

**ENGLISH**

**DISCOURSE**

**MARKERS**

**In**

**SOCIOCULTURAL**

**PERSPECTIVES**

*A Compilation on Dissertation Frameworks*

*Dias Andris Susanto*

**ENGLISH DISCOURSE MARKERS**  
**In SOCIOCULTURAL**  
**PERSPECTIVES**  
*A Compilation on Dissertation*  
*Frameworks*

**Penulis:**

Dias Andris Susanto

**Penerbit:**

**UPT Penerbitan**

**Universitas PGRI Semarang Press**



**Sanksi Pelanggaran Pasal 72  
Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2002**

1. Barangsiapa dengan sengaja dan tanpa hak melakukan perbuatan sebagaimana dimaksud dalam pasal 2 ayat (1) atau pasal 49 ayat (1) dan ayat (2) dipidana penjara paling singkat 1 (satu) bulan dan/atau denda paling sedikit Rp. 1.000.000,00- (satu juta rupiah) atau paling lama 7 (tujuh) tahun dan/atau denda paling banyak Rp.5.000.000.000,00 (lima miliar rupiah)
2. Barangsiapa dengan sengaja menyiarkan, memamerkan, mengedarkan, atau menjual kepada umum suatu ciptaan dan barang hasil pelanggaran hak cipta atau hak terkait, sebagaimana dimaksud ayat (1) dipidana dengan pidana paling lama 5 (lima) tahun dan/atau denda paling banyak Rp. 500.000.000,00 (lima ratus juta rupiah)

**Dilarang keras memfotokopi atau memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh buku ini tanpa seizin tertulis dari penerbit**

**ENGLISH DISCOURSE MARKERS  
In SOCIOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVES  
*A Compilation on Dissertation Frameworks*  
ISBN: 978-602-5784-25-5**

**Penulis : Dias Andris Susanto  
Editor : Lontar Media  
Penyunting : Lontar Media  
Perancang Sampul dan Penata Letak : Lontar Media**

**Penerbit:**

**UPT**

**Jl.**

**Jawa**

**Telepon: 085640369110**

**Email: [upgrispress@gmail.com](mailto:upgrispress@gmail.com)**

**<http://www.upgris.ac.id/uppt-penerbitan/>**

**iii+ 60 hal, 21 cm x 29,7 cm**



**Penerbitan Universitas PGRI Semarang Press**

**Sidodadi Timur No 24, Dr. Cipto Semarang 50125**

**Tengah.**

## **PREFACE**

Thanks to God, finally I can happily accomplish this book “English Discourse Markers in Sociocultural Perspectives as the supported product of the dissertation. This book is designed through some compilation specified toward the four big variables they are; English Discourse Markers, EFL Learners of University, Classroom Interaction, and Sociocultural Perspectives. This book is also proper for those who are interested in having some related topics such as; TEFL, Discourse Analysis, Sociolinguistics, Semantics, Pragmatics, and Intro to Linguistics. The writer encompasses the topic areas like: What is Discourse Markers; What is English as Foreign Language for Indonesian Learners?; What is Classroom Interaction at University?; What is Sociocultural Perspectives?; EDMs Apply in EFL Learners; EDMs in Classroom at University. I do hope this book will be compassing lecturer, teachers, linguistics in supplementing their teaching and discussing material in the classroom.

## LIST OF CONTENTS

COVER.....	i
KATA PENGANTAR .....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENT .....	iii
UNIT 1 WHAT IS DISCOURSE MARKERS .....	1
1.1 Defining Discourse Markers .....	1
1.1.1 Deborah Schiffrin.....	7
1.1.2 Halliday.....	12
1.1.3 Fraser.....	16
1.1.4 Andreas H. Jucker.....	19
1.1.5 Diane Blackmore.....	21
1.1.6 Redeker .....	24
1.1.7 Aijmer .....	27
1.1.8 Muller.....	33
1.2 Properties of DMs .....	38
1.3 Function of Dms .....	41
UNIT 2 WHAT IS ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE FOR INDONESIAN LEARNERS?.....	47
2.1 Definition EFL .....	47
2.2 How to Teach as a Foreign Language .....	48
2.3 Benefit of Studying a Foreign Language .....	52
2.4 EFL Students need .....	55

UNIT 3 WHAT IS CLASSROOM INTERACTION AT UNIVERSITY? .	58
3.1 Aspect of classroom interaction.....	61
3.2 The Role of Teacher in Classroom Interaction.....	63
3.3 Types of Classroom Interctions .....	64
3.4 Principles Of Classroom Interaction.....	67
3.5 Improving classroom interaction .....	72
UNIT 4 WHAT IS SOCIOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVES? .....	80
4.1 An Introduction to Sociocultural Theory .....	80
4.2 The Field of Sociocultural .....	85
4.3 The origins of Sociocultural Approach on Education.....	87
4.4 Studies and Further Suggestions to Sociocultural .....	92
4.5 The Sociocultural Perspective Defined.....	95
4.6 The Arrival of Sociocultural Perspective.....	107
UNIT 5 EDMs APPLY IN EFL LEARNERS .....	111
5.1 The Review of the Pragmatics Fossilization of DMs in Non-Native Speaker.....	112
5.2 The Review of a Comparative Study Bilingual Dms .....	114
5.3 The Review of the Function of Discourse Markers.....	115
5.4 The Review of The Use of Okay,Right,an Yeah .....	117
5.5 The Review of A Discourse Pragmatics Functional Study of Dms	118
5.6 The Review of Discourse Markers and Modal Practices.....	119

5.7 The Review of EDMs in the Speech of Chinese EFL .....	120
5.8 The Review of Re-examining the Role of Explicit Instruction .....	121
5.9 The Review of Using EDMs by Saudi EFL Learners .....	122
UNIT 6 EDMs IN CLASSROOM AT UNIVERSITY.....	125
6.1 The Review of Differential Effect of Explicit, Implicit, and Incidental .....	126
6.2 The Review of DMS and Foreign Language Teachers.....	127
6.3 The Review of Language which is not Taught .....	128
6.4 The Review of the Use and Function of DMs by native EFL .....	129
6.5 The Review of an Analysis of Spanish Bien as a Marker .....	131
6.6 The Review of DMs as Triggers of Code-Switching in EFL Classes	138
REFERENCES .....	139

# UNIT 1

## WHAT IS ENGLISH DISCOURSE MARKERS?

### I. Defining Discourse Markers

The term 'discourse marker', as used by scholars such as Schiffrin (1987) and Müller (2005), is only one of many terms used to refer to the items belonging to the heterogeneous group described above. Some other terms commonly used are 'cue phrases' (Knott and Dale, 1994), 'discourse connectives' (Blakemore, 1987), 'discourse operators' (Redeker, 1990), 'discourse particles' (Schourup, 1999), 'discourse signaling devices' (Polanyi and Scha, 1983), 'phatic connectives' (Bazzanella, 1990), 'pragmatic connectives' (Stubbs, 1983), 'pragmatic expressions' (Erman, 1987), 'pragmatic operators' (Ariel, 1993), 'pragmatic particles' (Östman, 1995), 'semantic conjuncts' (Quirk et al., 1985), and 'sentence connectives' (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). All these terms attribute approximately the same characteristics to the markers, albeit with some variation. As Fung and Carter put it, "[t]he multiplicity

of terminology surrounding DMs reflects diverse research interests and analytical categories, as well as difficulties in accounting for them adequately in theoretical terms” (2007: 411). The present study will not participate in the discussion of which term is most suitable and which is not. The term ‘discourse marker’ has been chosen, as this appears to be the most neutral and including term of them all.

DMs are often characterized through some common features. For example they can be stressed or separated from their surrounding context, by pauses and/or into natural breaks, just as parenthetical constructs, or they can be pronounced unstressed, without pauses and with possible phonological reduction. They can also be uttered with rising intonation. DMs usually derive from lexical categories (i.e., verbs, verbal constructs, prepositional phrases, adverbs). They are typically placed at the beginning of an utterance, but they can also be utterance-internal or even, on occasion, utterance-final. Regardless of their position, they are always syntactically separated from the rest of the sentence. Thus, they can be omitted without syntactic consequences. Semantically they do not add anything to the propositional content of the utterance nor do they affect its truth conditions. Thus, omitting them has

normally no effect on the truth-conditional meaning of the utterance. In relation to their general function, DMs show the speaker's estimate of the role of the current utterance within a larger discourse.

Characteristics of DMs In the following section the features most commonly attributed to DMs are identified and briefly discussed beginning with those features most widely referred to;

1. Connectivity. One of the characteristics of DMs is their use to relate utterances or other discourse units. Hansen defines DMs as "linguistic items of variable scope, and whose primary function is connective" (1997: 160); and Schiffrin, defines DMs as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk", specifies that "brackets look [...] forward and backward [...] [T]he beginning of one unit is the end of another" (1987: 31). The connectivity of DMs is most often taken to be a necessary characteristic (Schwenter, 1996). This connectivity is, however, conceived in different ways. There is, for example, disagreement about whether DM connectivity must involve more than one textual unit. Schiffrin and Fraser's definitions, and most others, specify that DMs relate two textual units, thus contributing to inter-utterance coherence. Claims that DMs mark boundaries between verbal activities

(e.g. Maschler, 1994: 325) also imply relations between two textual units. Connectivity can be used to distinguish DMs from various other initial elements, such as illocutionary adverbials (frankly, confidentially), attitudinal adverbials (fortunately, sadly), and from primary interjections (yipes, oops); however, connectivity alone is insufficient to distinguish DMs from coordinators joining intrasentential elements.

2. Optionality. DMs are frequently claimed to be optional in two distinct senses. They are almost universally regarded as syntactically optional in the sense that removal of a DM does not alter the grammaticality of its host sentence (e.g. Fraser, 1988: 22). However, DMs are also widely claimed to be optional in the further sense that they do not enlarge the possibilities for semantic relationship between the elements they associate. Therefore, if a DM is omitted, the relationship it signals is still available to the hearer, though no longer explicitly cued. Non-truth-conditional DMs are generally thought to contribute nothing to the truth-conditions of the proposition expressed by an utterance (e.g. Blakemore, 1988). Some (e.g. Fraser, 1996: 167) take this to mean that DMs do not affect the truth-conditions of sentences, but support has grown for the view that truth-

conditions pertain not to sentences but to mental representations (see Kempson, 1986: 102; Blakemore, 1987: 16).

3. Weak clause association. DMs are usually thought to occur “either outside the syntactic structure or loosely attached to it” (Brinton, 1996: 34). Quirk et al. classify many forms elsewhere included among DMs as conjuncts, which are considered to be clause elements but to have a detached role relative to closely interrelated clause elements such as subject, complement, and object (1985: 631). Although putative DMs are at best weakly related to more central clause elements, some clearly have their own internal syntactic structure (e.g. *on the other hand*) and some potential DMs (e.g. *y’know*) are clearly clausal despite their apparent nontruth conditionality. Weak clause association is frequently correlated with phonological independence. DMs are often said to constitute independent tone units (Hansen, 1997: 156), or to be set off from the main clause by ‘comma intonation’. This is true of many DMs, as of conjuncts and disjuncts in general, regardless of whether they occur within the clause or at its extremes. Nevertheless, lack of intonational integration might not be a necessary characteristic of DMs. Hansen notes that forms that share the

principal defining qualities of DMs described above, are intonationally integrated with the clause (1997: 156). Some initial elements frequently identified as DMs may also be intonationally integrated with a host clause (e.g. SO I refused).

4. Literality. DMs “prototypically introduce the discourse segments they mark” (Hansen, 1997: 156; cf. Schiffrin, 1987: 31-32,328). The tendency toward initiality must be understood to refer to the position of DMs in relation to the central clause elements rather than to the position of the first word in an utterance since items supposed to be DMs frequently cluster at utterance onset and elsewhere.
5. Morality. Most forms claimed to be DMs occur primarily in speech (e.g. by the way, well, after all; see Brinton, 1996: 33), but no principled grounds exist on which to deny DM status to similar items that are largely found in written discourse (e.g. moreover, consequently, contrariwise). Association of a particular DM with the written or spoken channel is often tied only to the relative formality/informality of the DM (e.g. also versus moreover). Some DMs may be associated with speech because their meaning presupposes a familiarity with the addressee not typical of impersonally addressed writing. After all, for example, encodes that the speaker has grounds for

believing that the premise introduced by after all is already accessible to the hearer (see Blakemore, 1987: 81).

6. Multi-categoriality. There is a view that DM status is independent of syntactic categorization: an item retains its non-DM syntactic categorization but does 'extra duty' as a non-truth-conditional connective loosely associated with clause structure. Categories to which extrinsic DM function has been attributed include adverbs (e.g. now, actually, anyway), coordinating and subordinating conjunctions (e.g. and, but, because), interjections (e.g. oh, gosh, boy), verbs (e.g. say, look, see), and clauses (e.g. you see, I mean, you know). When DM status is seen, instead, as a matter of syntactic categorization, multi categoriality is viewed diachronically and DMs are taken to arise from other categories through historical processes.

### **1.1.1 Deborah Schiffrin**

Schiffrin (1987) presents one of the earliest and most prominent studies on discourse markers. Operating within the field of interactional sociolinguistics analyzing discourse markers from the theoretical framework of discourse coherence, she studies the use of the discourse markers oh,

well, and, but, or, so, because, now, then, I mean, and y'know in data collected from sociolinguistic group interviews with seven Jewish Americans from Philadelphia.

According to Schiffrin (1987; 2006), the first scholar to bring the most detailed effort regarding DMs, discourse includes several different planes of coherence and structure. She proposes a discourse model with five planes: a participation framework, information state, ideational structure, action structure, exchange structure. Schiffrin (et al 2001, 57) claims that DMs can work at different levels of discourse to connect utterances on either a single plane or across different planes. The scholar proposes (ibid. p. 58) that DMs are multifunctional despite having their primary functions (e.g. the primary function of and is on ideational plane). Being located in the five planes of talk of coherence model, DMs are defined by Schiffrin (1987, 31) as “sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of talk, i.e. non-obligatory initial items that function in relation to ongoing talk and text”. The scholar (see Schiffrin et al 2001, 57) also suggests that discourse markers comprised a set of linguistic expressions from word classes such as conjunctions (e.g., and, but, for), interjections (oh), adverbs (now, then) and lexicalized phrases (y'know, I mean). Another aspect of her

analysis shows that DMs display relationships that are local (between adjacent utterances) and global (across wider spans and structures of discourse). Schiffrin (2006, 14) also points out that some discourse markers are based on their propositional meaning (e.g., I mean, y'know), whereas other markers (e.g. oh) have no propositional meaning. Finally, the scholar (Schiffrin, 1987, 322) does not only compare DMs to indexicals or to contextualization cues, but pursues the indexical properties of DMs more fully and suggests that markers are a subclass of indexicals which have meaning not only in discourse, but also grammatical (aspectual) meaning. Moreover, he has developed his own model known as Schiffrin's coherence model (1987) which contends that EDMs have four coherence functions. These are: Exchange structure, action structure, ideational structure, and participation framework. Generally, EDMs have been agreed to have a crucial role in the organization of interlocutors' speech. According to Schiffrin (1987) "They help understanding speech and information progression and facilitate speakers' comprehension by creating a smooth and spontaneous interaction between them" (Schiffrin, 1987, P. 31).

The first plane, **Exchange Structure**, includes turns of "conditionally relevant adjacency pair[s]" (Schiffrin, 1987: 24),

i.e. anticipated turns initiated by adjacency pairs such as greetings, questions and answers. This fixed system of turn-taking is by Goffman (1981a) referred to as the system constraint of talk, and refers to speech situations where the first turn in the adjacency pair determines, or at least affects, the respondent's following turn.

**Action Structure** reflects the order of speech acts, the way in which the interlocutors manage themselves and others in terms of appropriateness and speech conventions, and the decision procedures upon which these speech acts are based (Schiffrin, 1987: 25). This category focuses on what Goffman (1981a: 21) refers to as ritual constraints, which are concerned with how the speaker manages him/herself and the interlocutor in terms of politeness and appropriateness. Schiffrin views both the Exchange Structure and the Action Structure as pragmatic categories.

**Ideational Structure**, however, is viewed more as a semantic category. The units within this structure reflect ideas or propositions, and how these ideas relate to each other within the discourse. Here, Schiffrin distinguishes between three different relations: cohesive relations, topic relations, and functional relations. Cohesive relations are closely connected to

Halliday and Hasan's (1976) definition of cohesion, and reflect ties that occur when the interpretation of one element presupposes information from another clause. Topic relations reflect the way in which topics and subtopics are organized, and functional relations reflect the role ideas play in relation to one another within the overall discourse (Schiffrin, 1987: 26).

**Participation Framework** refers to the relation between the speaker and the utterance and between the speaker and the hearer (Schiffrin, 1987: 27). An example of a speaker-utterance relationship is how a speaker chooses to tell a story; either by reporting only what actually happened, or by also including subjective evaluation. The latter option will open up for hearer-evaluation, and is thus an example showing that speaker-utterance relations also affect speaker-hearer relations. There are also numerous ways and levels in which the hearer and speaker may relate to one another, such as teacher/student relationships, or hearers being intended recipients of talk vs. hearers being unintended recipients of talk, and these different relationships affect the discourse

The Information State also refers to the ways in which the speaker and hearer relate to one another. But as the Participation Framework refers to the interactional aspect, the

Information State refers to the cognitive aspects in which the interlocutors may relate. This cognitive state includes what Schiffrin refers to as management of speaker/hearer knowledge and speaker/hearer meta-knowledge. Speaker/hearer knowledge refers to the interlocutors' specific knowledge about a certain topic, whereas speaker/hearer meta-knowledge refers to the interlocutors' conscious awareness of this respective knowledge and of the other person's knowledge (Schiffrin, 1987: 28).

### **1.1.2 Halliday**

Halliday and Hasan (2006) whose work on cohesion in English proves that cohesion is a part of the text-forming component in the linguistic system. They (Halliday&Hasan 2006, 303) discuss cohesion under the five heading, i.e. reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Although Halliday and Hasan (2006) do not speak directly of DMs, their analysis includes conjunctive items which are parallel to the words called DMs in other studies. Conjunctions are somewhat different from the other cohesive relations. They are based on the assumption that there are in the linguistic system forms of

systemic relations between sentences (ibid. p. 320). They can be located in the phenomena that

Constitute the content of what is being said (external), or in the interaction itself, the social process that constitutes the speech event (internal) (ibid. p. 321). The meanings conveyed by conjunctions can be additive (e.g., and, in addition, for instance), adversative (e.g., but, however, rather), causal (e.g., so, because, under the circumstances) and temporal (e.g., then, next, finally) (ibid. p. 241-244). The multiplicity is found not only in forms, but in function, too, i.e. each type of cohesive meaning can be conveyed not only through a variety of words, but also a single word can convey more than one conjunctive relation. Halliday and Hasan (2006, 226) define conjunctive elements as following:

Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meaning; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse. Halliday and Hasan propose that a set of cohesive devices (reference, repetition, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction) help create a text by indicating semantic relations in an underlying structure of ideas (see Martin, this volume). A range

of expressions (including, but not limited to, conjunctions) conveys conjunctive relations. Whereas most cohesive features establish cohesion through anaphoric or cataphoric ties to the text, conjunctive items “express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse” (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 236). The meanings conveyed by conjunctive items are relatively straightforward: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. Within these general meanings, however, are specific subtypes: a causal relation, for example, includes general causal (with simple and emphatic subtypes), and specific causal (with reason, result, and purpose subtypes). Each (sub)type of cohesive meaning can be conveyed through a variety of words: a general causal simple conjunctive relation, for example, can be conveyed through so, then, hence, and therefore. Multiplicity is found not just in a function (e.g. causal relation) → form (e.g. so, hence) direction, but also in a form → function direction. Thus a single word [form] can convey more than one conjunctive relation [function]: then, for example, can convey temporal, causal, and conditional relations, between clauses (cf. Biq 1990; Hansen 1997; Schiffrin 1992). Whereas many analyses of conjunctions argue for either a simple semantic interpretation or a set of polysemous meanings (e.g. Posner 1980), Halliday and Hasan allow variation

in the degree to which meaning results from the semantics of a word itself or from the propositions in a text. For example, although and is a texturecreating device that can contribute an additive meaning, its meaning can also reflect the semantic content of a text: thus, if and prefaces an upcoming proposition whose meaning contrasts with that of a prior proposition, and would then convey an adversative relation (comparable to but and on the other hand). Just as contributions to meaning can vary in source – word meaning and/or propositions – so too, meanings can fluctuate between “external” and “internal” sources. External meaning is “inherent in the phenomena that language is used to talk about” (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 241); it is roughly analogous to referential meaning and the domain of semantics. Internal meaning is nonreferential pragmatic meaning: it is “inherent in the communicative process” (1976: 241), e.g. the speaker’s choice of speech role, rhetorical channel, attitude (1976: 240). Rather than separate external and internal meanings, however, Halliday and Hasan posit a continuity. The additive meaning of and, for example, may be viewed “as an extension of the underlying patterns of conjunction into the communication situation itself, treating it, and thereby also the text . . . as having by analogy the same structure as ‘reality’” (1976: 267). Although meaning can be

reshuffled – between word and propositions, between internal and external sources – the boundary between sentence and text is less permeable. The systemic-functional grammar in which Halliday and Hasan’s analysis is located draws a sharp distinction between sentence and text: thus, the structural role of words like *and* (to coordinate clauses at a sentential level) is qualitatively different from its cohesive role (to mark interpretive dependencies between propositions, and thus create texture).

### **1.1.3 Fraser**

Fraser (1988; 1996; 1999), who works within a grammatical-pragmatic perspective. Fraser’s (ibid.) theoretical framework concerns the meaning of sentences and depends upon a differentiation between the propositional and non-propositional part of a sentence. The aspect of sentence which represents a state of the world when the speaker wishes to bring to the addressee’s attention is regarded by Fraser (1996, 2) as propositional content. The non-propositional content is called by Fraser (ibid.) “everything else”. This part of sentence meaning, which represents non-propositional content, the scholar proposes (Fraser, 1996) to analyse as different types of signals, called Pragmatic Markers. Although the pragmatic

markers do not contribute to the propositional content of the sentence, they signal different types of messages (ibid. p. 936). Messages, and hence their associated pragmatic markers, are divided into four types (ibid. p. 2-3): basic messages, commentary messages, parallel messages, and discourse messages. Discourse messages, and hence the presence of discourse markers, are optional and signal a message specifying how the basic message is related to the foregoing discourse (ibid. p. 3). Fraser (ibid.) suggests that there are four naturally occurring classes of DMs: topic change markers (e.g., back to my original point, by the way, on a different note), contrastive markers (e.g., in contrast, nevertheless, though), elaborative markers (e.g., above all, what is more, in particular), inferential markers (e.g., all things considered, consequently, therefore). He (ibid. p. 391) defines DMs as lexical expressions, drawn from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbs and non-propositional phrases, which “signal a relationship between the interpretation of the segment they introduce, S2, and the prior segment, S1”. “They have a core meaning which is procedural, not conceptual, and their more specific interpretation is negotiated by the context, both linguistic and conceptual” (Fraser 1999, 950). Fraser (1999) also introduced two main types of EDMs: EDMs which relate to messages and those

relating to topics. The former type, according to Fraser, consists of four sub-types: Contrastive markers (e.g. though, but, contrary to this/that, conversely, etc.), collateral markers (e.g. above all, also, besides, I mean, etc.), inferential markers (e.g. accordingly, so, then, therefore, thus, etc.), and additional subclass (e.g. after all, since, because, etc.). The second type includes examples such as “back to my original point”, “before I forget”, “by the way”, etc. (Fraser, 1999, P. 946).

The use of discourse markers could make conversation more interesting, more understandable, and even more polite, and more powerful, though it won't change its grammatical meaning. It can be read from Fraser's statement: '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' (Fraser, 1988:22). From that statement, we can see that discourse marker can make conversation easier, and more interesting to be discussed.

#### **1.1.4 Andreas H. Jucker**

The different studies of DMs distinguish several domains where they may be functional, in which there are included

textual, attitudinal, cognitive and interactional parameters. Accordingly, as stated by Jucker & Ziv (1998) DMs have been analyzed as text-structuring devices that serve to mark openings or closings of discourse units or transitions between them. Also, they serve as modality or attitudinal indicators, as markers of speaker-hearer intentions and relationships, and as instructions on how given utterances are to be processed or interpreted.

Jucker (1997). He defines that in modern English, discourse marker 'well' has four distinct uses. The first is 'well' as a frame marker; it introduces a new topic or prefaces direct reported speech. For example: A: I think it is not a big problem because our financial report will shown by the simple graphs. Are you going to present it? B: It's ok. 'Well' did you study marketing also during your training?

The conversation above shows us, 'well' marks the starting of a new topic in a conversation. The hearer B recognizes the explanation of the speaker A by responding 'it's ok' and then the hearer introduces a new topic in a question form. A: Did he ask you to train him how to play Polo? B: Yes, and he said 'well' tell me more about Polo? The respond of the hearer uses 'well' introduces direct speech. Jucker (1997) admits that 'it' separates the reported speech from the immediately preceding

reporting clause 'he said.' The switch from the reporting clause to the reported speech entails a deictic reorientation.'

Jucker (1997) states that discourse marker of 'well' can function as a face threat mitigator, but in the conversation above, the function of 'well' is as mitigator to lessen the imposition of the utterance. Without using 'well', the conversation above will change its politeness level as we can see below: A: How far is it? B: It's too far to walk.

From the conversation above, we can see that the imposition of the utterance in the second conversation is stronger than the first conversation.

### **1.1.5 Diane Blackmore**

Blakemore (1987, 2002) who works within the framework of Relevance Theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1996). The object of the study in the Relevance Theory is not discourse itself, but "the cognitive processes underlying successful linguistic communication" (Blakemore 2002, 5). For Blakemore (1987), discourse connectives are employed to signal how one discourse segment is relevant to another. Her analysis focuses on the procedural nature of discourse connectives in the sense

that they constrain the process of utterance interpretation. In other words, the meaning encoded by such expressions as *therefore*, *so*, *after all*, *but* controls the choice of context under which the utterances containing them are relevant (Blakemore 1987, 75). Blakemore (1992, 138) suggests four ways in which information conveyed by an utterance can be relevant: it may allow the derivation of a contextual implication (e.g., *so*, *therefore*, *too*); it may strengthen an existing assumption, by providing better evidence for it (e.g., *after all*, *moreover*, *furthermore*); it may contradict an existing assumption (e.g., *however*, *but*, *nevertheless*); it may specify the role of the utterance in the discourse (e.g., *anyway*, *by the way*, *finally*).

Theory states that speakers interpret information searching for relevance. As the information carried by an utterance only has contextual effects if it is combined with the adequate assumptions existing in the mental representation of the world the hearer has stored in his memory, a crucial aspect of Sperber and Wilson's theory is how the appropriate context is selected and made accessible in each case. It is at this point where, according to Blakemore (1987), the expert in the study of DMs (she calls them discourse connectives) from a relevance-theoretic approach, connectives contribute essentially to the

interpretation process. From this theoretical perspective, connectives are considered signals the speaker uses to guide cooperatively his hearer's interpretative process. Blakemore (especially 1987, 1988, 1989a, 1989b, 1992 and 1993) considers that the essential function of elements like likewise, therefore, because, etc is to guide the hearer's interpretation process through the specification of certain properties of the context and the contextual effects; more specifically, these elements constrain the relevant context for the interpretation of an utterance, reinforcing some inferences or eliminating other possible ones and thus help process the information. DMs, therefore, have a guiding meaning for inference in the interpretation process. Blakemore proposes that DMs do not have a representational meaning the way lexical expressions like boy and hypothesis do, but have only a procedural meaning, which consists of instructions about how to manipulate the conceptual representation of the utterance (cf. Blakemore, 1987, 1992). Words with conceptual meaning contribute to the content of assertions and are analysed as encoding elements of conceptual representations. Words with procedural meaning, on the other hand, encode information about how these representations are to be used in inference, they tell you how to "take" these representations. In Blakemore's view, DMs do

not contribute to the proposition expressed by an utterance or to any other conceptual representation the utterance may communicate; rather they point the hearer to the context in which he is expected to process the utterance and the conclusions he should be drawing from it

### **1.1.6 Redeker**

Redeker (1990; 1991) also approaches DMs from a discourse-coherence point of view. Yet, she is critical of Halliday and Hasan (1976), and claims that utterances can be cohesive without overlapping references in the text, and that overlaps do not necessarily mean that an utterance is cohesive. She uses the two examples below to illustrate her point, as both examples demonstrate a cohesive text although they lack overlapping textual references. The examples in (2.6) illustrate semantic coherence, where cohesion occurs between the ideas or semantic meanings the utterances convey (Redeker, 1990: 368). Example (2.7) illustrates pragmatic coherence, where cohesion is a result of pragmatic relations rather than textual relations. Consequently, these examples illustrate that “coherence always has both an ideational and a pragmatic component” (Redeker, 1990: 369), but that one of them usually is weighted heavier than the other.

2.6 (1a) *Sally is crying.*

(1b) *Nanny has thrown out the time-worn teddy bear*

(1c) *The holes were getting too large to fix.*

(Redeker,1990:367)

2.7 (2a) *Take those dirty shoes off!*

(2b) *there's a brand-new carpet in the hallway.*

(2c) *Mom's ALREADY mad at me.* (Redeker,1990:368)

Redeker further classifies the two components of discourse coherence, semantic and pragmatic coherence, by dividing pragmatic coherence into a) rhetorical relations, and b) sequential units. Rhetorical relations comprises units considered cohesive based on the observation that the strongest relation lies between the utterances themselves or between “the beliefs and intentions motivating them” (i.e. antithesis, concession, evidence, justifications, conclusions, etc.), as in example (2.7 (2a-c)) above (Redeker, 1990: 369). Sequential units, on the other hand, include utterances that are considered cohesive without displaying any obvious ideational or rhetorical relation (paratactic sequential relations: transitions, change of topic, and hypotactic sequential relations:

leading out of a commentary, correction, paraphrase, digression etc. (Redeker, 1990: 369).

Redeker thus builds on Schiffrin's (1987) model, but criticizes it for relying too "heavily on the markers themselves in identifying the intended relations" (Redeker, 1991: 379). This is especially seen in Schiffrin's (1987) two planes of talk Information Structure and Participation Framework. As an improvement of these two planes, Redeker (1991: 1167) proposes a broader model within which any utterance is considered to participate in at least two of the components, and where one constituent will be more dominant than the other. This model involves three components of coherence: 1) Ideational structure, 2) Rhetorical structure, and 3) Sequential Structure. According to Redeker, two discourse units are related 1) ideationally "if their utterances in the given context entails the speaker's commitment to the existence of that relation in the world the discourse describes" (i.e. temporal sequence, elaboration, cause, reason, consequence etc.), 2) rhetorically "if the strongest relation is not between the propositions expressed in the two units but between the illocutionary intentions they convey" (i.e. antithesis, concession, evidence, justification, and conclusion), and 3) sequentially if there is a

paratactic relation (“transition between issues or topics that either follows a preplanned list or is locally occasioned”) or a hypotactic relation (transitions “leading into or out of a commentary, correction, paraphrase, aside, digression, or interruption segment”) (1991: 1168).

### **1.1.7 Aijmer**

Aijmer (2002) presents an empirical study of the discourse markers now, oh, ah, just, sort of, actually and and that sort of thing based on data from the 500,000 word London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English. This corpus includes spoken data collected from informal private conversations and public discussions and prepared speech produced by English speakers of both genders and from different social groups (Aijmer, 2002:5).

Aijmer analyzes the discourse markers in the framework of grammatical pragmatics, believing that these markers have gone, or are going, through a process of grammaticalization. Grammaticalization refers to the development of lexical items or phrases from being used only “in certain highly constrained local contexts to be reanalyzed as having syntactic and morphological functions” (Traugott, 1995: 32). Aijmer (2002: 5) argues that this grammaticalization process may help

explain why so many discourse markers are multifunctional and thus difficult to classify and define. She also sees core meaning as a very “abstract notion” (Aijmer, 2002: 23), and therefore finds Hansen’s approach to the analysis of discourse markers as having serving different functions according to the contexts in which they occur (1998: 87) as a better solution. This view leads Aijmer to describe discourse markers as “lexical words which have undergone a change of function from propositional meaning to textual and interpersonal function” (2002: 55). However, although Aijmer provides a different explanation to how discourse markers have emerged than Schiffrin and Redeker, it seems as if they all see them as cohesive devices to a certain degree. This is especially clear in Aijmer’s analysis of DMs, where her three main functions of DMs appear to be very similar to those presented by Schiffrin and Redeker. I therefore find it relevant and useful to draw on Aijmer’s (2002) framework in addition to Schiffrin (1987) and Redeker’s (1990; 1991) when creating the framework of classification for the present analysis.

In her analysis Aijmer (2002) discovers that discourse markers can a) occupy several positions in the utterance, b) be either prospective or retrospective, and c) serve three main functions: as phatic connectives in the interpersonal

function, as framers in the textual function, and as qualifiers in the qualifying function. In terms of positions in the utterance, Aijmer (2002: 37) finds that discourse markers can serve as 'themes' occurring in the prefront field, as 'insertions' occurring somewhere in the middle of the utterance, or as 'tails' or 'afterthoughts' occurring in the post-end field. Thus, discourse markers are not only phenomena occurring sentence-initially as Brinton (1996) claims.

In terms of utterance orientation, discourse markers are found to function both as prospective markers, directing the listener's attention forward to something that is about to come, and as retrospective markers, commenting on something that has already been said. Prospective markers are also called 'attention-getters' (Aijmer, 2002: 37), and typically serve to announce a new topic, a new point in discussion or refer to items on a list. The retrospective markers signal a reaction to something that has already been said, and this reaction is often followed by an explanation, elaboration, or justification (Aijmer, 2002: 37).

As for the main functions in the utterance, Aijmer reports that the markers can serve at three levels, the interpersonal, textual and qualifying. Interpersonal functions, or what Bazzanella (1990: 630) refers to as 'phatic

connectives', includes cases where the discourse markers are used to express feelings and attitudes, to mark pauses and planning of speech, or to hedge or boost the illocutionary force of the utterance, i.e. the speaker's intention (Aijmer, 2002: 50). This category can be viewed as an extension of Schiffrin's two categories Participation Framework and Information State. Since the illocutionary force is a culturally dependent speech act, as different cultures have different strategies for expressing the intended meaning, one can say that the interpersonal function also deals with face and politeness (Aijmer, 2002: 39). Aijmer's textual level is inspired by Halliday's category with the same name. Halliday defines textual meaning as an item's "relevance to the context" (1985: 53), and this is also what discourse markers functioning within the textual domain do in Aijmer's categorization. Accordingly, markers functioning within this domain may serve to mark transitions, introduce new turns, introduce explanations, justifications of backgrounds, introduce/close digressions, indicate self-corrections, or introduce direct speech. Thus, speakers use discourse markers with the textual function in order to help the listener to keep track of topic changes, repairs and other rapid changes in discourse that often occur in conversations. This category also bears

resemblance to Redeker’s (1990) Sequential Relations and Schiffrin’s (1987) Ideational Structure.

Discourse markers used with qualifying functions serve to indicate that “some qualification is needed because the dialogue does not ‘go well’” (Aijmer, 2002: 46). This usage can for instance occur in beginnings of disagreements, in exchanges, or before arguments where the speaker feels the need to express his/her response to what has been said. Discourse markers are also used as qualifiers when the speaker is listing several items. This category can be read as an extension of Schiffrin’s (1987) Exchange and Action Structure, which is also concerned with speaker-hearer relations, appropriateness and politeness strategies.

Table 1 below presents an overview of Aijmer’s framework for categorizing the discourse markers now, oh, ah, just, sort of, actually and and that sort of thing in terms of pragmatic functions and utterance orientation. This framework has a great influence on this study’s framework, where the same structure is applied and several of the pragmatic functions are included.

Variables	Values
	Marking transition

Textual functions (Framers)	Introducing a new turn
	Introducing an explanation, justification or background
	Introducing or closing a digression
	Self-corrections
	Introducing direct speech
Interpersonal functions (Phatic connectives)	Expressing attitudes, feelings and evaluations
	Hedges expressing uncertainty
	Boosters
	Hearer-oriented appeals for confirmation
	Expressing responses or reactions to the preceding utterance
	Backchannelling
Qualifying functions (Qualifiers)	Face and politeness
	Indicating agreement or disagreement
	Response to a question
	Indicating comparison or contrast
Orientation	Listing
	Prospective
	Retrospective

***Table1 :Aijmer's (2002) framework for categorizing DMs***

### **1.1.8 Simone Müller**

Simone Müller (2005: 23) introduces her work by claiming that, although discourse markers have been thoroughly investigated by several scholars during the past decades, few attempts have been made to systematically connect research on discourse markers with research on learner languages. Based on this argument, she aims to fill this gap. By investigating data extracted from the Giessen-Long Beach Chaplin Corpus (GLBCC), a 350,000 word corpus of native (mostly American) and non-native (mostly L1 German) English spoken data, Müller (2005: 24) analyzes how the discourse markers *so*, *well*, *you know*, and *and like* are used by the two speaker groups both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Müller gives an account of the already existing frameworks presented by Schiffrin (1987) and Redeker (1991), and agrees with Redeker's criticism of Schiffrin. Yet,

she does not find Redeker's (1991) revised model to be an improvement, as it does not open up for all potential functions of DMs, and by such does not appear to be any more precise than Schiffrin's model (Müller, 2005: 30). As a result, Müller decides to analyze her material with a bottom-up approach, where she, with as little influence from previous theories as possible, attempts to categorize her data based on how the target discourse markers behave in her material. She also disagrees with the assumption made by several other scholars such as Schourup (1985), Schiffrin (1987), Fraser (1990), and Redeker (1991) that discourse markers have a core meaning, and rather sees them as multifunctional markers that possibly can serve several functions depending on the situation in which they occur. This brings her to the conclusion that the four discourse markers under investigation function on two main levels, textual and interpersonal, and that the markers within these two main levels may serve several subfunctions and thus convey several meanings (Müller, 2005: 30-31). Except for the fact that Müller only proposes two main levels, this approach is highly comparable with Aijmer (2002).

Müller's textual function is, like Aijmer's, similar to Schiffrin's (1987) ideational structure, but "goes slightly

beyond” (Müller, 2005: 30). Instead of addressing the hearer, it serves to direct focus toward “expressions and propositional content expressed in units of various length” (Müller, 2005: 30). This can for instance include cases where the discourse markers are used to mark false start and repair, or to introduce quotations and examples. Other cases of discourse markers functioning at the textual level may for example include DMs used to structure discourse by marking transitions or indicating lexical/content search.

Discourse markers functioning at the **interpersonal** level focus on the speaker-hearer relationship rather than on the textual and structural properties of the utterance. Müller discovers that these cases most often occur when there is a shift or transition, and normally function to, for example, “mark a speech act, a response, an opinion, or an evaluation” (2005: 31). Consequently, this category can be seen as a combination of Schiffrin’s (1987) Action and Exchange Structure and Participation Framework and Information state. Discourse markers within this category often serve as an appeal to the hearer in order to direct the hearer’s focus toward a particular word or phrase or in order to elicit a certain response. This latter point is particularly relevant for you know and like. It also seems, according to Müller (2005:

31), that the functions within the interpersonal level are more dependent on the individual marker than functions at the textual level. She further states that these two levels are not closed groups, and that different sub-functions will occur depending on the markers and the contexts in which they occur. Table 2 below illustrates Müller's classification and results in terms of the textual and interactional functions of the discourse markers *so*, *well*, *you know*, and *like* as used by native and non-native speakers of English (Müller, 2005: 246).

**Table 2: Müller's (2005) framework for categorizing the DMs *so*, *well*, *you know* and *like***

Level/marker	Textual	Interactional
	<b>Marking result or consequence</b>	Speech act marker - question or request
	Main idea unit marker	Speech act marker – opinion
<i>So</i>	<b>Summarizing/rewording/giving an example</b>	Marking implied result
	<b>Sequential <i>so</i></b>	Marker of a transition relevance place
	Boundary marker	
	<b>*Searching for the right phrase</b>	<b>*Indirect answer</b>
	Rephrasing/correcting	Direct answer
	Quotative <i>well</i>	Response to self-raised expectations
<i>Well</i>	Introducing the next scene	Contributing an opinion
	<b>*Conclusive <i>well</i></b>	<b>*Continuing an opinion/answer</b>
	<b>Marking lexical/content search</b>	Evaluating a previous statement

<i>You know</i>	<b>Marking lexical/content search</b>	<b>"Imagine the scene"</b>
	<b>Marking false start and repair</b>	<b>"See the implication"</b>
	<b>Marking approximation</b>	<b>Reference to shared knowledge</b>
	<b>Introducing an explanation</b>	Appeal for understanding
	<b>Quotative <i>you know</i></b>	<b>Acknowledge that the speaker is right</b>
<i>Like</i>	<b>Searching for the appropriate expression</b>	
	<b>Marking an appropriate number of quantity</b>	
	<b>Introducing an example</b>	
	<b>Introducing an explanation</b>	
	<b>Marking lexical focus</b>	

As can be read from Table 2 above, Müller (2005) discovers certain differences between the native speakers and the German learners of English. Those functions marked with **bold** indicate that the native (American) speakers use this particular DM with this function significantly more often than the German speakers. And those marked with **\*bold** indicate that the German speakers use this function for this particular marker significantly more often than the native speakers do. Thus, we can see that the native speakers for example use *you know* to ‘mark lexical/content search’ significantly more often than the non-native German speakers, whereas the non-natives use *well* to ‘search for the right answer’ significantly more often than the native

speakers do. Also, *like* is found only at the textual level, whereas the three other markers can occur at both the textual and the interpersonal level.

## **2. Properties of DMs**

Strictly speaking, most of the authors come to conclusion that a single definition is inadequate for differentiating DMs from other linguistic expressions and they set criteria to distinguish the marker's use from its literal use. These criteria usually consist of properties typical of DMs and like the definitions and terminology concerning DMs, the authors' opinions vary on what is regarded as a property of DMs. Schourup (1999, 241) notes even though most of the definitions concentrate on connectivity and non-truth-conditionality, "no definition seems likely to win universal acceptance in view of the unresolved theoretical differences and varying background assumptions that inform these definitions." Nevertheless, determining properties of these items is important as it helps to differentiate marker's use of an expression from its literal use. The following characteristics serve as the basis for the criteria applied to the analysis for distinguishing the discourse marker use of *you know* and *I mean* from their literal use. Brinton (1996, 33-35) puts forward the following summary of features characteristic of DMs:

- 1) they appear more frequently in oral rather than written discourse
- 2) they are often stylistically stigmatized and negatively evaluated
- 3) they are short and often phonologically reduced
- 4) they form a separate tone group
- 5) they are often restricted to sentence-initial position, or may always occur sentence initially
- 6) they appear either outside the syntactic structure or may be loosely attached to it and have no clear grammatical function
- 7) they are optional
- 8) they carry little or no propositional meaning
- 9) they are multifunctional, can operate on both local and global plane

The fact that DMs mostly occur in the oral discourse is simply explained by the characteristics of speech. In contrast to writing, speaking usually does not provide speakers with so much time for planning and DMs can provide clues for the hearer to understand the intended interpretation of the message. Stressing the importance of DMs in spoken discourse, Lenk (1998, 203) claims that these items have significant discourse structuring functions which are beneficial for the hearer. Consequently, DMs prevail in

speech-related text types such as records of spoken language (court records), texts written to be spoken (sermons) or text imitating spoken language (plays) (Lutzky 2012, 24).

Moreover, Lutzky notes that the use of DM is related to informality (ibid.). Consequently, the predominance of DMs in oral discourse can be related to the fact that spoken language is frequently less formal. This is confirmed by Archer et al. (2012, 77) who explain that an informal conversation with no DMs whatsoever would be unnatural. Their association with informality may be one of the reasons for the fact that they may be negatively perceived and even criticized. Brinton (1996, 33) claims that when they occur in high frequency in oral discourse or when they appear in written formal discourse, their use is seen as a sign of dysfluency or carelessness. Others assert that only DMs that function interpersonally are occasionally stigmatized. One of them is *you know about* which Schourup (1982, 68) writes that English teachers condemn this DM as a “verbal garbage” or “anemic phrase” and regard it “as a 'crutch' used when one has nothing to say, or when one cannot, or will not bother to, find the proper words to express something.”

### **3. Functions of DMs**

It is generally acknowledged that a marker does not fulfil a single function, rather DMs are characterized as being multifunctional. An abundance of theoretical frameworks classifying functions of DMs have been proposed which is a consequence of the fact that describing and constraining their multifunctionality is not a simple issue for DMs can perform a large number of functions depending on the context and in some meanings they can overlap with other markers (Aijmer and Vandenberg 2011, 229).<sup>8 9</sup>

This is an area where authors' stances diverge but many scholars propose that markers function primarily on two levels. Lutzky (2012, 39) gives a list of functions of DMs which operate on structural and interactional levels:

Structural	Interactional
Initiating function	Conveying positive or negative attitudes
Closing or conclusive function	Attention-catching
Turn-taking devices	Hesitation devices, fillers

Frame function, marking boundaries in discourse (e. g. topic changes/shifts, digressions...)	Face-threat mitigation (hedging)
Quotative function	Acknowledging function
Introducing parts of an adjacency pair	Qualifier function (signalling some kind of insufficiency)
	Intensifying function

Table 3. Functions of DMs according to Lutzky (2012, 39)

A particular marker can fulfil more functions in each group, for instance, a marker can signal a speaker change and thus perform a structural function but at the same time it can convey the attitude of the speaker (ibid. 38). Lutzky divides the functions into two levels but some authors agree on the textual level and further subdivide the interactional level. Namely, Andersen (2001, 26) perceives their functional complexity as divided into three groups subjective, interactional and textual functions which resemble Lutzky's categorization. Her structural function corresponds to Andersen's textual function since it communicates "what the speaker perceives as the relation between sequentially arranged units of discourse" (Andersen 2001, 66), in other words, it is the connection between propositional content or communicated assumptions. However,

what Lutzky sees as interactional functions Andersen further distinguishes the communicative content of utterances and speaker's informative intention into interactional and subjective functions. While subjective function expresses the attitude of the speaker towards a proposition (ibid. 66), interactional function conveys "the speaker's conception of the hearer's relation to the proposition" (ibid. 69)

Similar classification to Andersen's can be found in Erman's study of you know (2001). Erman also agrees that DMs perform textual functions but he proposes two other domains. Namely, a social domain which is concerned with the addressee and the management of discourse and a metalinguistic domain in which markers are focused on the message and speaker's attitude towards it (Erman 2001, 1341).

Similar classification is given by Brinton who stresses that in spite of being grammatically optional and carrying non-propositional meaning, DMs bear important pragmatic functions and their absence would result in the unnaturalness and disjointedness of discourse (Brinton 1996, 35). She provides a number of functions and then, drawing on Halliday's functions of language, she describes how these functions fit into two modes of language: textual and interpersonal (ibid. 38). The

interpersonal mode covers “the expression of the speaker’s attitudes, evaluations, judgments, expectations, and demands as well as of the nature of the social exchange, the role of the speaker and the role assigned to the hearer” and is divided into two other functions of DMs (ibid.):

- a) subjective
- b) interpersonal

The textual mode mostly functions to structure text and the entire discourse and subsumes the following functions:

- c) initiating and closing discourse
- d) turn-taking
- e) signalling topic shifts
- f) indicating new and old information
- g) constraining the relevance of adjoining utterances
- h) structuring utterances as a text on a global level
- i) repair making

Brinton’s understanding of functions of DMs as working on two levels corresponds to domains recognized by Schiffrin who describes DMs as indexing utterances to the participants, which

parallels interpersonal level, and also indexing utterances to the text, paralleling the textual level (Brinton 1996, 39).

To conclude, the terminology, definition and characteristics of DMs is a complex issue and there is a diversity of approaches taken to study DMs which results in the fact that there is no universally agreed set of properties that would be common to all DMs. However, my conception of DMs is that they are various words or phrases from different word classes which have little or no propositional meaning, are syntactically optional and since they are usually not integrated into their host utterance, they can occupy sentence initial, medial or final position. They are more frequent in oral rather than written discourse and they tend to be phonologically reduced. They do not usually carry grammatical functions yet they are very important for their discourse or pragmatic functions which help in the interpretation of an utterance. Their functions fall into two main domains, textual and interpersonal.

Furthermore, in some cases it might be difficult to determine whether an item is or is not a DM. To deal with this, I agree with Hansen (1998, 358) who sees the properties as structured around prototypes. Jucker and Ziv (1998, 2-3) propose this as well and explain that since discourse marker appears to be a fuzzy

concept, there are more prototypical members of the class that possess more criterial features and there are peripheral members displaying less characteristic properties. Therefore, the next chapter looks at the two DMs essential in this study, I mean and you know, and what properties they have. Focusing only on the above stated criteria, I will disregard their phonological properties since they will be analyzed in corpora where no prosodic features are available.

## UNIT 2

# WHAT IS ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE FOR INDONESIAN LEARNERS?

## 2.1. Definition of EFL

'English as a foreign language' (EFL) is taught in non-English-speaking countries where English is not the official language such as Japan, China or Venezuela. However, as Modiano states, "the traditional definition of the foreign-language speaking speech community is now breaking down...because the increased use of English through globalization has made it difficult to differentiate between second language and foreign language speech communities" (2009, p. 38). Sweden is a prime example of such a 'break down'. A traditional term for the use or study of the English language by non-native speakers in countries where English is generally not a local medium of communication.

*English as a Foreign Language* (EFL) corresponds roughly to the Expanding Circle described by linguist Braj Kachru in "Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle" (1985).

ESL and **EFL** instructional approaches differ in significant ways. ESL is based on the premise that English is the language of the community and the school and that students have access to English models. EFL is usually learned in environments where the language of the community and the school is not English. EFL teachers have the difficult task of finding access to and providing English models for their students. As the number of ESL students has increased in schools across North America, classrooms and school have become more like EFL (Lee Gunderson, *ESL (ELL) Literacy Instruction: A Guidebook to Theory and Practice*, 2nd ed. Routledge, 2009)

## **2.2. How to Teach English As a Foreign Language**

The low English language competence of the learners is a multidimensional and complex phenomenon. To address the major problems and to seek practical solutions, it is important to first address the factors underlying this problem. Low English language achievement can be attributed to a variety of interrelated factors ranging from learner-related variables (e.g., gender, motivation, and anxiety) to sociocultural variables (e.g., the influence of L1, society, culture, and religion). In addition, the variables of EFL instruction (i.e.,

teacher behavior and practices, the curriculum, and the teaching method) and other factors related to problems with the educational system may also contribute to the poor EFL results. There are some way to teach foreign language, such as;

1. **Be able to act.** Teaching is not only a profession but also an art. A good teacher is he who performs well. It has become a form of acting. A good teacher should be a good actor, especially when it is a matter of teaching a language. This task has become challenging as well as rewarding. Here are some practical suggestions for the teachers of languages.
2. **Use body language.** A good teacher is a good actor as told earlier. He should act according to the meanings of the word. He should wipe out sweat and fan with his hands if he is telling about hot weather. In the same fashion he should do his best to illustrate the meanings with the gestures of his body and facial expressions. It becomes extremely helpful while teaching second language.
3. **Begin teaching with modifiers and quantifiers.** The best way for the beginner is to familiarize him with nouns pronouns and adjectives. Avoid using verbal hints in the very beginning. Modifiers and quantifiers are the best cues for this purpose.

Performance on the modifiers is easy and leads to the easy understanding of verbs later.

4. **Make lessons interesting.** There are many ways to make lesson interesting. Some kind of joke anecdote or recitation of poetry rise interest in the learner.
5. **Use media in classroom.** Use of media in classrooms has proved very useful. It enables a teacher to use few words.
6. **Audio visual aids lessen the burden.** Example is better than precept. Always keep this proverb in mind and openly use audio visual aids. A lot of words fail in making learner to understand an idea while a little picture make it easy to comprehend. These can be more helpful in teaching vocabulary, prepositions and verbs.
7. **Regroup the learners.** After some preliminary teaching a teacher comes to know the abilities of his students. He should divide the students in groups according to their mental approach and learning capability. This grouping help the learners as well the teacher. The group should be made to practice together the lessons taught to them. Individual practice is always helpful in learning and grouping is the best way for this kind of drill.
8. **Use the language of the learner.** If a teacher is well conversant in the language of the learner he should use it as the base of

his material. The bilingual method that can also be called as translation method becomes very beneficent for the learner. It saves a lot of burden of the teacher too.

9. **Practice makes a man perfect.** Practice of anything makes one perfect in his art. Language is a thing that is quite a complex thing. It needs severe repetitions. Not only learners but also teacher should repeat his lesson at least two times in the class. Every sentence he speaks should speak two times with intervals or continuously. This repetition will make the learner expert and would produce in him the language skills
10. **Avoid descriptive grammar.** Descriptive grammar should be avoided in teaching language. It deviate the learner from his real objectives. It may be used in disguise. The teacher should not stress on the rules but the function of the words. Too much corrective attitude of the teacher may annoy the learner and he may become disappointed.
11. **Build confidence in the learner.** Second language learners are conscious of their weakness of not knowing the language. Sometimes they may become emotional or irritated. It is the duty of the teacher to provide him safer atmosphere for language learning. He should take the learner into confidence by telling him that every second language learner does not

know the language. The mistakes are not to disappoint but to correct his language and are made by all

### 2.3. ***BENEFITS OF STUDYING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE***

Courses in foreign languages and literatures meet the general studies needs of all students and develop communication skills and appreciation for international literatures and cultures. Augusta University's foreign language faculty have lived and studied in Europe, Africa, Canada, Mexico, and South America, as well as in the United States. Students are introduced to many cultures and points of view through literature, film, journalism, and the Internet. Drama students read and produce French and Spanish plays, and faculty and students publish essays and poetry in academic journals, magazines, and in the yearly *Foreign Language Notes*. Students and faculty benefit from small upper-division classes, which create a sense of close community and warm congeniality.

Below are seven cognitive advantages to learning a foreign language. Many of these attributes are only apparent in people who speak multiple languages regularly – if you haven't spoken a foreign tongue since you're a levels, your brain might not be

reaping these bilingual benefits. However, people who begin language study in their adult lives can still achieve the same levels of fluency as a young learner, and still reap the same mental benefits, too.

You become smarter

Speaking a foreign language improves the functionality of your brain by challenging it to recognize, negotiate meaning, and communicate in different language systems. This skill boosts your ability to negotiate meaning in other problem-solving tasks as well. Students who study foreign languages tend to score better on standardized tests than their monolingual peers, particularly in the categories of math's, reading, and vocabulary.

You build multitasking skills

Multilingual people, especially children, are skilled at switching between two systems of speech, writing, and structure. According to a study from the Pennsylvania State University, this “juggling” skill makes them good multitasks, because they can easily switch between different structures. In one study, participants used a driving simulator while doing separate, distracting tasks at the same time. The research found that people who spoke more than one language made fewer errors in their driving.

Your memory improves

Educators often liken the brain to a muscle, because it functions better with exercise. Learning a language involves memorizing rules and vocabulary, which helps strengthen that mental “muscle.” This exercise improves overall memory, which means that multiple language speakers are better at remembering lists or sequences. Studies show that bilinguals are better at retaining shopping lists, names, and directions.

You improve your English

Learning a foreign language draws your focus to the mechanics of language: grammar, conjugations, and sentence structure. This makes you more aware of language, and the ways it can be structured and manipulated. These skills can make you a more effective communicator and a sharper editor and writer. Language speakers also develop a better ear for listening, since they’re skilled at distinguishing meaning from discreet sounds.

#### 2.4. ***EFL* students need**

There are some lists of EFL students need when they are want to understand foreign language;

1. Lots of practice using English, especially orally. Get them speaking in the classroom, but also teach them where to find

opportunities to practice speaking English outside of class, and reward them for doing so.

2. Exposure to living English. Never lead your students to believe that English is a set of rules and words to memorize. It is the living, breathing creation of cultures and communities around the world. Do whatever you can to reveal this depth. Pen pals, non-traditional teaching materials, and field trips are great ways to make English come alive for your students.
3. Reasons to learn English, and motivation to stick with it. English can be very theoretical when you're growing up in a village in Belarus. Find out about each student's other passions and tie English into them. There are so many English communities online and off that it's possible to find a tie-in for almost any other area of interest. Social networks are powerful tools.

In Indonesia both the government and the people realize the importance of English, but the question on when the students should formally start learning English is still debatable. Previously, the implementation of the policy of introducing English as a local content for primary school pupils since 1993 has allowed more Indonesian younger students to learn English. This policy was based on public

aspiration for providing a strong foundation of English for their children in order to face the globalization era. However, in 2013 the government released a new curriculum called Kurikulum 2013 in which the government places English only as an elective subject in primary schools (Karli, 2014). According to Sahiruddin (2013) while English lessons have been compulsory in secondary schools, the recent Curriculum has revised the status of learning English in Primary schools from local content subject to an extra-curricular one. The implication of this policy is that English is an optional subject and should be given outside school hours. This current curriculum has been argued by many linguists, practitioners and parents as they believe that English should be a compulsory subject from primary schools for the following reason

## **UNIT 3**

### **WHAT IS CLASSROOM INTERACTION AT UNIVERSITY?**

Communication in the class is understood through classroom interaction. In the other words, in order for interaction to be realized, there must be some kind of the contact between the teacher and the learners. It does not have to be just the verbal interaction but the teachers can also try the non-verbal communication (mime, teaching aids...). Every subject requires a different type of interaction. When we compare the subject chemistry with the language, the methods of interaction differ immensely. While the students of natural science usually need just headwords for preparing some solution, the students of language need to communicate in whole sentences. It is because the main aim of this kind of the subject is to teach the learners a confident discourse, both written and spoken.

Jack C. Richards, John Platt and Heidi Platt, (1992) define classroom interaction in these words:

The patterns of verbal and non-verbal communication and the types of social relationships which occur within classrooms. The study of classroom interaction may be a part of studies of Classroom Discourse, Teacher Talk and Second Language Acquisition.

Classroom learning is a co-operative effort between the teacher and the students. It points to how the teacher and the students interact and how students interact amongst themselves, all of which affects language learning.

To practice critical thinking, students need to participate in the discourse of the discipline to think, speak, and be listened to as they participate in the discipline's particular mode of inquiry. Students will not get enough practice just by talking to the instructor, and very little by just listening to the instructor. Students develop competency and become critical thinkers in classroom that provides opportunities for intensive, structured interaction among students. The interaction between the teacher and the students is an essential part of teaching and learning process.

Classroom interaction stimulates the student involvement in the classroom. It fuels student motivation and help the students see the relevance of teachers' topic. It increases

participation as all students are involved. The interaction can be between the teacher and the students. This form of classroom interaction teaches the students to respect their superiors. They are given a chance to air their opinion in the class.

The other form of classroom interaction is between the student and students. This one allows the student to learn and understand how to work with partners. It develops and improves the skills of team work. It improves peer relationship. By encouraging students in the classroom to work together they learn the importance of working cohesively with other. Whether by small groups or whole-class discussion, teachers can do much to create an interactive classroom. Chet Meyers suggests some basic rules for consistently encouraging student interaction. The other method is whole class interaction. Learners interacting this way in a classroom learn the importance of patience and to value the point view of other.

By asking the student to raise their to speak or calling student by randomly the teacher teaches the students that when someone else is speaking, they should let them have their say without interruption as their voices are as equal as that of anyone else. Classroom interaction also other method like role playing, conversation, reading around, and questions and answer. Reading aloud includes a situation whereby one person read

while others listen. Role playing is whereby the students take on given role and act out on scene with other. This allows students to demonstrate creativity and knowledge and help them to outside the constraints of classroom. In conversation, the students in a class discuss a given topic. A conversation can involve the whole class or among small groups of students in the class. In question and answer method, the teacher or student poses a question to assess the learner. The student may pose a question to the teacher meant to obtain more or new information.

### **3.1. ASPECTS OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION**

The dominant pattern of interaction is that of the teacher's question, the student's response and the teacher's feedback. This is commonly found in all classrooms and is typical of classroom exchange. Teacher's talk not only takes up the largest portion of talk but also determines the topic of talk and who talks. It is therefore a very important component of classroom interaction.

Amy B.M. Tsui defines teacher's explanation, which is another component that takes up a significant portion of teacher's talk: There are different ways of defining explanation. Some define it very generally as providing information or communicating content, others make a distinction between explanation of

procedures and explanation of concepts, vocabulary and grammatical rules. How teachers deal with explanation is very important: inappropriate explanation or over- explanation hinder rather than help students to comprehend

The ways in which students behave and interact during a classroom organized and controlled by the teacher (or sometimes by the learners themselves) to enable teaching to take place most effectively is called classroom management. It also includes procedures for grouping students.

For different types of classroom activities, the use of lesson plans, handling of equipment, aids, etc., and the direction and management of student's behavior and activity are helpful.

### **3.2. The role of teacher in classroom interaction**

The teacher acts as a facilitator. Since students do not always spontaneously interact well with one another they hence need encouragement. To cultivate interaction, the teacher may divide the learners into small groups and give them tasks, projects or assignments. Soon all the students will be communicating with each other role playing and offering ideas; shyness will be forgotten in the excitement of accomplishing the group project. The teacher has the role to

create a classroom environment. Students often mimic a teacher's actions. If the teacher prepares a warm, happy environment, students are more likely to be happy. An environment set by the teacher can either be positive or negative. The students sense the mode of the teacher; if the teacher is angry, they may react negatively hence the learning is impaired. The teacher acts a role model. Teachers typically do not think of themselves as role models, however, inadvertently they are. Students spend a great deal of time with their teacher and therefore, the teacher becomes a role model to them. This maybe a positive or negative effect depending on the behaviors of the teacher. The teacher acts as a mentor. It can be intentional or not. It encourages the students to work hard to achieve the best. It can be positive or negative depending on the character of the teacher. The teacher can mentor learners by taking time to listen to them by doing so, the students build courage. The teacher should be aware of the elements that prevent good classroom interaction. By knowing them, the teacher will be able to avoid them hence create proper classroom interaction. For example, some teachers discourage students by criticizing their answers. Criticizing mostly shuts the students down hence affecting the interaction negatively.

Peer pressure or when some students have overpowering personalities that cause other students keep quiet in class.

### **3.3. Types of classroom interactions**

Taking the different main participants in classroom interactions, namely students and teachers, one can think of the following possible patterns:

- Teacher-students.
- Teacher-students .
- Students-teacher.
- Students-students.

One may argue that the more the initiative comes from students in classroom interaction, the more learning is taking place. In other words, the more students are free:

- to ask and answer questions,
- to take decisions about the learning process,
- to participate in discussions,
- to initiate conversations, the more they contribute to the learning process.

#### **3.3.1. Teacher-centered vs. student-centered classes**

It is worthwhile noting that there is a huge difference between classes where the focus is on teaching and classes where focus is on learning:

**Teacher-centered classes:**

- Focus is on teaching
- They are lecture-focused
- Students' talking time is low.
- Students have little say on what's happening
- Teacher have to listen, take notes and memorize what they are being taught

In these classes, teachers do not provide an opportunity for interactions among students. Most of the classroom interaction is teacher-student oriented.

**Student-centered classes:**

- Focus is on learning.
- Focus is not on lectures but on tasks.
- Students work collaboratively in small groups to answer tasks.
- Tasks are designed in such a way that they have the potential for more than one answer.
- Students talking time is high.

- Students are provided with sufficient time and opportunity to listen and consider the ideas of others.
- Critical thinking is promoted.
- Conversation with learners Classroom conversation is a form of classroom interaction in which students in the class discuss a given topic. The conversation may be held across the whole class or in smaller groups. Conversation is an important form of classroom interaction because it helps students develop their language skills. In a conversation, students may apply the skills and knowledge they have acquired in the class, making classroom conversation a practical form of interaction.
- Role Play Role-playing is an activity in which students take on given or chosen roles and act out a scene with others. This form of interaction lends itself to almost any situation, and the only restriction is a student's imagination. Role-playing allows students to demonstrate their creativity and knowledge about their roles, and it allows students to think outside of the constraints of the classroom and consider how they might apply the learned material to the real

world. This form of interaction can integrate different subjects into one activity.

### **3.4. Principles of classroom interaction followed by some benefits and advantages**

There are some kinds of classroom interaction and there also discusses about what is the benefits and advantages using some principals of classroom interaction

#### **1. Student-Teacher Interaction**

Theories behind student and teacher interaction state that this type of interaction is vital for students because it compares to the relationships they'll have in their lives, such as the relationship with a boss or superior. Students must learn to interact respectfully, but must also learn how to be assertive without being rude, so that their points and opinions are heard without disruption.

#### **2. Student-Student Interaction**

One-on-one student interaction is important because it allows students to understand what it means to work

with a partner. Theories of this type of interaction say that it prepares students for one-on-one relationships they will have with work associates, friends and even their spouses. Students must learn to rely on one other person and must be able to evaluate what their own strengths and weaknesses are as they try to complete a task.

### **3. Small-Group Interaction**

Theories behind small-group interaction speculate that this is one of the best ways for students to learn from others. In groups of three to six people, students have equal time to talk and learn to perform a role that they are assigned. They learn to depend on the other members of the group to do their own parts. They also learn that a small group must have a leader and how to incorporate different learning and working styles into a group in harmony.

### **4. Entire Classroom Interaction**

Entire classroom interaction allows all students to interact with all of the other students in the classroom. This is important in several different ways, according to different theories. Students learn how it feels to be only a small part of a very large group. They need to learn to

wait their turn to talk and be prepared to do much more listening than talking. Students also gain insight about different types of people and how all will react. This is the interaction that is most closely related to the real world, where students will need to interact with people of all types.

Most teachers do not strictly stick to one teaching method or strategy, but rather combine different aspects of several strategies to create effective classroom interaction. Students need input from a source who knows the target language, which is why "the Silent Way" is not a very effective teaching method. Students will not learn to produce a language without input and exposure, and both vocabulary and grammar are important tools for language learners. In addition to exposure, students perform better when they have motivation to communicate. First and foremost, you should enforce an "English only" policy in the classroom. Beyond this, you can create motivation in the form of interactive games or activities where the students need to communicate in order to complete a task--also known as a "task-based"

activity. An example of this type of activity is a "gap fill"; one student has the information that his partner needs to fill in the blanks.

Before deciding on what type of classroom interaction you want to use for a particular lesson activity, think about whether the goal of the activity is fluency or accuracy. In fluency-oriented activities, you will want the students to be able to speak without much interruption. The point of fluency activities is to encourage the students to use as much language as they know in order to communicate fluidly without halting. The point of accuracy-oriented activities is the opposite. You want students to focus on a particular point, usually grammar or vocabulary, and focus on getting it right. In accuracy exercises, the flow is not as important as pronouncing or saying the target vocabulary or grammar correctly.

Another key part of classroom interaction is teacher feedback. In order to improve, students must get feedback and correction. During accuracy exercises, you may choose to correct students right

away, while during fluency exercises you may want to simply listen and jot down any glaring mistakes. You can give feedback orally or in writing. Sometimes you may want to correct an individual student in front of other students, while at other times it is better to offer general suggestions and corrections for the entire group. When giving feedback, always bear in mind the cultural context, as some students may not be comfortable receiving individual correction in front of their peers

### **3.5. Improving Classroom Interaction**

This information provided below focuses on how to stimulate student involvement in the classroom. It includes ideas on how to fuel students' motivation, how to help students see relevance in your topic, and how these techniques can increase class participation.

#### **A. Stimulating Discussion**

Two of the major barriers to discussion in an undergraduate classroom are that some students are afraid to talk in a group, and that they may not be

interested in the subject matter. Thus, the two most important things to do in stimulating a discussion are to create a "safe" environment, and to motivate students by making the topic relevant, to stimulate their interest in the material.

The idea of a "safe" environment refers to the fact that we want students to feel comfortable about speaking out and sharing their views with the class. There are three major components to creating a safe environment:

- 1) Welcome the ideas of students. Let them know directly that an ideal discussion section is about discussion of ideas and perspectives among students.

- 2) Give all ideas and points of view reasonable consideration without rushing to judgment. Sometimes a student may be factually wrong about a topic and it is OK to point out their error. However, when discussing more subjective topics try to give all ideas and all students equal time and consideration.

3) Maintain the focus of the class on discussion of ideas rather than the judgment of people. Some topics can evoke powerful emotions. Try not to let the discussion of ideas degrade into the judgment of people.

There are a number of different specific methods for generating a safe and comfortable environment for students:

1. Get to know the students and have them get to know you. The discussion should really be an interaction among the students instead of all the individual students talking to you, or to each other through you. Getting students to know each other will stimulate their interaction with each other. Here are some suggestions on how to build familiarity among students:

- a) Call on students by name
- b) Have them refer to each other by name
- c) Play some sort of name game or ice-breaker on the first day
- d) Have the students address each other instead of just you

e) Ask students to react to other students' comments

2. Break the students into smaller groups. A popular method of making students feel comfortable about sharing ideas is to break them down into small groups (about 3-4 people) and have them discuss the topic of the day. Group work is a great way to get students to know each other and to get them talking (people who are nervous about speaking up in front of 25 people may feel comfortable with just 3.) Let them talk it over for about 10 - 15 minutes and then reconvene the group. You could have one member of each group report their ideas, or make a list on the board of what the groups come up with. Group work has two major advantages. One was already listed; student may feel more comfortable talking with three people rather than 25. The other is that when the ideas are reported to the class as a whole the ideas are somewhat separated from the individuals that offered them. Thus students can find comfort in a degree of anonymity.

How do you deal with students who don't participate?  
Should you call on them by name? Hopefully if you get to know the students well, and everybody feels comfortable and interested, you won't have too many of these. But if you do:

- Have students write down answers to your questions. Then you can ask them what they wrote without putting them on the spot to generate an answer.
- Ask the student a question that has no wrong answers

How do you deal with students who monopolize the discussion?

- Ask for other people to contribute
- Talk to the student specifically

Make the course material relevant to students' everyday lives.

Discuss how to make the material relevant to the students. If a discussion is too abstracted students might lose interest. Find ways to remind them that what they are studying is important, practical, or real.

- Give credit for bringing newspaper/magazine articles.
- Show the students your own interest in the topic. Muster up some energy without being falsely enthusiastic. Especially if you are teaching on a topic that is your field of interest, you should be able to convey why you have devoted your life to its study.
- Talk about why you find the material interesting.
- Ask the students to relate the material to something in their own lives.

## **B. Asking Effective questions**

Asking questions in the appropriate way is key to leading a good discussion. Here are a few ideas.

- a) Be aware of the difference between questions that have one right answer and questions that have many. If you are trying to generate discussion among students asking for the "right" answer is probably the wrong thing to do. Instead, formulate questions that are open ended
  - that is questions that either have no clear right

or wrong answer or that might have multiple right answers. On the other hand, if you are trying to get students to exercise their factual knowledge of a subject, it might be appropriate to ask "right/wrong" questions or those sort of questions that have a single answerer.

- b) Aim your questions at varying levels: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, etc.
- c) Wait at least 10 seconds for responses. It seems like a long time, but it usually takes this long to formulate a response. Research has shown that most teachers answer their own questions to quickly.
- d) Prepare some questions beforehand

### **C. The cycle of Feedback**

Improving classroom interaction involves continually assessing your teaching, students learning, and your relationship with the students. The students have a relationship with you, with each other, and with the material. It's important to get feedback about all three of these relationships.

- a) Feedback happens on many timescales. How did this go today? How is the quarter going?
- b) Try a written mid-quarter evaluation. For example: Ask which exercise was most helpful? Which was least?
- c) Use office hours to talk informally about how things are going
- d) Have your teaching observed or videotaped.
- e) Make sure students understand your assignments.
- f) Make your teaching transparent. Ask the students if they understand why we are doing this assignment.

## UNIT 4

### WHAT IS SOCIOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVES?

#### 4.1. An Introduction to Sociocultural Theory

Sociocultural theory grew from the work of seminal psychologist Lev Vygotsky, who believed that parents, caregivers, peers, and the culture at large were responsible for developing higher order functions. According to Vygotsky, learning has its basis in interacting with other people. Once this has occurred, the information is then integrated on the individual level:

Vygotsky was a contemporary of other great thinkers such as Freud, Skinner, and Piaget, but his early death at age 37 and suppression of his work in Stalinist Russia left him in relative obscurity until fairly recently. As his work became more widely published, his ideas have grown increasingly influential in areas including child development, cognitive psychology, and education.

Sociocultural theory focuses not only how adults and peers influence individual learning, but also on how cultural beliefs and attitudes impact how instruction and learning take place.

According to Vygotsky, children are born with basic biological constraints on their minds. Each culture, however, provides what he referred to as 'tools of intellectual adaptation.' These tools allow children to use their basic mental abilities in a way that is adaptive to the culture in which they live. For example, while one culture might emphasize memory strategies such as note-taking,

other cultures might utilize tools like reminders or rote memorization.

An important concept in sociocultural theory is known as the zone of proximal development. According to Vygotsky, the zone of proximal development "is the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers."

Essentially, it includes all of the knowledge and skills that a person cannot yet understand or perform on their own yet but is capable of learning with guidance. As children are allowed to stretch their skills and knowledge, often by observing someone who is slightly more advanced than they are, they are able to progressively extend this zone of proximal development.

The zone of proximal development (ZPD) is the range of abilities that an individual can perform with assistance, but cannot yet perform independently.

Vygotsky's Definition of ZPD

Zone proximal development is a concept that was created by influential psychologist Lev Vygotsky. According to Vygotsky, the zone of proximal development is: "the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers." (Vygotsky, 1978)

### The Importance of the "More Knowledgeable Other"

The concept of the "more knowledgeable other" is quite simple and fairly self-explanatory. The more knowledgeable other is someone who has a higher level of knowledge than the learner. It is the more knowledgeable other who provides the critical guidance and instruction during the sensitive learning period. While a child might not yet be capable of doing something on her own, she is able to perform the task with the assistance of a skilled instructor.

### The Importance of Social Interaction

This more knowledgeable other is often a parent, teacher, or another adult, but this is not always the case. In many instances, peers provide valuable assistance and instruction. During certain

periods of a child's life, they may even look to peers more than they look to adults. The teen years, when forming an identity and fitting in is so critical, is just one example. Kids at this age often look to their peers for information about how to act and how to dress. Vygotsky believed that peer interaction was an essential part of the learning process. In order for children to learn new skills, he suggested pairing more competent students with less skilled ones.

### Scaffolding

When children are in this zone of proximal development, providing them with the appropriate assistance and tools, which he referred to as scaffolding, gives students what they need to accomplish the new task or skill. Eventually, the scaffolding can be removed and the student will be able to complete the task independently.

### Applications of ZPD in the Classroom

It is important to realize that the zone of proximal development is a moving target. As a learner gains new skills and abilities, this zone moves progressively forward. Teachers and parents can take advantage of this by continually providing educational

opportunities that are a slight stretch of a child's existing knowledge and skills. By giving children tasks that they cannot quite do easily on their own and providing the guidance they need to accomplish it, educators can progressively advance the learning process.

For example, a teacher in an experimental psychology course might initially provide scaffolding for students by coaching them step-by-step through their experiments. Next, the teacher might slowly remove the scaffolding by only providing outlines or brief descriptions of how to proceed. Finally, students would be expected to develop and carry out their experiments independently.

#### **4.2. The Field of Sociocultural**

A sociocultural field delimits and structures a system of spontaneous interactions between individuals and their associated meanings, values, and norms, and orders their perceptions and expectations. It is not necessarily the totality of such elements, for there are many sociocultural fields, overlapping, coexistent, involving at one level a social dyad like

two loved ones, and at another level a super cultural system like Western civilization.

A sociocultural field comprises six aspects. First, it is a complex of *interdependent social interactions* among agents in the field; it is the web of interrelated acts, conduct, behavior, responses, reactions, transactions, deeds, and so on involving individuals and their groups. Second, the field is the collection of acting, reacting *agents* (individuals and groups) and their objective *vehicles* (such as house, constitution, courtroom, or cross) that carry or contain meaning and values for them.

So far these aspects--interactions, agents, and vehicles--define only a relational field. However, the sociocultural field is a dynamic one of energy and potential energy. For the third aspect of the field is that it is *generated* by our goals and motives, our attitudes and interests, our sentiments and roles, and our will. These provide the energy for the field, its potential forces. The fourth aspect, then, is the field *forces*. Psychologically these are the sociocultural distances between the agents in the field, as well as their perspectives, expectations, and behavioral dispositions. Sociologically, these are their interests, capabilities, and wills.

But then any dynamic field has a medium for transmitting forces, a medium within which forces are potentials. The fifth aspect, then, is a *medium* of sociocultural meanings, values, and norms spread continuously throughout a sociocultural space. The cultural components of this space are language, science, religion-philosophy, ethics-law, and fine arts; the social components consist of wealth, power, prestige, and class.

And finally, we have the dynamic field *processes* through which the sociocultural field becomes solidified, maintained, transformed, or obliterated. These processes are those of the free adjustment of interests and conflict, the conflict helix.

Overall, then, a sociocultural field is characterized by interactions, agents and vehicles, generators, forces, medium, and processes. Now, the purpose of this book is to bring together the sociocultural field and conflict in a way to enrich our understanding of conflict and violence. Already I have posed conflict as a field process, a hint of things to come. To work up to this connection, I have dealt with the nature of social perception and interactions in these fields and with the social field forces and their generators.

#### **4.3. The Origins Of A Socio-Cultural Approach On Educational And Psychological Issues.**

Because of the described characteristics, to merge the basic research units and combine different types of analysis to a holistic one, the socio-cultural perspective is a multidisciplinary undertaking since its date of birth. The main influences are made by anthropological research and psychology with its different sub-disciplines.

The deep origins of the socio-cultural perspective on educational and psychological phenomena go back to three important Soviet Researchers in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century – they founded a socio-historical school of psychological processes: Alexander R. Luria, Lev S. Vygotsky and Alexei N. Leont'ev.

The first one, A. Luria, started two expeditions to Central Asia in the early 1930s to investigate the hypothetical links between socially organized modes of interaction and cognition. He tried to find differences between people in the region of Central Asia, who hadn't been influenced by Soviet concepts of industrialization yet, and those, who already lived in industrialized circles of Russian culture. His aim was to create an anthropologically and culturally colored approach on human behavior and cognition. However, Luria had serious problems of interpretation because of unclear results: although some studies

showed influences of e.g. age and literacy on behavior, there weren't general results, which could have legitimated a basic theory (Cole, 1985).

A. Leont'ev was interested more in psychological issues of research and his investigation was less empirical. He criticized the "two-part scheme" of all cross-cultural psychological research, also Luria's: the theories are based on the imagination of the individual and its functions on the one side, and the social environment on the other side. However, these ideas exclude the process which active subjects use to form real connections with the world of objects. Hence, the possibility of a principled psychological analysis including both parts is denied. For that reason, Leont'ev pointed out the need of a three-part scheme: the third part consists of the subject's activity. It includes the goals, means and constraints, which are operating on the subject, and it relates the individual to the social environment (ibid.).

It was Lev S. Vygotsky who interconnected Luria's and Leont'ev ideas to a socio-cultural approach on psychological and educational concerns. Influenced by Leont'ev's thoughts, he denied the strict separation of the individual and its social environment. Instead, they interact with each other, and cognitive development is the process of acquiring culture. Vygotsky's basic ideas were expressed in the "general law of

cultural development”: general higher psychological functions appear on two planes. First, they appear on the social plane and then through internalization on the psychological plane. Therefore interpsychological categories become intrapsychological categories over time. Higher mental functions, which are seen as totally individualistic in the Classical Cognitive Psychology, thus have social origins. Worth mentioning here is that the transformation from the external plane to the internal plane isn’t seen as a simple copy process; it’s rather a process wherein an internal plane of consciousness is formed by external influences. Thinking, a seemingly lonely process, is quasi-social: we behave like socially interacting with ourselves. Vygotsky calls this process Internalization and it is a well-known concept of him (Wertsch, 1985).

A second term, well related to the one of Internalization, is Vygotsky’s concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZoPD). A series of studies on developmental processes of children with his students caused Vygotsky to reject the assumed relationship between learning and development of Western psychologists. He criticized the imagination of development as something predetermined and necessary for learning. Piaget as well as Gestalt psychologists reduce learning to a general and formal process. Behaviorists even define development as habit

formation. In contrast, Vygotsky suggests learning as a process that occurs any time in everyday life and that isn't just an external phenomenon. Children learn all the time and through people who are more capable in doing a specific kind of action. So learning becomes the essential process and is necessary for development (Vygotsky, 1978). Because learning isn't an individualistic process anymore, it's more useful to measure children's potential level of development under the guidance of adults rather than the actual level like in common intelligence tests. On this point, Vygotsky's concept of the ZoPD gets into account: It "is the difference between a child's actual development as determined by independent problem solving and the higher level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, p.86). The ZoPD defines the functions that are in development at the moment. For educational concerns, that seems more important than the actual status.

Surprisingly, there's a strong correspondence between the Soviet concept of activity and the anthropological notion of an event or context by some researchers at the same time. Cole (1985) reviewed the contributions of cultural anthropology for a socio-cultural approach. He came to the conclusion, that other important anthropologists like S.F. Nadel and Meyer Fortes

address the problem of the units of analysis, too. They also define a basic unit of research, which contains both the cultural environment and the individual.

#### **4.4. Studies And Further Suggestions To Socio-Cultural Influences On Learning Activities**

Especially the socio-historical Soviet School influenced a number of psychologists and anthropologists e.g. M. Cole, S. Scribner, J. Lave and B. Rogoff. They started several studies to investigate socio-cultural influences on cognitive development and the role of social communities on learning activities. Also here, especially the influence of the social environment on the individual's learning activities is essential. Moreover, one's participation on the social community is pointed out by these researches.

For instance, J. Lave conducted several studies on the phenomenon of apprenticeship in communities of practice. They provided an insight in an individual's multiple changing levels of participation and the development of expertise. Through increased involvement individuals have access to acquire and use resources available to their particular community.

One of Lave's studies examined and analyzed the process and curriculum of tailor apprenticeship of Vai and Gola tailors in

Liberia. The finding was that there's no direct instruction given in the whole process of learning. The apprentices learn through observation, imitation, interaction and reflection, thus through whole-activity practice. The curriculum consists of a list of complex, intertwined tasks which are essential to becoming a master tailor. Tailors begin their apprenticeship with easy tasks that become more complex. The first focus of the apprentices is on the broad outlines of garment construction (e.g. sewing on buttons), then the attention turns to the logic of sewing different pieces together, which explains why the different pieces are cut out as they are. The way the curriculum is organized gives apprentices the "unstated opportunity to consider how the previous step contributes to the present one" (Lave, 1990). In sum, the apprentices learn a trade without being taught – in practice.

A further study conducted by De la Rocha (1986) explored the math activities of nine American "Weight Watchers" – beginners. The main emphasis of weight watchers is on controlling the meal portions by thoroughly weighing every ingredient and thus assigning points to the meal. The participants incorporate the goals of Weight Watchers into their daily routines of shopping and food preparation, for which math skills are required that are

set far away from school. After six weeks of observation, the participants took part in arithmetic tests and interviews referring to their food diaries. The arithmetic tests showed a consistent success in the solving of math problems that occur in other settings than school, e.g. grocery shopping. As the participants gained more experience in measurement and calculation they developed individual calculation patterns. The participants generated reusable solutions to recurring math problems by finding solutions as part of the ongoing activity. The use of arithmetic was not explicitly necessary for the preparation of meals, therefore De la Rocha concluded that the “abundance of food products in the United States and Americans’ fascination with the self-mastery reflected in a slim physique have provoked an obsession with body weight and its control”(De la Rocha,1986).

A great example for internalization of external categories to intrapsychological ones is given in a study by S. Scribner (1985). She analyzed the relationship between cognitive operations and behaviors in principal work tasks of dairy farm workers. “Dairy knowledge” was examined across five groups: Students, language institute employees, office workers, warehouse assemblers and drivers (the last three groups are employees of the dairy farm).

Recall tasks and sorting tasks provided evidence that different work tasks provide opportunities for people to learn specific things about the underlying domain. As Scribner (1985) puts it: “What you learn is bound to what you have to do”. Furthermore, common knowledge in a domain is structured differently for groups working in different areas of that domain. That is because certain properties of a work environment are more obvious and essential than others. So the way, how your working conditions structure the objects, directly influences the process of cognitive categorization.

#### **4.5. The Sociocultural Perspective Defined**

Psychologists use many different approaches that work together to understand and explain human behavior. The **sociocultural perspective** is one approach to understanding why humans behave the way they do. The sociocultural perspective seeks to understand human behavior and personality development by examining the rules of the social groups and subgroups in which the individual is a member. These rules are often unwritten guidelines that direct a person's actions.

The **sociocultural perspective** is a theory used in various fields such as psychology and is used to describe awareness of circumstances surrounding individuals and how their behaviors are effected specifically by their surroundings, social and cultural factors. According to Catherine A. Sanderson (2010) “Sociocultural perspective: A perspective describing people’s behavior and mental processes as shaped in part by their social and/or cultural contact, including race, gender, and nationality.” Sociocultural perspective theory is a broad yet significant aspect in our being. It applies to every sector of our daily lives. How we communicate, understand, relate and cope with one another is partially based on this theory. Our spiritual, mental, physical, emotional, physiological being are all influenced by sociocultural perspective theory.

Various studies examine topics using the sociocultural perspective in order to account for variability from person to person and acknowledge that social and cultural differences affect these individuals. One example comes from the journal *European Psychologist: Investigating Motivation in Context: Developing Sociocultural Perspectives* by Richard A. Walker, Kimberley Pressick-kilborn, Bert M. Lancaster, and Erica J. Sainsbury (2004). Recently, however, a renewed interest in the

contextual nature of motivation has come about for several reasons. First, the relatively recent influence of the ideas of Vygotsky and his followers (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996; Greeno & The Middle School Through Applications Project, 1998) in educational psychology has led writers in the field (Goodenow, 1992; Pintrich, 1994; Anderman & Anderman, 2000) to acknowledge the importance of context and to call for its greater recognition in educational psychology, and more particularly in motivational research. As both Goodenow (1992) and Hickey (1997) note, in sociocultural theories deriving from Vygotsky, human activities, events, and actions cannot be separated from the context in which they occur so that context becomes an important issue in sociocultural research. Second, researchers concerned with learning and cognition (e.g., Greeno et al., 1998) have come to see these processes also as being situated in particular contexts.

This theory or perspective is examined in *The Modern Language Journal* "A Sociocultural Perspective on Language Learning Strategies: The Role of Mediation" by Richard Donato and Dawn McCormick. According to Donato and McCormick (1994) "Sociocultural theory maintains that social interaction and cultural institutions, such as schools, classrooms, etc., have

important roles to play in an individual's cognitive growth and development." "We believe that this perspective goes beyond current cognitive and social psychological conceptions of strategic language learning, both of which assume that language tasks and contexts are generalizable. The sociocultural perspective, on the other hand, views language learning tasks and contexts as situated activities that are continually under development (22) and that are influential upon individuals' strategic orientations to classroom learning.

Recent sociocultural oriented research on teachers' learning has drawn on two perspectives: a discourse perspective and a practice perspective (cf Forman, 2003). The discourse perspective focuses on the dynamics of mathematical communication in classrooms, an approach exemplified by research undertaken by Blanton, Westbrook and Carter (2005). Their study examined how a prospective teacher's classroom discourse changed as her perception of teacher and student roles shifted from teacher as teller to student as mathematical participant. This change was no accident; it was deliberately planned by the university practicum supervisor (Blanton) in the conversations she had with the prospective teacher about classroom interactions she had observed and what this revealed

about how students learned materials. Blanton calls this a “pedagogy of supervision”, which she claims opens up a ZPD that can challenge a prospective teacher’s models of teaching in the context of actual practice.

Various studies examine topics using the sociocultural perspective in order to account for variability from person to person and acknowledge that social and cultural differences affect these individuals. One example comes from the journal *European Psychologist: Investigating Motivation in Context: Developing Sociocultural Perspectives* by Richard A. Walker, Jesus Christ, Kimberley Pressick-kilborn, Bert M. Lancaster, and Erica J. Sainsbury (2004). Recently, however, a renewed interest in the contextual nature of motivation has come about for several reasons. First, the relatively recent influence of the ideas of Vygotsky and his followers (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996; Greeno & The Middle School Through Applications Project, 1998) in educational psychology has led writers in the field (Goodenow, 1992; Pintrich, 1994; Anderman & Anderman, 2000) to acknowledge the importance of context and to call for its greater recognition in educational psychology, and more particularly in motivational research. As both Goodenow (1992) and Hickey (1997) note, in sociocultural

theories deriving from Vygotsky, human activities, events, and actions cannot be separated from the context in which they occur so that context becomes an important issue in sociocultural research. Second, researchers concerned with learning and cognition (e.g., Greeno et al, 1998) have come to see these processes also as being situated in particular contexts. While this view, with its emphasis on the distributed nature of learning and cognition, has origins in sociocultural theories".

Unlike the cognitive and psychological perspectives, the sociocultural perspective considers mind to be located in the individual-in-social-action, taking non-dualistic ontology. Reflecting the interactions between diverse social and cultural factors and individuals, the sociocultural perspective shows how human cognition develops. The basic concept of this perspective is to include the external conditions of life in which human beings live to explain the highly complex forms of human consciousness. Cognitive processes are subsumed in social and cultural processes and the person is constructed in a social context, formed through practical activity, and shaped in relationships of desire and recognition. The sociocultural perspective considers that self-consciousness arises not from the individual but from social relations with others and "the individual dimension of

consciousness is derivative and secondary” (Vygotsky, 1979, p. 30). Thus, the perspective emphasizes social participation, the relationship and interaction with others, the settings of activity and historical change (Scribner, 1997). The key aspects of human cognition identified in the sociocultural perspective are as follows: human cognition 1) is mediated by cultural artifacts such as tools and signs, 2) occurs in human purposive activity (“human action-in-the-world”) and 3) develops historically as changes at the sociocultural level impact psychological function (Scribner, 1997). In other words, social interaction has primacy in human development. Social participation can activate diverse interactions between social practice and the self. Participation in a wide variety of activities becomes a significant social source of development. Cultural artifacts as “carriers of sociocultural patterns and knowledge” (Wertsch, 1994, p. 204) play a significant role in connecting human cognition and cultural and historical circumstances. Also, social conditions are constantly changing, and this gives rise to changed contexts and opportunities for the development of human cognition. Learning, in the sociocultural perspective, is situated (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and occurs continuously through collaboration between the person and the social context through cultural mediations, and is transformed within sociocultural history. In

particular, the sociocultural perspective of learning focuses on the interdependence of social and individual process in the construction of knowledge. The knowledge, however, includes not only intellectual aspects, but knowing oneself, in a broader sense, knowing one's identity. In this sense, realizing oneself, that is, the process of constructing identity, is learning as a sociocultural phenomenon. Since identity originates through daily activities and "experience of engagement" (Wenger, 1998, p.151) in social practices, reviewing lived experiences and activities within daily life plays a critical role in understanding the concept of identity and examining the process of identity construction. Therefore, the sociocultural perspective which focuses on social interactions at living situations and activities can suggest the initial step to discovering an appropriate theoretical framework for examining the process of constructing identity. In particular, the concept of activity can be employed as the unit of analysis to describe how people construct their identity in daily life. In the sociocultural perspective, people learn within human actions-in-the world activities. Through dynamic and continual interactions in activities, people act in and on the world, learn, develop and become (Sawchuk, 2013). Namely, as socially constituted beings, humans develop their personalities, skills and consciousness by participating in activities. Thus, activity as the

minimal meaningful context can provide directions for describing how people carry out their lives (Sannino, Daniels & Gutierrez, 2009; Sawchuk, 2013) and how they learn their identity in daily life.

Sociocultural perspectives on curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment support teachers in developing and implementing inclusive pedagogies. Sociocultural assessment approaches disregard impairment as an identity in itself, privileging the strengths and knowledge evident in observed interactions. A sociocultural approach to assessment recognizes the dynamic interaction between teaching, learning, and assessment, spread across people, places, and time. Where traditional forms of curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment focus on a decontextualized individual, a sociocultural perspective pays close attention to contexts. Teachers' practices, expectations, and understandings of learning and diversity form a key part of the contexts.

In culturally responsive paradigms, learning is recognized as sociocultural—being informed through interactions with others. All students are recognized and valued as people who gain experiences and knowledge across many contexts. Multiple perspectives are valued as shared understandings and

constructions of learning are developed in response to observations and interactions in a community of learners—where students and teachers learn with and from each other. Teachers who recognize themselves as capable of teaching everyone in the class are more likely to recognize everyone as a learner, to think critically about their positioning and understanding of disability, and to plan teaching, learning, and assessment in inclusive ways of working.

The use of sociocultural approaches to curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment has led to identification of three key themes that support quality teaching and learning for all students. The themes are integral to recognizing the unique potential of all students. The approaches are responsive to the social and cultural contexts of students, and to those people who support their learning. Although the themes are identified and discussed individually, they are also recognized as informing each other, as being interconnected. The themes are:

- a) Multiple perspectives that inform a richer knowledge of learning and curriculum.
- b) The recognition and valuing of students as learning partners.

- c) The impact of collaboration through the use of learning communities.

Sociocultural perspective considers mind to be located in the individual-in-social-action, taking non-dualistic ontology. Reflecting the interactions between diverse social and cultural factors and individuals, the sociocultural perspective shows how human cognition develops. The basic concept of this perspective is to include the external conditions of life in which human beings live to explain the highly complex forms of human consciousness. Cognitive processes are subsumed in social and cultural processes and the person is constructed in a social context, formed through practical activity, and shaped in relationships of desire and recognition. The sociocultural perspective considers that self-consciousness arises not from the individual but from social relations with others and “the individual dimension of consciousness is derivative and secondary” (Vygotsky, 1979, p. 30). Thus, the perspective emphasizes social participation, the relationship and interaction with others, the settings of activity and historical change (Scribner, 1997)

In particular, the sociocultural perspective of learning focuses on the interdependence of social and individual process in the

construction of knowledge. The knowledge, however, includes not only intellectual aspects, but knowing oneself, in a broader sense, knowing one's identity. In this sense, realizing oneself, that is, the process of constructing identity, is learning as a sociocultural phenomenon. Since identity originates through daily activities and "experience of engagement" (Wenger, 1998, p.151) in social practices, reviewing lived experiences and activities within daily life plays a critical role in understanding the concept of identity and examining the process of identity construction. Therefore, the sociocultural perspective which focuses on social interactions at living situations and activities can suggest the initial step to discovering an appropriate theoretical framework for examining the process of constructing identity. In particular, the concept of activity can be employed as the unit of analysis to describe how people construct their identity in daily life. In the sociocultural perspective, people learn within human actions-in-the world activities. Through dynamic and continual interactions in activities, people act in and on the world, learn, develop and become (Sawchuk, 2013). Namely, as socially constituted beings, humans develop their personalities, skills and consciousness by participating in activities. Thus, activity as the minimal meaningful context can provide directions for describing how people carry out their lives (Sannino, Daniels & Gutierrez,

2009; Sawchuk, 2013) and how they learn their identity in daily life.

#### **4.6. The Arrival Of Sociocultural Perspectives On Sla (second language acquisition)**

These more recent arrivals to the field of SLA—sociocultural perspectives on language and learning—view language use in real-world situations as fundamental, not ancillary, to learning. These researchers focus not on language as input, but as a resource for participation in the kinds of activities our everyday lives comprise. Participation in these activities is both the product and the process of learning. We provide brief summaries of the sociocultural perspectives we find typically invoked in recent SLA research, mentioning relevant studies. We do not, however, refer to all studies that draw on these perspectives. Readers are urged to see Lantolf (2000) for an overview of Vygotskian SLA studies and Zuengler and Cole (2005) for a review of language socialization research in second language learning. The order we have chosen is somewhat arbitrary. We begin, however, with Vygotskian sociocultural theory and language socialization because one or the other is often positioned as the primary theoretical framework. These two also seem to be invoked more

frequently than situated learning theory, Bakhtin an approaches to language, or critical theories of discourse and social relations—the remaining perspectives we discuss. Segregating these sociocultural perspectives into their own sections allows us to address their unique disciplinary roots and contributions to SLA. Though we believe researchers must take care in how they bring together these varying approaches, given their distinctiveness, we suggest that the “hybrid interdisciplinary” that many SLA scholars practice (Rampton, Roberts, Leung, & Harris, 2002, p. 373) has been productive and mirrors the increasing interdisciplinary found in much of the current social science research.

SLA research using Vygotskian sociocultural theory first began to appear in the mid-1980s (Frawley & Lantolf, 1984, 1985) but quickly gained momentum in the mid-1990s with a special issue of the *Modern Language Journal* (Lantolf, 1994), devoted to sociocultural theory and second language learning. That same year, an edited volume appeared (Lantolf & Appel, 1994), and the first of a series of annual meetings dedicated to sociocultural research in SLA convened in Pittsburgh. Since then, conference presentations and publications taking this approach to SLA have only increased. Like traditional cognitive approaches to learning, Vygotskian sociocultural theory is fundamentally concerned with

understanding the development of cognitive processes. However, its distinctiveness from traditional cognitive approaches can best be highlighted by citing Vygotsky: “The social dimension of consciousness [i.e., all mental processes] is primary in time and fact. The individual dimension of consciousness is derivative and secondary” (1979, p. 30). Lantolf and Pavlenko (1995) clarify that even though Vygotskian sociocultural theory does not deny a role for biological constraints, “development does not proceed as the unfolding of inborn capacities, but as the transformation of innate capacities once they intertwine with socioculturally constructed mediational means” (p. 109). These means are the socioculturally meaningful artifacts and symbolic systems of a society, the most important of which is language. Of significance for SLA research is the understanding that when learners appropriate mediational means, such as language, made available as they interact in socioculturally meaningful activities, these learners gain control over their own mental activity and can begin to function independently. And as Lantolf (2000) notes, “according to Vygotsky, this is what development is about” (p. 80). SLA researchers have focused on learners’ linguistic development in the zone of proximal development (ZPD), Vygotsky’s conception of what an individual can accomplish when working in

collaboration with others (more) versus what he or she could have accomplished without collaboration with others (less). The ZPD points to that individual's learning potential, that is, what he or she may be able to do independently in the future (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 1994; Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Anton, 1999, 2000; DiCamilla & Anton, 1997; Nassaji & Cumming, 2000; Ohta, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998).

## **UNIT 5**

### **EDMs Apply in EFL Learners**

An approach to English Discourse Markers (EDMs) was introduced by Halliday & Hasan (1976) and is known as systematic function grammar approach. The philosophy of this approach is based on the view that EDMs are effective cohesive devices that have different meanings and functions in segment organization. Based on such approach, Schiffrin (1987) defines EDMs as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units

of talk” and that they are used as providers to “contextual coordinates for utterances” (Schiffrin, 1987, P. 31). Moreover, he has developed his own model known as Schiffrin's coherence model (1987) which contends that EDMs have four coherence functions. These are: Exchange structure, action structure, ideational structure, and participation framework. Generally, EDMs have been agreed to have a crucial role in the organization of interlocutors’ speech. According to Schiffrin (1987) “They help understanding speech and information progression and facilitate speakers’ comprehension by creating a smooth and spontaneous interaction between them” (Schiffrin, 1987, P. 31). Redeker (1990) classifies EDMs into two broad categories: EDMs that mark ideational structure, such as connectives and temporal adverbials (e.g. and, meanwhile, or now) and those which mark pragmatic structure (e.g. oh, alright or well). The second approach is Fraser’s (1999) grammatical-pragmatic perspective. According to Fraser, EDMs are not only used for textual coherence; rather, they refer to the intention of the speaker to the next turn in the preceding utterances. However, some linguists suggested examining such ideas by applying them to more than one language to see whether or not information processing and transformation can be made based on EDMs (Sankoff et al., 1997; Jucker & Smith, 1998; Hellermann & Vergun,

2007). Others preferred testing the functional and grammatical-pragmatic part (Jucker & Ziv, 1998) which opened the door for other linguists who came later on and investigated the phenomenon broadly.

### **5.1. The Review of The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English by Trillo.**

Douglas (2008) points out that discourse analysis involves examining both the language form and language function used by speech community members. Some linguists add that the focus should be on the pragmatic fossilization of EDMs in both EFL children and adults. They justify their view by saying that EDMs are context-specific and have functions on the textual and interpersonal level (Trillo, 2002; Aijmer, 2002). Others prefer comparing ESL learners to native speakers to see to what extent they make use of EDMs in their conversations. Müller (2004) compared German ESL college learners to American native speakers and found that the former used EDMs less than the latter. EDMs like “you know” may be employed to make information clear, “Oh” may be used to indicate that the speaker received new information, and “Ok” may act as a movement towards closure. Since EDMs are integral to native speakers' everyday speech, it may be assumed that they deserve special

attention in language classrooms. Despite their vital role in spoken, EDMs have a minor role in the syllabus. According to De Klerk (2005), this can be attributable to "their (EDMs) lack of clear semantic denotation and syntactic role, which makes formal or explicit commentary on their use fairly difficult" (De Klerk, 2005, P. 275). Interdisciplinary, this means that EDMs help build the local coherence that is collectively setup by both the hearer and the speaker in their interaction and context. EDMs are text-structuring tools that act as markers of openings or closings of discourse units or in-between transitions (Thornbury & Slade, 2006). In addition, EDMs are largely used by teachers to assist in the flow of information from them to students during the learning process. According to Walsh (2006), EFL teachers use EDMs in order to achieve certain pedagogical purposes that map the classroom lesson plan. The use and functions of EDMs are key elements in teacher talk. A more elaborated study was undertaken by Liu (2006) who examined EDMs in Chinese literature class from a pragmatic analysis perspective. Results show that EDMs have a role in the functions of discussion and control of social relationships. Some linguists claim that this social relationship starts from the school where EDMs used by the students should be integrated by those of the learners which

make them (EDMs) sentence connectives (Amador Moreno, 2006; Cohen, 2007).

## **5.2. The Review of A comparative study of bilingual discourse markers in Chicago Mexican, Puerto Rican, and MexiRican Spanish.**

Results of a study by Torres & Potowski's (2008) comparing Mexican (n=23), Puerto (n=17) and MexiRican (n=11) Spanish use of bilingual EDMs shows that "so" is a core borrowing for all bilingual subjects. Such results encouraged some researchers to investigate EDMs during teaching process. One of those researchers is Yu (2008) who examined the EDMs in six moves during the teaching process: Opening, information checking, information clarification, responding, comment, and repetition. She concluded that using EDMs appropriately strengthens the effectiveness' of classroom teaching. Strictly speaking, EDMs have been broadly researched in pedagogical settings. Many studies concentrated on the use of these markers in second language teaching (Romero, 2002; Müller, 2005; Seedhouse, 2009). Some linguists have examined whether or not social environment affects individual when using EDMs. Liao (2009), for example, examined the use of nine (9) EDMs among six Chinese learners. Mainly, these EDMs are: "yeah", "oh", "you know",

“like”, “well”, “I mean”, “ok”, “right”, and “actually”. Results of the study show that social identities, language attitude, and participation in the local community with their individual repertoires are some of the effects.

### **5.3. The Review of The Function of Discourse Markers in Arabic Newspaper Opinion Articles by Kohlani**

Undertaking three experiments to find out the effect of the substitution of EDMs on their suggested role, the results of Al Kohlani’s study (2010) show that substitution has a differential effect on the localization and assessment of coherence and dialogue goal. Investigating the indexicality of EDMs (EDMs) in Chinese conversational narrative, Xiao (2010) found that EDMs not only manifests the broad and complex relationships between linguistic forms and discourse situations, but also reveals fundamental tensions that drive human communication. Some EDMs have more than one function like EDMs “I think” and “I believe” that are also found to be used as main clause (MC), and comment clause (Dehé, 2010). Such results confirmed the fact that EDMs have discursive and pragmatic functions (Matei, 2010). These functions, according to other researchers, could be invested for pedagogical purposes in matters concerning thought organizing and structuring like the DM “now” for example which

can be used as temporal relations between utterances in a discourse (Gulzar & Qadir, 2010; Gánem-Gutiérrez & Roehr, 2011; Schourup, 2011).

#### **5.4. The Review of The use of okay, right and yeah in academic lectures by native speaker lecturers: Their “anticipated” and “real” meanings by Othman.**

In recent studies, new trends have been developed to investigate EDMs in depth. Researchers almost covered all aspects of EDMs. One of the few studies is Othman’s (2010) study in which he investigated three particular EDMs: “Okay”, “right”, and “yeah” employed by college lecturers in Lancaster University. He found that college lecturers use these three EDMs as structural signals in turn-taking during lecture as a subconscious behavior. The researchers concluded that EDMs serve as functions or organizers for the utterance at the structural level that help the speaker (teacher) to communicate his ideas or knowledge with the hearer (learner). Der & Marko (2010) investigated the use of some EDMs among 50 Hungarian learners. The researcher focused on the most frequent EDMs and whether or not they are used independently. Regarding the first point, the study’s results show that some EDMs exceed 200 tokens and these EDMs are: “well”, (415 tokens) “so” (338

tokens), “but” (290 tokens) and “yes” (264 tokens). Another group of EDMs, however, ranged between 100 and 200 tokens. Notably, these EDMs are: “no” (194), “and” (149), “then” (114), and “yeah” (100). Last group are those EDMs that had below 100 tokens. These EDMs are: “thus” (98), “let’s say” (83), “so that” (68), “good” (56), “incidentally” (54), and “let me see” (53). Concerning the second question whether or not these EDMs can be separately used, the results show that all the above mentioned EDMs stand-alone (i.e., independently used).

### **5.5. The Review of A Discourse-Pragmatic Functional Study of the Discourse Markers Japanese Ano and Chinese by Yan**

Investigating the wider use of the DM “that” in 302 Japanese learners (302) and 252 Chinese learners, Yan’s (2011) study concluded that this DM has a dual usage. That is, it can be used as politeness marker as well as modality marker. Some researchers concentrated on other probable roles played by EDMs. For example, Popescu-Belis & Zufferey (2011) have elaborately discussed the lexical, prosodic/positional and sociolinguistic features EDMs “like” and “well”. Outlined results show that the most reliable indicators are followed by prosodic/positional features, while sociolinguistic features are marginally

useful for the identification of DM “like” and not useful for “well”. Others preferred examining the use of EDMs outside the pedagogical frame. Vickers & Goble (2011) investigated the use of some EDMs including: “Well” and “Now” among Spanish speakers working in the field of medicine. The two researchers show that out of 915 English words, 317 tokens EDMs were used. They also concluded that EDMs serve to exacerbate the power relationship between providers and patients even though it does not cause overt miscommunication in the ongoing interaction.

#### **5.6. The Review of Discourse marker and modal particle: The functions of utterance-final then in spoken English by Haselow**

Depending upon corpus data from the British component of the International Corpus of English, Haselow’s study (2011) provides a detailed account of the pragmatic functions of one of the EDMs in spoken English. Mainly, this DM is the final “then”. According to the researcher, DM “then” is used to link the utterance it accompanies to a preceding utterance that is retrospectively converted into a conditional particle. Some researchers chose comparing the frequency of EDMs. For example, Jabeen et al., (2011) compared the frequency of eight EDMs (I mean, you know, I think, kind of, sort of, well, you see, so) in British and Pakistani speech. The outcomes of the study

validated the claim that native speakers use more EDMs than non-native speakers. According to the team, Pakistani learners use EDMs in all positions (i.e., initial, medial and final) unlike native learners who, generally speaking, use them at the beginning. Others went further by interpreting EDMs lexically and grammatically. For instance, Lewis (2011) analyzes two EDMs: “instead”, and “rather” from different linguistic perspectives and concludes that DM senses are closer to the grammatical end of the lexical-grammatical cline, the expressions can be said to have grammaticalized.

#### **5.7. The Review of EDMs in the speech of Chinese EFL learners to test the effect of conjunctives on their listening comprehension by Zhuang**

Discussing a sentence-terminal DM “Ketun” meaning “if/ when that is the case” in his language (Korean), Kim (2011) found that this DM plays a catalytic role in the grammaticalization processes. According to the researcher, the speaker tends to use this DM to clarify a point, make excuses, apologize, provide background information, mitigate illocutionary forces, or redress face-threatening acts. Likewise, Zhuang (2012) investigated the most frequent EDMs in the speech of Chinese EFL learners to test the effect of conjunctives on their listening comprehension. Having

classified the conjunctives into three groups: adversative, temporal, additive and causal, Zhuang concluded that additive is the most frequent group (13) followed by assertive (11) then temporal (9) and finally causal (4). Specifically and according to the researcher, “also” and “but” are the most frequent EDMs with 7 tokens for each. While “and” is the second most frequent DM (3 tokens), “however”, “because”, “firstly”, “second” and “secondly” come after with 2 tokens each. Other EDMs are only mentioned once. These include: “in other words”, “for instance”, “for example”, “nevertheless”, “in fact”, “for all of these reasons”, “so”, “thirdly”, “then”, and “first of all”.

### **5.8. The Review of Re-examining the role of explicit instruction and input flood on the acquisition of Spanish discourse markers by Hernandez**

Hernández (2011) has undertaken a study to examine the combined effect of overt instruction (EI) and input flood (IF) among 66 Spanish subjects (EI= 36 and IF= 30) by comparing them to a control group (25 subjects). Results show that the combined effect of EI and IF was not superior to IF alone in promoting students’ use of EDMs as measured on the post-test speaking tasks. It is for this reason, perhaps, that some linguists recommend drawing a great attention to the teacher’s language

(Ghabanchi, et al., 2011; Gießler, 2012). Some suggested that a distinction ought to be made between EDMs used for different purposes depending upon what topic we are talking about. Hengeveld (2012) examines the referential markers and agreement markers in functional discourse grammar. According to the researchers, these markers are on a language-specific basis classified as either contextual agreement markers or as appositional referential markers.

#### **5.9. The Review of Using English Discourse Markers (EDMs) by Saudi EFL Learners: A Descriptive Approach by Sadeq A. Saad Al-Yaari**

Al-Yaari (2013) investigated how EDMs are used in EFL classrooms in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) in his study. Two hundred Saudi EFL learners were randomly selected from 20 public and private schools (ten students from each school) across the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA). Subjects were individually recorded while they were studying English in class. Recordings were then linguistically and statistically analyzed by the researchers. Results illustrate that EDMs “and”, “but” and “also” are the most frequent EDMs in the talk of Saudi EFL learners. These devices are randomly used by Saudi EFL learners who mix their use (appropriateness) with usage (correctness) due to the

influence of their L1 (Arabic). In compare to other EFL learners (native and non-native), Saudi EFL learners use less EDMs. These results confirmed the claims that EFL learners use EDMs less than native speakers. This paper, although preliminary in nature, can help arrive a better understanding of using EDMs by Saudi EFL learners. Further, it can also assist in getting appropriate insights into the way how these EDMs are used in Arab Gulf countries. The researchers decided to conduct an in-depth study into the use of EDMs in the oral work of Saudi EFL learners. Saudi EFL learners used EDMs less than native speakers. This includes the corpus itself which proved to be lesser in number in compared to native a speaker's studies. For example, the 8 million corpus of Bell (2010) yielded 802 tokens of the EDM "yet", 262 tokens of the EDM "still" and 254 tokens of "nevertheless/nonetheless". In addition, the EDM "you know" is found to be the most frequent EDM among American learners (2300 tokens per 100,000 words) (Polat, 2011). According to the researcher, the occurrence of the EDM "you know" was 2300 tokens per 100,000 words. In response to these findings, it can be said that the current study confirms the assumption that non-native speakers used EDMs in their speech less than native speakers. However, the researchers recommend further research with more corpora and different methodology.

## **UNIT 6**

### **EDMS IN CLASSROOM AT UNIVERSITY**

Discourse markers are lexical items such as oh, well, but, you know, I mean, actually, and, okay etc. which have various functions notably serving as connective elements of speech. Fung & Carter (2007) state that according to a corpus analysis conducted by Allwood in 1996, DMs are represented among top 10 word forms in native speakers' spoken discourse. Due to the significance of DMs in native speakers' spoken discourse, a substantial body of research has been devoted to the study of DMs with an emphasis on the learner use in an English as A

Foreign Language (EFL) context (Sankoff et al., 1997; Trillo, 2002; Hellermann & Vergun, 2007; Fung & Carter, 2007; Liao, 2008; Aşık & Cephe, 2013; Bu, 2013; Liu, 2013; Aysu, 2017). Some of these studies concentrated on the comparative use of DMs by native speakers and foreign language learners (Trillo, 2002; Fung & Carter, 2007; Aşık & Cephe, 2013). Some gave emphasis to the impact of various factors such as gender and style on the use of DMs by foreign language learners (Sankoff et al., 1997; Hellermann & Vergun, 2007; Liao, 2008; Bu, 2013). These studies revealed the restriction in the use of DMs by foreign language learners in their spoken discourse.

### **6.1. The Review of Differential Effects of Explicit, Implicit, and Incidental Teaching on Learning Grammatical Cohesive Devices by Rahimi and Riasati.**

As a result, further studies suggested teaching DMs explicitly to EFL learners (Rahimi & Riasati, 2012; Sadeghi & Heidaryan, 2012; Jones & Carter, 2014). In addition, empirical research has shown the efficacy of teachers' use of DMs on EFL learners' comprehension skills (Flowerdew & Tauroza, 1995); Eslami & Eslami-Rasekh, 2007). Walsh (2011) emphasizes the significance of DMs occurring in educational context as in the following : Words such as right, ok, now, so, alright - typically discourse

markers - perform a very important function in signalling changes in the interaction or organisation of learning. They function like punctuation marks on a printed page: consider how difficult it would be to read a newspaper without punctuation. The same applies in a classroom if teachers fail to make appropriate use of transition markers. This important category of discourse markers enables teachers to guide learners through the discourse, hold their attention, announce a change in activity, signal the beginning or end of a lesson stage. Crucially, they help a class „stay together“ and work in harmony (p.7). As Yang (2011) states, educational research on DMs in classroom discourse is mainly restricted to second / foreign language learners, and there is an obvious gap in literature examining DMs in teacher talk.

## **6.2. The Review of DMs and foreign language teachers focused on exploring the attitudes of EFL teachers towards the use of DMs in EFL classrooms by Fung**

Available research on DMs and foreign language teachers focused on exploring the attitudes of EFL teachers towards the use of DMs in EFL classrooms (Fung, 2011; Kalajahi & Abdullah, 2012; Aşık, 2015), and few research concerned describing the DMs occurring in teacher talk in the context of EFL classroom (Demirtaş, 2004; Ding & Wang, 2015). The scarcity of research on

the use of DMs in teacher talk makes the current study significant since this study provides a comparative analysis of DMs used by Turkish EFL teachers and native EFL teachers in their classroom discourse. The significance of our study can also be attributed to its implications for the field of ELT because it provides us with an understanding of whether Turkish EFL teachers in this study can model the use of these extracurricular lexical items which are not taught explicitly in foreign language classrooms.

### **6.3. The Review of Language which is not taught: The discourse marker use of beginning adult learners of English by Hellerman and Vergun.**

In a recent research Hellerman & Vergun (2007) investigated the frequency of use and some functions of three particular discourse markers, well; you know; and like in classroom interaction and inhome interviews. 17 adult learners of English as a second language at the beginning level, provided the data of this 5year research project. Their results suggest that the students who use more discourse markers are those who are more acculturated to the US and use them outside their classroom. After this overview on discourse markers, a brief account on research regarding nonnative EFL teachers discourse will be presented.

Most research pertaining to DMs in EFL context has been devoted to the investigation of DMs used by EFL learners. Some studies were carried out to investigate the role of various factors in foreign language learners' use of DMs. Hellermann & Vergun (2007) examined the use of DMs well, you know and like as they occurred in classroom interaction and in home interviews. To reach the objectives of the study, they analyzed the language data gathered from 17 beginning adult learners of English residing currently in the US with no former instruction on English language. Then, they searched for an explanation into which learners used the above DMs to what degree. They found that the participants who tended to use DMs more frequently were the more proficient ones in English language and they saw that these learners were also the ones spending more time in the US and the ones who were more acculturated to the target language.

#### **6.4. The Review of the use and functions of DMs by native and Hong Kong EFL teachers in primary and secondary school settings by Ding & Wang**

Among few research regarding the use of DMs by EFL teachers is Demirtaş's (2004) study conducted in a local context to identify the functions of DMs well, I mean, you know, now, okay, so,

because, but, and, or, alright, actually, anyway, used by two Turkish EFL teachers in foreign language classrooms. It was found that the teachers used DMs for a variety of functions such as showing contrast, topic shifting, pause filling, exemplification and showing relation etc. Still, this study did not explain the variety and frequency of DMs occurring in nonnative EFL teachers' classroom discourse. A relevant study was conducted by Ding & Wang (2015) who examined the use and functions of DMs by native and Hong Kong EFL teachers in primary and secondary school settings. Results revealed that Hong Kong teachers of English tended to use DMs more frequently compared to native teachers of English. Qualitative analyses indicated that both groups of teachers used DMs for the purposes of developing interactional relationships with the students and constructing coherent classroom discourse. Regarding the study of DMs in classroom settings, Chaudron & Richards (1986) investigated the comprehension of university lectures by nonnative speakers of English living and studying in The United States, that is, in English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts. Chaudron & Richards (1986) made use of four different versions of the same text with different categories of discourse markers (baseline, micro, macro, or micromacro versions). Overall results showed that macromarkers produced better text recall than micromarkers. It

was hypothesized that micromarkers do not provide enough information to help in making content more salient. Implications for the teaching of listening skills in ESL settings were discussed as well.

### **6.5. The Review of An analysis of Spanish *bien* as a marker of classroom management in teacher-student interaction by De Fina**

De Fina (1997) analysed the function of the Spanish marker *bien* in classroom interaction. She argued that *bien* has two main functions: a transitional and an evaluative one. Transitional *bien* is used to signal upcoming transitions between or within activities, while evaluative *bien* is used to signal a positive response by the teacher in the feedback move of an initiation/response/feedback cycle. She compared the use of this specific DM in classroom discourse to its use in conversation and discussed both similarities and differences of situational variations. In their aim at determining if consultation of a corpus of classroom discourse can be of benefit in language teacher education, Amador, O'Riordan & Chambers (2006) examined the uses of discourse markers in French and Spanish. A quantitative analysis showed the low number of occurrences of DMs in both a French class and a Spanish class while a qualitative analysis

described the main functions of DMs identified in classroom discourse. These functions were categorized into five groups considering mainly the role of the teacher in the classroom: To introduce a new topic or activity; to motivate or encourage the pupils; to call the pupils' attention; to recap or clarify what has been said; to rephrase what has been said.

As Schiffrin (2001) explains, DMs tell us not only about the linguistic properties (semantic and pragmatic meanings and functions) and the organization of social interactions, but also about the cognitive, expressive, social and textual competence of those who use them.

This smallscale study showed that DMs were effectively used by the nonnative teacher to organize his discourse in the classroom and to fulfill interpersonal, pragmatic functions as well. These findings might be useful to nonnative EFL teachers and practitioners. On the one hand, increased awareness on the textual functions of DMs could facilitate the structuring and organization of the practitioners' lesson as they work as signals of the main segments (e.g. frame markers) and perform a number of organizational functions such as floor management (e.g. turn takers and turn givers). On the other hand, teachers might find the pragmatic uses of DMs useful since they help to establish

more interpersonal relationships in the classroom and may help to create a more inviting atmosphere for active participation.

Research on classroom interaction based on an analysis of the discourse can be very illuminating for two main reasons: First, it may contribute to gaining a better understanding of what happens inside the EFL classroom and second, it provides a valuable possibility to examine and describe the language used by non-native teachers and students of EFL. Of course there has been research on this issue. A seminal publication on classroom interaction by Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) provides a comprehensive review, traced back to the late 1940s, of the considerable amount of research on the language used by teachers and pupils in classroom practices. An important contribution on discourse analysis for language teachers was made by McCarthy (1991) who provided not only a sound theoretical framework and descriptions based on research but also practical activities which sensitized teachers towards the language used inside their own classrooms. On the same line, Celce-Murcia & Olshtain (2000) propose a discourse and context based perspective on language teaching and learning to redefine the roles for teachers, learners and materials. With the exception of the notable work by Llurda (2005) who explicitly addresses and

puts together the research conducted in different EFL settings such as Catalonia, the Basque Country, Hungary and Brazil, the language used by non-native English-speaking teachers and students remains largely unexplored.

According to van Dijk (1997) discourse is a form of language use which includes the functional aspects of a communicative event. It means that people use language in order to communicate ideas, beliefs or emotions in social events and situations such as an encounter with friends or a lesson in the classroom. This also suggests that in these communicative events, the participants do not limit themselves to using the language or communicating: they interact. As Douglas (2001) points out, discourse analysis is the examination of language used by the members of a speech community which involves looking at both language form and language function. In this study language is viewed as social interaction that takes place within a classroom community, among adult students and a non-native teacher of EFL. As mentioned earlier, one specific aspect of classroom interaction and language use is the occurrence of discourse markers. This literature review deals with the two central concerns of this study: discourse markers (DMs) and studies on the discourse of non-native EFL teachers.

Research on DMs has abounded since the 1980s<sup>4</sup>. Studies include analyses and descriptions of their use in different languages. DMs have also been examined in a variety of genres and interactive contexts, and in a number of different language contact situations as pointed out by Schiffrin (2001), who provides a rich discussion on the three different perspectives to approach DMs and summarizes recent studies that have contributed to understanding how DMs work.

Castro (2009) conducted a small-scale study on the use of DMs by five students and a male teacher in EFL classroom interaction. The analysis is based on Brinton's work (1996, 35-40). Results show that 'and' was the most frequently used DM in the research sample and that most DMs were used by teachers (61%). Based on the detailed analysis of the functions of DMs in EFL classroom interaction, this small-scale study concludes that DMs were effectively used by the non-native teacher to organize his discourse in the classroom and to fulfill interpersonal and pragmatic functions. To conclude, although there is confusion regarding DM terminology as a result of the varying research perspectives, the literature shows that the term discourse marker is the most widely accepted. DMs are defined as intra-sentential and supra-sentential linguistic units which fulfill a

largely non-propositional and connective function at the level of discourse (Fung & Carter, 2007, p.411). There are major common features of DMs namely connectivity, optionality, non-truth conditionality, initiality and multi grammaticality which can serve as basic criteria for the verification of DM status (Fung, 2011). In pedagogical settings, not much attention has been paid to the use and effects of DMs in teachers' talk, though many researchers argue that DMs play an important role in classroom interaction and inevitably contribute to classroom communication (Othman, 2010; Castro, 2009; Fung 2011). Fung (2011) suggests that teachers in Hong Kong perceive DMs positively for their pragmatic and pedagogic value in EFL classroom.

Rong rong and Lixun (2015) said that this exploratory study attempts to find out what and how DMs are used by both native and local English teachers in EFL classroom interaction in Hong Kong. The results show that the DMs 'okay', 'so', 'and', 'right/all right and 'now' are the top five most frequently used DMs found in both local and native teachers' classroom discourse. Generally speaking, the LETs and NETs used DMs similarly in terms of the frequency ranking of the DMs and the number of DMs used in their classroom teaching. Both groups of teachers show personal

preferences for certain DMs, and there appears to be a tendency that LETs would overuse 'okay'. Local English teachers tend to use more DMs than native English teachers in general. Possible reasons are that some local teachers tend to rely heavily on certain DMs in their speech, using them frequently in order to gain time for information processing in spontaneous speech. The local teachers are found to use the DM 'um' far more in their speech than the NETs, which can be considered as an indication of dysfluency. The native English teachers used more 'so' while the local English teachers used more 'now' which may suggest the different cultural and personal traits of the NETs and LETs. Since DM use is highly idiosyncratic, individual differences should always be considered while interpreting the teachers' use of DMs. Previous studies tend to focus on a limited number of DMs. This study includes 20 DMs altogether (mostly those considered by Fung and Carter (2007)) and adopts a corpus-based approach to empirically analyze a significant amount of natural classroom discourse data. Both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the use of DMs by the LETs and NETs contributes to our understanding of the varying advantages and disadvantages of the LETs and NETs in terms of their English proficiency and teaching practices.

## **6.6. The Review of Discourse Markers as Triggers of Code-switching in EFL Classes by Yao**

Yao (2015) discussed In EFL classes; teachers employ a lot of discourse markers. It is found that discourse markers can trigger code-switching. Four major discourse markers have been described and their functions have been discussed. Other discourse markers also play a very important role in teaching. The disappearance or appearance of some classroom discourse markers are connected with the particular contexts of classroom discourse. They are made and organized socially and culturally, so they must be interlaced with society and the culture of the society. In EFL classes, each discourse marker may have different functions in process of teacher as they are described in the above sections, and different discourse markers may have the same function in teachers" discourse.

## Books

- Aijmer, K. & A.-M. Simon-Vandenberghe (2011). "Pragmatic Markers ". In: Zienkowski, J., Östman, J.-O. & Verschueren, J. (eds.), *Discursive Pragmatics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a corpus*. Amsterdam &
- Aijmer, K. (2002). English discourse particles. Evidence from a corpus. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Aijmer, K. (2002). English discourse particles. Evidence from a corpus. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Aijmer, K. (2011). "Well I'm not sure I think... The use of *well* by non-native speakers".
- Bell, D. (2010). Nevertheless, still and yet: Concessive cancellative discourse markers. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 1912-1927.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.12.010>
- Blakemore, D. 1987. *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Blakemore, D. 1992. *Understanding utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blakemore, D. 2002. *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantic Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brinton, L., J. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Dehé, N., & Wichmann, A. (2010). Sentence-initial I think (that) and I believe (that): Prosodic evidence for uses as main clause, comment clause and

- discourse marker. *Studies In Language*, 36-74.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sl.34.1.02deh>
- De-Klerk, V. (2005). Procedural meanings of well in a corpus of Xhosa English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1183–1205
- Dér, C., & Markó, A. (2010). A Pilot Study of Hungarian Discourse Markers. *Language & Speech*, 135-180.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0023830909357162>
- Douglas, A. (2008). Discourse analysis for language teachers. *Applied Linguistics: Digests*, 2-8.. Web site: <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0107demo.html>.
- Erman, Britt. 2001. Pragmatic markers revisited with a focus on you know in adult and adolescent talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1337-1359.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers?. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 931-952.
- Fraser, B. 1996. „Pragmatic markers“. *Pragmatics* 6/2: 167-190
- Fraser, Bruce. 1987. Pragmatic Formatives. In Jef Verschueren & Marcella Bertucelli-Papi (eds.), *The pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publ.
- Fung, L., & Carter, R. (2007). Discourse markers and spoken English: Native and learner use in pedagogical settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 410-439
- Gánem-Gutiérrez, G., & Roehr, K. (2011). Use of L1, metalanguage, and discourse markers: L2 learners' regulation during individual task performance. *International Journal Of Applied Linguistics*, 297-318.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2010.00274.x>.
- Ghabanchi, Z., Moghaddam, M., & Malekzadeh, S. (2011). The Study of EFL Teacher Discourse in Reading Skill Using Bloom's Cognitive Taxonomy. *International Journal Of Linguistics*, 1-16.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v3i1.812>.
- Gießler, R. (2012). Teacher language awareness and cognitive linguistics (CL): building a CL-inspired perspective on teaching lexis in EFL student teachers. *Language Awareness*, 113-135.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.639891>
- Gulzar, M., & Qadir, S. (2010). Socialized Patterns of Discourse: Language Choice in Teachers' Talk. *Kashmir Journal Of Language Research*, 29-57
- Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan. 1985. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London, Longman.
- Halliday, M., A., K. & Hasan, R. 2006. *Cohesion in English*. Harlow: Pearson Education

- Haselow, A. (2011). Discourse marker and modal particle: The functions of utterance-final then in spoken English. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 3603-3623. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.002>
- Hengeveld, K. (2012). Referential markers and agreement markers in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Language Sciences*, 468-479. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2012.03.001>
- Hernández, T. (2011). Re-examining the role of explicit instruction and input flood on the acquisition of Spanish discourse markers. *Language Teaching Research*, 159-182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168810388694>. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 16 (2), 231-254.
- Jabeen, F., Rai, M., & Arif, S. (2011). A corpus based study of discourse markers in British and Pakistani speech. *International Journal Of Language Studies*, 69-86.
- Jucker, A. H. and Y. Ziv (eds.). *Discourse Markers: Description and Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jucker, A., & Smith, S. (1998). And people just you know like “wow”: Discourse markers as negotiating strategies, In Jucker, A. H., & Ziv, Y. (eds), *Discourse markers: Descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins B.V. Jucker, A., & Ziv, Y. (1998). Discourse markers: Introduction. In Jucker, A. H., & Ziv, Y., (eds.), *Discourse markers: Descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.
- Kim, A. (2011). Rhetorical questions as catalyst in grammaticalization: Deriving Korean discourse marker KETUN from conditional connective. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 1023-1041. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.001>
- Kohlani, f. A. (2010). The Function of Discourse Markers in Arabic Newspaper Opinion Articles. *UNDINI*, 278-280 *language teaching and applied linguistics*,. Harlow, Essex, 1992, P.52
- Lenk, U. 1998. Discourse markers and global coherence in conversation, *Journal of pragmatics*, 30/2:245-257
- Lewis, D. (2011). A discourse-constructional approach to the emergence of discourse markers in English. *Linguistics*, 415-443. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/LING.2011.013>
- Liao, S. (2009). Variation in the use of discourse markers by Chinese teaching assistants in the US. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 1313-1328. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.09.026>
- Liu, S. (2006). Teachers’ discourse markers and classroom context. *Journal of Hunan Institute of Humanities (Science and Technology)*, 148-150
- Lutzky, Ursula.2012. *discourse markers in early modern English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Modiano, M. (2009). *Language Learning in the Multicultural Classroom - English in a European and Global Perspective*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Moreno, C. A., O'Riordan, S., & Chambers, A. (2006). Integrating a Corpus of Classroom Discourse in Language Teacher Education: The Case of Discourse Markers. *Recall*, 83-104
- Müller, S. (2004). "Well you know that type of person: functions of well in the speech of American and German students". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36 1157-1182.
- Müller, S. (2004). Well you know that type of person: Functions of well in the speech of American and German students. *Journal of pragmatics*, 193-208.
- Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Othman, Z. (2010). The use of okay, right and yeah in academic lectures by native speaker lecturers: Their "anticipated" and "real" meanings. *Discourse Studies*, 665-681 Philadelphia: John Benjamins B. V. .
- Polat, B. (2011). Investigating acquisition of discourse markers through a developmental learner corpus. *Journal Of Pragmatics*,, 3745-3756. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.009>
- Popescu-Belis, A., & Zufferey, S. (2011). Automatic identification of discourse markers in dialogues: An in-depth study of like and well. *Computer Speech & Language*, 499-518. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.csl.2010.12.001>
- Redeker, G. (1990). "Ideational and Pragmatic Markers of Discourse Structure". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14 367-381.
- Redeker, G. (1991). "Linguistic markers of discourse structure". *Linguistics*, 29 1139-1172.
- Redeker, Gisela 1990 "Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure". *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 367-381. Richards, Jack C., Platt John, Platt Heidi, Longman Dictionary of
- Romero, T. (2002). The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 769-784.
- Sahiruddin (2013). The Implementation of the 2013 Curriculum and the Issues of English Language Teaching and Learning in Indonesia. Proceedings of The Asian Conference on Language Learning 2013: Globalization, Culture and Society: What role does language play? Retrieved from [http://iafor.org/archives/offprints/acll2013-offprints/ACLL2013\\_0362.pdf](http://iafor.org/archives/offprints/acll2013-offprints/ACLL2013_0362.pdf).

- Sankoff, G., Thibault, P., Nagy, N., Blondeau, H., Fonollosa, M., & Gagnon, L. (1997). Variation in the use of discourse markers in a language contact situation. *Language Variation and Change*, 191–217.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Schiffrin, D. 2006. Discourse marker research and theory: Revisiting “and”, in Fischer, K. (ed.) *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, p. 315-338
- Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & H. E. Hamilton (eds). 2001. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Schourup, L. (2011). The discourse marker now: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 2110-2129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.01.005>
- Schourup, L. (2011). The discourse marker now: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 2110-2129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.01.005>
- Schourup, L. C. 1999. Discourse markers, *Lingua*, 107: 227-265.
- Seedhouse, P. (2009). The Interactional Architecture of the Language [Classroom](#). *Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 1-13.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. 1996. Fodor's frame problem and relevance theory: A reply to [Chiappe](#) & Kukla. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 19: 530-32
- Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: [Blackwell](#).
- Thornbury, H., & Slade, M. (2006). The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English. *Journal of pragmatics*, 769-784.
- Torres, L., & Potowski, K. (2008). A comparative study of bilingual discourse markers in Chicago Mexican, Puerto Rican, and MexiRican Spanish. *International Journal Of Bilingualism*, 263-279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1367006908098571>
- Trillo, J. (2002). The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English. *Journal of pragmatics*, 769-784. Tsui, Amy B.M., *Introducing Classroom Interaction*,. Penguin books Ltd,
- Vickers, C., & Goble, R. (2011). Well, Now, Okey Dokey: English Discourse Markers in Spanish-Language Medical Consultations. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 536-567.
- Xiao, Y. (2010). Discourse Markers in Chinese Conversational Narrative. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 1-6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0142716409990257>

- Yan, W. (2011). A Discourse-Pragmatic Functional Study of the Discourse Markers Japanese *Ano* and Chinese *Nage*. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 41-61.
- Zhuang, X. (2012). A Study of the Effects of Conjunctives on Lecture Comprehension. *US-China Foreign Language*, 855-863.

## Website

<http://conference.kuis.edu.my/pasak2017/images/prosiding/ilmubahasa/15-abd-rahman-stain.pdf>

<http://darhiv.ffzg.unizg.hr/id/eprint/5637/1/The%20Role%20of%20Personality%20in%20EFL.pdf>

<http://education.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-147>

<http://gs.elaba.lt/object/elaba:8645298/8645298.pdf>

[http://host.uniroma3.it/docenti/boylan/courses/variety/discuss/ac\\_spo\\_e/celt\\_e\\_discourse\\_markers.htm](http://host.uniroma3.it/docenti/boylan/courses/variety/discuss/ac_spo_e/celt_e_discourse_markers.htm)

[http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/11241/12/12\\_chapter%204.pdf](http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/11241/12/12_chapter%204.pdf)

<http://www.academypublication.com/ojs/index.php/jltr/article/download/jltr0805881890/1213>

<http://www.gloriacappelli.it/wp-content/uploads/2009/05/youknow.pdf>

<http://www2.oid.ucla.edu/units/tatp/old/lounge/pedagogy/interaction>

[http://wwwhomes.uni-bielefeld.de/sgramley/Foreigner%20English%20\(EFL\).pdf](http://wwwhomes.uni-bielefeld.de/sgramley/Foreigner%20English%20(EFL).pdf)

[https://ipfs.io/ipfs/QmXoypizjW3WknFiJnKLwHCnL72vedxjQkDDP1mXWo6uco/wiki/Sociocultural\\_perspective.html](https://ipfs.io/ipfs/QmXoypizjW3WknFiJnKLwHCnL72vedxjQkDDP1mXWo6uco/wiki/Sociocultural_perspective.html)

<https://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1138&context=aerc>

<https://pressto.amu.edu.pl/index.php/gl/article/download/333/240>

<https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0354-3293/2016/0354-32931603137R.pdf>

<https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:624579/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

<https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/51621/Karoline-L--Sandal-Master-thesis.pdf?sequence=1>

<https://www.eslteacheredu.org/what-is-tefl/>

<https://www.jobs.ac.uk/careers-advice/working-overseas/1028/guide-to-teaching-english-as-a-foreign-language-tefl>

<https://www.kenyaplex.com/resources/2426-classroom-interaction-and-the-role-of-teacher-in-classroom-interaction.aspx>

[https://www.mathunion.org/fileadmin/ICMI/files/About\\_ICMI/Publications\\_about\\_ICMI/ICME\\_11/Goos.pdf](https://www.mathunion.org/fileadmin/ICMI/files/About_ICMI/Publications_about_ICMI/ICME_11/Goos.pdf)

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationopinion/10126883/Why-learn-a-foreign-language-Benefits-of-bilingualism.html>

<https://www.thoughtco.com/discourse-marker-or-dm-1690463>

<https://www.thoughtco.com/english-as-a-foreign-language-efl-1690597>

<https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/TCH.CHAP15.HTM>