

University of Bahrain

College of Arts



**Department of English
Language and Literature**

An Investigation of Discourse Markers in English and Arabic TV Comedies: A Contrastive Study

A Thesis Submitted in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MA in Applied English Studies

Submitted by

Hanoof Khaled Alajmi

ID Number 20120848

Supervised by

Dr. Madani Othman Ahmed

(Associate Professor)

University of Bahrain

Kingdom of Bahrain

2023

Abstract

DMs have several characteristics as they are a feature of oral discourse only and occur in a high frequency orally. They are phonologically short and do not have a stable location in the syntactical structure. This study investigates how the discourse markers pair in structures in Bahraini Arabic. It examines the frequency of those DM structures and functions in a contrastive study comparing Bahraini Arabic and American English comedies. The study sample included two television works, one is Bahraini and one is American and it also includes 16 Bahraini participants responses in audio interviews to examine the DMs. The study aims to answer five questions: (1) What are the discourse markers structures in both the Bahraini Arabic and American English series?, (2) What is the frequency of the DM structures in both the Bahraini Arabic and American English comedies?, (3) What is the frequency of the functions of those structures in both the Bahraini Arabic and American English selected comedies?, (4) What are the similarities and differences between the DM functions in both Bahraini Arabic and American English series? (5) What are the discourse markers mentioned in audio interviews with a real Bahraini sample? The research method is mixed method and the research design used is content analysis research design. The approach used is the inductive approach. The principal findings reveal that the most used DM in the Bahraini television program is "بل," while "عاد" is the most prevalent in Bahraini interviews. Based on these results, recommendations for future research are presented. This study contributes novel insights into the structures, functions, and frequencies of DMs in Bahraini Arabic when compared to American English. The discovery of 56 Bahraini Arabic DMs is significant for a variety of reasons. It underscores the richness of the Arabic dialect in such detail that is underexplored in the literature. This paper will serve as a reliable source for future linguists who are interested in the Bahraini Arabic dialect. The comparison between the mentioned DMs and the American English DMs is crucial for comprehending cross-linguistic variation and communication dynamics highlighting similarities and differences. Based on the outcomes of the study, several recommendations are made for linguists. The results of the audio interviews do not match the results of the comedies, that could exaggerate the dialect for the comical effect. Therefore, the researchers could

further investigate the DMs in real-life setting in Bahrain. Moreover, Longitudinal studies could investigate how DM usage evolve over time within the speaking community, providing insight into language change and sociocultural dynamics. The results also enable comparative studies to analyse the usage of the DMs across different dialects in the region, exploring cross-linguistic and cross-cultural variations in DMs patterns.

Defense Committee's Approval

University of Bahrain

College of Arts

Department of English Language and Literature

Master Degree in Applied English Language Studies

Student Hanoof Khaled Alajmi, ID number: 20120848 defended her thesis by which she fulfilled the requirements for the degree of M.A. in Applied English Language Studies entitled 'Exploring Discourse Markers Use in the Bahraini Comedy and the American English Comedy: A Contrast Study' on this day of

The committee recommends awarding of With the grade of

Thesis Defense Committee:

Name

Dr. Madani Othman Ahmed

Supervisor

Dr

Internal Examiner

Dr

External Examiner

Academic department's stamp

Declaration

I declare that this work, which is submitted to the University of Bahrain, contains my own investigation. This research has not been previously accepted for any degree and is not currently considered for any other degree at any other university.

Name: Hanoof Khaled Alajmi

ID Number: 20120848

Signature:

Date:

The thesis defense committee considered the thesis title:

Exploring Discourse Markers Use in the Bahraini Comedy and the American English Comedy: A Contrast Study

Submitted to the Department of English Language and Literature for the degree of Master in Applied English Language Studies.

Thesis Defense Committee:

Name

Dr. Madani Othman Ahmed

Supervisor

Dr

Internal Examiner

Dr

External Examiner

Acknowledgement

First, I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Dr. Madani Othman, who guided my research towards its full potential. Also, I would like to thank the department of English language and literature staff at the university of Bahrain for their direct and indirect support, mainly: Dr Abdulaziz Bulaila, Dr. Yasser and Dr. Nouri Ageli. Special thanks to Dr Lamya Alkoheji for her guidance on the proper conducting of qualitative research. I would also like to thank my parents for their support during this journey.

Table of Contents

Topic	Page
Abstract	A
Defense Committee's Approval	B
Declaration	C
Acknowledgement	D
Table of Contents	E
List of Tables	H
CHAPTER ONE Introduction	
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 The Research Problem	1
1.2 Research Questions	2
1.3 Research Objectives	3
1.4 Research Significance	3
1.5 Research Setting	4
1.6 Definition of Key Terms and Acronyms	4
1.7 Organisation of the Study	4
CHAPTER TWO Theoretical Framework and Literature Review	
2. Introduction	7
2.1 Theoretical Framework	7
2.1.1 The Development of Theoretical Frameworks	7
2.1.2 Schifffrin	8
2.1.3 Fraser	10
2.1.4 Brinton	11
2.1.5 Ramadhani	13
2.1.6 Clark's Framework	15
2.1.7 Explanations of Basic Concepts in the Theoretical Framework	16
2.1.7.a Definitions of Qualitative Method	16
2.1.7.b Definitions of Content Analysis	17
2.1.7.c Text Analysis	18
2.1.7.d The Theories	19
2.1.7.e Summary	20
2.2 Literature Review	20
2.2.1 Introduction	20
2.2.2 Informal DMs in American English	21
2.2.3 Discourse Markers in American English Television	22

2.2.4 Discourse Markers in Arabic Television	25
2.2.5 Discourse Markers Functions	28
2.2.6 Functional Categories	28
2.2.7 DMs and Coherence	29
2.2.8 Duplications of Discourse Markers	30
2.2.9 Pragmatic Functions and Meaning	31
2.2.10 Recent Studies on the Multifunctionality and Traits of Discourse Markers	34
2.2.11 Discourse Markers as Linguistic Cues	36
2.3 Summary and Conclusion	37
CHAPTER THREE Methods and Procedures	
3 Introduction	40
3.1 Research Design	41
3.2 Material & the Sample of Subjects	41
3.2.1 Material & Series	41
3.2.2 Sample & Subjects	41
3.3 Research Instruments	42
3.4 Data Collection Methods & Procedures	42
3.5 Scoring and Statistical Tools Used	44
3.6 Summary	44
CHAPTER FOUR Results and Discussion	
4. Introduction	46
4.1 Findings	46
4.2 Question One: What are the discourse markers in both Bahraini Arabic and American English data?	46
4.2.1 DMs in Bahraini Arabic Data	47
4.2.2. DMs in American English Data	49
4.2.3 The Duplicated DMs	53
4.2.4 Types of DMs in Bahraini Arabic	54
4.2.5 Types of DMs in American English	54
4.3 Question two: What is the frequency of the discourse markers in both Bahraini Arabic and American English data?	55
4.3.1 Frequency of DM Variations and Structures in Bahraini Arabic Data	55
4.3.2 Frequency of DM structure in American English Data	58
4.4 Question Three: What is the frequency of functions of those DMs in both Bahraini Arabic and American English data?	59
4.4.1 The Functions of the DM Structure in Bahraini Arabic Data	59
4.4.2 The Functions of the DM Structure in American English Data	62

4.5 Question Four: What are the similarities and differences between the DM functions in both Bahraini Arabic and American English data?	65
4.5.1 The Frequency of Repeated Functions in Bahraini Arabic Data	65
4.5.2 The Frequency of Repeated Functions in the English Data	66
4.5.3 The Multifunctional DMs in Bahraini Arabic Data	67
4.5.4 The Multifunctional DMs in American English	68
4.5.5 Expressing Attitude as a Function in both Bahraini Arabic and American English Data	69
4.5.5.a Expressing Attitude as a Function in Bahraini Arabic Data	69
4.5.5.b Expressing Attitude as a Function in American English Data	71
4.5.6 Syntactic Positions in Bahraini Arabic Data	72
4.5.7 Syntactic Positions in American English Data	73
4.5.8 The Most Frequent Syntactic Position in Bahraini Arabic Data	73
4.5.9 The Most Frequent Syntactic Position in American English Data	76
4.5.10 Annotated Examples from the Samples	79
4.5.11 Expressing Attitude in Bahraini Arabic	80
4.5.12 The Discussion of <i>بل</i> in Tafash Season1	87
4.5.13 The Discussion of <i>بل</i> in Expressing Attitude	88
4.5.14 Expressing Attitude in American English	89
4.5.15 Examples from Everybody Hates Chris Season1	89
4.5.16 Agreement in Bahraini Arabic	93
4.5.17 Agreement in American English	94
4.5.18 Discussion of Duplicated DMs as Equivalents in the Data	96
4.5.18.a The Investigation of Yeah in American English	96
4.5.18.b The Investigation of <i>اي</i> in Bahraini Arabic	98
4.5.18.c Okay in American English	100
4.5.18.d <i>انزين</i> in Bahraini Arabic	100
4.6 Question Five: Would a Bahraini sample match the results of the most frequent DM found in Bahraini Television Series?	101
4.6.1 The Interview Results	102
4.6.2 The DM <i>عاد</i> in Bahraini Interviews	112
CHAPTER FIVE Conclusion & Recommendations	
5. Introduction	117
5.1 Summary of the Results	117
5.2 Implications	118

5.3 Recommendations	118
REFERENCES	119
APPENDECIES	I
Appendix1: The Audio Interviews	I
Appendix2: Everybody Hates Chris Sample	XXI
ABSTRACT TRANSLATED TO ARABIC	

Lists of Tables

Table 1: Five-plane model of talk (Schiffrin,1988)	10
Table2: DMs in Bahraini Arabic Data	47
Table3: DMs in American English Data	49
Table 4: Duplicated DMs	53
Table5 Types of DMs in Arabic	54
Table6 Types of DMs in English	55
Table7 Repeated Discourse Marker Structures in Arabic Data	56
Table8 DM Structures in English Data	58
Table9 Functions of DM Structures in Arabic	59

Table10 Functions of DM Structures in English	62
Table 11 Frequency of Repeated Functions in Arabic	66
Table12 Frequency of Repeated Functions in English	67
Table13 The Multifunctional DMs in Arabic	67
Table14 The Multifunctional DMs in English	68
Table15 DM Expressing Attitude in Arabic	69
Table16 DM Expressing Attitude in English	71
Table17 Frequency of Syntactic Positions in Arabic	72
Table18 Frequency of Syntactic Positions in English	73

Table19 The DMs in the Beginning of an Utterance in Arabic	74
Table 20 Types Frequency	76
Table 21 The Frequency of Functions	76
Table22 The DMs in the Beginning of an Utterance in English	77
Table 23 Expressing Attitude in Bahraini Arabic	86
Table24 ب in Expressing Attitude in Arabic	88
Table 25 Expressing Attitude in English	93
Table 26 Agreement in Arabic	94
Table 27 Agreement in English	94
Table28 Yeah Pairing in DM Structures in English	96
Table29 اِي in Bahraini Arabic	99
Table30 Okay in American English	100

Table31 انزين in Bahraini Arabic	101
Table 32 DM Structures in Interview	102
Table33 عاد as a Bahraini DM	112

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1. Introduction

Spoken language is a system of communication between people. Discourse markers play a significant role in giving these conversations an organized flow, and all discourse markers have functions in these interactions in the spoken discourse. Interactions are full of meaning and attitude and they define the frame of the nature of people and the relationships between those people. Discourse markers contribute to meaning especially in how discourse markers pair with other discourse markers. The aim of this thesis is to provide a missing piece of language documentation, which is documenting Bahraini Arabic DMs. This is all an attempt to understand a dialect, and to provide further focus on its social and cultural identity through language. The study is important due to the scarcity of literature regarding Bahraini discourse markers. This study is an attempt to enhance the inventory of Bahraini discourse markers while examining which one is the most frequent one highlighting the way this discourse marker is used and why. By documenting Bahraini DMs, the study contributes to a comprehensive understanding of language variations across linguistic communities. Additionally, it sheds light on sociolinguistics factors influencing language use including social identity and social situations. DMs play a crucial role in signalling speaker attitudes and emotions within discourse. By examining the usage in the dialect, the study offers insights into how language speakers convey meaning and negotiate social interactions, enhancing our

understanding of language as a context-dependent system of communication. Moreover, the study showcases the utility of interdisciplinary methodologies in linguistics, integrating insights from sociolinguistics, pragmatics and psychology to address the research questions. By implementing a unique combination of frameworks, this paves the way for future studies to further document the Bahraini DMs. In this study, a mixed-method approach was employed to explore Bahraini discourse markers. The research design utilized content analysis as the primary method of this investigation, complemented by observational data collection techniques. The data, consisting of word-based content, was analysed to pinpoint Bahraini discourse markers while documenting types, functions and frequencies. The primary data source involved a comparative analysis of two television series; Everybody Hates Chris and Tafash. Supplementary data was gathered through audio interviews with locals. The theoretical frameworks guiding this research include Relevance Theory, Brinton's Pragmatic Functions Framework, and Ramadhani's cognitive functions framework, which all provide a comprehensive lens through which to interpret the findings and contribute to the understanding of Bahraini discourse markers. The following chapters will further address theoretical frameworks, literature, research methodology, and findings to add to the existing literature and measure the objectives of this study.

1.1. The Research Problem

This study investigates the types and functions of discourse markers in Bahraini Arabic. The American English series Everybody Hates Chris is analysed as a reference point for comparison between it and Bahraini television series Tafash Season1. This documentation of Bahraini DMs was measured by a content analysis of a local Bahraini episodes and

recorded interviews with 16 Bahrainis to name the discourse markers used if any and categorize them and analyse them. The understanding of a discourse can be affected significantly when the DMs' functions are taken into account, which will reflect on the reading of the conversation, and an analysis would be incomplete without encompassing the reading of the DMs. This is highly important in analysing conversation as in how it starts, shifts and how it ends. There are no sufficient studies that deal with the discourse markers in the Bahraini dialect and this research aims to fill the gap and further enrich the literature. Therefore, this study sheds light on the importance of documentation of linguistic cues that ease the cohesiveness of text or adds to meaning. This plays a significant role in enriching the linguistics field that aims to cover every aspect of language in as many dialects as possible on a global level.

1.2 Research Questions

The research questions for this study stem from the need in literature for more emphasis on Arabic DMs. Therefore, this study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the discourse markers structures in both Bahraini Arabic and American English series?
1. What is the frequency of the discourse markers structures in both Bahraini Arabic and American English series?
2. What is the frequency of functions of those paired DMs in both Bahraini Arabic and American English series?
3. What are the similarities and differences between the DM functions in both Bahraini Arabic and American English series?

1.3 Research Objectives

This study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. Identify the discourse markers structures in Bahraini Arabic selected comedy and American English selected comedies.
2. Determine and analyse the frequency of the occurrences of the discourse markers structures in Bahraini Arabic data and American English data.
3. Investigate the functions of the paired DMs and their frequency.
4. Investigate how the Bahraini Arabic selected comedy differ from the American English selected comedy in terms of DM functions.

1.4 Research Significance

This research will likely contribute to the body of literature by adding to the further documentation of Arabic DMs that Bahraini DMs fall under. It may benefit linguists who conduct studies on discourse markers. Scholars from hundred schools of thought still have not set foot on a general agreement on a unified basis of discourse markers in speech communication. The light was not shed on these language expressions until the middle and late 1970s and this area is still in progress internationally with more focus on the English DMs in pragmatic research (Qian, 2021). The literature on Discourse Markers from Arabic television is scarce, where most of the literature is corpus-based. In general, research on DMs and other functional classes in Arabic are clearly in their early phases when compared to cross-linguistically established scholarship and literature, such as English. This subject of linguistics and discourse-pragmatic inquiry has yet to gain notably from empirical studies dedicated to advancing the slowly developing features connected to theories and techniques; areas in desperate need of explorations and inquiries. The study has a value to linguists and adds enrichment to the field of Applied Linguistics. Other than the fact that it adds the Bahraini markers to the literature for referencing, it serves as a tool to enrich the understanding of the Bahraini community and the

comparison with the already existing DMs in the English language will help achieve that goal.

1.5 Research Setting

This study relies mostly on the analysis of both Bahraini Arabic series and American English series as the main source of data. A secondary source of data is the analysis of 16 audio interviews with Bahrainis.

1.6. Definition of Key Terms and Acronyms

DM: Discourse markers.

Cognitive Functions: Mental processes involved in language processing and comprehension.

Syntactic Positions: The grammatical positions within sentences where DMs occur.

Expressing Attitude Function: A specific pragmatic function of discourse markers that involves conveying speaker attitudes, beliefs, or emotions in discourse. DMs used to express attitude may signal the speaker's certainty, uncertainty, skepticism, approval, disapproval, or other stances toward content or interlocutors.

1.7. Organisation of the Study

The study consists of five chapters. Chapter One is an introduction which briefly (1) describes the topic of the study, (2) discusses the research problem, questions, objectives and significance, and (3) defines terms that are used. Chapter Two is divided into two sections: theoretical framework and literature review. Chapter Three describes the methods and procedures of the study. Chapter Four presents the results and discussion. Chapter Five is a conclusion.

CHAPTER TWO

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

CHAPTER TWO

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Discourse markers play a role in shaping the spoken discourse of everyday conversations adding layers of meaning while maintaining structure and coherence. In this chapter, Bahraini Arabic discourse markers are investigated under the scope of a comprehensive combination of theoretical frameworks. This chapter addresses the gap in literature through examining existing literature and theoretical foundations of Sperber and Wilson (1986) relevance theory, Brinton's (1996) pragmatic functions framework and Ramadhani's. This is all to document and uncover the pragmatic and cognitive functions of Bahraini discourse markers.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The conceptual framework is a broad cognitive model that was created by combining various theoretical approaches like relevance theory, cognitive linguistics and pragmatics. The study draws on the relevance theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1986), Brinton's (1996) pragmatic functions framework and Ramadhani's cognitive functions (2017). These approaches were selected because they fit the functions of the found discourse markers in both languages in this study. The frameworks come together to further deliver the objectives of this study and answer the questions to fill the gap in literature.

2.1.1 The Development of Theoretical Frameworks

Several traits in spoken discourse that were formerly seen as empty are now regarded as critical parts of interpersonal communication. These phrases, known as discourse markers or pragmatic expressions, have piqued the interest of academics who are researching situated language usage due to their function in demarcating discourse linkages as well as their potential for indexing social interactions. It is necessary to examine the theoretical approaches to Discourse Markers that have emerged over the decades, as well as the most renowned investigations on DMs and their roles in spoken discourse.

2.1.2 Schiffrin

The term ‘Discourse Markers’ was coined by Schiffrin (1988). She defines the linguistics particles and connectives as a word or a sequence of words that contribute to the structure of a discourse functioning on the level of the discourse and connecting units without interfering with their individual comprehensible meaning. She further claims that they add to the coherence and pragmatic flow of the discourse thus providing clarity and avoiding ambiguity all to enhance communication. She clarifies that DMs have several functions besides connecting such as showing attitude, diverting from the topic, turn taking and opening and closing the conversation.

Deborah Schiffrin's (1988) exhaustive research of 11 DMs in English may be the most complete study on DMs. Assuming that language is designed for communication, Deborah Schiffrin develops a theoretical model in her book to demonstrate how DMs contribute to the coherence of conversation discourse by creating links between units of talk, and how the same item performs different functions depending on where it appears in conversation. Her extensive analysis of DMs, which is a sociolinguistic approach to the markers and the discourse in which they work, describes

DM behaviour on five levels of conversation. Schiffrin (1988) specifies the following qualities for DMs while emphasizing that these properties each of them cannot be understood without attention to the others and that they are interdependent:

1. DMs form structure.
2. DMs convey meaning.
3. DMs accomplish actions.

Schiffrin (1988) defines five planes of talk based on her belief that conversation is a multifaceted interaction:

1. Exchange structure (ES) which represents the mechanics of the verbal exchange and demonstrates the outcomes of the speakers' turn taking and how these alternations are connected to one another.
2. Action structure (AS) which represents the sequence of speaking activities that occur over the course of the discourse.
3. Ideational structure (IdS) which represents a particular relationship between concepts (propositions) found in the discourse.
4. Participation framework (PF) which describes the various ways in which a speaker and a listener might relate to one other.
5. Information state (InS) which relates to the continuing arrangement and management of knowledge as it grows throughout the discourse.

Each of these elements is linked to the others, and they all contribute to the flow of the discourse. Schiffrin argues that all of these components must be integrated for communication to be effective, and discourse markers contribute to discourse coherence by situating utterances on certain plane(s) of conversation. The table below depicts the potential consequences of the 11 English DMs she investigated in the five-plane model of talk.

Table (1): Five-plane model of talk (Schiffrin,1988)

Exchange Structure (ES)	Action Structure (AS)	Ideational Structure (IDS)	Participation Framework (PF)	Information State (INS)
	oh		oh	oh
well	well	well	well	well
and	and	and		
but	but	but		
or		or		
so	so	so	so	so
	because	because		because
		now	now	
	then	then		then
		I mean	I mean	I mean
Y'know		Y'know	Y'know	Y'know

2.1.3 Fraser

Fraser defines DMs as having the following characteristics (Fraser, 1999):

1. They have a fundamental meaning, and their specific meaning is negotiated by the situation.
2. They indicate a connection between the interpretation of the new segment, S2, and the previous segment, S1.

Fraser differentiates between "content meaning" and "pragmatic meaning". Content meaning is the literal reading of the phrase, a less explicit portrayal of some condition of the world that the speaker wishes to draw the listener's attention to. The pragmatic meaning is focused on the speaker's communicative aim, or the direct message conveyed by the utterance (Fraser, 1990). Fraser argues that four types of pragmatic markers transmit

pragmatic meaning which are basic pragmatic markers, commentary pragmatic markers, parallel pragmatic markers, and discourse markers. While Fraser distinguishes between conceptual and procedural interpretations of DMs, Andersen (2001) contends that this distinction cannot be taken as the basic condition for characterizing the DMs category.

2.1.4 Brinton

Brinton proposes that DMs are phonologically short elements with no or little referential value but serve pragmatic or procedural purposes. This suggests that DMs primarily operate on the pragmatic/metadiscourse plane of discourse, with little or no propositional contribution to the meaning of the discourse. (Brinton, 1996)

Brinton suggests that DMs have the following functions in fulfilling the textual function in discourse:

- 1.To define various types of borders to initiate or end a discourse or to affect a shift in topic
- 2.To aid in the taking of turns in oral speech or the chunking of textual discourse

The textual functions of DMs include the necessity to launch and conclude conversation, to identify topic changes, to signify new and old information, and to restrict the relevance of adjacent utterances (Brinton, 1996). For the interpersonal function, they are used:

1. To express attitude, subjectively
2. To achieve intimacy between the speaker and the hearer, interactively

From an interpersonal standpoint, DMs are viewed as vehicles that help the speaker and hearer build and maintain connections. The ability to demonstrate the link between the speaker and his/her orientation toward

the generated discourse is seen as an inherent quality of DMs. They are employed as hedges to show doubt and as requests for confirmation from the listener. They might also be used as a response or reaction to the previous speech.

Brinton (1996) views DMs as lexical items having the following characteristics: they are optional, difficult to translate, marginal in terms of word class, syntactically free, devoid of lexical meaning, and lack propositional meaning and grammatical functions. Brinton defines DMs as having a predominance in oral speech, a mainly start clause position, a high frequency of occurrence and an optional usage.

Brinton (1996) created a model in which he states that the DMs serve pragmatic functions, which can be categorized mainly into the textual function, which is related to context, and the interpersonal function, which is related to social roles. Brinton (1996) classified pragmatic functions of the DMs. The textual functions consisted of opening frame markers that are used to initiate discourse. There are also closing frame markers to close the discourse. There are turn takers and givers to assist the speaker to acquire the floor. There are also fillers and turn keepers to hold the floor. There are topic switchers to indicate a topic shift. There are also information indicators to denote information. There are sequence markers to mark the sequence. Finally, in this category, there are the repair markers to repair one's or the other's discourse. As for the interpersonal functions, there are confirmation seekers and face savers to check understanding, express differences and be polite.

This study will be employing Brinton's (1996) inventory of 33 items as well. The opening frame markers are 'so, ok, now'. The closing frame markers are 'ok, right, well.'. The turn takers are 'ok, yeah, e, well.'. The fillers are 'um, e, and.'. The topic switchers are 'ok, well, now.'. The

information indicators are ‘and, because, so.’. The sequence markers are ‘so, and, and then, because.’. The repair markers are ‘well, I mean, you know, like.’. As for the textual functions, there are inventories for them as well. The Back-Channel signals ‘mhm, uh huh, yeah.’. The cooperation/agreement markers are ‘ok, yes, yeah, mhm.’. The Disagreement markers ‘but, no.’. The response/reaction markers are ‘yeah, oh, ah, but, oh yeah, well, eh, oh really?’. The checking understanding markers are ‘right? Ok?’. Finally, the confirmation markers are ‘ah, I know, yeah, mhm, yes.’.

2.1.5 Ramdhani

There are several cognitive purposes for using discourse marker fillers in communication. These include (Ramadhani, 2017):

- **To Signal the Beginning or End of a Conversation:**

Discourse marker fillers like "so," "well," or "anyway" can be used to signal the start or conclusion of a conversation. These markers help to establish the structure and flow of the discourse by indicating when it is appropriate to begin or end a conversation (Ramadhani, 2017).

- **To Gain Time to Think:**

Discourse marker fillers like "um," "ah," or "er" can be used to gain time to think or to organize thoughts before continuing to speak (Ramadhani, 2017). These fillers serve as a type of "mental placeholder" that helps the speaker to maintain the flow of the conversation while they consider their next words.

- **To Emphasize a Point:**

Discourse marker fillers like "you know," "I mean," or "actually" can be used to emphasize a point, to clarify a meaning, or to signal a change in direction in the conversation (Ramadhani, 2017). These fillers help to

highlight important information and to make the speaker's intended meaning clearer to the listener.

- **To Express Uncertainty or Tentativeness:**

Discourse marker fillers like "sort of," "kind of," or "maybe" can be used to express uncertainty or tentativeness, which can be useful in situations where the speaker is not entirely sure about what they are saying, or where they want to avoid making a strong assertion (Ramadhani, 2017). These fillers help to convey a sense of openness and flexibility in the speaker's thinking.

- **To Establish Rapport or to Manage Social Dynamics:**

Discourse marker fillers like "hey," "hello," or "hi" can be used to establish rapport or to manage social dynamics in a conversation (Ramadhani, 2017). These fillers can help the speaker to signal friendliness, politeness, or respect, which can help to build rapport and to create a positive conversational atmosphere.

- **To Indicate a Change in Topic:**

Discourse marker fillers like "by the way," "speaking of," or "on a different note" can be used to signal a change in topic in a conversation (Ramadhani, 2017). These fillers help to smoothly transition from one topic to another and to maintain the coherence of the conversation.

- **To Express Hesitation or Doubt:**

Discourse marker fillers like "well," "hmm," or "uhh" can be used to express hesitation or doubt. These fillers convey a sense of uncertainty or ambivalence in the speaker's thinking, and can be used to express skepticism or to indicate a lack of confidence in what is being said (Ramadhani, 2017).

- **To Manage Turn-Taking:**

Discourse marker fillers like "so," "anyway," or "right" can be used to manage turn-taking in a conversation (Ramadhani, 2017). These fillers help to signal that the speaker has finished speaking and that it is now the other person's turn to speak.

From the above, it can be seen that discourse marker fillers serve a variety of cognitive and social functions in communication, helping to structure conversations, signal intentions, manage social dynamics, and convey meaning. By understanding the different types of discourse markers and how they are used, we can improve our ability to communicate effectively and to build positive relationships with others.

2.1.6 Clark's Framework

Clark's (1996) framework is based on the assumption that conversations are not reducible to the outputs of individual speakers' independent acts. Conversations, on the other hand, are viewed as a type of cooperative action which, such shaking hands or performing a duet, needs two or more individuals to carefully coordinate their separate behaviours towards some shared goal (Clark, 1996). According to Clark's collaborative paradigm, all communication activities are naturally geared toward other participants in the discourse. It is analogous to performing a good duet, which demands musicians to pay attention to what their duet partners are doing. They continuously change their own performance in response (for example, in timing or loudness). Similarly, effective conversational coordination necessitates a person paying attention to the nonverbal and verbal activities of other participants. They structure their own contributions according to the present conversational objectives (Clark, 1996). Clark's investigations show how participants change and build on their original discourse representations by cooperating on common understandings of important conversational themes.

2.1.7 Explanations of Basic Concepts in the Theoretical Framework

In this section we will examine a few definitions.

2.1.7.a Definition of Qualitative Method

In a situated activity like qualitative research, the observer is somewhere in the world. The world is made visible through a variety of interpretive and practical actions. These actions have a beneficial effect on the environment. They turn the world into a series of representations, including interviews, conversations, photographs and recordings. This level of qualitative research requires a naturalistic, interpretive perspective on reality. This implies that qualitative researchers examine phenomena in their natural settings with the intention of explaining or interpreting events in terms of the meanings that people ascribe to them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013). Case studies, personal experiences, introspection, life stories, interviews, artifacts, cultural productions and texts, visual, observational, interactional, and historical texts are all used in qualitative research to explore meaning. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013).

As a collection of interpretative actions, qualitative research favors no particular methodological technique above another. Qualitative research is challenging to characterize as a venue of dialogue or discourse. It does not have a separate theory or paradigm. From constructivism to cultural and ethnic studies, ethnic, feminism, and Marxism, several theoretical frameworks claim the use of qualitative research methodologies and strategies. Qualitative research is applied in a variety of fields. It is not confined to a particular discipline. Similarly, qualitative research does not have its own set of procedures or practices (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013).

Narrative, semiotic, discourse, content, and phonemic analysis, and even tables, statistics, numbers, and graphs are used by qualitative researchers. They also draw on and use interviewing, ethnomethodology, hermeneutics, phenomenology, cultural studies, feminism, ethnography, deconstructionism, psychoanalysis, participant observation, and survey research among other techniques theories and methodologies. All of these research methods may yield valuable insights and knowledge (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013).

2.1.7.b Definition of Content analysis

Parveen and Showkat (2017), addressed the importance of content analysis as a research method in communication studies. They explain that this scientific method is used in analysing large complicated texts like newspapers. They describe it as the study of hidden messages in a text. Berelson (1952) define content analysis as ‘a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication.’ However, the methodology developed later on and it took a more qualitative approach to address the grey areas in the quantitative approach as well.

Kleinheksel, Winston, Tawfik and Wyatt (2020) claim that content analysis, as a branch of thematic analysis, is a data analysis method that has taken its course towards a more qualitative approach lately. They explain this shift by the increasing interest in both the context and the participants and this method predicts that there are patterns that point to a phenomenon. They further emphasize that the qualitative method, which is the latent content analysis, is used to produce a structure to a text that can highlight concepts. They claim that this method depends on the researcher’s analysis and their use of mental schema to analyse the data. They further explain that this method is divided into a manifest approach

and a latent pattern approach. The first approach is to describe observations in coding and counting of them, which is suitable for content analysis. The second approach is useful to reveal patterns in those observations, which is associated with thematic analysis.

2.1.7.c Text Analysis

Text mining is an intriguing field that includes innovative research methodologies and software tools that are employed in academia, businesses and government organizations. Text mining technologies are already being used by researchers in ambitious initiatives to forecast anything from the direction of financial markets to the occurrence of political demonstrations. Text mining is also widely utilized in marketing research and a variety of other commercial applications, as well as in government and defense work. Text mining has gained popularity in the social sciences in recent years, with applications in anthropology, communications, economics, education, and political science (Ignatow & Mihalcea, 2018).

Before social scientists started to adapt text mining technologies for use in their research, they studied newspaper articles, transcribed interviews, speeches, and other types of textual data for decades, developing sophisticated text analysis methodologies. While text mining is a new multidisciplinary topic based on computer science, text analysis approaches have a long history in the social sciences. Text mining techniques often incorporate information retrieval (text acquisition methods) and advanced statistical approaches and natural language processing (NLP) applications such as part-of-speech tagging and syntactic parsing. Text mining also includes more fundamental data acquisition and processing techniques. These approaches include online scraping and

crawling tools, dictionaries and other lexical resources, and tools for processing texts and linking words to texts (Ignatow & Mihalcea, 2018).

2.1.7.d The Theories

Qian (2021) also claims that there are three main theoretical frameworks at the moment; coherence theory, relevance theory and adaptation theory. Maschler (1998) introduced his own categories/types for the DMs. They are interpersonal discourse markers, structural discourse markers, cognitive discourse markers and referential discourse markers. The interpersonal discourse markers examine a sense of relationship between the listener and the speaker. Perception is one of those relationships and good examples of those would be ‘look’, ‘you know’ and ‘believe me’. Another face to the interpersonal discourse markers is the agreement and disagreement with examples such as ‘definitely’ and ‘I beg to differ’. These markers can also be used for amazement such as ‘wow’. As for the referential discourse markers, they are conjunctions in most cases. There are markers from this category that signify sequence of events such as ‘now’ and ‘then’. There is also causality in those markers, such as in the ‘as a result of’ and ‘because’. These markers could also signify coordination such as ‘so’ and non-coordination such as ‘but’ and they are used to link sentences that do not depend on each other for meaning. As for the structural discourse markers, those examine a hierarchy of action in a story. An example of those would be used for organization such as ‘first of all’. Another example of the mentioned markers is for introduction such as ‘so’ and ‘to begin with’ and some markers for summarization such as ‘to conclude’. Finally, the cognitive discourse markers can be used in different aspects displaying the thought process. They can be used for processing information such as in ‘uh’, they can be used for realization such as in ‘Oh no’ and ‘Really!’ and they can also be

used in rephrasing such as ‘I mean’ and ‘in other words’. Shciffirin (1988) proposed a model of five levels of coherence, and within this framework the discourse markers move freely. The relevance theory was introduced in the 1980s in which human cognitive process and language communication intertwine and the way to achieve this is that the speaker focuses on relevant information by using the DMs. The Adaptation Theory was introduced in the 1990s where discourse markers present a choice that is the result of a speaker’s metapragmatic awareness in the process of language use.

2.1.7.e Summary

The preceding sections represent the first part of Chapter Two, which is the theoretical overview. The main topics discussed and chosen were the theoretical frameworks of Brinton (1996) and Ramadhani (2017). The chapter also discussed Qian (2021) main theoretical frameworks as well as Maschler’s (1998) types of DMs.

2.2 Literature Review

2.2.1 Introduction

Linguists have different conceptions when it comes to the DMs. Since the nineteenth century, academics have been interested in the study of discourse markers as a branch of linguistics. The theoretical position of discourse markers in regard to how and why they are utilized has been the topic of research in many contexts and situations. Thus, this chapter examines the available literature on discourse markers. Qian (2021) claims that scholars from hundred schools of thought still have not set foot on a general agreement on a unified basis of discourse markers in speech communication. He also claims that the light was not shed on these language expressions until the middle and late 1970s and this area is

still in progress internationally with more focus on the English DMs in pragmatic research.

2.2.2 Informal DMs in American English

Informal discourse markers (IDMs) are words or phrases that are used in informal conversation (Crible, 2020) to signal a change in topic, to emphasize a point, to express an attitude or to manage turn-taking. IDMs are often colloquial and vary widely based on the context and the speaker's regional and cultural background. Some common examples of IDMs in American English include "like," "you know," "I mean," "um," "well," "so," "anyway," and "right." IDMs are used extensively in American English conversation to signal a change in topic, to emphasize a point, or to express an attitude (Crible, 2020). For example, "like" is often used to signal a comparison or analogy, as in "She's like a ray of sunshine." "You know" is often used to indicate the speaker's assumption that the listener knows what they are talking about, as in "You know what I mean, right?" "I mean" is often used to clarify or emphasize a point, as in "I mean, it was just ridiculous." "Um" and "well" are often used as fillers to indicate hesitation or to give the speaker time to think. "Anyway" is often used to signal a return to the main topic after a digression, as in "Anyway, back to what we were talking about." The use of discourse markers in American English could differ from other varieties of English in several ways. Firstly, American English tends to use more IDMs than other varieties of English, such as British or Canadian English (Gabrys, 2017). This may be due in part to the influence of American culture and media on the English language worldwide. Secondly, the specific IDMs used in American English may differ from those used in other varieties of English, reflecting regional and cultural differences (Gabrys, 2017). For example, "like" is more commonly used in American English than in British English. Finally,

the use of IDMs in American English may be more informal and colloquial than in other varieties of English, reflecting the casual nature of American conversation (Gabrys, 2017). Thus, the use of informal discourse markers is a common and important aspect of American English conversation. IDMs are used to signal a change in topic, to emphasize a point, to express an attitude, or to manage turn-taking, and their use varies based on the context and the speaker's regional and cultural background. The use of IDMs in American English differs from other varieties of English in terms of the specific markers used, the frequency of their use, and the informal and colloquial nature of their use.

2.2.3 Discourse Markers in American English Television

Fabricated scenarios are part of the gamut of speech interactions that occur in society (Pallotti, 2007). One study that investigates the use of discourse markers in American English television is by Covolan (2021). This study's approach involves two corpora, the "Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English" and "Friends: The TV Series Corpus," whereby texts are studied using an analytic tool called AntConc. It is a freeware corpus with a wide range of tools for text analysis. DMs, which are conversational characteristics often linked with organically occurring encounters, are the focus of this research. DM examples include, *well*, *you know*, *so*, *like*, *anyhow*. Words employed as DMs take on new significance depending on their situation. For example, the word *well* might appear as an elaborative discourse marker, adjective, or adverb, all with various meanings, making it extremely difficult to analyse when seeking for certain qualities. The study also suggests that there has been a shift in the way scripted conversation is created where features that were once exclusive to real language are now increasingly appearing in non-authentic language as well (Covolan, 2021).

The "Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English" was utilized in the analysis of discourse indicators in actual language use. It was compiled by scholars at the University of California, Santa Barbara's Linguistic Department. It is divided into four parts, including audio and transcriptions with a total around 240,000 words. It contains a significant number of naturally occurring spoken encounters from all around the United States and portrays a wide range of society, including people of various ages, genders, socioeconomic backgrounds, ethnicities occupations and so on. "Friends: the TV series Corpus," which was utilized in the examination of DMs in non-authentic language use, is the second corpus. The findings of the research revealed that *I mean* is the more often used of the discourse markers. Nonetheless, there is a difference in frequency between the two corpora. In the Santa Barbara Corpus, it appears 2.10 times per thousand words, while in the Friends Corpus, it occurs 1.70 times per thousand words. This suggests that in the first corpus, which reflects actual language, this DM is 0.04% more common. In the Santa Barbara Corpus, the DM *in fact* had 0.20 occurrences per thousand words, whereas the Friends Corpus had just 0.06 occurrences per thousand words. "*In fact*" is infrequently used in both corpora, although it is 0.01% more often in the Santa Barbara Corpus than in the Friends Corpus. These findings revealed an intriguing pattern, which is that both DMs are more common in the corpus that includes authentic language use than in the corpus that includes non-authentic language use. As a result of the findings, the researcher concludes that authenticity in scripted dialogue is undoubtedly reflected by the introduction of real-time features, in this instance discourse markers, although it is still less visible than spontaneously occurring interactions (Covolan, 2021).

Another study that sought to explore DMs in American English TV was conducted by Mohammed & Ahmed (2019). The researchers in this study deemed face-to-face interviews as a genre in spoken discourse that involve a variety of linguistic tactics worth exploring. Because the contact between participants is active and direct, there is context sensitivity in these interviews. Thus, some terms should be used to fulfil a variety of activities such as subject shift, presenting a new topic, creating personal comments by participants, conveying politeness, and so on. Discourse markers, according to Mohammed & Ahmed (2019) are phrases that transmit textual functions expressing coherence and cohesiveness as well as pragmatic functions representing the speaker's mood and other communication aims. DMs serve as connectors joining clauses, phrases, and paragraphs, indicators indicating discourse connections. This paper (Mohammed & Ahmed, 2019) is discourse research that looks at the roles of several types of DMs in spoken discourse through social interviews. The study aimed at presenting a broad theoretical examination of discourse markers and their relationships to other types of markers. This was in an attempt to develop a unifying framework for analysing the data in the research examining the impact and importance of context, particularly social context, in establishing the meanings and purposes of DMs and describing the numerous purposes that distinct sorts of DMs express in spoken discourse, notably in social interactions. To accomplish these aims, the study hypothesized that context is the most important element influencing the choice of meanings and functions of the DM. Certain forms of DMs are often utilized in active spoken contact, and DMs express specific types of functions in social interviews. The study used two selected TV interviews from the same context, featuring both genders and from the same show. Because the purpose of this study was to discover the roles of various types of discourse markers in social context interviews on the one hand, and the

influence of context on those markers on the other, the data gathered are two interviews from one program. The Ellen Show is an American TV comedy that specializes in interviewing individuals, and thus the data selection is deliberate. As a result, the statements are spontaneous and amenable to examination.

The results of the study reveal that participants utilize several forms of DMs (SDMs and parallel markers) that exhibit pragmatic functions on their own. SDMs include *so, because, and, but* whereas parallel markers include *well, now, really*. Laughing with each other and telling jokes, indicating agreement and understanding, expressing an opinion or comment, and delivering praises without attempting to mitigate the effect of specific face risks are examples of pragmatic functions. These are also referred to as interpersonal functions (Mohammed & Ahmed, 2019). DMs also demonstrated textual functions such as creating cohesiveness and coherence, filling gaps, providing elaboration, emphasizing something, and marking the beginning or conclusion of something. As a result of this study and the data analysed, it was demonstrated that context functions as a primary independent element that impacts the usage of DMs, rather than as a dependent component that interacts with other factors such as gender and social distance in spoken discourse. The interpretation of meanings and roles of DMs that differ in each speech is determined by context. Furthermore, the most common functions of the DMs employed in the study's data were textual and interpersonal functions (Mohammed & Ahmed, 2019).

2.2.4 Discourse Markers in Arabic Television

One study that investigated discourse markers in Arabic TV was carried out by Al-Khalidy (2017). The study examined the discourse analysis and pragmatic meanings of the discourse marker *ta:lʃ* in Jordanian Spoken

Arabic as it appears in a TV comedy series. The data reviewed comprised of series episodes, each of which lasted roughly 45 minutes, with some lasting almost 15 minutes. The investigator discovered that *ta:lʕ* has eight various meanings depending on the situation. Furthermore, the recordings were transcribed and studied in order to determine the properties of *ta:lʕ* from a discourse and pragmatics analytical standpoint. The paper's approach was based on discourse analysis, conversation analysis, and pragmatic analysis of Jordanian spoken Arabic DM *ta:lʕ* that was translated and transliterated (Al-Khalidy, 2017). The investigator gathered the data for this study by watching two Jordanian television comedy series in spoken Jordanian Arabic that highlighted the social and economic concerns of Jordanian society at the time. One of these comedy programs, *Abu Awwad*, aired in 1981 and consisted of 12 episodes lasting around 45 minutes each. *Ghafil ghawi mashakil*, another comedy series, aired in 2014, with 28 episodes lasting around 15 minutes each. The data analysis yielded eight distinct pragmatic interpretations for Jordanian spoken Arabic DM *ta:lʕ*. They were divided into eight separate groups (Al-Khalidy, 2017).

Taking a closer look at the cases above, this study demonstrated that the discourse marker under investigation performs a variety of functions depending on the settings and situations. However, the environment and setting play an important part in interpreting the DM. Its meaning changes depending on the circumstance. Furthermore, the aforesaid research revealed that the DM *ta:lʕ* appeared in three different locations in Jordanian spoken Arabic. This consists of middle, beginning, and final where it appeared (5) times in the middle position out of (8) times, followed by beginning position (2) and final position (1). Finally, the DM *ta:lʕ* has appeared in positions to demonstrate distinct functions according to their

contexts in Jordanian spoken Arabic. It was discovered that the pragmatic meanings of *ta:lʕ* are “from now on, going out, hearable, going, looks like, appear, sharing, and ascending” (Al-Khalidy, 2017).

Another research that examined the use of DMs in Arabic TV was conducted by Mobarki (2018). According to the researcher *Yaʕni*, which meaning "it/he intends/means/signifies," is a discourse-pragmatic and linguistic phenomena that appears in numerous variations and speech circumstances of spoken Arabic. Nonetheless, the few scientific studies on *Yaʕni* have come from constrained and limited settings of language usage. The fundamental goals of this dissertation were to first expand and widen research on Arabic *Yaʕni* into new situations of language usage, and then to investigate the linguistic and discourse-pragmatic functions of *Yaʕni* (Mobarki, 2018). Ten episodes of five separate one-hour-long Saudi TV programs were first gathered and stored into a YouTube account and playlist. The assembled TV shows and episodes covered varied settings of language use showcasing distinct language users, different communication aims, and different linguistic registers and styles in this initial stage. Later, the data for this dissertation were gathered, chosen, and analysed using a sample of spoken data obtained from two episodes of the Saudi sports TV show *Alkurah Tatakallam*, which translates as "the ball speaks." The analytical procedures and discussions revealed that *Yaʕni* served the following linguistic and discourse-pragmatic functions: as a verb, for elaboration and turn expansion, for repair organization, for managing the turn-taking system, for alleviation and hedging, for marking contrastive/concessive relations and for emphatic *Yaʕni* (Mobarki, 2018). This indicated the steady consolidation of three points of view: First, it is proposed that categorical statuses spanning from verb *Yaʕni* to discourse marker *Yaʕni* may be interpreted in terms of prototypicality, scalarity, and

gradience. Second, there is another notion that gradations might be found between *Yaɣni* 's discourse-pragmatic functions. Third, there is evidence that *Yaɣni* as a form has been dramatically diverging from its category verb status, propositional meaning, lexical source, and even discoursepragmatic markerhood. According to Mobarki (2018), *Yaɣni* questioned relevance theory's binary difference between conceptual meaning and procedural meaning since it appeared ambiguous. However, the hypothesis and theories such as grammaticalization and pragmaticalization appear to corroborate *Yaɣni*'s categorical and discourse-pragmatic behaviour.

2.2.5 Discourse Markers Functions

Since Schiffrin's initial publication in 1988, DMs have been the subject of much investigation. They are difficult to describe, identify and classify. Their polyfunctionality, both as a category and as individual utterances, has been conceived through a wide range of frameworks, and no consensus on the quantity and labelling of meanings that discourse markers may represent has yet been achieved. The methodology and theoretical assumptions underlying classification schemes differ depending on the linguistic discipline used to describe them, ranging from Conversation Analysis to more and computational approaches, among many others (Crible & Pascual, 2020).

2.2.6 Functional Categories

Existing taxonomies reveal three major functional categories: textual functions related to discourse coherence and structure as in relationships between utterances, topics, or turns, modal functions related to the expression of the speaker's attitude or emotion and interpersonal functions related to the speaker-hearer relationship (Cuenca, 2013). Crible & Pascual (2020) carried out a corpus-based investigation of discourse markers and

repetitions inside and outside repairs in native English, French, and Spanish samples which showed a number of variations and similarities between these three languages. The most common markers tend to be relatively similar across languages and they generally serve textual functions, but they are more formally and functionally diversified in Romance languages.

Fritz (2007) also examines the functions of Discourse Markers. The first is the textual function which is concerned with topic- and content-related difficulties such as altering or introducing subjects, introducing direct speech, and so on. This function also has the role of drawing the listener's attention to a certain area of the discourse. The second function of discourse markers is concerned with turn sequence and floor-holding. This is typically the turn-taking function. Finally, there is a modal component. It is applicable anytime attitudes and assessments, or changes in the illocutionary power of an utterance, are involved (Fritz, 2007). The researcher also mentions that when it comes to analysing occurrences of discourse markers, the single functions cannot be easily distinguished. More than one function is frequently used, and it is just a matter of determining which function is more prominent. The textual and interpersonal domains are not mutually incompatible categories, but they should be viewed as alternative meanings of the particles that might co-occur in the same conversation.

2.2.7 DMs and Coherence

Forms and functions of discourse markers, as well as categories of discourse cohesion markers, are unquestionably important as useful language techniques in a conversation and spoken discourse. According to Alami (2015), DMs are used to underline coherence relationships within the text, give the hearer with the chance to process instructions for various

interpretations, emphasis propositional/illocutionary force, and stress interpersonal relationships. He went on to say that in order to keep the conversation flowing smoothly, interlocutors are likely to employ a variety of methods and present a variety of cues to build mutual comprehension at both the interpersonal and textual levels. Linguistic objects such as conjunctions, adverbs, and verbal phrases from various word classes might serve as DMs, which are semantically defined in classical grammar (Eckle-Kohler et al., 2015).

2.2.8 Duplication of Discourse Markers

Using two discourse markers twice in a row, whether the same one or two different ones, is a phenomenon known as "duplication of discourse markers." This phenomenon is commonly observed in natural language use, particularly in informal conversations. Duplication of discourse markers can serve an emphasizing or reinforcing function (Fraser, 2013). In this case, the speaker may use the same or different discourse marker twice in a row to draw attention to a particular aspect of their speech. For instance, a speaker may say "you know, you know" to stress that the listener should already be familiar with what they are saying, or "I mean, I mean" to emphasize that they want to clarify their point. Secondly, duplication of discourse markers can also serve a pragmatic or conversational function (Fraser, 2013). Here, the speaker may use repeated discourse markers to signal a change in the topic or to indicate a shift in their perspective. For example, a speaker may say "so, so" to mark the end of one topic and the beginning of another, or "well, well" to indicate that they are changing their mind or reconsidering their position. Thirdly, duplication of discourse markers can also serve a social or interactional function (Fraser, 2013). In this case, the speaker may use repeated discourse markers as a way of building rapport with their interlocutor or

signalling their alignment with a particular group or community. For example, a speaker may say "like, like" to indicate that they share a similar perspective or attitude with the listener, or "you know, you know" to suggest that they are part of a shared culture or social group.

In Fraser (2013) the role of discourse markers in language and how they can be used in combination to convey complex meaning is explored. One aspect of this exploration is the combination of two consecutive discourse markers. Fraser (2013) argues that the use of two consecutive discourse markers is common across languages and can convey different types of relationships between clauses or sentences. For example, he notes that the combination of "but" and "yet" can be used to introduce a contrasting idea while also suggesting a surprise or unexpected outcome. It is worth noting that the specific functions of duplication of discourse markers may vary depending on the language, the culture, and the context of use. Nonetheless, the phenomenon is a common feature of natural language use, and it reflects the complex and multifaceted ways in which speakers use language to convey meaning, establish relationships, and achieve their communicative goals.

2.2.9 Pragmatic Functions and Meaning

Discourse Markers or DMs are obvious signs of as well as windows into continuing metalinguistic activity in the speaker's thinking (2013). It means that by supplying information with the speaker's communicative goal, DMs give contextual signals about how to understand what is said or when to seize the speakership. In this approach, DMs act as cues or guides to the hearer's perception in the conversation's dynamic progression (Lee, 2019).

Pragmaticians have paid close attention to discourse markers. DMs are thought to be multifunctional and to communicate in several dimensions at

the same time. DMs have different pragmatic meanings depending on the interactional and situational setting in which they occur (Aijmer, 2013). When an attempt is made to use the surrounding context to deduce the pragmatic meaning of DMs, the contextual reliance becomes clear. This account is congruent with the numerous roles of DMs, which are associated with a wide range of pragmatic values reflecting the interlocutors' social circumstances and connections. In that both are anchored within context, the many functions of DMs are strikingly similar to the pragmatic meanings they carry. One of the distinguishing properties of DMs is the polyfunctional property restricted by contextual factors (Lee, 2019). Thus, understanding what markers are truly doing in spoken conversation is closely connected to understanding pragmatics which is what people mean rather than what words imply. No matter how much they appear to be unneeded or untranslatable lexical elements, this is not the case. Meaning is not only denotational, but can also be subjective, expressing the speaker's connection to the hearer, the speech or the text.

Discussing the connection between DMs and pragmatics, previous research has demonstrated that DMs are utilized in discussions to serve a variety of pragmatic tasks, which vary depending on the situation (Al Rousan et al., 2020). As an example, according to Brinton (1996), DMs are not pragmatically superfluous or optional, yet they perform a variety of pragmatic tasks. For starters, DMs add significantly to the coherence of spoken discourse by connecting a current turn and a previously mentioned one. Second, they establish linkages between speech turns by connecting adjacent and non-adjacent phrases (Al Rousan et al., 2020). They also assist the addressee in comprehending the message conveyed by the speaker's statement. Furthermore, DMs can be used to signify the beginning and finish of a debate. DMs can be either local or global. Local

DMs emphasize inter-sentential links by emphasizing propositional content of phrases and identifying transitions between sentences. Global DMs, on the other hand, communicate links between bigger discourse units, such as presenting new subjects, participating in turn-taking, marking the beginning or end of a discussion, and so on (Al Rousan et al., 2020). Furthermore, DMs have textual or interpersonal purposes (Brinton, 1996). The former involves beginning conversation, capturing the listener's attention, concluding discourse, filling in or holding a turn, signalling a subject transition, signalling old or new information, mending discourse, and expressing sequential reliance. Interpersonal functions include conveying views, validating shared assumptions, expressing comprehension, asking confirmation, expressing courtesy and responding to a previous dialogue.

While DMs may not always offer propositional meaning, they do facilitate the hearer's processing by conveying the context necessary for the speaker's intended interpretation of the utterance and how it is significant (Brinton, 1996). Hence, DMs are phonologically tiny entities with little or no referential significance, but they have a procedural or pragmatic purpose. She refers to "pragmatic markers" in her idea. Several researchers believe that the primary role of DMs is to indicate the relevance of a speech to its context. DMs are more common in oral than in written communication. The use of pragmatic markers is made more convenient by the informality of oral conversation and the grammatical "fragmentation" induced by a lack of preparation time. (Brinton, 1996, pp. 33-35)

2.2.10 Recent Studies on the Multifunctionality and Traits of Discourse Markers

Research by Ismail et al. (2020) suggests that language researchers disagree over the process of defining groupings, properties and roles of discourse markers or discourse particles. Various definitions and classifications of elements have created uncertainty about its status. The attempts to organize diverse opinions connected to discourse markers or discourse particles according to specified functions are capable of creating systematic categories and clearly exposing their functions. Ismail et al. (2020) purpose was to look at a variety of discourse markers or discourse particles and their roles in the context of grammar and pragmatics, as well as the qualities and domains of discourse markers or discourse particles from previous research. The approach employed consisted of the investigation of discourse markers or discourse particles into a theory, a model that described the roles of discourse markers or discourse particles. This detailed the research findings, which included a listing of the inventory idea of discourse markers or discourse particles, as well as the roles, properties, and domain of discourse markers or discourse particles. Based on previous research, the distribution of concepts, functions, and domain of discourse markers or discourse particles suggested that discourse markers or discourse particles are a meaningful element in communication. Discourse connections, turn-taking, confirmation-seeking, intimacy signals, subject switching, hedging markers, hesitation markers, boundary markers, attitude markers, prompters, fillers, and repair markers were all included (Ismail et al., 2020).

Discourse markers can serve a variety of tasks depending on the situation. Taking this into account, Farahani & Ghane (2022) examined and revealed quantitatively and qualitatively the roles of four discourse markers in academic spoken English in their corpus-based study. For their study, four discourse markers were chosen: "I mean," "I think," "you see," and "you

know." Base corpus was utilized to collect data. Concordance lines from the corpus were read and analysed to find discourse indicators. The quantitative analysis revealed that "you know" and "you see" were respectively the most and least common speech markers in the corpus. In accordance with the quantitative study, the qualitative examination of the concordance lines revealed that the four discourse markers served different purposes. According to the corpus research, all four discourse markers were multifunctional in their context of usage in spoken English. This multifunctionality distinguishes them from the analogous form(s) as an isolated clause. Indeed, the findings of this study revealed that in spoken discourse, discourse markers fulfil a variety of purposes depending on the context of usage and the speaker's intention (Farahani & Ghane, 2022). This indicates that the usage of discourse markers is context-sensitive, rather than context-free.

According to Blanchard & Buysse (2021), the tendency of discourse markers to cluster is an often-mentioned trait. This feature has gotten little scholarly attention thus far, even for a marker as common in spoken English as *like*. As a result, their research studies the clustering behaviour of *like* in peer-to-peer interactions amongst native English speakers. In all, 516 similar clusters were found in their sample. The vast majority of these clusters share scope over the same utterance while keeping their individual roles. In such Addition clusters, the most common markers *like* combines with are *and*, *but*, *so*, *because*, and *just*. These clusters follow an extremely invariant ordering pattern in which other markers almost always come before *like*. A functional examination of all clusters containing these five markers revealed that *like* may duplicate the function of the previous marker, act as an elaboration marker, or as a downtoner, and appears to represent the speaker's attempt to provide an account in a more engaging

tone. The findings for *like* lend credence to the concept that in clusters, discourse markers retain functional independence while being syntactically limited (Blanchard & Buysse, 2021).

Prace (2016) analyzed 2000 occurrences of the DMs 'I mean' and 'You Know' in the sub corpora of fiction and subtitles from the InterCorp in relation to their Czech equivalents and syntactic structures. The study claims that the translation in the data highlighted a variety of aspects of the meaning of those DMs and that the translations suggest that they can multifunctional in that language. 'I mean' usually occurred in translation in 'myslim' and 'chci rict' all to illustrate intention, reformulation, explicitness and propositional information. There were other translations of 'I mean' and they all addressed sympathy. As for 'You Know', there were several translations for it and *hele/heled* and *poslys* were used to evoke attention and secure comprehension as functions of this DM. The study claims that the functions affect the syntactic position of the DMs but it is mostly unchanged in translation. 'I Mean' usually took the clause-initial position used for reformulation. 'You Know' was mostly in the clause-medial position to seek confirmation as a function.

2.2.11 Discourse Markers as Linguistic Cues

Discourse markers are linguistic cues that help signal the structure and organization of a discourse or conversation (Maschler & Schiffrin, 2015). They can be words, phrases, or expressions that indicate a speaker's intention or attitude (Maschler & Schiffrin, 2015), such as "well," "you know," "I mean," "actually," or "in fact." Discourse markers can also convey a speaker's level of interest, agreement, or disagreement, and can help maintain coherence and cohesion in a conversation (Maschler & Schiffrin, 2015).

Body language and facial expressions, on the other hand, are nonverbal cues that convey a speaker's emotional state, attitude, or intent. These cues can include gestures, postures, and facial expressions, such as a smile, a frown, a nod, a shrug, or an eyebrow raise (Mlakar et al., 2021). Nonverbal cues can also help emphasize or reinforce the meaning of the spoken message and provide additional context to the listener.

When combined, discourse markers, body language, and facial expressions can enhance the meaning and emotional impact of a speaker's message (Mlakar et al., 2021). For example, a speaker may use the discourse marker "wow" to express enthusiasm or surprise, while simultaneously widening their eyes, raising their eyebrows, or leaning forward to signal their emotional state. Similarly, a speaker may use the discourse marker "oh" to express disappointment or frustration, while simultaneously frowning, lowering their head, or shaking it to convey their emotional response.

The combination of verbal and nonverbal cues in communication creates a complex and dynamic interplay between the speaker and the listener (Mlakar et al., 2021). By paying attention to these cues, listeners can gain a more complete understanding of the speaker's message and respond accordingly. Moreover, skilled communicators can use discourse markers, body language, and facial expressions strategically to achieve their communicative goals and to build rapport and empathy with their interlocutors.

2.3 Summary and Conclusion

The study is about documenting discourse markers found in the Bahraini dialect. This chapter has described the functions of discourse markers, the multifunction of discourse markers, discourse markers found on Arabic television and the duplication of discourse markers. It is anticipated that

this research will add to the scarce literature regarding discourse markers in the Bahraini dialect. This is likely to be visible at the end of the study, when the Bahraini discourse markers are documented from the Bahraini TV episodes and the Bahraini recorded interviews.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

CHAPTER THREE

Methods and Procedures

3. Introduction

This chapter introduces and argues for the methodology that is used in the study. This section includes a detailed description of the samples chosen. Moreover, the chapter further illustrates the research tools that were used including data collection and analysis tools. It also explains the rationale behind the reasons for choosing them. The research design chosen in this research is content analysis research design. The research philosophy chosen in this paper is pragmatism. The data collection method chosen is observational method. The data analysis strategy chosen is the descriptive technique. This combination allows the research to achieve its aim, which is to document a side of the use of Bahraini discourse markers. The research type is mixed-methods consisting of a mix between qualitative and quantitative. The nature of the data is word-based and the only numbers that arise are those mentioning simple frequency. The approach is the inductive approach because the data is leading the research. This will lead to more space for many changes and flexibility to work with the data and observe what is breaking or making a pattern. The data analysis strategy is the descriptive technique. This will allow the description of the qualitative findings while taking note of the quantitative observations. This also allows room for simple statistics and description of those numbers. This is also the best strategy for this type of research since the aim is to document a part of the Bahraini dialect. The following

paragraphs will go into detail into why these choices were taken to shape the overall coherent blueprint of the components that will sort and analyse the data to answer the research questions.

3.1 Research Design

Content Analysis Research Design is accomplished by allocating consecutive chunks of the information to coding frame categories. This frame is at the heart of the approach, and it encompasses all of the features that appear in the material's presentation and interpretation. When it comes to the manner by which qualitative content analysis is carried out, the process of qualitative content analysis is separated into many parts. This begins with deciding on a research question, selecting material, building a coding frame, segmentation, trial coding, evaluating and modifying the code frame, the main analysis, and finally, presenting and interpreting the findings. Content Analysis Research Design is chosen due to the fact that two TV works will be entered as scripts in the Wordsmith software that uses text mining to examine the frequency and context of chosen words, and in this case, discourse markers.

3.2 Material and the Sample of subjects

3.2.1 Materials & Series

The selected comedies were the first season of a Bahraini Arabic comedy called Tafash and the first season of an American English series called Everybody Hates Chris. The Bahraini selected comedy was unavailable as a script and it took about 450 hours to watch it but replays took more time. Everybody Hates Chris has an available written transcript online.

3.2.2 Sample & Subjects

The population of the study was Rifaai and Muharaqi Bahrainis. A selection of those Bahrainis was made, both males and females. The

sampling was non-probability sampling. It was a volunteer/self-selection sampling. The need for data was publicized on the Whatsapp application. The research needed about 16 participants. The data was accepted when it was whole and it fully met the need of having two subgroups according to gender for a comparison. The 16 participants were 8 males and 8 females equally. Confidentiality was promised to the participants providing them with the confirmation of their anonymous participation.

3.3 Research Instruments

It is important to select the right methods to address the research questions and objectives. Content analysis research design was used to determine themes. A mix of qualitative and quantitative methods was used to describe the data followed with frequencies in tables. This was achieved by comparing American English series and Bahraini Arabic series and then by analysing audio interviews with Bahrainis, all to answer the research's questions regarding discourse markers.

3.4 Data Collection Methods & Procedures

There are two types of data that this study relied on. The main source was the manual comparison between the selected first season of a Bahraini Arabic comedy called Tafash and the selected first season of an American English comedy called Everybody Hates Chris. The discourse markers were written down and categorized according to several categories such as type and function. The minor source, which was the second step, was the analysis of 16 audio interviews conducted with Bahrainis to provide further documentation of Bahraini discourse markers. The locals were asked to respond vocally to social situations that require expressing attitude. This all was an attempt to create an inventory of Bahraini discourse markers. The researcher analysed the occurrences of spoken discourse markers in audio and video recordings of social interaction in

order to compile a set of examples that served as the empirical foundation for the study. The goal was to collect extensively and generously in order to capture a wide range of variation in the target phenomenon. The phenomenon was outlined according to the criteria that was established for the preliminary description and anything that approximated but did not precisely comply to them. Since the research is qualitative, trustworthiness and employing triangulation must be achieved for enhancing credibility. After recording the participants in the interviews, participants were presented the chance to review the script of the conversation to ensure that the answers are accurate and to erase vagueness or miscommunication. This also allowed to validate the context, and the fact that 16 people from both genders were interviewed erases biases. Triangulation was achieved by exploring multiple data sources as explained, and by involving basic coding and frequency. Biases were removed by asking people if they understood what I understood while looking at the data produced by the interviews mentioned and this increased the transparency and reflexivity. All of the interviewees are from Riffa and Muharaq. These collective combined measures add to the methodological rigor and ensure the quality of my study. The study can also be replicated for getting results in a clear manner to be applied following my steps while exploring other aspects of the Bahraini dialect or applying the steps to another language in an informal setting.

3.5 Scoring and Statistical Tools Used

The only tool that was used was WordSmith to save the transcript of Everybody Hates Chris episode per episode and this made navigating the text easier.

3.6 Summary

Chapter three has explained the methodology that was used in conducting the research. It began with discussing the reasons of the chosen methodology and the justification behind these choices. It also provided a description of the chosen sample. It goes further into explaining the procedure for data collection. The chapter concludes with describing the statistical means to provide any necessary numbers in the qualitative data.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

4.0 Introduction

This chapter describes and explains the results of the qualitative study. The results are organized to answer each of the research question separately.

4.1. Findings

The results were finalized to document Bahraini discourse markers. This was achieved by analysing both Bahraini series and through conducting interviews with Bahrainis. The Bahraini series were not just analysed but also compared to an American English series to explore the characteristics further.

4.2. Question One: What are the discourse markers in both Bahraini Arabic and American English data?

To answer this question, a good number of Discourse Markers were recorded in the mentioned samples in both Arabic and English. Those DMs examined a variety in functions, types and syntactic positions. This question is divided in the subsections below into: DMs in the Arabic Data and DMs in the English Data. This section also discusses Duplicated DMs in both of the data. It also discusses the types of those DMs in both the data.

4.2.1 DMs in Bahraini Arabic Data

In the table below, the discourse marker structures are listed in the Bahraini Arabic data. This is followed by the syntactic position; the beginning, middle or end. The last category in the table is the discourse marker type; interpersonal, textual or cognitive.

Table (2): DMs in Bahraini Arabic Data

No.	Discourse Marker Structures	Syntactic Position	DM Type
1	روح روح روح	Beginning	Interpersonal
2	افا بس افا	Middle	Interpersonal
3	اي شعليك	Beginning	Interpersonal
4	انزين انزين	Beginning	Textual
5	انزين معليه	Beginning	Interpersonal
6	اي معليه خوش	Beginning	Interpersonal
7	بل بل بل	Beginning	Textual
8	اي اي	Beginning	Interpersonal
9	انزين انزين بس بس	Beginning	Interpersonal
10	اي لا كلش	Beginning	Interpersonal
11	يه روح	Beginning	Interpersonal
12	يلا روح	Beginning	Interpersonal
13	بس عاد	Beginning	Textual
14	روح روح روح روح	Beginning	Interpersonal
15	بس بس	Beginning	Interpersonal
16	بعدين هاك	Beginning	Textual
17	يه يلا عاد	Beginning	Interpersonal
18	اي اي تدري عاد	End	cognitive
19	بل بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Textual
20	يه اسكت	Beginning	Interpersonal
21	اسكت اسكت	Beginning	Interpersonal
22	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Textual
23	ها اي لا لا	Beginning	Interpersonal + cognitive
24	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal
25	بس بس بس بس	Beginning	Interpersonal
26	يلا خذ	Beginning	Textual
27	ها اي اي اي	Beginning	cognitive
28	انزين عيل	Beginning	interpersonal

29	اي اي	Middle	cognitive
30	يه عين ابوه	Beginning	interpersonal
31	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Textual
32	لا لا	Beginning	interpersonal
33	يه يه يه	Beginning	interpersonal
34	عاد ها	Beginning	Textual
35	لئيش عاد	Beginning	Interpersonal
36	معليه معليه	Middle	Interpersonal
37	ها اا اي اي	Beginning	cognitive
38	يلا عاد	Beginning	Interpersonal
39	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal
40	بل بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal
41	بل بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal
42	اي اثوة	Beginning	Interpersonal
43	ها اي صح صح	Beginning	Interpersonal
44	بل بل	Whole utterance	Interpersonal
45	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal
46	شدعوة عاد يه	End	Interpersonal
47	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal
48	اي نعم	Beginning	Interpersonal
49	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal
50	عيل لا	End	Interpersonal
51	بعد شلون	End	Interpersonal
52	بل بل بل بل	Whole utterance	Interpersonal
53	عاد ها	Beginning	Interpersonal
54	يلا بية روح يلا	Whole utterance	Interpersonal
55	اي نعم	Beginning	Interpersonal
56	روح انت بعد روح	Beginning	Interpersonal

The discourse markers in the table are those DMs that come in a row either with the same DM or another twice or three times. The entries of those DMs are: “بعد , بل بل بل بل , عاد ها , يلا بية روح يلا , اي نعم , روح انت بعد روح”

ها اي ,بل بل ,بل بل بل بل ,بل بل بل بل ,اي نعم ,بل بل بل بل ,عيل لا ,شلون
ها اا اي اي ,يلا عاد ,بل بل بل بل ,بل بل بل بل ,بل بل بل بل ,اي اشوة ,صح صح
,انزين عيل ,اي اي ,يه عين ابوه ,بل بل بل بل ,لا لا ,يه يه يه ,عاد ها ,لش عاد ,معليه معلية
,اسكت اسكت ,بل بل بل بل ,ها اي لا لا ,بل بل بل بل ,بس بس بس بس ,يلا خذ ,ها اي اي اي
,بس عاد ,روح روح روح روح ,بس بس ,بعدين هاك ,يه يلا عاد ,بل بل بل بل بل ,يه اسكت
,انزين معلية ,اي معلية خوش ,اي اي ,انزين انزين بس بس ,اي لا كلش ,يه روح ,يلا روح
,انزين انزين ” The most frequent mentioned DM is *بل* which occurs 13 times in the Bahraini Arabic data in a variety of repetitions in every single utterance.

4.2.2 DMs in American English Data

In the table below, the discourse markers are listed in the American English data. This is followed by the syntactic position; the beginning, middle or end. The last category in the table is the discourse marker type; interpersonal, textual or cognitive.

Table (3): DMs in American English Data

No.	Discourse Marker Structures	Syntactic Position	Type of DM
1	<i>Yeah, yeah, I know, I know.</i>	It was the whole utterance	Interpersonal
2	<i>Yeah, um...</i>	It was the whole utterance	cognitive
3	<i>Good good good</i>	It was the whole utterance	Interpersonal
4	<i>Oh yeah alright</i>	It was the whole utterance	Interpersonal

5	<i>Uh, so... so</i>	The beginning	cognitive
6	<i>Hey hey hey</i>	It was the whole utterance	Textual
7	<i>So uh</i>	The beginning	cognitive
8	<i>Well I guess</i>	The beginning	cognitive
9	<i>So uh</i>	The beginning	Textual
10	<i>All right, but, uh,</i>	The beginning	cognitive
11	<i>I mean, seriously,</i>	The beginning	cognitive
12	<i>Oh oh oh</i>	The beginning	cognitive
13	<i>Hey, man, look.</i>	It was the whole utterance	cognitive
14	<i>I mean, you know,</i>	The beginning	cognitive
15	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
16	<i>Okay, well, it's, um...</i>	The beginning	cognitive
17	<i>Yeah, and I mean, like,</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
18	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
19	<i>Hey, uh...</i>	The whole utterance	cognitive
20	<i>Yeah yeah yeah</i>	The whole utterance	Interpersonal
21	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	cognitive
22	<i>Yeah, well, I guess</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
23	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
24	<i>Oh yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
25	<i>Okay well</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
26	<i>Oh okay</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
27	<i>Okay well</i>	The beginning	Textual
28	<i>Hey, man</i>	The beginning	Textual
29	<i>Hey come on</i>	The beginning	Textual
30	<i>Hey, man</i>	The beginning	Textual

31	<i>Um yeah</i>	The beginning	cognitive
32	<i>Oh man</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
33	<i>Come on man</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
34	<i>Yeah, but, you know</i>	The beginning	cognitive
35	<i>Oh well</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
36	<i>Yeah I mean</i>	The beginning	cognitive
37	<i>Yeah? Well</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
38	<i>So um um</i>	The beginning	cognitive
39	<i>Uh um</i>	The beginning	cognitive
40	<i>Alright well</i>	The beginning	textual
41	<i>Oh oh</i>	The beginning	cognitive
42	<i>Alright then</i>	The beginning	textual
43	<i>I know I know</i>	The beginning	textual
44	<i>But uh</i>	The middle	textual
45	<i>Oh um</i>	The beginning	interpersonal
46	<i>Yeah well</i>	The beginning	interpersonal
47	<i>Oh no. uh-uh. Uh-uh</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
48	<i>Oh well</i>	The beginning	Cognitive
49	<i>I know I know I know</i>	The whole utterance	Interpersonal
50	<i>Okay okay</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
51	<i>Yeah. I mean</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
52	<i>Oh alright</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
53	<i>Uh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
54	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
55	<i>Yeah uh</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
56	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
57	<i>Okay um</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
58	<i>Okay uh</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
59	<i>Okay then damn</i>	The whole utterance	Interpersonal
60	<i>Uh huh? Uh</i>	The beginning	cognitive

61	<i>Oh well</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal and cognitive
62	<i>So uh</i>	The beginning	cognitive
63	<i>So uh</i>	The beginning	cognitive
64	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
65	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal
66	<i>um... uhem... uh</i>	Middle	cognitive

The discourse markers in the table are those DMs that come in a row either with the same DM or another twice or three times. The entries of those DMs are: “*Yeah yeah I know I know, Yeah um, Good good good, Oh yeah alright, Uh so so, Hey hey hey, So uh, Well I guess, so uh, All right but uh, I mean seriously, oh oh oh, Hey man look, I mean you know, Oh yeah, okay well it’s um, Yeah and I mean like, Yeah yeah, Hey uh, Yeah yeah yeah, oh yeah, Yeah well I guess, Yeah yeah, Oh yeah yeah, Okay well, oh okay, Okay well, Hey man, Hey come on, hey man, Um yeah, oh man, Come on man, Yeah but you know, oh well, Yeah I mean, yeah? well, So um um, uh um, Alright well, oh oh, Alright then, I know I know, But uh, oh um, Yeah well, Oh no uh-uh Uh-uh, Oh well, I know I know I know, Okay okay, Yeah I mean, oh alright, Uh yeah, Yeah yeah, Yeah uh, Oh yeah, Okay um, Okay uh, Okay then damn, Uh huh? Uh, Oh well, So uh, So uh, Oh yeah, Oh yeah, um... uhem... uh.*” The most frequent mentioned DM in the examples regardless if it is repeated by itself or was joined with another, the DM yeah occurs 23 times and is the most frequent.

Some of the discourse markers in both of the tables above have the same discourse marker repeated a number of times in a row. This differs from having a number of various discourse markers in a row that were also mentioned in the discussed table. A few do repeat themselves but are

joined with a different discourse marker. The table below will examine the purely repeated marker with the translation.

4.2.3 The Duplicated DMs

Table (4): Duplicated DMs

Arabic Data	Translation	English Data
روح	Go away	
انزرين	Okay	<i>Okay</i>
بل	Yikes	
اي	Yeah	<i>Yeah</i>
بس	Enough	
اسكت	Shut up	
يه	-	
معليه	Alright	
صح	Right	
		<i>Good</i>
		<i>I know</i>
		<i>so</i>
		<i>Hey</i>
		<i>Oh</i>
		<i>Um</i>

From the table above, we conclude that the two discourse markers that repeat itself in both the data, are “*Yeah*” and “*Okay*”. In Arabic, as established, the translation is *اي* and *انزرين*. This is discussed in the subheading that explains the similarities and differences between Bahraini Arabic data and American English data.

4.2.4. Types of DMs in Bahraini Arabic

The types of discourse markers in Bahraini Arabic are interpersonal, textual, cognitive and interpersonal and cognitive. The table below shows the frequencies of each of those DM types mentioned.

Table (5): Types of DMs in Arabic

Type of DM – Arabic	Frequency
Interpersonal	42
Textual	9
Cognitive	4
Interpersonal + Cognitive	1

From the table above, information is deduced. The interpersonal DMs in the Bahraini Arabic data is the highest, of 42 times. Even though the textual DMs are second highest, the frequency of 9 is still low in comparison to the 42-time occurrences of the mentioned interpersonal DMs.

4.2.5 Types of DMs in American English

The types of discourse markers in American English are interpersonal, textual, cognitive and interpersonal and cognitive. The table below shows the frequencies of each of those DM types mentioned.

Table (6): Types of DMs in English

Type of DM - English	Frequency
Interpersonal	32
cognitive	23
Textual	10

Interpersonal + cognitive	1
---------------------------	---

Both the Arabic and English have interpersonal type of DM the highest. In the Bahraini Arabic data, interpersonal is repeated 42 times. In the American English data, the interpersonal DM is used 32 times in total. The Arabic data this is followed by the textual DM, while in the English data, it is followed by the cognitive DM of 23 times. The Arabic data only has 4 cognitive DMs. Both of the tables have only one example of the interpersonal cognitive DM.

4.3. Question Two: What is the frequency of the discourse markers in both Bahraini Arabic and American English data?

To answer this question, the frequency of DMs was calculated to Bahraini Arabic data and American English data. The frequency is inserted into two tables to separate the data. The tables were also discussed and the discussions were placed under the tables.

4.3.1 Frequency of DM Variations and Structures in Bahraini Arabic Data:

There is a variety of discourse markers examples in the Bahraini Arabic data. There are 50 DM structures in the table below. For the sake of making this cohesive, these DMs were grouped into 10 groups. This was based on the repeated discourse marker that was joined with the others in the structure. The main discourse markers that the other DMs joined in the table below are as follow: *روح, يل, انزين, اي, عاد, اسكت, معليه, يا, هه, يه*

Table (7): Repeated Discourse Marker Structures in Arabic Data

Type	Tokens	Frequency
------	--------	-----------

روح	روح روح روح روح انت بعد روح يلا بيبة روح يلا يه روح يلا روح روح روح روح روح	6
بل	بل بل بل بل بل بل بل بل بل بل بل	13
انزيرين	انزيرين انزيرين انزيرين معلية انزيرين عيل انزيرين انزيرين بس بس	4
اي	اي اشوة اي نعم ها اي اي اي اي ها اي اي اي ها اي لا لا اي اي تدري عاد اي لا كلش اي شعليك اي معلية خوش	13
عاد	يلا عاد شدعوة عاد به لئيش عاد عاد ها به يلا عاد اي اي تدري عاد بس عاد	8
اسكت	به اسكت اسكت اسكت	3
معلية	انزيرين معلية	3

	اي معليه خوش معليه معليه	
يه	يه روح يه يلا عاد يه اسكت يه عين ابوه يه يه يه	5
ها	ها اي لا لا ها اي اي اي عاد ها ها اي صح صح عاد ها	6
يلا	يلا روح يه يلا عاد يلا خذ يلا عاد يلا يبة روح يلا	5

The most repeated Discourse Marker in the Arabic data is a tie of 13 times each. The first structure out of the two mentioned is *يلا*, which occurs in twice in a row, four times in a row and five times in a row. The second structure of equal mentions is the combination of *اي* and other DMs. This includes “*اي اشوة, اي نعم, ها اي اي, اي اي, ها اي اي اي, ها اي لا لا, اي*” “*اي تدري عاد, اي لا كلش, اي شعليك, اي معليه خوش*”

4.3.2 Frequency of DM Structure in American English Data:

There is a variety of discourse markers structures examples in the American English data. There are 47 DM structures in the table below. For the sake of making this cohesive, these DMs were grouped into 14 groups. This was based on the repeated discourse marker that was joined with the others in the structure.

Table (8): DM Structures in American English Data

DM & Structure	Frequency
<i>So uh / So um</i>	5
<i>Oh yeah / Uh yeah / Um yeah / Oh yeah yeah / Oh yeah alright</i>	9
<i>Yeah yeah yeah / yeah yeah</i>	4
<i>Okay uh / Okay um</i>	2
<i>Okay well</i>	3
<i>So uh / So um um</i>	5
<i>Hey man / Hey come on / Hey man come on / Hey uh / Hey hey hey / Hey man look</i>	7
<i>Uh so / Uh um</i>	5
<i>Oh well / Oh yeah / Oh okay / Oh man / Oh um / Oh no / Oh alright / Oh oh oh</i>	18
<i>Alright well / Alright then / All right but uh</i>	3
<i>Yeah I mean / Yeah um / Yeah and I mean like / Yeah well I guess / yeah yeah I know I know / Yeah but you know / yeah? Well / yeah uh</i>	11
<i>Um yeah / Um uhem uh</i>	2
<i>I know I know / I know I know I know</i>	2
<i>I mean, seriously / I mean, you know</i>	2

The most frequent DM Structure in the English data is the variation of what is combined with the discourse marker “oh”, which is repeated 18 times. This includes “*Oh well / Oh yeah / Oh okay / Oh man / Oh um / Oh no / Oh alright / Oh oh oh*”. This is followed by the structure with the marker *yeah*, which occurs 11 times in total. This includes “*Yeah I mean*

/ Yeah um / Yeah and I mean like / Yeah well I guess / yeah yeah I know I know / Yeah but you know / yeah? Well / yeah uh”.

4.4 Question Three: What is the frequency of functions of those DMs in both Bahraini Arabic and American English data?

To answer this question, the functions of the DM structure in the Bahraini Arabic data and American English data were stated. The information was inserted into tables. Those tables were discussed and explained.

4.4.1 The Functions of the DM Structure in the Arabic Data:

There are a variety of functions in the Bahraini Arabic data. The functions that were found in the mentioned data are: expressing attitude, response, turn-taking, cooperation/agreement, filler, disagreement, opening marker, lying, response and realization and remembering.

Table (9): Functions of DM Structures in Arabic

No.	Discourse Marker Structure	DM Function
1	روح روح روح	Express attitude
2	افا بس افافا	Express attitude
3	اي شعليك	Response
4	انزوين انزوين	Turn taker
5	انزوين معلية	cooperation
6	اي معلية خوش	cooperation
7	بل بل بل	Filler
8	اي اي	Agreement
9	انزوين انزوين بس بس	Express attitude
10	اي لا كلش	Disagreement
11	يه روح	Express attitude
12	يلا روح	Express attitude
13	بس عاد	Opening marker

14	روح روح روح روح	Express attitude
15	بس بس	Response
16	بعدین هاك	Opening marker
17	یه یلا عاد	Express attitude
18	ای ای تدری عاد	Lying
19	بل بل بل بل بل	Filler
20	یه اسکت	Cooperation
21	اسکت اسکت	Express attitude
22	بل بل بل بل	Filler
23	ها ای لا لا	Response + Realization
24	بل بل بل بل	Response
25	بس بس بس بس	Express attitude
26	یلا خذ	Opening marker
27	ها ای ای ای	Lying
28	انزین عیل	response
29	ای ای	Remembering
30	یه عین ابوه	Express attitude
31	بل بل بل بل	Filler
	لا لا	Express attitude
	یه یه یه	Express attitude
32	عاد ها	Opening marker
33	لیش عاد	Express attitude
34	معلیه معلیه	Express attitude + persuading
35	ها اا ای ای	Lying
36	یلا عاد	Express attitude
37	بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
38	بل بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
39	بل بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
40	ای اشوة	Response
41	ها ای صح صح	Agreement

42	بل بل	Express attitude
43	بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
44	شدعوة عاديه	Express attitude
45	بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
46	اي نعم	Agreement
47	بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
48	عيل لا	Express attitude
49	بعد شلون	Express attitude
50	بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
51	عادها	Express attitude
52	يلا بيه روح يلا	Express attitude
53	اي نعم	Agreement
54	روح انت بعد روح	Express attitude

From the table above, there are statistics regarding the mentioned functions. Expressing attitude is the most frequent function of all, which is 28 times. This is followed by agreement/cooperation, which takes place 7 times. Then, this is followed by response, which occurs 5 times. Then, there is a tie of 4 times for each for filler and opening marker. This is followed by lying, which only takes place 3 times. The least frequent ones occurred 1 for each; disagreement, turn taking, remembering and a combination of (expressing attitude + response) and (response + realization). Expressing attitude is therefore the dominant function of all in the table above.

4.4.2 The Functions of the DM Structure in American English Data:

There are a variety of functions in the American English data. The multifunctional DMs are mentioned in this paragraph in the equation of X+Y. The functions that were found in the mentioned data are:

expressing attitude, gaining time to think, cooperation/agreement, to signal the beginning of turn, turn taker and information indicator, to gain time to think and to express hesitation or doubt, opening marker, to emphasize a point, realization, to establish rapport, acknowledgement, Agreement and lying, agreement and expressing attitude, filler, To manage turn taking and exhibiting a mental state (distraction), To express attitude and persuading, disagreement, To emphasize a point and persuading, To gain time to think and exhibit a mental state of panicking, response and remembering.

Table (10): Functions of DM Structures in English

No.	Discourse Marker Structure	Function/Purpose
1	<i>Yeah, yeah, I know, I know.</i>	To express attitude
2	<i>Yeah, um...</i>	To gain time to think
3	<i>Good good good</i>	Expressing attitude
4	<i>Oh yeah alright</i>	cooperation
5	<i>Uh, so... so</i>	To signal the beginning of turn
6	<i>Hey hey hey</i>	Turn taker + Information Indicator
7	<i>So uh</i>	To signal the beginning of turn
8	<i>Well I guess</i>	To gain time to think + To express hesitation or doubt
9	<i>So uh</i>	Opening marker
10	<i>All right, but, uh,</i>	To emphasize a point
11	<i>I mean, seriously,</i>	To emphasize a point
12	<i>Oh oh oh</i>	Realization
13	<i>Hey, man, look.</i>	Establish Rapport
14	<i>I mean, you know,</i>	To emphasize a point

15	<i>Oh yeah</i>	Agreement
16	<i>Okay, well, it's, um...</i>	To gain time to think
17	<i>Yeah, and I mean, like,</i>	Agreement
18	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	Agreement + lying
19	<i>Hey, uh...</i>	To gain time to think
20	<i>Yeah yeah yeah</i>	Express attitude
21	<i>Oh yeah</i>	Acknowledgement
22	<i>Yeah, well, I guess</i>	To express attitude
23	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	Agreement
24	<i>Oh yeah yeah</i>	Agreement + Express attitude
25	<i>Okay well</i>	Express attitude
26	<i>Oh okay</i>	Acknowledgement
27	<i>Okay well</i>	Turn taking
28	<i>Hey, man</i>	Filler to grab attention
29	<i>Hey come on</i>	filler
30	<i>Hey, man</i>	filler
31	<i>Um yeah</i>	To manage turn taking + a mental state (distraction)
32	<i>Oh man</i>	To express attitude
33	<i>Come on man</i>	To express attitude + persuading
34	<i>Yeah, but, you know</i>	To emphasize a point + persuading
35	<i>Oh well</i>	Disagreement
36	<i>Yeah I mean</i>	To emphasize a point
37	<i>Yeah? Well</i>	Response
38	<i>So um um</i>	To gain time to think + mental state was a state of panicking
39	<i>Uh um</i>	To gain time to think + mental state was state of panicking
40	<i>Alright well</i>	Turn taker

41	<i>Oh oh</i>	Realization
42	<i>Alright then</i>	filler
43	<i>I know I know</i>	filler
44	<i>But uh</i>	filler
45	<i>Oh um</i>	response
46	<i>Yeah well</i>	cooperation
47	<i>Oh no. uh-uh. Uh-uh</i>	Disagreement
48	<i>Oh well</i>	Realization
49	<i>I know I know I know</i>	Agreement
50	<i>Okay okay</i>	Express attitude
51	<i>Yeah. I mean</i>	Agreement
52	<i>Oh alright</i>	Agreement
53	<i>Uh yeah</i>	Agreement
54	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	Agreement
55	<i>Yeah uh</i>	Agreement
56	<i>Oh yeah</i>	Agreement
57	<i>Okay um</i>	Express attitude
58	<i>Okay uh</i>	response
59	<i>Okay then damn</i>	Express attitude
60	<i>Uh huh? Uh</i>	Gain time to think
61	<i>Oh well</i>	realization
62	<i>So uh</i>	Hiding emotion
63	<i>So uh</i>	To signal beginning of a turn
64	<i>Oh yeah</i>	Agreement
65	<i>Oh yeah</i>	Agreement
66	<i>um... uhem... uh</i>	Trying to remember

From the table above, there are statistics regarding the mentioned functions. The most frequent DM is the agreement/cooperation of 14 times. This is followed by expressing attitude, which took place 9 times. This is then followed by 6 occurrences of fillers. Then, there is a tie of 4 times each for realization, gaining time to think and emphasizing a point.

Then, there is a tie of 3 times each for signalling the beginning of a turn and response. Then, there is a tie of 2 times each for turn taking, acknowledgement, disagreement and to gain time to think and exhibit a mental state of panicking. This is followed by a tie of 1 each for the least frequent; hiding emotion, remembering, opening marker, establishing rapport, to emphasize a point and persuading, to express attitude and persuading, to manage turn taking and exhibit a mental state (distraction), agreement and expressing attitude, agreement and lying, turn taker and Information Indicator, to gain time to think and to express hesitation or doubt.

4.5. Question Four: What are the similarities and differences between the DM functions in both Bahraini Arabic and American English data?

To answer this question, the frequency of repeated functions in both data is mentioned as well as the multifunctional DMs in both the data as well as analysing the duplicated DMs and examining the most frequent syntactic position in both the data and exploring expressing attitude and agreement as functions in both the data.

4.5.1 The Frequency of Repeated Functions in Bahraini Arabic Data

The repeated functions are: express attitude, response, agreement, filler, lying, opening frame marker and mental states. The table below examines the frequency of the mentioned functions in the mentioned data.

Table (11): Frequency of Repeated Functions in Arabic

Repeated Function	Frequency
Express Attitude	29

Response	6
Agreement / Cooperation	7
Filler	4
Lying	3
Opening Frame Marker	4
Mental states (remembering / persuading / realization	3

The highest frequency of repeated functions across the Arabic data is expressing attitude. This occurs 29 times, which in comparison to the other frequent repeated functions, is high. In the upcoming pages, there is a focus on this area where the study examines the use of those DMs to express attitude in a variety of ways.

4.5.2 The Frequency of Repeated Functions in the English Data

In the American English data, there are repeated functions. These functions are as follow: to express attitude, agreement/cooperation, disagreement, to gain time to think, signalling the beginning of turn, turn taking, realization, filler, acknowledgement, emphasizing a point, response, hiding emotion and mental states.

Table (12): Frequency of Repeated Functions in English

Repeated Function	Frequency
To Express Attitude	10
Agreement / Cooperation	16
Disagreement	2
To gain time to think	7

Signal beginning of turn / Opening marker	4
Turn Taking	4
Realization	4
Filler	6
Acknowledgement	2
Emphasize a Point / Persuading	6
Response	3
Hiding emotion / lying	2
Mental states (panicking / distracted)	2

From the repeated functions in the American English data, there are high frequencies registered in the table above. The highest is the frequency of 16 times, and it is the agreement/cooperation function. This is followed by expressing attitude, which occurs 10 times in the mentioned data.

4.5.3 The Multifunctional DMs in Bahraini Arabic Data

There are only two multifunctional DMs in the Arabic data. However, there are no repeated uses. This is shown in the table below.

Table (13): The Multifunctional DMs in Arabic

Multifunction	Frequency	Multifunctional DM
Response + Realization	1	ها اي لا لا
Express attitude + persuading	1	معليه معليه

The only multifunctional ones are (Response and realization) and (expressing attitude and persuading). This took place once each, which is low frequency. The examples in the table above are ها اي لا لا and معليه معليه.

4.5.4 The Multifunctional DMs in American English Data

In the English data, there was a variety of multifunctionality. However, there was only one repeated function in the ratio of 4:1 in comparison with the other multifunctional DMs each. The repeated multifunction is the cognitive functions; which are gaining time to think and in expression of the mental state such as hesitation or doubt or distraction or panicking.

Table (14): The Multifunctional DMs in English

Multifunction	Frequency	Multifunctional DM
Turn taker + Information Indicator	1	<i>Hey hey hey</i>
Agreement + lying	1	<i>Yeah yeah</i>
To gain time to think (cognitive) + To express mental state like hesitation or doubt or distraction or panicking	4	<i>Well I guess</i> <i>Um yeah</i> <i>So um um</i> <i>Uh um</i>
Agreement + Express attitude	1	<i>Oh yeah yeah</i>
To express attitude + persuading	1	<i>Come on man</i>
To emphasize a point + persuading	1	<i>Yeah but you know</i>

The difference between the multifunctional DMs in the Arabic and English data is that there is one in English data that occurs 4 times instead of just 1. Although the English data here share the occurrence of

multifunctional DMs once each, one of them challenges the odds. It is a cognitive function that is about gaining time to think while expressing a mental state. There are 4 examples to this so the states differ and are as such: hesitation, doubt, distraction and panicking. The examples from the table are as follow: *Well I guess, Um yeah, So um um, Uh um.*

4.5.5 Expressing Attitude as a Function in both Bahraini Arabic and American English Data:

This section will discuss expressing attitude as a function in Bahraini Arabic and then it will discuss expressing attitude as a function in American English.

4.5.5.a Expressing Attitude as a Function in Bahraini Arabic Data

Since expressing attitude was the dominant function in the Arabic data, this section examines the many examples of the highly occurrent previously mentioned function.

Table (15): DM Expressing Attitude in Arabic

No.	Discourse Marker Structure	DM Function
1	روح روح روح	Express attitude
2	اها بس اها	Express attitude
3	انزوين انزوين بس بس	Express attitude
4	يه روح	Express attitude
5	يلا روح	Express attitude
6	روح روح روح روح	Express attitude
7	يه يلا عاد	Express attitude
8	اسكت اسكت	Express attitude
9	بس بس بس بس	Express attitude

10	يه عين ابوه	Express attitude
11	لا لا	Express attitude
12	يه يه يه	Express attitude
13	لئيش عاد	Express attitude
14	معليه معليه	Express attitude + persuading
15	يلا عاد	Express attitude
16	بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
17	بل بل بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
18	بل بل بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
19	بل بل	Express attitude
20	بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
21	شدعوة عاد يه	Express attitude
22	بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
23	بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
24	عيل لا	Express attitude
25	بعد شلون	Express attitude
26	بل بل بل بل	Express attitude
27	عاد ها	Express attitude
28	يلا بية روح يلا	Express attitude
29	روح انت بعد روح	Express attitude

There are 29 examples of expressing attitude in the Bahraini Arabic data.

This is shown in the table above and will be discussed thoroughly in

upcoming sections. The examples are as follow: *افا بس افا*, *روح روح روح*,

بس, *اسكت اسكت*, *يه يلا عاد*, *روح روح روح روح*, *يلا روح*, *يه روح*, *انزين انزين بس بس*

بل بل, *بل بل بل بل*, *يلا عاد*, *معليه معليه*, *لئيش عاد*, *يه يه يه*, *لا لا*, *يه عين ابوه*, *بس بس بس*

بل بل بل بل, *بل بل بل بل*, *شدعوة عاد يه*, *بل بل بل بل بل بل*, *بل بل*, *بل بل بل بل بل بل*, *بل بل بل*

روح انت بعد روح, *يلا بية روح يلا*, *عاد ها*, *بل بل بل بل*, *بعد شلون*, *عيل لا*

The most frequently repetitive DM in this table is *بل* of 8 times in its variations. The

second most frequent DM here is *روح* of 6 times in its variations. This is

then followed by عاد with its variations occurring 5 times. The only one that is pure in repetition not joined with another DM out of these is the DM بل.

4.5.5.b Expressing Attitude as a Function in American English Data

Expressing attitude was not the most frequent function in the English data. The most frequent one in the mentioned data was agreement. However, expressing attitude in this data is the second highest frequency. This table is to register the examples for the sake of comparison between the Bahraini data and the American data in this aspect.

Table (16): DM Expressing Attitude in English

No.	Discourse Marker Structure	Function/purpose
1	<i>Yeah, yeah, I know, I know.</i>	To express attitude
2	<i>Good good good</i>	Expressing attitude
3	<i>Yeah yeah yeah</i>	Express attitude
4	<i>Yeah, well, I guess</i>	To express attitude
5	<i>Oh yeah yeah</i>	Agreement + Express attitude
6	<i>Okay well</i>	Express attitude
7	<i>Oh man</i>	To express attitude
8	<i>Come on man</i>	To express attitude + persuading
9	<i>Okay okay</i>	Express attitude
10	<i>Okay um</i>	Express attitude
11	<i>Okay then damn</i>	Express attitude

The table above shows 11 examples of expressing attitude as a function and as a part of a multifunction for the sake of having a number of examples to compare in the upcoming sections between the function in the two data. The examples are as follow: *Yeah yeah I know I know, Good good good, Yeah yeah yeah, Yeah well I guess, Oh yeah yeah, Okay well, Oh man, Come on man, Okay okay, Okay um, Okay then damn.*

4.5.6 Syntactic Positions in Bahraini Arabic Data

The table below shows the frequency of the occurrences of the syntactic positions of the DMs in Bahraini Arabic. This is to count how many times the DM was found in the beginning of an utterance or the middle or the end or was the whole utterance.

Table (17): Frequency of Syntactic Positions in Arabic

Syntactic Position in the Arabic Data	Frequency
Beginning	46
Middle	3
End	4
Whole Utterance	3

As the table shows, the most frequent syntactic position in the Arabic data is the beginning. This occurs 46 times out of 56.

4.5.7 Syntactic Positions in American English Data

The table below shows the frequency of the occurrences of the syntactic positions of the DMs in American English. This is to count how many times the DM was found in the beginning of an utterance or the middle or

the end or was the whole utterance. Both of the Arabic and English data shared the trait of the highest syntactic position being the beginning.

Table (18): Frequency of Syntactic Positions in English

Syntactic Position in the English Data	Frequency
Beginning	54
Middle	2
End	-
Whole Utterance	10

The table shows that the frequency of the highest syntactic position occurrence in the English data is 54 out of 66. This is in line with what was found in the Bahraini Arabic data. Both of the Arabic and English data have the most occurrence of DMs in the beginning of an utterance. Since most of the DMs in both data occurred in the beginning, this invites room for exploration and further comparison.

4.5.8 The Most Frequent Syntactic Position in Bahraini Arabic Data

The table below shows the number of times the DM was in the beginning of an utterance in the Arabic data. It shows all the information regarding the DMs that have the syntactic position mentioned, which was the most frequent in the mentioned data.

Table (19): The DMs in the Beginning of an Utterance in Arabic

No.	Discourse Marker	Syntactic Position	DM Type	DM Function
-----	------------------	--------------------	---------	-------------

	Structure			
1	روح روح روح	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
2	اي شعليك	Beginning	Interpersonal	Response
3	انزين انزين	Beginning	Textual	Turn taker
4	انزين معليه	Beginning	Interpersonal	cooperation
5	اي معليه خوش	Beginning	Interpersonal	cooperation
6	بل بل بل	Beginning	Textual	Filler
7	اي اي	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
8	انزين انزين بس بس	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
9	اي لا كلش	Beginning	Interpersonal	Disagreement
10	يه روح	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
11	يلا روح	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
12	بس عاد	Beginning	Textual	Opening marker
13	روح روح روح روح	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
14	بس بس	Beginning	Interpersonal	Response
15	بعدين هاك	Beginning	Textual	Opening marker
16	يه يلا عاد	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
17	بل بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Textual	Filler
18	يه اسكت	Beginning	Interpersonal	Cooperation
19	اسكت اسكت	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
20	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Textual	Filler
21	ها اي لا لا	Beginning	Interpersonal + cognitive	Response + Realization
22	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal	Response
23	بس بس بس بس	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
24	يلا خذ	Beginning	Textual	Opening marker
25	ها اي اي اي	Beginning	cognitive	Lying
26	انزين عيل	Beginning	interpersonal	response
27	يه عين ابوه	Beginning	interpersonal	Express attitude
28	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Textual	Filler
29	لا لا	Beginning	interpersonal	Express attitude
30	يه يه يه	Beginning	interpersonal	Express attitude

31	عاد ها	Beginning	Textual	Opening marker
32	ليش عاد	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
33	ها // اي اي	Beginning	cognitive	Lying
34	يلا عاد	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
35	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
36	بل بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
37	بل بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
38	اي اشوة	Beginning	Interpersonal	Response
39	ها اي صح صح	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
40	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
41	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
42	اي نعم	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
43	بل بل بل بل	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
44	عاد ها	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
45	اي نعم	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
46	روح انت بعد روح	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude

In the table above, the DMs that occur in the beginning are paired with their types and functions. The most frequent type in the table is interpersonal, which occurred 34 times and once joined with cognitive. This is followed with 9 occurrences of textual DMs. The least occurring DM in this table above is the cognitive type, which only happened twice.

Table (20): Types Frequency

From the table above, Table 19, this frequency table is extracted:

Type	Frequency
Express attitude	21
Response	6
Agreement	4

Filler	4
Opening marker	4
Cooperation	3
Lying	2
+ Realization	1
Disagreement	1
Turn taker	1

This table examines the frequency of the types present in table 19.

Table (21): The Frequency of Functions

This table shows the frequency of the functions found in table19.

Function	Frequency
Interpersonal	34
Textual	9
Cognitive	3
Interpersonal +	1

4.5.9 The Most Frequent Syntactic Position in American English Data

The table below shows the number of times the DM was in the beginning of an utterance in the English data. It shows all the information regarding the DMs that have the syntactic position mentioned, which was the most frequent in the mentioned data.

Table (22): The DMs in the Beginning of an Utterance in English

Discourse Marker Structure	Syntactic Position	Type of DM	Function/purpose
----------------------------	--------------------	------------	------------------

<i>Uh, so... so</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To signal the beginning of turn
<i>So uh</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To signal the beginning of turn
<i>Well I guess</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To gain time to think + To express hesitation or doubt
<i>So uh</i>	The beginning	Textual	Opening marker
<i>All right, but, uh,</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To emphasize a point
<i>I mean, seriously,</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To emphasize a point
<i>Oh oh oh</i>	The beginning	cognitive	Realization
<i>I mean, you know,</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To emphasize a point
<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
<i>Okay, well, it's, um...</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To gain time to think
<i>Yeah, and I mean, like,</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement + lying
<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	cognitive	Acknowledgement
<i>Yeah, well, I guess</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	To express attitude
<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
<i>Oh yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement + Express attitude
<i>Okay well</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
<i>Oh okay</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Acknowledgement
<i>Okay well</i>	The beginning	Textual	Turn taking
<i>Hey, man</i>	The beginning	Textual	Filler to grab attention
<i>Hey come on</i>	The beginning	Textual	filler
<i>Hey, man</i>	The beginning	Textual	filler

<i>Um yeah</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To manage turn taking + a mental state (distraction)
<i>Oh man</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	To express attitude
<i>Come on man</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	To express attitude + persuading
<i>Yeah, but, you know</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To emphasize a point + persuading
<i>Oh well</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Disagreement
<i>Yeah I mean</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To emphasize a point
<i>Yeah? Well</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Response
<i>So um um</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To gain time to think + mental state was a state of panicking
<i>Uh um</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To gain time to think + mental state was state of panicking
<i>Alright well</i>	The beginning	textual	Turn taker
<i>Oh oh</i>	The beginning	cognitive	Realization
<i>Alright then</i>	The beginning	textual	filler
<i>I know I know</i>	The beginning	textual	filler
<i>Oh um</i>	The beginning	interpersonal	response
<i>Yeah well</i>	The beginning	interpersonal	cooperation
<i>Oh no. uh-uh. Uh-uh</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Disagreement
<i>Oh well</i>	The beginning	Cognitive	Realization
<i>Okay okay</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
<i>Yeah. I mean</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
<i>Oh alright</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
<i>Uh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
<i>Yeah uh</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
<i>Okay um</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude

<i>Okay uh</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	response
<i>Uh huh? Uh</i>	The beginning	cognitive	Gain time to think
<i>Oh well</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal and cognitive	realization
<i>So uh</i>	The beginning	cognitive	Hiding emotion
<i>So uh</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To signal beginning of a turn
<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement

The most frequent DM type in the DMs occurring in the beginning in the English data, is the interpersonal DMs. This happens 26 times in the table, followed by the cognitive DMs, which happens 19 times in the table. The least frequent types here are the textual, which occurred 8 times, and an interpersonal cognitive DM that happened once. The similarity between the two tables is that the most frequent DM type is the interpersonal DMs. However, the cognitive DMs in the beginning in English are high, in comparison to the Arabic data.

4.5.10 Annotated Examples from the Samples

In this section, examples from both of the American English data and Bahraini Arabic data are examined. This section discusses the Expressing Attitude function in both of the data. It chose all the examples from the tables to examine what exactly are those attitudes expressed by the speakers.

4.5.11 Expressing Attitude in Bahraini Arabic

There are examples of utterances with Bahraini DMs from Tafash. They are discussed in this section. These examples are all about expressing

attitude. This section is dedicated to examine what are these attitudes that are expressed with the DMs.

Example1 Episode1

روح روح روح عيل تشك فيني انا هذي اخرتها يا جسم افا بس افا صج اني ما هجيتها منك

These two DMs, as previously mentioned, are used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is reprimanding/scold/tell off a friend.

Example2 Episode2

يطلع لنا بني و انت بالاس هني اكيد بيخاف و بيشرد

انزوين انزوين بس بس الواحد ما يتحجى وياك

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to shut down a conversation.

Example3 Episode 2

ما سمعت سالفه بو عذاري

يه روح انت وياه بعد احد يصدق بو عذاري بو عذاري من هذي الا بو سلاخ

لا انت ما تصدق باجر بوديك حقه و بخليك تسمع باذونك سالفه ويا اليناوة

يلا روح شبيسيوي يعني يخرعني

These two DMs, as previously mentioned, are used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to discredit the speaker.

Example4 Episode 2

طفاشو يلا دش شوف عمك بيه و انا بنطركم برع

روح روح روح روح دش يقولي مب داش

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to coerce the speaker into performing an action the speaker refrained from.

Example 5 Episode 4

اياني وياك تذرني في العين
يه يلا عاد لا تصير لي خواف

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to coerce the speaker into performing an action the speaker refrained from.

Example 6 Episode 5

وين رحت
اسكت / اسكت يا جسم حصلت لنا خوش شغلة لي و لك

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is expressing excitement and signal turn taking.

Example 7 Episode 6

ها شسويت رجعت بيزات الاوادم
رجعت بيزات الاوادم كلها و ما تمت عندي و لا بيزة حتى حق استكانة جاي ما عندي
بس بس بس بس لا تيب لي طاري الجاي كرهت الجاي و الي يشرب الجاي

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to shut down the conversation.

Example 8 Episode 14

احين فطرت انا
ااه عين ابوه طازك بماي انا

شتبي احد ايي حزة فطور

These two DMs, as previously mentioned, are used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to express the feeling of exaggeration felt towards the speaker from the other speaker.

Example 9 Episode 14

يه يه يه شحلياتج يا فريستنا

لا لا حلوة شغل عدل

These two DMs, as previously mentioned, are used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to express excitement.

Example 10 Episode 14

يه يمة المفروض انتي الي تعطينا مب احنا الي نعطي

ليش عاد بعطيكم و عطوني عيل الخلق ذي ببلاش

ما سويننا شي عزة الله

الطفشي معليه معليه انا بعطيها من سهمي انت قتلتي جم صار سهمي قبل

لك نص جيس و البقايا لي

These two DMs, as previously mentioned, are used to express attitude. The attitude in this context in the first mentioned DM is to provoke sympathy and object the second DM is to express sympathy in reply to the other speaker's DM.

Example 11 Episode 15

يه طفاشو افا عليك بس احين احنا ربع صاير جذي اناني

انا الاناني لو انتة تخليني اشيل بروحي ما اتيي تساعدني و اخرتها اصير انا الاناني

يلا عاد انت تكبر السالفة

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to shift blame.

Example 12 Episode 17

تحمل تحشر نفسك بيني و بين غلوم شله من انتة
بل بل بل اكلني اكلني غلوم خل الخبز بصوب برجع لك بعد شوي
السلام عليكم
سلامم حي الله بابا طفاش
بل بل بل بل بل شهاالفريج هذي كلش ما ينخش فيه شي
بل بل بل بل بل الطفشي شصاير
طلع عنده اهل

These three DMs, as previously mentioned, are used to express attitude. The attitude in this context of the first DM is to express the exaggeration felt towards the speaker from the other speaker. The attitude of the second DM is to express contempt towards the culture and small environment that leads to lack of privacy. The third DM is used to express confusion.

Example 13 Episode 21

الطفشي بو عذاري بو عذاري!
بل بل

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is upset and contempt felt towards the first speaker from the second one.

Example 14 Episode 23

اووف

بل بل بل سلم عالقل الناس تغني من الصبح مستانسة قول ياالله صباح خير

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is reprimanding a friend and expressing upset.

Example 15 Episode 24

طفاش:

جان ما بيت بعد ياتني النودة رقت و انا انطرك شدة عاديه

بو عذاري:

قولي راس و لا حنج

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to express objection.

Example 16 Episode 24:

ام عذاري:

الا اشوف يدك خالية وين الي وصيتك عليه

بو عذاري:

بل بل بل بدال ما تقولين لي الله يعطيك العافية شلونك شلون صحتك الله يبارك لك

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to express contempt and objection and upset towards the first speaker from the second.

Example 17 Episode 24:

جسوم/حين صبح اهي تسوي سحر و طبوب و لا تشلخ عالوادم و تقص عليهم

والله انا شدراني بس شكلها تشلخ تاخذ بيزات من عند الناس و تقول لهم انا اسوي لهم سحر
شعليك منها

اصلا كله خرطي في خرطي و لا في سحر و لا شي

بل بل بل يا جماعة تعاونوا من ابليس شفيكم لا اتبيون لي سواف السحر اهني في القهوة

This DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to change the topic and express fear.

Example 18 Episode 26

جسوم:

يه احين اذا الواحد ضايع وين تلاقيه؟

طفاش:

في بيتهم

جسوم:

بس اسكت عيل لا

بو داوود:

عدل لا بعد شلون

These two DMs, as previously mentioned, are used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is goofing around with friends and exhibit a sense of humour.

Example 19 Episode 27

تنزوج عليها وراح

بل بل بل بل

قطها مثل العنزة الجربانة

The DM, as previously mentioned, are used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to express shock and disbelief and fear and objection.

Example 20 Episode 29

سلوم بو تيلة و سلوم بو تيلة من هذي سلوم بو تيلة الي تعتد فيه
 عاد ها كلش و الا سلوم بو تيلة سلوم بو تيلة مات شهيد مو فنشوه و هو فقير
 يلا بية روح يلا

The DMs, as previously mentioned, are used to express attitude. The first DM's attitude in this context is to express objection and defence towards a fictional character from the speaker's web of lies. The second DM's attitude is to express disbelief and to discredit the other speaker regarding the existence of this character.

Example 21 Episode 30

خلك جريئ مثل ابوك كان جريئ
 روح انت بعد روح شفادته جرأته ابوي ما ذبحته الا جرأته

The DM, as previously mentioned, is used to express attitude. The attitude in this context is to dismiss the speaker's attempt to invoke bravery in the other speaker and to shut down the conversation.

From the examples above, we conclude that the attitude expressed with those DMs vary. This leads us to the table below examining the frequency of the attitude expressed with the mentioned DMs.

Table (23): Expressing Attitude in Bahraini Arabic

No.	Expressing Attitude	Frequency
1	reprimanding/scold/tell off	2
2	shut down a conversation	2
3	discredit the speaker	2
4	coerce the speaker into performing an action the speaker refrained from	2
5	expressing excitement and signal turn taking	3

6	express the feeling of exaggeration felt towards the speaker from the other speaker.	3
7	to provoke sympathy	1
8	express sympathy	1
9	Shift Blame	1
10	Express contempt	2
11	Express Confusion	1
12	Express Objection	2
13	Express both Contempt and Objection	1
14	Express fear and change topic	1
15	Express sense of humour	2
16	Express shock/disbelief with objection	1
17	Express Disbelief to discredit the speaker	1
18	Dismiss Speaker	1

From the table above, there are 18 different attitudes that were expressed with the mentioned DMs. The most frequent ones, with a tie of 3 frequency, are expressing excitement, to express the exaggeration felt towards the speaker and to express objection. The objections were a variety of combinations. There was objection alone, objection mixed with contempt and objection mixed with a shock and a sense of disbelief. All of the attitudes are extremely emotional and were done with extreme facial expressions and change of tone.

4.5.12 The Discussion of ﺃ in Tafash Season1

In this section, ﺃ is discussed in general and in its most frequent function, which is expressing attitude. ﺃ also serves other functions. 61.538% of those functions are expressing attitude, which is discussed below. The remaining functions are being used as empty fillers for 4 times and once as a response. ﺃ in general takes 24% of the DMs in Bahraini Arabic, and

it is the most frequent. When *bi* is used as a filler, it is 100% textual at all times. It is always interpersonal in the remaining functions. It is also worth mentioning that *bi* is always used in the beginning of an utterance or as a full utterance.

4.5.13 The Discussion of *bi* in Expressing Attitude

The DM *bi* is used 8 times in expressing attitude. There is a variety in using this DM as it can carry different meanings and perform in different contexts in the Bahraini Arabic dialect, according to the local series. This is shown in the table below.

Table (24): *bi* in Expressing Attitude in Arabic

No.	<i>bi</i> in Expressing Attitude	Frequency
1	change the topic and express fear	1
2	express contempt and objection	1
3	reprimanding a friend	1
4	express shock and disbelief and fear and objection	1
5	Express upset and contempt	2
6	to express the exaggeration felt towards the speaker from the other speaker	1
7	Express Confusion	1

bi is used in 7 ways. It is used to express confusion. It is used to express upset and contempt. It is used to express the exaggeration felt against the speaker. It is used to reprimand someone. It is used to express contempt while objecting. It is used to express shock while objecting. It is used express fear and change the topic. There is a rich field to investigate in this interesting DM in the Bahraini Arabic, which translates into “Yikes!”. This can lead to further documentation regarding this specific

DM in the mentioned dialect and this can lead to further studying and investigating by researches in the field of Linguistics.

4.5.14 Expressing Attitude in American English

In American English data, express attitude is scarce in comparison to the Bahraini Arabic data. For the sake of further contrast, this section explores the DMs that explore attitude in the American English data. There are 4 okay variations in the American English data expressing attitude and, equally, four variations of yeah. Below are all of the examples of expressing attitude from Everybody Hates Chris.

4.5.15 Examples from Everybody Hates Chris Season1

Example 1 Episode 1

but, Chris, don't fool around after school.

I need you to be here to let Drew and Tonya in, okay?

You won't be here?

No, I gotta work today.

But you know the drill.

Yeah, yeah, I know, I know.

In this example, the discourse markers “*Yeah, yeah, I know, I know.*” expresses boredom.

Example 2 Episode

Hey, baby. It's mommy.

Is your father up?

- Yep.

- *Good, good, good.*

Take his plate out of the refrigerator and put it in the oven for him

In this example, the discourse marker “*Good, good, good*” is used to express satisfaction and feeling of being pleased with a piece of information.

Example 3 Episode 5

But it's only down to the corner

Yeah yeah yeah

This example uses the DM “*Yeah yeah yeah*” to express boredom with the information. It suggests that the first speaker is nagging and it is used in the meaning of I heard you stop talking.

Example 4 Episode 5

Don't worry about it

Yeah, well, I guess

I'm going to go to bed, then.

The DMs “*Yeah, well, I guess*” is used in this context to express frustration.

Example 5 Episode 6

Hey, you know where

Lisa Patterson's party is?

Oh, yeah, yeah,

that's gonna be the jam.

Even though the DMs “*Oh, yeah, yeah*” is used as agreement, it is also to express attitude. It is acknowledgement and it is used to express excitement and familiarity.

Example 6 Episode 7

Do you want me

to make you some chicken?

Okay, well, I'm gonna

call Sheila's baby-sitter.

The DMs “*Okay, well*” is used to express attitude. It is used to establish a sense of authority and dominance.

Example 7 Episode 8

You spent our quarters?

I was thirsty

Oh man, we need those.

The DMs “*Oh man*” is used to express frustration in this context.

Example 8 Episode 9

Come on man who else will partner with me?

Chris it's not that I don't want to be your partner, it's just... I take my science very seriously

Yeah, but, you know, we could still have fun.

The DMs “*Come on man*” is used for persuasion and to express objection.

Example 9 Episode 17

Girl I haven't seen you since Cheryl's funeral

(sobbing)

I know I know I know

Grievy stop crying. Come on.

Okay okay let me go

The DM “*Okay okay*” is used to express fear in this context.

Example 10 Episode 19

I could tie your shoe

Nah I got it I can tie it with one hand

Okay um I could write out your homework

Here Chris is asking Drew if he needs help with things since he broke his hand

The DMs used in this context are used to express a state of panic and guilt and an eagerness to help.

Example 11 Episode 20

I know what to do with crazy glue

No. it's trickier than you might think. You might glue your fingers together. Let me do it.

Okay then damn.

Okay. Thank you. Okay.

The DMs “*Okay then damn*” are used to express a sense of exaggeration directed at the speaker.

These varieties of attitudes expressed by using the mentioned DMs, can be inserted into a table.

Table (25): Expressing Attitude in English

No.	Attitude Expressed/Social Situation	Frequency
1	Expressing boredom or redundancy to shut down a conversation	2
2	Satisfaction	1
3	Frustration	2
4	Excitement	1
5	Authority	1
6	Objection and persuasion	1
7	Fear	1
8	Guilt and emotional extensions of guilt	1
9	express a sense of exaggeration directed at the speaker.	1

The attitudes expressed vary in number but not so much in frequency. In general, it is concluded that in American English, the DMs are used to express emotional states in the function of expressing attitude the most. With that said, there are some similarities with the Bahraini Arabic entries regarding the function. The data crosses in expressing a sense of exaggeration directed at the speaker and in expressing objection. This can open further room for investigation in future studies.

4.5.16 Agreement in Bahraini Arabic

Agreement as a DM function in the Bahraini Arabic data is scarce and is not the highest in frequency. This section is included to be compared with the data collected from the American English, which has Agreement/Cooperation as the highest in frequency as a DM function. The data from the Bahraini Arabic is inserted into the table below.

Table (26): Agreement in Arabic

No.	Discourse Marker Structure	Syntactic Position	DM Type	DM Function
1	انزين معلية	Beginning	Interpersonal	cooperation
2	اي معلية خوش	Beginning	Interpersonal	cooperation
3	اي اي	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
4	يه اسكت	Beginning	Interpersonal	Cooperation
5	ها اي صح صح	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
6	اي نعم	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
7	اي نعم	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement

100% of the DM type for the mentioned function is interpersonal. 100% of those DMs share the syntactic position of being in the beginning of the utterance. There is a variety of DMs used for agreement such as انزين معلية, اي نعم, اي نعم, ها اي صح صح, يه اسكت, اي اي, اي معلية خوش.

4.5.17 Agreement in American English

Agreement is investigated due to the fact that it is the most frequent function in the American English data. The table below examines the cooperation/agreement DMs found in the American English data.

Table (27): Agreement in English

No.	Discourse Marker Structure	Syntactic Position	Type of DM	Function/purpose
1	<i>Oh yeah alright</i>	It was the whole utterance	Interpersonal	cooperation
2	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
3	<i>Yeah, and I mean, like,</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement

4	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement + lying
5	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
6	<i>Oh yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement + Express attitude
7	<i>Yeah well</i>	The beginning	interpersonal	cooperation
8	<i>I know I know I know</i>	The whole utterance	Interpersonal	Agreement
9	<i>Yeah. I mean</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
10	<i>Oh alright</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
11	<i>Uh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
12	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
13	<i>Yeah uh</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
14	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
15	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
16	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement

100% of the agreement DMs in English are interpersonal. 98% of those DMs are in the beginning of the utterance and 2% is the whole utterance. 87.5% of those DMs in the table are the Yeah variations. There is a wide similarity between the Bahraini Arabic and American English data in this

aspect. As mentioned earlier, 100% of the DM type is interpersonal in the provided agreement/cooperation table from the Bahraini Arabic data and 100% of the DMs in that table is in the beginning of an utterance.

Although the Agreement/Cooperation is not the most frequent function in the Bahraini data, unlike the American English, it shares the characteristics mentioned with it regarding the type of DM and syntactic position.

4.5.18 Discussion of Duplicated DMs as Equivalents in the Data

In Table 4, there are duplications both the American English and Bahraini Arabic data. Two of those DMs, yeah and okay, matched as equivalents that exist in both of the data. This gives room for exploration to examine Yeah and Okay in both of the languages for the sake of comparison.

4.5.18.a The Investigation of Yeah in American English

Yeah is found to be the most frequent DM, making 34.85% of the recorded DMs in the American English data. It occurs 23 times in the DM table extracted from the American English data mentioned. The table below shows the information regarding the DM yeah recorded.

Table (28): Yeah Pairing in DM Structures in English

No.	Discourse Marker Structure	Syntactic Position	Type of DM	Function/purpose
1	<i>Yeah, yeah, I know, I know.</i>	It was the whole utterance	Interpersonal	To express attitude
2	<i>Yeah, um...</i>	It was the whole utterance	cognitive	To gain time to think

3	<i>Oh yeah alright</i>	It was the whole utterance	Interpersonal	cooperation
4	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
5	<i>Yeah, and I mean, like,</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
6	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement + lying
7	<i>Yeah yeah yeah</i>	The whole utterance	Interpersonal	Express attitude
8	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	cognitive	Acknowledgement
9	<i>Yeah, well, I guess</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	To express attitude
10	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
11	<i>Oh yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement + Express attitude
12	<i>Um yeah</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To manage turn taking + a mental state (distraction)
13	<i>Yeah, but, you know</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To emphasize a point + persuading
14	<i>Yeah I mean</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To emphasize a point
15	<i>Yeah? Well</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Response
16	<i>Yeah well</i>	The beginning	interpersonal	cooperation
17	<i>Yeah. I mean</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement

18	<i>Uh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
19	<i>Yeah yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
20	<i>Yeah uh</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
21	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
22	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
23	<i>Oh yeah</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement

There is a variety of the type of DM and the functions. However, *Yeah* comes in the beginning of an utterance 98% of the time and the rest of 2% it is the whole utterance. It only comes as an interpersonal DM or a cognitive one. *Yeah* comes as an interpersonal DM in this table 78.26% of the time, while it comes as a cognitive DM 21.739% of the time. This DM serves a variety of functions in this table. It came to use for the sake of agreement, to emphasize a point, as a response, to manage turn taking, to express attitude, to acknowledge and to gain time to think. *Yeah*, therefore, is multifunctional according to the context it is present in and it can serve a variety of functions. *Yeah* is paired with other discourse markers in structures such as *oh, uh, I mean, well, but you know, um, and, I know*.

4.5.18.b The Investigation of *ي* in Bahraini Arabic

ي is not the most frequent used DM in the Bahraini data, however, this section is required for the sake of comparison. The table below marks the entries of this DM in the Bahraini Arabic.

Table (29): /اي/ in Bahraini Arabic

No.	Discourse Marker Structure	Syntactic Position	DM Type	DM Function
1	اي شعليك	Beginning	Interpersonal	Response
2	اي معلية خوش	Beginning	Interpersonal	cooperation
3	اي اي	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
4	اي لا كلش	Beginning	Interpersonal	Disagreement
5	اي اي تدري عاد	End	cognitive	Lying
6	ها اي لا	Beginning	Interpersonal + cognitive	Response + Realization
7	ها اي اي اي	Beginning	cognitive	Lying
8	اي اي	Middle	cognitive	Remembering
9	ها اا اي اي	Beginning	cognitive	Lying
10	اي اشوة	Beginning	Interpersonal	Response
11	ها اي صح صح	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
12	اي نعم	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement
13	اي نعم	Beginning	Interpersonal	Agreement

The only feature that /اي/ shares with yeah in this situation is the fact that they come as either interpersonal or cognitive. This comes with an exception for /اي/ that comes once as an interpersonal and cognitive DM at the same time in the Bahraini Arabic. /اي/ comes in a variety of syntactic positions and with a variety of functions. The DM comes for the functions of agreement, response, lying, remembering, realization, disagreement and agreement.

4.5.18.c Okay in American English

Table (30): Okay in American English

No.	Discourse Marker Structure	Syntactic Position	Type of DM	Function/purpose
1	<i>Okay, well, it's, um...</i>	The beginning	cognitive	To gain time to think
2	<i>Okay well</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
3	<i>Oh okay</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Acknowledgement
4	<i>Okay well</i>	The beginning	Textual	Turn taking
5	<i>Okay okay</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
6	<i>Okay um</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
7	<i>Okay uh</i>	The beginning	Interpersonal	response
8	<i>Okay then damn</i>	The whole utterance	Interpersonal	Express attitude

Okay is the second highest in frequency after *Yeah* in the American English data. It came 99% of the time in the beginning of an utterance and only once was it the whole utterance. The types of this DM have varied and so did the functions. *Okay* came to express attitude, for turn taking, as a response, to acknowledge and to gain time to think

4.5.18.d *النرين* in Bahraini Arabic

النرين is not a dominating DM in frequency. It has been chosen to be discussed in this section as the equivalent of *Okay*, that was present in

table 4 discussing the DM Duplication. As previously discussed, the only matching DMs in this table across languages are *انزین*, *اي*, *okay* and *Yeah*.

Table (31): *انزین* in Bahraini Arabic

No.	Discourse Marker Structure	Syntactic Position	DM Type	DM Function
1	<i>انزین انزین</i>	Beginning	Textual	Turn taker
2	<i>انزین معلیه</i>	Beginning	Interpersonal	cooperation
3	<i>انزین انزین بس بس</i>	Beginning	Interpersonal	Express attitude
4	<i>انزین عیل</i>	Beginning	interpersonal	response

The table examines the only uses of *انزین*. It has been purely repeated twice and the rest it is paired with other DMs. *انزین* has been paired with *معلیه*, which means ‘it’s ok’. It has also been paired with *بس*, which means ‘enough’. Finally, it is paired with *عیل* which means ‘then’ as in ‘alright, then’. The small number of the occurrences of this DM has always been in the beginning, but there is not enough data to conclude that it is definite. There is a variety of the types of this DM in its occurrences as well as its functions. So far it has been used for cooperation, as a response, to express attitude and as a turn taker.

4.6 Question Five: Would a Bahraini sample match the results of the most frequent DM found in the Bahraini Television series?

To answer this question, 16 Bahrainis were interviewed. Half of them were men and the other half are women. The locals were asked to respond vocally to social situations extracted from Tafash Season1. Below is the discussion of the results of those interviews.

4.6.1 The Interviews Results

Audio interviews were recorded with Bahrainis using the situations in Tafash Season1 that were listed under the express attitude function examples. The participants were asked to answer accordingly to what they would say in the 16 situations that were required for them to react to, in informal settings. Those 16 situations are stated in the appendices. The DMs were then extracted from the interviews and put in this table below. Surprisingly, the most frequent DM in the interviews is not *يا* and it does not match the Bahraini episodes. The most frequent DM in the sample is *عاد*. Both of the males and females expressed with DMs in some of the situations, but expressed with words in others. The females portrayed a variety of DMs in their speech. Some of those females had multiple DMs and gave two preferences as their personal answer. Some of those females used two DMs structures in one answer separated by words. It is worth mentioning that some locals did not use discourse markers when answering, so it is natural that those answers were not analysed as part of this study.

Table (32): DM Structures in Interview

Social Informal Situation	Structures with DMs Used by Males	Structures with DMs Used by Females
Situation1 – Persuasion	يا عاد يا الذيب	يا
	يا عاد يا	يا يا يا
	فوقه فوقه	يا عاد يا انت قدها يا
		يا عاد عشان خاطري

	خلك هاب ربح يلا عاد	امش يلا خنسويها يلا شفيها الدنيا يلا عاد امشي امشي امشي يلا يلا جدام جدام جدام الجدماني يلا عاد
Situation2 - Interrupting	هاااا ابيي كملل اسكت اسكت اسكت عني اسكت والله فلة و بعدين؟ من صجك دقيقة انزين و بعدين	لحظة لحظة لحظة انزين انزين انزين خل اقول لحظة لحظة لحظة شوي عاد عطني فرصة شوي اتكلم ايييييي صح و بعد بقولج اي لحظة لحظة لحظة لا لا لا لحظة لحظة بقولج بقولج لحظة
Situation3 – Expressing a Sense of Exaggeration Towards Speaker	بيبييه سوا من الحبة دبة فكني يلا بللل انتته عاد قمبالجي ما نخلص عاد فارجني أأأأ	اوه اوه اوه اوه أأأأ قوبش جنك بالغت شوي أأأأه الله اكبر يلا عاد مو لهدرجة لا لا مو جدي مو جدي لا تجذبن لا لا لا لا والله مب جدي لا لا لا شدةوة لا

	ما نخلص؟ فكني يلا	
Situation4 – Provoking Sympathy	عاد انت مكانك في القلب عاد بو فلان ولي يسلمك اذا عليك بس اذا عليك عاد قول شي عني يا الطرح زين ابد كل شي مب زين او هووو	ابييه شفتي شلون والله ارجووك ارجووك يلا عاد يلا عاد والله يعني؟ - مادري والله يعني جي من صجي - من صجي والله ما عرف والله أأأأأأ شدة عود عاد
Situation5 - Extending Sympathy	عاد كل شي الا انت يا الاخر	اووووه/ ااه /ابيبي ويبي ويبي اية عليج - وويبي معليه معليه معليه - ما يخالف ما يخالف ما يخالف
Situation6 – Defending Self from Blame	جوف نفسك انت قبل ترى كلن يشوف الناس بعين طبعه	اي اي اي اي اي اممم انزين انزين او كي اممم يه الي بسمعه يتكلم يقول انه بريء مو مسوي شي الحين

		بالللال طلعت خرطي
Situation9 – General Objecting	لالالا مو مقبول افاا لالالالا لا ما يصير هلون بيبييه طل	هااا؟ لا لا لا لا لا هي هي لالالا كلش غلط مب عدل استغفر الله لا حول و لا قوة الا بالله ما عرف والله ما عرف مادري يعني انا ما حس ان يعني هلون مثل ما تقولين لا لا لا ما حس جذي ما افكر هلون
Situation10 – Reprimanding	افاا افاا الله يا الدنيا افا	اوه اوه اوه اوه يعنيي؟ انا جذي جذي جذي؟ روح يلا روح هناك ما توقعتك جذي هذي جوك يعني يلا او من صجك لا عاد ليش يعني ليش ليش يعني جذي
Situation11 – Confronting a Liar	اي هذي قملة عاد هذي الصراحة قملة عودة بااااا شوي شوي اكي الطوفة تشلخت على هالعبيب	اوله لا عاد – أأ – امبله صدقتك – ههاي عاد جوف عاد مصختها ترى عاد يبين ان شلخ مصختها أأأأ الله اكبر سيووو سيووو صوار يخ صوار يخ السقف لا يطيح امممم شها العيارة شها الجذب شها الشلخ

		ههههه بسك عاد يلا عاد
Situation12 – Closing a Conversation in Frustration	تراك غثيته نبحتنه عاد سكر السالفة بل بل بل لوعت جبدنه بس انطم انطم	يلا يلا يلا يلا ام ام ام انزين انزين او كي او كي او كي او كي امهمهم انزين بس او كي او كي بجوف بحوف انا بخليك الحين شوي بس و اتصل لك عندي شغلة ضرورية استغفر الله او الصمت او لا حول و لا قوة الا بالله بعد شنسوي او كي
Situation13 – Expressing Confusion	عطني الزبدة عاد عطني الزبدة	ها أأأ ما فهمت أأأ قصدك جدي جدي؟ ها؟ اشارات جسدية مب فاهمة و ارفع حواجبي او اضحك وايد او اقول بعد ما عرف والله بعد مادري والله شلون هلون
Situation14 – Changing the Subject Due to Fear	تري في صبيان يخافون لالا ما في شي هناك بس تقعد تطلع عليه انت	أأأ وي انزين بس خلاص خلاص خل نصك الموضوع بس بس بس وي بس خلاص خلاص خلاص

	ببس بس بس غير الموضوع غير الموضوع بدبت اخاف ترى بسة بسة لا لا بس غير غير الموضوع انزين زين أأأ خنغير الموضوع – شرايكم في ذي الشي – شرايكم في ذي المطعم انزين	بالل قوم منالك اقول صب لنا جويهة ابرك لنا من هالسوالف غير الموضوع ترى
Situation15 – Dismissing Speaker	بل اي روح روح عطني مقفالك بلا عطني مقفالك بل بل بل بل بل	ام انزين انشغلت و الصمت بلا بامشي انا خلاص بامشي ها بلا لا لا بس سكر السالفة بس معليه صكي الموضوع – انزين بس صكي الموضوع شهست هلون بعد – شخبار الدنيا او الصمت اوكي
Situation16 – Reacting to Casual Threat	معليه معليه لا عالاد قوم قوم منالك انتة ما تيوز يا جليل الحيا معليه معليه بسيطة	هيه بنشوف وي كلش انزين اوكي على كيفك لا لا ببة لا رايحة رايحة انا خر عتني عاد اي عاد شهست شورانه اشبالك ترى سندر تنا نبجة عاد

situation used by both the genders. For the males, there is *تري* twice and *لا* as well. For the females, they share the *لا* in the variety *لا لا لا*. The same speaker uses another DM structure in the same utterance; *بس بس بس تري*, *انزين*. The females also use *انزين* *لا لا لا* *انغير الموضوع* *وي انزين بس خلاص خلاص خلاص خل نصك الموضوع بس بس بس وي بس خلاص خلاص خلاص*. This table concludes that the DM *انزين* is the most common with females in this situation. Situation 15 has a variety of DMs. *بل بل بل* is used once by a male. The males also use it once more without repetition. They also use *اي روح روح* and *يلا*. The DM *يلا* is also used by a female; *يلا بامشي انا خلاص بامشي ها يلا*. *انزين* is used twice by the females in *بس معليه صكي الموضوع – انزين بس صكي الموضوع* *او كي*. The females also used *ام انزين انشغلت* and *شهست هلون بعد – شخبار الدنيا* and *لا لا بس سكر السالفة*.

In Situation 16, *معليه* is used thrice by three different speakers in the male category. This is in *معليه معليه*, *معليه بسيطة* and *معليه*. The females do not use this DM in this situation. The only DM that repeats itself in the female category is *اي عاد شهست شورانه* and *نبة عاد* and *خرعتني عاد* in *عاد*. This DM only appears once in the male category; *لا عاد*. The females also used *هيه* and *هوي كلش انزين او كي*, *على كيفك لا لا بية لا رايحة رايحة انا*, *اشبلاك تري سندرنا* *قوم قوم منالك انتة ما*. The only remaining DM that is used by males is *تيوز يا جليل الحيا*. It is worth noting that across the Bahraini data in the recorded interviews in general, there were many DMs that share the meaning ‘Go away’. These DMs, other than *قوم قوم مناك*, are *اي روح روح*, *روح منالك* and *روح يلا روح هناك*, *بالاال قوم منالك*.

4.6.2 The DM *عاد* in the Bahraini Interviews

Table (33): عاد as a Bahraini DM

Situations	DM عاد	Frequency
Situation1 – Persuasion	يلا عاد يا النيب يلا عاد يلا خلك هاب ريح يلا عاد يلا عاد يلا انت قدها يلا يلا عاد عشان خاطري امش يلا خنسويها يلا شفيها الدنيا يلا عاد امشي امشي امشي يلا عاد	7
Situation2 - Interrupting	لحظة لحظة شوي عاد عطني فرصة شوي اتكلم	1
Situation3 – Expressing a Sense of Exaggeration Towards Speaker	ما نخلص عاد فارجني يلا عاد مولهدرجة لا لا مو جذي مو جذي لا تجذبين	2
Situation4 – Provoking Sympathy	عاد انت مكانك في القلب ارجووك ارجووك يلا عاد يلا عاد	6

	عاد بو فلان ولي يسلمك عاد قول شي عني يا الطرح زين ابد كل شي مب زين أأأأ شدعوة عاد	
Situation5 - Extending Sympathy	عاد كل شي الا انت يا الاخو	1
Situation6 – Defending Self from Blame	لا عاد شدعوة ما لا ما ما يطلع مني لا لا ما يصير تو لا ما اتوقع	1
Situation7 – Objecting While Feeling Upset	بالل لا تشلخ عاد لا عاد	2
Situation10 – Reprimanding	لا عاد ليش يعني ليش ليش يعني جدي	1
Situation11 – Confronting a Liar	اي هذي قملة عاد هذي الصراحة قملة عودة لا عاد عاد جوف عاد مصختها ترى عاد يبين ان شلخ مصختها بسك عاد	5

frequently paired with **عاد**, which was 11 times. 7 out of those 11 times were to persuade a friend. The second most frequently paired DM with **بى** is **ي**. This occurred 5 times in different situations.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion and Recommendations

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion and Recommendations

5.0 Introduction

This chapter concludes the thesis by summarizing the main findings of the research and recommending future studies in this field. Several limitations and delimitations influenced the research process and outcomes. Firstly, the recruitment of participants posed a significant challenge, resulting in a smaller sample size of 16 volunteers. Despite efforts to increase participant numbers, time constraints limited further recruitment, impacting the diversity and representativeness of the sample. Additionally, the data collection method presented challenges, particularly with the main data source consisting of the first season of two television series. Analysing discourse markers within the episodes required extensive replaying, which was time-consuming and impractical. As a result of all limitations mentioned, the scope of the analysis may have been limited, and certain variations of discourse markers may not have been fully captured. Future research should address these constraints and enhance the validity and reliability of the study. The delimitations of this study consist of the fact that soliloquy and monologue are ignored. This is to achieve the goal of narrowing the scope and providing more focus to the study, and as a result, only the DMs in social interactions are chosen within the range of the mentioned phenomenon. This research has value of being one of the many steps towards further future documentation of the Bahraini dialect in general and of the Bahraini

discourse markers specifically through focusing on the mentioned phenomenon.

5.1. Summary of the Results

The study attempted to answer five questions. The first four questions aimed to compare between Bahraini Arabic data and American English data using television series to document the discourse markers in an attempt to compare and further document the Bahraini DMs. The last question's aim was to further solidify the results of the most frequent Bahraini DM used and to test whether the results of the interviews with the sample match the results of the analysis of the Bahraini television series. The reported results of the findings in Chapter Four indicate that there is a difference between the most frequent DM in Bahraini Arabic data and American English data as well as a difference between the most frequent DM in Bahraini episodes versus the Bahraini people in real life. In the Bahraini series, *بل* was the most frequent DM, in real life, *عاد* was the most frequent DM. It is worth mentioning that papers on the Arabian Gulf discourse markers are scarce. The Arabian Gulf countries share similar dialects that differ from the rest of the Arab world. *بل* and *عاد* are rarely used if used by Arabs who do not come from the Gulf. However, Arabs do share other discourse markers such as *ta:lʃ* and *Yaʃni*.

5.2 Implications

This chapter aimed to conclude the current thesis. The study started with providing a summary of the findings, and then explained thoroughly the major limitations and delimitations encountered by the researcher, all followed by a number of recommended future researches.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the results of this research, several recommendations are made. Further research could be conducted on the Bahraini discourse markers *عاد* and *بل*. It would also be worthwhile to conduct studies to investigate the different dialects within Bahrain and their different usage of the discourse markers and the functions that come with them. More efforts

are also needed for documenting the expressing attitude function in the mentioned dialect.

References

Aijmer, K. (2013). *Understanding Pragmatic Markers: A Variational Pragmatic Approach*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748635511>

Alami, M. (2015). Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: A Review of Related Literature. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 3(3), 1-10.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283498166_Pragmatic_Functions_of_Discourse_Markers_A_Review_of_Related_Literature

Al-Khalidy, H. O. (2017). The Discourse Analysis and Pragmatic meanings of ta:lʃ in Jordanian Spoken Arabic. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(4), 22. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n4p22>

Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation: a relevance-theoretic approach to the language of adolescents*. J.

Benjamins. <https://benjamins.com/catalog/pbns.84>

Blanchard, M., & Buysse, L. (2021). Like in Discourse Marker Combinations in Spoken Interaction. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 5(4), 463–485. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-021-00105-4>

Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic Markers in English*. DE GRUYTER MOUTON: Berlin; New York

https://books.google.com.bh/books?id=CL_TMpaMsdcC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge University Press.

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/using-language/4E7EBC4EC742C26436F6CF187C43F239>

Covolan, E. (2021). *Discourse Markers in TV Series: The Issue of Authenticity in Scripted Dialogue*. (Thesis) University of Padua, Padua, Italy.

https://thesis.unipd.it/retrieve/3161c553-e4b9-4c48-950f-1cb11601d6f9/Covolan_Eleonora.pdf

Crible, L. (2020). Weak and Strong Discourse Markers in Speech, Chat, and Writing: Do Signals Compensate for Ambiguity in Explicit Relations? *Discourse Processes*, 57(9), 793–807.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853x.2020.1786778>

Crible, L., & Pascual, E. (2020). Combinations of discourse markers with repairs and repetitions in English, French and Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 156, 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.05.002>

Cuenca, M. J. (2013). *The fuzzy boundaries between discourse marking and modal marking*. *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles*, 191–216. John Benjamins: Amsterdam
https://www.academia.edu/26254675/2013_The_fuzzy_boundaries_between_discourse_marking_and_modal_marking_Degand_L_Cornillie_B_Pietrandrea_P_eds_Discourse_Markers_and_Modal_Particles_Categorization_and_description_John_Benjamins_Amsterdam_181_216_Draft_version

Eckle-Kohler, J., Kluge, R., & Gurevych, I. (2015). *On the Role of Discourse Markers for Discriminating Claims and Premises in Argumentative Discourse*. *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
<https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/d15-1267>

Farahani, M. V., & Ghane, Z. (2022). Unpacking the function(s) of discourse markers in academic spoken English: a corpus-based study. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-022-00005-3>

Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(3), 383–398.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/245296163_An_approach_to_discourse_markers

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 931–952. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166\(98\)00101-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(98)00101-5)

Fraser, B. (2013). Combinations of Contrastive Discourse Markers in English. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 5(2), 318–340.

<https://doi.org/10.1163/18773109-13050209>

Fritz, E. (2007). *Discourse Markers*. Grin Verlag.

https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9783640466214_A19422603/preview-9783640466214_A19422603.pdf

Gabrys, M. (2017). *Like as a discourse marker in different varieties of English* (Master's Thesis). The Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium.

https://dial.uclouvain.be/memoire/ucl/fr/object/thesis%3A11925/datastream/PDF_01/view

Ismail, S., Sarudin, A., Osman, Z., Redzwan, H., & Othman, W. (2020). Distribution of Discourse Markers Elements or Discourse Particle as an Entity Relationship in Discourse. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*. <file:///C:/Users/dell/Downloads/3062-Article%20Text-5920-1-10-20201217.pdf>

Lee, J. (2019). Functional Spectrum of a Discourse Marker so in Korean EFL Teacher Talk. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 19(3), 371–406. <http://journal.kasell.or.kr/xml/21082/21082.pdf>

Maschler, Y., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). *Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning, and Context*. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 189–221.

John Wiley & Son, Hoboken, New Jersey.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194.ch9>

Mlakar, I., Rojc, M., Majhenič, S., & Verdonik, D. (2021). Discourse markers in relation to non-verbal behavior. *Gesture*, 20(1), 103–134.

<https://doi.org/10.1075/gest.20018.mla>

Mobarki, Y. (2018). *Exploring the Linguistic and the Discourse-pragmatic Functions of Arabic Yaʿni in a Novel Context of Language Use*. (Thesis) Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, United States.
<https://keep.lib.asu.edu/items/156816>

Mohammed, S. J., & Ahmed, M. B. (2019). Discourse Markers Functions in Social Interviews. *Journal of Tikrit University for the Humanities*, 25(1), 353–374. <https://jtuh.tu.edu.iq/index.php/hum/article/view/397>

Pallotti, G. (2007). *Conversation Analysis: Methodology, machinery and application to specific settings*. In H. Bowles & P. Seedhouse (eds) *Conversation Analysis and Language for Specific Purposes*. Bern: Peter Lang: New York.
https://www.academia.edu/6143195/Pallotti_G_2007_Conversation_Analysis_Methodology_machinery_and_application_to_specific_settings_In_H_Bowles_and_P_Seedhouse_eds_Conversation_Analysis_and_Language_for_Specific_Purposes_Bern_Peter_Lang

Ramadhani, S. (2017). Recognizing Discourse Markers as One of the Essential Components for Assisting Students in Acquiring Natural English Communication. Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT 2017). *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, Atlantis Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/iselt-17.2017.24>

Schiffrin, D. (1988). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press: Washington DC.
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/discourse-markers/A03E5F3A2E1A32F803256EF79F37374E>

Appendices

Appendices I (Recorded Interviews Transcript):

The interviewees were asked about their verbal reactions when being in social situations that were extracted from the Tafash Season1 express attitude examples.

The script that was handed to them:

في كلمات بالبحريني تنقال في وسط السياق حق التعبير عن المشاعر مثل بل ، افا ، روح هناك ، يه ، يلا عاد ، انزين، بس عين ابوه ، لالا ، آه ، اوه ، معلية ، عيل شلون... عيل ، يلا يبة، الخ

طبعا في كلمات بحرينية اكثر من ذلين بس هذي مجرد امثلة و كلها كلمات ما نعليها بالشكل الحرفي كثر ما ان احنا نخليها نوع التعبير عن المشاعر هدف المقابلة الصوتية تحديد هذي الكلمات المستخدمة من البحرينيين الي يستخدمونها مع الاهل و الاصدقاء في جو غير رسمي في ١٦ موقف

هويتك و اجوبتك بتكون سرية و مجهولة و ما راح يتم عرض التسجيل الصوتي فقط النتائج العامة الكلية مكتوبة اما التسجيل فهو خاص باللجنة و مشاركتك بتساهم في بحث محلي لتسجيل جانب من اللهجة البحرينية و الوقت المتوقع ٥ دقائق حق تخلص قول لنا شنو التعبير الي انت شخصيا تستخدمه في هذي الحالات و اتمنى تسجيل الصوت و ارساله - البحرينيين فقط

هذيلين اهم ال ١٦ موقف... شبتقول؟

1. لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تنبيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
2. لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس

- ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يبالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي
يعني
4. انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك
5. انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك
6. انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
7. تعبر عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
8. تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدك من شخص
9. انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام
10. لن تعاتب صديقك
11. تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ
12. تقفل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل
13. انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه
14. اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سؤالف ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع
15. تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
16. ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني

Participant1 – Female

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبنيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
يلا

لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس

لحظة لحظة لحظة

ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يبالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني

اوه اوه اوه اوه

انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك

صح لا؟

انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك

وياك وياك

انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو

اي اي اي اي اي

تعبّر عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي

اذلف

تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدّمك من شخص

الله يا الدنيا

انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام

كراهاات

لن تعاتب صديقك

اوه اوه اوه اوه

تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ

اوله

تقلل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل

يلا يلا يلا يلا

انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه

ها

اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سؤالف ينانوة شلون تغيّر الموضوع

أأأأ

تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك

صوت توتوتوتوتو

ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني

هيه بنشوف

Participant 2 – Male

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبنيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي

تكفى

لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس

لا يوجد

ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يببالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني

أأأأه

انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك
او هووو
انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك
لا يوجد
انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
او هوووو
تعبير عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
شدعوة
تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدك من شخص
او ففففف
انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام
لا يوجد
لن تعاتب صديقك
الله يا الدنيا
تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ
بسك تطير صواريخ
تقلل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل
عندي شغل
انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه
لا يوجد
اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سؤالف ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع
غير الموضوع ترى
تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
غير الموضوع
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
على راحتك

Participant 3 - Female

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبينه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي

لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس
انزين انزين انزين خل اقول
ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يببالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني
أأأأ

اوووووه/ اااه/ اایییی

هالاہ؟ لا

لا عاد – أأ – امبلة صدقتك - ههاي

أأأ ما فهمت أأ قصدك جزي جزي؟

خلاص خلاص

تعبيرك لما تبني تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
ام انزين انشغلت و الصمت
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
وي كلش انزين او كي

Participant 4 – Female

[illegible]

رد رد رد عيد كلامك ما فهمت شقاع تقول رد رد عيد الموضوع مب فاهمة لك شنتول
اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سولف ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع
بس بس بس غير الموضوع غير الموضوع بديت اخاف ترى
تعبيرك لما تبني تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
يلا بامشي انا خلاص بامشي ها يلا
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روعة او اي شي يعني
على كيفك لا لا بية لا رايحة رايحة انا

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبنيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
يلا عاد عشان خاطري

لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس
مسامحة قاطعتج

ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يببالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني
أاأاه الله اكبر

انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك
يلا عاد

انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك
ويلبي

انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم وجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
أنا؟ الله اكبر عليج الا انتي

تعبر عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
لا لا لا لا لا شذوة كلش لا

تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدمك من شخص
الله اكبر

انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام
لا لا لا

لن تعتابب صديقك
يلا او من صحك

تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ

أأأ الله اكبر

تقفل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل

بس بس بس صكر الموضوع لو عت جبدي

انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه

ها؟ ما فهمت شي – شنو؟

اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سوالف ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع

يمة يمة لا لا لا بس غير غير الموضوع

تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك

لا لا بس سكر السالفة

ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني

خر عتني عاد

Participant 6 – Female

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبنيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي

امش يلا خنسويها يلا شفيها الدنيا يلا عاد امشي امشي امشي

لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس

اييبيبي صح و بعد بقولج اي لحظة لحظة لحظة

ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يببالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني

يلا عاد مو لهدرجة لا لا لا مو جذي مو جذي لا تجذبين

انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك

جوفيني تراني مسكينة انا فقير و

انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك

ويبي اية عليج – وويبي

انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو

هي هي هي مو صج لا تجذبين انتي تعيرين

تعبر عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي

أأأه شدةوة مو لهدرجة ترى

تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدمك من شخص

ماصدق مو من صجج مب عدل لا لا لا كلش مب عدل ماصدقج

انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام
لا هي هي لالا لا كلش غلط مب عدل
لن تعاتب صديقك
جوفي يا فلانة الي سويتيه مب عدل مب صحيح
تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ
سيووو سيووو صواريخ صواريخ السقف لا يطيح اممم شهاالغياره شهاالغذب شهاالشلخ
تقفل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل
مسامحة عندي شغلة انكمل موضوعنا بعدين
انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه
لحظة لحظة انا فهيت ما كنت وياكم عالخط شسالفه
اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سوافل ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع
بس سكتي سكتي سكتي صكي الموضوع
تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
بس معليه صكي الموضوع – انزين بس صكي الموضوع
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
بالطفاق او كي مابي مو لازم مو شرط

Participant 7 – Female

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبنيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
يلا يلا جدام جدام الجدماني
لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس
لا لا لا لحظة لحظة بقولج بقولج لحظة
ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يببالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني
لا لا لا لا والله مب جذي لا لا لا شدة لا
انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك
والله يعني؟ - مادري والله يعني جي من صجي – من صجي والله ما عرف والله
انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك
معليه معليه معليه – ما يخالف ما يخالف ما يخالف
انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
لا عاد شدة ما لا ما ما يطلع مني لا لا ما يصير تو لا ما اتوقع

تعبّر عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
 مادري والله يعني مادري يعني كلش ما حظيت في بالي ما حسيت ببصير جذي
 تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدّمك من شخص
 لا لا لا لا لا لا لا ما اتوقع ما ابي في بالي والله ما حس ان السالفة جذي يعني غريبة يعني صار
 جذي
 انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام
 استغفر الله لا حول و لا قوة الا بالله ماعرف والله ماعرف مادري يعني انا ما حس ان يعني هلون
 مثل ما تقولين لا لا لا لا ما حس جذي ما افكر هلون
 لن تعاتب صديقك
 لا عاد ليش يعني لبيش ليش يعني جذي
 تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ
 صبيووو طاح - اااا هههه؟
 تقفل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل
 استغفر الله او الصمت او لا حول و لا قوة الا بالله بعد شنسوي
 انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه
 اشارات جسدية مب فاهمة و ارفع حواجبي او اضحك وايد او اقول بعد ماعرف والله بعد مادري
 والله شلون هلون
 اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سوالف ينانوة شلون تغيّر الموضوع
 ازين زين أأأ خنغير الموضوع - شرايكم في ذي الشي - شرايكم في ذي المطعم
 تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
 شهست هلون بعد - شخبار الدنيا او الصمت
 ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
 اي عاد شهست شورانه

Participant 8 – Male

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبنيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
 خلك هاب ريج يلا عاد
 لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس
 دقيقة انزين و بعدين

ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يبالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني
ما نخلص عاد فارجني
انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك
عدل و لا مو عدل صدقني ما نجذب عليك
انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك
صاج
انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
انت اضير ضيرتني
تعبير عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
واحد واحد شفيك
تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدك من شخص
طحت من عيني
انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام
بيبيه طل
لن تعاتب صديقك
افااا
تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ
بوووم بح
تقفل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل
لوعت جبدي
انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه
شلون؟
اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سؤالف ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع
ما غثيتنا
تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
بل بل بل بل بل
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
معليه

Participant 9 – Male

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي

فوقه فوقه

لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس

من صجك

ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يبالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني

قص علينا قص علينا

انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك

عاد قول شي عني يا الطرح زين ابد كل شي مب زين

انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك

عاد كل شي الا انت يا الاخو

انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو

لا لا لا تقول ما قال الا لسانك

تعبر عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي

روح مناالك

تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدك من شخص

بل بل بل قول غير هالجلام ذي قول شي غير

انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام

مب راضي على الي قاعد يصير كله

لن تعاتب صديقك

يا الهلكة

تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ

بالااا شوي شوي اكي الطوفة تشلخت على هالعبيب

تقلل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل

بل بل بل لوعت جبده بس انطم انطم

انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه

يا الدلخ انت كل مرة ما نفهم شي من الي تقوله

اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سوالف ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع

بأااا قوم مناااا اقول صب لنا جويهة ابرك لنا من هالسوالف
تعبيرك لما تبني تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
استو عدل و صير ريال ما بقى الا مثل هالاشكال يشلخون عليه
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
قوم قوم مناااا انتة ما تيزو يا جليل الحيا

Participant 10 – Male

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تنبيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
شنو رايك في – النشاط – مع بعض؟
لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس
والله فلة و بعدين؟
ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يببالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني
بللل انتة عاد قمبالجي
انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك
افا عليك بس افافا عليك
انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك
روح و القلب داعي لك
انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
انتة عباب ما تجوف روحك
تعبر عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
باللل لا تشلخ عاد
تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدمك من شخص
ما هقيتك جذي
انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام
ماصدقك لو تناقز
لن تعاتب صديقك
ما هقيتها منك
تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ

ودي اصدقك بس قوية
تقل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل
ذبحته عاد سكر السالفة
انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه
عطني الزبدة عاد عطني الزبدة
اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سوالف ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع
ما نبي سوالف يهالوه
تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
عطني مقفااك يلا عطني مقفاك
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
ما بقيت الا انتة يا البشة

Participant 11 – Male

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تنبيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
يلا عاد يلا
لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس
اسكت اسكت اسكت عني اسكت
ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يبالي عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني
انا؟ اننااااا؟ جذاب
انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك
عاد بو فلان ولي يسلمك
انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك
هلاً هلاً بوسع امر
انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
جذاب
تعبير عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
لا لا ذي غلط لا تسوي هلون ذي غلط
تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدمك من شخص
اذا حسافة هلون شلون جذي افا

انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
اشهست خل عنك السندارة
تعبير عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
مش اعرقاتك تهطل
تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدملك من شخص
بللبللبلل طلعت خرطي
انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام
جان بخت ايمر المارد وايمر دقك او نفتك منك
لن تعاتب صديقك
خلاص فكنا
تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ
امعنجج في الجنيزة بسك عاد
تقفل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل
عباب بس اسكت
انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه
متدودة مب فاهمة لك
اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سوالف ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع
ما عندك غير سوالف ام حمار او ربعه
تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
عطنا من الازرق
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
اشبلاك ترى سندرتنا

Participant 13 – Male

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
خلك لهلوب
لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس
شسالفة

Participant 14 – Male

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
يلا عاد يا الذيب
لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس
هاااا ابيي كملل
ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يبالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني
يبيبيه سوا من الحبة دبة
انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك
عاد انت مكانك في القلب
انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك
طيح واقف
انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
جوف نفسك انت قبل ترى كلن يشوف الناس بعين طبعه
تعبير عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
حدك
تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدك من شخص
افاااا ما هقيتها منك
انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام
ما يصير هالكلام
لن تعاتب صديقك
انت ما ينزعل منك
تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ
عطانه الصاروخ
تقلل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل
بس بس غير السالفة
انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه
انا ضعت
اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سوالف ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع

ترى في صبيان يخافون
تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
اففف اخلص
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
ما تخرع و لا عشرة مثلك

Participant 15 - Male

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تنبيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
خلك ذيب
لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس
لحظة لحظة شسالفة
ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يببالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني
ما نخلص؟ فكني يلا
انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك
عدل ولا مو عدل يا الغالي
انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك
ابصم بالعشرة
انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
كلن يرى الناس بعين طبعه
تعبير عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
بل بل بل
تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدملك من شخص
طحت من عيني
انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام
مستحيل
لن تعاتب صديقك
افا
تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ
بسك قنابل

تقفل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل
لوعت جبدي
انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه
شلون يعني؟
اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سوالف ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع
ما غثيتنا انت؟
تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
سد الموضوع
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
معليه بسيطة

Participant 16 – Female

لن تحاول في صديقك يسوي شي تبنيه يسويه مثلا ينط وياك البرجة او اي شي
يلا عاد عن السخافة
لن تقاطع صديقك و اهو يسولف من كثر ما انك متحمس
احلف - جذاب
ردك لن تحس صديقك قاعد يببالغ عن موضوع يخصك مثل متهمك بصفة معينة او اي شي يعني
أأأأ شدة عاد
انك تحاول تخلي صديقك يتعاطف وياك
اي والله مسكينة انا
انك تبين تعاطفك مع صديقك
ايبي فاهمة
انك تدافع عن نفسك عن لوم موجه صوبك من احد تعرفه و ترد اللوم عليه اهو
لا تقط بلاك على غيرك – انا شدخلني شوف روحك
تعبير عن اعتراضك مع الاستياء على شي
لا عاد
تعبيرك عن الصدمة و الاعتراض على الشي مثل موقف يصدمك من شخص
مستحيل ماصدق
انك تبين الاعتراض بشكل عام

لا مو على كيفكم
لن تعاتب صديقك
ما هقيتها منك
تبين لصديق انه قاعد يشلخ
يلا عاد عن الصواريخ – لا تشلخ
تقفل المحادثة لان انسدت نفسك من الموضوع مع شخص تعرفه عدل
او كي بس خلاص
انك تبين انك مب فاهم عدل مع شخص تعرفه
اسفة بس ما فهمت
اذا صديقك يسولف عن شي يخوف مثل سوافل ينانوة شلون تغير الموضوع
انزين غير الموضوع
تعبيرك لما تبي تصد عن شخص تعرفه يقول كلام مب عاجبك
او كي انا بمشي عندي شغل
ردك لما الي قدامك يهددك ببشي عادي مثل ترى ما في روحة او اي شي يعني
يمة خفت – ذبحة عاد بسمع كلامك

Appendix II (Everybody Hates Chris Transcript Sample)

1982.

That was the year I turned 13.

Before I was a comedian, I thought the coolest thing that would happen to me

was being a teenager.

I was gonna have women, money, stay out late.

I thought it was gonna be the bomb.

'sup?

Chris! Chris! Chris!

Boy, was I wrong!

Chris!

Get in the bathroom and wipe the pee off the toilet seat!

Disgusting!

When I was 13, my mother convinced my father to move us out of the Project.

She always said Project is just another word for experiment.

In a lab, the government gives rats cheese.

In the Projects, the government gives people cheese.

Dad, can we stop at McDonald's?

You guys have MacDonald's money?

Julius, the kids have to eat.

They ain't got to eat MacDonald's.

We got some beloni in the back. I'll pull over.

My father Julius always kept beloni handy just in case.

We get one combo meal.

Drew gets the burger, Tonya gets the fries, Chris you can have the drink.

One time I just got ice.

We moved to an apartment in Bedstyle, Brooklyn.

Now had we known that Bedstyle would be the center of a crack epidemic,

I guess we'd have picked some place else.

Bedstyle even had its own motto:

"Bedstyle, do or die"

Look at that! Look at that!

Those were some of the guys that were gonna die.

If I ever catch any of y'all spray painting on anybody's wall,

I'm gonna put my foot so far up your behind, you'll have toes for teeth.

Get inside.

That's my mother Rochelle.

She had a hundred recipes for whooping ass.

Boy, I will slap the caps off your knees.

I will knock you into last night.

I will slap your name out the phonebook and call my Bell and tell I didn't.

That's my younger brother Drew.

There's nothing worse than having a little brother that's bigger than you.

My sister Tonya was the youngest and would do anything to get me in

The script for all episodes can be found on this website:

https://subscribescript.com/series/Everybody_Hates_Chris-460637

الخلاصة

تتميز علامات الخطاب بالعديد من الخصائص كونها سمة من سمات الخطاب الشفهي وتحدث بتعدد عالٍ شفهيًا، فهي قصيرة صوتيًا وليس لها موقع ثابت في البنية النحوية. تبحث هذه الدراسة في كيفية اقتران علامات الخطاب في التراكيب في اللهجة البحرينية. البحث يدرس تكرار هياكل ووظائف هذه العلامات في مقارنة بين أعمال كوميدية مختارة تقارن بين اللهجة البحرينية والإنجليزية الأمريكية و أيضا ضمت الدراسة 16 مشاركاً بحرينياً أجابوا في مقابلات صوتية كيف يستجيبون لمواقف اجتماعية مستوحاة من العمل التلفزيوني البحريني للاحاطة بجانب علامات الخطاب البحريني. تهدف الدراسة إلى الإجابة على خمسة أسئلة: (1) ما هي تراكيب علامات الخطاب في كل من البيانات العربية البحرينية والإنجليزية الأمريكية؟، (2) ما هي نسبة التردد في تكرار هذه التراكيب؟ (3) ما هو رقم تكرار وظائف تلك التراكيب في كل من البيانات العربية البحرينية والإنجليزية الأمريكية؟، (4) ما أوجه التشابه والاختلاف بين وظائف علامات الخطاب هذه في كل من البيانات العربية البحرينية والإنجليزية الأمريكية؟ (5) هل تتطابق العينة البحرينية مع نتائج الرسالة المباشرة الأكثر تكرارا الموجودة في المسلسلات التلفزيونية البحرينية؟ طريقة البحث مختلطة ما بين النوعية و الكمية وتصميم البحث المستخدم هو تصميم بحث تحليل المحتوى. النهج المستخدم هو النهج الاستقرائي. كشفت النتائج الرئيسية أن العلامة الخطابية الأكثر استخداما في البرامج التلفزيونية البحرينية هي "بل"، في حين أن كلمة "عاد" هي الأكثر انتشارا في المقابلات البحرينية. وبناء على هذه النتائج تم تقديم توصيات للبحث المستقبلي. تساهم هذه الدراسة برؤى جديدة حول تراكيب علامات الخطاب ووظائفها و كمية ترددها في اللهجة البحرينية.

2023

جامعة البحرين

قسم اللغة الانجليزية و ادابها



كلية الاداب

دراسة في علامات الخطاب في الأعمال الكوميدية التلفزيونية الإنجليزية والعربية البحرينية: دراسة مقارنة

رسالة مقدمة استكمالاً لمتطلبات درجة الماجستير في الدراسات التطبيقية في اللغة الانجليزية

مقدمة من قبل الطالبة

هنوف خالد العجمي

الرقم الجامعي 20120848

بإشراف

د. مدني عثمان احمد

أستاذ مشارك

جامعة البحرين

مملكة البحرين

2023

XXV