



P-ISSN 2355-2794  
E-ISSN 2461-0275

## Discourse Markers in Diplomatic Settings: Ministerial Dialogue between Australia and Indonesia

Rosaria Mita Amalia\*  
Elvi Citraesmana  
Nurul Hikmayaty Saefullah

Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran,  
Bandung 45363, INDONESIA

### Abstract

*This descriptive research discusses the use of discourse markers in a diplomatic setting between the governments of Indonesia and Australia during a Joint Press Conference between Indonesia-Australia Foreign and Defence Ministers. The particular aims of this research are to identify and analyze forms of discourse markers employed by the representatives of each government and describe the most frequent discourse markers used by these representatives. The data were collected from the transcript of the Joint Press Conference between Indonesia and Australia Foreign and Defence Ministers (2+2) Dialogue. The data are classified based on the typology of discourse markers and analyzed to identify their function within the diplomatic discourse. The data are input into the AntConc corpus analysis toolkit for analysis. The results show that the Foreign and Defence Ministers of Indonesia employed three forms of discourse markers, namely textual discourse marker, interpersonal discourse marker, and cognitive discourse marker, whereas the Foreign and Defence Ministers of Australia only applied textual discourse marker and cognitive discourse marker. Both representatives employed textual discourse markers more frequently than other forms of discourse markers. Discourse markers partially control how meaning is constructed by showing turns between speakers, joining concepts, displaying attitude, and finally, controlling communication. By understanding the discourse markers in ministerial dialogues, spectators can learn to find clues in the change of*

---

\* Corresponding author, email: [rosaria.mita.amalia@unpad.ac.id](mailto:rosaria.mita.amalia@unpad.ac.id)

**Citation in APA style:** Amalia, R. M., Citraesmana, E., & Saefullah, N. H. (2021). Discourse markers in diplomatic settings: Ministerial dialogue between Australia and Indonesia. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8(1), 346-359.

Received October 19, 2020; Revised December 2, 2020; Accepted December 4, 2020; Published Online January 3, 2021

<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i1.18350>

*direction in their talks to better understand the conversation that affects the policies and citizens of both countries involved.*

**Keywords:** Discourse markers, discourse analysis, bilateral negotiations, diplomacy, Indonesia-Australia partnership.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Language is powerfully associated with the contexts of where and for what it is used (Risdanaeva, 2018), and context is one aspect of a speech situation (Amalia, 2017). Discourse, therefore, reveals the relationship between language and contexts. In this sense, discourse is not necessarily defined as a text. The basic definition and method of discourse may vary between two fundamental paradigms in linguistics: the formalist paradigm and the functionalist paradigm (Gollin-Kies et al., 2015; Schiffrin, 1994). Such a distinction may immediately result in a distinctive definition of discourse as well as its analytical method.

Formalists tend to perceive discourse as the language above the sentence or above the clause (Schiffrin, 1994; Stubbs 1983). This view implies that discourse only focuses on what is written, instead of what is spoken, since what comprises a sentence is not essentially similar to what constitutes an utterance. In a written sentence, more attention is usually paid to its structure; while an utterance has more focus on its use within a particular context. Therefore, by emphasizing the importance of syntactic structure, discourse beyond a written sentence may not produce relevant meaning.

On the other hand, functionalists view discourse as language use (Schiffrin, 1994). This view implies that discourse is all the things that can be communicated aside from the written words, i.e., the tone, the way, and the context it is said. Discourse, for this purpose, is concerned more with the pattern of how talk is used in utterances for certain purposes in particular sociocultural contexts (Adjei, 2013). Functionalists claim that language and society partially influence one another (Bates et al., 1991). Discourse and social life are assumed to be interdependent, and thus discourse is associated with meanings, activities, and systems outside itself (Schiffrin, 1994). The functionalist paradigm of linguistics allows discourse to be applied in a broader range of social fields other than linguistics itself.

Discourse can be studied based on its relation to other social sciences, particularly those which involve language use as a strategy of communication to cover certain goals, one of which is diplomacy. In diplomatic negotiation, particular and specific communication is necessary to undertake the task of negotiating (Meerts, 2015). This function requires the use of language in the most appropriate manner to express certain and relevant intention and meaning. This is where the functionalist paradigm may apply. Negotiation involves a specific discussion between official representatives (Berridge, 2010). It is designed to achieve formal agreement of two or more countries regarding the issues arising within their bilateral or multilateral relations. A successful negotiation must take into consideration the attentive use of language to (1) establish the substantives of negotiation, (2) to achieve equal gains, and (3) to avoid misunderstanding that may harm the diplomatic relation between involved parties (Berridge, 2010).

## 1.1 Ministerial Dialogue between Indonesia and Australia

In March 2012, the government of Australia hosted the 2+2 Dialogue between Foreign and Defence Ministers of Indonesia and Australia. The purpose of any given ministerial dialogue is to discuss significant issues related to foreign and Defence bilateral policies established by the two governments and to conduct diplomatic negotiations to solve them (Pesto, 2010). This dialogue is available to the public and can be classified as the settlement stage of negotiation. Pre-negotiations and the detailed stage of this dialogue were not displayed for public concern. During this stage, the representatives were expected to perform cautious strategies to produce simple, comprehensive, and balanced language, to promise solutions with equal gains for both parties without resulting in any harmful misunderstandings. The strategies carried out by the representatives of each government can be reflected through their use of language.

It is common to evaluate diplomatic utterances through other functionalist studies of linguistics, such as pragmatics or sociolinguistics, by embracing contextual and sociocultural aspects of given utterances (Wodak & Forchtner, 2017). Prayitno et al. (2019, p. 349) note that “in the context of language use, pragmatics is a study of either oral or written speech based on the pragmatic context attached”. In this research, the writers shall treat these diplomatic utterances as discourse. The main cause for this is to perceive diplomatic utterances as syntactically well-structured language arranged to be applied for certain goals. The given method may consider both micro and macro aspects of discourse within diplomatic utterances. Such a consideration allows the writers to discuss how microelements of diplomatic discourse can impact its meaning.

## 1.2 Discourse Markers

Discourse markers are linguistic-pragmatic items covering several functions, and they are from some parts of speech (i.e., adverb, conjunction, verb, etc.) and numerous structural levels (i.e., lexemes, phrases, clauses) (Markó & Dér, 2013). Besides their primary function as cohesion and coherence devices within discourse, these markers actually can indicate the speaker’s intention and why the discourse is structured in such a manner based on its context (Banguis-Bantawig, 2019). The use of discourse markers can also be influenced by the speakers’ status (Sharif et al., 2019).

Several studies have discussed discourse markers based on their use within a written discourse. For instance, the research conducted by Kohler et al. (2015) observed the role of the conjunctive, adverb, and other lexical discourse markers to discriminate claims and premises in argumentative discourse in German corpus. Based on a similar goal, this research attempts to identify and analyze discourse markers in the ministerial dialogue between Indonesia and Australia based on its function within particular domains, by answering the following questions:

1. What discourse markers are employed by the representatives of each government?
2. How often are certain discourse markers used by representatives of each government?

Not many studies focus on the discourse markers in the ministerial dialogue between Indonesia and other countries. By understanding the discourse markers in ministerial dialogues, spectators can learn how discourse markers are used to control meaning.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Discourse Analysis

The first section of this study has already explained the different definitions of discourse based on two popular paradigms in linguistics (formalist and functionalist). To conclude these definitions, discourse analysis is the study of language beyond word, phrase, clause, and sentence required for effective communication (Paltridge, 2007). Such a conclusion describes discourse analysis as a study of language use that is concerned with the scheme of the language across texts, the correlation of language and sociocultural contexts in which it occurs, and the use of language to depict various views and understandings of the world.

After discussing the functionalist paradigm of discourse in its relation to social fields in the previous section, we shall focus on how discourse is syntactically structured to fulfill the goal assigned to it. The syntactic structure of discourse refers to how the sentences are arranged sequentially to deliver coherent meaning (Wang & Guo, 2014). The coherence of discourse can be identified through the use of coherence devices to connect one sentence to others. Sanders et al. (1992) describe coherence as the immediate relation of meaning between two or more sentences that cannot be defined in isolation. Redeker (1990) proposes three models of discourse coherence, two of which are related:

- Ideational: temporal sequence, elaboration, cause, reason, and consequence.
- Rhetorical: antithesis, concession, evidence, justification, and conclusion.
- Sequential: paratactic and hypotactic relation within the discourse.

### 2.2 Discourse Markers

According to Schiffrin (1987, p. 31), discourse markers are “sequentially-dependent elements which bracket units of discourse”. These elements include sets of linguistic expressions, such as conjunctions (*and, but, or*), interjections (*oh*), adverbs (*now, then*), and lexicalized phrases. Schiffrin (1987) further adds that perception verbs (*see, look, listen*), deictic (*here and there*), interjections (*gosh and boy*), meta-talk (*this is the point and what I mean is*), and quantifier phrases (*anyway, anyhow, and whatever*) can also be accounted as discourse markers. Schiffrin (1987) claims that these discourse markers usually function to establish discourse coherence.

However, discourse markers do not necessarily have to always be linguistic items, since paralinguistic features and non-linguistic gestures are likely to be included, as long as they indicate the relation between speaker and discourse and the function to which they are assigned (Schiffrin, 1987). Therefore, discourse markers may contain “core meaning” based on these patterns of use within particular discourse (Maschler & Schiffrin, 2015, p. 197):

- Distributional pattern:  
When in interaction are discourse markers employed?
- Functional pattern:  
What types of function do discourse markers fulfill?
- Structural pattern:  
What structural properties do they exhibit?

Based on their use, discourse markers primarily function to establish discourse coherence through their relations with other adjacent units within the discourse (Fraser, 1999). Schiffrin (1994) proposes that discourse markers may typically contribute to discourse coherence by determining the utterance function, indicating the utterances to the speaker, audience, or both, and indicating the utterances which precede or follow.

### 2.3 Typology of Discourse Markers

The notion of ‘core meaning’ previously suggested by Redeker (1991, p. 1164) refers to “the core meaning should specify the marker’s intrinsic contribution to the semantic representation that will constrain the contextual interpretation of the utterance”. Such a constraint depends on the discourse domains in which the markers occur. Discourse markers usually occur in cognitive, expressive, social, and textual domains (Chapetón Castro, 2009; Schiffrin, 2001). Through the given domains, the markers can obtain their meaning (Maschler & Schiffrin, 2015). Each domain in which the discourse markers draw on invokes various forms of markers, such as textual, interpersonal, and cognitive discourse markers.

#### 2.3.1 Textual discourse markers

Textual markers in discourse show the relationship between the preceding and the following discourse, and the continuation of the narrative within the discourse (Schiffrin, 1987). In this domain, discourse markers can be: (a) referential markers (i.e., *well, anyway, and so, then, additionally*), (b) deictic markers (words that direct show or point out, i.e., *this, those, you, us*), (c) conjunctive markers (*so, and, but, because, or, if, although*), and (d) structural markers (*first of all, anyway*). Textual discourse markers indicate the relation between conversational actions in a way that reflects semantic relations outside the discourse, and they also signal the relationship between conversational actions in terms of order and hierarchy (Maschler & Schiffrin, 2015).

#### 2.3.2 Interpersonal discourse markers

Interpersonal discourse markers negotiate the relation between speaker and their audience (*go on*), express enthusiasm toward an interlocutor’s talk (*woah*), and negotiate the relation between speaker and interlocutor (Maschler & Schiffrin, 2015). Interpersonal discourse markers may take the form of epistemic discourse markers (*dunno*) or other modal markers (*regretfully, to my sorrow*) (Maschler, 2017).

#### 2.3.3 Cognitive discourse markers

In cognitive discourse analysis, the aim is to identify linguistic features that potentially indicate the speaker or writer’s cognitive processes and representations (Tenbrink, 2015). The ways spoken or written texts are structured are expected to relate systematically to the way the underlying cognitive processes are structured (Gralla et al., 2012; Halliday, 1994; Tenbrink & Wiener, 2009). Hence, cognitive discourse markers illustrate the speaker’s cognitive processes that take place during frame-

shifting within discourse (Maschler, 2009). These processes are often verbalized in spoken discourse (Chafe, 1994), for instance, ‘ah’ to realize new information and ‘um’ to process information.

### **3. METHODS**

The method of this research is qualitative, a naturalistic, explanative approach to unfold social phenomena related to actions, decisions, beliefs, and values (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). The data of this research were collected from the transcript of the Joint Press Conference between Indonesia and Australia Foreign and Defence Ministers (2+2) Dialogue (Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2015). They are retrieved from the official profile page of Bob Carr in the Australian Ministers for Foreign Affairs webpage. The names of the Indonesian and Australian politicians in this paper are coded as IP1 and IP2 for Indonesian politician 1 and Indonesian politician 2. Meanwhile, for the Australian politicians, they are coded as AP1 and AP2 for Australian politician 1 and Australian politician 2.

The transcript comprises 3,685 words. In analyzing data for the first research question, we followed the steps proposed by Miles et al. (2014) that include substantive start, displaying data, and making good sense of data. In the substantive start, the researchers carefully read the transcript. While doing so, the identification and classification of the transcript data based on the typology of discourse markers by Maschler and Schiffrin (2015) (i.e., textual, interpersonal, and cognitive discourse markers) were conducted. In displaying data, the researchers further analyzed each data on its use to pinpoint its function within the diplomatic discourse. These steps allowed the researchers to progress to the third step that is making sense of data. In making sense of data, the researchers describe each use of discourse markers in the diplomatic setting based on data. To answer the second question, the researchers input the data into the AntConc corpus analysis toolkit (Anthony, 2019) to identify and describe the discourse markers frequently used within the political discourse setting in this study.

### **4. RESULTS**

The results of data analysis are described in the following subsections. The percentages in Table 1 refer to the occurrences of the textual discourse markers during the whole talk of the joint conference.

#### **4.1 Textual Discourse Markers**

Table 1 shows that three representatives used more referential textual discourse markers in similar amounts. The representatives in question are the Foreign and Defence Ministers of Australia and the Defence Minister of Indonesia. This use of referential discourse markers helped the representatives syntactically structure their discourse by referring, connecting, and signaling each utterance with other utterances to deliver meaning that is aimed to be easily grasped by the interlocutors. However, such a case does not seem to apply to the Foreign Minister of Indonesia. Unlike the

other speakers, he used more conjunctive markers. It is assumed that the given strategy is conducted to provide comprehensive meaning by interconnecting each proposition to other propositions.

**Table 1.** The results of Textual Discourse markers.

Participant	Conjunctive markers	Deictic markers	Referential markers	Structural markers
AP1	0.08%	0.04%	0.11%	0.01%
IP1	0.23%	0.12%	0.19%	0.11%
AP2	0.12%	0.1%	0.27%	0.4%
IP2	0.12%	0.19%	0.33%	0.05%

Below are the samples from the data:

D1 AP1: We (*referential discourse marker*) already work together in substantial ways. Indonesia played a key role as chair of the East Asia Summit last year. It (*referential discourse marker*) was a critical time with US and Russian entry. And (*conjunctive discourse marker*) with Indonesia hosting APEC in 2013 and Australia hosting the G-20 in 2014, our cooperation in these groupings will continue to strengthen.

In D1, the overall discourse markers AP1 employed in his diplomatic discourse are included as textual discourse markers. These markers are varied based on their use. Referential markers function to relate the given utterance to its preceding plane by using anaphora. For instance, the anaphora *we* refers inclusively to the government of Australia and Indonesia mentioned in the preceding utterance. Another example is the anaphora *it* which refers to the adverb of time in the previous utterance. The use of given anaphora adjusts the following utterance in a temporal frame.

On the other hand, conjunctive markers connect one proposition with other propositions within a discourse by adding more information or countering the information. The conjunctive markers used by AP1 in his diplomatic discourse above functions to connect the given utterance with the previous proposition by adding more information about Indonesia hosting APEC in 2013. The marker illustrates a local relationship between adjacent utterances in the given discourse.

D2 IP1: Well (*structural discourse marker*) thank you very much. May I begin on behalf of myself and my good colleague and friend, the Minister of Defence of Indonesia, Bapak IP2, by conveying our (*referential discourse marker*) most heartfelt appreciation to both you, AP1, as well as AP2 and the Government of Australia, for welcoming us (*referential discourse marker*) in such a warm way and such a friendly way for the two-plus-two meeting we (*referential discourse marker*) have just concluded just now.

One characteristic of IP1 diplomatic discourse in D2 is his varied use of textual discourse markers. At the beginning of each of his sentences, IP1 often used a structural discourse marker. In this data, the marker is shown by the use of the marker *well*. The given marker functions to structure the overall discourse, which implies that the topic of the given discourse revolves around that. Therefore, this marker can assist interlocutors to easily access the gist of overall discourse.

Other textual discourse markers shown in the given data are referential discourse markers. Similar to AP1, IP1 used referential markers to refer to persons previously mentioned. The referential markers *our* and *us* refer exclusively to the Defence Minister of Indonesia and himself without including the Foreign and Defence Ministers of Australia, whereas the referential marker *we* refers inclusively to all representatives present in the ministerial dialogue. Since these referential markers were used within a sentence, these markers demonstrate the local coherence of the given discourse.

D3 AP2: Well (*structural discourse marker*) thanks, AP1. Can I join with you in publicly welcoming IP1 and Pak IP2 to Australia for our (*referential discourse marker*) two-plus-two?

Another finding of structural discourse marker used in diplomatic discourse can also be identified in the utterance of AP2 in D3. Here, the structural discourse marker *well* has a similar function to the structural discourse marker applied by IP1. The marker adjusts the discourse by concluding the proposition. In D3, AP2, through this use of a structural marker, intended to offer his warm welcome to the Defence and Foreign Minister of Indonesia for attending their two-plus-two ministerial dialogue.

D4 IP2: Last night and this (*deictic discourse marker*) morning I talked with several officials that now study here in Australia and (*conjunctive discourse marker*) they (*referential discourse marker*) really enjoy it (*referential discourse marker*).

There are three textual discourse markers employed by IP2 in D4. They include a deictic discourse marker, a conjunctive discourse marker, and a referential discourse marker. Although its function appears to be quite similar to a referential discourse marker, a deictic discourse marker settles the referents outside the discourse. The deictic marker *this* describes the temporal setting of the utterance when IP2 arranged a meeting between him and several diplomatic officials of Indonesia studying in Australia. He then used a conjunctive discourse marker *and* to illustrate the local relationship within the utterance by adding coherent information to a previous proposition. In addition, the referential discourse markers *they* and *it* can also demonstrate the coherence of the utterance. The former exclusively refers to the officials of Indonesia studying in Australia, while the latter refers to their diplomatic training in Australia.

To conclude, the data illustrate that each representative from the given governments similarly employed more textual discourse markers within their diplomatic discourses. In this case, textual discourse markers are perceived to be the most practicable devices to establish the coherence of their discourses. This proves that they treated their diplomatic negotiation similarly to formal discourse.

## 4.2 Interpersonal Discourse Markers

In terms of interpersonal discourse markers, the data illustrate that only the representatives of Indonesia applied interpersonal markers into their diplomatic discourse (see Table 2). Interpersonal discourse markers concern with the negotiation



of the relation between speaker and audience. As has been previously discussed, interpersonal discourse markers consist of enthusiasm markers, epistemic markers, relation markers, and modal markers. However, the diplomatic discourses of the Indonesian representatives only provide the latter two. This finding emphasizes the nature of this ministerial dialogue, which is set to be formal.

The fact that only the representatives of Indonesia employed interpersonal markers suggests that the representatives attempted to negotiate the interpersonal relationships between them and the interlocutors present in the given meeting. It reduces the social gap between the participants during diplomatic negotiation.

**Table 2.** The results of Interpersonal Discourse markers.

Participant	Relation markers	Modal markers
IP1	0.14%	0.02%
IP2	0.02%	0.02%

Some examples from data:

- D5 IP2: So, our discussion today is part of the preparation for that leaders' level meeting and I must say that, all in all, the relations, as I said, is strong and solid and profoundly important but I am, you know (*relation marker*), looking for more opportunities for enhancement of that already very positive relations.
- D6 IP1: And I believe that Australia is supporting us too in that case, you know (*relation marker*), for building that project and we would like, on behalf of the Government Republic of Indonesia, to thank the Australian Government.

IP1 and IP2 used both relation markers and modal markers. The former is illustrated in D5 and D6. The relation marker *you know* indicates the relation negotiation between speaker and interlocutors. The negotiation is accomplished by assigning the presuppositions confirmed by each participant during the meeting. In the case of IP1, he attempted to negotiate his relationship with the representatives of Australia by providing the presupposition shared between them. The presupposition in question is to enhance the bilateral relationship between the government of Indonesia and Australia. Similar analysis corresponds with the case of IP2. He similarly developed his relation with the representatives of Australia by asserting the presupposition shared between them. Besides relation markers, the representatives of Indonesia also employed modal markers, such as: *may I* and *let me*. These markers have an identical function to relation markers.

### 4.3 Cognitive Discourse Markers

The data shows that only three participants of the ministerial dialogue applied cognitive discourse markers during the dialogue. They include the representatives of Indonesia and the Defence Minister of Australia (see Table 3). In this sense, cognitive discourse markers are accounted to be practical in implying the cognitive process during frame-shifting within the discourse. There are two forms of cognitive discourse markers: processing information and realizing information. However, the data only provides cognitive discourse markers in the form of processing information. This

finding suggests that each representative from each government is expected to be well-informed and decisive during the diplomatic dialogue.

**Table 3.** The results of cognitive discourse markers.

Participant	Processing information
IP1	0.09%
AP2	0.01%
IP2	0.01%

An example from data is shown in D7:

- D7 IP1: I think (*processing information*), since the episode that our two countries went through recently, there is already a strong determination from both sides to be able to address this issue.

It has been stated that there is no steady or conventionalized form of discourse markers. Any class of words can function as discourse markers based on their intended use. Thus, it is plausible for verbs to act as discourse markers. The finding of this research recommends that not only perceptual verbs can function as discourse markers, but also cognitive verbs.

- D8 AP2: The holding of the two-plus-two or the meeting of Foreign and Defence Ministers is a very important and, indeed, I think (*processing information*), a historic moment.

AP2 in D8 and IP2 in D9, on the other hand, applied cognitive discourse markers to deliver their opinions related to the on-going ministerial dialogue.

- D9 IP2: I think (*processing information*) that's what I can say to add to what my colleagues just mentioned to you before. Thank you.

It is found that the three participants of the ministerial meeting similarly applied cognitive verb to indicate their cognitive process during diplomatic dialogue. They both used the verb *think* to indicate such a process. One of them, IP1, implied his view regarding the cattle export issue between Indonesia and Australia by projecting his frame-shifting within the discourse.

## 5. DISCUSSION

Based on the findings of this research, it is found that the Foreign and Defence Minister of Indonesia employed three forms of discourse markers: textual discourse marker, interpersonal discourse marker, and cognitive discourse marker. In terms of textual discourse markers, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia consistently employed conjunctive discourse markers. Such a strategy is intended to connect an utterance to other utterances by adding more information to the preceding proposition, to produce coherent diplomatic discourse. Halliday and Hasan (2006) explain that these conjunctive elements are not just indirectly interconnected with the preceding (or following) text or statements, but they also outline certain connotations that affect the

existence of other components in the discourse. Hence, the purpose of using numerous conjunctive discourse markers by the Foreign and Defence Minister of Indonesia was to signal extension and to enhance relations among the discourse of his dialogue and messages with the Foreign and Defence Minister of Australia.

Moreover, the Defence Minister of Indonesia frequently employed a referential discourse marker as well to relate an utterance to other utterances by asserting a coherent referent. Referential markers function to signpost the sequence, connection, and coordination between statements to represent the ideas and experiences of the speaker (Halliday, 1994). Then for interpersonal discourse markers, both representatives of Indonesia used relation markers and modal markers to negotiate their relationship with the interlocutors' presence in the given ministerial dialogue. Modality styles the presentation of personal attitude expressions by the speakers in discourse and sets up positivity and negativity for sorting divergences (Martin & Rose, 2003). To illustrate their cognitive process during frame-shifting within the diplomatic discourse, the Foreign and Defence Ministers of Indonesia similarly used cognitive discourse markers in the form of the cognitive verb *think* such as shown in D7 to D9.

The Foreign and Defence Minister of Australia, on the other hand, only employed two forms of discourse markers, which were textual discourse markers and cognitive discourse markers. Both representatives of Australia similarly used more referential discourse markers to imply the coherence of their diplomatic discourse in terms of textual discourse markers. Accordingly, a number of researches have shown that the use of referential markers is common to be used more than other markers in discourse because their primary function is to show cause and contrast, consequence and comparison (Ament & Parés, 2018). A diplomatic dialogue involves much negotiation to tell and influence the interlocutors to tolerate the strategic objectives of the speaker's government. Therefore, referential markers designate to inform these government's objectives more comprehensive and clearer to avoid different perspectives between speakers and hearers that may cause miscommunications.

The data further illustrates that only the Defence Minister of Australia applied cognitive discourse markers. He employed the markers in questions to suggest his cognitive process during the dialogue and instruct the interlocutors on how "to construct their mental representation of the ongoing discourse" (Ament & Parés, 2018, p. 47). Perhaps the aim was to lower the burden of thoughts of the interlocutors so that they could respond rapidly towards the speaker's proposals in the dialogue. Likewise, this condition leads to the circumstance that the representatives of Australia almost did not employ any interpersonal discourse marker. It underlines the lack of negotiation relation between the representatives with the interlocutors in the ministerial dialogue.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The findings of this study conclude that the Foreign and Defence Ministers of Indonesia employed three forms of discourse markers, namely textual discourse marker, interpersonal discourse marker, and cognitive discourse marker, whereas the Foreign and Defence Ministers of Australia only applied textual discourse marker and cognitive discourse marker. Hence, both representatives employed textual discourse markers more frequently than other forms of discourse markers. Textual discourse markers signify the organization of discourse so that the dialogue could proceed

smoothly between the two countries. Hence, these markers directed the communication to be coherent to the context of the situation. Correspondingly, discourse markers partially control how meaning is constructed by showing turns between speakers, joining concepts, displaying attitude, and finally, controlling communication. By understanding the discourse markers in ministerial dialogues, spectators can learn to find clues in the change of direction in their talks to better understand the conversation that affects the policies and citizens of both countries involved.

Even though this study has countered the research questions, some limitations to be complemented in future research are proposed. First of all, the data from this research only focused on the ministerial dialogues between Indonesia and Australia. Second, the data is only taken from one talk of a joint press conference between these two countries. Thus, future research should consider dialogues between Indonesia and other countries and add more data from other dialogues to corroborate the findings of this study.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research is funded by Universitas Padjadjaran through Fundamental Research Scheme.

## REFERENCES

- Adjei, S. B. (2013). Discourse analysis: Examining language use in context. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(25), 1-10.
- Amalia, R. M. (2017). Use of implicit performative utterances at University of Padjadjaran and at University of Pennsylvania. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 4(1), 66-75.
- Ament, J., & Parés, J. B. (2018). The acquisition of discourse markers in the English-medium instruction context. In C. P. Vidal, S. López-Serrano, J. Ament & D. J. Thomas-Wilhelm (Eds.), *Learning context effects: Study abroad, formal instruction and international immersion classrooms (EuroSLA Studies 1)* (pp. 43-74). Language Science Press.
- Anthony, L. (2019). *AntConc Corpus Analysis Toolkit* (Version 3.5.8) [Computer software]. <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/>
- Banguis-Bantawig, R. (2019). The role of discourse markers in the speeches of selected Asian presidents. *Heliyon*, 5(3), 1-57.
- Bates, E., Thal, D., & MacWhinney, B. (1991). A functionalist approach to language and its implications for assessment and intervention. In T. M. Gallagher (Ed.), *Pragmatics of language: Clinical practice issues* (pp. 133-161). Chapman & Hall.
- Berridge, G. R. (2010). *Diplomacy: Theory and practice* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chafe, W. (1994). *Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. The University of Chicago Press.

- Chapetón Castro, C. M. (2009). The use and functions of discourse markers in EFL classroom interaction. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 11 (1), 57-77.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 931-952.
- Gollin-Kies, S., Hall, D. R., & Moore, S. H. (2015). *Language for specific purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gralla, L., Tenbrink, T., Siebers, M. & Schmid, U. (2012). Analogical problem solving: Insights from verbal reports. *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 34, 396-401). <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/55j4q6k3>
- Halliday, M., A., K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M., A., K. & Hasan, R. (2006). *Cohesion in English*. Pearson Education
- Kohler, J. E., Kluge, R., & Gurevych, I. (2015). On the role of discourse markers for discriminating claims and premises in argumentative discourse. In L. Màrquez, C. Callison-Burch & J. Su (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 2236-2242). The Association of Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D15-1267>
- Markó, A., & Dér, C. I. (2013). Age-specific features of the use of discourse markers in Hungarian. *Język Komunikacja Informacja*, 7, 61-78.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. Continuum.
- Maschler, Y. (2009). *Metalanguage in interaction: Hebrew discourse markers*. John Benjamins.
- Maschler, Y. (2017). The emergence of Hebrew *loydea/loydat* ('I dunno MASC/FEM') from interaction: Blurring the boundaries between discourse marker, pragmatic marker, and modal particle. In C. Fedriani & A. Sansó (Eds.), *Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and modal particles: New perspectives* (pp. 37-69). John Benjamin Publishing.
- Maschler, Y. & D. Schiffrin (2015). Discourse markers: Language, meaning, and context. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 189-221). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Meerts, P. (2015). *Diplomatic negotiation: Essence and evolution*. Clingendael Institute.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Sage.
- Minister of Foreign Affairs. (2015, December, 20). *Australia-Indonesia 2+2 press conference, Sydney* [Joint transcript]. <https://www.foreignminister.gov.au/minister/julie-bishop/transcript/australia-indonesia-22-press-conference-sydney>
- Paltridge, B. (2007). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. Continuum.
- Pesto, H. (2010). The role of diplomacy in the fight against terrorism. *Connections*, 10(1), 64-81.
- Prayitno, H. J., Ngali, A., Sutopo, A., Pangestu, D. W., Jamaluddin, N., & Ali, A.H. (2019). Directive politeness act strategy in the discourse of education column in national newspaper as the formation of students' character in Indonesia. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(2), 349-362.

- Redeker, G. (1990). Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(3), 367-381.
- Redeker, G. (1991). Linguistic markers of discourse structure. *Linguistics*, 29, 1139–72.
- Risdaneva. (2018). A critical discourse analysis of women’s portrayal in news reporting of sexual violence. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(1), 126-136.
- Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2013). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Sage Publications.
- Sanders, T., Spooren, W., & Noordman, L. (1992). Towards a taxonomy of coherence relations. *Discourse Processes*, 15, 1-35.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Schiffrin, D. (2001). Discourse markers: Language, meaning and context. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 54-74). Blackwell Publishers.
- Sharif, T. I. S. T., Noor, M. Y. M., & Omar, S. R. (2019). Politeness in online communication: Retailer-client interaction. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(2), 233-239.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Tenbrink, T. (2015). Cognitive Discourse Analysis: accessing cognitive representations and processes through language data. *Language and Cognition*, 7(1), 98-137.
- Tenbrink, T. & Wiener, J. (2009). The verbalization of multiple strategies in a variant of the traveling salesperson problem. *Cognitive Processing*, 10(2), 143-161.
- Wang, Y., & Guo, M. (2014). A short analysis of discourse coherence. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(2), 460-465.
- Wodak, R., & Forchtner, B. (Eds.) (2017). *The Routledge handbook of language and politics*. Routledge.