| **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Pragmatic Functions of the Discourse Marker *ʕandʒad "really"* in Jordanian Spoken Arabic

Sajeda Khaled Altaweel[1] ✉ and Dr. May Fadhil Al-shaikhli[2]

[1]Master Degree of Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Amman Arab University, Jordan
[2]Associate Professor, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Amman Arab University, Jordan
Corresponding Author: Sajeda Khaled Altaweel, **E-mail**: sajedaaltaweel373@gmail.com

| **ABSTRACT**

This study examines the pragmatic functions of the Jordanian Spoken Arabic discourse marker *ʕandʒad "really"*. A quantitative study used the questionnaire to collect data from 207 native Jordanian Arabic speakers from Amman Arab University. The pragmatic functions analysis is based on Searle's categories (1975) by adopting John Austin's Speech Acts Theory (1962). The study finds that gender is a significant social factor as males tend to use this variant more than females. The participants' responses were analyzed with SPSS. The study concludes that that DM *ʕandʒad "really"* communicate sixteen functions namely; anger, surprise, apologies, sympathy, commands, requests, challenges, advice, assertions, suggestions, complaints, claims, promises, oaths, threats, and offers. The study recommends that future research focuses on the pragmatic functions of this discourse marker (DM) *ʕandʒad "really"* in larger social contexts than those investigated in this study. In addition, teachers should emphasize the pragmatic functions of Jordanian discourse markers, like DM *ʕandʒad "really"*. They should provide multiple oral examples of Arabic discourse markers in different contexts for AFL learners to grasp and apply them in everyday intercultural contexts.

| **KEYWORDS**

Discourse Marker, Pragmatics, Jordanian Arabic, Speech Acts Theory, *ʕandʒad.*

1. Introduction

Discourse markers (DMs) are "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk that signal relationships between immediately adjacent units of talk, and which have thus a coherence building function on a local coherence level" (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 31). DMs indicate how the speaker believes the following core message to be connected to the preceding speech (Fraser, 1990).

Schiffrin (1987) and Brinton (1996) state that DMs are unnecessary; a phrase can be understandable and grammatically correct. Meanwhile, Fraser (1990) argues that a lack of DMs may lead to a breakdown in interaction. They perform a variety of roles, and they are related to pragmatic features of speech (Fraser, 1990). According to Alami (2015), DMs serve several pragmatic functions, such as opening and ending the conversation. Fraser (1990, p. 385) defines Pragmatics as "the direct message the speaker intends to convey in uttering the sentence". Furthermore, DMs can serve various pragmatic functions (Paltridge, 2012).

As a significant contribution to linguistic research, pragmatics has focused on actual language use. It has also made it necessary to relate linguistic investigation to context-related issues, where context is understood to include speakers' and hearers' identities, knowledge, and intentions (Levinson, 1983). According to Widdowson (2000), context is those features of actual language use considered significant to the meaning. Thus, context is a schematic construct, and pragmatic meaning is achieved by matching the linguistic parts of the code with the schematic elements of the context. According to Brown, Malmkjaer, and Williams (1996), when a term is used in many contexts, a native speaker of a particular language can automatically figure out its practical meaning. Brown, Malmkjaer, and Williams (1996) state that competence is seen as the fundamental understanding of a language, and it is also

concerned with comprehension performance related to the spoken or written word. Koike (1989, p. 279) defines pragmatic competence as "the speaker's knowledge and application of appropriateness and politeness rules that indicate the speaker's understanding and formulation of speech acts (SAs)."

According to Austin (1975), language is more than simply a tool for communicating information; it also allows us to do various activities in daily life. Because of the rising interest in pragmatic issues in general linguistics, the significance of social factors in understanding pragmatic variations between languages has gained significant attention (Schneider & Barron, 2008). However, sociolinguists have paid less attention to language's discourse and pragmatic components in interaction (Kridalaksana, 1978). Gender linguistic studies are a subfield of sociolinguistic studies. Gender is a factor in linguistic differences since it is an essential component of identity, and the vocabulary chosen by each gender differs as well (Meyerhoff, 2017). As a result of these differences being incorporated in idiolect studies connected to a person's linguistic traits, the language used by both men and women differs in written and spoken form (Kridalaksana, 1980). Studies on DMs are included in a thought-provoking debate about gender and the usage of language elements (Pasaribu, 2017).

Jordanian Spoken Arabic (JSA) is rich with many DMs used in everyday conversations. They have lately received much interest in many studies, such as ماشي Mashi (Al-Shishtawi, 2020),طيب Tayib(Al Harahsheh &Kanakri, 2013), إن شاء الله inʃaːllah (Nazzal, 2015), بس bas (Ennasser& Hijazin, 2021), واللهي wallahi (Al-Khawaldeh, 2018), and عادي Aaːdi (Kanakri& Al-Harahsheh, 2013).

This study shows how the DM ʕandʒad "really" is used in JSA. The literal meaning of ʕandʒad "really" is "seriously, really, and for real". However, it has several meanings depending on the context. ʕandʒad "really" is also employed in social media, radio discussions, Jordanian music, TV shows, and casual conversational situations. Such DMs are commonly spoken rather than written, which explains why they frequently go unnoticed.

Several studies examine the pragmatic functions of various DMs in using various frameworks. However, studies on the pragmatic functions of DM ʕandʒad "really" have yet to be conducted. As a result, this study contributes significantly to pragmatics in terms of the intended meaning of the speaker, while also offering an in-depth explanation of numerous meanings of this DM in different contexts. It is worth mentioning that all contexts of the DM ʕandʒad "really" in the current study are in JSA. However, other DMs have received little attention in investigating gender differences. Therefore, this study contributes significantly to a complete understanding of how males and females use this DM. After reviewing the relevant literature, there has yet to be a study addressing the DM ʕandʒad "really" in JSA, this study aims to fill this gap in the field of DMs literature.

This study is also expected to provide valuable information to other researchers, allowing them to do similar studies or use the same DM in more profound and extensive examinations. It will have a great impact on the comparative studies of various Arabic dialects or languages to understand DM ʕandʒad "really" better. Moreover, this effort is expected to contribute to the knowledge of DMs in spoken Arabic. In addition, this study is expected to contribute a more in-depth understanding of DM's linguistic features. This study can help syllabus developers, material designers, and teachers determine how to incorporate and introduce DMs to AFL learners methodically.

1.1 The main objectives of this study are as follows:
- Examining the Pragmatic functions of DM ʕandʒad "really" in Jordanian Spoken Arabic.
- Explaining the impact of gender differences on using the DM ʕandʒad "really" statistically.

1.2 The present study aims to answer the following questions:
- What are the pragmatic functions of DM ʕandʒad "really", and what kinds of illocutionary speech acts are performed?
- Are there any statistically significant differences in using DM ʕandʒad "really" based on gender?

2. Literature Review
Several studies on the DMs have been conducted, including those of Alqahtani (2023), Al Kayed (2021), Al-Khawaldeh (2018), Al-Khalidy (2017), Alazzawie (2014), Tonio (2021), Lee (2017),...etc. These studies were designed to perform various functions. The following investigation of previous literature sheds light on how others have studied DMs in Arabic and English. Thus, various studies on DMs or pragmatic functions may be employed in the current study, and this previous literature contributes to this study with crucial knowledge and facilitates a complete understanding.

2.1 Discourse Markers in Arabic
Alqahtani (2023) investigates the colloquial Arabic DM /bʕdɪn/. This study attempts to assist speakers in understanding those uses in their interactions. It eliminates the possibility of misunderstanding by discovering its meanings and identifying the most commonly utilized ones. "Twitter" is the primary data collection instrument for this study. The dataset includes 105 tweets that contain the phrase /bʕdɪn/ by adopting relevance theory. The study's findings indicate that /bʕdɪn/ has semantic meanings like the English adverb "then". It is utilized as a semantic temporal adverb. In this regard, and based on the data gathered, seven pragmatic

meanings for /bʕdɪn/are evoked in this study. These meanings are a direction shift marker, a result marker, an uncertain marker, a marker of dissatisfaction, an arrangement marker that means "but," a marker of acceptance, and a marker of explanation.

Similarly, Berot (2023) studies the discourse-pragmatic functions of the lexical elements wellah and wellahi, which are investigated by twenty-four Iraqi Kurdish-speaking adults (24 first and fourth-year undergraduate students) in this study. All participants are English majors at the University of Raparin in Kurdistan. In this qualitative study, Brinton's (1996) binary categorization is used as a theoretical framework for identifying the roles of wellah and wellahi at the textual and communication levels. Five specific functions connected to the use of wellah and wellahi are proven using empirical data. Three literary functions: clarification, filler, and a subject shift; and two interpersonal functions, such as reaction marker and affirmation marker. Throughout, the findings are related to those found in earlier Arabic investigations. The data analysis shows that the use of wellahi in Kurdish is similar to the use of wellahi in Arabic. Furthermore, the study shows that wellah and wellahi may be used interchangeably as discourse markers in most situations. The findings show that grammaticalization principles such as phonetic reduction and layers might explain the evolution of the interchangeability of discourse markers.

Another study by Rabab'ah, Al-Yasin, and Yagi (2022) investigate the discourse marker walak and its variations in the Jordanian dialect. They employ a mixed-method approach and examine how this discourse marker differs depending on gender. The data are gathered from 200 Jordanian Arabic native speakers using informal interviews and a validation questionnaire. Walak and its variations are found to execute six linguistic functions. Regarding gender disparities, the data reveals statistically significant differences between males and females using walak and its variations in favor of males.

In a line of research investigating gender differences, Habib (2021) investigates the discourse markers yaʕni and ʔinnu. This research compares data from children and adults using quantitative, standard variationist sociolinguistic methodologies. Age and gender are examined in four categories of children and gender within adults to determine whether there is a shift in progress toward employing the creative form ʔinnu. On the other hand, children utilize ʔinnu more than adults. ʔinnu is used more by women than by men and used more by boys than by girls. The gender difference exists statistically.

Al-Kayed (2021) examines the Jordanian Arabic discourse marker hasa, applying relevance theory. The study also investigates how hasa began to be used as a discourse marker and how it is grammaticalized. According to this study, the verb hasa, which means "now," derives from the noun hai elsa3ah, which means "this hour." The study also shows that hasa, an adverb that originally means "now," transforms into a discourse marker with several uses. The study also finds that hasa limits the hearer's possibilities for understanding utterances, therefore facilitating the hearer in identifying what it relates to.

Furthermore, Ennasser and Hijazin (2021) study the pragmatic functions of DM bas, which signifies "enough" in various contexts, using Fraser's (2006) grammatical-pragmatic method. According to the findings, the DM bas can be considered multifunctional in pragmatically marked contexts, performing 12 different functions: denial of anticipation, replacement, an indication of insufficient data, return to the primary subject, topic change, assault, decrease of the face-threatening act, and an indication of cognitive procedure completion, padding, instruction marker, expressing, and modifier markers.

In addition, Al-Shishtawi (2020) examines the discourse marker Mashi, which literally means "walking." Data are gathered from the website Arabi-corpus, where over 400 instances of the DM Mashi are discovered. The study lists 28 possible functions of the DM Mashi according to their contextual realizations: threatening, approving, walking, ending the conversation, and so on. The study's sample includes all 65 English language Ph.D. students from two divisions at The University of Jordan, with data from 47 assessed questionnaires. The results show that the term Mashi is understood by 87.9% of the study's sample.

Moreover, Alsager, Afzal, and Aldawood (2020) discuss how DMs are used in newspaper articles. Using Fraser's approach, this study seeks to investigate the positions and functions of English DM but and its Arabic equivalent lakin in newspaper articles written by non-native, native English speakers, Egyptian and Saudi Arabic speakers. This study also emphasizes the differences and similarities between the positions and functions of DMs but and lakin . This quantitative study employs a corpus-based methodology. The articles are gathered from twelve newspapers, classified as Arabic newspapers, published in Egypt and Saudi Arabia, and English newspapers in the United States and Saudi Arabia. The findings show that the DM but is regularly utilized as an affirmation or addition marker by both speakers (native and non-native). However, in standard Arabic, lakin serves as the significant corrective DM. Despite their diverse dialects, native Arabic speakers typically share the same purposes while utilizing lakin. This research also demonstrates that lakin can only be discovered in the medial position, whereas but can be detected in both the initial and medial positions. It finds that DMs but and lakin prove that Fraser's approach to DM functions is fundamental and may be generalized.

2.2 Discourse Markers in English

Guo (2023) examines the discourse marker you know. This DM has a high frequency in English communication and is mainly utilized as a discourse marker. People utilize it in various contexts and situations, and it serves multiple pragmatic functions. Understanding these functions and usages can help English learners participate in communication more effectively by increasing the expression and understanding of the speaker-hearer dialogue. Based on the relevance theory, the researcher recovers you know in actual usage from financial periodicals gathered in the Corpus of Contemporary American English and investigates the pragmatic functions of the discourse marker. This study discovers five pragmatic functions that you know performs: knowledge modifying marker, switching marker, behavior marker, mitigator marker, and counseling marker.

In a line of corpus studies, Tonio (2021) investigates the roles of the discourse marker well in selected Philippine English-spoken conversations. The functions and frequency of the DM well in various speech event categories placed in conversation and monologue situations are investigated in this study. The International Corpus of English - Philippines provided the data for the analysis. Furthermore, the study focuses on the corpus's spoken component, one of the least studied aspects of Philippine English. Moreover, this study adopts quantitative and qualitative analyses while employing Ran's (2003) and Jucker's (1993) recommended classification. This study proposes that the discourse marker well has many discourse-pragmatic functions in distinct speaking circumstances based on 346 occurrences of well in four different spoken forms include: beginning utterance, showing the speaker's uncertainty, reducing Face Threatening Acts, fixing one's speech, and shifting the present topic.

Tagliamonte (2020) explores a discourse-pragmatic usage of the term wait in the spoken English language in North America. This function is taken from a former linguistic meaning of halting or delaying, which has expanded to indicate a pause in conversation when a speaker reflects on or corrects a previous issue. 340 examples from 211 people allow for comparative sociolinguistic methods and statistical modeling to assess the differences among changes in this creative utilization and to examine wide social and linguistic variables to comprehend the underlying procedures. The findings reveal significant recent movements: older persons employ lengthier, more temporally defined versions, such as wait a second/wait a minute, whereas wait alone is rising, with women leading the way. The distinctive contribution of socially divided corpora also reveals that wait evolves from a verb with a temporal description to a complete discourse-pragmatic marker on the left peripherally, following well-known principles of language evolution.

In addition, Turiman (2020) investigates the usage of "so" in job interview discourse in Malaysian English as a Second Language environment. This study seeks to explain the multifunctional uses of so in a developed corpus of 16 employment interviews performed in English in two Malaysian firms. The word so is the tenth most common in the corpus, making it the most-used discourse marker in the job interview speech. According to the findings, the word so in the corpus has five primary functions: it introduces a summary, continues the preceding speaker's topic, marks sequence interactions, maintains the audience's attention, and introduces elaboration to substantiate a prior remark. When so is used in turn-initials, it indicates a unique role: introducing fresh information. However, it is shown that the high-frequency usage of so in the corpus is connected with "pseudo-bridging," in which so is merely employed to provide additional information to make speech appear coherent.

Following the review of previous literature, it is evident that further research on DMs in Arabic dialects, particularly Jordanian Arabic, is needed to study gender differences. Since few researches explores gender differences in discourse markers, limited attention has been paid to how gender is utilized in DMs. Rabab'ah, Al-Yasin, and Yagi (2022) analyze how the use of the DM Walak varies based on gender speech. Furthermore, Habib (2021) investigates yani and innu in Syrian Arabic to investigate the influence of gender on these DMs in adults.

Furthermore, among the several studies examining Jordanian discourse markers, the DM ʕandʒad "really" in JSA has yet to be studied. Thus, the current study aims to illustrate that ʕandʒad "really" serves various pragmatic functions in JSA. It is worth mentioning that this study examines the uses of ʕandʒad "really" in Jordanian Arabic using speech acts theory from the theoretical perspective of Searle's taxonomy. The study also sheds light on how gender differences affect the use of this DM.

3. Methodology
3.1 Ressources
The study's population consisted of students selected from Amman Arab University's English department who are in the second semester of the academic year 2023/2024. The data were acquired using random sampling.

The study included 207 students selected from Amman Arab University in Jordan. They were B.A and M.A students during the second semester of the academic year 2023/2024, with specialties in English Language Translation and Applied Linguistics. They were male and female native speakers of Jordanian Arabic from various towns and cities. The sample number of male and female participants differed due to the number of females being more significant than the number of males representing the study population. The number of males was 71 participants, and females' number was 136.

3.2 Procedures
The data was collected using a questionnaire for obtaining descriptive data related to the study's topic. The questionnaire included closed-ended questions divided into two sections: demographic information and sixteen Likert scale items. The demographic information included gender, and educational level. The researcher additionally provided examples and added them to the questionnaire based on her observations of situations in everyday conversations under different contexts. The questions yielded sixteen pragmatic functions for ʕandʒad "really", including whether the participants use the pragmatic functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" based on Searle's taxonomy, such as Expressing Anger, Surprising, Apologies, Sympathy, Commands, Requests, Challenges, Advice, Assertions, Suggestions, Complaints, Claims, Promises, Oaths, Threats, and Offers. Using a three-point Likert scale ranging from Never (1) to Always (3), the participants were asked to rate their frequency by characterizing the discourse marker's function in each sentence. The researcher distributed the electronic structured questionnaire to the students who agreed to participate in the study. The researcher sent the link over WhatsApp.

The responses of 207 participants were analyzed with SPSS. The analysis also explored whether there were any significant differences in the pragmatic functions of this DM based on gender. The results of the two research questions were presented using descriptive statistics such as percentage and frequency. In addition, tables illustrate the results.

4. Results
4.1 Results Related to Research Question One
What are the pragmatic functions of DM ʕandʒad "really", and what kinds of illocutionary speech acts are performed?

The following section presents the analysis of the questionnaire's items.

4.1.1 Sample Characteristics (Demographic Data)
This section analyzes the sample's demographic characteristics. Gender and educational level of respondents are essential variables in determining which group of individuals is interested in the pragmatic functions of DM ʕandʒad "really" in JSA.

Table (1) Sample's Demographic Characteristics

Variable	Category	Counts	%
Gender	males	71	34.3
	females	136	65.7
	Total	207	100.0
Educational level	bachelor	178	86.0
	master	29	14.0
	Total	207	100.0

As shown in table (1) 207 have participated in the questionnaire. the vast majority of responders (65.7%) were females, with only (34.3%) male responders. Regarding the education level, 178 participants were B.A holders (86.0%) and 29 were MA holders (14.0%).

4.1.2 Results Analysis of the Dimensions Assessed By the Whole Sample.
To analyze the items of the constructs (Expressive, Directive, Commissive, and Representative), the means, standard deviations, and mean indices (MI) were calculated for each item in each subscale. The results are presented below.

Table (2) Means, Standard Deviations and Mean Index (MI) For the Pragmatic Functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" in JSA Arranged in descending order (N=207)

No.	Function	M	SD	Mean index (MI)	Mean Level	Mean order
1	Expressive	2.28	0.42	76.00	Moderate	1
4	Representative	2.18	0.55	72.67	Moderate	2
3	Commissive	2.07	0.59	69.00	Moderate	3
2	Directive	2.01	0.45	67.00	Moderate	4
	All functions	2.13	0.40	71.00	Moderate	

Means description categories (1 – 1.66: low, 1.67 – 2.33: moderate, and 2.34 – 3.00: high)

Table (2) displays the descriptive statistics for the pragmatic functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" in JSA. It was noticed that Expressive is the most utilized function of the DM ʕandʒad "really" as it satisfied the highest mean value and ranked the first (2.28) representing a mean index of (76.00 %), while the Directive functions had reported as the least utilized function of the DM ʕandʒad "really" as it was rated by the lowest mean (2.01) representing a mean index of (67.00 %) and fell in the (last) rank.

The overall rating's mean that reflects the overall functions of DM ʕandʒad "really" was (2.13) expressing a mean index of (71.00 %).

4.1.3. Results Analysis of the items of the Expressive functions of the whole sample
Table (3) Means, Standard Deviations and Mean Index (MI) For the Expressive Functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" Arranged in descending order (N=207)

Item no.	Items	Mean	SD	Mean index (MI)	Mean Level	Mean order
1	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for a surprise?	2.51	0.58	83.67	High	1
2	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for an apology?	2.13	0.69	71.00	Moderate	4
3	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for anger?	2.31	0.71	77.00	Moderate	2
4	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for sympathy?	2.16	0.70	72.00	Moderate	3
	Overall Expressive function	2.28	0.42	76.00	Moderate	

Means description categories (1 – 2.33: low, 2.34 – 2.67: moderate, and 3. 68 – 5.00: high)

Table (3) depicts the values of descriptive statistics for the Expressive Functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" arranged in descending order based on the means values. By exploring the mean results, it can be seen that using the DM ʕandʒad "really" to express the "surprise" function was the greatest use of this DM as it attained the highest mean value that fell in the first rank (2.51); this mean value represented a mean index of (83.67 %), on the other hand the use of the DM ʕandʒad "really" to express the "an apology" function was the least common as it reported the lowest mean value that placed in the last rank (2.13), this mean value represents a mean index of (71.00 %).

The mean value of rating's that reflects the Expressive function of DM ʕandʒad "really" was (2.28) which is equivalent to a mean index of (76.00 %).

4.1.4. Results Analysis of the Items of the Directive Functions by the Whole Sample.
Table (4) Means, Standard Deviations and Mean Index (MI) for the Directive Functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" Arranged in descending order (N=207)

Item no.	Items	Mean	SD	Mean index (MI)	Mean Level	Mean Order
1	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for a request?	1.34	0.57	44.67	Moderate	4
2	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for a command?	2.35	0.68	78.33	High	1
3	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for a challenge?	2.12	0.74	70.67	Moderate	3
4	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for advice?	2.25	0.69	75.00	Moderate	2
	Overall Directive functions	2.01	0.45	67.00	Moderate	

Means description categories (1 – 2.33: low, 2.34 – 2.67: moderate, and 3. 68 – 5.00: high)

Table (4) addresses the values of descriptive statistics for the Directive (oriented) Functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" arranged in descending order based on the means values. A look at the mean values show that using the DM ʕandʒad "really" to express the "the command " function was the greatest use of this DM as it gained the largest mean value that satisfied the first rank (2.35); this mean value matches a mean index of (78.33 %),on the contrary the DM ʕandʒad "really" function that was used the least was to express the "request " function which placed in the last position (1.34) this mean value reflects a mean index of (44.67 %).

The mean value of rating's that reflects the Directive functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" was (2.01) this value matches a mean index of (67.00 %).

4.1.5. Results Analysis of the Items of the Commissive Functions by the Whole Sample.
Table (5) Means, Standard Deviations and Mean Index (MI) For the Commissive Functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" Arranged in descending order (N=207)

Item no.	Items	Mean	SD	Mean Index (MI)	Mean Level	Mean order
1	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for threats?	2.23	0.68	74.33	Moderate	1
2	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" to take an oath?	1.98	0.80	66.00	Moderate	4
3	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for a promise?	2.06	0.72	68.67	Moderate	2
4	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for an offer?	2.00	0.77	66.67	Moderate	3
	Overall Commissive functions	2.07	0.59	69.00	Moderate	

Means description categories (1 – 2.33: low, 2.34 – 2.67: moderate, and 3. 68 – 5.00: high)

Table (5) reflects the values of descriptive statistics for the Commissive Functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" arranged in descending order based on the means values; by investigating the means results, it can be interpreted it is clear that using the DM ʕandʒad "really" to express the "threatening" function was the most frequent use of this DM as it represented the highest mean value that fell in the first rank (2.23)- this mean value reflected a mean index of (74.33 %). Alternatively, it can be detected that using the DM ʕandʒad "really" as a "take an oath " function reported as the least used of this DM with the lowest mean value that ranked last (1.98), this mean value reflects a mean index of (66.00 %).

The mean value of ratings that reflect the Commissive functions of DM ʕandʒad "really" was (2.07) which match a mean index of (69.00 %).

4.1.6. Results Analysis of the Items of the Representative Functions by the Whole Sample.
Table (6) Means, Standard Deviations and Mean Index (MI) For the Representative Functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" Arranged in descending order (N=207)

Item no.	Items	Mean	SD	Mean index (MI)	Mean Level	Mean order
1	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for an assertion?	2.29	0.74	76.33	Moderate	1
2	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for a suggestion?	2.16	0.69	72.00	Moderate	3
3	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for a complaint?	2.27	0.73	75.67	Moderate	2
4	Do you use DM ʕandʒad "really" for a claim?	2.01	0.73	67.00	Moderate	4
	Overall Representative functions	2.18	0.55	72.67	Moderate	

Means description categories (1 – 2.33: low, 2.34 – 2.67: moderate, and 3. 68 – 5.00: high)

Table (6) indicates the values of descriptive statistics for the Representative Functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" arranged in descending order according to the means values. The mean results show that using the DM ʕandʒad "really" to express the "assertion" function was the most important use of this DM as it satisfied the top mean value that occupied the first order (2.29); this mean value reflected a mean index of (76.33 %). Opposingly, it is evident that using the DM ʕandʒad "really" to express the"claim" function is the least used function of this DM as it reported the lowest mean value that ranked the last (2.01), this mean value expresses a mean index of (67.00 %).

The mean value of ratings that reflect the Representative functions of DM ʕandʒad "really" was (2.18) which reflect a mean index of (72.67 %).

4.2 Results Related to Research Question One
Are there any statistically significant differences in using DM ʕandʒad "really" based on gender?

4.2.1 Differences According to Gender
Table (7) presents the results related to the differences in the functions of using DM ʕandʒad "really" according to gender.

Table (7) T-Test to Assess the Differences in the Functions of Using DM ʕandʒad "really" According to Gender

Functions	Gender	n	mean	SD	t	sig	result
Expressive	males	71	2.18	0.40	2.407	0.017*	Significant
	females	136	2.33	0.43			
Directive	males	71	2.20	0.41	4.557	0.000*	Significant
	females	136	1.92	0.44			
Commissive	males	71	2.32	0.56	4.672	0.000*	Significant
	females	136	1.94	0.56			
Representative	males	71	2.38	0.55	3.956	0.000*	Significant
	females	136	2.08	0.52			
All functions	males	71	2.27	0.36	3.609	0.000*	Significant
	females	136	2.06	0.41			

* indicates that the two means are considered statistically different at 0.05

Table (7) illustrates the results of t-test to assess the differences in the functions of using DM ʕandʒad "really" according to gender. The probability values represented by the "sig" column show that the Expressive functions reported a sig value of (0.017); for the Directive functions the sig value was (0.000); for the Commissive functions the observed sig value was (0.000); for the Representative the sig value being reported was (0.000); and the sig value concerning all the functions was (0.000).

All the previously mentioned sig values were less than (0.05), suggesting significant mean differences between males and females, notably that the means differences were skewed towards the males who resulted in greater mean values compared to females (except in the Expressive which was in favor of females).

5. Discussion

Except for declarations, ʕandʒad "really" accompanied all the significant speech acts categorized by Searle as illocutionary forces. According to Green (2012), declarations, such as declaring war, appointing, baptizing, rewarding, and naming, immediately impact the world. It appears that ʕandʒad "really" does not come with declarations for reasons of formality. Declarations in Arabic are typically made in highly formal situations using official, if not ceremonial terminology, which means that ʕandʒad "really" is utilized informally.

5.1. ʕandʒad "really" within Expressive Illocution

The expressive function of illocution involves speech acts in which the addressers express their attitudes, emotions, and intentions toward the addressee and the propositional substance of the utterance. ʕandʒad "really is used the most frequently in this category; thus, ʕandʒad "really assigns four pragmatic functions: surprise, anger, sympathy, and apology.

5.1.1. ʕandʒad "really" Expressing Surprise

تمزح! عنجد هيك صار معك !!

Btimzaħ	ʕandʒad	haik	sˤar	maʕak
Joking	really	like this	happened	with you

"you'r joking! Does this really happen?!"

The DM ʕandʒad "really" can convey surprise or shock over the propositional substance of a prior statement. The DM emotive meaning seems to be typically expressed with a rising intonation and a high pitch. Moreover, it takes up an entire conversational turn. The "intonation of exclamation," as Bolinger (1989, p. 248) defines it, is expected to demonstrate the voice as "out of control".

Reisenzein (2000) emphasizes that surprise faces typically exhibit only one of the facial components associated with surprise: brow lifting, eye-widening, or mouth opening, but two or three-component presentations are less common. Expressing surprise indicates an expressive speech act (Potts, 2005). As a result, the surprise speech act might represent the addresser's emotional condition through the use of DM ʕandʒad "really" which the addressee cannot deny.

5.1.2. ʕandʒad "really" Expressing Apology

عنجد انا آسف بتمنى تقبل اعتذاري عن التصرفات الي صدرت مني

ʕandʒad	ʔana	ʔasef	batmana	tiqbal	ʔiʕtiðarj
really	I	sorry	I wish	accept	my apology

"I am really sorry please accept my apology."

In this context, the addresser apologizes to his/her friend for certain behaviors. ʕandʒad "really" emphasizes the illocutionary act of apologizing when the addresser indicates that he/she did not intend to hurt their friend's feelings. ʕandʒad "really" collocates with ʔanaʔāsef, meaning "I am sorry." The addresser attempts to apologize or beg pardon for his/her unfavorable effect on the hearer to be more polite in negative sensation (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Apologizing is an illocutionary act in which the addresser uses a negative-politeness method to address the hearer's facial needs after committing an offense and attempting to apologize for the situation (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

This is in line with Al-Khawaldeh (2018), who concluded that the Jordanian discourse marker Wallahi also functions as an apology. Speech act of apology occurs naturally among participants when the addresser expects or believes that the addressee deserves an explanation or restitution for an offense committed by the addresser (Cohen &Olshtain, 1983).

5.1.3. ʕandʒad "really" Expressing Anger

عنجد خلص حل عني مش طايق حالي

ʕandʒad	xalasˤ	ħailʕanni
really	stop	get away

"please get away now I am not in the mood."

In this context, disputes often happen among people. The addresser employs ʕandʒad "really" to express anger with, for instance a brother. Meanwhile, the speech act of the addresser indicates the intention to show anger.

Anger expression is an illocutionary act in which the addresser reveals anger, irritation, and annoyance toward others or situations he/she dislikes. According to Atkinson (1983), people may raise their voices in verbal action, the addresser communicates by using a high or low tone, aggressive voice, word pressure, and nasty words in direct and indirect ways.

5.1.4. ʕandʒad "really" Expressing Sympathy

عنجد زعلت كتير بس سمعت بالخبر لعله خير ان شاالله

ʕandʒad zʕilit	bas	smaiʕt	bilxabar
really	angry	when	hear	news

"I was really sorry when I knew about the news."

In this context, the addresser expresses sympathy for a colleague due to the difficulties encountered. One of the main findings regarding the use of ʕandʒad "really" to signal the sympathizing act is that it demonstrates the addresser's ability to use it.

Sympathizing is a speech act that serves as a positive politeness procedure intended for achieving solidarity, and a friendly, positive image of the addresser, consequently making the addressee feel good (Lakoff, 1973). According to Lakoff (1973) argues in the third politeness rule, sympathizing is an expression of intimacy among the participants, it strengthens the feeling of sympathy, which leads to solidarity. As a result, the addresser seeks to express sympathy with the addressee in the problematic situation to make them feel better.

5.2. ʕandʒad "really" within Directive Illocution

The speech acts of directives are attempts by the addresser to stimulate the addressee to undertake a specific action. ʕandʒad "really" has demonstrated some diversity in the illocutionary acts used, serving as a politeness device for mitigating the many performative acts of directives. ʕandʒad "really" assigns four pragmatic functions in this category: requesting, commanding, challenging, and advising.

5.2.1. Using ʕandʒad "really" for a Request.

لو بس اغلبك معي تجيبيلي الكتاب وانت جاي لو سمحت عنجد

ʕandʒad ʔaɣalbak tdʒeblj	lktab	maʕak
really	please	bring	the bookwith you

"would you please bring my book with you?"

In this context, a person asks someone to bring the book. ʕandʒad "really" functions here as a performative hedge to the illocutionary act of the requesting acts (Wilamová, 2005).

The use of ʕandʒad "really" as an attenuator for the requesting act could be attributed to addressers typically beginning their acts with a softener to avoid threatening the addressee. Addressers use the attenuation device to reduce the imposition on the addressees and allow them to choose whether to perform the requested act (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Within this category, the addresser uses the DM ʕandʒad "really" as a polite marker to show that this is a polite request rather than a command.   The research discovers that ʕandʒad "really" is assigned the pragmatic meaning 'please' as a method of respectfully requesting someone to do something or asking for something, as well as preventing someone from doing something.

5.2.2. Using ʕandʒad "really" for a Command

عنجد بحكي اطلع برة وسكر الباب وراك

ʕandʒad ʔitʕlaʕ	barra
really	go	out

"I'm serious, get out"

In this context, the addresser uses ʕandʒad "really" to command someone to leave the room and close the door behind him. ʕandʒad "really" here is used when an addresser orders someone to do something. According to Syah (2014), commands are used when the addresser wants the addressee to perform a specific action for their benefit.

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), commands require the addresser to be in a position of authority rather than simply one of power. Directing someone by invoking a position of authority or power binds the addresser to not providing him/her the choice of refusing.

5.2.3. Using ʕandʒad "really" for a Challenge

<div dir="rtl">هاد الاسبوع عنجد رح اجيب تارجت اكتر منك</div>

Hada	ʔilʔosboʕ	ʕandʒad	raħ	adʒeeb	target	akbar	minak
This	week	really	will	get	target	more	you

"This week, I promise I will get a higher target than you."

In this context, the DM ʕandʒad "really" indicates a challenge. The addresser reveals the challenge by claiming he will have a bigger target than his colleague, using the DM ʕandʒad "really" to signify, "I challenge" This utterance is classed as directive speech with a challenging function. The DM ʕandʒad "really" verifies that this phrase is directive speech with challenge conversational partner.

5.2.4. Using ʕandʒad "really" for Advice

<div dir="rtl">عنجد انا بنصحك تدرس منيح للامتحان لانه رح ييجي صعب</div>

ʕandʒad	ʔna	bnsˤaħak	todrus	mniħ	lalʔimtiħan
really	I	advise	study	well	for the exam

"I advise you to study well for the exam."

Using DM ʕandʒad "really" the addresser tells a university colleague to study hard for the exam, fearing it will be difficult. Thus, advice implies a future course of action only in the hearer's best interests (Martinez, 2003).

Advice falls under the category of directions, in which the addresser's objective is to convince the hearer to commit to a specific future course of action (Searle, 1969).

5.3. ʕandʒad "really" within Commissive Illocution
According to Yule (1996), Commissive speech acts demonstrate the addresser's commitment to an activity. The addresser's speech occurs only after some time, but in the future. Using commissives, the addresser attempts to make the world suit the words (via the addresser). ʕandʒad "really" assigns four pragmatic meanings in this category: threat, take an oath, promises, and offers.

5.3.1. Using ʕandʒad "really" for a Threat.

<div dir="rtl">عنجد رح احكي لابوك ازا بتعيدها تاني مرة</div>

ʕandʒad	raħ	aħki	la ʔabouk
seriously	will	tell	your father

"I will definitely tell your father."

In this context, the addresser shows a commitment to do a future harmful act. When used as a threat, the DM ʕandʒad "really" introduces the subordinate conditional clause in the conditional sentence. According to Al-Khawaldeh (2018), conditional sentences encode the speech act of threat in Arabic.

This function of the DM ʕandʒad "really" presents a threat; when utilizing ʕandʒad "really", the illocutionary force of an utterance demonstrates the addresser's intent to damage someone else in penalty. According to the findings, ʕandʒad "really" is used to introduce the speech act of threatening, which is a commissive act (Searle, 1975) since it implies a commitment or obligation to do something in the future.

5.3.2. Using ʕandʒad "really" to take an Oath

<div dir="rtl">والله عنجد اني صادق وهاد الي صار</div>

Wallahi	ʕandʒad	ʔini	sˤadeeq
I swear	seriously	that-I	sincere

"I swear, seriously, I'm being honest."

By swearing to God, the addresser assures the listener that he is telling the truth. The addresser utilizes the DM ʕandʒad "really" and Wallahi "I swear" to express his oath. Wallahi "I swear" an oath phrase is widely employed in Arabic to serve different roles and is typically utilized as an oath marker (Al-Khawaldeh, 2018).

According to Thayer (1996), swearing is "to affirm, promise, and threaten with an oath". Abdalla (2018) investigated many elements of oath phrases in Saudi Arabia, including their roles, forms, and meanings. He discovered that the primary goal of swearing is to be trusted to tell the truth.

5.3.3. Using ʕandʒad "really" for Promises

<div dir="rtl">عنجد رح اجيبلك هدية كتير حلوة اذا بتنجح بالامتحان</div>

ʕandʒadʕ	raħ	ʔadʒiblakħadjeh
really	will	buy	gift

"I promise I will buy you a gift."

In this context, the addresser will bring the listener a nice gift when passing the exam with the DM ʕandʒad "really". According to Searle (1975), the preparatory condition rule states that for the act of promising to be performed with full intent, the listener must have a sufficient reason to believe that the addresser can perform the obligation and that the addressee is willing and receptive to the addresser's future action.

The DM ʕandʒad "really" connects with promise. ʕandʒad "really" illocutionary act has an effect based on the addresser and addressee's intimate relationship, the context of the speech, and the likelihood of an occurrence in the future.

5.3.4. Using ʕandʒad "really" for Offers

<div dir="rtl">عنجد لازم تيجي على العزيمة وما في اعذار ابدا</div>

ʕandʒadʕ	lazim	tedʒj	ʕalʕazomeh
Really	should	come	the invitation

"You should accept my invitation."

An offer expresses your willingness to do something for someone or give them something. It is the addresser's statement to offer an act in the addressee's interest (Searle, 1975).

In this context, the addresser utilized the DM ʕandʒad "really" to extend an invitation to the audience. This is an example of a commissive speaking act classified as 'offering' speech. This is evident from the utterance ʕandʒad lazim tedʒj ʕalʕazomeh so, the addresser offers an invitation to the listener without making excuses.

5.4. ʕandʒad "really" within Representative Illocution

Representatives' performative utterances indicate telling or informing others about the current situation. These utterances commit the addresser to the truth of the propositional content (Searle, 1975). ʕandʒad "really" assigns four pragmatic meanings in this category: assertion, suggestion, complaint, and claim.

5.4.1 Using ʕandʒad "really" for Assertion

<div dir="rtl">أنا عنجد بحب القهوة</div>

ʕandʒadʕ	ʔana	baħib	ʔilqahweh
really	I	like	coffee

"I really like coffee."

In this context, ʕandʒad "really" can function as an assertion when the addresser asserts that he loves coffee and emphasizes the fact that he is enjoying drinking coffee.

5.4.2. Using ʕandʒad "really" for Suggestion

<div dir="rtl">تعرف عنجد لو ننقل المكتب مكان تاني بكون افضل</div>

ʕandʒad law   ninqol   ʔilmaktab

really   if   move   the desk.

"I suggest that we move the desk."

According to Searle (1985), the suggestion is the act of introducing an idea into someone's head. In this context, the employee suggests changing the desk to a more suitable place. This is an example of a suggestion as the addresser indicated that the addressee transfers the desk.

5.4.3. Using ʕandʒad "really" for a complaint

<div dir="rtl">عنجد الدكتور جاب الامتحان كتير صعب</div>

ʕandʒad ʔilʔimtiħan   kan   sˤaʕeb

really   the exam   was   hard

"The exam was really hard."

The addresser complains to his university colleague about the difficulties of the exam set by the professor employing the DM ʕandʒad "really". His colleague understands that the addresser's utterance is intended as a complaint.

Trosborg (1995) defines a complaint as an illocutionary act in which the addresser expresses disapproval or other negative feelings about the situation described in the proposition and holds the hearer directly or indirectly accountable.

5.4.4. Using ʕandʒad "really" for a Claim

<div dir="rtl">عنجد انا بحتاج ترقية بالوظيفة لاني انجزت منيح الفترة الماضي</div>

ʕandʒad ʔana   baħtadʒ tarqjeh

really   I   need   promotion

"I really deserve a promotion."

In this context, the employee used the DM ʕandʒad "really" to demand a promotion. It seems that he /she is exerting effort so, he/she wanted a promotion and used ʕandʒad "really" to emphasize the claim.

5.5. Are There Any Statistically Significant Differences in Using the DM ʕandʒad "really" Based on Gender?

The result of research question two is complied with theories of gender differences (Lakoff, 1975; Tannen, 1990; Coates et al., 2004). The t-test results showed that there are differences between male and female participants of the pragmatic functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really".

5.5.1. Significant Differences between Genders According to Expressives

Concerning expressive functions, the results showed significant differences (Sig. 0.017) between male and female participants in favor of the female participants. Female participants used the DM ʕandʒad "really" more than males, and this DM serves as an apology, sympathy, and surprise. Females reached a higher mean score than males (Mean score = 2.33 and 2.18, respectively). This is consistent with a study conducted by Banikalef (2019), who investigated gender disparities in speech acts in Jordanian Arabic on Facebook and discovered that male Jordanian Facebook users are more aggressive. In contrast, female Jordanian Facebook users are more expressive and emotional. Subsequently males had a higher mean score for the Anger function than females. This supports Tannen's (1990) observation that men's language is more factual, whereas women's is more emotional.

5.5.2. Significant Differences between Genders According to Directives

The directive functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" serve as request, command, challenge, and advice. The results showed significant differences between males and females. The results were in favor of the male participants. Males registered a higher mean score than females (Mean score = 2.20 and 1.92, respectively). This implies that females are more polite than males, and they make more commands, resulting in increased use of the DM ʕandʒad "really". This finding is arguably related to the Jordanian norms of men giving directives, which is in line with Tannen's (1990) and Coates's (2004) observations that men use more imperative language than women. These findings can be connected to Wood (2011) and Haas (1979); they claim that males prefer to use more directive utterances than females.

5.5.3. Significant Differences between Genders According to Commisives

Concerning Commissive functions, the results showed significant differences between males and females in favor of the male participants. Males used the DM ʕandʒad "really" more than females in this function, and this DM serves as threatening, promising, taking an oath and offer. Males registered a higher mean score than females (Mean score = 2.32 and 1.94, respectively). These findings fit in with Tannen's (1990) and Coates's (2004) hypothesis that males assert their dominance in society through their language to show their power and masculinity.

5.5.4. Significant Differences between Genders According to Representatives

Concerning Representative functions, the results showed significant differences between males and females in favor of the male participants. Males used the DM ʕandʒad "really" more than females in this function, and this DM serves as an assertion, suggestion, complaint, and claim. Males assigned a higher mean score than females (Mean score = 2.38 and 2.08, respectively).

6. Conclusion

This study followed a unique approach by applying Austin's (1962) speech act theory to delve into the pragmatic functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" in the Jordanian dialect. The classification of illocutionary acts is based on Searle's classifications (1976), which have led the study to organize and classify four primary constructs: Expressive, Directive, Commissive, and Representative.

The study has examined sixteen distinct pragmatic functions of the DM ʕandʒad "really" in Jordanian dialect. These functions encompass a wide range of communicative purposes, including expressions of anger, surprise, apologies, sympathy, commands, requests, challenges, advice, assertions, suggestions, complaints, claims, promises, oaths, threats, and offers. Participants were asked to rate the frequency of these functions in each sentence, showing exciting patterns in their usage. Notably, the Expressive function is the most commonly used, while the Directive function is the least common.

The study found that the pragmatic functions had significant values, which indicate significant mean differences between male and female participants. Males reported greater mean values than females, except Expressive, which favored females.

DMs still need to receive more attention in the AFL classroom. As a result, learners should recognize methods, functions and other elements to convey language in everyday conversation. Therefore, using ʕandʒad "really" not only introduces new learners to the language's most common pragmatic functions and other linguistic aspects but also serves as a pillar to understanding the culture and customs of native speakers. As learners progress in their skill level, the functions and linguistic characteristics of ʕandʒad "really" can be further highlighted, fostering a deeper connection and appreciation for the language. Consequently, DMs are pragmatically functioned and often occur in everyday contacts, AFL learners interact with native addressers, and they should be addressed as soon as they are linguistically experienced in the classroom to avoid an intercultural gap between the two parties. In addition to DM ʕandʒad "really", teachers should focus on many pragmatic uses of Jordanian discourse markers (such as Maʃi, inʃallah, Wallahi, ʔino, etc). They should give AFL learners numerous oral examples of the discourse markers mentioned above and others in context so that they can understand them and use them in daily intercultural situations.

First, this study has contributed to increasing knowledge about the need to study discourse markers to distinguish their different linguistic and extra-linguistic features. As a result, it is strongly recommended that additional research be conducted on other pragmatic functions of DM ʕandʒad "really" in JSA to shed light on the critical function of this category of vocabulary items in maintaining and improving explicit communication.

Second, this study could be reproduced to investigate and analyze other characteristics that may influence ʕandʒad "really" use and function, such as age and social class, etc. Finally, the current study used a quantitative method, namely a questionnaire, to explore DM ʕandʒad "really" pragmatic functions. As a result, future research may employ both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

References
[1] Al-Kayed, M. (2021). A relevance-theoretic approach to the discourse marker hasa'now'in JordanianArabic. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17*(S2), 937-945.
[2] 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.
[3] Al-Harahsheh, A., & Kanakri, M. (2013). The pragmatic functions and the translatability of "Ťayib" in Jordanian spoken Arabic. *US-China Foreign Language, 11*(3), 196-202.

[4]   Al-Khawaldeh, A. (2018). Uses of the discourse marker wallahi in Jordanian spoken Arabic: A pragma-discourse perspective. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 8*(6), 114-123.

[5]   Al-Shishtawi, H. (2020). The Pragmatic Functions of „Mashi" in Modern Arabic Language. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 7*(1), 32-49.

[6]   Al-Zumor, A. W. (2003). Apologies in Arabic and English: *An inter-language and cross-cultural study*.

[7]   Artstein, R., & Poesio, M. (2008). Inter-coder agreement for computational linguistics. *Computational linguistics*, *34*(4), 555-596.

[8]   Austin, J.L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. London: *Oxford University Press.*

[9]   Baron, J. M., Lewandrowski, K. B., Kamis, I. K., Singh, B., Belkziz, S. M., & Dighe, A. S. (2012). A novel strategy for evaluating the effects of an electronic test ordering alert message: optimizing cardiac marker use. *Journal of pathology informatics*, *3*(1), 3.

[10]   Braun, M., Hasson-Ohayon, I., Perry, S., Kaufman, B., & Uziely, B. (2005). Motivation for giving birth after breast cancer. *Psycho-Oncology: Journal of the Psychological, Social and Behavioral Dimensions of Cancer, 14*(4), 282-296.

[11]   Brinton, L. (1996). Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions. *New York: Mouton de Gruyter*.

[12]   Brown, G., Malmkjær, K., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1996). Performance and competence in second language acquisition. *Cambridge university press*.

[13]   Cohen, P. R., & Perrault, C. R. (1979). Elements of a plan-based theory of speech acts. *Cognitive science, 3*(3), 177-212

[14]   Colston, H. L., & Lee, S. Y. (2004). Gender differences in verbal irony use. *Metaphor and Symbol, 19*(4), 289-306.

[15]   Creswell, J. W. (1999). Mixed-method research: Introduction and application. In *Handbook of educational policy* (pp. 455-472). Academic press.

[16]   Ehrlich, S., Meyerhoff, M., & Holmes, J. (Eds.). (2017). *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality. John Wiley & Sons.*

[17]   Ennasser, N., & Hijazin, R. (2021). The Jordanian arabic discourse marker bas: A pragmatic analysis. Kervan. *International Journal of African and Asian Studies, 25*(1).

[18]   Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of pragmatics, 14*(3), 383-398.

[19]   Habib, R. (2021). The use of the discourse markers yaʕni and ʔinnu:'I mean'in Syrian Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics, 178, 245-257.*

[20]   Hamdan, J. M., & Rumman, R. A. (2020). The pragmatic functions of Yahummalali in Jordanian spoken Arabic. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures, 12*(3), 327-345.

[21]   Hamdan, J., & Hammouri, D. (2022). The Pragmatic Functions of the Idiomatic Expression Yalla in Jordanian Spoken Arabic. *PSYCHOLINGUISTICS, 31*(2), 137-160.

[22]   Heine, B., Kaltenböck, G., Kuteva, T., & Long, H. (2021). On the rise of discourse markers. *Studies at the Grammar-Discourse Interface: Discourse Markers and Discourse-Related Grammatical Phenomena. John Benjamins Publishing Company*, 23-56.

[23]   Holmes, J. (1990). Apologies in New Zealand English1. *Language in society, 19*(2), 155-199.

[24]   Jarrah, M., Al-Marayat, S., & Salem, E. (2020). The discourse use of ʔilʔa: n'now'in Jordanian Arabic. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics, 17*(1).

[25]   Kanakri, M. A., & Al-Harahsheh, A. M. (2013). The Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics of ʔa: di in Jordanian Spoken Arabic. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 3*(6), 59.

[26]   King, B. W., & Holmes, J. (2014). Gender and pragmatics. *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics,* 1-4.

[27]   Klassen, A. C., Creswell, J., Plano Clark, V. L., Smith, K. C., & Meissner, H. I. (2012). Best practices in mixed methods for quality of life research. *Quality of life Research*, *21*, 377-380.

[28]   Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(3), 279-289.

[29]   Kridalaksana, H. (1978). Spelling reform 1972: a stage in the process of standardisation of bahasa Indonesia. *In Papers from the Conference on the Standardisation of Asian Languages, Manila, Philippines, December 16-21, 1974*. Pacific Linguistics.

[30]   Kridalaksana, H. (1980). Linguistic postulates as outlined above underlie all approaches in. Yang tersirat dan tersurat: *Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Indonesia*, 1940-1980, 98.

[31]   Leimgruber, J. R., Lim, J. J., Gonzales, W. D. W., & Hiramoto, M. (2021). Ethnic and gender variation in the use of Colloquial Singapore English discourse particles. *English Language & Linguistics, 25*(3), 601-620.

[32]   Lenk, U., (1998). Discourse Markers and Global Coherence in Conversation. *Journal of pragmatics, 30*(2), 245-257.

[33]   Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge university press.

[34]   lshammary, M. S. (2021). The Meaning and Functions of qSdk and yAny as Discourse Markers in Saudi Arabic. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 11*(6), 717-722.

[35]   Mahsun. (2005). Metode Penelitian Bahasa. *PT Raja Grafindo Persada.*

[36]   Maschler, Y., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). Discourse markers language, meaning, and context. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 189-221.

[37]   Moutaouakil, A. (2014). *Pragmatic functions in a functional grammar of Arabic* (Vol. 8). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

[38]   Munira, S., Hossain, A., & Nessa, M. (2020). The Perception of Using Language in Gender Disparity: A Study on Tertiary Level Students. *Asian Journal of Social Science Studies, 5*(1), 1.

[39]   Nasser A, H., Afzal, N., & Abdulaziz A, A. (2020). Discourse markers in Arabic and English newspaper articles: The case of the Arabic lakin and its English equivalent but. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume, 11*.

[40]   Nazzal, A. (2005). The pragmatic functions of the recitation of Qur'anic verses by Muslims in their oral genre: The case of Insha'Allah,'God's willing'. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA), 15*(2-3), 251-273

[41]   Nunnally, J. C. (1978). An overview of psychological measurement. *Clinical diagnosis of mental disorders: A handbook*, 97-146.

[42]   Paltridge, B (2012). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Bloomsbury.

[43]   Pasaribu, P. (2017). Female directors and firm performance: Evidence from UK listed firms. Gadjah *Mada International Journal of Business, 19*(2), 145-166.

[44]   Pasaribu, T. A. (2017). Male and female students' use of textual discourse markers in writing academic essays. *Journal of Language and Literature*, *17*(1), 74-81.

[45] Rabab'ah, G., Al-Yasin, N., & Yagi, S. (2022). A Socio-Pragmatic Study of Gender Differences in the Use of "Walak'(Woe) and Its Variants in Spoken Jordanian Arabic. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics, 9*(1).

[46] Rosyidi, A. Z., Mahyuni, M., & Muhaimi, M. (2019). Illocutionary Speech acts use by jokowidodo in first Indonesia Presidential Election Debate 2019. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding, 6*(2), 735-740

[47] Rugg, G., & Petre, M. (2006). *A gentle guide to research methods*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

[48] Sadock, J. (2006). Speech acts. *The handbook of pragmatics*, 53-73.

[49] Saeed, A., Mukarram, S. S., & Belghitar, Y. (2021). Read between the lines: Board gender diversity, family ownership, and risk-taking in Indian high-tech firms. *International Journal of Finance & Economics*, *26*(1), 185-207.

[50] Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers* (No. 5). Cambridge University Press.

[51] Schneider, K. P., & Barron, A. (Eds.). (2008). *Variational pragmatics: A focus on regional varieties in pluricentric languages* (Vol. 178). John Benjamins Publishing.

[52] Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts1. *Language in society*, *5*(1), 1-23.

[53] Utami, W. R. (2021). *An Analysis Of Perlocutionary Acts in Nissa Sabyan's Instagram* (Doctoral dissertation).

[54] Xia, X. (2013). Gender differences in using language. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, *3*(8).

[55] Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford university press.