



IRAQI  
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية  
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية

ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

**Journal of Language Studies**

Contents available at: <http://www.iasj.net/iasj/journal/356/about>



## Explicit Frameworks to Teach Spoken Discourse Markers: Present-Practice-Produce and Illustration-Interaction-Induction

**Rizgar Ahmed Haji Mohammed \***

Assistant Lecturer at Ministry of Education, Azmar College for Gifted Students

[rizgarlinguist@yahoo.com](mailto:rizgarlinguist@yahoo.com)

&

**Prof. Dr . Abbas Mustafa Abbas**

Professor at College of Basic Education English Department, University of Sulaimani

[abbas.abbas@univsul.edu.iq](mailto:abbas.abbas@univsul.edu.iq)

Received: 12/ 4 / 2023, Accepted: 21 / 5 /2023, Online Published: 30 / 9/2023

©This is an open Access Article under The Cc by LICENSE

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



### **Abstract**

Researchers and language instructors have attempted to utilize the most influential teaching frameworks which are related to enhance language production and how they influence the learners' outcome positively. The study aims at exploring two explicit teaching frameworks; Present – Practice – Produce (PPP) and Illustration – Interaction – Induction (III) on learning spoken discourse markers by Kurdish non-native speakers of English. The current research reports findings from an experimental design conducted at Knowledge University in Kurdistan Region which is a private university. 66 Kurdish EFL learners participated and they were on the Upper intermediate or B2 level on the Common European Framework of Reference Ability Scale (CEFR). Two different experimental groups were taught the same categories of spoken discourse markers compared to a control group. One way ANOVA and post-hoc S-N-K test of

\* **Corresponding Author:** Rizgar Ahmed Haji, E.Mail: [rizgarlinguist@yahoo.com](mailto:rizgarlinguist@yahoo.com), **Affiliation:** university of Sulaimani - Iraq

post-test revealed statistically significant differences of PPP group compared to III and control groups in relation to the higher mean scores of the total spoken discourse markers used in the post-test. The qualitative findings showed that PPP group insisted on the usefulness of their method that helped them exhibit good performances in their speaking test. Moreover, participants from both PPP and III groups gave importance to practicing as a crucial aspect of learning the target language forms.

**Keywords:** Spoken discourse markers, Kurdish non-native speakers of English, explicit teaching frameworks, PPP, III

اطر صريحة لتعليم علامات الخطاب المنطوق: الحاضر \_ الممارسة \_ الإنتاج والتوضيح \_

التفاعل \_ الاستقراء

رزكار احمد حاجى محمد

جامعة السليمانية

و

ا.د. عباس مصطفى عباس

جامعة السليمانية

### المستخلص

سعى الباحثون ومعلمي اللغة استخدام أطر التدريس الأكثر تأثيراً والتي تخص بتعزيز إنتاج اللغة وكيفية تأثيرها على حصيلة الطلاب بصورة ايجابية. الغرض من الدراسة الحالية هو الاستطلاع على إطارين تعليميين واضحين؛ الحضور-الممارسة-الإنتاج(PPP) والتوضيح-التفاعل-التعريف (III) على تعلم روابط الخطاب الملفوظة من جانب الأكراد الذين يعتبرون من المتكلمين الغير الاصليين للغة الأنكليزية. الدراسة الحالية تقدم النتائج من تصاميم تجريبية أجريت في جامعة نولج في اقليم كردستان العراق والتي تعتبر جامعة أهلية. شارك (66) طالبا في البحث الجاري وكانوا في مستوى فوق المتوسط (2B) حسب الاطار المرجعي الاوروبي الموحد للغات . مجموعتين تجريبيتين من الطلاب تم تدريسهم من نفس فئات روابط الخطاب الملفوظة مقارنةً بالمجموعة المرجعية. كشف اختبار التباين الأحادي ANOVA واختبار البعدية S-N-K نتائج لبعده التجارب عن وجود فروق ذات أهمية إحصائية من مجموعة PPP مقارنةً بالمجموعة (III) الثالثة ومجموعات المرجعية نسبة الى متوسط الدرجات الأعلى لإجمالي روابط الخطاب الملفوظة المستخدمة بعد الاختبار. بينت النتائج النوعية أن مجموعة PPP أصرت على فائدة طريقتهم التي ساعدتهم على إظهار أداء جيد في اختبار التكلم. ضف الى ذلك، أعطى المشاركون من كلا المجموعتين PPP و III أهمية للممارسة لأنها تعتبر جانباً مهماً للدرس تكوين أشكال اللغة

المستهدفة. الكلمات الدالة: روابط الخطاب الملفوظة، الأكراد المعترين من المتكلمين الغير الأصليين للغة الأنكليزية، الأطار الصريح، PPP، III،

## 1. Introduction

Writing and speaking are regarded as the two language productive skills that learners can exhibit through what they have learnt from the input they have received. These two skills also seem to be different from each other in terms of their grammar, lexis, or even their phonology. McCarthy and Carter (1995, 2001), Carter and McCarthy (1995, 1997, 2006) and Carter (1998) insist that speaking is special for its characteristics of grammar. On the other hand, writing skill is always being considered as the most demanding tasks for the university students and its application as Aljafen (2013) notes, needs a good level of proficiency by the EFL university learners. These two skills are the most demanding and difficult skills among the university learners since they perform and reply to their academic texts whether in written or spoken form. Thus the university and college courses include writing and speaking skills as the basic components of their curriculum and syllabus (Barnawi, 2011).

Crystal (1988) believes that discourse markers (hereafter DMs) serve as the “oil which helps us perform the complex task of spontaneous speech production and interaction smoothly and efficiently”. DMs such as *well*, *you know*, and *I mean* are the most commonly used language items in spoken language (McCarthy, 2010) and are significant as key indicators of fluency (Hasselgreen, 2005). Being able to utilize common DMs naturally is a major skill for the language learners. With the help of DMs in spoken discourse, the naturalness of talk can be attained and similarly in written discourse the text gains a higher level of coherence (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). However, teachers and coursebook materials might have not given a due attention to DMs but rather to lexis which is more traditional and grammar-based. Thus DMs might be regarded as being stigmatized especially when considered as signals of disfluency. Still there are controversies concerning whether teachers need to teach them to language learners who seek their good performance in the target language (Prodromou, 2008).

There has been a great deal of research on DMs and their functions concerning how they affect the pragmatic and communicative competence of the learners and also their pedagogical importance in (Svartvik, 1980; Östman, 1981; Schiffrin, 1986; Aijmer, 1987). Lam (2009) states that DMs are essential for learners to communicate successfully at the pragmatic level of interaction. The area of investigation that refers to explicitly teaching how these language forms in spoken discourse are taught is not sufficiently researched yet. According to Timmis (2012), there are still few empirical studies concerning teaching and learning spoken grammar. The main aim of the current study is to teach spoken DMs (henceforth SDMs) via two explicit teaching frameworks; Present, Practice, and Product (hereafter PPP) and Illustration, Interaction, and Induction (henceforth III). With the former, the majority of classroom time will be spent on practice and production of language and the latter with noticing which may help the learners in producing the language forms. There is a line of argument for the effectiveness of PPP and III framework. The argument behind PPP as a practical direction of teaching the language forms has to do with practicing these target language forms but there is also another line of argument that is grounded in ‘noticing’ as features of spoken grammar alone might help the learners in producing the language. There are

some researchers who support the effectiveness of PPP including (Lindsay & Knight, 2006; DeKeyser, 2007a: 1) but some others prefer III framework such as (Ellis, 2002). Taking the EFL settings into considerations, studying DMs has also increased but is not empirically researched enough via giving explicit instructions for language productive skills. Kurdish context of EFL classrooms has been insufficiently investigated concerning proposing explicit teaching frameworks for teaching and learning SDMs. The main objective of the current research is to fill this gap in the literature in EFL classrooms. In addition, it contributes to the field of English Language Teaching by examining and proposing a description of the effectiveness of different teaching approaches for teaching and acquisition of the target SDMs in Kurdish EFL academic setting. It is considered as a small attempt of empirical research in addressing this issue and it is worth investigating since this study proposes a pedagogical implication regarding teaching and learning DMs in both spoken and written discourse

### 1.1 Problem Statement

Discourse is basically connected with written and spoken modes of communication through which learners produce a piece of language they have mastered. With reference to McCarthy (1991), students via these two elements formulate various sorts of discourse. Speaking skill is the major interest of Kurdish EFL university students because they face problems and difficulties in using the target language forms namely; DMs. DMs have not received enough and serious attentions by native and non-native researchers in relation to Kurdish EFL university students since they are essential elements to spoken discourse cohesion and coherence. Besides, less attention has been given to their pedagogical implications and no clear and precise pedagogical frameworks have neither been utilized nor been proposed for teaching this area of discourse in terms of DMs in speaking skill.

### 1.2 Research Aims

Since DMs are crucial elements in spoken discourse, the current study has set forward significant aims within two main folds. Firstly, it is concerned with learners to know the type and frequency of the common DMs used in spoken discourse by Kurdish EFL learners. Secondly, it is associated with the Kurdish university instructors to highlight a suitable framework from the study for teaching SDMs and later this could be a basis for teaching these elements of language with the most effective explicit teaching framework in EFL classrooms.

### 1.3 Research Questions

For the PhD stage, the current study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. Which types (categories) of DMs are used by Kurdish non-native speakers of English in the spoken discourse?
2. Which explicit teaching framework, PPP or an III aids the learning of SDMs by Kurdish non-native speakers of English?
3. How do Kurdish non-native speakers of English consider the greater effectiveness of learning the SDMs through PPP and III?

### 1.4 Significance of the study

The findings of the current study are reflected within two main folds: theoretical and pedagogical prescriptive. Since there is a huge gap in the literature in relation to DMs in spoken discourse in Kurdish EFL academic setting, no empirical research have been carried out on proposing productive teaching frameworks for teaching SDMs but the current research makes a huge contribution in this issue. From a theoretical angle, it contributes to a small but growing proportion of research into the spoken discourse of Kurdish EFL speakers of English. In addition, it contributes to the ongoing argument concerning the effectiveness of III and PPP as explicit teaching frameworks for

teaching and acquisition of target language forms. As for the pedagogical angle, it contributes to highlight an effective explicit teaching framework to teach target language forms and thus it will contribute to the pedagogical implication of SDMs in the future. In addition, the results of this study motivate EFL teachers help and encourage their students use DMs appropriately in spoken discourse. It will also benefit the syllabus designers pay a great deal of attention to the significance of DMs in discourse when teaching materials are designed.

#### 1.5 The hypothesis

Since the current study investigates the pedagogic aspect of SDMs, some hypotheses are set forward to meet the requirements. I assume that when DMs are taught explicitly through either framework will bring about a difference to both experimental groups regarding learning and the number of DMs used and rather these groups stay superior to the control group who are not taught the DMs. In terms of acquiring the DMs of focus PPP framework brings about greater learning rather than III framework. Learners would insist that studying the DMs of focus is significant and beneficial and they will prefer PPP framework rather than III framework in terms of having greater impacts on learning the targeted DMs.

#### 1.6 SDMs of focus in this study

As mentioned above the current study emphasizes on the use of DMs in spoken production. This section explains the frequency of the use of SDMs by Kurdish EFL learners under two explicit teaching frameworks; PPP and III. The DMs of focus in this study are the whole ranges of DMs through Fung and Carter's (2007) taxonomy from a multi-categorical perspective as illustrated in Table 1.1 below. Under PPP framework the students receive enough explicit instructions along with practical use of these DMs in the spoken production inside the classroom. On the other hand, under III framework the same students receive enough explicit instruction but no practices are given concerning the proposed SDMs inside the class setting.

Table 1.1 Fung and Carter's (2007) classification of SDMs

Category	DMs
Interpersonal	Marking shared knowledge: <i>see, you see, you know</i> Showing responses (agreement, confirmation, acknowledgement): <i>OK/okay, oh, right/alright, yeah, yes, I see, great, oh, great, sure</i> Indicating attitudes: <i>well, really, obviously, absolutely, basically, actually, exactly, to be frank, etc.</i> Indicating a stance towards propositional meanings: <i>really, exactly, obviously, absolutely</i>
Referential	Mostly conjunctions, marking cause, consequence, contrast, coordination, disjunction, digression, comparison: <i>because/cos, so, but, and, yet, however, nevertheless, and, or, anyway, likewise, similarly</i>
Structural	Opening and closing of topics: <i>now, OK/okay, right/alright, well, let's start, let's discuss, let me conclude</i> Sequencing: <i>first, firstly, second, next, then, finally</i> Marking topic shifts: <i>so, now, and what about, how about</i> Marking continuation of the current topic: <i>yeah, and, cos, so</i> Regain control over the talk or to hold the floor: <i>and, cos</i> Summarizing opinions: <i>so</i>
Cognitive	Indicating the thinking process: <i>well, I think, I see, and</i>

	Reformulation/self-correction: <i>I mean, that is, in other words, what I mean is</i> Elaboration: <i>like, I mean</i> Hesitation: <i>well, sort of</i> Assessment of the listener's knowledge about the utterances: <i>you know</i>
--	---

## **2. Literature Review**

This section introduces DMs and also focuses on the connection between DA and pedagogy and previous studies in relation to discourse analysis in classroom teaching and learning practices. SDMs studies which are undertaken through recent works by different researchers are illustrated. Moreover, as the core aim of this dissertation is to propose a suitable and beneficial framework for teaching and learning DMs in spoken production, the current study discusses the previous works in relation to the teaching and learning DMs in classroom setting.

### **2.1 DMs**

There has been a great interest in DMs studies via focusing on pragmatics, discourse analytic, sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, and language pedagogy. As Schiffrin (1987) pointed out the importance of DMs, studies focused on DMs as linguistic items such as *you know, okay, and well* especially in written and spoken discourse. Thus, the studies of DMs have been related to individual DMs (Greasley, 1994; Schourup, 2001; Müller, 2004; Cuenca, 2008; Aijmer, 2011; Schourup, 2011; Lee-Goldman, 2011; Erman, 2001; Macaulay, 2002; Fox Tree and Schrock, 2002; Mukherjee, 2009) as well as DMs as a group (Schiffrin, 1987; Aijmer, 2002; Müller, 2005). The majority of research has focused on DMs in English language concerning how they are used (Fraser, 1990; Blakemore, 2006; Bell, 2010). These markers have been studied from both written discourse (Castele and Collewaert, 2013; Koike, 1996; Cotter, 1996) and spoken contexts (Fuller, 2003; Fung and Carter, 2007; Aijmer, 2011; Buysse, 2012).

Though DMs have grammatical functions they also have interactional characteristics (Fraser, 1999; Maschler, 1998; Schiffrin 1987). Fung and Carter (2007) state that, in spoken discourse the frequency and amount of DMs used are crucial compared to the other forms of words. To this fact, there is not a hard and fixed agreement among researchers concerning what DMs are because they have different perspectives including discourse coherence, pragmatics, relevance theory, and other alternative approaches (Aijmer, 2002; Blakemore, 2002; Fischer, 2006; Jucker and Ziv, 1998; Müller, 2005; Schourup, 1999).

Since there have been rare studies taking the Kurdish EFL learners into considerations, the current study investigates the learning of these markers under explicit teaching frameworks in spoken discourse. Likewise, Muller (2005) claims that DMs have been understudied within the field second language acquisition by which the language learners are not bilingual learners but they are second or foreign language learners of English language. For the purpose of the current study the researcher focuses on SDMs through Fung and Carter's (2007) taxonomy that best works with the Kurdish EFL learners.

### **2.2 Discourse analysis and classroom pedagogy**

Discourse analysis (henceforth DA) and language teaching have increasingly attracted the attention of researchers and practitioners. Researchers have focused on both written

and spoken modes of communication inside classrooms. To McCarthy (1991) DA is considered as the study of the relationship between language and the context where it is used. DA investigates the issue of turning sentences into larger chunks of discourse in different social situations to a much institutionalized form of talk. Meaning that, the data that are obtained from DA proposes that language in communication is socially, cognitively, and linguistically interrelated (Hatch, 1992). The use of DA inside classroom setting has been related to the evaluation of both teachers and students' output. Based on Olshtain & Celce-Murcia (2001, p. 721) the success behind communicative approaches to language teaching is significantly related to their involvement with DA specifically "language teachers and other teaching professionals (curriculum developers, textbook writers, language testers) with proper grounding in discourse analysis". Taking the EFL teaching context into considerations, DA is defined as "how stretches of language, considered in their full textual, social, and psychological context, become meaningful and unified for their users" (Cook, 1990, p. 3). As Olshtain & Celce-Murcia (2001) pointed out that communicative language teaching is impossible to be effective if teachers are not enriched with theoretical issues that are based on DA, the next point to be considered is how to put these theoretical knowledge into practice. In addition, taking DA into considerations in pedagogical settings in EFL classrooms, a highly contextualized teaching methodology would come into play that is equipped with authentic language practices in various social situations (Cots, 1996).

DA in pedagogical settings especially in EFL classrooms has received a great deal of attention by researchers in the field of DA. Basically, all skills of language have been given prior attention. Thus, since the current study focuses on DMs use in pedagogical settings it is seen essential to shed the light on some research in the field of DMs. Within the classroom discourse-oriented approach, two explicit teaching frameworks have been given the due attention by researchers in the field of DA. PPP framework is considered to work effectively in teaching DMs in classroom settings. There also other researchers who are in line with the second form of explicit teaching which is III framework that is said to be more effective than PPP framework in teaching DMs. The former provides the learners with explicit knowledge and instructions regarding the target language forms to be taught along with practices provided to the learners to be promoted towards the target language forms. On the other hand, the latter is designed to provide learners with explicit instructions and knowledge for the learners but they are not provided with target language practice. There is still controversy concerning which framework leaves more positive impacts on the acquisition of the target language DMs. Thus, the current study intends to shed the light on this gap in literature and highlighting which framework is effective in teaching DMs.

#### 2.2.1 Related studies

This section illustrates several studies on the SDMs used under PPP and III teaching frameworks in spoken productions of English language learners. To this fact the current study investigates the SDMs used in the conversations which are carried out by Kurdish EFL learners at the university level. Taking the effect of DMs on learning into granted, the process of learning is of two main folds, comprehension and production. In the comprehension stage learners are targeted towards what they learn such as language features and forms and they are resorted to pay attention to a particular teaching framework that meets their needs. After receiving sufficient input in the target forms then the next phase comes which is practicing that knowledge that is being learned. To do so, sufficient practices are needed to be done in classroom learning and teaching. Though researchers have come to an agreement that DMs are undoubtedly significant

but the way they are taught and learned is still controversial and need further research to be conducted. In the current study, two explicit teaching frameworks are proposed for teaching and learning SDMs. Since to my knowledge in Kurdish EFL context till now there have not been any studies tackled using these two explicit frameworks for teaching SDMs or the pedagogical aspect of them but rather they focused on literary texts (Hama and Farooq, 2018) or what DMs are, what types are used (Majeed, 2015), and their frequency of use such as in English Journals (Hasan and Seyyedi, 2020)

Several studies were conducted on SDMs and various taxonomies and frameworks were used in these studies. Awni and Salim (2015) through a functional approach and using Fung's (2003) taxonomy studied the use of interpersonal DMs in interviews and the results indicated that Native speakers used (*really, kind of, just and you know*) more frequently while non-native speakers used (*well, I think, yeah, yes and actually*) more frequently. Min (2011) and Sei (2020) used Fung and Carter's (2007) taxonomy of SDMs. The results of Min's (2011) study showed that EFL learners tended to use more of referentially and cognitively functional DMs and a rare use of other markers. Likewise, Arya (2020) investigated the use and function of DMs from a functional perspective and the findings were; referential markers (46.30%), interpersonal markers (28.91%), structural markers (12.93%), and cognitive markers (11.95%). Similarly, Aşık and Tevfik (2013) through MICASE orthographic transcription conventions and mark-up system made use of DMs functions that were proposed by Schiffrin (1987), Brinton (1996), Fraser (1999), Müller (2005) and Fung and Carter (2007). The findings illustrated that Turkish non-native speakers of English did not use DMs effectively and showed insufficient variety in their spoken discourse. Hussein et al. (2022) conducted a study on the use and function of DMs among Arab learners and adapted Fraser's (1999) taxonomy and generally, elaborative, contrastive, and temporal markers were used from most to least degree of occurrence. Additionally, Ament and Barón (2017) followed Maschler (1994) and Fung & Carter (2007) taxonomies of SDMs. Sujarwati (2017) use the theory of Thornbury (2005) to analyze the interactivity functions of DMs in casual conversations. Huang (2011) utilized the Linear Unit Grammar analysis of Sinclair and Mauranen (2006) and text-based analyses. ŞAHİN (2021) used Granger's (2009) Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis. Deng (2021) based his study on Boersma and Weenink (2018). Fung (2003) used the functional and attitudinal perspective. Dan (2018) utilized Brinton's and Alami's theories and it was found that all textual functions were used, i.e.: sequence, repair, opening and closing frame markers, filler, information indicator, topic switcher, and turn taker but interpersonal function was almost never found. Ndanu (2020) used content analysis and Schiffrin's (1987) model of English DMs and Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model. The additive category was the most frequently used and the marker *and* was the dominant. Nookam (2010) made use of the documentary method of conversation interpretation of Seedhouse (2004) which is adopted by Conversational Analysis. Okati and Ghasedi (2017) based their study on Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1974) transcription system. Dina and Fatmawati (2019) studied the types and frequency of DMs used based on Schiffrin (1987). It can be notice that the findings of the studies mentioned above showed different interpretations and results since they were carried out through using different spoken interactions and different taxonomies and perspectives.

Within the literature there are still disagreements and controversies concerning the effectiveness of either framework in the acquisition of DMs in spoken discourse. There are some researchers who support the effectiveness of PPP including (Lindsay & Knight, 2006; DeKeyser, 2007a: 1) but some others prefer III framework such as (Ellis, 2002). Based on Thornbury's (1999) view PPP framework is in accordance with both teachers and learners since it is based on the assumption that practice makes perfect and



this approach tends to cover the whole skills of language. Teachers highly control the first two stages of this framework but later it is decreased by avoiding teachers' support and giving learners autonomy in producing naturalistic production and understanding (Ur, 1996, p. 19). As target language items are introduced by the teacher, learners will stick to them without deviating from the required learning (Read 1985, p. 17, cited in Carless, 2009, p. 51). In addition, Carless (2009) argues that PPP as a traditional framework enables low achieving learners to perform better and learn effectively. Apart from language learners, novice teachers who have just started their teaching direction will get benefit from PPP which provides them with what to teach and how to teach (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 246). Similarly, Harmer (2001) states that this approach has been recommended for trainee teachers to be helpful and useful procedures from 1960s onwards. In addition, Burrows (2008) and Sato (2009) found PPP framework to be the most effective and suitable one in Japanese EFL context.

On the other hand, PPP is not free from criticism. It does not embrace language learning complexities and it is simple and straightforward that through the logical sequences acquisition would be provided. For instance, Tomilson (1998) claims that the acquisition of linguistic structures *"takes much longer than this approach suggests and that far more experience of the item in communication is needed for any lasting learning to take place"*. Starting from the 1990s onwards it was under attack including Ellis (2003) in which to him PPP considers language as a series of products that can be acquired one after the other in a particular manner but researchers in the field of second language acquisition argue that learners do not acquire language in such a way. In addition, this framework is considered to be too linear and behaviorist in nature and it does not account for the learners' stages of developmental preparedness. In addition, Skehan (1996) explains that this approach does not bring about a successful occurrence of language acquisition. Lewis (1993) claims that it does not have any reflection on the nature of language and learning by which learners are dependent of a mimic model. It was suggested that this framework to be a discredited one (Lewis, 1993; Skehan, 1996). It is in under sever control of teachers and it is considered to be tough and rigid (Willis, 1990, p. 151). It is inflexible and it cannot be incorporated with the changes of classroom situations (Scrivener, 1996, p.80) and cannot be useful to learners' learning processes (Lewis, 1993, p.151). Lastly, Wong and Van Patten (2003) claim that this framework is strictly connected with decontextualized and meaningless exercises that forces learners to practice and imitate what the teachers say.

Alternative approaches have been proposed in the field of Applied Linguistics for example; the III framework by McCarthy (1998). He believes that, to foster and facilitate the transformation of discourse features across languages learners need to acquire cultural awareness. In addition, McCarthy and Carter (1995:217), explain that learners' language awareness which is an aspect of III is suitable for teaching aspects of language forms. Bocale (2004: 121-124) argues that it provides a suitable social and linguistic environment for language acquisition. It helps passive learners to get engaged in classroom interactions, speak out voluntarily, and point the areas of difficulties in understanding the target language. But this framework works well with highly motivated learners and if compared to the PPP framework, it needs more attention on the part of learners and this sometimes causes difficulties for the learners. Other researchers such as (Alanen 1995, Leow 1997, 2001, Rosa and O'Neill 1999, Lindgren and Sullivan 2003, Lai and Zhao 2006 and Shekary and Tahririan 2006) insist on the usefulness of noticing as an aspect of III in classroom context as they tried to promote and expose learners towards noticing aspects of language.

Few studies were conducted on testing frameworks concerning the effectiveness of noticing framework which III shares. A study was conducted by Timmis (2005) by testing a Noticing framework through which learners were asked to notice some forms of language in listening texts. He helped them understanding the input before they work on any activities on language forms. They were only required to notice some grammatical forms without asking them for production. The attitudes of the learners and teachers were taken through a questionnaire and the results showed that most of them agreed that this framework was useful. Moreover, Lindgren and Sullivan (2003:184) tested students via writing compositions and they tried to stimulate their recall. This was later discussed with both teachers and peers and the results showed that recalling brought about more noticing and text revision and thus as learners noticed errors they were then able to correct them. In a similar line, Shekary and Tahririan (2006) studied the effect of noticing in online chats. The results of the immediate and delayed post-tests revealed that learners were able to remember the forms. Incidental noticing was found effective to learning language forms.

On the other hand, there are also few studies conducted in classrooms for teaching and learning DMs. Thus some studies were conducted in relation to the effectiveness of PPP framework. It was found effective compared to the III framework in the study conducted by Jones and Carter (2013). They investigated the effectiveness of two teaching frameworks of PPP and III to teach the same SDMs to two different groups of Chinese learners and a control group at the same level of language proficiency. Though both frameworks had positive influences on the learners' output but PPP was found more effective. Similarly, Yoshimi (2001) studied the explicit instruction of some Japanese DMs as each group was given a pre-test and a post-test by completing a story telling task. The findings indicated that presentation and explicit explanation followed by practice and corrective feedback were found more helpful in using the target language forms than the control group through giving no instruction. Hernandez (2008) carried out a study to test explicit instruction plus input flood compared to input flood alone concerning Spanish DMs. The first experimental group was taught with explicit instruction plus input flood and the other experimental group was taught with input alone. The results indicated that explicit instruction plus input flood group performed better than input flood alone group. Muslim (2016) studied the effect of PPP and TBLT on the acquisition of structural DMs by Saudi learners. There were two groups and each group was given five topics and two hours for each lesson. Both methods were found to be positive in the acquisition of the DMs but TBLT was more effective than PPP.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Research design**

An experimental design was used in this study that was based on Nunan (2005) and Ellis (2001b) and it is described as classical experimental design by Nunan (2005: 227) and as true experimental design by Cohen et al, (2007: 275). Meaning that, the same target language forms are taught to two experimental groups in which each group is taught under a different framework. There is also the third group which is the control group and this group is provided with general instructions but no intended lessons are given considering the target language forms. Since instructions are important for the two frameworks used in this study it is also significant to know that according to Norris and Ortega (2000, 2001) the length or the total hours for giving instructions vary considerably. Thus, one semester of explicit instruction was given to both experimental groups. Normally, the number of participants is around fifteen in an experimental group

(VanPatten and Cadierno, 1993). There were 66 participants in this study and they were randomly divided in two three groups through which 22 participants were in each group. They aged between 18 to 28 years. Tests were used in this study as instruments for collecting quantitative data concerning the DMs used and then comparing the results of the groups to know the effectiveness of the teaching frameworks. Thus, a pretest and a posttest were used for obtaining some measurements of the experimental groups throughout the whole study (VanPatten and Cadierno, 1993).

Since the current study was based on experimental design some other features were also included in the study such as conducting interview which is to some extent different from the typical experimental design and close to mixed methods that is termed by (Dornyei, 2007:169). So, the model that was followed in this study is closely related to sequential explanatory design (Creswell and Clark, 2011: 305). First, the quantitative method was used to measure the overall frequency and type of DMs used during the pretest and the posttest stages. Then the qualitative method was implemented through conducting interviews to get more insights into the effectiveness of the explicit teaching frameworks.

### 3.2 Participants

There were two classes of second year students at KNU with a total of 75 students but 66 were randomly selected (Cohen et al., 2007: 275) for the study and they were between 18 to 28 years. Since the current study is only related to Kurdish EFL non-native speakers of English, there were 2 Arab students among them and their performance results were excluded from the data. In addition, the real participants of the main study are all upper-intermediate learners but since an English placement test is carried out to know their language proficiency level there were 7 students under the upper-intermediate level thus their performance results were not taken into considerations. This level is supported with Bocale's claim (2004: 121-124) that the two explicit teaching frameworks used in the study especially III works well with upper-intermediate learners who show a great deal of language competency in interaction. In addition, the students were at upper-intermediate level B2 on the Common European Framework of Reference Ability Scale (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001: 24). The level of the participants is considered as appropriate and significant to be taught under these two explicit teaching frameworks. The participants were assigned to three groups; experimental group 1 (PPP), experimental group 2 (III), and group 3 (control group). All the students of both classes were given the same English placement test but only the data of those students whom their level was upper-intermediate (B2) was taken into considerations.

### 3.3 Instruments

There were some instruments used in this study for collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. The first instrument used is using tests, thus pretest and posttest were used to investigate the SDM used in the conversations conducted with the participants about topics selected by the researcher. The Topics were taken from IELTS Books. On the other hand, interviews were used and the interviewees were randomly selected (Dornyei, 2007) to elicit complimentary data of the learners' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the teaching approaches. For the semi-structured interview 10 interviewees were interviewed that is supported by Dornyei (2007) who believes that for interviews from 6 to 10 interviewees are conventional for a qualitative data collection. Thus, five interviewees were selected for each of PPP and III groups.

### 3.4 Data collection and Analysis

Two qualitative data were used in the current study to collect the necessary data. First, the first qualitative data were from the audio-recorded conversations of the participants

for investigating the DMs used in the spoken discourse. Pre-test and Post-test were used in this study which is supported by Dornyei (2007) as an established instrument for this type of study. Tests were given to both experimental groups and the control group prior to the treatment and immediately following the treatment. The ‘gain scores’ were measured to compare the effects of the experimental groups and thus through the pre-test and post-test comparisons were measured against the control group (Dornyei, 2007: 118).

The second qualitative data were through semi-structured interviews to obtain complimentary data concerning the effectiveness of the teaching frameworks. The procedures that were followed in this type of instrument were that the researcher designed some questions in form of semi-structured interview, carried out the interview, audio- recorded the interviewees, provided individualized transcriptions (Lapadat, 2000) of the recordings, analyzed them and lastly reported the data obtained from them. The transcriptions of the interviews were done through basic interview transcription convention that was proposed by Lapadat (2000) and Dornyei (2007).

The recordings of both qualitative data were made by the researcher. The researcher and two instructors analyzed the transcription of the conversations to count the DMs that were used and they agreed on the correct ones which were used. The scores of the DMs that were used were done manually and were put into SPSS for measurement through one-way ANOVA and post-hoc S-N-K test to find out if there were any statistical significant differences in the overall scores in both pre-test and post-test.

In addition, the interviews were transcribed to investigate learners’ perceptions towards the effectiveness of the applied teaching frameworks. The transcripts of the interviews were analyzed quantitatively through utilizing descriptive statistics to establish the learners’ perceptions towards the effectiveness of the frameworks. Manually, Codes and themes were used for the interviews that were conducted concerning the learners’ understanding and perception concerning the effectiveness of the teaching frameworks. Thus, the interviews were coded into four categories: applicability of studying DMs, applicability of practicing, applicability of noticing, and the teaching frameworks.

#### **4. Results**

As mentioned earlier there were three research questions raised so as to explore the categories of the DMs used, the effectiveness of the explicit teaching approaches, and the learners’ understanding concerning which framework has greater impact than the other.

4.1 1<sup>st</sup> Research Question: Which types (categories) of DMs are used by Kurdish non-native speakers of English in the spoken discourse?

The first research question was raised to investigate the type or the category of the SDMs used in the conversations carried out in the Pre-test and the Post-test. The conversations were held and transcribed at two time points; pre-instruction and post-instruction to explore which type of the DMs were used in the conversations. Thus the pre-test and post-test scores were performed and through descriptive statistics the frequencies of SDM used were compared as shown table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1 Types of DMs used in Pre-test and Post-test stages

Interpersonal DMs	Pre-test (N)	Post-test (N)
PPP	12	173
III	13	71

Ctrl	12	21
Referential DMs		
PPP	14	115
III	11	51
Ctrl	12	14
Structural DMs		
PPP	10	39
III	10	20
Ctrl	12	7
Cognitive DMs		
PPP	1	92
III	2	27
Ctrl	1	3

It can be noticed from the above table that both PPP and III groups showed increase in the number of DMs used from

pre-test to the post-test. Interpersonal category was dominantly used in the first place and then referential category was used. Later, Cognitive and structural types were used respectively. In the pre-instruction phase for Interpersonal DMs PPP group scored 12 DMs and increased to 173 DMs whereas III group scored 13 and increased to 71 DMs. For Referential category PPP used 14 DMs and later scored 115 DMs. On the other hand, III made use of 11 DMs and in the post-instruction the number increased to 51 DMs. In terms of the Cognitive DMs, PPP showed a great improvement from the pre-test to the post-test and III as well; PPP 1 to 92 and III 2 to 27. It is clear that these two types Interpersonal and Referential categories were the most commonly used ones.

#### 4.2 2<sup>nd</sup> Research Question: Which explicit teaching framework, PPP or an III aids the learning of SDMs by Kurdish non-native speakers of English?

To check if there are any significant differences between the groups the probability (p) was stated to be .05 or less ( $p < .05$ ). Thus a one way ANOVA revealed that there were significant differences in all the four categories of the SDMs used by the PPP group. Taking the Interpersonal DMs for granted, the results were PPP ( $M= 7.86, SD= 5.083$ ) when compared to III ( $M= 3.23, SD= 3.038$ ) and Ctrl groups ( $M= .95, SD= 1.731$ ). The III group showed improvement in learning the targeted DMs. The mean of total Interpersonal DMs used was significant ( $p = .000$ ). Tables 4.2 and 4.3 illustrate the findings from one way ANOVA and post-hoc S-N-K test.

Table 4.2: Total amount of Interpersonal DMs used at the post-test stage

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	545.576	2	272.788	21.498	.000
Within Groups	799.409	63	12.689		
Total	1344.985	65			

Table 4.3: Student-Newman-Keuls post-hoc test

(Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.)

Group	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
-------	---	-------------------------

		1	2	3
Ctrl	22	.95		
III	22		3.23	
PPP	22			7.86
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000

The results of total amount of the Referential DMs used are explained in Tables 4.4 and 4.5. The same one way ANOVA and post-hoc S-N-K test were used to find out which framework is affective in the learning of Referential DMs. Thus, the test was run on both the pre-test and the post-test instructions to find out if there is any significant difference among the three groups through means for groups in homogeneous subsets.

Table 4.4: Total amount of Referential DMs used at the post-test stage

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	190.394	2	95.197	33.369	.000
Within Groups	179.727	63	2.853		
Total	370.121	65			

Table 4.5: Student-Newman-Keuls post-hoc test

(Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.)

Group	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Ctrl	22	.64		
III	22		2.32	
PPP	22			4.77
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000

The findings showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups as PPP group outperformed the other two groups III and Ctrl. Similar to the Interpersonal DMs; III group increased the number of targeted DMs learned. Thus PPP group scored (M= 4.77, SD= .752) compared to III group which scored (M= 2.32, SD= 2.662) and Ctrl group (M= .64, SD= .953). It can be seen that the mean of total Referential DMs used was significant (p. = .000).

Table 4.6 and 4.7 highlight the findings related to the mean of total amount of the Structural DMs learned. One way ANOVA and post-hoc S-N-K test were also applied to Structural DMs to investigate if there is any significant difference in the total mean of the DMs used by the learners in their spoken productions they carried out in the test.

Table 4.6: Total amount of Structural DMs used at the post-test stage

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	23.545	2	11.773	18.334	.000
Within Groups	40.455	63	.642		
Total	64.000	65			

Table 4.7: Student-Newman-Keuls post-hoc test

(Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.)

Group	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Ctrl	22	.32		
III	22		.91	
PPP	22			1.77
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000

The findings revealed that PPP group stayed superior to the other two groups in the learning of Structural category. PPP group showed (M= 1.77, SD= 1.270) when compared to III (M= .91, SD= .294) and Ctrl groups (M= .32, SD= .477). The III group showed improvement in learning the targeted DMs. The mean of total Interpersonal DMs used was significant (p. = .000). Similarly, III group showed increase in learning the targeted DMs of focus.

The last two tables; 4.8 and 4.9 are concerned with Cognitive DMs learned during the conversations the learners carried out through the speaking test. The results of the post-test were analyzed and explained through one way ANOVA and post-hoc S-N-K test which indicated that PPP had (M= 4.18, SD= 1.006) when compared to III (M= 1.23, SD= .685) and Ctrl groups (M= .14, SD= .351). The results for III group revealed that they showed progress in learning the targeted Cognitive DMs. The mean of total Cognitive DMs used was significant (p. = .000).

Table 4.8: Total amount of Cognitive DMs used at the post-test stage

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	192.758	2	96.379	180.028	.000
Within Groups	33.727	63	.535		
Total	226.485	65			

Table 4.9: Student-Newman-Keuls post-hoc test

(Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.)

Group	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Ctrl	22	.14		
III	22		1.23	
PPP	22			4.18
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000

4.3 3<sup>rd</sup> Research Question: How do Kurdish non-native speakers of English consider the greater effectiveness of learning the SDMs through PPP and III?

The results for this research question were analyzed based on the codes and themes that were set by the researcher. Thus, the interviews were coded into four themes: applicability of studying DMs, applicability of practicing, applicability of noticing, and the teaching frameworks.

#### 4.3.1 Applicability of studying DMs

The results showed that both groups PPP and III found that studying DMs was very useful for their speaking skills and it was found necessary to be studied. Below samples of their answers can be seen.

(PPP) The first thing I want to say is that it was not very short indeed. My friends have that feeling but we think that it is good for our speaking.

(III) We studied about DMs that we use in speaking daily in life. I think I can use now DMs in my speaking with my friends at university. This program was short but my problem was how to use them correctly. The way we studied has benefits and disadvantages.

#### 4.3.2 Applicability of practicing/Noticing

This section highlights comments from both groups concerning the usefulness of practicing and noticing. The findings indicated that PPP group paid more priority to practicing but III group paid less importance to noticing as they found is somehow useful to learn DMs but if they had practiced the targeted DMs they could use them in their conversations. The following comments from both groups illustrate that.

(PPP) As far as I know and according to my understanding it was easy process that we worked on DMs.

(III) It was useful to me to learn those markers and applying them in my conversation but not all of them.

(III) It was indeed to some extent difficult to me and some = because the teacher never told me to use the markers in my group class in my speaking my problem that I faced.

As it can be seen, learners from both group commented on the necessity of practicing rather than noticing alone because they thought that when they are provided with practices they would be able to use the targeted DMs of focus.

#### 4.3.3 Applicability of the teaching frameworks

Both PPP and III groups focused on the necessity and usefulness of both explicit teaching approaches. They both gave prior importance to both frameworks but III group still insisted on having opportunities and chances for practicing DMs of focus.

(PPP) Well, I knew some of these markers before. On the other hand, with this method we followed it made easier how to use them and for what aim. You know I remember when I was in high school I knew hundreds of words but because I did not had the chance using them I forgot most of them. What I mean is, I had more practicing for example; with my friends, with my teacher, in my activities.



(PPP) I have to say it is a perfect style to encourage students to master what they study. I believe that when you practice something you will never forget that thing.

(III) It was impossible to learn them by myself and the lesson were good help for me to learn them. If I exercised more in my class it was good for me to learn but all in all the lessons were also helpful.

(III) The same as you said. If there is practicing and using in the lessons learning is easy for anything.

## **5. Discussion**

There were two sorts of qualitative data used in this study; the first data were from the conversations held with the participants to check the categories of the SDMs used and the effectiveness of the teaching approaches. The second data were related to the interviews that were carried out with the learner to obtain complimentary data from their perceptions and insights concerning effectiveness of the teaching frameworks.

Interpersonal DMs were given the priority of use by the learners and Referential DMs came after. In addition, Cognitive markers came after Referential category in terms of use but the Structural type was rarely used. Similarly, the results of Min's (2011) study showed that EFL learners tended to use more of referentially and cognitively functional DMs and a rare use of other markers. Likewise, Arya (2020) found that; referential markers were (46.30%), interpersonal markers (28.91%), structural markers (12.93%), and cognitive markers (11.95%). Conversely, Dan (2018) found that all textual functions were used, i.e.: sequence, repair, opening and closing frame markers, filler, information indicator, topic switcher, and turn taker but interpersonal function was almost never found.

Concerning the effectiveness of the explicit teaching frameworks, both explicit frameworks PPP and III helped learners in learning the targeted DMs of focus in all the four categories but there was a statistically significant difference between PPP group with III and Ctrl groups. It was seen that teaching DMs was more important and useful than no teaching them. As I raised earlier in this article, there are still controversies and disagreements concerning the effectiveness of both PPP and III as explicit teaching frameworks in learning the target language forms. The results of the current study are in line with some researchers who support the effectiveness of PPP including (Lindsay & Knight, 2006; DeKeyser, 2007a: 1). In addition, as PPP is well-known for providing learners with practices the results are supported by Thornbury's (1999) view of PPP framework who believes that that practice makes perfect. Also, it gives learners autonomy in producing naturalistic production and understanding (Ur, 1996, p. 19). Moreover, Burrows (2008) and Sato (2009) found PPP framework to be the most effective and suitable one in Japanese EFL context.

On the other hand, some others stay against such as (Ellis, 2002). In addition, Skehan (1996) explains that this approach does not bring about a successful occurrence of language acquisition. Lewis (1993) claims that it does not have any reflection on the nature of language and learning by which learners are dependent of a mimic model. It was suggested that this framework to be a discredited one (Lewis, 1993; Skehan, 1996). It is in under sever control of teachers and it is considered to be tough and rigid (Willis, 1990, p. 151). It is inflexible and it cannot be incorporated with the changes of classroom situations (Scrivener, 1996, p.80) and cannot be useful to learners' learning processes (Lewis, 1993, p.151). Lastly, Wong and Van Patten (2003) claim that this framework is strictly connected with decontextualized and meaningless exercises that forces learners to practice and imitate what the teachers say.

The data from the interviews indicated that studying the targeted language forms was useful for their communication and interactions. In addition, they stated that practicing and noticing are two important ways they could learn DMs but both groups insisted on practicing (Thornbury's, 1999) that helped them in mastering the target language forms. PPP framework was found to be more effective than III one that is supported by both Burrows (2008) and Sato (2009). As target language items are introduced by the teacher, learners will stick to them without deviating from the required learning (Read 1985, p. 17, cited in Carless, 2009, p. 51). The results are also in line with Jones and Carter's (2013) study who found that both frameworks had positive influences on the learners' output but PPP was found more effective. In addition, Yoshimi (2001) revealed that presentation and explicit explanation followed by practice and corrective feedback were found more helpful in using the target language forms than the control group through giving no instruction.

Muslim (2016) studied the effect of PPP and TBLT on the acquisition of structural DMs by Saudi learners. There were two groups and each group was given five topics and two hours for each lesson. Both methods were found to be positive in the acquisition of the DMs but TBLT was more effective than PPP.

## **6. Conclusion**

To conclude, the findings showed that after the treatment stage Interpersonal and referential categories were the most dominant and common ones that were used in the conversations carried out on certain speaking topics by Kurdish non-native speakers of English. In addition, after the treatment stage the results illustrated that both explicit teaching frameworks assisted the learners in mastering the target language forms but there was a statistically significant difference between PPP group and III group and Ctrl group. The results stated that the total mean score of the DMs used by PPP group was much higher than both III and Ctrl. It was also found that teaching DMs explicitly was much better than no teaching of them. The interviews from both PPP and III interviewees also supported that both approaches are useful for learning the target language forms but they were still considered practicing to be essential.

There is a huge gap in the literature in general concerning the pedagogical aspects of DMs concerning how to teach them and also in Kurdish EFL context as there have not been any studies conducted regarding this issue. Thus, the current article suggests further applied-discoursal studies to be carried out in different Kurdish EFL context of English through applying different frameworks.

## **References**

- Aijmer K (1987). Oh and ah in English conversation. In: W. Meijs (Ed.), *Corpus Linguistics and Beyond*. (pp.61-86). Amsterdam: Rodopi
- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aijmer, Karin. 2011. "Well I'm not Sure I think... The Use of Well by Non-native Speakers." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 16: 231-254.
- Alanen, R. (1995). Input Enhancement and Rule Presentation in Second Language Acquisition. In R. W. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 259—302). Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Aljafen, B. S. (2013). Writing anxiety among EFL Saudi students in science colleges and department at a Saudi University (Unpublished master's thesis). Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA.
- Arya, T. (2020). Exploring Discourse Marker Use in Thai University Students' Conversations. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal*, Volume 13(1).
- Aşık A, Cephe PT (2013). Discourse markers and spoken English: Nonnative use in the Turkish EFL Setting. *Eng. Lang. Teach.* 6(12):144-155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n12p144>
- Awani, E. and Salim, R. (2015). The Use of Interpersonal Discourse Markers by Students of English at the University of Jordan. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* Vol.6 (4). Pp. 306 -319
- Barnawi, O. (2011). Finding a Place for Critical Thinking and Self-voice in College English as a Foreign Language Writing Classrooms. *English Language Teaching.* 4. 10.
- Bell, D. M. (2010). Cancellative discourse markers: A core/ periphery approach. *Pragmatics*, 8(4), 515-54.
- Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and linguistic meaning: The semantic and pragmatics of DMs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blakemore, Diane (2006). "Discourse Markers". In: Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward, eds. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing. 221–240
- Boersma, P., & Weenink, D. (2018). Praat: doing phonetics by computer [Computer program]. Version 6.0. 37. Retrieved February, 3, 2021.
- Brinton, L. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English. Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Burrows, C. (2008). Socio-cultural barriers facing TBL in Japan. *The Language Teacher*, 32(8), 15-19.
- Buysse, L. (2012). So as a multifunctional discourse marker in native and learner speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 44. 1764–1782.
- Carless, D. (2009). Revisiting the TBLT versus P-P-P debate: Voices from Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of English Language teaching*, 19, 49–66.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1995). Grammar and the spoken language. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 141-158.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1997). *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. (2006) *Cambridge grammar of English: A comprehensive guide to spoken and written English grammar and usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castele, A. and Kim C. (2013). The use of discourse markers in Spanish language learners' written compositions. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 95.550- 556.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Cook, G. (1990). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Cots, J. M. (1996). Bringing discourse analysis into the language classroom. *Links & Letters*, 3, 77–101
- Cotter, C. (1996). Engaging the reader: the changing use of connectives in newspaper discourse. In J. Arnold, R.

- Blake, B. Davidson, S. Schwenter, and J. Solomon (eds), *Sociolinguistic Variation: Data, Theory and Analysis*. Stanford University: CSLI Publications, pp. 263–78.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1988). Another look at, well, you know ... . *English Today*, 4(1), 47-49.
- CUENCA, M. (2008), «Pragmatic markers in contrast: The case of well», *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(8): 1373-1391.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (Ed.). (2007a). *Practice in a Second Language. Perspectives from Applied Linguistics and Cognitive Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deng, D. (2021). Acquisition of English Discourse Markers by Chinese L1 Speakers Learning English in the US: Frequency and Social impact. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, Vol 22, 1-16
- Dina, N. and Fatmawati. THE APPROPRIACY OF DISCOURSE MARKERS USED IN PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT STUDENTS' CONVERSATIONS. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Missio, Volume 11(Nomor 2). 179-316*
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2001b). Investigating Form-Focused Instruction. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Learning* (pp. 1—46). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. (2002). Grammar Teaching – Practice or Consciousness-Raising? In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 167—174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erman, Britt. 2001. Pragmatic markers revisited with a focus on you know in adult and adolescent talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1337-1359.
- Fischer, K. (2006). *Approaches to discourse particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language Studies*, 14(3), 383-395.
- Fox, T. (1995) The effects of false starts and repetitions on the processing of subsequent words in spontaneous speech. *Journal of Memory and Language* 34: 709–738
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are Discourse Markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 931—952.
- Fuller, J. (2003). The influence of speaker roles on discourse marker use. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 23-45.
- Fung, L. & Carter, R. (2007). Discourse Markers and Spoken English: Native and Learner Use in Pedagogic Settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 410 - 439.
- Granger, S., Dagneaux, E., Meunier, F. & Paquot, M. (2009). The International Corpus of Learner English. Version 2. Handbook and CD-ROM. Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses Universitaires de Louvain.
- Greasley, P. (1994) 'An Investigation into the Use of the Particle Well: Commentaries on a Game of Snooker', *Journal of Pragmatics* 22: 477-94.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. H., 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hama, P. and Farooq, H. (2018). Adversative DMs in Kurdish Literary Texts. *English Language Teaching*; 12 (1) 2019.

- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hasan, H. and Seyyedi, K (2020). Additive DMs in English Journal Articles written by Kurdish and English native speakers: A corpus-based study. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT)*, 3 (1). DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2020.3.1.7
- Hasselgreen, A. (2005). Assessing the language of young learners. *Language Testing*, 22. 337-354.
- Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Henandez, T. (2008). The Effect of Explicit instruction and Input Flood on Students' Use of Spanish Discourse Markers on a Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview. *Hispania*, 19(3), 665—675.
- Huang, L. F. (2011). Discourse markers in spoken English: A corpus study of native speakers and Chinese non-native speakers. The University of Birmingham
- Jones, C. & Carter, R. (2013). Teaching spoken discourse markers explicitly: A comparison of III and PPP. *International Journal of English Studies*, 14 (1), 37-54.
- Jucker, A., & Ziv, Y. (Eds.). (1998). *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Koike, D. (1996) Functions of the adverbial *ya* in Spanish narrative discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(2), 267–80.
- Lai, C., & Zhao, Y. (2006). Noticing and Text-Based Chat. *Language Learning and Technology*, 10(3), 102—120.
- Lam, Phoenix. W. Y. 2009. What a difference the prosody makes: the role of prosody in the study of discourse particles. In Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Nicole Deh' e, and Anne Wichmann, eds. *Where Prosody Meets Pragmatics*. Bingley: Emerald, pp. 107–26
- Lapadat, J. (2000). Problematizing transcription: Purpose, paradigm and quality. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3 (3), 203-219.
- Lee-Goldman, R. (2011). *No* as a discourse marker. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(10), 2627–2649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.03.011>
- Leow, R. P. (1997). Attention, Awareness and Foreign Language Behaviour. *Language Learning*, 47(3), 467—506.
- Lewis, M. (1993) *The Lexical Approach: The state of ELT and the way forward*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
- Lindgren, E., & Sullivan, K. (2003). Stimulated Recall as a Trigger for Increasing Noticing and Language Awareness in the L2 Writing Classroom: A Case Study of Two Young Female Writers. *Language Awareness*, 12(3 & 4), 172—186.
- Lindsay, C., & Knight, P. (2006). *Learning and Teaching English. A Course for Teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Macaulay, R. (2002). “You know, it depends”. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 749–767.
- Majeed, F. (2015). The Problems of Using DMs in Kurdish EFL Undergraduate Students' Essays. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*; 3(4): 230-238.
- Maschler, Y. (1994). Metalanguaging and Discourse Markers in Bilingual Conversation. *Language in Society* 23 (3), 325–366
- Maschler, Y. (1998). ‘Rotse’ lishmoa ke’ ta? ‘Wanna hear something weird/funny?’ [lit. a segment’]?: The

- Discourse Markers Segmenting Israeli Hebrew Talk-in-action'. In A. H. Jucker and Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (1995). Spoken grammar: What is it and how can we teach it?. *ELT Journal*, 49(3), 207-218.
- McCarthy, M. (1998). *Spoken language and applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2001). Ten Criteria for a Spoken Grammar. In E. Hinkel, & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Grammar teaching in Second Language Classrooms* (pp. 51–75). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Min, S. (2011). A corpus-based analysis of EFL learners' use of discourse markers in cross-cultural communication. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 16(4), 177-194.
- Mukherjee, J. (2009). The grammar of conversation in advanced spoken learner English: Learner corpus data and language-pedagogical implications. In *Corpora and Language Teaching*, edited by Karin Aijmer, 203-230. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 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 (6), 1157-1182.
- Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non- native English discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Muslim, B. (2019). The Effect of Teaching Structural DMs in an EFL Classroom Setting. *English Language Teaching*, 9 (7).
- Nookam, W. (2010). Thai EFL learners' use of discourse markers in English conversation: A study of business English students at Didyasarin International College (Unpublished master's thesis). Prince of Songkla University, Thailand.
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2001). Does type of instruction make a difference? substantive findings from a meta-analytic review. *Language Learning*, 51, 157–213.
- Nunan, D. (2005). Classroom Research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 225-240). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Okati, F., & Ghasedi, P. (2017). *Applied Discourse Markers in Casual Conversations of Male Students in Dormitory Settings and Their Pedagogical Implications for EFL: An Iranian Case Study*.
- Olshtain, E., & Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 707–724). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc
- Östman, J. (1981). *You know: A Discourse-Functional Approach* [Vol. II:7: Pragmatics & Beyond]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Prodromou, L. (2008). *English as a Lingua Franca: A Corpus-Based Analysis*. London: Continuum. *QSR International*. (2011). Retrieved March 22, 2022, from [http://www.qsrinternational.com/#tab\\_you](http://www.qsrinternational.com/#tab_you)
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. London:

Cambridge University Press.

Rosa, E., & O'Neill, M. (1999). Explicitness, Intake and the Issue of Awareness: Another Piece to the Puzzle.

*Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(4), 511—566.

ŞAHİN, A. (2021). Discourse Markers in Learner Speech: A Corpus Based Comparative Study. *Journal of Language Education and Research*, 7(1), 1-16.

Sato, R. (2009). Suggestions for creating approaches suitable to the Japanese EFL environment. *The Language Teacher*, 33(9), 11-14.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair

in conversation. *Language*, 5(3), 361-381.

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

Schourup, L. (1999). Discourse Markers. *Lingua*, 107, 227-265.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841\(96\)90026-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(96)90026-1)

Schourup, L. (2001). Rethinking well. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 1025-1060

Schourup, L. (2011). The discourse marker now: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Fuel and Energy Abstracts*. 43. 2110-2129.

Scrivener, J. (1996). ARC: A descriptive model for classroom work on language. In J. Willis, & D. Willis, (eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 79-92). Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann English Language Teaching.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Shekary, M., & Tahririan, M. H. (2006). Negotiation of Meaning and Noticing in Text-Based Online Chat. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 557—573.

Skehan, P. (1996). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis & D. Willis

(Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 17–30). Oxford: Heinemann.

Skehan, P. (2003). Task-based instruction. *Language Teaching*, 36, 1–14.

Sujarwati, I. (2017). An Investigation of Interactivity Function of Discourse Markers used by Non-Native

English Speakers in a Casual Conversation. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*. Vol 10 (1), 72-87

Svartvik, J. (1980). “Well in conversation”. In S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik (Eds.),

Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar*. Harlow: Longman.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *Beyond the sentence*. Macmillan Publishers Limited Tomlison, B. (ed.). 1998. Materials

development in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Timmis, I. (2005). Towards a Framework for Teaching Spoken Grammar. *ELT Journal*, 59(2), 117—125.

Timmis, I. (2012). Spoken language research and ELT: Where are we now?. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 514-522.

Ur, P. (1996) *A course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Input Processing and Second Language Acquisition. *The Modern*

*Language Journal*, 77(1), 45—57

Willis, D. (1990). *The lexical syllabus: A new approach to language teaching*. London: Collins COBUILD.

- Wong, H., & Van Patten, B. (2003). The best English: A claim for the superiority of received standard English. *Society for Pure English*, 39, 603-21.
- Yoshimi, D. R. (2001). Explicit Instruction and JFL Learners' Use of Interactional Discourse Markers. In K. R. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 223—244). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.