

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

2.0 Introduction

This chapter provides the context of the literature review that is relevant to this study. Also, in this chapter, it is planned to identify literature sources and set out relevant titles in the hope of making a clear focus on the intended study area. Such as; the definitions of the terms discourse and discourse markers, what are the elements of discourse, and what types of discourse markers? Then, it sheds some lights on listening comprehension of spoken discourse in EFL classes. Moreover, the literature review of this study deals with two central concerns; discourse markers (DMs) and studies on how discourse markers enhance EFL learners' listening comprehension of the lectures. Finally, the study gives some previous studies of other studies which are relevant to the subject matter of this study.

Part One

2.1 Conceptual Framework of the Study

2.1.1 What is Discourse?

The term 'discourse' has taken various, sometimes very broad meanings in order to be specified in the real sense when it is introduced to modern sciences. Originally, the word 'discourse' comes from Latin '*discursus*' which means 'conversation or speech'. However, Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary defined the word "*discourse*" as along and serious treatment or discussion of a subject in speech or writing. Whereas, in Longman dictionary of the English language, (1984) it is a conversation, especially of a formal nature; formal and orderly expression of ideas in speech or writing.

In addition to the above mentioned definitions, the term discourse is explained in Collins Concise English Dictionary, (1988) as follows;

- a. Verbal communication; talk, conversation.
- b. A formal treatment of a subject in speech or writing.
- c. A unit of text used by linguists for the analysis of linguistic phenomena that range over more than one sentence.
- d. To discourse on/upon: to speak or write about formally.
- e. To hold a discussion.

Frances and Carol, (2002) define the term “Discourse” as the way, in which language is used socially to convey broad historical meanings. Also, it is language identified by the social conditions of its use, by who is using it and under what conditions. Frances and Carol add that language can never be 'neutral' because it bridges our personal and social worlds.

The researcher has noticed that, the above definitions reflect general usage of the term ‘discourse’ which is related to conversation or giving a speech. Nevertheless, this fact is defined by many other authors about the core meaning of the term discourse is ‘speech’. So, the term discourse marker is used as an academic technique in this study in terms of facilitating the delivering of lectures in EFL classes.

During the 1960s the general meaning of the term “discourse”, it was philosophical meaning and a new set of more theoretical meanings then, it began to diverge gradually in a variety of disciplines; such as; critical theory, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, social psychology, and many other fields. It is used widely in analyzing literary and non-literary texts and it is often employed to signal a certain theoretical sophistication in ways which are vague and

sometimes diverted. Thus, the term discourse occurs more significantly in trying to determine the accurate meaning of it.

Sara Mills, (2004) tried to narrow down the varieties of possible meanings of the term discourse and created academic boundaries which distinguish the various meanings of such term. She explained that, when linguists talk of a “discourse of advertising” they are clearly referring to something different to a social psychologist who talks of a “discourse of racism”. As a result, there are different ways of tracing the meaning of discourse in different fields to have a sense in its own logic, in linguistic field is made by Geoffrey Leech and Michael cited in Hawthorn, (1992: 189) argue that:

Discourse is linguistic communication seen as a transaction between speaker and hearer, as an interpersonal activity whose form is determined by its social purpose. Text is linguistic communication (either spoken or written) seen simply as a message coded in its auditory or visual medium.

In the above quotation the term discourse used as contract between the speaker and hearer in a social context, in this respect, the researcher uses such term in classroom contexts to this study, in which lecturers and learners engage in a communication for educational purposes.

2.1.2 Types of Discourse

According to many authors views the term discourse is not only difficult to define, but it is complex to make a clear cut division of it. Thus, linguists have distinguished various kinds of communicative products. Generally, discourse might be characterized as a class of either written or spoken text. In this respect, there are many ways to classify the term “discourse”:

- According to whether it is *written or spoken*
- According to the *register* (level of formality)

- According to the *genre* (communicative purpose, style, audience)
- According to whether it is *monologue* (one speaker/writer produces an entire discourse)/ or *dialogic/ multiparty* (two/more participants interact/ construct discourse together).

The researcher sees that, all of the above mentioned classifications of the term “discourse” influence the relation between the speaker and the hearer. Therefore, in this regard the spoken discourse will be the type of interest to the present study.

2.1.2.1 Spoken Discourse

Historically, languages were first found in spoken form. Then, they were formulated in written type. However, many languages do not have a written form, and many people cannot read or write. Likewise, when children can acquire spoken language innately, they have to learn written form at schools. Therefore, discourse analysts study the oral and written styles in different perspectives. Aaron, (1998:3) mentions that “spoken language relies heavily on prosody (pitch, pause, tempo, voice quality, rhythm, etc.) and body language for deixis respects, inters propositional relations, and so on”. Aaron adds that, spoken language is the most commonly an interactive, face –to –face process, in which meanings are often created by referring to the shared knowledge or by understanding based on context or because what is referred to, is physically and visually presented before the speakers. Spoken language often looks chaotic and unorganized. However, speakers do not need to organize their discourse rather, they need to preface what they are going to say and reflect back upon what they have said.

Crystal, (1995) and Dakowaka, (2001) claim that the spoken discourse takes the advantage of extra- linguistics signals as grimaces, gesticulation, expressions such as ‘her’, ‘now’, or ‘this’ are used. Also, employment of nonsense vocabulary, slang and contracted forms (we’re, you’ve) are another

features of spoken discourse. Moreover, there are others features like; rhythm, intonation, speed of uttering, and inability to conceal mistakes made while speaking.

2.1.2.2 Written Discourse

Francis, (2006) has explained the written discourse by claiming that there is no common patio- temporal ground between the writer and their reader(s). Since this is the case, and since inevitably there will be little or no opportunity to use non-verbal signals, the used text will need to be relatively explicit, since the textual input is confined to the verbal content in conjunction with punctuation and various graphic devices. The much greater availability in principle of planning time, allows the writers to review and to amend their written production. Michael McCarthy, (1992) adds that; in written texts, some of the problems associated with spoken transcripts are absent. The writer usually has time to think about what to say and how to say it, and the sentences are usually well formed in a way that the utterances of natural, spontaneous talk are not. But the overall that, what norms or rules do people adhere to when creating written texts? Are texts structured according to recurring principles, is there a hierarchy of units comparable to acts, moves and exchanges, and are there conventional ways of opening and closing texts?

The researcher sees that the questions of McCarthy are answered briefly by Widdoson, (2007:7) who explained that the written text or discourse as, it is typically designed and recorded unilaterally in the act of production by the writer as a completed expression of the intended message should be in terms of the occupied completion.

2.1.2.3 Spoken Discourse versus Written Discourse

The differences between spoken and written language have specific applicability to many types of practical linguistic works. For example, in comparing cohesion and coherence of a language, one cannot use both oral and written style simultaneously. So, each style has its own characteristics; they are different text types and consequently different discourses. Biber, (1988) suggests that written and spoken discourses in English do not have single absolute differences. These variations are as a result of different texts and genres. They can be mixed with each other in settings where spoken language occurs in the form of written language in emails or informal letters.

Woods, (2006) suggests that, discourse analysis includes spoken, written, and sign language. Although both written and oral language are kinds of social acts and what is applicable to oral speech is also applicable to written language. The most important difference between the two discourses is that, in oral style the discourse act occurs when language users are face to face, and this interaction is established by turn-taking, and generally the speakers react to what the previous speaker had said. Paltridge, (2006) has classified the differences between spoken and written English into eight important aspects, namely these are; grammatical intricacy, lexical density, nominalization, explicitness, contextualization, spontaneity, repetition- hesitation and redundancy, and continuum view. Halliday, (1989) and Tanen, (1982) claim that, spoken language is dependent on a shared background knowledge or context that is needed for a reasonable interpretation. Conversely, written discourse does not depend on a shared background.

2.1.3 Discourse in the Mainstream of Linguistics

For many theorists within mainstream of linguistics, like Brown and Yule, (1983) who see that, the term discourse signifies a turning away from sentences

as in the way that language is structured as a system to concern with language in use. While for others, such as Sinclair and Coulthard, (1975) and Carter and Simpson, (1989) discourse implies a concern with the length of the text or utterance. Thus, discourse is an extended piece of text which has some form of internal organization, coherence or cohesion. For many other mainstream linguists, the term discourse is defined by the context of occurrence of certain utterances (the discourse of religion, the discourse of advertising). These contexts of production of texts will determine the internal constituents of the specific texts produced. In this regard, David Crystal's attempt is to pin down the meaning of discourse within linguistics, by contrasting to the use of the term discourse. Crystal, (1987: 116) states that:

Discourse analysis focuses on the structure of naturally occurring spoken language, as found in such 'discourses' as conversations, interviews, commentaries, and speeches. Text analysis focuses on the structure of written language, as found in such .texts. as essays, notices, road signs, and chapters. But this distinction is not clear-cut, and there have been many other uses of these labels. In particular, 'discourse'. and 'text' can be used in a much broader sense to include all language units with a definable communicative function, whether spoken or written. Some scholars talk about 'spoken or written discourse'; others about .spoken or written text.

The researcher sees that, Crystal's attempt in narrowing down the meaning of discourse within linguistics ordinary is not only used for the purpose of communication to transfer ideas or information from one person to the other whether it is in the spoken or the written form, but there are other functions to include all language units. Therefore, the most straightforward definition of *discourse* is the one often found in textbooks for students of linguistics: *'language above the sentence'*. Of course, that is not at all straightforward unless

there will be a kind of understanding basic assumptions in linguistics, because linguists treat language as a ‘*system of systems*’, with each system having its own characteristic forms of structure or organization. For instance, the sound system of a language (its phonology) does not have the same kinds of units, or the same rules for combining them, as the grammatical system of that language. As the unit gets larger (e.g. words are larger than sounds and sentences are larger than words), it metaphorically moves ‘up’ from one level of organization to the next.

2.1.4 Discourse Analysis

According to Carter, (1993:23) “Discourse analysis” is a primarily linguistic study examining the use of language by its native population whose major concern is investigating language functions along with its forms, whether it is produced either spoken or written. Moreover, identification of linguistic qualities of various genres, are vital for their recognition and interpretation, together with cultural and social aspects which support its comprehension. Therefore, the field discourse analysis is a vast and ambiguous field to be investigated. Schiffrin, (1996) has considered two recent quotations. The first one by Brown and Yule (1983: 1) who state that:

the analysis of discourse, is necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs.

The Second definition is by Stubbs, (1983: 1) who states that discourse analysis consists of:

attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts. It follows that discourse

analysis is also concerned with language in use in social contexts, and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers.

Schiffrin, (1996) explains that, Brown and Yule emphasize a particular perspective toward language (functional versus structural) which is tied to a focus on *parole* versus *langue*. Whereas, Stubbs' emphasis on a particular unit of analysis ('above the sentence') that leads him toward a similar pragmatic emphasis on 'language in use'. The authors then observe a definitional problem similar to the one noted above, such as; Brown and Yule, (1983: viii) who observe that the term discourse analysis;

has come to be used with a wide range of meanings which cover a wide range of activities. It is used to describe activities at the intersection of disciplines as diverse as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, philosophical linguistics and computational linguistics.

Discourse analysis can be characterized as the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used. Crystal, (1992:25) defines discourse as, 'a continuous stretch of language larger than a sentence, often constituting a coherent unit'. In practical terms, it centers on the actual operation of language, beyond the restrictions of grammar. Its overriding focus is on context and on the behavioral patterns that structure the social functions of a language, above and beyond the construction of structural models.

Recently, discourse analysis is carried out on classroom language, i.e. the language used in the classroom contexts. It analyses teachers' classroom language to see the effectiveness of classroom language and how could the use of discourse analysis help in the process of teaching and learning as in this study which deals with one of the main features of discourse analysis namely, "discourse markers".

2.1.4.1 Discourse Analysis and the Roles of Discourse Markers

Discourse markers have significant role in making the text cohesive and more clarity. Hans Guth, (1980:49) points out: “*Apt transitional phrases help the reader move smoothly from one point to the next.*” Also, as Sloan, (1986:168) suggests, “*In order to avoid the unclarity of the discourse, discourse markers must be used especially in scientific papers which are characterized by so many logical analyses and arguments.*” Hence in scientific papers, readers can often see various discourse markers in almost each and every paragraph. So, macro-markers differ from micro-markers in their features and effects. Macro-markers help the reader better understand the macro structure of a text by revealing the major information contained in the text and the arrangement of that information. Whereas micro-markers type assist the reader in discerning the links between sentences within a text. As micro-markers help to reveal the internal relationship within transitional units or between sentences, the reader will find it easy to grasp the discourse efficiently. However, even though relational signals sometimes lie within transitional units already, micro-markers are still needed. Under certain circumstances the absence or omission of micro-markers may create ambiguity that can lead the reader to the misunderstanding or misreading. The following example is cited below to explain the importance of micro-markers.

"He was an unqualified doctor. HOWEVER, he was assigned to study medicine at a medical university for three years." If "However" is removed, readers may consider the relationship between the two sentences as "cause and effect", and then they may think that the doctor was thus sent to get more training at a medical university because he was unqualified at the moment. In fact, this sentence means that though the doctor was unqualified, others had to trust him with the thought that he studied medicine in any case.

Sloan, (1986:175) states that, the second rule of micro-markers is to act as fillers to allow readers to have a pause and to catch their breaths before plunging into the next thought. As Sloan says, "The written language, an outgrowth of speech, should also allow for the momentary suspension of thought." On the other hand, Schiffrin,(1988:9) suggests that, "Cohesive devices do not themselves create meaning; they are clues used by speakers and hearers to find the meanings which underlie surface utterances." And discourse markers are the most commonly used cohesive devices. Then, how do readers manage to use these clues to find the meanings underlying surface writing? In this respect the present study is going to trace relationships between listening comprehension processes and the use of discourse markers in Sudanese university level.

2.1.5. Definition of Markers

The word 'marker' in Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary, (2016) is an object or sign that shows the position of something. Moreover, Schiffrin (1987:31) explained the definitions of markers in three different concepts firstly, markers as sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk rather than a more finely unit such as sentence, proposition, and speech act, or tone voice. Secondly, markers as brackets or devices which are both cataphoric and anaphoric whether they are initial or terminal position. Thirdly, markers as sequential dependence.

2.1.5.1 Markers as Units of Talk

Schiffrin, (1987) defined units of speech for their structural relations with other units, their cohesive relations, or interactional relations. Her claim is that, because there are many units of talk which influence the use of markers, such as a syntactic unit. Although, markers often precede sentences, i.e. syntactic configurations of an independent clause plus all clauses dependent on it, they are independent of sentential structure. Though, removal of markers from its sentence initial position leaves the sentence structure intact. Furthermore, several

markers like – *y’know, I mean, oh*, can occur quite freely within a sentence at locations which are very difficult to be defined syntactically.

Another reason for the sentence as the unit of talk is that, sentences are not the unit most relevant to understanding language use and social interaction. It is well known, for example, that speech acts can be realized through a variety of sentence structures; a request can be enacted through a declarative sentence (the door should be closed) or an interrogative sentence (close the door). Goodwin, (1981) goes so far to propose that sentences themselves are internationally constructed; his argument based on the ways in which conversationalists use verbal and nonverbal signals to negotiate syntactical boundaries.

Defining markers relative to propositions reflect other problems such as many occurrences of markers would be excluded and also considered as propositional modifiers, or only in relation to propositional meaning. The casual conjunction *because*, for example; is regularly used as a link between speech act and a reason for performance of the act. Schiffrin (1987:33) claims that, basing definition of markers on speech act, or tone voice is also problematic. In terms of all units of language use are coterminous; speech acts are sometimes accomplished in less than a sentence, in a single sentence. Whereas, tone voice or a utterance according to Harris, (1951:14) utterance is ‘*any stretch of talk by one person*’ before and after which there is silence on the part of the person. To Harris this definition could vary in size, structural complexity, propositional content, and so on, since the only defining feature was surrounding silence.

2.1.5. 2 Markers as Brackets

Goffman and etal, (1971) state that markers as brackets at the level of social organization function in ratifying the participants’ identities and establishing the rules and procedures to be followed during un upcoming period of increased access of participants to one another. However, Schiffrin, (1980)

claims that markers as brackets do not work only at different social organization levels, but at different levels of the organization of talk. Meta-linguistic brackets, for instance, can mark discourse units as long as conversation or as short as a word; they can mark units embedded within larger units, e.g. reason with explanations, or answers within question /answer pairs. Furthermore, Snakoff and Brown, (1976) see that, brackets which begin as part of the organizational apparatus of discourse can work their way into the grammar of language where their bracketing function continues on both a discourse and sentence level.

2.1. 5. 3 Markers as Sequential Dependence

The term sequential dependence is used to indicate that markers are devices that work on a discourse level. According to Stubbs, (1983) markers are not dependent on the smaller units of talk of which discourse is composed; his justification is that elements such as particles, adverbs, and connectors cannot be accounted for by explanations which draw solely upon syntactic characteristics of upcoming sentences. Furthermore, the distribution of other elements, such as the marker '*Firstly*' as well as sentence adverbs like '*frankly*' can be constrained only by discourse and pragmatics facts. Finally, elements such as; "*well now right, you know*", make no syntactic predictions although, they do allow some predictions about discourse content. Therefore, when speakers use such markers in their speeches, however, these markers work as independent words or phrases in the discourse contents, rather they facilitate the speech.

2.1.6 Discourse Markers

According to Redeker, (1991) discourse markers traditionally, are restricted only to speech, as is illustrated in the following definitions; Goldberg, (1980) defines DMs as linguistic expressions that is used to signal the relation of an utterance to the immediate context with the primary function of bringing to listener's attention a particular kind of the upcoming utterance with the

immediate discourse context. Whereas, Keller, (1979) his definition of discourse markers is marking devices which display the speaker's understanding of the contribution's sequential relationship or relevance to the information set as established by the immediately preceding contribution. While Erman, (1986) put it like; certain set of signals in the conversationalist's speech, used to introduce level shifts within the conversation, or to prepare listeners for the next run in the logical argument expressions which help the speaker divides his message into chunks of information and hence they also help the listener in the process of decoding these information units. It is obvious that, most of the above -mentioned definitions confine DMs only to spoken language.

Accordingly, the term discourse marker is used to maintain and achieve conversational continuity. Also it is seen as responsive signals and essentially interactive to express the relation or relevance of an utterance to the preceding utterance or to the context. However, as the view about DMs is gradually broadened, discourse markers also include more and more items in written language. Vande Kopple, (1985) points out that, discourse markers are a kind of linguistic items which appear both in spoken and written language and are those items which can help the reader and the listeners organize, interpret and evaluate the information. According to him, the researcher works on the level of spoken language. When the information convey about the subject matter to show the listener how to listen to react, and to evaluate what was spoken about the subject matter. It is usual to find sequences of two or more sentences serving discourse marker purpose, especially in introductions and conclusions to academic texts. Therefore, in this prescription discourse markers are as inclusive as involving many language forms, that is words, phrases and clauses. Lenkl and eatal, (1998) agreed that DMs bear the characteristics of being oral and multifunctional which have common characteristics such as in syntax. DMs can be placed at any

position that fits into the utterance. In most cases, however, it is common to find DMs in turn-initial position to signal upcoming information.

2.1.7 Discourse Markers; *Terminology and Definition*

In many studies of particles and discourse markers across languages: terminology, definition, and classification they are inextricably linked. Therefore, that will be discussed together below by different authors.

2.1.7.1 The Terminology

First, how to call words that, rather than modifying propositional content, mainly have pragmatic functions? Many scholars point to this problem of terminology, noting that many different terms are used for roughly the same group of words in several languages. The term “discourse marker” is the most well-known and frequently used, but many other terms exist. The four most frequent terms are “discourse marker”, “pragmatic marker”, “discourse particle”, and “pragmatic particle.” The important terminological distinctions, then, are between “marker” and “particle,” and between “discourse” and “pragmatic.”

There are many scholars use “marker” and “particle” in different ways: they may refer to the same class of words, to two different possibly overlapping classes, or to a class and its subclass. For example, Jucker and Ziv, (1998:2) see “discourse marker” as an umbrella term, including “discourse particles” as a subclass. Hölker, (1990:81) and Andersen and Fretheim, (2000:1) also consider “marker” to be a broader term than “(pragmatic) particle.” In contrast Lenk, (1998:1) claims that, “discourse markers” are a subgroup of particles. Whereas, Schourup, (1999:229) and Fischer (2006:4) among others, argue that “particle” concerns the form and syntactic behavior of the words, whereas “marker” is a functional term. Particles are small, uninflected words that are only loosely integrated into the sentence structure, or not at all.

As for the difference between “discourse” and “pragmatic,” choosing one or the other often has theoretical and methodological implications. Scholars who speak of “discourse markers” tend to consider these words as primarily playing a role in coherence. Whereas, those who use the term “pragmatic markers” often focus on how they constrain a hearers or readers inferential processes in utterance interpretation. Notably, Andersen and Fretheim, (2000:2-3) claim that, the term “discourse marker” implies that the words in question have textual functions only, and that the methodology is confined to corpus research. As a result they adopt the term “pragmatic marker,” which they consider more neutral. Lenk, (1997:1) writes that, studies of pragmatic markers focus more on interactional aspects between participants than studies of discourse markers, which tend to investigate the structural organization of discourse.

2.1.7.2 The definition

In Cambridge Dictionary online, Discourse markers are words or phrases like *anyway, right, okay, as I say, to begin with*. These words are used to connect, organize and manage what is said or written and to express the users’ attitude of such words.

For example [friends are talking]

A: *So*, I’ve decided I’m going to go to the bank and ask for a car loan.

B: That sounds like a good idea.

C: *Well*, you need a car.

B: *Right*.

A: *Anyway*, I was wondering if either of you would teach me how to drive.

The discourse markers in the above example have a number of uses: ‘*so*’ marks the beginning of a new part of the conversation. ‘*Well*’ marks a change in the focus (from getting a car loan to needing a car). ‘*Right*’ marks a response (B is agreeing with C). ‘*Anyway*’ marks a shift in topic (from buying a new car to

having driving lessons) for the different uses of discourse markers. Carter and McCarthy (2006:208) state that;

Discourse markers are words and phrases which function to link segments of the discourse to one another in ways which reflect choices of monitoring, organisation and management exercised by the speaker. The most common discourse markers in everyday informal spoken language are single words such as anyway, cos, fine, good, great, like, now, oh, okay, right, so, well, and phrasal and clausal items such as you know, I mean, as I say, for a start, mind you”.

It is clear that, Carter and McCarthy have explained the term discourse markers in a way which control the speaker's speech and signal his/her speech in an informal conversation. Accordingly, such function of discourse markers can be used in a formal situation in EFL classes to facilitate the comprehension of the lecturers' speech. Moreover, Stenström, (1994: 13) defines DMs as textual devices used to organize and hold turns and to mark boundaries in a discourse as suggested by Schiffrin (1987: 31), that DMs are sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk which are drawn principally from grammatical classes such as conjunctions, adverbs, prepositional phrases, minor clauses and interjections, DMs are uttered with the primary function of bringing to the listener's attention a particular kind of linkage of the upcoming utterance with the immediate discourse context. Redeker, (1991 :1168) explained that DMs as; they have a core meaning, which is procedural, not conceptual, and their more specific interpretation is negotiated by the context.

2.1.8 Discourse Markers in Different Implies and Approaches

Discourse markers have been basically studied by many researchers and they are still focusing their interest in such discourse area. Nevertheless, the term discourse marker has aroused some discussion in understanding what the term

discourse marker implies or refers to. On the other hand, researchers may come about an agreement on the underlying concept of discourse markers, but they use different names to refer to the same concept. Thus, it is found in Knott and Dale, (1994) as cue phrases discourse connectives, to Redeker, (1990) as discourse signaling devices, to Polanyi and Scha, (1983) like pragmatic connectives, and to Schiffrin and et al (1987) as pragmatic markers which will be the center of attention in this study.

As regards, the theoretical status of discourse markers in this study focus on what they are, what they mean, and what functions they manifest. For more illustration to this point there will be a reviewing of two works that have been of great impact in the field of discourse markers. The first approach is the work undergone by Schiffrin, (1987) who studied elements which mark “sequentially-dependent units of discourse”. The second approach is the one that defined by Fraser, (1999) who approached discourse markers from solely a grammatical-pragmatic perspective.

2.1.8.1 Schiffrin’s Approach (1987)

Schiffrin, (1987: 326) in her book “*Discourse Markers*” has concerned with the ways in which Discourse Markers (DMs) function to “add to discourse coherence” Schiffrin, (1987: 24) maintains that coherence is constructed through relations between adjacent units in discourse. She basically sees DMs as serving an integrative function in discourse and therefore contributing to discourse coherence. In her approach also points out to the different nature of DMs, while some DMs relate only the semantic reality (the facts) of the two clauses, others, including ‘so, may’ relate clauses on a logical (epistemic) level and/ or speech act (pragmatic) level.

In Schiffrin’s view discourse markers have both semantic and pragmatic meaning. This idea differs from Chadron and Richard’s (1986) definition of

DMs, who argue that DMs simply indicate problems of on-line discourse production, that is, they act as filled pauses in order to give the speaker time to organise his/ her thoughts, and to give the listener time to process the spoken signal. However, Chaudron and Richard's (1986) do not attribute DMs signposting relations between different parts of the discourse. Schiffrin was aware of the limitations of her research since she analyzed only eleven expressions in the first instance, namely; *and, because, but, I mean, now, oh, so, then, well, and y'know*, as they occur in unstructured interview conversations. She clarifies that "except for "oh" and "well"...all the markers she has described have meanings", which are called 'core meaning' (Schiffrin, 1987: 314). Later, she suggests other categories to be considered as DMs and that were not taken into consideration in her study in a first stage. These are perception verbs such as *see, look, and listen*, deictics such as *here and there*, interjections such as *gosh and boy*, meta-talk such as '*what I mean*' and quantifier phrases such as *anyway or anyhow* (1987: 328). In any case, this study is relevant to Schiffrin's research on DMs that has been particularly relevant in the field of discourse studies and extremely influential in the spoken discourse of ordinary conversation. Another study within the same approach is that of Redeker (1990, 1991), who quotes a 'discourse operator' (1991: 1168) as:

[...] a word or phrase that is uttered with the primary function of bringing to the listener's attention a particular kind of linkage of the upcoming utterance with the immediate discourse context. An utterance in this definition is an intonationally and structurally bounded, usually casual unit.

It is noticed that, Redeker has proposed a revised model of discourse coherence based on three components: Ideational Structure, Rhetorical Structure and Sequential Structure. Redeker (1991: 1170) points out that, "any utterance in a discourse is then considered to always participate in the above three

components, but one will usually dominate and suggest itself as the more relevant linkage of this utterance to its context”. Then Redeker revises Schiffrin’s notion of ‘core meaning’ and expands on this by suggesting that “the core meaning should specify the marker’s intrinsic contribution to the semantic representation that will constrain the contextual interpretation of the utterance”.

2.1.8.2 Fraser’s Approach (1999)

Fraser (1999) thinks that, Discourse markers can be defined as “a class of lexical expressions drawn primarily from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositional phrases which signal a relationship between the interpretations of the segment they produce”. Distinguishing discourse markers from whether they refer to a textual segment between sentences or discourse segment in structure. Fraser, (1999. 946) categorized DMs as follows:

1) Discourse markers which relate messages

- a. contrastive markers: though, but, contrary to this/that, conversely.. etc.
- b. collateral markers: above all, also, besides, I mean, in addition.. etc.
- c. inferential markers: accordingly, as a result, so, therefore, thus... etc.
- d. additional subclass: after all, since, because.

2) Discourse markers which relate topics

E.g. back to my original point, before I forget, by the way.... etc.

The researcher thinks that, Schiffrin, (1987) and Fraser, (1999) are the most quoted scholars in the study of discourse markers. The two ideas resort to a descriptive framework of DMs’ linguistic entity rather than function. There are also other possible labels resulting from different research perspectives, including lexical markers, discourse particles, utterance particles, semantic conjuncts, continuatives and so on.

As a result, Fung and Carter, (2007) state that, there are different discourse markers are used in speaking and writing. In spoken conversation, the frequency

and amount of discourse markers that people use is significant compared with other word forms as one important element that constitutes and organizes conversation? Schiffrin (1987) , Maschler, (1998) and Fraser, (1999) see that “Discourse Markers” not only have grammatical functions but also work as effective interactional features. Jucker and Smith, (1998) add that one way to evaluate how information is processed and transferred in talk is to rely on DMs. The terminology of DMs, however, has never reached an agreement due to different research perspectives (Jucker and Ziv, 1998; Fraser, 1999; Frank-Job, 2006; Cohen, 2007; Han, 2008). DMs have been defined as sentence connectives from a systemic functional grammar perspective (Schiffrin, 1987; Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Cohen, 2007), and also as pragmatic markers (Fraser, 1999) from a grammatical-pragmatic view.

2.1.9 Semantic Discourse Markers

Moore and Carling, (1982:161) say that, there are many researchers, however take a more comprehensive view of the role of semantic instructions rather than directly representing real world phenomena and concepts. Even content words such as nouns or verbs function in the first instance as processing instructions to the hearer. On this view, utterances do not convey meaning in and of themselves, but are rather one means among others that a speaker can use to “cause [the hearer] to access his own ‘store’ of accumulated and generalized knowledge and experience, to locate what appears to make sense of the sounds he hears”. In other words, linguistic items in themselves have only a meaning potential which must be actualized by a specific hearer in a specific context, via the construction of a mental representation as defining the meaning of a word or an expression means it is explained “explicated” in simple universal human concepts that do not need additional explanation themselves and can be found as words (or word like elements) in all languages. This method is the implementation of the idea put forward by European seventeenth century philosophers such as Arnauld,

Antoine, Descartes and Leibniz, that only a small set of simple concepts are needed as a base for all human understanding. Arnauld & Nicole (1996:64) quote that;

...it would be impossible to define every word. For in order to define a word it is necessary to use other words designating the idea we want to connect to the word being defined. And if we again wished to define the words used to explain that word, we would need still others, and soon to infinity. Consequently, we necessarily have to stop at primitive terms which are undefined.

This quotation reflects that all languages of the world share a common core of simple basic meanings. Therefore, if there is a word or term need to be explained, there will be a need for other words for explanation, which means it is a kind of repetition of ideas. Over almost four decades of empirical cross linguistic research has been dedicated in discovering and testing these primes. Goddard and et al, (2006) they used to define words and concepts that are semantically more complex than they are themselves. Explications attempt to model a speaker's meaning by paraphrasing the semantic content in its entirety.

Semantically, most of the uses of discourse markers seem not to affect the truth conditions of an utterance. It is apparent that this is not the case with all markers and all their uses. In the following examples, it is found that (i) is an example of a discourse marker that is not truth-conditional. On the other hand, (ii) illustrates a case of a discourse marker that affects the truth-conditions of the proposition.

(1) a. He was really tired. However, the noise did not let him sleep.

b. He was really tired. The noise did not let him sleep.

(2) a. John went to Paris and therefore, Mary went to Rome.

b. John went to Paris and Mary went to Rome.

In (1) ‘*however*’ occurs as an example of a discourse marker that does not affect the truth conditions of either the preceding sentence or the sentence it appears in. Most authors believe that (1a) means the same as (1b). Even though most researchers would agree that *however*, as other discourse markers, does not affect the truth conditions, it is not a clear connection. On the other hand, in (2a) ‘*therefore*’ is used as a discourse marker that can be paraphrased in this example as ‘as a result of this’. In this example, Mary may want to avoid meeting John on holidays; so she decides to go on holidays to a different country in order to avoid seeing him. In (2a), the discourse marker *therefore* makes a contribution to the truth conditions of the utterance. It expresses a causal connection between the two propositions. (2a) means something different from (2b). While some discourse markers seem to convey meaning; other markers apparently have only the function to structure discourse.

2.1.10 Pragmatic Discourse Markers

González, (2005) explains the different nature of discourse markers by distinguishing these DMs as logico-semantic argumentative relations of (cause, result, reason, concession, contrast, time...etc.) from pragmatic markers. She states that, these DMs have “descriptive or lexical meaning and have been traditionally called in the literature ‘argumentative connectors’”. DMs that are included in this category are; *for instance, therefore in contrast, on the other hand, nevertheless, and because*. Additionally, González (2005: 54) explains the functions of discourse markers as:

[...] whose main functions are rhetorical signal the speaker’s intentions and goals and basically help convey the illocutionary force of the story. Markers found in the sequential structure delimit segments boundaries and sustain the discourse network; they highly facilitate the in-and-out shift of the narrative segments. In the case of markers that have a dominant inferential

role, the link that is set up between the cognitive domain of the speaker and hearer is fundamental to understand and grasp the point of the story.

In the above quotation this category of discourse marker as a pragmatic one, which is explained by González into three structures: rhetorical, sequential and inferential. González, (2004) disregards semantic markers for her study paying attention only to the so called pragmatic markers, in particular she takes for her study markers such as *well, so, then, I mean, you know and anyway*. The same as the researcher of this study who focuses on the macro markers such as *I mean anyhowetc.* pragmatically in facilitating the comprehension of the lecturers' speech in EFL classroom. Therefore, this study and the study of González display a discourse coherence model based upon Schiffrin (1987) and Redeker's (1990) discourse coherence which is on the semantic versus pragmatic source of coherence.

In general, the researcher claims that the use of DMs by the non-native teacher and students of English as a foreign language serves structural, pragmatic and interactional purposes. As Müller, (2005) says that DMs contribute to the pragmatic meaning of utterances and thus play an important role in the pragmatic competence of the speaker. Also, Schiffrin (2001) explains, discourse markers 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.

In sum, it is agreeable that pragmatic discourse markers illustrate the meaning of utterances and play an important role in improving communicative competence of the speaker. Thus, it enhances EFL learners' understanding of the lectures in EFL contexts.

2.1.11 Semantics Discourse Markers versus Pragmatic Discourse Markers

The semanticists' view of discourse markers has been remarkably different from that of the pragmatists' view. The conventional (coded) meanings of discourse markers do not contribute to the truth-conditional meaning rather than they have been allocated to the category of conventional implication and largely ignored by semanticists. But, as Lyons, (1995: 274) points out that, "the lexical and grammatical resources of a particular language can be adapted and exploited to propositionalize what is not of its propositional nature". Therefore, discourse-relational meanings can be easily propositionalized, and according to some semanticists may even be analyzed truth-conditionally: "perhaps conventional implications do make a contribution to truth conditions of a special context-dependent kind that reflects only the speaker's attitudes in a way analogous to certain uses of modals" (Chierchia and et al, 1990: 284).

Within pragmatics, by contrast, discourse markers have been a focus of attention. Valuable qualitative work on individual expressions is being followed up by quantitative analyses that can throw new light on the semantics/pragmatics interface. The distribution of discourse-marking expressions reveals several regularities which any model of the semantics/pragmatics interface should take account of. First, many though not all the forms used for discourse marking have an external use as well as one or more speaker-oriented uses. While some of these expressions plausibly have a single semantics in the mental lexicon, for others it is hard to imagine a single sense rich enough to produce adequate interpretations in context. Second, interpretations of discourse marking expressions tend to be influenced by more than one level of the rhetorical hierarchy at a time: that is, by the host unit and the wider rhetorical context. Third, one-to-one mapping between discourse marker and coherence relation is rare: the extensions of markers tend to overlap.

2.1.12 Types of Discourse Markers

There are many discourse markers that express different relationships between ideas. The most common types of relationship between ideas, and the sentence connectors that are most often used to express these relationships, are macro and micro types of discourse.

2.1.12.1 Macro and Micro Discourse Marker

This is a broad area of discourse markers classification which deals with the discourse genres. Therefore, the researcher focuses on such classification of macro and micro types of discourse markers that have been very significant in this study. These types have been classified firstly by Chaudron and Richards, (1986). They propose a distinction between micro markers (lower-order DMs) and macro-markers (higher-order DMs). Micro-markers indicate links between sentences within the lecture, or function as fillers. They fill pauses giving listeners more time to process individual segments of a piece of discourse; While Macro-markers signal the macro-structure of a lecture through highlighting major information in the lecture and the sequencing or importance of that information.

2.1.12.2 Macro Discourse Markers

According to Which (1986), Macro discourse markers indicate the overall organization of lectures through highlighting major information and sequencing or importance of that information. More clarification, they are the signals or meta-statements about the major propositions. Chaudron and Richards, (1986: 123) in their study findings have reflected that, macro-markers “are more conducive to successful recall of the lecture. Chaudron and Richards’ study deals with the university lecture genre as the present study does. Moreover, Decarrico and Nattinger (1988, 1997: 185) also express a similar view. They suggest that macro organizers such as topic-markers, topic-shifters, summarizers, amplifiers, relators, evaluators, qualifiers and aside markers play significant roles in lectures.

Whereas, Murphy and Candlin, (1979) distinguish three types of discourse markers within macro-markers division:

- a. Markers, they include signaling devices such as *well, right, now*, providing clearer discourse segmentation.
- b. Starters, for example, *well, now, let's get on with*, which establish links among discourse.
- c. Met-statements, used to emphasize important information in the discourse as for example *I want to mention three types of pollution*.

Murphy and Candlin, (1979) developed the following macro-marker divisions: Starter, to begin the discourse; Elicitation, which includes the words or expressions eliciting information; Accept, in order to show approval; Attitudinal, where the speaker takes positions about the discourse content; Informative, words used to emphasize important information; Comment, to express additional information; Aside, considered as an attempt to deviate from the ongoing discourse; Meta-statement, which includes all the words and expressions used to strengthen and validate points in the discourse; and Conclusion, including final remarks. Although these two divisions of micro and macro-markers proposed above are a daring attempt to classify DMs (Murphy & Candlin 1979, Chaudron & Richards 1986), these taxonomies are mainly based on semantic categories. Quirk et al, (1972: 664) further include some other expressions into the categories of markers (see Table 1). Where, Cook, (1975) names them as “macro-markers” because they signal the macro-structure of a text.

Table (2.1): Quirk’s Classification of Certain Expressions

Category	Expressions
Enumeration	The first point I want to make is this...
Transition	I want to begin by saying...
Summation	Let us now turn to ...
Apposition	The next thing is...

Result	My conclusion is...
Inference	I will sum up by saying...
Reformation	Another example is...
Replacement	This means that...
Concession	The consequence was...
	This is because...
	That implies..
	A better way of putting it is...
	The alternative is...
	Another possibility would be...
	It is true...
	The truth is that...

Biber and et al., (1999:1095) explain that, there are various suggestions have been made for classifying discourse markers. However, different classifications are possible because each study focuses on certain aspects of discourse markers. So that, classification is adopted as it proves to be typical and comprehensive. They offer the following types of discourse markers.

A. Interjections

This type of discourse markers has been described in most books of grammars. Interjections are words or set of sounds used as a sudden remark to express feelings. Thomas and Martinet (2002: 19).] and Leech and Svartvik (1994: 152), offer a survey of common English interjections which are used to express emotions:

{Oh} *Surprise:*

- a. Oh what a beautiful present!

{Ah} *satisfaction, recognition*

- b. Ah that's just what I want.

{Aha} *Jubilant satisfaction, recognition.*

- c. Aha these books are exactly what I was looking for.

{Wow} *great Surprise.*

- d. Wow what a fantastic goal!

- {Yippee} *excitement, delight*
- e. Yippee this is fun!
- {Ouch} *express a sudden physical pain.*
- f. Ouch, my foot.
- {Ow} *pain*
- g. Ow what hurt!

B. Greeting and Farewells Expressions.

Greetings and Farewells occur in special discourse situations and constitute conventionalized responses to these situations, despite their phatic use. Schourup, (1985:11) argues that, these markers can be used as an instrument to maintain a link among people. In general, greeting can vary in formality, *hi* and *hello*, are used in informal situations. They are less formal than "good" forms: good morning, good afternoon and good evening Biber et al, (1999: 1088).

C. Linking Adverbials.

Levinson, (1983:87) indicates that there are words and phrases in English, and in most languages, are used to indicate the relationship between an utterance and the prior discourse such as the initial position of *therefore, in conclusion, to the contrary, still, however, well, besides and after all*. For instance;

- a. Layla has gone home.
- b. After all, she was sick. (Fraser, 1990: 187)

D. Stance Adverbials

Trask, (1993: 251) explained this type of discourse markers as a lexical item that behaves semantically as an operator upon the entire sentence, to express modality, illocutionary force and evaluation. Stance adverbials are called sentence adverbials by Leech and Svartvik, (1994) and disjuncts by Quirk et al. (1985). In this respect, Halliday, (1985: 82) Suggests four- Categories for Sentence –initial adverbs:

Probability: *maybe, perhaps, certainly, surely.*

Presumption: *of course, obviously, clearly, evidently.*

Usuality: *usually, typically, occasionally.*

Desirability: *un (fortunately), luckily, hopefully, regrettably.*

Stance adverbials; appear in different grammatical structures single adverb like *honestly*, or *fortunately*, or prepositional phrase like *of course* or noun like *the fact is*, adjective such as *it is likely to* or modal verbs such as *maybe* and *perhaps* and the large number of these adverbials are comment clauses like *you know, you see* etc. to express the speaker's attitude, opinion and even feelings. Stubbs, (1983:70) explains that if the adverb occurs in initial position possibly separated by a pause and / or uttered a separate tone, group, for example:

Admittedly / frankly / fortunately, I can't see anything.

E. Vocatives

Generally, Vocatives are viewed by Levinson, (1983:71) as noun phrases that refer to the addressee, but are not syntactically or semantically incorporated as the argument of prosodically, they are separated from the body of a sentence prosodically. Nevertheless, vocatives can be divided into two types.

- a. Calls or Summons.
 - b. Addresses.
- *Hey you*, you just scratched my car with your Frisbee.(calls or summons)
 - The truth is, *Madam*, nothing is as good nowadays. (addresses)

F. Response Elicitors

Biber et al, (1999: 1080) characterized these markers as generalized question tags, such as *huh?* , *eh?* Which is usually pronounced [ei], *alright?* and *okay?*

These markers are called "appealers" by Gramley and patzold, (1992: 227) that are used by the speaker to get or elicit agreement from the hearer. They serve important communicative functions.

G. Response Forms

Biber, & et al., (1999: 189) comment that these markers are brief and routinized responses to a previous remark. They classify these markers into:

1. Response to questions as *yes*, *no* and their variants.
2. Response to directives as *ok*.
3. Response to assertions as backchannels *yes*, *yah*, *I see* this type is called "uptakers" by Gramley and patzold (1992: 227) that are used on the part of the hearer to indicate the active listening in communication.

Accordingly, Coulthard and Montgomery (1981: 25) use the terms 'acknowledge' 'accept' and 'endorse' to describe these markers.

H. Hesitators

Er, *erm* and *uh* are discourse markers that are used to fill hesitation pauses in speech. Such markers tend to be condemned by people who do not understand why they are used, but they are very important. They allow the addressee to catch up, and they help the speaker to plan what to say next. Knowles, (1987:185) and Stubbs, (1983) supported Knowle's statement by claiming that these markers are normal non-fluency phenomenon occurs in unplanned discourse like repetition, false start and the like.

I. Various Polite Speech- Act formulae.

Biber et al. (1999: 1093) refer to discourse markers like *sorry*, *pardon*, *thank you* and *please* that are used in respectful language, they add that these markers have speech act function in thanking, apologizing and regretting. And they have, in fact, a respective role in the interactive nature of speaker's conversation.

J. Expletives

These markers are words or phrases that do not contribute any meaning to the text. Some of them are taboo expressions like swearwords or "semi- taboo

expression" that are used as exclamations especially in strong negative experience (Biber et al, 1999: 1095)

- a. Taboo expletives: these markers are used to express something bad and not

in polite use, such as:

Blast! Damn! Oh hell!! Bloody hell!!!

- b. Moderated expletives: Leech, (1989: 14) explain that, these markers are socially acceptable in many situations, such as: *my goodness! My God! Good heavens! Good God!*

2.1.12.3 Micro Discourse Markers

Chaudron and Richards, (1986) propose a distinction between micro markers (lower-order DMs) and macro-markers (higher-order DMs). Micro-markers indicate links between sentences within the lecture, or function as fillers. They fill pauses giving listeners more time to process individual segments of a piece of discourse; they hence provide more opportunities for bottom-up processing. These discourse signals help top-down processing. Under this two folded categories. Chaudron and Richards, (1986) classified micro-markers into five different categories these are; Segmentation category such as; *and, right, and alright*. Temporal category like *at the time, after this eventually*. Causal category these are words like, *so, then, because*. Contrast category such as; *both, But, Only*. Emphasis category like *Of course, You can see ,For the moment ,On the other hand, In fact*.

This classification, however, is exclusively based on semantic relations across the discourse, avoiding other domains provided by (Schiffrin 1987; Blakemore 1987; Fraser 1990, 1999, 2004) about the role of DMs within interaction. Regarding the classification of macro-markers and contrarily to what they had done with micro-markers, Chaudron and Richards (1986) did not

distinguish any semantic category. On the contrary, a list of those macro-markers contained in the lecture established for the development of their study was provided. The list included signals or met statements about the major propositions within the lecture, or the important transition points in the lecture.

Table (2.2): Micro- markers Categories:

Segmentation	Temporal	Causal	Contrast	Emphasis
Well	At the time	So	Both	So of course
OK	And	Then	But	You can see
Now	After this	Because	Only	You see
And	For the moment		On the other hand	Obviously Unbelievably As you know In fact Naturally
Right	Eventually			
All right				

This taxonomy, however, is exclusively based on semantic relations across the discourse, obviating other domains provided by the state-of-the art research on DMs (Schiffrin 1987; Blakemore 1987; Fraser 1990, 1999, 2004) and therefore clearly misinterpreting the signposting role carried by DMs within interaction. Moreover, labeled categories are not morphologically and syntactically homogeneous. For instance comparing “Emphasis with Contrast”, from this view, Begoña, (2006) assume that the establishing the contrast relation

across utterances aims not to emphasize. Regarding the classification of macro-markers and contrarily to what they had done with micro-markers, Chaudron and Richards (1986) did not distinguish any semantic category.

2.1.13 Classification of Discourse Markers

Hyland and Tse, (2004) mention that, discourse marker categories are intrinsically and ultimately interpersonal, and one of their main aims is to persuade the reader. They classify discourse markers into the functional headings of *interpersonal and textual markers*. The *interpersonal* reflects the writer's stance towards both the content of the text and the potential reader, while *Textual discourse markers* refer to the organization of discourse. They also fulfill a persuasive function and attain a persuasive effect. Whereas, Halliday and Hasan, (1976) classified discourse markers into three categories:

Coordinating conjunctions: *and, but, for...etc.*

Conjunctive adverbs: *furthermore, however, therefore;*

Prepositional phrases: *in addition; in spite of; as a result;*

Moreover, Halliday and Hassan, (ibid) in terms of their functions, discourse markers are classified into four types these namely are;

Additive: and, furthermore; in addition;

Adversative: but, however; in spite of

Causal: for; so; therefore; due to;

Temporal: first; then; finally;

2.1.13.1 Textual Discourse Markers

Hyland and Tse, (2004:156-177) sub-classify textual discourse markers into seven categories. They are:

a. Logical markers: are markers which express semantic and structural relationships between discourse stretches, and help readers interpret pragmatic connections, which are:

A. a Additive (*and, furthermore. . .*)

The marker "*and*" has both cohesive and structural roles; structural because it links two (or more) syntactic units such as clauses, phrases or verbs, and cohesive because the interpretation of the whole conjunctive utterance depends on the combination of both conjuncts. Also, "*and*", can precede support units of talk (explanation, evidence and clarification to previous units). It can also have a pragmatic effect in the sense that it indicates a speaker's continuation. However, "*and*" does not provide information about what is being continued. Such information is derived from the discourse content and structure. Moreover, it is used to indicate the speaker's continuation.

Ab. Adversative (*but, however. . .*)

Ac. Conclusive relationships (*finally, in sum. . .*) in the text.

Ad. Causatives (*so, because, as a result*). According to Schiffrin (1987:330), "*because*" is used by the speaker to indicate a relation of 'cause and result'." *so*" is used to indicate a relation of 'premise and conclusion' and also indicating a result and to establish a causal link among events.

B. Sequencers: are markers which indicate particular positions in a series and serve to guide the reader in the presentation of different arguments in a particular order (in the first place, secondly).

C. Reminders: are markers that refer back to previous sections in the text in order to retake an argument, amplify it or summaries some of the previous argumentation. For example (as....said)

D. Topicalisers: are markers that explicitly indicate some type of topic shift to the reader so that the argumentation can be easily followed. For example (now). Schiffrin, (1987:241) claims that "*now*" is used to indicate a speaker's progression through a discourse which contains an ordered sequence of

subordinating parts. It is also used to indicate the upcoming shift in talk, or when the speaker wants to negotiate the right to control what will happen next in talk.

E. Code glosses: are markers that explain, rephrase, expand or exemplify propositional content. Overall, they reflect the writer's expectations about the audience's knowledge or ability to follow the argument (*that is, in other words, for instance*).

F. Illocutionary markers: are markers that explicitly name the act the writer performs through the text (*I hope to persuade, I back up this idea. ...*)

G. Announcements: are markers which refer forward to future sections in the text in order to prepare the reader for prospective argumentation (*ibid.*).

2.1.13.2 Interpersonal Discourse Markers

Hyland and Tse, (2004:156-177) sub-classify interpersonal markers into five main categories, these are:

a. Hedges: are markers which refer to markers that withhold full commitment to the statements displayed in the text. From a linguistic point of view, epistemic verbs (*may, might, would*), probability adverbs (*perhaps, maybe*) and epistemic expressions (*it is likely, it is probable. . .*) have been analyzed.

b. Certainty markers: are markers that express full commitment to the statements presented by the writer (*undoubtedly, of course, naturally, in fact, you know*).

Schiffrin (1987:268) maintains that "y'know" has two discourse functions: a marker of meta-knowledge about what speakers and hearers share, and a marker of meta-knowledge about what is generally known. It is also used to indicate a situation in which the speaker knows that the hearer shares some knowledge about a particular piece of information.

c. Attributors: are markers that perform a double function in the text. They refer explicitly to the source of the information (*as the Prime Minister indicated*), or at the same time using these references of authoritative value with persuasive goals.

d. Attitude markers: are markers which express the writer's affective values towards the reader and the content presented in the text. Linguistically, these markers can adopt the following form:

1. Denotic verbs: (*must, have to. . .*)

2. Attitudinal adverbs: (*surprisingly. . .*)

3. Adjectival constructions: such as (*it is difficult, impossible. . .*)

4. Cognitive verbs: such as (*I think, I believe. . .*)

5. Commentaries: These markers help to establish and maintain rapport with the audience by means of rhetorical questions (*is this the right attitude?*), direct appeals (*dear reader, you*), personalization (*I, we, me, my feelings*). Personalizes, contribute to the development of a relationship with the reader.

A relationship that, ultimately, may convince or not but that is inherently persuasive.

Yumin, (2007:22) mentions that the aim behind using the personal marker (*we*), is to shorten the distance between the speaker and the audience, regardless of their disparity in age, social status and professions and it may include both the speaker and the listener into the same arena, and thus make the audience feel close to the speaker and his points. Therefore, this classification will be the model to be adapted in analyzing the data in this research.

2.1.14 Functions of Discourse Markers

Michael Halliday's functional pragmatic approach to language helps in understanding the concept and classification of DMs. He divides the meaning systems of language into three major systems or functions: ideational, interpersonal and textual. This concept of the three functions of language lays the

theoretical foundation for DMs. The ideational function is concerned with the content of language propositions that are either true or false, and it is representational, referential and informational. Whereas, the interpersonal function is concerned with establishing and maintaining human relationships and it includes all that may be understood by the expression of our own personalities and personal feelings on the one hand, and the forms of interaction and social interplay with the other participants in the communication situation on the other hand. Here language is used as the mediator: it allows language users to express their personal feelings about the ideational content of their texts and to guide the readers in processing propositional content. While, the textual function is an enabling function and essential for cohesive texts and for effectively conveying ideational and interpersonal meanings; it makes discourse possible by creating text. It has the function of creating texts, which are distinct from strings of words or isolated sentences and clauses. Bases on Halliday's meaning, functions of DMs can be classified into two broad categories: the interpersonal and textual. Schiffrin explains how discourse markers function according to Schiffrin; (1987: 318) states that:

I suggest that markers select a meaning relation from whatever potential meanings are provided through the content of talk, and then display the relation. This means that whatever meaning inheres in the marker itself has to be compatible with the meanings of the surrounding discourse.

Siepmann (2005: 45) claims that this is the major purpose of discourse markers. It is definitely a very important function of discourse markers but if one function can be picked out and called central is questionable. The needed compatibility, which Schiffrin addresses, seems obvious as the use of discourse markers does not make sense if their function cannot become obvious to the hearer or writer. Schiffrin (1987: 314) further remarks that the needed

compatibility is not only a restriction rather, it is the meanings that conveyed by markers not only restrict the discourse in which they can occur, but also influence the overall meaning of that discourse.

According to many authors like Blakemore, (2006) discourse markers can function both as cohesive devices and given the fact that they have a pragmatic meaning, they can also ensure text and discourse coherence. Schiffrin, (1987:326) defines the contribution of discourse markers to coherence as follows: ‘discourse markers provide contextual coordinates for utterances: they index an utterance to the local contexts in which utterances are produced and in which they are to be interpreted’. Also, there are several authors have attempted an analysis of the functions of discourse markers and have discovered a set of main functions to which, of course, other context dependent ones could be added. Here is the list of functions that have been mentioned in the literature (Schiffrin, 1987, 2006; Blakemore, 2006; Müller, 2005; Murar, 2008; Downing, 2006; Eggins, 2004). The following list goes from the general functions to the particular ones. *Discourse markers contribute to or highlight cohesion and coherence relations in discourse.* As opposed to other cohesive devices such as conjunctions, discourse markers involve speaker choice.

Conjunctions have an inherent meaning that determines their almost automatic selection especially by native speakers. However, with a discourse marker that is known to be able to fulfill a number of functions, it becomes a matter of how the speaker chooses to construct meaning. In other words, it is a matter of selecting the most appropriate sign that could accommodate the desired pragmatic meaning.

In a functional use of language, discourse markers constitute important functional elements that contribute to the coherence and cohesion of discourse, have an important role in the interpersonal and expressive use of language and

show conformity to the institutionalized uses of language in its social and cultural context. The lack of semantic meaning that characterizes some discourse markers is compensated by the manifest presence of pragmatic meaning, an ever-changing meaning in full accordance with the dynamics of language use. The following is the list of functions based on Laurel J. Brinton, (1990:47) which is still relevant to current studies of discourse markers. According to this list, discourse markers are used;

- To initiate discourse.
- To mark a boundary in discourse (shift/partial shift in topic).
- To preface a response or a reaction.
- To serve as a filler or delaying tactic.
- To aid the speaker in holding the floor.
- To effect an interaction or sharing between speaker and hearer.
- To bracket the discourse either cataphorically or anaphorically.
- To mark either foregrounded or back grounded information.

Nevertheless, it is not easy to present a complete list of discourse markers and their various functions. There are many of them, and, perhaps even more importantly, some of them are used more in speech than in writing, or vice versa or some of them are more informally used than formally and so on. The best way to understand an effective use of discourse markers (which, remember, is essential for academic writing!) is to read a lot. The following table is presented by Jones, (2011) which shows different types of discourse markers and their functions, illustrated with examples.

Table (2.3) Function of Discourse Markers

Function	Discourse markers	Examples
Opening conversations/topics	Right, So	Right, shall we start? So, what do you think about the cuts?
Closing conversations and topic boundaries	Right, Anyway, Well	Right /well, I think that's everything. Anyway I'd better go, I'll see you next week.
Monitoring shared knowledge	You see, You know	You see, since I've hurt my back I can't walk very well. The weather in England is, you know, pretty awful.
Response tokens	Right	A. I think we should go there first. B. Right
Reformulating	I mean, Mind you	I don't like English food. I mean, some of it is OK but most of it I don't like. The weather in England is terrible. Mind you, I guess it's OK sometimes
Pausing	Well	A. What do you think of the plan? B. Well, let's see... I guess it's a good idea
Sequencing	In the end, First, Then, First,	we started walking quickly... Then, we started running... In the end, we managed to escape.
Shifting	Well	A. Do you live in Preston? B. Well, near Preston.
Resuming	Anyway, As I was saying, Where was I?	Erm, yeah, anyway, we started walking really fast Erm, yeah as I was saying, we started walking really fast Erm, where was I? We started walking fast and then started running.

Introducing examples	Like	I think being healthy is much more important so you need to have, like, green food.
Justifying	Cos	I don't want to go cos it's too expensive.

2.1. 15 Coherence-Based Account of Discourse

The concept of coherence is of a central importance to discourse analysis. However, these significances have led discourse analysts seek for definitions or accounts of the term coherence particularly in discourse. Yet, many acknowledge in need for theories of coherence. Stubbs, (1983: 147) suggests a need for multiple theories of discourse coherence:

We need accounts not only surface lexical and syntactic cohesion, and of logical propositional development. We also need an account of speech acts, indirect speech acts (in which the illocutionary force of an utterance is overlaid by markers of mitigation or politeness), the context- independence of illocutionary force, and the sequential consequences (predictive power) of certain speech acts. In other words, we have to have multiple theories of discourse coherence.

Stubbs, in the above quotation is looking for more studies and different functions of coherence to contribute to the overall sense of coherence discourse. Consequently, there are many authors who have different suggestions in the coherence of discourse, like Gumperz, (1984) suggests that communicative meaning is achieved through a process of situated interpretation in which hearers infer speakers' underlying strategies and intensions by interpreting the linguistic cues which contextualize their messages. Such cues are called contextualization cues: they are the verbal (prosodic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, rhetorical) and nonverbal (kinesics, proxemics) aspects of communicative code

which provide an interpretive framework for the referential content of a message. While Schiffrin, (1988:23) suggests that the properties of discourse that discussed contribute to the overall sense to the coherence of discourse. Not only do speakers and hearers use different kinds of contextualization cues to situate their communicative intentions, but they do so within an integrated framework of internationally emergent structures, meanings, and actions. Schiffrin also, proposes both language users and language analysts construct model of the relation between units (sentence, proposition, actions) based on a patterned integration of units from different levels of analysis to make overall sense out of particular segment of talk to define it as coherence.

2.1.15.1 Halliday and Hasan's Approach

In their seminal work on cohesion in English, Halliday and Hasan (1976) propose five principal cohesive devices, i.e. *reference, repetition, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction*, which assist in discourse creation indicating various relations in an underlying structure of the text. Among these, expressions conveying conjunctive relations and their functions in discourse partially parallel items that have currently been referred to as discourse markers. Conjunctive items, *such as and, but, because, I mean, by the way*, to sum up generally express additive, adversative, causal or temporal meanings. The authors claim that the crucial role of the conjunctive items is to work as a cohesion device contributing to coherence of a text. In other words, the importance of conjunctive items lies in their capacity “to mark interpretive dependencies between propositions, and thus create texture”.

2.1.16 Schiffrin's Analysis of Discourse Markers

Schiffrin's analysis of DMs shares some views with Halliday and Hasan, (1976) analysis of the cohesive devices in English. Halliday and Hasan argue that there are linguistic expressions in English, such as ‘pronouns’, ‘conjunctions’

and ‘adverbs’ that have cohesion functions. These expressions indicate links between two parts within the text. Schiffrin agrees with Halliday and Hasan that such expressions indicate that the interpretation of one clause is determined by the information derived from the prior clause.

Both Schiffrin (1987) and Halliday and Hasan (1976) agree that DMs should be considered as linguistic devices that link adjacent unites of talk to make the whole discourse coherent. Schiffrin proposes that DMs play a cohesive role in the sense that they relate informational units in the present discourse with informational units in the prior discourse; this kind of coherence achieved by DMs is known as local coherence in Schiffrin’s framework. It is local in the sense that DMs link two adjacent units in the text (or indicate coherence relationships between two adjacent utterances in discourse). Schiffrin’s approach concentrates on some of the DMs markers and showed what coherence relationships they indicate and how they contribute to the interpretation of the text they are used in. Schiffrin gives a detailed analysis of twelve DMs in English: *and, but, or, so, well, then, now, because, oh, well, y’know, and I mean*. The researcher purpose, here, is not to discuss all these DMs in detail, but rather investigate the functions (or coherence relations) achieved by such markers. The data that Schiffrin used to analyze these DMs are based on her sociolinguistic corpus which is composed of tape-recorded interviews with ordinary speakers. The data consist of long transcribed speech units taken from these interviews. In this study the researcher will use some of her examples for illustration. Schiffrin maintains that DMs can function on different levels of discourse structure (linguistic or non-linguistic). They can operate on the ‘ideational’ (informational) structure in the sense that they indicate relations between ideas in discourse or in other words, they mark the organization of ideas in discourse. For instance, a DM such as *but* indicates that what follows it contrasts with what precedes it. They

can also operate on the participation framework (discourse exchange and interaction) in the sense that they play a role in controlling the conversational labor between speakers and hearers as the case with *oh* and *well*.

Schiffrin, (1987:29) argues that DMs such as *and*, *but*, *or*, *so* and *because* are operative on the ideational structure. Such markers can indicate three types of relations that contribute to the configuration of idea structures: cohesive relations, topic relations and functional relations. As for the other DMs, such as *well*, *oh*, *now*, *y’know* and *I mean*, they operate on the other levels: exchange, action, participation framework and information state. Schiffrin (1987) argues that DMs contribute to the coherence of discourse through relating different components of talk in the sense that the interpretation of any component is dependent on the interpretation of the other. Schiffrin (1987: 330) states;

Since coherence is the result of integration among different components of talk, any device which simultaneously locates an utterance within several emerging contexts of discourse automatically has an integrative function. That is, if a marker acts like an instruction to consider an upcoming utterance as speaker-focused on prior text within an information state, with a simultaneous instruction to view that utterance within a particular action structure, then the result is a type of integration between those components of talk.

It can be noticed that Schiffrin views ‘discourse unit’ as a linguistic entity. She uses the term to refer to syntactic (structural) units such as ‘clauses’ and ‘phrases’ as well as ideational (informational) units such as ‘ideas’ and ‘opinions’. She has used the term interchangeably with other terms such as ‘discourse segment’, ‘unit of talk’ and ‘component of talk’. However, in this study, the researcher argues that the well-formedness of text is not achieved by coherence which is signalled by linguistic means. It is rather achieved pragmatically through the relations between discourse units.

2.1.17 Listening Comprehension as an Authentic Lecture

Listening comprehension in a lecture seems to be an isolated skill, not interacting with other language skills. Flowerdew, (1994:7) explains that, students frequently experience difficulties in listening and comprehending in their own languages. It can, therefore, be expected that they will experience even more difficulty in listening in a second language. Furthermore, despite the recognition that academic listening skills are crucial for academic success, relatively little research has been conducted into ESL listening comprehension.

Although, most of the students' problems derive from linguistic discorsal or cultural sources, at least part of the difficulty is the nature of the lecture format itself. As Bilbow,(1989) points out, "unlike face to face communication [i.e. conversation] where the rate of delivery is governed by conversational rules which encourage comprehension, a lecture is unique in that it consists of a steady flow of information delivered at a rate which may be only marginally influenced by a sensitivity to the problems faced by the speaker's audience". He adds a further difficulty: "within the lecture's formal context, no student feels at liberty to stop the speaker to ask for clarification". This would be especially relevant to the context of a typically Sudanese classroom, where teachers are accorded great "respect" and are not likely to be interrupted while speaking.

ESL and EFL students may encounter problems in comprehending the lecture that due to different reasons. Balizet, (2001) asserts "need experiences with longer and authentic text to encounter the characteristic of real lecture, such as interpersonal techniques, discourse features integration with other media, and the messiness of authentic lectures. Ideally, these would not be one shot lecture, but part of a lecture course". Authentic lectures based on micro and macro markers as the claim of many linguistics and researchers can help in comprehending the lecture.

Benson, (1994:189) states that, the lecture as a spoken genre shares distinctive features with other types of spoken language. However, lectures share properties with written texts as well, as they are planned and employ primarily an informational type of language. The lecture genre itself brings its own particular and potential areas of difficulty for students, as it requires of them to be able to concentrate on and understand long stretches of talk without the opportunity of engaging in the facilitating functions of interactive discourse such as asking for repetitions and negotiating of meaning.

Therefore, it can reasonably be assumed that if academic success is to be achieved, EFL students at university will need all available strategies to support them in integrating the content information presented in oral lectures effectively. Chaudron & et al, (1986) claim that, research has shown that the introduction of appropriate discourse markers as well as training students to recognize and interpret them may assist the lecturer in ensuring that his/her intended meaning is conveyed. This is considered necessary as there is usually not much possibility provided for the negotiation of meaning in the lecture situation.

In lecture discourse listeners require knowledge of the specialist subject matter and must distinguish between what is relevant and what is less important to the main purpose. The emphasis in lectures is generally assumed to be on the content conveyed. Particular skills that are associated with lecture listening are:

- a. The ability to concentrate on and understand long stretches of talk without the opportunity of engaging in the facilitating functions of interactive discourse, for example asking for repetition;
- b. Negotiating meaning and using repair strategies;
- c. note-taking;

- d. Integrating incoming messages with information derived from other media such as handouts, textbooks, the blackboard and the overhead projector.

2.1.18 Current Approaches to Listening Comprehension

Listening is often treated like a “neglected stepchild” and is “an overlooked dimension in language acquisition” (Oxford, 1993:205). Although other language skills often receive direct instructional attention, teachers frequently expect students to develop their listening skills without help. Lerner (1997:365) also sees listening as “an element of the language system that has been neglected by educators.” Flowerdew, (1994:11) argues that lecturers at tertiary level often believe that L2 students will not experience any real difficulties with the purely linguistic processing of the material. They falsely assume, however, that students’ poor performances in tests and examinations are related to their problems in assimilating the content information imparted by the lecturer.

Vandergriff, (2004:3) says that, the listening process has been considered under the listening to repeat approach of the audio-visual period or in a question and answer comprehension approach. Recently, though, the approach has been towards real-life listening in real time. The little listening instruction that takes place is expanding from a focus on the product of listening – listening to learn– to an emphasis on the process – learning to listen. So, in order to develop specific training programmes in listening comprehension in academic lecture situations, it is necessary to scrutinize the processes that constitute listening.

2.1.19. Listening as a Top-Down/Bottom-Up Process

Chaudron and Richards, (1986:113) describe listening comprehension as involving both bottom-up and top-down processes. Bottom-up processes refer to the analyzing of incoming data and categorizing and interpreting them on the basis of information in the data. In language comprehension, bottom-up processes could be regarded as those which assign grammatical status to words on the basis of syntactic and morphological cues. They also include those processes that assign topics and meanings on the basis of syntax and word order and the meanings of lexical items used in the message. Top-down processing, on the other hand, makes use of the previous knowledge as part of the process of comprehension. This may include expectations of the topic and structure of a piece of discourse based on real-world knowledge and reference to various types of frames, schemata and macro-markers. Top-down processing involves prediction and differencing on the basis of hierarchies of facts, propositions and expectations. It also enables the listener to by-pass some aspects of bottom-up processing.

Field & et al, (2004) explain that, DMs play a significant role in both bottom-up and top-down processing as far as listening comprehension is concerned. Chaudron and Richards, (1986:116) claim that, Macro-markers indicate major transitions in the lecture structure as well as helping top-down processing by initiating expectations and predictions about the lecture. These expectations are confirmed and supported by the speaker's use of discourse signals of the relationships between successive episodes and moves in the lecture. Whereas, micro-markers work with bottom-up processing. They mark inter-sentential relations and function as pause fillers. Such as; "well", "right" and "let's see."Markers seem to enable listeners to attend to the more relevant text

information since they guide the listeners' cognitive resources in an optimal manner.

Smit, (2005:2) affirms that, the terms top-down and bottom-up do not refer to particular levels of processing but to directions of processing. In a bottom-up process, small or lower level units are progressively reshaped into larger ones; in a top-down process, larger units exercise an influence over the way in which smaller ones are perceived.

Top-down and bottom-up processes are also not alternatives; rather, a great deal of synergy exists between these two processes. When looking at meaning on a discourse level, Anderson and Lynch, (1991) point out that, in the early stages of language learning, the meaning level may consist of merely recognizing the topic of a conversation or being able to make predictions about likely developments in the topic. Wolff, (1987, as cited in Rubin, 1994:210) found that, while students appeared to make "harmonious use of bottom-up and top-down processes" with an easy text, they used more top-down processing strategies with more complex texts. Conrad (1985, as cited in Rubin, 1994:210) found in his study of university students of English, with scores ranging between 83.7% and 96% for the Michigan State University English Examination that ESL listeners relied more on syntax than on contextual semantic cues as their proficiency levels decreased. Shohamy and Inbar, (1991, as cited in Tsui and Fullilove, 1998:431) further found that while "high level listeners seemed to process the text in a knowledge-based manner, low-level test takers seemed to process it in a data-driven manner." In this study the researcher included inference questions in the pre- and post-tests to determine the extent to which students responded in a knowledge-based manner to the text. The multiple-choice questions in the test, on the other hand, were data-driven.

Tsui and Fullilove, (1998:432) investigated over a period of seven years the kind of processing skills that is most important in identifying the performance of L2 learners on listening test items, in large-scale public examinations in Hong Kong. They looked at the schema type of the aural text and the question type used in these public examinations. They traced a correlation between level of listening skill and success in answering items which were not schematically supported. This suggested that it was the less-skilled listener who relied most heavily upon top-down processing to compensate for problems of perception. The researchers also found evidence that it was the poorer listeners who were sometimes misinformed by false assumptions based on contextual cues.

It is thus evident that the relationship between top-down and bottom-up processing is a complex one which is based to a large extent on a considerable degree of interdependence (Tsui and Fullilove, 1998:366) or “parallel processing” (Rubin, 1994:210). When investigating L2 listening comprehension, it appears to be not about which path is taken but rather which of the two processing routes is preferred over the other (Field 2004:364).

Vogely, (1995:42) says that, comprehension process earlier has been normally viewed as simply a question of understanding. However, it is progressively being recognised as a process of “constructing meaning based on multi-dimensional relationships between the learner and all the internal and external influences and the intrinsic and extrinsic elements involved in that learner’s reality”. This includes meta-cognitive and cognitive knowledge. According to Flowerdew, (1994:9), comprehension is a two-stage process: the first stage consists of the results of the linguistic processing (input) and the second of the application of these results to background knowledge and context (out-put).

2. 1.20 Discourse Markers in Lectures

In recent times, there has been an increasing concern in the study of academic lectures from different points of views for instance; Tehrani and Dastjerdi,(2012: 423), believe that , “lectures in their different forms, are the most commonly used techniques for transferring information”. Whereas, Gomez and Fortuño, (2005) think that, because of internationalization of higher education both from the viewpoint of students and from that of teachers lecturing style is required. While, Waggoner, (1984:9) sees that, lectures have “paradigmatic stature” and, Benson, (1994:189) sees that, lectures are “the central ritual of the culture of learning” For the very same reasons, there have been several studies on the use of the English language in academic discourse and its effects on the way academic lectures are presented. Particularly, studies on discourse markers and different aspects of lectures have made researchers interested in this area. Such as Adel, (2010), Chaudron and Richards (1986), Christodoulidou (2011), Fortanet Gomez and BellésFortuño, (2005) Kaveifard and Allami (2011), Khedri, Ebrahimi and Heng (2013), and Rashidi and Alhosseini, (2012). In addition to this study that will contribute in supporting the same area of discourse markers.

There are some other researchers like Rose, (1998:13) who believes that "DMs such as; *'okay'*, *'all right'*, which articulated pauses and strategic silence can be used in lectures to frame transactions and exchanges". According to him, DMs can take the role of shaping exchanges and transactions in lectures. Besides, Christodoulidou, (2011) who explained that DMs perform on different functional levels depending on various pedagogical aims, although one should know that it is very much difficult to categorize discourse markers based on their function.

2.1.21 Comprehension of the Lecture; in Terms of Discourse Markers

Listening comprehension of the academic lecture is much more complex than listening comprehension in a social context, since there is a little room for negotiation of meaning. Therefore, in the process of selectively listening to the discourse, discourse markers may be able to assist the listener in selecting the most probable interpretation of the possible pragmatic meaning of the utterance. In other words, the hierarchical representation that is stored in the long-term memory would be more directly in line with the original structure of the lecture text. It is believed among many researchers that, students will be able to recall more exactly what the lecturer conveys should they be conversant with the roles that discourse markers play in the spoken academic lecture.

In Nattinger and DeCarricos study, (1988) they investigated lexical phrases occurring in a variety of natural academic lectures including history, linguistics, biology, anthropology and literature among others. They defined lexical phrases as representative of a higher level of information and describe them as macro-organizers. Nattinger and DeCarrico, (1988) use the term macro-organizers to better illustrate the function of lexical phrases that help students mentally organize information as they listen and helps stress the importance of students' awareness of lecture organization. Nattinger and DeCarrico, (1988) divided the macro-organizers into eight categories on the basis of their function: topic markers, topic shifters, summarizers, exemplifiers, relators, evaluators, qualifiers and aside markers. They further divide these functional categories into local and global organizers as follows;

- a. Global Macro-organizers: indicate the overall organization of the lecture.
- b. Local Macro-organizers: highlight the sequencing or importance of information within the framework at specific points set by the global organizers.

This further classification helps in distinguishing main topics from the explanations, examples, relations etc., which in turn serves as development and support for the topics.

Flowerdew and Tauroza's study, (1995) has investigated the impact of the presence and absence of discourse markers such as, 'so', 'right', 'well' and 'ok', on L2 lecture comprehension. Their results indicate that a spoken lecture with DMs present is comprehended better by listeners than the same lecture with the DMs edited out. This means that the discourse markers function to help listeners avoid the confusion that would arise if they tried to connect two disjointed utterances and provides cues on how to anticipate and process the relationship of utterances to a discourse marker.

Thus, it can be summarized that discourse markers are an important aspect of academic discourse and their existence serves as signals that highlight the cataphoric and anaphoric relationship between discourse utterances. As listeners process a stretch of spoken text, their interpretation depends upon a particular frame of reference or mental model. Segal et al., (1999) claim that, the role of DMs in this process provides signals of whether a text is interpreted as continuous or discontinuous with the current stretch as Flowerdew and Tauroza, (1995) who claimed that DMs presence in lectures has been found to help listeners extract more meaningful and comprehensible input.

2.1.22 Discourse Markers in Pedagogical Settings

In pedagogical settings, Fung and Carter, (2007) explains that, discourse markers can be found operating in four dominions of functional categories, these namely are *interpersonal*, *referential*, *structural* and *cognitive* level So far, little attention has been paid to the use and functions of discourse markers as one essential interactional factor in classroom teacher-student conversation. The studies on DMs in classroom context are also limited to L2 learners' acquisition

rather than teacher talk, according to Fung and Carter, (2007) ,Yu, (2008), and Othman, (2010) claims that, the use and functions of discourse markers as one essential interactional factor in teacher talk. In fact, the appropriate use of DMs in classroom not only can improve the participation of the students but also contribute to the effectiveness of learning .It is important that more researches and attempts are needed to probe on this issue.

There are still few exceptions though. For instance, Othman, (2010) investigated three specific discourse markers these are; *okay, right* and *yeah* which used by NS lecturers in Lancaster University, UK. It is found that college lecturers use discourse markers as signposts on structural level when taking turns in lecturing as a subconscious behaviour. The study uses naturalistic video recorded data and interviews with lecturers to cross-check the interpretation from both the lecturers and the researcher's point of view. It recognizes the functional significance of those three DMs in conversational interactions when organizing utterances.

In Chinese context, Yu (2008) investigated interpersonal meaning of DMs in Chinese EFL classroom within the framework of systemic functional linguistics. In her article, discourse markers are studied in six moves of the process of teaching: *opening, information checking, information clarification, responding, comment* and *repetition*. According to Yu (2008), the appropriate use of DMs can improve the effectiveness of classroom teaching. Liu (2006) conducted a pragmatic analysis on one Chinese literature class and concluded that teachers' discourse markers have five major textual functions: *connect, transfer, generalize, explain* and *repair*. In the process of constructing classroom context, he argued that DMs contribute to the functions of discussion, emotion control and adjust of social relationship. Though little attention has been paid to the use and functions of DMs in a pedagogical environment, discourse markers

are constantly used in teacher language to help creating an effective flow of information from teachers to students in different stages of learning process, if used appropriately. Walsh, (2006). Claims that different from other applications of discourse markers used by EFL teachers can assist to realize certain pedagogical purposes that direct EFL classroom lesson plan.

Walsh, (2006) and Fung and Carter, (2007) observe that, in classroom context, DMs function as a lubricant in interaction to reduce understanding difficulties, incoherence and social distance among students, and between teacher and student . Discourse markers in teacher talk play an important role for students to understand teacher language better, which hence helps them to improve learning efficiency. As it is observed, DMs perform both social and educational functions simultaneously in classroom context. The relationship between discourse markers and efficacy of classroom interaction is still not yet fully presented. Therefore, one of the significances of this study is to contribute in presenting classroom interaction.

2.1.23 Teaching and Learning Discourse Markers

Although many linguists through researches and studies have reached a general agreement on the importance of discourse markers, there is still a need for further researches on how to teach and learn DMs. Timmis, (2012) states that there have been few empirical studies which have investigated the teaching and learning of spoken grammar in classroom contexts. DMs are not highly idiomatic and do not seem to be a mark of cultural identity in the way that slang or colloquial language can be and are therefore likely to be worth acquiring for productive use in ESL or EFL classrooms. McCarthy & Carter, (2007:65) add that, data from spoken corpora indicate that DMs are very common in (at least) native speaker speech. '*You know*' and '*I mean*', for example, are the first and second most frequent two-word chunks in the can code spoken corpus of British

English. Jones, (2010) says that, the frequency of DMs is as a result of them having a number of useful functions in speech such as showing listenership or opening conversation but their high frequency may also mean that they do not always stand out and can seem banal or irrelevant to learners. Additionally, Cullen & Kuo, (2007) their claim despite this, discourse markers rarely appears in textbooks and has only occasionally been the subject of classroom research.

According to the lexical approach, a common characteristic of acquiring language is the progression from routine to pattern to creative use. Thus one method of teaching lexical phrases is to get students to start with a few basic fixed routines, which they then would analyze increasingly variable patterns as they were exposed to more varied phrases. According to this view, there is nothing wrong with memorizing some essential chunks, especially at the beginning stage of language learning, which will surely ease frustration, promote motivation and fluency when learners are unable to construct and use successfully.

More specifically, the lexical approach follow this way: first it is to pattern practice drills which will provide a way of gaining fluency with certain basic fixed routines. Then it is to introduce controlled variation in these basic phrases of simple substitution drills. Next, it is to have students learn to segment and construct new patterns of their own by modeling the analysis done in classroom. Thus the process goes from memorizing some basic and fixed routines to substitution exercises and last to analysis of those variable phrases to find out the construction rules for a full acquisition.

The researcher thinks that if students begin to realize the existence of discourse markers is somewhat helpful, they may use DMs in their daily conversation. Therefore, teachers are supposed to provide timely help by correcting their wrong and inappropriate uses. During this period students are

required and encouraged to read more and listen more model materials and try to pay attention to these special items and learn to use them. Then through constant practice, students are supposed to come to an advanced level to learn and know some knowledge about discourse and discourse analysis such as the important cohesion and coherence view in discourse analysis, discourse structure, and discourse style, which will greatly help them to deal with reading and writing more efficiently as well as to have a better understanding and employing of DMs.

In conclusion, discourse markers are in fact helpful in English Language Learning (ELL), bases on the theories and the current research and studies in this field. As Avon Crismore, (1989) points out that DMs are important for English studies because they can lead to more efficient and effective speaking, listening, writing, reading, interpreting and critical thinking. And in James and et al, (1992) they illustrate the possibility and prosperity to apply these linguistic items to an effective teaching of speaking, listening, reading and writing. They believe that these special words and expressions will, to certain extent, facilitate students' study, save their time and help them to grasp the main idea of the speaker or of the writer's intention and attitudes more quickly and accurately. Therefore, the findings of the present study which is under investigation may help teachers and learners of English as ESL/ EFL to use discourse markers efficiently as well as helping teachers to deliver the lecture effortlessly and also to help learners understand the lecture easily.

Part Two

2.2 The Previous Studies

2.2.0 Introduction

The field of discourse markers as linguistic phenomena have been analyzed and widely discussed by many linguists such as: (Levinson, 1983, Schiffrin, 1987, Blakemore, 1987, Fraser, 1993,... etc.). So, there is a wide range of words that could be interpreted as discourse markers. The field of discourse genres is a wide- broad for the researchers to investigate and come out with findings, suggestions, and recommendations that are helpful in promoting the process of teaching and learning in EFL contexts, Therefore, the researcher has surveyed and reviewed a number of studies that are relevant to the present study i.e. Discourse Markers and its Effect on Lectures' listening Comprehension among EFL Students. This review has showed a uniqueness of it is own as it has looked into the importance of discourse markers in helping EFL students to comprehend the lecture simply in Sudanese universities level.

The investigation of discourse markers in enhancing listening comprehension of the lecture in EFL contexts is an area that has not been investigated much in local studies (Sudan). Relatively, there are many studies that investigated the field Discourse Analysis in terms of related studies to this study. In contrary, the international relevant studies to this study are quiet acceptable number.

The following are some of the previous related studies in the same field of discourse markers:

2.2.1 Local Previous Studies.

Ameer, (2008) investigated in his PhD thesis titled: The Enhancement of Foreign Language Listening Comprehension in Academic Lectures Using Discourse Markers at University of Khartoum. The study actually aims at

enhancing lectures comprehension delivered in English in a foreign language (FL) context. Moreover, the study has shed lights to the problems that foreign language learners' (FLL) level of lecture comprehension in English medium is relatively low. In which, the study adopted the quantitative method to determine whether the students would gain a practical skill which they could employ to enhance their listening comprehension in academic lectures. The data of this study is gathered through authentic lecture. In the pre-test the existing listening comprehension of both the experimental and control groups was tested before the training. The data have been collected, analyzed, and discussed in order to answer the research questions and verify or refute the hypotheses. The study has come out with the results that, discourse markers significantly enhance learners' comprehension in academic lectures. Based on these results the study made some recommendations that, discourse markers' effects on lecture comprehension should be given attention ,and to determine instructional actions to be undertaken in different teaching contexts such as writing course material, syllabus design, curriculum development and supplementation.. Also, there are suggestions for future study.

According to Ameer's study (2008), which states on enhancing students' listening comprehension by using DMs at university level. Whereas, the present study tries to trace the effectiveness of discourse markers in enhancing listening comprehending of the lecture and to what extend DMs help in grasping the lecture in an EFL classroom. Therefore, the researcher agrees with the study of Ameer in the general framework of the research problem but disagrees with him in the methods that are used for data collection and the dependent and independent variables of the study.

Ayman, (2015) investigated in his PhD, research titled; the Impact of Grammatical Accuracy and Discourse Features on the Quality of EFL M.A

Students' Written Performance, at University of Sudan for Science and Technology. The main objective of the study is to examine the major discourse features of cohesion misuses in the academic written performance of those students using discourse analysis. The study emerges as a result of the fact that, M.A students have real problems in some grammatical categories and cohesion devices for analyzing the discourse sub- features in his study. The study adopted the descriptive analytical method in which he used two tools for data collection a test for M.A students and a questionnaire for university teachers. Data have been collected, analyzed, and discussed in order to answer the research questions and verify or refute the hypotheses. The study has come out with the results that, the most problematic areas of grammatical categories that yielded the highest percentages of occurrence, the articles, prepositions, concord, and adjectives successively. Based on these results, the study made some recommendations for more systematic assignments on grammar and on the use of discourse features should be applied and practiced, until teachers make sure that those students do not have any grammatical or discourse problems. Also, there are suggestions for future researches.

The above mentioned study of Aymen, (2015) which tries to examine the major discourse features of cohesion misuses in the academic written performance of M.A students using discourse analysis. Whereas, this study examines the discourse features in the spoken performance of B.A students. The researcher agrees with Ayman's study only in the general usage of discourse markers by EFL learners but the two studies are quite different in the general framework of the problem and the objectives.

Abdel Magid, (2015) investigated in his PhD thesis titled: Code Switching Use as an Interactive Tool in EFL Classrooms: at University of Khartoum. The study actually aims at identifying and addressing the role of code switching (CS)

to first language (L1) in this case Arabic, when teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). It explains the issues related to CS and interprets the perceived gap for sociolinguistics and applied linguistics in the EFL teaching environment. Moreover, the study has shed lights to the problems that foreign language learners' (FLL) level of lecture comprehension in English medium is relatively low. The data of this study is collected from basic, secondary and college EFL classrooms in the Sudan and Saudi Arabia. It incorporates various data gathering techniques: audio-taped spoken data, a questionnaire, observational field notes and semi-structured interviews. The findings propose that CS has been used extensively, purposefully and functionally as part and parcel of EFL classrooms' discourse. Although the use of L1 has been greatly criticized in the existing literature, the findings of this study support the view that EFL teachers' use of L1 is unavoidable in the classes. In cases where both students and teachers share the same L1, there is a great tendency for using it in various aspects as a natural process, active and effective tool and strategy in EFL teaching environment. The study forwards some recommendations. First, both teachers and students should be sensitised about the value of CS as an important pedagogical tool. Second, teachers should be trained on the role of L1 in EFL classrooms. Whereas, the present study tries to investigate the discourse markers of the target language in EFL classes as a tool that have effect on students' comprehension of the lecture.

Elham, (2016) conducted study titled; Investigating Some Discourse Features of American Presidential Political Speeches, at Khartoum University. The aim of the study is to uncover such hidden meanings and analyze them so as to raise an awareness of the manipulative use of language in political speeches. This study examines some specific linguistic features at the levels of: Personal Pronouns, Modal Auxiliary Verbs and Conceptual Metaphor. Speeches of four presidents are selected as the corpus of this study. Two of them are Democratic

(Barack Obama and Bill Clinton) and two are Republican (George W. Bush and Ronald Reagan). The approaches that are used in this study are; Corpus Linguistics, CDA, Stylistic Analysis , Rhetorical Analysis and ideological Analysis, to approach qualitatively and quantitatively the analysis of salient Personal Pronouns, Modal Auxiliary Verb and Conceptual Metaphors, examining their frequencies, patterns and implications of manipulative use. The findings of the investigation reveal a correlation between the aforementioned three linguistic levels which prevails the speeches of all presidents. The above mentioned items are used for a couple of manipulative purposes: First, to reveal someone's positive face and negative others' presentation. Second: to hide someone's negative face and positive others' presentation. The drawn similarity between this study and the present study, it is clear that both of the studies used linguistics features to have positive effect on the delivering speech whether it is in political field or in the pedagogical field.

2.2.2 International Previous Studies.

Rido, (2010) conducted Ph.D. thesis at University of Malaysia., the study titled; The Use of Discourse Markers as an Interactive Feature in Science Lecture Discourse in L2 Setting. This research is aimed to investigate the function of discourse markers as an interpersonal-interactive feature in a science lecture in second language (L2) setting in Malaysia where English is used as the medium of instruction in tertiary level. The study emerges as a result of the fact that, second language (L2) listeners often have difficulties in following the structure of a text for a substance of comprehension, even though sometimes they have no lexical obstacles at all. This research employs qualitative method while the data are gathered through non-participant observation and video recording. Data have been collected, analyzed, and discussed in order to answer the research questions and verify or refute the hypotheses. The study has come out with the results that,

the use of discourse markers will help students to comprehend a lecture. Based on these results, the study made some recommendations that there is, indeed, a potential in this area for further research. Also, there are suggestions for the same research that can be repeated with larger corpus so then there will be richer data to be analyzed further.

The study of Rido, (2010) tries to investigate the function of discourse markers as an interpersonal-interactive feature in a science lecture in second language (L2) setting in Malaysia. Whereas the present study, tries to trace the function of discourse markers in enhancing listening comprehension of the lecture in an EFL setting in Sudan. Therefore, the researcher agrees with the study of Rido in the general framework of the study but strongly disagrees with his study in the method, the population, and the objective of the study.

Al Makoshi, (2014) conducted Ph.D. thesis at University of Birmingham, the study titled; Discourse markers and code-switching: academic medical lectures in Saudi Arabia using English as the medium of instruction. The main objective of the study is to investigate the roles of DMs in academic medical lecture discourse using data from a non-native English academic corpus and a native English academic sub-corpus. This thesis is a corpus-based study of two spoken academic corpora in English as the (foreign) medium of instruction (EMI) context. The first part of the research qualitatively and quantitatively investigates the use of English discourse markers (DMs) on two levels: Structural (e.g. so, because...etc.) and Interactional (e.g. okay?, I mean, any question?). The study has come out with the results that, structural DMs are found to function frequently as topic Initiators, topic developers, summarizers, and closers, and occur more frequently in NS lectures' discourse. Interactional DMs, which function as confirmation checks, rephrases and elicitors, are found to occur more frequently in the NNS lectures. This study demonstrates that the uses of DMs by

the NS and NNS lecturers are affected by discourse context, pedagogic goals, personal lecturing styles, interaction with students and the need to create a conducive learning environment. The second part explores the use of Arabic discourse markers (ADMs) in the NNS lecture discourse on similar Structural and Interactional levels. Interactional ADMs (e.g. *يعنى*{means}, *مفهوم؟* {understood}) have a higher overall frequency than Structural ADMs (*فا* {so}, *لانو* {because}). The third part of this thesis explores the pedagogical functions of English-Arabic code-switching (CS) in the NNS lectures. When the purpose of CS is to make meaning clearer and convey knowledge more efficiently, it is not a language barrier but an effective communicative strategy. This study emerges as a result that has identified the most frequent roles of CS in the academic medical lectures and illustrated the pedagogical purposes of incorporating the L1 in EMI lectures. First and foremost, it saves valuable time for lecturers and students by clarifying a point through the shared language. There is great potential in this study for further research. Foremost, a broader corpus with similar lectures from other medical colleges would provide richer data and extended generalizations about the uses, functions and roles of DMs.

The above mentioned study of Al Makoshi, (2014) is divergent in the methods that are used in collecting data and also the two different population of the study in which it explores the use of English and Arabic discourse markers in the NNS lecture discourse on similar Structural and Interactional levels. Whereas, the present study explores the function of English discourse markers in EFL context, whether is lecturer a native or non-native speaker. In spite of, the differences between the two studies the researcher thinks that discourse markers are used in all most languages domains of teaching and learning to help in facilitating the comprehension process. As in Al Makoshi study which sheds some lights on the Arabic discourse markers.

A similar study was carried out by Chaudron and Richards, (1986) in their study, titled; ESL students' comprehension of academic lectures. They aimed to establish the use of discourse markers which indicated the overall organization of the lecture, had effect on students' listening comprehension. The study adopted the quantitative method for data collection in which they used a test in four different versions of the lecture was audio-recorded. Each version included a different combination of micro- and macro-markers. These lectures were then played to L2 learners of different ability levels and measures were taken of their comprehension. The researchers were testing three hypotheses, they found a consistent result across the groups listening to the lectures that macro-markers, that is the "higher order markers signaling major transitions and emphasis in the lectures" were more conducive to recall than micro-markers or "lower-order markers of segmentation and inter-sentential connections". Based on these results, the study made some recommendations for more systematic assignments on grammar and on the use of discourse markers should be applied and practiced. Also, there are suggestions for future researches.

Whereas, the present study tries to investigate that do discourse markers have effect on students' listening comprehension of the lecture? Despite the similarities of the two studies, they are different in the methods that are used for collecting the data and also, the population of the study. In addition to that, the study of Chaudron and Richards conducted in 1986 which is a huge gap date from the present study.

In another study, Young (1994) aimed at identifying some of the more prominent micro-features that contribute to the macro-structure of the university lecture. Her research was based on an analysis of seven two-hour lectures from third and fourth year courses. She chose a model that would not only reveal the macro-structure of the lecture but would also identify some of its most significant

micro-features. She used the Systematic Functional Grammar Model which allowed her to identify both the macro-structure of a language variety as well as the micro-features which make up this variety. She found that her study confirmed her assumption that “an acquaintance with the correct schematic patterning of lectures will greatly assist students” especially for foreign students who had great difficulty in taking notes. She concluded that, lecturers in the different disciplines need to be made aware of the contribution of discourse markers in the assimilation of content information as it may contribute to the more effective use of such markers which might add to students’ chances of academic success.

According to Young, (1994) who suggested that lecturers in the different disciplines need to be made aware of the contribution of discourse markers in more effective use of such markers which might add to students’ chances of academic success. Whereas the present study tries to recommend after verifying the hypotheses that lectures should be aware of using discourse markers particularly in EFL contexts in order to facilitate the grasping of their speech in the classroom.

Generally, the previous studies provided the researcher with different precious information as they are to some extent related to the present study. This information includes:

- a) The study populations of all these studies were university students and this does not contradict with the present study which uses the same population for the study.
- b) The researcher also benefited lots from the related literature which followed the quantitative method which is also adopted by the researcher in this study so as to achieve the objectives.

c) The researcher also benefited from the statistical measures and statistical treatment of these studies in obtaining accurate data analysis and results.

Additionally, while several researchers have studied discourse markers from the descriptive and contrastive perspectives, there is a relative lack of experimental work on this topic. In order to fill the gap in this research area however, this study investigates the effect of the use of discourse markers in enhancing EFL listening comprehending the academic lecture at Sudanese university level. The study is based on the premise that the knowledge derived from this investigation will provide insights to facilitate the academic listening comprehension of the lecture in ESL/EFL contexts.

2.2.3 Summary

This chapter has shown the theoretical framework of the study in terms of providing; definitions, quotations and paraphrases cited from the viewed literature in support of the values of discourse markers. The researcher tried to find and survey many studies that in a way or another are related to the present study. However, the researcher succeeded in pointing out some related studies which can be considered quite enough to this study. In addition, these studies are supposed to contribute positively in the main body of the present study.