-10119-1-SM.pdf.

Vande Kopple, W., 1985. Some exploratory discourse on meta-discourse. In: Zand-Moghadam, Amir, Bikineh, Leila (Eds.), Discourse Markers in Political Interviews: Contrastive Study of Persian and English, 3(1). Retrieved from. http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_4_Special_Issue _February _2014/34.pdf.

Wang, Gang, Qiao, L.I.U., 2014. On the theoretical framework of the study of discourse cohesion and coherence. In: Sharif, A.M. (Ed.), The Analysis of Cohesive Devices in Psychology Research Papers Using Discourse Analysis Technique, 3(7).

Watkins, T., 2000. The Economic History and Economy of Thailand. Retrieved from:http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/watkins/thailand.htm.

Wilson, D., Sperber, D., 1986. Relevance: Communication and Cognition. In: Dylgjeri, Ardita (Ed.), (2014). The Function and Importance of Discourse Markers in Political Discourse. Retrieved from. http://bjes.beder.edu.al/uploads/arch-201405071008533025.pdf.

Witte, Faigley, 1981. Coherence, cohesion and writing quality. In: Karadeniz, A. (Ed.), (2017), Cohesion and Coherence in Written Texts of Students of Faculty of Education, 5(2). Retrieved from. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1125748.pdf.

Worldatlas, 2018a. Where Is Singapore? Retrieved from. https://www.worldatlas.com/as/sg/where-is-singapore.html.

Worldatlas, 2018b. Where Is South Korea. Retrieved from. https://www.worldatlas.com/as/kr/where-is-south-korea.html.

Yang, F., 2004. Thematic progression and textual coherence. In: Fan, Jiafen, Yi, Zhang (Eds.), (2016). A Quantitative Study on Discourse Coherence in Linguistic Research Articles from Perspective of Thematic Progression Pattern. International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, 4(7). Retrieved from. http://ijlass.org/data/frontImages/gallery/Vol._4_ No._7/8._61−74.pdf.

Yilmaz, E., 2004. A practical analysis of Turkish discourse markers: ysni, esti andsey. In: Alami, Manizheh (Ed.), Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: a Review of Related Literature, International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(3), pp. 1−10. Retrieved from. https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijsell/v3-i3/1.pdf.

Yinxiu, Ji, 2014. Discourse analysis and development of English listening for non-English majors in China. Engl. Lang. Teach. 8 (2).

Yung, Frances, Komura, Taku, Duh, Kevin, Matsumoto, Yuji, 2016. Modeling the Usage of Discourse Connectives as Rational Speech Acts. Retrieved from. http://aclweb.org/anthology/K16-1030.

Zand-Moghadam, Amir, Bikineh, Leila, 2014. Discourse Markers in Political Interviews: Contrastive Study of Persian and English. Int. J. Soc. Cult. Lang. 3 (1). Retrieved from. http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_4_Special_Issue _February _2014/34.pdf.

Zhang, M., 2000. A comparative study of the discourse marker types in the body section of the research papers of DLSU students. In: Alghamdi, E.A. (Ed.), (2014). Discourse Markers in ESL Personal Narrative and Argumentative Papers: A Quantitative Analysis. Retrieved from. http://www.ijscl.net/pdf_6756_ b9e936095c164ee7e5d72a34218d5573,html.

Zhou, P., 2017. Tourism Development in China. Retrieved from. https://www.thoughtco.com/tourism-development-in-china-1434412.