PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

THE MORPHOLOGICAL PATTERNS OF ENGLISH DISCOURSE MARKERS IN PASHTU SPEECH IN PAKISTAN.

Dr. Sohaib Sultan[1], Dr. Naveed-Ur-Rehman Khattak[2], Dr. Afia Kanwal[3]

[1] Department of Education, Air University Islamabad.

[2,3] Department of English, Air University Islamabad.

Email: [1]sohaib.sultan@mail.au.edu.pk, [2]naveed.khattak@mail.au.edu.pk,

[3]afia.kanwal@mail.au.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

English, the language of education, government, power, judiciary, military and media etc.; in Pakistan (Rahman, 1992), has crucial influence on Pashtu language. Pashtu speakers these days use hybrid Pashtu embedded with English morphological characters. While speaking Pashtu, the English expressions like *yea*, *hmm*, and *exactly* etc., are frequently used as discourse markers. 'Discourse markers' (DMs) are often called 'Pragmatic Markers' (Fraser, 2005). These are a class of morphological expressions found almost in every language. The study has examined the use of English discourse markers in Pashtu speech by identifying the morphological patterns of the use of English expressions; used as discourse markers in Pashtu speech, analyzed the functions of English expressions as discourse markers, and illustrated the influence of English discourse markers on Pashtu speech. By using Mixed Methods research, data for the research was collected from several Pakistani Pashtu television programs and day to day conversation via 'Non-Participant Observation' (Kothari, 2004), and analyzed according to the analytical framework of 'Discourse Markers' by Fung and Carter (2007). The study is significant in exemplifying the morphological patterns of English discourse markers in Pashtu communicative events.

INTRODUCTION

Discourse markers (DMs) are often called Pragmatic Markers (Fraser, 2005). These are a class of lexical expressions found almost in every language. Fraser (2005) is of the view that although 'it is part of discourse but a propositional content of the message conveyed'. Richards and Schmidt (2002) stated that

Discourse markers are 'expressions that typically connect two segments of discourse but do not contribute to the meaning of either. These include adverbials e.g. *however, still,* conjunction e.g. *and, but,* and propositional phrases e.g. *in fact*''.

Fraser (1999) further states that these classes of lexical expressions are from the grammatical classes of preposition, adverbial and conjunctional phrases. Shiffrin (1987) defines discourse markers as the linguistic expression that are sequentially dependents elements join 'the non-obligatory part i.e. the initial utterance with the ongoing talk' that includes linguistic expressions consist of variety of word classes like conjunctions like *but*, adverbs like *similarly, now,* Interjections like *oh* and lexicalized phrases like *you know, I mean*. She further added that these markers function in five different planes; a participation framework, information state, ideational structure, action structure, exchange structure (Schifrin, 1987). The discourse markers playing an important role in everyday use of a language. As the discourse markers create cohesion, unity and interlink topics in ongoing discussion. Fraser (1988) is of the view that 'the absence of the discourse marker does not render a sentence ungrammatical and /or unintelligible. It does, however, remove a powerful clue about what commitment the speaker makes regarding the relationship between the current utterance and the prior discourse'.

A morphological pattern is a set of associations and/or operations that build the various forms of a lexeme, possibly by *inflection*, *agglutination*, *compounding* or *derivation* (Crystal, 2008). English, the language of education, government, power, judiciary, military and media etc. in Pakistan (Rahman, 1992), has crucial influence on Pashtu. Pashtu speakers, these days, use language that is mixed with English morphological constructs, for instance, English expressions like yea, hmm, exactly, etc. are frequently used as pragmatic markers. If one observes in the surrounding so, almost all of the local languages like Pashtu have lost its purity especially in speech events, and using both mother and English language interchangeably has become a linguistic behavior in Pakistan. The study has examined the use of morphological patterns of English discourse markers in Pashtu speech, identified their use, analyzed their functions, and illustrated their influence in Pashtu speech events. The study is significant in exemplifying the impact of English pragmatic markers and their role in Pashtu speech, thus, manifested the hybrid use of English and Pashtu in communicative events.

LITERATURE REVIEW
English, a common source of communication is used as a bridge to avoid conflict of languages, due to which 'nowadays everybody speaks English' (Cholakova, 2015) therefore has strongly influenced other languages in the world. It is the preferred medium of communication and social interaction in the sub-continent. It is the vehicle of achieving modernization, scientific and technological development and financial advancement for one's self and the country. Since independence, English language has a strong position in Pakistan and due to the strong influences of the colonization has adopted the status of being the language of the employment. With the passage of time, the sub-continental English acquired neutrality in linguistic context resulting in

acquired undesirable connotations of native languages, dialects and style (Kachru, 1994). In Pakistan it is the language used for performing regulatory, instrumental, inter-personal and creative functions (Kachru,1986), and is considered the passport of social mobility and access to national and international opportunities. In a multilingual country like Pakistan, the influence of languages on each other is affected through the user. Generally, an individual's mother tongue does influence his mastery of the second language resulting in the process that has been variously referred to as mother tongue interference, approximation, or inter-language. The influence, however, is seldom uni-directional. If the second language is a dominant language, as is the case of English language, the impact on the first language can have far reaching implications. Fillmore (1991) states that English has a greater impact on the first language if children start learning it the younger age. Cummins (2000) talks about the relationship between L1 and L2 by 'Common Underlying Proficiency' (CUP) that these two languages cannot exist independently.

Pakistan is a multilingual country in which along with Urdu as a national language, four major provincial languages are spoken in different provinces i.e. Sindhi, Baluchi, Pashtu and Punjabi. The lexical influence of English on local languages in Pakistan is wide in scope and can easily be observed from the linguistic behaviors of the users both in speech and writing at 'inter or intra-sentential level" (Mooneeb, Ahmad & Fakhar, 2016). Verma (2015) found that many words of military, education, administration and courts are added from English to Punjabi and got modified according to the rhythm of Punjabi speech. Along these, there are many words that are accepted in Punjabi without any change in pronunciation and spellings such as; rail, bus, line, press, fee, school, college, pen, tax, shave, hotel, vote, etc. (Talib, 1970). On the other side, many words added into Punjabi have lost its English characteristics and "have adopted the rules of Punjabi morphology (Sethi, 1976). Mugheri and Lohar (2018) on use of English words in Sindhi language reported that due to the enhancing trend of interference of English words, Sindhi language is changing and revamping rapidly.

In Pakistan, Pashtu language is spoken mainly in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. In the province Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, English-Pashtu hybridization is a sociolinguistic phenomenon, and the social and linguistics features of both the language are interlinked in communicative events (Ahmad, 2018). The hybridization of Pashtu and English with the passage of time has results in the "desertion of original Pashtu equivalents" (Ahmad, 2018). Also, 'Pashto English hybridization is a manifestation of the changing attitudes of Pashto speakers towards their ethnic identity" Ahmad, 2018: 15). The speakers of Pashtu language frequently code mix with English in daily conversations, as a result many loan words of English language have become integral part of the lexical choices in speech events. For examples words like cable, officer, program, list, system, and normal etc., have become permanent part of speech in Pashtu, and in the social communicative events people are in a state of 'linguistic confusion' (Mustafa, 2015). Kachru (1986) states the languages that a multilingual mix determines his social status and "code mixing also marks his attitude and relationship towards the participants in a speech act and consequently, the attitudes of the other participants towards him" (p. 36).

Though Pashtu language is spoken pre-dominantly in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, it is not the language of education, law, commerce, judiciary etc. It is said that Pashtu is not used by the Pashtu speaking community in any significant way other than as mother tongue and native language (Rehman, 1995). The English masters who brought with them modernity, advancement in technology, new concepts unknown to the local people, and growing communication in English, as a future lingua franca, are some of the factors that influence the use of Pashtu language. In KPK and tribal areas, the Pashtu language is not used in the domains of power or education. The medium of instruction in education is either Urdu or English; therefore, the domains of use for Pashtu language are restricted only to local social interactions. The social interaction is even marred by 'Code Switching or Code Mixing'. The speakers of Pashtu language frequently code mix with English in daily conversations. Words like, computer, television, telephone, internet, cable TV, laptop, mobile, channel etc are used by all and sundry preferring it over alternative in the Pashtu language. During our conversations, as Pashtu speakers, we often mix code and also switch code which is slightly different. Pashtu-English code-mixing leads to the creation of hybrid forms, which further contribute to a shift from original Pashtu equivalents. The frequent use of English lexical items in Pashtu language indicates and reflects the societal acceptance of linguistic change. It also points towards the changing attitude of Pashtu speaker towards English language. Based on Kachru (1986) 'Englishization of Hindi', we can say that Pashtu-English mixing may give way to a new variety of Pashtu language. This variety may come into existence owing to rich vocabulary of English language, reduction in proficiency problems for the Pashtu speakers and provision of more adaptability in the swiftly changing world. The study has examined the use of English discourse, identified the use of these discourse markers, and analyzed their functions in Pashtu speech.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study has used Mixed Methods research by employing both quantitative and qualitative methods. Data for the present research has been collected from several Pakistani television programs and day to day conversation. Thirty-Five Pashtu TV programs were selected from different Pashtu TV channels like Mashriq TV, Khyber TV and Khyber News, by using the technique of Simple Random Sampling (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005). The data i.e. English discourse markers used in Pashtu speech from different T.V. programs, was collected through Non-Participant Observation (Kothari, 2004). Then the discourse markers used in its real contexts are analyzed according to the analytical framework of 'Discourse Markers' by Fung and Carter (2007). Fung and Carter formulated the following classification for the analysis of the use of English Discourse Markers and its function.

Table no.01. Discourse Markers

Category A:	Category B:	Category C:	Category D:
Interpersonal Markers:	Referential Markers	Structural Markers	Cognitive Markers
Sub-Categories:	**Sub-Category**	**Sub-Category**	**Sub-Category:**
a. Shared Knowledge b. Attitude c. Propositional Stance d. Showing Response	a. Cause b. Contrast c. Coordination d. Consequence e. Digression f. Comparison	a. Opening and Closing of Topic b. Sequence c. Topic Shifts d. Summarize e. Continuation of the Topic	a. Elaboration b. Reformulation c. Thinking Process d. Hesitation

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Interpersonal Discourse Markers

As per Fung and Carter model of Discourse Markers (2007), there are four categories of Discourse Markers. The first one is Interpersonal Discourse Markers. These are the markers used by a speaker to improve social relationship by referring to shared knowledge, show attitude to the concerned matter of discussion, express different viewpoint with the use of propositional stances and pass judgment with his/her response. Interpersonal Discourse markers, as per functions, are categorized into four sub categories i.e. shared knowledge, attitude, propositional stance and showing response.

a.   Shared Knowledge

This category performs the function of referring to the knowledge shared by both the speaker and listener. On the interpersonal dimension, perception verbs such as see, listen, know etc., are often used as DMs for sharing knowledge between the speaker and the listener. (Fung and Carter, 2007). Following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of this category in the data obtained.

Sub-Category	Discourse Markers (DMs)	Frequency	Percentage
Shared Knowledge	You know	17	50 %
	You see	8	23%
	See	9	26%

Table. 01. DMs of Shared Knowledge

You know, you see, and see etc., are used in the situation when one starts the conversation and to address someone. While using it, the Pashtu speakers have actually tried to involve the listener in the conversation by referring to the addressee's previous knowledge e.g., in the conversation, '*Pakistan k da Cricket shaiqeen der d and **you know** che dagha team performance khan na wi nu khalq*

wrta der ghusa wi' (As in Pakistan there are huge fans of Cricket but if the team is not performing well so the anger of Pakistanis is at peak then.) the DM 'you know' is used to expect the same knowledge from the listener and make him/her involved in the discourse. *'Quarter final k Pakistan performance kha wo, **you see**, Shaheen Afridi sumra kha form k wo'* (In quarter final Pakistan's performance was best, you see, Shaheen Afridi was in good form.) the DM 'you see' is used to refer to the point which is already clear and known to the listener and *'ma first time swat ta visit oko, **see**, d area k behtareen mosam di.'* (I visited for the first time to Swat and see how best the weather here is!) the speaker has used the DM 'see' in an attempt to talk about the thing already known to the listener.

b.   Attitude and Propositional Stance

These discourse markers show the attitude of the speaker to what has been said or expressed with verbal expressions. The adverbs like surprisingly, amazing, and off course, etc., are mostly used to express the attitude and propositional stance of the speakers. The attitude can either be negative or positive thus can either function to facilitate the smooth flow or stop the conversation. As attitude refers to 'a complex mental state involving beliefs and feelings and values and dispositions to act in certain ways'; whereas, proposition is "a statement that affirms or denies something and is either true or false" (Advance Oxford Dictionary) therefor, both of these show the mental response to something thus are alike in nature that's why both of these have been discussed under one sub-heading. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these categories in the data obtained.

Discourse Markers	Frequency	%age	DM	Frequency	%age
Well	12	23%	Specially	8	4%
I think	22	42%	Obviously	28	14%
Directly	6	3%	Honestly	18	9%
Collectively	5	2%	Hopefully	12	6%
Unfortunately	4	2%	Basically	15	7%
Appropriately	2	1%	Generally	10	5%
Personally	8	4%	Easily	4	2%
Clearly	9	4%	Ultimately	10	5%
Deadly	2	1%	Definitely	19	9%
Luckily	8	4%	This is the fact	8	4%
Believe me	12	6%	Please	18	34%
			Literally	7	3%

Table no. 02 Attitude & Propositional Stance

As illustrated in the above table, different DMs are used by Pashtu speakers as marks of attitude and prepositional stance. For instance, in a conversation, *'Parony game k khu sarfaraz der zabrdast performance kare wo'* (Yesterday Sarfaraz performed best in the game) a speaker talked about the best performance to which an another speaker replied with DM 'Wow..**really!'** that shows the happy feelings of the speaker to the news which helped in keeping the conversation continued. *'Zu ba school ta visit kom...'* (I will visit the school) a person replied **'Well**...*bya khu*

ba grana wi che da documentation complete shi' (Well… then it will be difficult for me to complete the documentation) the DM 'well' is used in the start of the sentence showing the hesitation and reluctance of the replier to the view of the speaker about not visiting the school today. '***Surprisingly**, Babar Azam der kha performance kare wo'* (Surprisingly, Babar Azam's performance was best) the DM surprisingly is used to create an impact of awe and surprise. *'Sir, Pakistan k zyat rujhan da parents medical or engineering taraf ta d'* (Sir in Pakistan parents are more inclined towards medical and engineering field for their kids) a person replied '***Exactly**, hm da khabara da che private medical and engineering colleges aw universities day by day khpl fees zyata wi as che demand y der d* (Exactly, this is the reason that day by day Private medical and engineering colleges and universities are increasing their fee). Also, the adverbs like 'specially, basically, honestly, literally, etc., are used by Pashtu speakers the stress on something going on in discussion e.g.*'ma taso ta **specially** medical field bara k khabara kawala'* (I was specially talking about the medical field), *'**basically** da dwe ishara political system ta da.'* (Basically they are referring towards the political system), *'**Literally** zama poetry ka sa interest nishta* (Literally I don't have any interest in poetry), and *'**Honestly** dwe da marks deserving kaye.'* (Honestly they deserved these marks.) In this category, the adverbs like 'luckily, hopefully, unfortunately, fortunately, etc., are used as discourse markers showing the attitude of the speaker towards the luck or fortune e.g. *'Monitoring wala che rala nu **luckily** zamong da school record ready wo'* (**Luckily**, our school record was ready when monitoring team visited), *'**Hopefully** de session matric result ba kha wi'* (**Hopefully**, the session of this session will be good), and *'**Unfortunately**, Pakistan semi-final na out sho'* (Unfortunately Pakistan is out of Semi-Final) etc. Whereas, the adverbs like 'collectively, generally, etc.' are used for giving an over-all and general view in the ongoing conversation e.g.*'**Generally** co-education Pakistan ki kha na consider kegi'* (Generally, co-education is not considered good in Pakistan), *'**Collectively** satso tol performance kha d'* (Collectively your performance is good). The DM 'ultimately' is used to assert the speaker's point of view e.g. *'taso khpala kawal khu **ultimately** zama point la ralei'* (Ultimately you all came to my point after you all have tested your own ways), *staso sa khyal d da amount d construction dapara enough na wo?*

(What do you think this amount isn't enough for construction?), and the DM 'to be honestly' is used to show the attitude of commitment by the speaker e.g. '*Five, six lakh ghat amount d, **to be honest'*** (To be honest, five, six lakhs is a huge amount).
.

c. Show Response

These DMs are used for showing response in order to keep the conversation continued and in progress. These include expressions like hmm, right, okay, etc. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these categories in the collected data.

DMs	Frequency	%age	DMs	Frequency	%age
Exactly	30	13%	I am sorry	18	8%
For one and for all	4	1%	Thank you so much	20	9%
Yah/yeah	18	8%	Okay	30	13%
Yes	22	10%	Very nice	9	4%
Not at all	5	2%	OH great	11	5%
Thank you	22	10%	Well	12	5%
No doubt	16	7%	For me	8	3%

Table no. 03 Show Responses

The DM *'For me'* is used by a Pashtu speaker when s/he wants to express his/er own view e.g. when a person said '*d blast sara khu ba der loss shawe d'* (This blast has done a lot of harm) another responded by using the DM 'for me' i.e. '***For me** khudkash bambar khu ba yaw 10 to 20 kasan wajale wi'* (For me the suicide bomber would have killed 10 to 20 people) to keep the conversation going on. The DM *'Yeah/ Yes'* is used to show addressee interest and involvement in the conversation e.g. when an anchor said *'Taso tol ba game k participation kawai*? (Will you all participate in the game?) a guest replied, '***Yes**. You know da aghwe games interested y and zu hamesha der enjoy kom* (You know their games are always very interested and I really enjoy it). Likewise, the DM 'right' is used by a guest in a reply and to keep the conversation continued when he said, '***Right**…zu ba next time koshish km che zyat students d program ta rawalm'* (Right, next time I will try to bring some more students to the program). The DM 'thank you' is used as a gratitude when a guest replied, '***Thank you so much** dear, der awesome d'* (Thank you so much dear, it's really awesome.). Some of the DMs in this category are used as response marker to emphasize that something is true or likely to be true e.g. '*Maulan Fazle Rahman, **no doubt**, mulaqat kare wo da Bilawal Bhutto sara'* (No doubt that Maulana Fazle Rahman met with Bilawal Bhutto), *'For one and for all, da statement da tolo dapara same da'* (For one and for all this statement is for all), and '***Well**, zu ba goram ku kali k me oko aw ku Peshawar k oko'* (Well, I may get admission either in village or Peshawar)

Referential Markers

According to the Fung and Carter (2007) model of Discourse Markers, the second category is Referential Discourse Markers. These DMs performs the textual functions of; the cause and effect, contrast and concession, coordination and comparison between two ideas, things and changing the ongoing topic. These are further divided into six sub-categories i.e. cause, contrast, coordination, consequence, comparison and digression. Referential Discourse Markers provide indexical direction to various semantic relationships such as causal (cos/because), consequential (so), contrastive (but), disjunctive (or), coordinative (and), digressive (anyway) and comparative (likewise, similarly).

a. *Cause*

Referential Discourse markers of cause are used to refer to the reason of why and how something has happened. The conjunction like 'through', 'because',

etc. are used for referring to the cause or reason of doing something. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of this discourse markers in the collected data.

Discourse Markers	Frequency	%age
Through	5	23%
Because	10	47%
After all	6	28%

Table no.04 Cause

The DM 'through' is dominantly found in the use of referring to the cause of development of something e.g. *'Da taleem pa **through** mong traqqi kawale sho'* (We can get development through education.) The discourse marker 'because' is used to refer to the reason of something done or going to do, like e.g. *'nan saba halaat der kha shawe it's **because** che khalqu k awareness raghale'* (Nowadays the circumstances are so good it's because of awareness in people). Likewise, in the example, *'Ma khu we che taso ba khabara kare wi, **after all** tu da de committee hisa y'* (I thought you would have talked with them after all you are the part of the committee), the DM 'after all' for stating the reason and referring to the fact.

b.　　Contrast and Concession

These discourse markers are used for making a contrast between the prior and preceding part of the talk, and connect two contrasting ideas. The DMs of contrast are; although, however, but, beside, on the contrary, while, in spite of the fact, on the other side, and still, etc. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

DM	Frequency	%age	DM	Frequency	%age
Still	5	12.5%	Nonetheless	1	2.5%
On the contrary	2	5%	Yet	6	15%
Beside	3	7.5%	Even though	2	5%
Though	2	5%	After all	2	5%
Although	3	7.5%	But	8	20%
Nevertheless	1	2.5%	Otherwise	5	12.5%

Table no. 05 Contrast/Concession

In a conversation, '*Garmi dera da **still** zu ba uni ta visit km'.* (It's too hot still I will visit university) a DM 'still' is used for the purpose of a concession to the fact that the weather is hot but a visit to the university be made. Whereas, DMs like 'but', 'in contrast', 'although', 'otherwise', 'even then' and 'on the other way', etc. have been used to create cohesion among contrasting ideas in conversations. e.g. In the conversations, *'Although che Pakistan der khkule d khu still tourism pake nade promote'* (Although Pakistan has a great natural beauty but still tourism has not been promoted), *'Pakistan k democracy da, **but***

Army influence hm der d' (Pakistan is a democratic country but at the same time army retains its power and influence), *'taso pa time da kar pora kai **otherwise** punishment ba drta milawigi.'* (You need to complete your work on time otherwise you would get punishment.) *and '**Although** che students late razi class dapara **even then** zu khpl duty properly kum' (*Although students come late to the class even then I perform my duty properly'

c.   Coordination

These DMs create a coordination and link between the preceding and prior statements, with lexical items 'and', 'additionally', 'when', 'whoever', and 'throughout' etc. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

DMs	Frequency	%age
Additionally	5	7.7%
Between	5	7.7%
Throughout	4	6%
Already	19	29%
When	8	12.3%
And whoever	6	9%
And	18	27.7%

Table. no. 06 DMs for Coordination

The above DMs have been identified with a dominate function of linking and coordinating ideas in a coherent Pashtu speech. For example, in the conversations, *'zu Peshawar ta zum **and** class ba attend km'* (I am going to Peshawar and I will attend the class), *'**Already** taso dlta raghale yai **so** zu ba leave wakhlm'* (As you have already arrived over here so, I will take the leave), *'**Whenever** che taso dalta visit kawai nu zu ba available ym'* (Whenever you visit here in future so I will be available), and *'Mong khpl pora koshish kawo che da dwe safety maintained ko aw **additionally** da dwe security guards army na well trained ve' (*we have been trying to maintain the security additionally two security guards are to be well trained from army).

d.   Consequence

Some of the discourse markers shows the consequence and the result of something like; 'as a result', 'consequently', 'so', 'hence', 'thus', 'so that', and 'therefore' etc. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

Discourse Markers	Frequency	Percentage
Even	5	16%
Otherwise	4	12.9%
As a result	3	9.7%
Consequence	4	12.9%
So	15	48%

Table. no. 07 DMs for Consequence

The DM 'as a result', and 'so' are used for showing the effect of a cause, e.g., *'Da Ahmad running speed tez wo **as a result** first position y achieve ko'* (Ahmad running speed was fast as a result he got first position) and *'sara passion doctor jore dal wo **so** aghe ba shpa aw wraz study kawala'* (Sara was passionate to become a doctor so she used to study day and night). Whereas, the DM **'consequently'** is used to show the consequence of first discourse segment on the other e.g., *'Young doctors ta khpl rights na milawida **consequently** aghwe strike shoro ku'* (Young doctors were not given their right consequently they went on strike).

e.   Comparison

These DMs are used in speech to establish comparison and highlight the similarity with the use of words, 'similarly', 'like', 'in the same way',' more than', and 'likewise' etc. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

Discourse Markers	Frequency	Percentage
Up to the mark	2	6%
Like	6	20%
Similarly	6	20%
In the same way	8	26%
Likewise	5	16%
More than	3	10%

Table. no. 08 DMs for Comparison

In the data the above-mentioned DMs have been identified with the functions of comparing and establishing similarities between the different segments of the same conversation. E.g. '*Taso practice kwai, **in the same way**, taso ba resources hm manage kawai'* (You continue practicing in the same way you have to manage resources as well), '*Zamong area k **more than** 20 kasan select d job dapara'* (In our area more than 20 candidates were selected for this post), and '*da DC of Swat performance **up to mark** d'* (The DC of Swat performance is up to the mark) etc.

f.   Digression

The discourse markers of digression are used in a speech to change the topic, and jump from one theme to another with the use of the words 'still', 'even' and 'anyways' etc. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

Discourse Markers	Frequency	Percentage
Still	2	16%
Even	3	25%
Anyways	7	58%

Table. no. 09 DMs for Digression

In the converstaion, *'Taso khpl surrounding k ogorei che khalaq sumra interest show kaye politics k,* **anyways** *khpl responsibilities bande focus kawal pakar d instead of criticising others'* (You observe in your surrounding that how many people are interested in the politics, anyways the focus should be on one's responsibility instead of criticizing others) and '***Anyways*** *razoo g staso taraf ta'* (Anyways coming towards you.) the DM **anyways** is used to change the topic and shift the dimension of the conversation.

Structural Markers

According to Fung and Carter (2007) model of Discourse Markers, the third category of DM is Structural Discourse Markers. It has been used for 'marking sequential relationship, helps in topic shifting, signposting of opening and closing of the topics. As per functions, these are divided into three sub-categories. Some discourse markers create sequential relationship, some helps in topic shifting and others are used for opening and closing of topics.

a.   Sequence

Discourse markers of sequence create sequential relationship among two or more events, incidents, talks, and happenings, etc. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

Discourse Markers	Frequency	Percentage
When	8	7%
Point number one, two	2	1%
Then	6	5%
Next	6	5%
Secondly	2	1%
Initially	9	7%
Currently	9	7%
Second	11	9%
Once	9	7%
Already	12	10%
Upcoming	3	2%
Recent/recently	10	8%
Rarely	9	7.9%
Last	8	7%
Firstly/first	10	8%

Table. no 10. Discourse Markers of Sequence

In the Pashtu speech the above DMs were used in different contexts. For instance, '***First*** *zu Peshawar hospital ta visit kum aw* ***next*** *khpl office ta zm'* (First I'll visit Peshawar hospital and next will visit my office), ***'Initially*** *ma as a school player start aghesty wo and* ***then*** *ma proper Cricket academy join kra.* (Initially I started as a school player and then joined a proper Cricket academy),and '***Once*** *taso da step complete kai* ***then next*** *steps easy d.* (Once

you complete this step then next is easy) the DMs are used to create sequential link between the utterances.

b.   New Topic and Digression

These DMs Many are used as a signal for changing the topic so as to develop coherence between two different topics. These include words like anyways, well, and let's, etc. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

Discourse Markers	Frequency	Percentage
Well	12	26.7%
By the way	8	17.8%
Anyways	15	33%
Let's	10	22%

Table no. 11. DMs of New Topic and Digression

In the Pashtu speech the above DMs were used in different contexts. For instance, *'Health der issues d Pakistan k. **Anyways** was ba mung break wakhlo'* (There are severe issues of health anyways let's take a break), *'Tapos pukhtana na pas **let's** start the discussion da games bara k'.* (After greetings now let's start discussion about the games), and *'Staso issue k ma khabara nada kare nu **let me talk'**.* (I didn't talk in your issue so let me talk) etc., the DMs 'anyways', 'let', and 'let me talk' signal the changing of the topic and dimension of the discussion.

c.   Opening and Closing of Topics

These DMs create coherence in the conversation. Some are used in the opening and some in the closing of the conversation with the function to either direct the listener to the end of the ongoing discourse or the beginning of the next discourse. (Fung & Carter, 2007 p.). Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) observed that these DMs include expressions like right, OK, good, now, let's start, ok now, and the next topic is etc. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) called these as a 'Pre-Closing Device', whereas Fraser (2005) labelled these as 'Conversational Management Markers'. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

DM	Frequency	Percentage
Let me	9	18.7%
Let's	7	14%
Okay	12	25%
Now	13	27%
Let's come toward	7	14.6%

Table no. 12. DMs of Opening and Closing

In the Pashtu speech the above DMs for instance are used as, '*nan mosam der garam d, **Well**, introduction koma da dwaro cricketers'* (today the weather is very hot Well, let me introduce the cricketers), and '***OK alright**…so was main topic ta razo'* (Ok alright, now let's come to the main topic) etc., thus perform the functions of signaling to the listener the closing signal and starting of the new topic.

d.   *Summarizing the Topic*

Some DMs are used for summarizing and concluding the whole conversation for example the expression like 'in short' etc. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of this discourse markers in the collected data.

Discourse Markers	Frequency	Percentage
In short	7	100%

Table no. 13. DMs of Summarising

In Pashtu speech the above DM for instance in the utterance '*In short monga da waile shu che Pakistan k army influence zyat d'* (In short we can say that Army has a huge influence in Pakistan.), is used to conclude and summarize the topic.

Cognitive Process

The cognitive process DMs are used for signifying the thinking and cognitive process, elaborating the ideas and reformulating some of the statements. For (Svartvik,1980), these are often used as reference to delay the talk in a sense that may signify a speaker is not ready to answer on the spot, or does not have readymade syntactic structure in the mind, thus, searching for the appropriate word. These include elaboration, reformulation and thinking process DMs.

a.   *Elaboration*

These DMs are used to further elaborate the propositional stance of the speaker in order to clarify his/her intention (Fung and Carter, 2007). Shiffrin (1987) is of the view that the DM 'I mean' clarifies and explain speaker's own idea and intention. Muller (2004) further explains that the DM 'like' is used as an expression to give some explanation and used as a lexical focuser. Along with it, Fraser (2005) is of the view that with the use of, "Elaborative discourse markers the message of S1 is paralleled, augmented or refined by the message of S2". The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

DM	Frequency	Percentage
Overall	3	3%
Over & above	8	8.9%
Over & over	5	5.6
Being	10	11%
As a	9	10%
For example	13	14%

Additionally	15	16.7%
In addition to this	8	8.9%
It means	15	16.7%
To all in one	4	4%

Table no. 14. DMs of Elaboration

In the Pashtu speech the above DMs are used in difference communicative events for different functions. For instance, *'Staso sa matlab d **like** mong tol dlta time killing la razo'* (What do u mean by this, like we are coming here for killing the time!), '*Taso Peshawar ta zai **so it means** che ma'am nan visit nakye school ta'* (You are going to Peshawar so it means that ma'am is not visiting the school today), '*English language sa role d pa nan time k?* (What is the role of English language in today's time?), and '*English speaking countries der powerful d and the same da aghwe language hm nu **In general** mong dase waile shu che English is the language che da aghe zaroorat pa her field k d'* (English speaking countries are very powerful and the same is for their language so in general we can say that English is the language that is required in every filed) etc.

b.　　　*Reformulation*

Reformulation is a discourse function by which the speaker re-elaborates an idea in order to be more specific and ''facilitate the hearer's understanding of the original'' (Blakemore, 1993), or in order to extend the information previously given. Cuenca (2003) states that reformulation is saying something in a different way that has already been said and 'also allows certain degree of modification'. It is through these DMs a speaker gets a chance to make self-correction, reformulate and repair the utterances. It can also be used as a tool to avoid misinterpretation in the ongoing discourse. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

DMs	Frequency	Percentage
Mean	13	21%
It means	12	19.7%
Let's suppose	9	14.7%
In general	11	18%
In other words	8	13%
That is	5	8%
Oh	03	4.9%

Table no. 15. DMs of Reformations

In the Pashtu speech the above DMs are used in difference communicative events for different functions. For instance, '*England match win ko, **in other words** Pakistan World Cup na out sho'* (England won the match in other words like Pakistan is no more in world cup), *'Pakistan on ground batting, bowling best wo although pa fielding k lg shortcoming wo but overall ku mong khabara oko nu Pakistan performance kha wo'* (Pakistan's batting and bowling were best although there were little shortcomings in fielding but overall Pakistan's

performance was good), '*Mong uni ta visit kare wo, buses hm na wo, transport dera masla wa pa d sakhta garmai ki, **in short words**, garmi der zyat kharab kare wo'* (We visited the university and the transport system wasn't active in this hot weather, in short words, our condition was severely bad due to high temperature), and '*mong 6 o'clock rawan shu and 8 o' clock la oraso. **Well**, almost two hours k raso school ta'* (We start our journey at 6 o'clock and reach at 8 o'clock. Well it takes almost two hours) etc. In these communicative events, the DM '*Over all'* is used to refer to something in general like, '*well*' to establish the coherence, *'as a whole'*. and '*in short words*' respectively have been used to say communicate crux of the ongoing discussion by reformulating and rephrasing the structure.

c.   Thinking Process

These DMs denote the thinking process, signify the initial stance, and identify the involvement of a speaker into the ongoing discourse (Fung & Carter, 2007). These includes expressions like 'well', and 'I think' etc. The following table presents the analysis of the occurrence of these discourse markers in the collected data.

DM	Frequency	Percentage
I think	8	34.7
Hmm	5	21.7
Well	8	34.8%
According to our prediction	2	8.9%
Total	23	100.1

Table no. 16. DMs of Thinking Process

In the Pashtu speech the above DMs are used in difference communicative events for different functions. For instance, *'**Well**…de player bara k zu hm der sure nayam'* (Well, I am also not sure about this player), '*Hmm…**I think** che nan saba actors and actresses only fam and glamour dapara TV join ki'* (I think…the actor and actresses join TV only for the sake of fame and glamour not because of their passion), and *'**Hmm**…zu ba goram ku mosam kha wo nu zm ba'* (Hmm…I will see if the weather was fine so I may visit) etc. In these communicative events, the DM '*hmm'* and '*Oh*' mark the thinking process. For Zarei, (2013) these DMs can also, "mark the change from some prior state to a different state, could be viewed as a kind of a repair itself". Whereas, Schiffrin (1987) further states that in these self-initiated repairs 'Oh' can serve an important function for the listener by referring back to the missing information. Li and Xio (2012) while talking about DM 'well' is of the view that it can be used in the situation when the speaker is not mentally ready to talk about something or reluctant to tell the truth or needs some time to organise what s/he wants to say.

CONCLUSION

The data analysis has shown that *Interpersonal Markers* has occurred with the highest frequency, followed by *Structural Discourse Markers*, then by *Referential Discourse Markers*, whereas, *Cognitive Discourse Markers*

occurred with the least frequency. The morphological patterns of these discourse markers perform different functions in Pashtu speech. For instance, 'Interpersonal Markers', perform the functions of referring to the background knowledge, attitude, judgment and showing response of the speakers during the conversation. 'Referential Markers' perform variety of functions, like, talking about the cause and consequence, maintaining a link and cohesion between contrasting and coordinating ideas, and the role of digression from one stream of discussion to other during the conversation. 'Structural Markers' perform the functions of creating sequence between number of happenings and ideas, shifting from one topic to the other, adding something new and extra, and signposting a topic in the conversation. Whereas, 'Cognitive Markers' perform the functions of signifying the thinking process of a speaker and listener, helping the participants in reformulating and elaborating a statement further for making a point clearer, and easy to understand. The study has illustrated, that the use of English Discourse Markers in Pashtu speech has become a common, obvious and frequently occurring linguistic behavior. The morphological patterns of English discourse markers have influenced Pashtu speakers, therefore, instead of using Pashtu words, speakers prefer to use English DMs because of either not being aware of Pashtu equivalents or preferring the use of English DMs as a mark of social prestige.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, N. (2018) Pashto- English hybridization: A lexical analysis. (Unpublished M.Phil. thesis). Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, Pakistan.

Blakemore, D. (1993). The relevance of reformulations. Language and literature, 2(2), 101-120.

Cholakova, M. (2015). The influence of the English language in a multilingual and a monolingual environment: A comparative approach. International Journal of English Language Teaching, 3(4), 35-78.

Crystal, D. (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th ed., pp. 243-244). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Cuenca, M. J. (2003). Two ways to reformulate: a contrastive analysis of reformulation markers. Journal of Pragmatics, 35(7), 1069-1093.

Cummins, J. (2000). Language, power, and pedagogy. Bilingual children in the crossfire. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Fillmore, L. W. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6(3), 323–346.

Fraser, B. (1988). Types of English discourse markers. Acta Linguistica Hungarica, 38(1-4), 19-33.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? Journal of pragmatics, 31(7), 931-952.

Fraser, B. (2005). Towards a theory of discourse markers. In: Fischer, Kerstin (Ed.), Approaches to discourse particles, (pp.189-204). Amsterdam: Elsevier Press

Fung, L., and Carter, R. (2007). Discourse markers and spoken English: Native and learner use in pedagogic settings. Applied Linguistics, 28(3), 410-439. doi:10.1093/applin/amm030

Ghauri, P., and Gronhaug, K. (2005). Research Methods in Business Studies, Harlow, FT/Prentice Hall

Kachru, B. B. (1986). The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes. University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1994). Englishization and contact Linguistics: World Englishes, 13(2), 135–54.

Kothari, C.R. (2004). Research methodology: Method and Technique (2nd Ed.), New Delhi, New Age International (P) Limited, Publishers p.96.

Li, M. and Xio, Y. A. (2012). A comparative study on the use of the discourse marker well by Chinese learners of English and native English speakers. International Journal of English Linguistics, 2(5), 65-71. doi:10.5539/ijel.v2n5p65 Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n5p65, January, 2019

Mugheri, N. A., and Lohar, S. A. (2018). Code-Mixing of English in the Sindhi Newspaper "Daily Kawish": A Case Study. 18:4. 180-198.

Mooneeb, M.A., Ahmad, N.M. & Fakhar, S.J. (2016). A critical analysis of intra sentential code-mixing in Indian film songs. Sci.Int.(Lahore),28(2),2119-2127. Retrieved from http://www.sci-int.com/pdf/636303919323069452.pdf

Mustafa, Z. (2015). Tyranny of language in education: The problem and its solution. Oxford University Press.

Müller, S. (2004). Well you know that type of person: Functions of well in the speech of American and German students. Journal of pragmatics, 33, 193-208.

Rahman, T. (1992). The rise of English in nineteenth century British India. Pakistan Journal of History and Culture, 13(2), 41-62.

Rehman, T. (1995). "The Pashtu Language and Identity Formation in Pakistan". Contemporary South Asia, 4:2: 151-170. DOI: 10.1080/09584939508719759

Richards, J. C, and Schmidt, R. (2002). Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics. (3rd Ed.). London: Longman.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. Language, 50(4), 696-735.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sethi, J. (1976). English Spoken by Educated Punjabi Speakers in India: A Phonological Study. Chandigarh: Punjabi University.

Sinclair, J. McH. and Coulthard, R. M. (1975). Towards an Analysis of Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Svartik, J. (1980). Well in conversation. In S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik (eds), Studies in English Linguistics for Randolph Quirk. London: Longman, 167–77.

Talib, G.S. (1970). Punjabi Ute European Bhashavan da Parbhav: Punjabi te Hor Bhashavan (1970) Pub. Languages Department, Punjab, Patiala.

Verma, H. (2015). Impact of English on Punjabi lexicon: An analytical study. International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies (IJELR), 2(3) 349-352.

Zarei, F. (2013). Discourse markers in English. International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 4(1), 107-117.