

MINISTRY OF HIGH EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF ALGIERS
FACULTY OF ARTS AND LANGUAGES
ENGLISH DEPARTEMENT

**THE EFFECT OF CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING TASKS
ON IMPROVING EFL STUDENTS' USE OF
DISCOURSE MARKERS IN SPEAKING**

*A Case Study of First Year Algerian LMD Students in the English
Department, at the University of Algiers 2*

*Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English, University of Algiers,
in Candidacy for the Degree of Magister in Linguistics.*

Presented by:

- Mrs. BOUZAR Siham

Supervised by:

- Prof. HAMITOUCHE Fatiha

Academic Year: 2011

Board of Examiners

Chair: Prof. BENSEMMANE Faiza (University of Algiers 2)

Supervisor: Prof. HAMITOUCHE Fatiha (University of Algiers 2)

Examiner: Dr. NEDJAI Fatima Zohra (University of Tizi Ouzou)

Declaration

I hereby declare that the substance of this dissertation is entirely the result of my own investigation and that due reference or acknowledgement is made, whenever necessary, to the work of other researchers.

Mrs. BOUZAR Siham

Dedication

To the dearest persons in my life:

My mother,

My husband Adlaine, my son Ilyes, my daughters Sarah and Sirine.

My sister and brother

Acknowledgement

I would like to take this opportunity to express my immense gratitude to Professor. HAMITOUCHE Fatiha as my supervisor and Professor. BENSEMMANE Faiza for their guidance and for their precious advice, and to all those who have provided me with their invaluable support and assistance. Moreover, special thanks are addressed to all first year Algerian LMD students who have participated in the survey for their collaboration and great help in realising this piece of work.

Abstract

The investigation described in this dissertation aims at studying some aspects of spoken discourse which are discourse markers, and will consider in particular the production of those devices by EFL students of English as well as the effect of consciousness-raising tasks on improving discourse competence and communicative language performance of non-native speakers of English in Algeria. In this context, the case of first year Algerian LMD students in the English department, at the University of Algiers 2 is considered.

Indeed, discourse markers of spoken English, such as “ you know, I mean, well, see, so, and, but, ...etc” perform an important function in conversation. They have been the subject of investigation in a host of studies focusing on native and non-native speakers and have been assigned a multitude of terminologies and various definitions by several researchers; however, no research has been conducted as far as Algerian EFL learners are concerned. Therefore, the present study will try to answer some issues related to Algerian students’ awareness about these items, their usage as well as the factors affecting the latter. Accordingly, a quasi experimental research was adopted consisting of two groups of twenty (20) students each belonging to first year LMD: one constitutes the experimental group while the other represents the control one. The experiment was conducted in three phases during which three techniques were adopted in the collection of the required data; i.e. we employed two written tests (a pre- test and a post- test), two interviews (from which we derived student corpora) and a questionnaire.

The study reveals some development in the students' discourse competence as far as the use of spoken discourse markers is concerned; nevertheless, a discrepancy is noticed in the frequency and use of those targeted features when compared with a sub-corpus of native speakers' talks containing 460,050 words, already employed by Fung and Carter (2007: 417), selected from the whole CANCODE pedagogical corpus. The latter comprises 5 million words of English spontaneous speech recorded in a variety of situations namely: transactional, pedagogical, socializing and intimate. Besides, Algerian EFL learners' speaking skill has evolved considerably in comparison with their output before receiving instruction. Nevertheless, they did not reach natives' level of proficiency.

Moreover, the investigation unveiled that some discourse markers were overused or underused whereas others were misused or not used at all. Thus, four categories of spoken discourse markers users were distinguished. These included: over users, under users, misusers and no users. Additionally, the findings attributed the reasons affecting Algerian EFL learners' use/ non-use of those discourse devices to three major factors. These include: situational anxiety, delay and inadequate English proficiency.

CONTENTS

Abstract.....	iv
List of Abbreviations	ix
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Appendices.....	x
General Introduction.....	01
CHAPTER I: Theoretical Background in the Field of Spoken	
Discourse.....	07
Introduction.....	07
1.1- Discourse Markers.....	07
1.1.1- Definition and Terminology.....	07
1.1.2- Properties of Discourse Markers.....	10
1.1.3- Functions of Discourse Markers.....	15
1.1.4- Discourse Markers and coherence.....	16
1.2- Issues in Teaching speaking to EFL Learners.....	20
1.2.1- The Spoken Language.....	20
1.2.2- Contrasting Spoken and Written Languages.....	23
1.2.3- Consciousness-Raising.....	25
1.2.4- Approaches to the Teaching of Speaking.....	29
Conclusion.....	32

CHAPTER II: Methodology.....	33
Introduction.....	33
2.1- Rationale.....	33
2.2- Research Questions.....	36
2.3- Research Design.....	41
2.3.1- The Subjects.....	41
2.3.2- Research Tools	42
2.3.3- Research Procedure	51
2.4- Method of Analysis.....	62
2.4.1- Written Tests Analysis.....	62
2.4.2- Oral tests Analysis.....	62
2.4.3- Questionnaire Analysis.....	64
Conclusion.....	64
 Chapter III: Results.....	 65
Introduction.....	65
3.1- Pre-test and Post-test Scores Analysis.....	65
3.2- Analysis of DMs used in Students' Corpora during Pre and Post Instructional Phases.....	70
3.3- Questionnaire Analysis.....	77

3.4- Comparative Analysis based on EFL Students' Corpus, before and after Instruction, with Reference to CANCODE Sub-Corpus.....	80
3.5- Summary of the Results.....	88
Conclusion.....	89
CHAPTER IV: Discussion and Implications.....	90
Introduction.....	90
4.1- Discussion.....	90
4.2- Implications for Teaching and Suggestions.....	103
4.3- Limitations of the study.....	105
Conclusion.....	107
General Conclusion.....	108
Bibliography.....	112
Appendices.....	122
Abstract in Arabic.....	150

List of abbreviations

BA Degree	Bachelor of Art Degree
CANCODE	Cambridge and Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in English
DMs	Discourse markers
EFL Learners	Learners of English as a Foreign Language
LMD	Licence, Master, Doctorate
PPP	Presentation, Practice, Production

List of Tables

Table 01: The Subjects Participating in the Investigation	P 42
Table 02: Composition of the Student Corpora	P 48
Table 03: Experimental and Control subjects' Pre-Test Marks	P 66
Table 04: Experimental and Control Subjects' Post-Test Marks	P 68
Table 05: DMs Use in Students' Corpora During Pre-Instructional Phase	P 72
Table 06: DMs Use in Student Corpora During Post-Instructional Phase	P 74
Table 07: Students' Awareness about the Use of DMs (Experimental Group/ Questionnaire)	P 78
Table 08: Students' Awareness about the Use of DMs (Control Group/ Questionnaire)	P 78
Table 09: Reasons for Using DMs/ (Experimental Group/ Questionnaire)	P 79
Table 10: Reasons for Using DMs/ (Control Group/ Questionnaire)	P 80
Table 11: Frequency of Discourse Markers among the Top 100 Most Frequent Words in the Pedagogic Sub-Corpus in CANCODE (460.005 words)	P 81
Table 12: Representation of DMs used in Students' Corpus with reference to CANCODE at the Pre-Instructional Phase	P 82
Table 13: Categories of DMs Users at the Pre-Instructional Phase	P 84
Table 14: Representation of DMs used in Students' Corpus with reference to CANCODE at the Post-Instructional Phase	P 85
Table 15: Categories of DMs Users at the Post-Instructional Phase	P 87

List of Appendices

Appendix N° 01: Data Sheet on Discourse Markers	P 122
Appendix N° 02: A Sample Interview (Before Instruction Phase)	P 125
Appendix N° 03: Questionnaire (Before Instruction Phase)	P 126
Appendix N° 04: Comparison of Texts	P 127
Appendix N° 05: Spoken and Written Language: Differences	P 129
Appendix N° 06: From Spoken to Written Language	P 131
Appendix N° 07: From Written to Spoken Language	P 132
Appendix N° 08: PRE –TEST	P 133
Appendix N° 09: POST- TEST	P 134
Appendix N° 10: Like To Do / Transcript	P 135
Appendix N° 11: Yesterday/ Transcript	P 140
Appendix N° 12: Going Home and Your National Identity/ Transcript/ BBC Learning English	P 144
Appendix N° 13: Transcription Conventions	P 149

General Introduction

In our daily interactions, we use language to fulfil many different goals. We communicate information, ideas, beliefs, emotions and attitudes to one another. When using language for communication, both the interlocutor and the addressee are involved in two major processes: transmitting ideas and interpreting the message produced. The same processes take place when learning another language as English. The latter requires a combination of knowledge of the target language with skills and strategies that enable to use it effectively.

Indeed, when using English language in conversation, both the speaker and the listener signal constantly how they want things to be understood and interpreted through the use of a multitude of small words such as you know, I mean, well, see, so, and, but and many others. The latter play an important role in discourse and have been allotted various names by various researchers such as “discourse particles, connectives, pragmatic expressions or pragmatic markers”, yet the term “discourse markers” (DMs) is more commonly employed by researchers who work on English discourse. Therefore, we use the term discourse markers in this survey.

A great deal of studies on discourse markers carried out during the last two decades by researchers such as Aijmer 2002, Fraser 1990, Schiffrin 1987, Schourop 1975 indicate that they are significant elements requiring to be learnt by non native speakers. In this respect, Taboda (2006) qualified the study of discourse markers as “an extensive area of research in itself”, while Fraser (1999: 932) characterised it

“as a growth industry in linguistics”. Furthermore, Lewis (2006: 43) highlights their presence in spontaneous conversation. In this context, he asserts:

“A glance at a sample of English spontaneous conversation is likely to find it peppered with expressions such as well, I mean, so, in fact, though, of course, anyway, actually, on the other hand, commonly described as discourse particles or discourse markers”

Accordingly, if we take for granted that discourse markers have a major role to play in spontaneous interaction between native speakers of English as the authors of discourse analyses claim, then we may assume that they constitute a relevant area for teaching the spoken discourse devices in the language classroom. Yet, discourse markers are seldom part of the classroom curricula. The reason may be returned back to “the lack of clear semantic denotation and syntactic role, which makes formal or explicit commentary on their use fairly difficult” (de Klerk, 2005:275). Besides, Svartvik (1980:71) claims that:

“If a foreign language learner says five sheeps or he goed, he can be corrected by practically every native speaker. If on the other hand, he omits a well, the likely reaction will be that he is dogmatic, impolite, boring, awkward to talk etc, but a native speaker cannot pinpoint an ‘error’”.

According to this claim, if foreign language speakers speak grammatically without employing discourse markers, it is impossible that native speakers pinpoint any grammatical error, yet it is essential to learn those linguistic devices to sound natural.

In this respect, this survey aims at exploring Algerian learners' use of English spoken discourse markers and investigating the effect of applying discourse analysis in the classroom with specific focus on teaching those devices to EFL learners. The reasons lying behind it are multiple and can be summarised as follows:

Throughout my modest experience as a teacher of oral and listening comprehension, I have observed first year Algerian EFL learners of English when engaging in conversation. I noticed that the latter had a tendency to imitate English people's talk via the frequent use of certain markers such as "well, so, ok, and" and "but"; however, they tended to overuse them or misuse them. Besides, they restricted their speaking to the use of the aforementioned devices and neglected the whole list of those elements smoothing conversation. This may be explained by the fact that some expressions are culture bound, and that learners often ignore them or do not know where and when to make use of them.

Furthermore, since no study has been conducted as far as discourse markers are concerned in the Algerian context, a call for a rigorous investigation is felt to be necessary to confirm or deny the Algerian EFL learners' consciousness about those devices, their appropriate use and the factors affecting their use. This can be put into concrete form on the basis of previous studies carried out in this field. Moreover, because spontaneous conversation requires prompt reflection and responses from speaker and the addressee, such devices are very helpful for EFL learners who lack strategies to keep the flow of conversation smoother and clearer. Likewise, a delay marked by pure silence would be socially and linguistically awkward. Thus, it is useful to highlight the use of discourse markers and elucidate their meaning as well as their

correct usage in the target language via awareness-raising activities. Additionally, since there is a lack of instruction on the use of those linguistic devices in the Algerian formal language classrooms, an urgent need, then, to develop the students' communicative competence and raise their awareness about discourse elements is required. This can be achieved through exposing them to authentic language implemented by audio-video activities. The latter will make learners avoid faulty production that can, according to Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001:720), "lead to mismatches and misunderstanding".

For all these facts, the present research will focus on some aspects of spoken discourse namely discourse markers and will attempt to answer some issues relating to students' use of these patterns. In this framework the following question stands out:

- What is the effect of DMs awareness-raising instruction on EFL learners' discourse competence and communicative language performance?

Likewise, some sub questions, which are explained and discussed in the rationale (second chapter), should be raised. These have to do with:

- Does classroom instruction of the spoken discourse markers, considered in this study, improve EFL learners' speaking competence and performance? In other words, how well does the experimental group do before and after awareness-raising instruction as compared to the control one?

- What are the factors that affect Algerian EFL learners' use of discourse markers?
- How well do EFL students do before and after instructional phase as compared to native speakers?

The present study, consequently, attempts to explore EFL learners' use of discourse markers in speaking and to investigate the effect of consciousness raising tasks about those linguistic devices on Algerian non-native speakers of English oral fluency. Accordingly, in the first chapter we start by reviewing the literature that looks at discourse markers, as linguistic devices which contribute to the flow of conversation, their definitions, properties as well as their functions and address the question related to discourse markers contribution to coherence. We also deal with issues of teaching speaking to EFL learners by looking at the spoken language specificities to highlight the contrast existing between spoken and written languages. Furthermore, it considers the role of consciousness-raising as well as the approaches relevant to the teaching of speaking appropriately.

The following chapter (chapter two) presents the rationale, the research tools as well as the steps followed to investigate EFL students' use of spoken discourse markers and the effect of consciousness-raising tasks about those linguistic patterns on developing Algerian EFL learners' speaking competence and performance. A number of justifications are put forward to explain the choice of the subjects, the procedure of investigation and the tools implemented.

The third chapter is concerned with the results retrieved from the study. In this chapter, the results are presented as follows. First, a comparative analysis of pre and post tests scores is set out. Second, a comparative analysis of experimental and control subjects' corpora before and after instructional phases is exhibited. Third, the questionnaire results are put forward followed by explanation and interpretation. Finally, a comparative analysis based on the study of EFL students' corpora, before and after instruction, with reference to CANCODE sub-corpus is presented.

The last chapter (chapter four) is concerned with the analysis and discussion of the research findings presented in the previous chapter, in addition to some implications to be considered when teaching discourse markers in order to foster Algerian EFL learners' discourse competence and communicative language performance.

CHAPTER I

Theoretical Background in the Field of Spoken Discourse

Introduction

This chapter looks at the significance of some discourse markers, as linguistic elements which greatly contribute to the flow of conversation. First, we overlook their definitions, properties as well as their functions and address the question related to discourse markers contribution to coherence. Then, we deal with issues in teaching speaking to EFL learners by looking at the spoken language and highlighting the contrast existing between spoken and written languages. Furthermore, it considers the concept of consciousness-raising as well as the approaches relevant to the teaching of speaking appropriately.

1.1- Discourse Markers

In this section, the definitions attributed to discourse markers, their properties as well as their functions are considered. Likewise, the issue related to the contribution of discourse markers to coherence is addressed.

1.1.1-Definition and Terminology

Despite the wide research interest raised by discourse markers for many years, there is no generally agreed upon definition of this term. In fact, discourse markers have been used under a multitude of terminologies and given various definitions.

As far as the terminology adopted to determine discourse markers, there is no definite consensus upon what to call those items. They have been assigned various names. Schiffrin (1987), McCarthy (1998: 178), Müller (2005:03) and O’Keefe et al (2007: 172) referred to them as “discourse markers”. Trillo (2006:194) called them “linguistic elements”. Schourup (1985), Aijmer and Blakemore (1987, 1992, 2002) gave them the name of “discourse connectives”. Another fairly frequent term is “pragmatic markers” (Andersen 1998). Furthermore, Pridham (2001:30) attributed to them the term “utterance indicators”, while Cook (1989:14) prefers the term “cohesive devices”. Redeker (1991) referred to them as “discourse operators” and were named “cue phrases” by Knott (2000), Knott & Sanders (1998) and Sanders and Noordman (2000). Other less frequent terms according to Fraser (2006:190) include “discourse particles, discourse signalling devices, indicating devices, phatic connectives, pragmatic operators, pragmatic particles, semantic conjuncts, and sentence connectives”.

Concerning the definitions attributed to those linguistic elements, Schiffrin (1987:31) gave an “operational definition” to markers. She defines them as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk”. McCarthy (1998: 178) put forward this definition: “discourse markers are words or phrases which are normally used to mark boundaries in conversation between one topic or bit of business and the next”. Another definition is submitted by Trillo (2006:191) who defines them as “those elements such as you know, I mean, well, oh, m, you see, look, listen, have a specific semantic meaning and contribute to scaffold the pragmatic coherence of interaction”. Besides, O’Keefe et al (2007: 172) defines them as “words and phrases

outside the clause structure that function to link segments of the discourse to one another in ways which reflect choices of monitoring, organisation and management exercised by the speaker”. Moreover, Pridham (2001:30) defines discourse markers or utterance indicators as “signposts indicating the structure of the conversation for the hearer, and helping the audience understand what is being said”.

In addition, Biber, Conrad and Leech (2002:449) define them as “inserts which contribute to the interactive character of speech, because they signal relations between speaker, hearer(s) and discourse”. They also assert that discourse markers “signal interactively how the speaker plans to steer the dialogue” (2002:456). Another definition is given by Thornbury (2008:15-33) who says that “discourse markers are used to buy time, to start a turn, or to mark the beginning or end of a segment through the use of grammar and vocabulary”. The International Encyclopaedia of Linguistics defines discourse markers as “a set of linguistic items in the cognitive, social, expressive and textual domains” (Bright: 1992).

Discourse markers are also said to “instruct discourse participants how to consider an upcoming utterance, providing a path toward the integration of different components of language into one coherent discourse” (Louwerse and Mitchell, 2003:202). Fraser (1999:91) provides a comprehensive definition of discourse markers:

“A class of lexical expressions drawn primarily from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbs and propositional phrases. With certain exceptions, they signal a relationship between the interpretation of the segment they introduce S2 and the prior segment S1. They have core meaning which is procedural, not conceptual, and their more specific interpretation is negotiated by the context, both linguistic and conceptual”.

Blakemore (2004:221) provides a functional definition to those linguistic elements. She states: “the term discourse marker is generally used to refer to a syntactically heterogeneous class of expressions which are distinguished by their function in discourse and the kind of meaning they encode”. Weydt (2006:206) supplies an additional definition to them. He mentions that “particles are (single) words, which have no dissecting (lexical) deictic, or word class meaning, but they do have semantic content which they deploy in connection with other elements of the utterance”.

1.1.2- Properties of Discourse Markers

The description of discourse markers and the delimitation of what kind of linguistic elements should be subsumed under this term were not definitely precised by authors who were concerned with the study of those items. For instance, Schourup (1985:1) starts his dissertation by declaring “this is a study of several common items in English conversation known variously as discourse particles, interjections, discourse markers and less respectfully hesitations or fillers”.

No details were given on any characteristics of these particles. Schifffrin (1987:328) on her part suggested some specific conditions as criteria for an expression to be used as a marker. According to her, it should be used at the beginning of an utterance and that its omission from a sentence does not alter its meaning. Furthermore, she cites:

- “- It has to have a range of prosodic contours, e.g. tonic stress and followed by a pause, phonological reduction;
- It has to be able to operate at both local and global levels of discourse, and on different planes of discourse, this means that it either has to have no meaning, a vague meaning, or to be reflexive (of the language of the speaker)”.

Schiffrin (1987:328)

Schiffrin (1987: 328) also addressed several features of discourse markers. Regarding syntactic position and grammaticality, she claims:

“Although markers often precede sentences,..., they are independent of sentential structure. Removal of a marker from its sentence initial position, in other word, leaves the sentence structure intact. Furthermore, several markers - you know, I mean, oh, like- can occur quite freely within a sentence at locations which are very difficult to define syntactically”.

The quotation actually contains two features: syntactic independence and place of occurrence in relation to the sentence structure. In other words, she offered suggestions to delimit the features of such expressions as “the initial position” as the common place of occurrence, and mentioned other characteristics as “phonological reduction and no or vague meaning” (Schiffrin 1987:328).

In sum, when searching the literature for definition of discourse markers we will find that authors who were concerned with the study of those linguistic devices did not delimit precisely their properties. In this context, let us have a look at the individual features of the latter:

1- No Single Word Class

In searching the literature concerned with discourse markers, there is a difficulty in placing the latter within a traditional word class. Svartvik (1980:168) mentioned this feature.

2- Phonological Features

In her attempt to delimit the properties of discourse markers, Schiffrin (1987:328) looked at their phonological aspect. She suggested that “they have a range of prosodic contours, e.g. tonic stress and followed by a pause, phonological reduction”.

3- Syntactic Position

Regarding the position of discourse markers within a discourse, we find that markers are supposed to occur at the initial place of a discourse unit. In this respect, Hansen (1997:156) states that discourse markers “prototypically introduce the discourse segment they mark”. Moreover, we can notice the presence of the notion of initiality in Schiffrin’s functional definition of those items as well as in the conditions she settled to delimit their features (1987:31-32,328).

Shourup (1999:233) on his part addressed the idea of syntactic position and mentioned that “although initiality is rarely considered criterial for discourse markers status, most items considered as discourse markers are at least possible in initial position, and many occur there predominantly”.

4- Syntactic Independence

There have been diverse formulations to describe syntactic independence. Fraser (1988:22) for instance declares that “the absence of the discourse marker does not render a sentence ungrammatical and/or unintelligible”.

The idea that discourse markers occur within a sentence and are not tied to its syntactic structure is supported by Schiffrin who states: “removal of a marker from its sentence initial position leaves the sentence structure intact”. (1987:32)

5- Lack of Semantic Content

Considering the literature about discourse markers, we find expressions such as “markers having no meaning in themselves” (Erman 2001:1339), “no apparent meaning” (Trillo 2002:774) and “relatively little semantic content” (Vandenberg 2001:82).

6- Orality

Most researchers who are interested in linguistic items which could be called discourse markers agree upon the fact that the latter occur in spoken language. According to Schourup (1999:234), most discourse marker studies are based on spoken data, and “most forms claimed to be discourse markers occur primarily in speech”.

Schiffrin (1987) on her part does not list orality as one of the features of discourse markers; however, it is obvious from the functional definition of those items as “contextual coordinates of talk” that she does not have in mind elements which occur exclusively in written language.

Besides, Müller (2005:7) holds that “even though orality may not be a defining feature, it describes a frequent condition of the linguistic items many academics treat as discourse or pragmatic markers”.

7- Multifunctionality

Discourse markers are hard to describe functionally. No single approach can tackle the multiple functions of those linguistic elements. In this respect, Jucker and Ziv write:

“Whether a specific linguistic element is monofunctional or polyfunctional is not a useful criterion in deciding whether it is a discourse marker or not because of the obvious analytical vicious circularity it entails. Many studies actually set out to argue explicitly for the monofunctionality or polyfunctionality of specific markers, thus nullifying this as a valid criterion”.

(1998b:4)

Likewise, Aijmer (2002:3) talked about multifunctionality as a feature of discourse markers and stated:

“Discourse particles are different from ordinary words in the language because of the large number of pragmatic value that they can be associated with. Nevertheless speakers are not troubled by this multifunctionality”.

Aijmer (2002:3)

1.1.3- Functions of Discourse Markers

Pragmatic markers are multifunctional and therefore difficult to describe functionally. In this respect, Aijmer (2009) cited some functions of discourse markers. According to him, discourse markers are “indexical”, i.e. they comment on the information by clarifying the speaker’s intentions and the hearer’s interpretation. In addition,

“They mark a transition from one part of the dialogue to another, providing thus, the grease between the propositional parts of the discourse making it possible for the conversationalist to move quickly and smoothly from one topic to another”.

Aijmer (2009:5)

Besides, Schifffrin (2001: 58) on her part claims that the use of discourse markers is multifunctional, and that the latter helps the creation of coherence. She states: “It is this multifunctionality on different planes of discourse that help to integrate the many different simultaneous processes underlying the construction of discourse, and thus helps to create coherence”.

Furthermore, discourse markers facilitate the hearer’s task of understanding the speaker’s utterances. According to Schifffrin (1987:326), 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”. They also provide the hearer with processing instructions regarding possible interpretations:

“markers select a meaning relation from whatever potential meanings are provided through the content of talk, and display that relation” (1987:318).

In addition, Schiffrin (1987:281) pointed out that discourse markers help speakers to interact with each other and verify the reception of the information appropriately without mismatches and misunderstanding. According to her, discourse markers allow “a speaker to check on how discourse is progressing away from the initial distribution: a speaker can solicit affirmation of information reception as well as evidence of shifts in their interactional alignment”. Schiffrin stated elsewhere that “the presence of discourse markers in conversation helps the mechanics of turn-taking, the organization of speech acts, the structuring of discourse ideas, the interactive structure of participants, and the presentation of information”.

1.1.4- Discourse Markers and Coherence

The establishment of a coherent conversation by discourse markers constitutes a central part for those interested in those linguistic items. Indeed, Schiffrin asserted that “one of the central tasks of every day talk is the accomplishment of conversational coherence” (1987:126).

The production of a coherent discourse is “an interactive process which requires speakers to have different types of communicative language in addition to grammatical knowledge of sound, form and meaning” (Schiffrin 2001:54). In fact, discourse markers do not only signal the coherence relations existing in a discourse but also give us a picture of the speaker’s competence who uses them. The latter

comprises “expressive and social ability” as well as “cognitive and textual competence”. In other words:

“...an expressive and social ability to use language to display personal and social identities to convey attitudes and perform actions, and to negotiate relationships between self and other. Others include a cognitive ability to represent concepts and ideas through language and a textual ability to organize forms, and convey meanings within units of language longer than a single sentence”.

Schiffrin (2001:54)

Indeed, establishing connection between linguistic units can be done with the implementation of the so called: “gambits, pragmatic, discourse markers or text forming devices”. These are as noted by Nunan (1993: 21), “words and phrases which enable the writer or speaker to establish relationships across sentence or utterance boundaries, and which help to tie the sentences in a text together”. The function of these elements as mentioned by Bührig and House (2007: 346) “can be characterised as signalling the relation between one utterance and the preceding and/or ensuing discourse by instructing the hearer how he/she is to interpret the utterance containing the discourse marker”.

In this context, research on the nature of the connections between linguistic units created by discourse markers is however often not limited to two adjacent utterances, and a distinction can be made between “local” and “global” coherence as was asserted for instance by Lenk (1998: 27):

“Local coherence are those relations between segments in discourse that appear immediately adjacent to each other, whereas global coherence relations are the relations between segments in discourse that appear further apart, with other stretches of discourse in between”.

Lenk (1998: 27)

According to Lenk (1998: 49) the use of discourse markers is motivated interactively. In other words, “the speaker wants to guide the hearer’s understanding and indicates the connections between discourse segments so that hearer’s final interpretation will be as close as possible to her intentions”.

The notion of coherence has been also used by Lenk (1995:341) to express that all parts of the discourse fit together. Additionally it has been defined in the Collins Cobuild Dictionary: “if something is coherent, its parts fit together well so that it is clear and easy to understand”.

Furthermore, discourse markers have been studied extensively by various researchers. How different people see verbal interaction as a meaningful whole and how they derive coherence from discourse has been the core of study undertaken by Aijmer and Povolna (2009), Blakemore (2004), Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Schiffrin (1987). For instance, Aijmer and Povolna view coherence in spoken discourse as “the result of interaction and cooperation” (2009:x). Aijmer (2009:5) also states that discourse markers provide “the grease between the propositional parts of the discourse making it possible for the conversationalist to move quickly and smoothly from one topic to another”. Moreover; Blakemore (2004:234) asserted that “coherence is a cognitive notion: it is a notion which people use when interpreting utterances”.

Schiffrin (1987:326) on her part addressed the question of the contribution of discourse markers to coherence as follows: “discourse markers provide contextual coordinates for utterances: they index an utterance to the local context in which utterances are produced and in which they are interpreted”. She argues that discourse markers 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. According to Schiffrin (1987:330):

“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”.

In the same context, Schiffrin maintains that discourse markers contribute to the coherence of the text by establishing coherence relationships between units of talk. Thus, “cohesive devices do not themselves create meaning; they are clues used by speakers and hearers to find the meanings which underlie surface utterances” (1987:09).

Schiffrin’s detailed analysis of twelve discourse markers in English, “and, but, or, so, well, then, now, because, oh, well, y’know and I mean”, shares some views with Halliday and Hasan’s (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 a 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.

1.2- Issues in Teaching Speaking to EFL Learners

We deal in this section with the issues related to the teaching of speaking which constitutes a priority for many foreign language learners by looking at the spoken language and highlighting the contrast existing between spoken and written languages. Furthermore, we consider the concept of consciousness-raising as well as the approaches relevant to the teaching of speaking appropriately.

1.2.1- The Spoken Language

The Oxford Pocket Dictionary of current English (2009) defines speaking as “the action of conveying information or expressing one’s thoughts and feelings in spoken language”. Besides, Tarone (2005:485) states that speaking constitutes the most difficult skill. According to her, “speaking is a process of oral language production. It is one of the traditional “four skills” involved in using a second language, and as such is usually viewed as the most complex and difficult skill to master”.

Thus, the basic idea in any oral interaction is that the speaker has the objective of transmitting his ideas, feelings, attitudes and information to the hearer through speech. However, in such oral communication, any faulty production may lead to mismatches and misunderstandings which according to Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001:720) could derive from any of the following:

- “The speaker does not have full command of the target language and produces unacceptable form (it could be unacceptable in terms of phonology, grammar, or lexical choice);
- The necessary background knowledge is not shared by the speaker and the hearer and they bring different expectations to the spoken interaction;
- The speaker and the hearer do not share sociocultural rules of appropriateness, and therefore the speaker may have violated such a rule from the hearer’s point of view due to pragmatic transfer from the first language’.

Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001:720)

Consequently, in order to ensure proper interpretation by the hearer, Harmer (2001: 269) listed some elements necessary for spoken production. According to him, “the ability to speak fluently presupposes not only knowledge of language features but also the ability to process information and language ‘on the spot’”. Likewise, ten prerequisites for speaking in another language were suggested by Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000:175). These are to do with knowledge of vocabulary, knowledge of syntax and the ability to use discourse connectors, in addition to the following list:

- a- Ability to use suitable ‘opening phrases’ and ‘closing phrases’ such as ‘Excuse me’ or ‘Thank you for your help’;
- b- Ability to comprehend and use reduced forms (reducing vowel sounds is particularly important in English);
- c- Ability to use the basic intonation-or-tone patterns of the language;
- d- Ability to use proper rhythm or stress in the language and to make proper pauses;
- e- Awareness of how to apply Grice’s maxims in the new language;

- f- Knowing how to use the interlocutor's reaction and input;
- g- Awareness of the various conversational rules that facilitate the flow of talk.

Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000:175)

In addition, speaking as a skill constitutes a real hurdle to overcome by both the teacher and the learner. In other words, the teacher has to find appropriate procedures to help the learner with while the latter has to find a way to master the language. In this context, Brown and Yule (1983:25) state: "Spoken language production, learning to talk in the foreign language, is often considered to be one of the most difficult aspects of language learning for the teacher to help the students with". Furthermore, Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000:164) claim that oral communication can be considered as:

"the most difficult skill to acquire since it requires command of both listening comprehension and speech production subskills (e.g, vocabulary retrieval, pronunciation, choice of grammatical patterns, and so forth) in unpredictable, unplanned situations. On the other hand, speaking can be viewed as the easiest skill since one can use body language, demonstration, repetition and various other strategies to make oneself understood".

Therefore, in an attempt to master speaking as a skill, learners have to develop, in addition to the linguistic competence, compensatory strategies. These would consist (according to Harmer 2001, 2007; Hedge 2000; Celce-Murcia and Olshtain 2000) of "paraphrasing when vocabulary items are missing, appealing for help when a concept or notion cannot easily be communicated, using examples and explanations to clarify

one's intention, and so forth''. These strategies can be developed by ample exposure to authentic language in the classroom and by implementing intensive practice activities.

In sum, it is obvious that the spoken language is very difficult to acquire; therefore, contrasting spoken and written languages, which will be developed in the next section, constitutes a must to improve EFL learners' conversational competence.

1.2.2- Contrasting Spoken and Written Languages

Although the speaking skill shares the production process with the writing skill, it is very different from the act of writing. In fact, Cook (1989:115) claims:

“Spoken language, as has been pointed out happens in time, and must therefore be produced and processed ‘on line’. There is no going back and changing or restructuring our words as there is in writing; there is often no time to pause and think, and while we are talking or listening, we cannot stand back and view the discourse in spatial or diagrammatic terms...”

Indeed, current literature (Bailey 2005, Cook 1989, Nunan 1993, Lazaraton 2001, Miller and Weinert 1998, Van Lier 1995) indicates that spoken and written languages are different. The terms “spoken language and written language do not refer merely to different mediums but relate to partially different systems of morphology, syntax, vocabulary and the organisation of texts” (Miller and Weinert, 1998: 4-5). According to Van Lier (1995) “spoken and written languages differ in many important ways”. Thus, the message conveyed orally is temporary as it is received by the hearer sometime after the text was generated and sometimes even centuries

later. Moreover, meaning according to Bailey (2005:125) in spoken language is “conveyed in part through the suprasegmental phonemes (including rhythm, stress and intonation), whereas punctuation marks and type fonts convey such information in writing”.

Spoken and written languages also differ in terms of the demands they make on the listener or reader. In other words, as speaking happens in “real time” unlike reading or writing, it requires the interlocutor; ie, the person we are talking to, to listen, understand and wait to take his/her turn to speak. In this context, Lazaraton (2001: 103) supports this idea by saying:

“Spoken English is almost always accomplished via interaction with at least one other speaker. This means that a variety of demands are in place at once: monitoring and understanding the other speaker (s), thinking about one’s own contribution, producing its effects, and so on”.

In addition, Bailey (2005:125) maintains that since spoken communication occurs in real time, “the opportunities to plan and edit output are limited, whereas in most written communication, the message originator has time for planning, editing, and revision”. Furthermore, with written language there is no opportunity for the readers to signal that they do not understand as in face to face interaction in which “interaction can be conveyed by non-verbal behaviour” (Nunan, 1993: 14). This idea is emphasized by Bailey (2005: 125) where she notes: “verbal interaction typically involves immediate feedback from one’s interlocutor, whereas feedback to the authors of written texts may be delayed or nonexistent”.

Written language has also certain features that are not shared by spoken language. As signalled by Nunan (1993: 10) both differ in terms of grammar and lexical density. In other words: “linguistically, written language tends to consist of clauses that are internally complex, whereas with spoken language the complexity exists in the ways in which clauses are joined together”. As far as lexical density is concerned or what is referred to by Nunan (1993: 11) as “the number of content words per clause”, it is highly present in written language than in the spoken one.

From what has been mentioned before, it is clear that spontaneous spoken language differs importantly from the standard written form; thus, it is essential to highlight these main differences existing between spoken and written language in order to develop EFL learners’ spoken skill.

1.2.3- Consciousness-Raising

English language is so vast and varied that it is hard for a teacher to provide the learners with a precise and comprehensive description of it. Therefore, if learners wish to gain fluency in spoken English, “it is essential for them to have exposure to features that are typical of spoken language and that they have time to reflect on these features” (Willis and Willis, 1996:76). Thus, in order to activate learners’ knowledge about spoken grammar forms and make them available for face-to-face talk, it is necessary to raise their awareness about the British spoken grammar features through the implementation of special activities. The latter will, according to Willis and Willis (1996:63), “encourage them to think about samples of language and to draw their own conclusions about how

language works''. The general term allotted for activities of this kind is "consciousness-raising" (Willis and Willis, 1996:63) or "awareness-raising activities" (Thornbury, 2008: 41). Besides, Schmidt's (2001) 'Noticing Hypothesis' holds that "conscious attention to features of L2 input is the key to learning". In this respect it is necessary to elucidate this concept.

Indeed the term consciousness-raising has been given various definitions. Ellis (2002: 168), for instance, defines it as:

"an attempt to equip learners with an understanding of a specific grammatical feature, to develop declarative (describing a rule of grammar and applying it in pattern practice drills) rather than procedural (applying a rule of grammar in communication) knowledge of it".

Likewise, Richards, Platt and Platt (1992: 78) define consciousness-raising as follows:

"It is an approach to the teaching of grammar in which instruction in grammar (through drills, grammar explanation, and other form-focused activities) is viewed as a way of raising learner's awareness of grammatical features of the language. This is thought to indirectly facilitate second language acquisition".

The concept of awareness-raising is adopted from the cognitivist learning theory which rejects the behaviourists view about the learners who are considered as "empty vessels waiting to be filled, and instead credits them with an information processing capacity, analogous to computers" (Thornbury, 2008: 38). In teaching terms, cognitivist theory called for some degree of conscious awareness about the rules

of the system. Consequently, it replaced the three-stage PPP model (presentation, practice and production) with one that progresses from “awareness-raising, through proceduralization to autonomy” (Thornbury, 2008: 38).

The main characteristics of consciousness-raising activities proposed by Ellis (2002: 168) involve:

1. There should be an effort to isolate a specific linguistic feature for focused attention;
2. The learners are provided with data which illustrate the targeted feature and an explicit rule description or explanation;
3. The learners are expected to utilize intellectual effort to understand the targeted feature;
4. Misunderstanding or incomplete understanding of the grammatical structure by the learners leads to clarification in the form of further data and description or explanation; and
5. Learners are required to articulate (although this is not obligatory) the rule describing the grammatical feature.

To summarize, in consciousness-raising, learners are required to pay attention, to notice and understand certain features of language, “but there is no requirement to produce or communicate certain sentence patterns taught” (Widodo, 2006: 124).

There are a variety of ways in which consciousness-raising activities might be achieved. Willis and Willis (1996:69) list some steps to achieve them as follows:

1. Identify and consolidate patterns or usages;
2. Classify items according to their semantic or structural characteristics;
3. Hypothesis building, based on some language data, and then perhaps checked against more data;

4. Cross-language exploration, through searching similarities and differences between patternings in learner's language and in English;
5. Reconstruction/deconstruction; ie, to manipulate language in ways which reveal underlying patterns;
6. Reference training.

Willis and Willis (1996:69)

In the same context; ie, applying consciousness-raising activities to the teaching of grammar in the language classroom, Thornbury (2005:13) outlined, in his examination of the knowledge and skills needed for the students to speak, a three step programme to develop EFL learners' spoken skill involving: "awareness-raising activities; appropriation; and Autonomy".

According to the author, one way to help learners uncover the gaps of their language begins with:

"awareness raising activities, where learners are either presented with or discover for themselves features of spoken language. This is followed by appropriation activities where learners gain control of these features, before achieving full autonomy as independent speakers in a range of different spoken genres".

Thornbury (2005:13)

With an idea of what to develop during the teaching process, we must now turn our attention to how to teach the spoken skill appropriately which is developed in the following section.

1.2.4- Approaches to the Teaching of Speaking

“Instruction constitutes an attempt to intervene in the process of language learning” (Ellis, 2005:713). As concerns the teaching of conversation in second language programs, current literature (Ellis 2005, Hedge 2000, Richards 1990, Thornbury and Slade 2006) indicates that there are two major approaches that can be applied in the teaching of conversation: “an Indirect Approach and a Direct one”.

A- The Indirect Approach

In his attempt to deal with the teaching of conversation, Richards (1990) makes a distinction between two major approaches aforementioned. According to him, the indirect approach is an approach “in which conversational competence is seen as the product of engaging learners in conversational interaction” (1990:76-77). In other words, learners can develop their spoken skill via their participation in communicative activities. Moreover, Thornbury and Slade (2006) state that “the indirect approach assumes that learners can acquire conversational competence simply by doing it” (2006:275). Ellis (2005: 725) on his part points out that “indirect intervention, with its emphasis on learning through communication, is likely to result in linguistic knowledge that is deployable (i.e. that learners can actually access when asked to engage in real- life communication)”.

The justification for an indirect approach to the teaching of conversation is based on the notion laid out by Krashen and SLA theorists which states that “language can be unconsciously acquired through conversation and exposure to

comprehensible input’’ (Richards 1990: 77). SLA researchers have argued that “in using conversation to interact with others, learners gradually acquire the competence that underlies the ability to use language’’ (Richards 1990: 77).

However, there are certain causes justifying hesitancy in recommending this instructional approach. In this respect, Ellis (2005: 725) mentions four causes that may prevent the implementation of the indirect approach in language pedagogy:

“First it may not result in high levels of linguistic and sociolinguistic competence, as noted earlier although this may be remediable by means of proactive and incidental focus-on-form. Second, because of its relative newness, there is no received set of principles on which to base the design of a course for indirect intervention. Third, such an approach may be too radical for some teaching contexts, especially if the teachers and students view classroom learning as necessarily analytical. Fourth, it is not clear how an indirect interventional approach can cater for self-directed language learning, as it depends very largely on social interaction’’.

B- The Direct Approach

Advocates of the direct approach argue that speaking skills should be taught explicitly via consciousness-raising activities (Hedge 2000, Richards 1990, Thornbury 2008, Thornbury and Slade 2006). Richards (1990) for instance stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to have conversations. He asserts that the direct approach “involves planning a conversation program around the specific microskills, strategies, and processes that are involved in fluent conversation’’ (Richards 1990:77). Thornbury and Slade (2006: 275) support this idea

by indicating that the direct approach “presupposes the need for a form-focused instructional stage at some point in the lesson .

The direct approach to teaching conversation raises learners’ awareness of the nature, systems and patterns involved in conversation. Richards (1990) states that it is “one that focuses on the processes and strategies involved in casual conversations” (1990: 79). The latter can according to him be applied by implementing certain aspects as “strategies for turn-taking, topic control, and repair, conversational routines; fluency; pronunciation; and differences between formal and casual conversational styles”.

Likewise, learners gain knowledge on how and where to make use of certain fixed phrases and expressions that are abundant in spoken English discourse by implementing some aspects of conversation. These, according to Thornbury and Slade (2006: 276),

may take the form of discourse markers and conversational gambits such as conversationalized ways of opening and closing conversations, of turn-taking, and of back-channelling etc. and they may take the form of conventionalized ways of performing certain speech acts, such as apologizing, requesting and thanking.

To sum up, this section has attempted to explore two major approaches to the teaching of conversation for EFL learners. It is evident that each approach has its properties, and it is not possible to declare that the direct approach is superior to the indirect one or vice versa. Nor is it possible to declare that a focus instruction on one

will lead to better learning than another. Consequently, a balance between explicit awareness raising techniques and indirect methods is suitable to provide competent Algerian speakers of English.

Conclusion

We attempted in this chapter to highlight the concept of discourse markers, as linguistic devices which contribute to the flow of conversation; likewise, we tried to deal with the issues relevant to the appropriate teaching of speaking to EFL learners. The three next chapters present respectively the research method and design adopted in this study, the research results and finally an analysis and a discussion of the results.

CHAPTER II

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter presents the rationale, the research tools as well as the steps undertaken to investigate the effect of consciousness raising tasks about discourse markers on developing Algerian EFL learners' spoken language performance. A number of justifications are put forward to explain the choice of the subjects, the procedure of investigation and the tools implemented.

2.1- Rationale

The purpose of this study is to investigate the production of discourse markers by Algerian students of English and explore the effect of applying discourse based approach in the classroom on improving EFL learners' discourse competence and communicative language performance. In other words, the main aim of this research is to study EFL students' use of spoken discourse markers as well as the effect of raising EFL learners' awareness about those devices on developing their oral competence. The reasons lying behind the present research can be summarised as follows:

- Some EFL learners may stand still without uttering a word once they are involved in English social interactions requiring prompt or spontaneous responses, especially in exchanges involving face to face requests, refusals

or compliments. This may be returned back to the lack of mastery of linguistic devices such as discourse markers. However, a delay marked by pure silence would be socially and linguistically awkward, so it is often filled in with discourse markers such as “well, uh, oh” as they refer to and anticipate the following utterance (Schiffrin 1987). Thus, in explaining the latter to students, instructors can make clear that such words are helpful or necessary to keep the flow of conversation going on and clear. Likewise, they can highlight the use of discourse markers and elucidate their meaning as well as their correct usage in the target language via awareness-raising activities.

- Another reason is that throughout my period of work as a teacher of oral and listening comprehension at the English department of the University of Algiers 2, I have noticed that first year LMD students of English tended to imitate English people’s talk when conversing with each other. They frequently made use of certain markers such as “well, so, ok, and” and “but”; however, they tended to overuse them or misuse them. Besides, they restricted their speaking to the use of the aforementioned devices and neglected the whole list of those elements smoothing conversation. This may be explained by the fact that some expressions are culture bound, and that learners often ignore where and when to make use of them. This idea is sustained by Aijmer (1996) who points out that “learners of the (target) language are usually not aware that there are rules governing these expressions” (1996:30).

- Furthermore, since no previous study has been conducted as far as discourse markers are concerned in the Algerian context, a call for a rigorous investigation is necessary to confirm or deny the Algerian EFL learners' consciousness about those devices, their appropriate use and the factors affecting their use. This can be put into concrete form on the basis of the studies carried out in this field (for example, Aijmer 2002, Fraser 1990, Schifffrin 1987, Schourop 1975) indicating that they are significant elements requiring to be learnt by non native speakers.
- In addition, in EFL classes, there exists a tendency to put great emphasis on teaching grammar and vocabulary to enable learners to communicate. Nevertheless, this tendency seems to disregard teaching the pragmatic component of the target language in the language classroom. The latter is supposed to link form and context to enable users to express and interpret the intended meaning accurately. In this respect Trillo (2006:194) asserts:

“Teachers and learners of a language tend to concentrate on the acquisition of the grammatical and lexical elements that enable communication, but tend to disregard the study and development of pragmatic weight that discourse markers add to language learning”.

Therefore, an urgent need to raise EFL learners' awareness about discourse elements as well as the pragmatic aspect of the target language is required. This can be achieved through exposing them to authentic language implemented by audio-video activities. The latter will develop the students' communicative competence and make learners avoid faulty production that can lead to misunderstanding.

- Moreover, as far as language acquisition is concerned, native speakers of English acquire pragmatic competence in their childhood. Therefore, EFL learners need to know about the cultural aspects of the foreign language in order to avoid misuse or any misunderstanding from the part of native speakers.

For all these facts, three sub-questions are raised in order to reach a response to the principal research question aforementioned. Likewise, we present in detail the research design.

2.2- Research Questions

On the ground of the reasons aforementioned, the present investigation aims at finding answers to three research sub-questions related to EFL learners' use of spoken discourse markers as well as the effect of awareness-raising instruction about those linguistic patterns on developing communicative competence as well as spoken language performance of non-native speakers of English in Algeria. These research questions are as follows:

- Does classroom instruction of the spoken discourse markers, considered in this study, improve EFL learners' speaking competence and performance? In other words, how well does the experimental group do before and after awareness-raising instruction as compared to the control one?

Indeed, as it has been mentioned previously, the short period of observation allotted to the subjects of study allowed us to discover that Algerian EFL learners make frequent use of certain types of markers; however, they neglect the whole list of those elements smoothing conversation either because of their unawareness of their existence or because of their ignorance of their use. Therefore, by determining the extent to which learners are aware of the presence of discourse markers in spoken English, one's path for moving to the next step will be obvious. On the one hand, if learners are aware of their utility, teachers may fetch for a way to enhance the use of those elements in their everyday talks to sound more natural. If, on the other hand, the learners are unaware of these spoken devices, teachers will seek for an appropriate approach to teach them and attract the learners' attention to their decisive role in native speakers' communication, and thus try to bring them forth to improve their level.

Consequently, the answer to this question can be reached via conducting a pre-test and a post-test, an interview and a questionnaire right after it to assess the level of awareness. Moreover, with the purpose to unveil the spoken DMs most frequently used when engaging in conversation and determine EFL learners' oral competence development a comparison is set out between the corpora retrieved from the interview realised with experimental and control groups subjects. This comparison realised during the pre and post instructional phases can give us a clear picture of how well they perform as far as the use of those linguistic devices is concerned. Besides, it will enable us to discover whether DMs awareness-raising instruction improved EFL students' discourse competence and performance.

- What are the factors that affect Algerian EFL learners' use of discourse markers?

This question comes in fact as a result of our curiosity to find out the reasons that lead Algerian EFL learners to make use of DMs or to not use them. Indeed, by defining the possible causes for the misuse of discourse markers by Algerian non-native speakers of English, one can attempt to find a way to remedy the deficiencies. This can be achieved through the administration of a questionnaire in which the students reveal the causes. In fact, since we are to investigate the case of first year Algerian LMD students of English, forthcoming, we observed that their knowledge about English does not allow them to hold spontaneous conversation without marking a delay by pure silence. In addition, even the few discourse markers that they make use of to keep the flow of conversation smooth and avoid appearing awkward are sometimes overused or misused. Consequently, it is important to determine the major factors that affect their use.

- How well do EFL students perform before and after instructional phases as compared to native speakers?

In fact, answering this question will allow us to draw conclusions about the efficiency or deficiency of classroom instruction, and whether EFL learners have learned native speakers' patterns of discourse markers variation. Likewise, it will give us a suggestive picture of the problems the students have or may encounter when engaging in an English talk. This can be done only by comparing the learners'

conversations, as non-native speakers, with reference to native speakers'. In our case, we made a comparison between experimental subjects' corpora and that of native speakers.

In this respect, it is worthy to underline the fact that since no native subjects were available for study in our pedagogical setting and because of time constraints, we adopted a sub-corpus of native speakers' talks containing 460,050 words, already employed by Fung and Carter (2007: 417), selected from the whole CANCODE pedagogical corpus. Consequently, elucidating CANCODE is essential.

Indeed, as stated previously, the CANCODE project, standing for the Cambridge and Nottingham Corpus of discourse in English, is a project aiming at developing spoken English for pedagogical purposes. In fact, "it was established in the department of English studies at the University of Nottingham, United kingdom, and at Cambridge University Press, Cambridge" (McCarthy, 1998: 05). It is a collection of 5 million words of spontaneous speech recorded in a variety of situations namely: "Transactional, Professional, Pedagogical, Socialising and Intimate". Accordingly, McCarthy (1998: 09-10) defines five of them as follows:

- "Transactional relationships are those where speakers display needs or imperatives and move towards satisfying those needs outside the context of professional, socialising or intimate relationships (e.g. day-to-day encounters in shops, restaurants, etc.);
- Professional relationships are displayed in talk between professional colleagues in professional situations (e.g. informal company meeting);
- Pedagogical relations are those between teachers and their students and student-student (e.g. informal tutorial conversations, pair-and group- work);

- Socialising relations accord with social or cultural activities (e.g. a group of friends preparing a party, talking with a stranger on a train);
- Intimate relations pertain between family members or close friends (e.g. mother and daughter discuss family matters)''.

McCarthy (1998: 09-10)

After that, three goal types were added namely: "Provision of information, Collaborative tasks and Collaborative idea'' to capture the varieties of everyday spoken English. In this context, McCarthy (1998:10) elaborated them as follows:

- "Provision of information is predominantly uni-directional, with one party imparting information to others (e.g. an inquiry at a tourist information office);
- Collaborative tasks show speakers interacting with their physical environment while talking (e.g. two people packing a car prior to a journey);
- Collaborative ideas are concerned with the interactive sharing of thoughts, judgements, opinions and attitudes''

Consequently, in our research we used CANCODE corpus for two major reasons. The first reason lies behind comparing discourse markers use in educational settings between Algerian EFL learners with regard to British native speakers. The second and last reason is to gain insight about the extent to which Algerian learners, as non-native speakers of English, use appropriately those linguistic elements when talking.

2.3- Research Design

In this section we present the subjects involved in the survey, the research tools employed as well as the procedure of investigation.

2.3.1- The Subjects

As previously introduced, the population of the present investigation, presented in Table n°01, comprises two groups of Algerian University students belonging to first year English LMD. They are enrolled in the English department, at the University of Algiers 2 to get a Bachelor of Art degree (BA degree) in English as a foreign language. The first group constituting the experimental group consists of twenty (20) students, while the second one comprising the same number (20 students) constitutes the control group. It is necessary to mention in this respect that the subjects were divided from the beginning into experimental and control groups to ease the flow of the experiment.

Both groups are a mixture of male and female young students aged between eighteen and twenty two years old belonging to different social and cultural backgrounds. In other words, they come from different regions of Algeria and have different baccalaureates: literary, scientific and exact sciences. Additionally, all the members of the population are multilingual. They speak at least two of the following three languages: Arabic, French, Berber besides the English language which they have been studying for approximately seven years.

Table 01: The Subjects Participating in the Investigation

Subjects	Experimental Group	Control Group
Number of students	20	20
Gender	Male: 05 Female: 15	Male: 02 Female: 18
Age	18-22 years old	18-22 years old
Occupation	English University Students	English University Students
Level	First year English LMD	First year English LMD

2.3.2- Research Tools

In this research we used multiple techniques to gather the data necessary to answer the enquiries previously mentioned. In other words we made use of two written tests (a pre-test and a post test); a pre-interview and a post-interview (from which derive student corpora) in addition to a questionnaire. Each of these tools is presented bellow.

a- A Pre-Test and a Post- Test

Two written tests were assigned to the subjects of the study: a pre test and a post test. The reason behind the implementation of the latter is to discover the extent to which Algerian EFL learners as non native speakers of English are aware of spoken discourse forms; i.e. discourse markers used in spontaneous spoken language. The students were devoted 15 minutes to do the task by identifying and noting down the items that they consider being discourse markers as well as explaining the reasons

lying behind their use. Besides, both tests were allotted 20 points each; then, the results scored were compared and analysed to determine the extent to which awareness about discourse has developed.

With regard to the pre- test (see appendix N°08), the subjects of both groups of the research were assigned a written task adapted from Thornbury (2008:51) to assess their knowledge about communication strategies and more precisely about discourse markers and their functions. Thus, the students were asked identify the DMs included in the task by noting them down and giving an eventual explanation about their function. The test included 20 items to which one point was allotted to each one so that the maximum score would be 20. In other terms, the marking of the test focused on the number of DMs identified. Accordingly, we considered the students scoring 10/20 and more as subjects aware of those items while those scoring bellow 10/20 as subjects requiring instruction in this matter. The DMs included in the written pre-test concerned: “well, stuff, or, and, um, something, er”

As concerns the post-test (see appendix N°09), it consisted of a task adapted from Thornbury (2008:50) focusing on discourse markers as features of talk that result from its real –time construction. The purpose behind it was to assess the students’ knowledge about communication strategies and more precisely about discourse markers and their functions. Thus, they were asked to identify and note down the fillers employed; likewise, they were asked to bring forth eventual explanation to their use. As in the previous test, the marking was focused on the number of DMs included. In our case, the task contained 20 items to which one point was allotted to each item so that the maximum score would be 20. Accordingly, we

considered the students scoring 10/20 and more as subjects aware of those items while those scoring below 10/20 as subjects requiring instruction in this matter. The DMs included in the written post-test concerned: “yeah, now, oh, I don’t know, or, so, I suppose, actually, well, I mean, really, but, um, you know, and, I think”.

It is worth underlining that because the tests conducted were too succinct and the discourse markers included were not obvious, we considered it not enough to draw conclusions about the learners’ improvement as far as discourse markers use is concerned. Consequently, the introduction of interviews was necessary to be carried out.

b- Interviews

In this study we employed two interviews with the intention to collect information about Algerian EFL learners’ consciousness in relation to discourse markers while engaging in verbal interaction. In other terms, the oral tests carried out required the subjects of study to deal with given topics to see whether they can make use of DMs, how many? What kind? And why? The first interview took place before the instructional phase; i.e., in December 2010. The second one was conducted after five months of instruction; i.e., in Mai 2011. Besides, it is worth noting that the participants were informed that the interview was more like a casual conversation without knowing that their use of discourse markers was the research target. In this context, it is judicious to elucidate the meaning of interview concept.

In fact, interviewing is defined simply “as a conversation with a purpose. Specifically, the purpose is to gather information” (Berg, 2001: 66). Moreover, according to Bell (2005:157), it is a means by which “the interviewer can follow up ideas, probe responses and investigate motives and feelings which the questionnaire can never do. It can provide information that a written response would conceal”. Three types of interviews can be determined: the standardized interview, the unstandardized interview and the semistandardized interview.

As concerns the first one, it is designed “to elicit information using a set of predetermined questions that are expected to elicit the subjects’ thoughts, opinions and attitudes about study-related issues” (Berg, 2001: 69). In contrast to the standardized interview, the unstandardized one requires the interviewer “to develop, adapt, and generate questions and follow-up probes appropriate to the given situation and the central purpose of the investigation” (Berg, 2001: 70). Concerning the last type of interviews; ie, the semistandardized interview, it is located between both the aforementioned types. It involves “the implementation of a number of predetermined questions and/or special topics, but interviewers are permitted to probe far beyond the answers to their prepared and standardized questions” (Berg, 2001: 70).

Accordingly, the interviews carried out in this investigation took the form of semistandardized interviews. That is, in the interview preceding instruction, the 40 subjects of the study belonging to both experimental and control groups were asked questions having connection with general topics such as the reasons lying behind choosing to study English; the students’ hobbies and their future plans after getting the degree (see appendix N° 02). The purpose behind it was to make

students deal with topics that are close to them freely and without any constraints. Besides, it aimed at assessing the subjects' oral fluency with a great focus on their use of discourse markers. Therefore, by replying to the enquiries of the interview, the students may face some difficulty in expressing themselves, since as it was mentioned previously they belong to first year English LMD. They may, thus, employ some discourse markers constituting the focus of our study as a strategy to keep the smoothness of conversation and to overcome their language difficulty. The time allotted to each interviewee ranged between 3 to 5 minutes talk. Besides, the subjects of investigation were given 2 additional minutes for brainstorming.

As concerns, the second interview, conducted after the instruction phase, the 40 subjects of the investigation belonging to both experimental and control groups were asked general questions in connection with what they had done during the holidays, describing the place where they lived in addition to a specific topic to chose relating to: comparison between reading books and internet, talking about illegal immigration. The aim behind this interview is twofold: to assess the improvement of the students' speaking skill as far as discourse markers use is concerned and to pay attention their appropriate use. The time allotted to each interviewee ranged between 3 to 5 minutes talk. It is worth noting that the subjects of study were given 2 additional minutes for brainstorming.

In this context, it is worth mentioning that both the pre and post interviews were recorded and transcribed. Consequently, students' corpora were realised, compared and analysed.

b-1- Student Corpora

As mentioned earlier, these corpora were established on the basis of the interviews, aforementioned, carried out with Algerian EFL learners in educational setting before receiving instruction about discourse markers and after instructional period. Thus four corpora were realised: the two first ones concern the control group (3365 words) and the experimental (2574 words) group in the period preceding instruction and the two other ones concern the same groups in the period following instruction; i.e. the control group (3067 words) and the experimental group (2866 words).

Before realising these corpora, the student data were transcribed, for “spoken language must be transcribed before it can be studied” (Biber, Conrad and Leech, 2002: 10). That is we had to listen to the recorded interviews and write down exactly what was said so as to achieve the goal of transcription which is to be “detailed enough to retain enough information to conduct linguistic analysis in an efficient way and simple enough to be readable” (Taglimonte, 2006). The student corpora were transcribed in a standard orthography resembling in some way CANCODE transcription. In this transcription the ordinary symbols of written texts as well as conventional punctuation were used. For instance, a full stop indicates a completed intonation unit; a comma indicates a continuing intonation unit; and a question mark indicates a question (see transcription conventions in appendix N° 13).

A comparison was made between experimental and control subjects’ corpora to determine the extent to which their level has evolved as far as the use of DMs is concerned; likewise, a comparison was realised between experimental subjects’

corpora with reference to CANCODE sub- corpus (460,050 words in size) of English native speakers, already employed by Fung and Carter (2007: 417), selected randomly from the whole pedagogical corpus (5 million words of spontaneous speech) CANCODE aforementioned . The latter was realised with the perspective to find out whether their level reached natives’ or did not. Yet, before moving to the next research tool, Table 2 bellow is set out to provide an overview of the overall composition of the students’ corpora.

Table 2: Composition of the Students’ Corpora

	Groups	Interaction Type	Talking Time Allotted	Number of Subjects	Corpus Size
Pre-instruction phase	Experimental	Interview	3 to 5 minutes	20 students	2574 words
	Control	Interview	3 to 5 minutes	20 students	3365 words
Post-instruction phase	Experimental	Interview	3 to 5 minutes	20 students	2866 words
	Control	Interview	3 to 5 minutes	20 students	3067 words

c- Questionnaire

A questionnaire was designed and administered to the subjects of the survey just after the interview preceding instructional phase. It aimed at providing us with the necessary information to answer the questions aforementioned. In fact, the questionnaire is viewed by Nunan (1986) as a popular means of collecting data. According to him, “it enables the researcher to collect data in field settings, and the data themselves are more amenable to quantification than discursive data such

as free-form field notes, participant observers' journals, and the transcripts of oral language'' (1986:143).

With regard to this questionnaire, it consisted of four questions and was administered to both experimental and control subjects of investigation just after the pre-interview, i.e. in the phase preceding instruction. The latter had twofold objectives: the first one aimed at determining whether Algerian EFL students are aware of the employment of discourse markers in the interview with emphasis on the frequency of these linguistic items in their conversation. The second objective concerned the possible reasons lying behind their use and the factors affecting their use. This objective is in fact connected with EFL subjects' use of DMs before and after receiving instruction in this matter to get insight about when, where and why Algerian non-native speakers of English make use of those linguistic devices. Accordingly, the subjects had to supply their answers in fifteen (15) minutes.

As pointed out earlier, the questionnaire consisted of four questions which took the form of "list questions" (Bell, 2005: 138). The reason behind the choice of this type of questions is that the more they are well structured the less problems will be encountered at the analysis stage. Thus, a list of items is presented (see appendix N° 03).

This questionnaire was constructed in a way to answer the issues considered to be significantly informative about the use of discourse markers in speaking by EFL students. The three first questions dealt with the learners' consciousness as far as discourse markers use during the pre-interview is concerned. It is somehow an attempt

to have a general picture of their knowledge about those linguistic devices before receiving instruction in this matter.

Regarding the last question, the latter reflects in fact our curiosity in connection with the eventual factors that may lead EFL students to use or misuse discourse markers. Thus, the response to this issue will help us to fetch a remedy to the eventual deficiencies. In this context, it is necessary to mention that the listed factors were selected from a whole list proposed by three Chinese researchers Yong, Jingli and Zhou (2010: 23) in their study of the use of “I Think” by Chinese EFL learners.

It is worth underlining in this context that the questionnaire had been piloted before being administered to the subjects of survey. The purpose lying behind this step is to make sure that the questions set are answerable and that the respondents in the main study will experience no difficulties in completing it. Accordingly, Bell (2000) and Nunan (1986) stressed the necessity to pilot questionnaires. Bell (2000:147), for instance, asserts that piloting enables us “to test how long it takes recipients to complete them, to check that all questions and instructions are clear and to enable to remove any items which do not yield usable data”. Moreover, Nunan (1986: 145) stated that “it is imperative to pilot any questionnaire which is developed”.

Consequently, the pilot study was applied on five subjects belonging to the control group and five others belonging to the experimental one. The results revealed no difficulty in understanding the wording of the questions; however, as concerns the time allotted to the accomplishment of the questionnaire, five more minutes were required; i.e., fifteen (15) minutes instead of ten (10) minutes.

Having constructed, piloted and administered the questionnaire, the next task was to interpret and analyse the responses collected. This will be set out in the next chapters.

2.3.3- Research Procedure

In order to investigate Algerian EFL students' use of spoken discourse markers and the effect of consciousness-raising tasks on improving their discourse competence, we have adopted the quasi-experimental approach. In this respect, it is essential to elucidate the quasi-experiment concept.

Indeed, current literature (Pitts, Prost and Winters 2005; Shadish and Luellen 2006; Vanderstoep and Johnston 2009) indicates that though quasi experiments share similar purposes as experiments, they are often considered not truly experimental research. For instance, Pitts, Prost and Winters mention some consideration to take into account when developing a research. According to them, "quasi experiments will have some form of a treatment or intervention and will have two or more measurement waves" (2005: 82). Shadish and Luellen defined quasi experiments as "experiments that lack random assignment of units to conditions but otherwise have similar purposes and structural attributes as all other experiments" (2006: 539).

In addition, Vanderstoep and Johnston (2009:147) defined quasi-experiment research as "a study that takes place in a real-life setting as opposed to a laboratory". They added: "a quasi-experiment falls somewhere between naturalistic observation and experimental research. A quasi - experiment involves conducting an experiment,

usually in a real - life setting, without the benefit of random assignment of participants to conditions or other controls'' (2009: 37). In other words, three tools were used to deal with three phases:

- Phase one: the two tests (written and oral) above mentioned were given to both experimental and control groups before instruction to identify their knowledge and use of DMs.
- Phase two: the two tests were used as classroom tasks for the instruction of experimental group only.
- Phase three: the two tests were used to investigate the effect of instruction on the use of DMs by experimental group.

As stated previously, the experiment consists of two groups of twenty (20) students each belonging to first year LMD: one constitutes the experimental group while the other represents the control one. The experiment was conducted in three phases during which three techniques were adopted in the collection of the required data; i.e. we employed two written tests (a pre test and a post test), a pre-interview and a post one (from which derived student corpora) and a questionnaire.

- ***Phase One***

As concerns the first phase related to the pre-instructional period, conducted by the end of December 2010, the subjects of both groups of the research were assigned a pre-test (see appendix N°08) consisting of a task adapted from Thornbury (2008:51) to assess their knowledge about communication strategies and more precisely about

discourse markers and their functions. Thus, the experimental and control groups subjects were asked to note down the fillers used in the task and to give an eventual explanation about their function. The test included 20 items to which one point was allotted to each item so that the maximum score would be 20. In this respect, it is worth noting that since the pre-test conducted was too succinct, and the discourse markers included were not obvious, we considered it not enough to draw conclusions about the learners' discourse markers knowledge. Consequently, an interview was necessary to be carried out.

Indeed, a pre-interview, aiming at assessing the subjects' oral fluency with a great focus on their use of discourse markers, was conducted and recorded. The latter dealt with themes having connection with general topics such as the reasons lying behind choosing to study English; the students' hobbies and their future plans after getting the degree (see appendix N° 02). The main reason behind this interview is to make students speak freely about topics that are close to them and without any constraints. Therefore, by replying to the enquiries of the pre-interview, we wanted to discover the difficulties the students may face when expressing themselves, since as it was mentioned previously they belong to first year English LMD. Moreover, we wanted to know whether they employ some discourse markers, constituting the focus of our study, as a strategy to keep the smoothness of conversation and to overcome their language difficulty. With this regard, it is worth mentioning that during our classes, we gave EFL learners a general idea about how native speakers talk and how they use some strategies to keep the flow of conversation. Besides, since our study was concerned with DMs, we handled a data sheet on this matter

(see appendix N° 01) to the experimental and control groups subjects. Once the pre-interview ended, it was recorded and transcribed; thus, student's corpora were established to define the frequency of DMs employed. Besides, a comparison was made between experimental and control groups to determine their level as far as the use of DMs is concerned.

Just after the pre-interview, the students were given a questionnaire to complete (see appendix N° 03). The latter comprised two major parts: the first one focused on the extent to which EFL learners are conscious about the use of those linguistic devices in conversation and whether they used discourse markers purposefully or unconsciously. The second part of the questionnaire underlined the reasons affecting their use of those elements. In other terms, this questionnaire had twofold objectives: the first one aims at determining whether Algerian EFL students are aware of the employment of discourse markers in the interview. The second objective concerns the possible reasons lying behind their use and the factors affecting them.

- ***Phase Two***

As concerns the instructional phase, which lasted almost a semester raising students' awareness about a range of discourse markers, the experiment evolved as follows:

Concerning the control group, it was assigned oral lessons devoted to enable EFL learners to communicate ideas, feelings, attitudes and information to the hearers and employ speech that relates to the situation. Thus, to achieve this purpose, we tried

through “group discussions” and “student presentations” to deal with a multitude of different topics. These were to do with themes related to: internet versus books; illegal immigration; corruption; delinquency; rural exodus; unemployment; war.

As concerns the first type of activity suggested by Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000:177), which provided the students with “opportunity to participate in group discussion”, it aimed at encouraging the students to use the knowledge they have in the target language by “always keeping the communicative goal in mind” (2000:176). In our case, the purpose behind this task was to push Algerian EFL learners to produce a word, a term, an expression without feeling shy or inhibited. They were not obliged to maintain a long stretch of conversation; furthermore, the fact that they could participate in the discussion with just an expression constituted a great achievement for them and gave them courage to pursue talking.

Students were also given the chance to give a talk on a given topic. Indeed, all the students had to prepare something about a given topic and they were allotted time to gather information about that via searching in various sources namely: books and internet. After that, one learner was chosen to make the presentation in the language classroom followed by a group discussion. Here, his/her classmates expressed their agreement or disagreement about the information presented, and added new information if available. Indeed, this type of tasks suggested by Harmer (2007:129-130) helped enriching the students’ vocabulary as well as gave them courage to overcome their fear about confronting an audience.

In this context, it is necessary to underline some problems noted with the above speaking activities which were treated by Ur (1996: 121). These were to do with “inhibition; nothing to say; and mother –tongue- use”. In fact, learners were at the beginning worried about what to say and fearful of making mistakes. Furthermore, they sometimes complained about having nothing to say when asked to talk. In addition, some learners occasionally slipped into their mother tongue for lack of vocabulary or because they were not accustomed to talk to one another in a foreign language. Nevertheless, group discussion activities as well as student presentation helped them in some way to overcome these difficulties.

As concerns the experimental group, the students were involved in tasks aiming at exploring language of interaction. In other words, they were introduced to tasks aiming at raising their awareness about the linguistic form and function of discourse markers in conversations. This was achieved via the adoption of the Cognitivists’ learning theory which called for some degree of conscious awareness about the rules of the system. Consequently, it replaced the three-stage PPP model (presentation, practice and production) with one that progresses from “awareness-raising, through proceduralization to autonomy” (Thornbury, 2008: 38). In this context, Aijmer (2009:218) asserts that “from a language pedagogical perspective, it is necessary firstly, to make learners aware of the natural use of discourse markers in spontaneous spoken language, and, secondly, to automatise, as it were, the use of discourse markers”.

In fact, the students were presented with a multitude of activities ranging between written ones and audio-video ones. The written tasks, which are set out in appendices forthcoming, were adopted from textbooks, while the others were downloaded from the internet.

With regard to the first type of tasks, the students received a data sheet on discourse markers containing extracts from real language data adapted from Richards and al (1997) (see appendix N°01) in addition to a table summarising the main discourse markers and their functions extracted from Biber and al (2002: 450) as well as Fung and Carter (2007:392).The latter aimed at familiarizing them with those linguistic elements.

Furthermore, since spontaneous spoken language importantly differs from the standard written form as indicated in the current literature aforementioned in the first chapter (Bailey 2005, Cook 1989, Nunan 1993, Lazaraton 2001, Miller and Weinert 1998, Van Lier 1995), it was essential to highlight these main differences existing between spoken and written language in order to develop the students' spoken skill. Thus, tasks in this matter were assigned to the students. The latter consisted of activities adapted from Willis's work (2003: 186; 201; 202) (see appendices N° 5; 6; 7).

Accordingly, the first task presented in appendix N° 5 is an extract from a discussion between two people talking about their fear of heights. It contains several features which are common in spoken English, but unusual or nonexistent in the written one. The aim of this task is to make students identify discourse markers and

think about their use. Moreover, it aimed at highlighting the differences existing between spoken and written language.

As concerns the second task of appendix N° 6, the students were asked to rewrite the previous extract as though it were part of a letter. Thus, in order to produce a written version of the story, the learners had to do a lot of work on the spoken version through the introduction of various changes such as cutting out “ers” and “erms”, changing colloquial forms to written forms, rewriting the ungrammatical forms and rewriting non-sentences. In making these adjustments, they would be focusing on the differences between spoken and written language.

Regarding the task presented in appendix N° 7, this task like the previous ones attempts to shed light on differences between spoken and written forms. Learners had to make a comparison between the scripted text and the written one focusing their discussion on features which are common in spoken English, but unusual or nonexistent in the written one.

Besides, to awake learners’ ability to noticing and analysing, the students had to consider two texts (see appendix N° 4) adapted from Willis (2003: 186; 194). The learners were asked to establish a comparison between the original texts (Script A) in which discourse markers have been highlighted and the deleted text (Script B) where all those devices are taken out. After that, they were required to draw conclusions about the effect discourse markers have on the spoken exchange when they are presented and when they are omitted.

Always with the objective of underlining the use of discourse markers, special tasks, reflecting accurately how language is used, were administered to the learners. In this context we borrowed Thornbury's method to teach speaking. According to him "one way to raise learners' awareness of features of spoken language is to expose them to recordings of speaking, and to study the transcripts of these recordings" (2005: 12) therefore, we proceeded as follows. We presented the experimental group with a set of authentic language data through the implementation of audio-video talks adopted from the internet (see appendices N° 10; 11; 12); meanwhile, we asked them to pay attention to the linguistic patterns employed by the participants to help the flow of conversation (in our case we refer to discourse markers). Once the data show was over, the students were asked to list the variety of discourse markers detected and cite their frequency. Then, they were asked to reproduce some extracts already heard.

Then, in order to integrate this new knowledge into their existing one, "appropriation activities" were implemented through repetition of the spoken task since "one way of gaining control over a speaking task is to repeat it" (Thornbury, 2005: 13). Accordingly, we had the students listen again to the sequence presented but this time with a transcript. The latter was distributed to the students to verify to what extent their answers were right and to have them analyse specific features of the conversation in pairs or in small groups. This was realised by asking students to consider some questions related to the number of times discourse markers were used and how they contributed to the participants' understanding of the

conversation. Once the use and function of discourse markers were highlighted, we made the students practice the dialogues of the scripts.

Finally, to achieve “autonomy” as independent speakers, learners were given opportunity to talk using the target elements; i.e., discourse markers. For instance, one asked another about their likes and dislikes; what he/she did the day before, and the addressee answered by attempting to use the targeted elements in context.

To sum up, we have sketched out the three steps for developing the students’ spoken skill and raising their awareness of discourse markers. It started with “awareness raising activities”, where the learners discovered the features of the spoken language. Then, it was followed by “appropriation activities” where learners gained control over these features before achieving “autonomy” as independent speakers.

- ***Phase Three***

As concerns the third phase related to the post-instructional period, conducted by the end of Mai 2011, the subjects of both groups of the research were assigned a post-test (see appendix N°09) consisting of a task adapted from Thornbury (2008:50) to assess their knowledge about communication strategies and more precisely about discourse markers and their functions. Thus, the students were asked to note down the fillers used in the task and bring forth eventual explanation to their use.

The test included 20 items in which one point was allotted to each item so that the maximum score would be 20. In this respect, it is worth noting that since the test was concise, a post interview was administered to the subjects of the survey so that conclusions about the students' development as far as discourse markers use is concerned would be drawn.

Indeed, a post- interview, aiming at assessing the improvement of the subjects' oral fluency with a great focus on their use of discourse markers, was conducted and recorded. The interviewees belonging to both experimental and control groups were asked general questions relating to what they had done during the holidays, describing the place where they lived in addition to a specific topic to chose related to: comparison between reading books and internet, talking about illegal immigration, delinquency, and unemployment. The aim behind this post-interview is twofold: to assess the development of the students' speaking skill as well as paying attention to the extent to which they employ discourse markers appropriately in their talk. Once the post-interviews ended, they were recorded and transcribed; thus, students' corpora were established to define the frequency of discourse markers employed. Besides, a comparison was made between experimental and control groups to detect any improvement in the subjects' level as far as the use of DMs is concerned.

Once the data necessary for the accomplishment of the survey were gathered, results were retrieved, analysed and discussed to try to find answers to the issues aforementioned. Yet, before looking at that, we will deal with the tools adopted in this survey to collect the data.

2.4- Method of Analysis

With the perspective to find answers to the research questions raised at the beginning of the survey, we analysed the data collected on the basis of the research tools employed. In other words, we proceeded by analysing the written tests, then the oral tests and finally the questionnaire.

2.4.1- Written Tests Analysis

As stated previously, two written tests were presented to experimental and control subjects of study to assess their awareness about DMs. Consequently, a marking system was adopted to evaluate the students' ability to identify those linguistic devices. Bearing in mind that each written test included 20 items, the latter were allotted 20 points. Such grading enabled us to distinguish the subjects' level; i.e., those who scored 10/20 and beyond exhibited awareness in this matter. However, those scoring below 10/20 needed instruction about those devices.

In addition to marking, the written tests were analysed through comparison. Indeed, the pre and post tests scores of experimental and control subjects were compared to determine the learners' level development as far as DMs awareness is concerned.

2.4.2- Oral Tests Analysis

The interview carried out in educational settings with the subjects of study before and after instruction about DMs enabled us to realise students' corpora. The

latter is defined by O’Keeffe (2007: 1) as “a collection of texts, written or spoken, which is stored on a computer”. Accordingly, this collection of texts was analysed quantitatively by examining the number of times the word occurred. The number of occurrences was then compared with the frequencies in other corpora. In this regard, it is necessary to underline that the number of words was calculated through the use of “writewords software” while the redundancy of words was counted via “wordcounttool software”.

Besides, since it was difficult to get an overall picture of what was really going on by just looking at the frequencies, we made use of percentages to make comparison between the groups much easier. The latter are according to Woodley (2004: 25) “the most used statistical technique in institutional and practitioner research...” Thus, the following formula was adopted to calculate percentages:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{\text{Frequency}}{\text{Total Number of Words}} \times 100$$

Additionally, with the aim to determine Algerian students’ speaking competence and performance development, a comparative analysis of DMs use in students’ corpora was established between control group and experimental group subjects and later between the latter and CANCODE.

2.4.3- Questionnaire Analysis

The questionnaire conducted just after the interview preceding instruction phase had two fold objectives: focusing on consciousness in using DMs and identifying the possible causes leading Algerian EFL learners to use those linguistic elements. Accordingly, we made use of percentages to render comparison between the responses expressed by the subjects of study much easier. Thus, the following formula was adopted to calculate percentages:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{\text{Subjects}}{\text{Total Number of Subjects}} \times 100$$

Therefore, in the light of the objectives underlined and the results retrieved an analysis of the data will be conducted.

Conclusion

We attempted in this chapter to present the rationale, the research tools as well as the steps undertaken to investigate the effect of consciousness raising tasks about discourse markers on developing Algerian EFL learners' discourse competence and spoken language performance. Besides, the method of analysis is set out. A number of justifications have been put forward to explain the choice of the subjects, the procedure of investigation adopted and the tools implemented. As concerns the results retrieved from the investigation, they will be dealt with in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

Results

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the results retrieved from the study. In this context, the results are presented as follows. First, an analysis of pre and post tests scores is set out. Second, an analysis of experimental and control subjects' corpora before and after instructional phases is exhibited. Third, the questionnaire results are put forward followed by explanation and interpretation. Finally, a comparative analysis based on the study of EFL students' corpus, before and after instruction, with reference to CANCODE sub-corpus is presented.

3.1- Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores Analysis

As mentioned earlier, this research made use of multiple techniques to gather the data necessary to answer the enquiries related to EFL students' use of discourse markers in speaking. Thus, a pre-test and a post test were assigned to the subjects of the survey. The results concerning the consciousness about discourse markers use retrieved from experimental and control subjects' test scores, realised before and after instruction, are compared and analyzed.

3.1.1- Pre-Instructional Phase

With the purpose to find out the extent to which Algerian EFL learners as non- native speakers of English are aware of spoken discourse markers, a pre-test was assigned to the subjects of the survey. The latter consisted of a task including 20 DMs that were to be noted down by the students with an eventual explanation to their function. The pre-test scores of experimental and control subjects realised before instructional phase were compared and analysed. Accordingly, table 3 was set out.

Table 3: Experimental and Control Subjects' Pre-Test Marks

Subjects	Experimental Group	Control Group
S1	14	14
S2	11	12
S3	10	10
S4	9	9
S5	8	8
S6	7	8
S7	7	8
S8	7	8
S9	6	7
S10	6	7
S11	6	7
S12	6	6
S13	6	6
S14	6	6
S15	6	6
S16	6	6
S17	5	5
S18	5	5
S19	5	5
S20	5	5

Based on the information suggested in Table 3, it appears that both groups are at the same level as far as their awareness about DMs use is concerned. In fact, the pre-test scores revealed the subjects' failure in identifying discourse markers as well as their limited knowledge concerning those devices.

For instance, the pre-test scores of the experimental group realised before receiving instruction about discourse markers indicated that only three subjects (S1, S2 and S3) out of twenty could identify the linguistic elements employed in the test, while the remaining ones have scored under 10. Regarding the control group subjects, the pre-test scores indicated that only three students (S1, S2 and S3) out of twenty could identify the DMs included in the test; i.e., only three subjects reached the average whereas the remaining ones failed. Consequently, raising EFL students' awareness about those elements smoothing conversation is required.

3.1.2- Post-Instructional Phase

In order to determine the extent to which Algerian EFL learners as non- native speakers of English are aware of spoken discourse markers, a post-test was assigned to the subjects of the survey. The latter consisted of a task including 20 DMs that were to be noted down by the students with an eventual explanation to their function. In this context, it is worthy to elucidate the kind of instruction each group received before being tested.

Indeed, with the objective to raise EFL students' awareness about English spoken markers, the subjects of experimental group received an instruction different from that of the control one. Indeed, experimental group subjects were involved in tasks aiming at exploring language of interaction via exposing students to a multitude of activities ranging between written ones and audio-visual ones. Concerning the control group subjects, they were assigned oral lessons devoted to enable them to communicate ideas, feelings, attitudes and information to the hearers and employ speech that relates to the situation in which they are involved.

The post-test scores of experimental and control subjects realised after instructional phase were compared and analysed. Accordingly, table 4 was set out.

Table 4: Experimental and Control Subjects' Post-Test Marks

Subjects	Experimental Group	Control Group
S1	13.5	9
S2	11.5	8.5
S3	15.5	11
S4	7.5	10
S5	13.5	11
S6	11	9
S7	11	8.5
S8	11	12
S9	7	7
S10	11.5	9.5
S11	10.5	7
S12	12.5	8
S13	10.5	4.5
S14	14	5.5
S15	12.5	5.5
S16	12.5	11.5
S17	6.5	6.5
S18	17	8
S19	12	12
S20	13	3.5

On the basis of the information exhibited in table 4, an amazing raise concerning experimental group subjects is witnessed contrary to the control group which achieved no improvement.

For example, the post-test scores realised after instruction phase, related to the experimental group, are better than those of the pre-test. Only three students (S4, S9 and S17) out of twenty did not reach the average. Consequently, those results indicate that certain discourse markers awareness among Algerian EFL learners is being settled. Concerning the post test scores achieved by the control group after instruction phase, they revealed no great amelioration, i.e. only six students (S3, S4, S5, S8, S16 and S19) reached the average whereas the remaining ones failed. As a consequence, those results unveil the reality that the subjects of the control group failed in identifying those linguistic items.

In addition, bearing in mind that the control group subjects have received just a normal instruction contrary to the experimental group; i.e. an instruction aiming at developing their speaking skill without any focus on discourse markers, the post-test scores demonstrate a raise in the scores of certain subjects. However, this raise is not comparable to that of the experimental group. In other terms, the control group marks are far beyond those of the experimental group; thus, a great gap is unveiled waiting to be remedied.

To sum up, in order to have a clear picture concerning the learners' awareness about the use of spoken discourse markers, the scores of the tests realised by both groups were compared. The latter unveiled the existence of a discrepancy in identifying discourse markers. In other words,

the scores realised by both groups before receiving instruction demonstrate no great difference as far as discourse markers identification in the pre-test is concerned. However, the gap was apparent between both groups after instructional phase during which only the experimental group received instruction about those linguistic items. Thus, the experimental group scores were higher than those achieved by the control one. Presumably the control group requires instruction on those items.

3.2- Analysis of DMs used in Students' Corpora during Pre and Post instructional phases

As stated previously, the interviews carried out with the survey subjects, during pre and post- instructional phases, were carefully studied for the use of some discourse markers in relation to the total number of words. The latter as well as the frequency of discourse markers were calculated and contrasted with each other (see Tables 5 and 6). In this regard, it is necessary to underline that the number of words was calculated through the use of "writewords software" while the redundancy of words was counted via "wordcounttool software". The purpose behind this procedure is to unveil the spoken DMs most frequently used when engaging in conversation and determine Algerian students' speaking competence and performance development.

3.2.1- Pre-Instructional Phase

In fact, with the purpose of highlighting the discourse markers most frequently used by Algerian EFL learners in their talk, a comparison was established between both experimental and control groups' corpora collected from the interview realised before instruction period. Thus, two corpora were realised namely that of the experimental group (2574 words) and that of the control group (3365 words). In this respect, it is worth mentioning that since the number of DMs used in English conversations is very big, we restricted our research on the study of a list borrowed from Fung and Carter's work (2007) on this matter.

Table 5 sets out the frequency of DMs use retrieved from experimental and control subjects' corpora. The variation in the frequency of use of the 26 discourse markers are highlighted as follows. Very high frequency is in bold; high frequency is underlined; limited frequency is in italics; and null frequency is in bold and underlined simultaneously.

As concerns the experimental group, the information suggested in table 5 shows that there exists a variation in the use of the 26 DMs under study. For instance, we notice a very high frequency in the use of "and, but, because and uh" representing 15.38% of the subjects' corpus. 38.46% represents the use of "so, or, just, okay, well, yes, I think and really" which is less frequent than the former. A limited frequency is shown in the employment of "yeah, you know, actually and cos" representing 15.38% whereas the remaining DMs (26.92%) are not existent or hardly employed in the interviewees' speech namely "right, like, now, sort of, see, say and oh".

Table 5: DMs Use in Student Corpora during Pre-Instructional Phase

Discourse Markers	Experimental Group (2574 words)		Control Group (3365 words)	
	Frequency	Student Corpus (%)	Frequency	Student Corpus (%)
And	54	2.09	140	4.16
So	15	<u>0.58</u>	33	<u>0.98</u>
Yeah	01	<i>0.04</i>	1	<i>0.03</i>
Right	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
But	39	1.52	37	1.09
Or	09	<u>0.35</u>	12	<u>0.36</u>
Just	07	<u>0.27</u>	04	<u>0.12</u>
Okay	03	<u>0.17</u>	04	<u>0.12</u>
Like	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
You Know	02	<i>0.07</i>	00	<u>00</u>
Well	04	<u>0.15</u>	13	<u>0.38</u>
Because	43	1.67	46	1.37
Now	00	<u>00</u>	01	<i>0.03</i>
Yes	17	<u>0.66</u>	27	<u>0.80</u>
Sort of	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
See	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
I think	03	<u>0.12</u>	01	<i>0.03</i>
I mean	00	00	02	<i>0.06</i>
Say	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
Actually	01	<i>0.04</i>	02	<i>0.06</i>
Oh	00	<u>00</u>	03	<i>0.09</i>
Really	03	<u>0.17</u>	04	<u>0.12</u>
Cos	01	<i>0.04</i>	00	<u>00</u>
Uh	125	4.85	189	5.62
Um/ Uhm	18	<u>0.70</u>	30	<u>0.89</u>
I don't Know	12	<u>0.46</u>	09	<u>0.27</u>

Regarding the control group, the data represented in table 5 above unveils a very high frequency (15.38%) in the use of “and, but, because and uh” while other markers such as “so, or, just, okay, well, yes, really, um/uhm and I don’t know” were less frequent (34.62%). A limited use (23.07%) concerning the employment of “yeah, now, I think, I mean, actually and oh” is exhibited. The remaining DMs namely: “right, like, you know, sort of, see, say and cos”, representing 26.92%, are not existent or hardly employed in the interviewees’ speech.

Consequently, from what has been mentioned before, it is indicated that both experimental and control subjects employed DMs in the interview; however, a difference in the use of those linguistic devices is noticed except for the use of “and, but, because and uh” which is shared between both groups. In other words, experimental and control subjects seem to be at the same level as far as the use of those elements smoothing conversation is concerned.

3.2.2- Post-Instructional Phase

As stated previously, students’ corpora were realised on the basis of the interviews aforementioned, carried out with Algerian EFL learners in educational settings, after receiving instruction about DMs. Thus, two corpora were obtained namely that of the control group (3067 words) and that of the experimental group (2866 words).

Furthermore, with the perspective to address whether the production of DMs by Algerian EFL students has improved or whether they have learned native speakers patterns of spoken discourse, findings reached after instruction are compared to each

other (see table 6 bellow) to get a picture of how experimental and control groups perform.

Accordingly, it is essential to mention that the variation in frequency of DMs use retrieved from experimental and control subjects' corpora are highlighted as follows. Very high frequency is in bold; high frequency is underlined; limited frequency is in italics; and null frequency is in bold and underlined simultaneously.

Table 6: DMs Use in Student Corpora during Post-Instructional Phase

Discourse Markers	Experimental group (2866 words)		Control group (3067 words)	
	Frequency	Student corpus (%)	Frequency	Student corpus (%)
And	105	3.66	122	3.97
So	36	1.26	33	1.07
Yeah	02	<i>0.07</i>	01	<i>0.03</i>
Right	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
But	24	<u>0.84</u>	32	1.04
Or	11	<u>0.38</u>	13	<u>0.42</u>
Just	05	<u>0.17</u>	03	<i>0.09</i>
Okay	08	<u>0.28</u>	04	<u>0.13</u>
Like	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
You Know	12	<u>0.42</u>	00	<u>00</u>
Well	15	<u>0.53</u>	12	<u>0.39</u>
Because	32	1.12	39	1.27
Now	00	<u>00</u>	02	<u>0.06</u>
Yes	04	<u>0.14</u>	24	<u>0.78</u>
Sort of	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
See	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
I think	16	<u>0.56</u>	05	<u>0.16</u>
I mean	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
Say	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
Actually	01	<i>0.04</i>	00	<u>00</u>
Oh	03	<u>0.11</u>	02	<i>0.06</i>
Really	06	<u>0.21</u>	00	<u>00</u>
Cos	00	<u>00</u>	00	<u>00</u>
Uh	238	8.31	198	6.33
Um/ Uhm	50	1.74	18	<u>0.58</u>
I don't Know	04	<u>0.14</u>	08	<u>0.26</u>

Regarding the experimental group, the results of the corpora indicate that during the interview following the instructional phase the interviewees made use of the 26 DMs under study; however, a variation in their use is noticed. For instance, 19.23% of the DMs selected were highly used by experimental group subjects. These included “and, so, because, uh and um/uhm”. 42.30% of the DMs were frequent namely “but, or, just, okay, you know, well, yes, I think, oh, really and I don’t know”. 7.69% of the listed DMs were used in a limited way such as “yeah and actually”; whereas, 30.26% of the remaining ones were not existent or hardly occur in the students’ corpora. These included “right, like, now, sort of, see, I mean, say and cos”.

Concerning the control group, the data exhibited in table 6 unveils a very high frequency in the employment of “and, but, because and uh” representing 15.38% of the whole DMs selected. 26.92% of the selection including “or, okay, well, yes, I think um/uhm and I don’t know” were less frequent. A limited use (15.38%) concerning “yeah, just, now and oh” was indicated while 30.77% of the remaining DMs selection were not existent or hardly employed by the control subjects.

Therefore, it is apparent from the corpora retrieved from both experimental and control groups after awareness-raising tasks about DMs that the subjects of study make use of those devices; however, their use differs from one group to another. In other terms, experimental group subjects make frequent use of DMs when talking then those of the control group.

To sum up, with the aim to get a suggestive picture of how Algerian EFL speakers make use of DMs and whether their linguistic competence and communicative language performance have improved after receiving instruction about

those elements smoothing conversation, a comparison was established between both experimental and control subjects' corpora during pre and post instructional periods. The latter was carefully studied and examined for the frequency in DMs use in relation to the total number of words.

Indeed, as mentioned earlier, the comparison realised with Algerian EFL subjects' corpora uncovers a lot of facts. As regards the experimental group, it was before instruction period nearly at the same level with the control group as far as the subjects' use of DMs is concerned. However, a change was marked at the post instructional phase. In fact, an improvement in the experimental group subjects' performance is witnessed. This can be explained by the type of instruction received which focused on raising students' awareness about English spoken DMs. The tasks achieved enabled the subjects of study to become more conscious about those devices smoothing conversation and enhanced their ability to make use of them. For example, the rate of DMs use before instruction period jumped from 53.84% to 61.53% after instructional phase while the rate of those hardly employed or less frequent reduced from 42.30% before instruction to 37.95% after awareness-raising tasks.

Regarding the control group, it was nearly at the same level with the experimental one concerning DMs use. Nevertheless, contrary to the latter, the control group did not realise any improvement. For example, the rate of the DMs frequently used before instruction period which was 49.97% decreased to reach 42.3%. In addition, the rate of the DMs less frequent raised from 49.99% to 50.15%. This can be returned back to the instruction implemented to the control subjects which differed from that of the experimental group. Indeed, they were assigned oral lessons devoted

to enable EFL learners to express themselves by communicating ideas, feelings, attitudes and information to the hearers and employ speech that relates to the situation.

All in all, the results of students' corpora analysis during pre and post instructional phases indicate that certain DMs awareness is established among the subjects of the experimental group while the necessity to underline those linguistic elements to the control subjects is required.

3.3- Questionnaire Analysis

With reference to what has been mentioned earlier and in order to find an answer to the question related to Algerian EFL students' use of discourse markers in speaking, one questionnaire underlining those linguistic elements was conducted just after the interview preceding instruction phase.

As shown in the appendix N° 03, the questionnaire consists of four questions, with question 1 to 3 focusing on consciousness in using discourse markers while question 4 focusing on the possible causes leading Algerian EFL learners to use those linguistic elements.

The subjects were primarily asked questions about their awareness in using discourse markers on the basis of the interview carried out. Table 07 bellow indicates that among the 20 subjects belonging to the experimental group 75% replied they realised; 65% answered that they were unconscious while 30 % hesitated between consciousness and unconsciousness.

Table 07: Students' Awareness about the Use of DMs (Experimental Group/ Questionnaire)

Responses	Subjects	Percentage
Realised	15	75%
purposefully	0	0%
unconsciously	13	65%
Sometimes purposefully and sometimes unconsciously	6	30%

Besides, Table 08 bellow demonstrates that among the 20 subjects relevant to the control group 85% replied they realised, 10 % used discourse markers purposefully, 15 % answered they were unconscious while 75 % were not sure.

Table 08: Students' Awareness about the Use of DMs (Control Group/ Questionnaire)

Responses	Subjects	Percentage
Realised	17	85%
Purposefully	2	10%
Unconsciously	3	15%
Sometimes purposefully and sometimes unconsciously	15	75%

As previously stated, the questionnaire was distributed to the subjects of study in the pre-instructional phase during which both experimental and control groups were at the same level as far as the use of DMs is concerned. However, the data collected from the questionnaire seem to be faulty. Indeed, the control group has scored higher about awareness than the experimental one which is not reflected in the results

retrieved from the interview. Apparently some of the control subjects answered this part of the questionnaire hastily. Thus, the part concerning the control group will not be considered in the discussion part.

Then, the subjects were asked for the reasons lying behind their use of discourse markers. In this question, some possible causes were supplied in case student cannot think of a proper expression. These were selected, as mentioned before, from a whole list proposed by three Chinese researchers Yong, Jingli and Zhou (2010: 23) in their study of the use of “I Think” by Chinese EFL learners. They included: situational anxiety, delay, inadequate English Proficiency, summary, emphasis of my opinion, habit and others (if any other suggestion available).

It is worth mentioning at this regard that this survey took into consideration the factors rating a high percentage among the students.

Thus, the results represented in Table 09, concerning the subjects of the experimental group reveal that habit (40 %), delay (25 %) and inadequate English proficiency (25 %) constitute the major causes for the use of discourse markers.

Table 09: Reasons for Using DMs/ (Experimental Group/ Questionnaire)

Responses	Subjects	Percentage
Situational anxiety	2	10%
Delay	5	25%
Inadequate English Proficiency	5	25%
summary	0	0%
Emphasis of my opinion	4	20%
Habit	8	40%
Others	2	10%

In addition, according to Table 10 bellow, delay (40 %) seems to be the principal reason for the use of discourse markers by control group subjects followed by situational anxiety (35 %) and inadequate English proficiency (35 %).

Table 10: Reasons for Using DMs/ (Control Group/ Questionnaire)

Responses	Subjects	Percentage
Situational anxiety	7	35%
Delay	8	40%
Inadequate English Proficiency	7	35%
summary	5	25%
Emphasis of my opinion	5	25%
Habit	4	20%
Others	0	0%

3.4- Comparative Analysis based on EFL Students' Corpus, before and after Instruction, with Reference to CANCODE Sub-Corpus

With the perspective to answer the enquiries related to EFL students' use of discourse markers in speaking and in order to get a suggestive picture about how EFL speakers perform compared to native ones, a comparative study of DMs use by Algerian non-native speakers and native speakers of English is established before and after instruction phases. In this respect, it is necessary to mention that since the communicative competence of the experimental group subjects as far as the use of DMs improved, the study was restricted to the findings related to this group only. In other words, a comparison is established between the subjects of the experimental group corpora with reference to native speakers' corpus.

In fact, the interviews, aforementioned in the previous section, carried out with the survey subjects were carefully studied for the use of 26 DMs in relation to the total number of words. The latter as well as the frequency of DMs were calculated and contrasted with reference to CANCODE sub-corpus results (see table 11) already employed by Fung and Carter (2007:417). Accordingly, it is worth stating that CANCODE was adopted in this survey because native speakers of English were not available for study in the educational settings.

Table 11: Frequency of DMs among the Top 100 Most Frequent Words in the Pedagogic Sub-Corpus in CANCODE (460.005 words)

Discourse Markers	Frequency	CANCODE (%)
And	11736	2.55
So	4424	0.96
Yeah	4118	0.90
Right	3262	0.71
But	3152	0.69
Or	2133	0.46
Just	1988	0.43
Okay	1865	0.41
Like	1822	0.40
You Know	1659	0.38
Well	1637	0.36
Because	1496	0.33
Now	1471	0.32
Yes	1250	0.27
Sort of	1172	0.25
See	1141	0.25
I think	1060	0.23
I mean	922	0.20
Say	920	0.20
Actually	867	0.19
Oh	819	0.18
Really	745	0.16
Cos	627	0.14
Uh	0	0
Um/ Uhm	0	0
I don't Know	0	0

3.4.1- Pre- Instructional Phase

As previously mentioned, a comparison was made between experimental group subjects' corpus (2574 words) and CANCODE sub corpus (460.050 words), already employed by Fung and Carter (2007: 417), selected randomly from the whole pedagogical corpus (5 million words of spontaneous speech) CANCODE forthcoming in table 12.

Table 12: Representation of DMs in Students' Corpus at the Pre-Instructional Phase with Reference to CANCODE

Discourse Markers	CANCODE (%)	Experimental Group (%)	Representation of DMs in Students' Corpus with Reference to CANCODE
And	2.55	<u>2.09</u>	Less represented
So	0.96	<u>0.58</u>	Less represented
Yeah	0.90	<u>0.04</u>	Under represented
Right	0.71	<u>00</u>	No representation
But	0.69	1.52	Over represented
Or	0.46	<u>0.35</u>	Less represented
Just	0.43	<u>0.27</u>	Less represented
Okay	0.41	<u>0.17</u>	Less represented
Like	0.40	<u>00</u>	No representation
You Know	0.38	<u>0.07</u>	Under represented
Well	0.36	<u>0.15</u>	Less represented
Because	0.33	1.67	Over represented
Now	0.32	<u>00</u>	No representation
Yes	0.27	0.66	Over represented
Sort of	0.25	<u>00</u>	No representation
See	0.25	<u>00</u>	No representation
I think	0.23	<u>0.12</u>	Less represented
I mean	0.20	<u>00</u>	No representation
Say	0.20	<u>00</u>	No representation
Actually	0.19	<u>0.04</u>	Under represented
Oh	0.18	<u>00</u>	No representation
Really	0.16	0.17	Over represented
Cos	0.14	<u>0.04</u>	Under represented
Uh	0	4.85	Over represented
Um/ Uhm	0	0.70	Over represented
I don't Know	0	0.46	Over represented

Table 12 above sets out the frequency of DMs use retrieved from experimental subjects' corpus with reference to CANCODE native speakers' sub-corpus during the pre- instructional period. The variation in the frequency of use of the 26 discourse markers are highlighted as follows. Very high frequency is in bold; high frequency is underlined; limited frequency is in italics; and null frequency is in bold and underlined simultaneously.

The reason behind this investigation is to find out what spoken discourse markers EFL learners use and to search insight about the extent to which Algerian EFL learners, as non-native speakers of English, use appropriately those linguistic elements when talking.

The results above indicate that both native and non-native speakers of English language employ discourse markers in their talk; nevertheless, the major difference lies in the frequency in use of those linguistic elements. Indeed, Table 12 shows that there is a discrepancy as far as discourse markers use is concerned. Algerian EFL learners of English either over use or under use discourse markers. They sometimes misuse them or use them less frequently or even do not use them at all. For example, 26,92% of the discourse markers selected in the study are over used by Algerian EFL students. These include "but, because, yes, really, uh, um, and I don't know". 26.92% of the discourse markers were frequent in both corpora, namely "and, so, or, just, okay, well and I think". 15.38% of the discourse markers are used in a limited way in comparison with CANCODE frequency. They include: "yeah, you know, actually and cos". Besides, common markers in native speakers' speech such as "right, like,

now, sort of, see, I mean, say and oh'' (30.77%) had an extremely low representation or no occurrence in the student corpora.

Moreover, through the comparison realised during the pre-instructional phase between the students' corpus with reference to CANCODE sub- corpus as far as discourse markers use are concerned, four categories of users were uncovered. These included over users, under users, misusers and no users (see table 13). The latter are better explained as follows:

- Over Users: are those who use the DMs listed in a frequency more than normal.
- Under Users: are those who use the DMs listed in a limited way.
- Misusers: are those who use the DMs listed less frequently and inappropriately.
- No Users: are those who do not make use of the DMs listed at all.

Table 13: Categories of Discourse Markers Users at the Pre-Instructional Phase

Users Categories	Subjects	Percentage (%)
Over users	5	25%
Under Users	5	25%
Misusers	3	15%
No Users	7	35%

3.4.2- Post-Instructional Phase

As previously stated, with the aim of addressing the use of spoken discourse elements smoothing conversation by Algerian learners of English and in order to have a plain picture about the extent to which they have learned native speakers linguistic

patterns, we made a comparison between experimental subjects' corpus (2866 words), retrieved from the students' interview during post-instructional phase, with reference to CANCODE sub-corpus (460.05 words). In this respect, a representation of DMs use is set out in table 14 forthcoming.

Table 14: Representation of DMs in Students' Corpus with Reference to CANCODE at the Post-Instructional Phase

Discourse Markers	CANCODE (%)	Experimental Group (%)	Representation of DMs in Students' Corpus with reference to CANCODE
And	2.55	3.66	Over represented
So	0.96	1.26	Over represented
Yeah	0.90	<i>0.07</i>	Under represented
Right	0.71	<u>00</u>	No representation
But	0.69	0.84	Over represented
Or	0.46	<u>0.38</u>	Less represented
Just	0.43	<u>0.17</u>	Less represented
Okay	0.41	<u>0.28</u>	Less represented
Like	0.40	<u>00</u>	No representation
You Know	0.38	0.42	Over represented
Well	0.36	0.53	Over represented
Because	0.33	1.12	Over represented
Now	0.32	<u>00</u>	No representation
Yes	0.27	<u>0.14</u>	Less represented
Sort of	0.25	<u>00</u>	No representation
See	0.25	<u>00</u>	No representation
I think	0.23	0.56	Over represented
I mean	0.20	<u>00</u>	No representation
Say	0.20	<u>00</u>	No representation
Actually	0.19	<i>0.04</i>	Under represented
Oh	0.18	<u>0.11</u>	Less represented
Really	0.16	0.21	Over represented
Cos	0.14	<u>00</u>	No representation
Uh	0	8.31	Over represented
Um/ Uhm	0	1.74	Over represented
I don't know	0	0.14	Over represented

Table 14 sets out the frequency of DMs use retrieved from experimental subjects' corpus with reference to CANCODE native speakers' sub-corpus during the post- instructional period. The variation in the frequency of use of the 26 discourse markers are highlighted as follows. Very high frequency is in bold; high frequency is underlined; limited frequency is in italics; and null frequency is in bold and underlined simultaneously.

In fact, the results retrieved from this comparison indicate that both native and non-native speakers of English language employ discourse markers in their talk; nevertheless, the major difference lies in the frequency in use of those linguistic elements. Indeed, table 14 shows that there is a discrepancy as far as discourse markers use is concerned. Algerian Non-native speakers of English either overuse or underuse discourse markers or do not use them at all. For example, 42.30 % of the discourse markers selected in the study were over used by Algerian EFL students. These include “and, so, but, you know, well, I think, really, because, uh, um and I don’t know”. 19.23 % of the discourse markers were frequent in both corpora, namely: “or, just, ok, yes, oh, and really”. 7.69 % of the discourse markers are used in a limited way in comparison with CANCODE frequency. They include: “yeah and actually”. Moreover, common markers in native speakers’ speech such as: “right, like, now, sort of, see, I mean, say and cos” (30.77%) were not existent or hardly occur in the student corpora.

Additionally, through the comparison realised during the post-instructional phase between the students' corpus with regard to CANCODE sub- corpus as far as discourse markers use are concerned, four categories of users were uncovered. These include: over users, under users, misusers and no users (see table 15). The latter are better explained as follows:

- Over Users: are those who use the DMs listed in a frequency more than normal.
- Under Users: are those who use the DMs listed in a limited way.
- Misusers: are those who use the DMs listed less frequently and inappropriately.
- No Users: are those who do not make use of the DMs listed at all.

Table 15: Categories of Discourse Markers Users at the Post-Instructional Phase

Users Categories	Subjects	Percentage (%)
Over users	8	40%
Under Users	4	20%
Misusers	2	10%
No Users	6	30%

To sum up, according to the data retrieved from the comparative study of DMs use by Algerian non-native speakers and native speakers of English before and after instruction phases, it appears that EFL learners' speaking competence and communicative language performance have improved after receiving instruction about those elements smoothing conversation. This can be noticed from the rate of DMs use which rose considerably when compared to the pre- instructional phase. Likewise, the rate of mis-users and those who do not use those elements decreased. However, their

output did not reach the level of native speakers. In fact, Algerian EFL learners of English either over use or under use DMs. They may even misuse them or do not use them at all. Thus, four categories of users were distinguished namely over users, under-users, mis-users and non-users.

3.5- Summary of the Results

As a global picture of the results of this study, it will be retained that the tests scores analysis applied on both experimental and control groups unveiled no great difference as far as discourse markers identification in the pre-test is concerned. However, the gap was apparent between both groups after instructional phase during which only the experimental group received instruction about those linguistic items. Thus, the experimental group scores were higher than those achieved by the control one. Presumably the control group requires instruction on those items.

Furthermore, the results of students' corpora analysis during pre and post instructional phases indicated that certain DMs awareness is established among the subjects of the experimental group while the necessity to underline those linguistic elements to the control subjects is required.

Additionally, the findings retrieved from the questionnaire analysis attributed the reasons affecting Algerian EFL learners' use of DMs to three major factors rating high percentage. These include: situational anxiety, delay and inadequate English proficiency.

Finally, according to the data retrieved from the comparative study of DMs use by Algerian non-native speakers and native speakers of English before and after instruction phases, it appears that EFL learners' speaking competence and communicative language performance have evolved considerably in comparison with their production before receiving instruction about those elements smoothing conversation. Nevertheless, they did not reach natives' level of proficiency. Moreover, four categories of users were distinguished namely over users, under-users, mis-users and non-users.

Conclusion

This chapter attempted to analyse the results of the data collected via various streams (pre and post tests, two interviews and a questionnaire). First, an analysis of pre and post tests scores is set out. Second, an analysis of experimental and control subjects' corpora before and after instructional phases is exhibited. After that, the questionnaire results are put forward followed by explanation and interpretation. Finally, a comparative analysis based on the study of EFL students' corpus, before and after instruction, with reference to CANCODE sub-corpus is presented. As concerns the discussion of the results retrieved from the investigation, it will be dealt with in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion and Implications

Introduction

This chapter considers the research findings, retrieved from the previous chapter, in the light of existing research studies “to show the relationship between the results of the study and the results of similar studies and related arguments in the published literature” (Paltridge and Starfield, 2007: 145). Accordingly, it states the implications and possible recommendations for further research, in addition to some restrictions which limited the flow of the survey.

4.1- Discussion

In order to discuss the research findings, we organised and presented data analysis following the research questions. In other terms, we tackled each research question raised at the beginning of the survey and tried to answer it on the basis of the data results obtained via various streams (tests, interviews and a questionnaire). This method of organising and analysing the collected data is according to Cohen et al (2007:468)

“a very useful way of organizing data, as it draws together all the relevant data for the exact issue of concern to the researcher, and preserves the coherence of the material. It returns the reader to the driving concerns of the research, thereby ‘closing the loop’ on the research questions that typically were raised in the early part of an inquiry”.

4.1.1- On Students' Awareness about DMs

Harking back to the first question regarding the extent to which Algerian EFL learners are aware of the existence of discourse markers as discourse forms to help oral fluency and whether classroom instruction about those elements improves learners' discourse competence and communicative language performance, a pre-test and a post test were administered to the population of study. The analysis of the scores realised by both the experimental and control groups revealed the failure of the subjects in identifying discourse markers included in the pre-test. This can be returned back to the fact that these linguistic elements are allotted little or almost no consideration as far as teaching of the target language is concerned; i.e. English language in our case.

Besides, a great discrepancy is noticed between both groups after instruction phase during which only the experimental group received instruction about English discourse markers. Thus the experimental group scores are far beyond those achieved by the control one. Presumably the control group requires instruction on those items.

Consequently, it is apparent that Algerian EFL learners as non-native speakers of English are not enough aware of the existence of discourse markers in spontaneous spoken language.

Additionally, the results of the comparative analysis of DMs used in students' corpora during pre and post instructional phases unveiled that Algerian EFL students as non-native speakers of English employ DMs in speaking; however, a discrepancy was underlined after receiving instruction in this matter. In other terms, the results of the survey indicate that certain DMs awareness is established among the subjects of

the experimental group while the necessity to underline those linguistic elements to the control subjects is required. As a result, raising students' awareness about spoken English DMs plays a great deal in improving their linguistic competence and spoken language performance; likewise, it increases the naturalness and fluency of the learners' speech.

Moreover a questionnaire was designed and administered to the subjects of investigation just after the interview, during the phase preceding instruction. The questionnaire consisted of four questions, with question 1 to 3 focusing on consciousness in using discourse markers. The results indicated that among the 20 subjects belonging to the experimental group 75% replied they realised; 65% answered they were unconscious; while 30% hesitated between consciousness and unconsciousness. Besides, among the 20 subjects relevant to the control group 85% replied they realised, 10% used discourse markers purposefully, 15% answered they were unconscious while 75% were not sure.

Therefore, the results revealed no great awareness about those linguistic devices. This idea is supported by Sanders et al (1993) who point out: "it is not clear how much speakers and hearers are aware of their presence in discourse". In other terms, the Algerian EFL learners make use of certain discourse markers in their talk, yet they do not realise neither their significance nor their appropriate functions. This statement can be illustrated by the following excerpts of transcripts extracted from student corpora realised before instructional phase.

(1) I love this language, but I have some difficulties. Um, uh, I don't know. I don't have the words, so uh, uh I don't have uh I I have a little just a little. I have some difficulty to speak English, because um I don't read books.

(Students' corpus/experimental group)

It appears from the first example that the speaker has difficulty in expressing herself in English. When trying to overcome this difficulty, she over uses some discourse markers. She clusters both hesitation markers “um, uh” with vagueness “I don't know” which reflects her ignorance about the significance of discourse markers as well as her lack of English proficiency. Besides, she puts the result marker “so” with hesitation marker “uh” to gain time to reflect about what to say. Besides, the addressee expects a result to come forward, yet another idea stands out.

(2) Oh, they it was awful because I had to stay at home, and um and pick my niece because uh it's the job of aunts, so I have to do that.

(Students' corpus/experimental group)

When considering the second example, we find an overuse of the linguistic elements “and um and” as well as a misuse of “and” which is supposed to be reflective of listing. Yet, in this case it took the role of a linker and a tool to mark delay.

This is due as mentioned before to the lack of consideration devoted to the teaching of discourse markers and also to “the strict divide between grammar practice activities and vocabulary practice activities”, underlined by

Hartmann and Von-Sitfurth (2004 :66), prevailing in the EFL classroom that limits or decreases the naturalness and fluency of the learners' speech. In this respect, Aijmer (2009) calls for the necessity to make learners aware of the natural use of those linguistic elements in spontaneous spoken language and to encourage their use. In this context she stresses:

“it's therefore necessary not only to teach the use of discourse markers more systematically to increase the naturalness and fluency of learners' speech, but also to overcome the still prevailing strict divide between grammar practice activities and vocabulary practice activities in the EFL classroom and promote the use of formulaic language”.

Aijmer (2009: 218)

4.1.2- On the Factors Affecting DMs Use

Regarding the question of the study proposed earlier relating to the factors that affect the use of discourse markers by non-native speakers of English and to find an answer to this concern, a questionnaire focusing on discourse markers was conducted just after the interview preceding instruction phase. As mentioned previously, the questionnaire consisted of four questions, with question 1 to 3 emphasising consciousness in using discourse markers while question 4 underlining the possible causes leading Algerian EFL learners to use those linguistic elements. The latter included some of them namely: situational anxiety, delay, inadequate English proficiency, summary, emphasis on opinion, habit and others. In this context, it is necessary to mention that the listed factors were selected from a whole list proposed

by three Chinese researchers Yong, Jingli and Zhou (2010: 23) in their study of the use of “I Think” by Chinese EFL learners.

Thus, in this discussion part, we deal mainly with the factors rating a high percentage among the students.

4.1.2.1- Situational Anxiety

In the follow up survey, when the subjects were asked for the reasons leading them to employ some discourse markers in their talks, 9 elements out of 40 (experimental and control groups) answered that they used them due to situational anxiety. Yet this term “is still not easy to define in a simple sentence” (Brown, 2007:161).

In this context, Scovel (1978:134) associates anxiety “with feelings of uneasiness, frustration, self-doubt, apprehension, or worry”. Moreover, Spielberger (1983: 01) defined anxiety as “the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an automatic nervous system”.

Thus, according to our survey, the students made use of those linguistic elements because of an anxiety which we consider positive, since it did not impede them from overcoming their limitations in speaking by compensating them with linguistic clues such as discourse markers. Accordingly, Bailey (1983), in her study of “competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning”, asserts that one of the major elements for success and development of learners’ language is “facilitative anxiety”. The latter has been distinguished from debilitating anxiety.

Indeed, several studies (Bailey 1983, Brown 2007, Oxford 1999, Scovel 1978) have suggested that anxiety can be both “detrimental” and “beneficial”. For instance, Scovel (1978) distinguished between “debilitative and facilitative anxiety”. Besides, Oxford (1999) made a distinction between “harmful and helpful anxiety”. In addition, Brown (2007: 164) pointed out that several sources of anxiety may be present in a language learning situation: “a quest for perfection, fear of negative evaluation and identity conflict, among others”.

4.1.2.2- Delay

Delay constitutes one major cause for the use of discourse markers among the subjects of study. The latter according to Tannen (1989: 54) can refer to “delay within a discourse or delay across days, weeks, months and years”.

In our investigation, 13 EFL learners out of 40 replied they used discourse markers for delay in order to gain more time to formulate their ideas in the foreign language. Consequently, it was common for them to use some of those linguistic elements such as “uh, um, and I don’t know” as a compensatory strategy to gain time to think about the words to employ. In this context Brown (2007: 138) pointed out to these strategies as “stalling or time gaining strategies; ie, using fillers or hesitation devices to fill pauses and to gain time to think”.

4.1.2.3- Inadequate English Proficiency

In addition to the above reasons attributed to the use of discourse markers by Algerian EFL learners, 12 subjects out of 40 answered that they made use of some

discourse markers because of inadequate English proficiency. In this respect, language proficiency has to be explained. It refers to how well an individual masters a language in terms of reading, writing, speaking and listening.

In our case .i.e. English speaking, when EFL learners fail to find an appropriate word or express themselves, they usually make use of “all purpose words where words are lacking” (Brown, 2007: 138) such as “and, because, um, I don’t know” to keep the flow of speech going on, establishing thus fluency and compensating their inadequate English proficiency at the same time.

4.1.3- On Classroom Instruction about DMs

We embark finally on addressing the question relating to whether classroom instruction about discourse markers improves learners’ spoken language performance, and the extent to which Algerian EFL learners use those spoken devices appropriately as compared to native speakers of English. It will be discussed as follows.

According to the data retrieved from the analysis of Algerian EFL learners’ use of discourse markers after having received instruction in this matter, it appears that their speaking skill and understanding have evolved considerably as concerns those linguistic devices in comparison with their production before receiving instruction. Nevertheless, the learners’ output did not reach the level of native speakers since “the native speaker model represented a target that was unattainable for intermediate learners of English” (Gairns and Redman, 2002a: 2). Likewise, the absence of the pragmatic component of language learning in non-native classrooms (aforementioned) makes learners unaware of the reasons and the context of use of those linguistic

elements. This statement is supported by Florez (1999: 1-2) who states: “speaking requires that learners not only know how to produce specific points of language such as grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary....but also they understand when, why and in what way to produce language”.

In addition, the investigation unveiled that Algerian non-native speakers of English either over use or underuse discourse markers. They even misuse them or do not use them at all. Consequently four categories of spoken discourse markers users are unveiled. These include: over users, under users, misusers and no users, which had been explained in the previous chapter. The reason behind that can be returned back to many factors. The first one is linked to the fact that Algerian educational settings do not provide EFL learners with sufficient exposure to authentic language to acquire the skills to engage in natural conversations. In this context, Trillo (2002: 770) points out that a language can be learnt via two parallel tracks: “a formal track and a pragmatic one”. The former relates to the grammatical and semantic rules that conform to the competent use of any given foreign language while the second track concerns knowledge about “the rules and principles which govern language in use” (Malmkjær, 1991: 476).

In our case; therefore, Algerian EFL learners would develop the formal track through formal instruction in the language classroom. Yet, the pragmatic track- which is defined as “an understanding of the relationship between form and context that enables us, accurately and appropriately, to express and interpret intended meaning” (Murray, 2010: 293) is difficult to implement in educational setting. This difficulty is underlined by several studies namely Trillo’s research on

Discourse Markers (2006:194) in which he asserts that “the pragmatic component of language learning that is formed by cognitive, affective and linguistic elements (discourse markers) is difficult to reproduce in the nonnative language teaching class”’.

The second factor responsible for the discrepancy in the use of discourse markers between Algerian learners and native speakers is that English is not a second language among learners but a foreign one. In other terms, in addition to the learning context which deprives non-native learners from receiving and producing authentically, learners do not interact with their peers in English outside the pedagogical setting. Instead, they use either their mother tongue, i.e., colloquial Arabic, or Berber or employ French, as a second language, to communicate (as mentioned in the second chapter when describing the population of study). Consequently their English is limited to academic language which makes their talk sound unnatural. The third factor that can explain this discrepancy is underlined by Trillo (2006). The latter is connected to the short comings of learning a foreign language in unnatural environment, especially as to the teaching and use of discourse markers in interaction. In other words,

“...teachers and learners of a language tend to concentrate on the acquisition of the grammatical and lexical elements that enable communication, but tend to disregard the study and development of the pragmatic weight that discourse markers add to language learning”’.

Trillo (2006: 194)

Furthermore, an analysis of the students' corpora after receiving instruction gave us insight about whether the use and functions of discourse markers employed by Algerian non-native speakers are appropriate in comparison with native speakers of English.

S1: **You know**, our Gregory he's only fifteen but he wants to be a pilot.

S2: Does he?

S1: Now he couldn't get in this year to go to Manchester, **you know**, on that erm course that they do, experience course thing.

S2: Work experience.

S1: But he's going for next we_ next year.

S2: Oh yeah.

(CANCODE)

As mentioned previously, several studies (Fung and Carter 2007: 426, Müller 2005: 230) have been conducted on the use of discourse markers by native and non-native speakers. All hint at differences between the two groups as far as the use of those items is concerned. Accordingly, in the aforementioned example, the discourse marker "you Know" implies a shared knowledge. In this context, O'Keefe et al (2007:72) determine its function: "You know" is the most frequent chunk of all, and is an important signal of (projected or assumed) shared knowledge between speaker and listener, as well as being a topic launcher". Besides, Giuliana (2004: 168) asserts that you Know "implies that something is expected to be known by both the hearer and the speaker (...)"

(S1) **Ok, well uh, well** to talk about my holidays, I didn't spend **uh** very good holidays **because uh** I was ill **and you know uh** when somebody is ill can't spend a good time, **but uh** I had lot of works to do. I had **uh** a project **and uh ok**, that, **and oh** I had to search for that and **uh**, to write my project, **but uh** I didn't have a lot of time **because uh** I was very tired **uh, and** that's all.

(Student's corpus after instruction)

In the above example, the speaker uses the discourse marker “you know” for the same purpose as natives; that is “the speaker uses this marker in an attempt to have his interlocutor cooperate or to have him/her accept the propositional meaning of the utterance” Giuliana (2004: 168).

As concerns the second example in connection with discussing the priorities for preserving lives in the British National Health Service, and whether age should be a factor, the respondent employed “**well**” to reply.

S2: I thought it was shocking.

S1: Mm. Do you think it would have made any difference if she was say eighty years of age instead of a teenager?

S2: **Well** I think that er anyone's attitude should be to save life irrespective of age.

(CANCODE)

The discourse marker “**well**” in this example is functioning as a response to what has come previously. Using Halliday's and Hasan's words (1976: 26), “it serves to indicate that what follows is in fact a response to what has preceded”.

Schiffrin (1987: 102-103) observes that “Well is a response marker which anchors its uses in an interaction”.

(S2) What did I do during the holidays? **Well** lot of things, I went out shopping, **because** I love shopping, I saw my friends, my old friends, I had such a nice holiday. I **um yeah** saw so many movies in English so that I can develop my skills **and uh yes** I went to the beach with my family, **but uh** I didn’t swim because we are in **uh** spring, **but uh** it was nice, **and uh yes** such a matter.

(Student’s corpus after instruction)

In this example, the discourse marker **well** is used appropriately by the respondent “indicating the speaker’s need to give brief thought to the point at issue” (Biber et al (2002: 450).

Yet, there is something that deserves to be highlighted. The latter regards the use of hesitators. Indeed, contrary to natives we notice in the Algerian non-native speakers of English output a tendency to place hesitators or pause fillers before or after markers to “signal that the speaker is hesitating, and has not yet finished what he/she wants to say”. (Biber et al, 2002: 452). Moreover, this hesitation is due to the learners’ inadequate English proficiency. Thus, it can be said that classroom instruction of discourse devices improved learners’ spoken performance without reaching the natives’ level of proficiency.

4.2- Implications for Teaching and Suggestions

The present study attempted to answer some issues in connection with Algerian EFL students' use of discourse markers in speaking as well as the effect of consciousness-raising tasks on improving their discourse competence. Furthermore, it tried to find a way to foster Algerian EFL learners' talk and give it a more naturalistic form. Therefore some considerations must be taken into account to put into concrete form this goal. These have to do with the pragmatic aspect and the grammatical aspect of English spoken language.

Regarding the pragmatic aspect of spontaneous spoken language, teachers and learners of language tend to concentrate on the acquisition of the grammatical and lexical elements that enable the establishment of communication; however, they neglect an important aspect which is the pragmatic component of language learning. The latter, as mentioned earlier, is difficult to reproduce in the non-native pedagogical setting, yet it is worth to be tried.

Clearly then, teachers have the responsibility to develop their students' pragmatic competence and "help them better appreciate and understand how form and context interact to create meaning" (Murray, 2010: 293). This can be achieved by awakening learners' abilities for pragmatic analysis via some activities suggested by Eslami-Raskh (2005), Crandall and Basturkmen (2004) as well as Bardobi-Harlig (1996) and listed by Murray (2010: 295). These activities include: involving learners in speech acts that reflect their needs and interests; using authentic materials, and engaging students in translation activities aiming at translating speech acts from their

own language into English. Additionally, the following list highlights some of the activities that can be adopted by Algerian EFL teachers.

- “Encouraging learners to become their own ethnographers and to observe how speech acts are realized in the L2 and in particular context.
- Incorporating native speaker role plays into classroom activities as a focus of student observation.
- Using video as a vehicle for getting students to compare how speech acts are realized differently in different contexts;
- Having students choose a speech act they are interested in and observe it in naturalistic rehearsed settings”.

Murray (2010: 295)

As concerns the grammatical aspect of spoken language, teachers are invited to raise students’ awareness about some discourse markers and encourage them to observe and analyze language for themselves, through the implementation of audio-video talks supported by transcripts in their courses in order to allow learners time to notice features of spoken language that cannot be found in textbooks. In fact, introducing authentic language in the language classroom provides an opportunity to the students to explore language as interaction rather than as grammatical units. Consequently, the Algerian EFL learners’ tendency to make sense of language and systematize it will be reinforced. Moreover, teachers are invited to initiate student in tasks aiming at making comparisons between the spoken and the written forms of English by looking at transcripts of natural language, such as the samples presented in the appendices

4.3- Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this research are clearly linked to several constraints which prevented us from gaining more desired results. First of all, the population of study was restricted to a limited number of subjects. Indeed, we have applied the tasks related to awareness raising about discourse markers to only forty (40) Algerian participants, all belonging to first year English LMD, among which twenty (20) received instruction about those linguistic elements.

Presumably, in order to make wider and more general remarks on the effect of instruction about those discourse devices on the students' speaking skill, a broader corpus of speakers would be needed. However, we believe that the findings obtained are valid to a certain extent to be considered as a starting point for further research since, to our knowledge, no previous research such as the one hereby presented had been conducted in the Algerian context.

Besides, the comparison that was established to draw conclusions about the use of discourse markers by Algerian EFL learners had been restricted to a comparison of the learners' corpora with reference to CANCODE sub-corpus, previously mentioned, adopted from the research undertaken by Fung and Carter (2007: 417). In this respect, it will be judicious to emphasise the fact that if ever the research was conducted with native English people in an English environment and the corpus was recorded authentically without referring to previous achievements, the results of this survey would have been of great value and satisfying. However, we consider that the conclusions reached are valid enough to be taken into account in the hope that future

investigations will be realised in a country where English native subjects will be involved.

Additionally, this research has been restricted to the study of students' use of DMs in speaking and neglected the investigation of the use of those elements in other skills such as listening, reading and writing. This can be returned back to time constraints which prevented us from covering other aspects of language learning. Yet, we consider that the results reached with spoken skill survey as a first step paving the way for eventual research in the future. Besides, time factor contributed to the restriction of our research. As it is mentioned in this paper, the research lasted just a semester during which tasks about discourse markers were introduced to the subjects of study. This period of time allotted to research and analysis of the data is according to us not sufficient since it was interrupted many times. In fact, the troubles which had been witnessed during this period namely the students' strike and the agents' strike compelled us to stop the research for a moment then launch it again. Besides, the strikes prevented us from collecting the necessary data in the planned time.

To conclude, a study with a larger population, i.e., a broader corpus would help to realise extended generalisations about Algerian EFL learners' use of discourse markers in speaking. Furthermore, other English levels, namely second and third year LMD students could be implied in this study to check whether our findings can be extended to them.

Conclusion

This chapter attempted to discuss the research findings by tackling each research question raised at the beginning of the survey and trying to answer it on the basis of the data collected via various streams. Then, we presented the implications for teaching followed by citing the constraints encountered during the course of study. Finally, we presented some suggestions for further research.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Using English language for communication involves two major processes from the part of both the interlocutor and the addressee: transmitting ideas, beliefs, emotions and attitudes to one another and interpreting the message produced. When doing this, both of them constantly signal how they want things to be understood or interpreted via the use of a multitude of small words such as you know, I mean, well, see, so, and, but,...etc. The latter, often called discourse markers (DMs), constitute the concern of this survey.

Indeed, this piece of research limited its consideration to some aspects of spoken discourse which are discourse markers. They have been the subject of investigation in a host of studies focusing on native and non-native speakers and have been assigned a multitude of terminologies and various definitions by several researchers; however, no research has been conducted as far as Algerian EFL learners are concerned. Therefore, the present investigation tried to answer some issues related to Algerian students' awareness about these items, their usage as well as the factors affecting the latter. Furthermore, it attempted to find a way to provide EFL students with knowledge and practice in usage of those linguistic elements in order to empower them to understand nuances of discourse flow in conversation besides making them sound more natural, more confident and less awkward.

Accordingly, it is through a quasi experimental approach adopting the Cognitivist's learning theory -involving: awareness-raising activities; appropriation; and autonomy- that this research was conducted in an attempt to answer the previous questions. As far as the first question regarding the extent to which Algerian EFL learners are aware of the existence of DMs as grammar forms to help oral fluency and whether instruction about those elements improved learners' linguistic competence and communicative language performance, the results of the experiment revealed that Algerian EFL learners as non-native speakers of English were not aware enough of the existence of discourse markers in spontaneous spoken language. In fact, even though there exists a large list of those elements in the English language, Algerian learners limited their use to some of them in their talk, yet they did not realise neither their significance nor their appropriate function. They might over use discourse markers and put them in clusters, underuse them or misuse them before reaching the final idea. This is due to their ignorance about the significance of those linguistic elements besides the lack of consideration allotted to those grammatical forms in the language classroom which limits or decreases the naturalness and fluency of the learners' speech. Therefore, it is necessary to make learners aware of the natural use of those linguistic elements in spontaneous spoken language and to promote their use.

Regarding the second issue related to the reasons affecting the use of discourse markers by non-native speakers of English, they were attributed to three major factors namely: situational anxiety, delay and inadequate English proficiency. Indeed, the survey unfolded that Algerian students made use of certain compensatory strategies, such as the use of linguistic clues, when involved in speaking situations to fill pauses and to gain time to think. Thus, they established fluency and compensated their inadequate English proficiency at the same time.

Finally, with regard to the third issue in relation to whether classroom instruction about discourse markers improved learners' spoken language performance and the extent to which Algerian EFL learners used spoken discourse forms appropriately as compared to native speakers, the results of the survey revealed that, after having received instruction in this matter, Algerian EFL learners' speaking skill had evolved considerably in comparison with their production before receiving instruction. Nevertheless, they did not reach the natives' level of proficiency. This may be returned back to many reasons namely the difficulty to implement the pragmatic aspect of English in the language classroom, the learning context which deprives non-native learners from receiving and producing authentically besides the use of languages other than English outside the pedagogical settings.

In fact, the research findings unveiled that some discourse markers were overused or under used whereas others were misused or not used at all. Thus, four categories of spoken discourse markers users were distinguished. These included: over users, under users, misusers and no users.

From all what has been mentioned before, it appears that if learners desire to improve their spoken English fluency, it is important for them to be exposed to features of authentic spoken language, and that they have time to reflect on these features. Therefore, language teachers concerned with developing speaking skill of EFL learners are invited to involve students in consciousness-raising tasks helping them to uncover the gaps of their language and providing them with input in context. This can be realised through the implementation of audio-video talks supported by transcripts in their courses in order to allow learners time to notice features of spoken language that cannot be found in textbooks. Besides, by encouraging learners to observe and analyze language for themselves, their tendency to make sense of language and systematize it will be reinforced.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aijmer, K (1996). *Conversational Routines in English: Conventions and Creativity*. Harlow: Longman.

Aijmer, K (2002). *English Discourse Particles, Evidence from a Corpus, Studies in Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins John.

Aijmer, K (2009). *Corpora and Language Teaching*. John Benjamin B,V, Library of Congress Cataloging- in Publication.

Aijmer, K (2009). The Pragmatic Marker Well: A Text Study. In Dontcheva-Navatilova Olga And Povolna Renata (Eds) , *Coherence and Cohesion in Spoken and Written Discourse*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, UK.

Andersen, G (1998). The Pragmatic Marker Like from Relevance Theoretic Perspective. In Jucker A, H and ZIV, Y (Eds), *Discourse Markers: Description and Theory* (147-170), Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bailey, K M (1983). Competitiveness and Anxiety in Adult second Language Teaching: Looking at and Through the Diary Studies. In H,W Seliger and M, H Long (Eds), *Classroom Oriented Research*. Rowley: MA: Newbury House, pp 67-102.

Bardovi-Harlig, K (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing Pragmatics and Pedagogy Together. In Bouton L. F (Ed): *Pragmatics and Language Learning. Monograph series Volume 7*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Bailey, K, M (2005). Issues in teaching speaking skills to adult ESOL Learners. In *NCALL review/ volume 6*, pp 114-164,

Bell, J (2005). *Doing Your Research Project: A guide for first-time researchers in education, health and social science*. Open University Press, England.

Biber, D, Conrad, S and Leech, G (2002). *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Longman Pearson Education Limited, England.

Blakemore, D (1987). *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Blakemore, D (1992). *Understanding Utterances*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Blakemore, D (2002). *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning, The semantics and pragmatics of Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Blackwell, Oxford.

Blakemore, D (2004). Discourse Markers. In Lawrence, R, H and Ward, G (Eds), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, pp 221-240, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Bright, W (1992). *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. New York: Oxford UP,

Crandall, E and Basturkmen, H (2004). Evaluating Pragmatics-Focused Materials. *ELT Journal* 58/1, pp 38-49.

Brown, G, and Yule, G (1983). *Teaching the Spoken Language: an approach based on the analysis of conversational English*. Cambridge University Press, UK,

Brown, H, D (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, fifth edition. Pearson Education, Inc, San Fransisco State University.

Bührig, K and House, J (2007). "So, given this common theme" linking constructions in discourse across languages. In Rehbein, J and al (Eds): *Connectivity in Grammar and Discourse*, pp 346-365, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amesterdam/Philadelphia.

Celce-Murcia, M and Olshtain, E (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom.

Celce-Murcia, M and Olshtain, E (2001), Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching. In Schiffrin D and al (Eds): *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, pp 707-724, Blackwell publishers LTD, United Kingdom.

Cohen, L; Marion, L and Morrison, K (2007), *Research Methods In Education*. 6th edition, Routledge. Tailor and Francis Group, London and New York.

Cook, G (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.

De Klerk, V (2005). Procedural meaning of well in a corpus of Xhosa English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37, pp 1183-1205.

Ellis, R (2002). Grammar teaching-Practice or consciousness-raising? In Richards, J and Renadia, W (Eds): *Methodology in language teaching: an anthology of current practice*, pp 167-174. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R (2005). Instructed Language Learning and Task-Based Teaching. In HINKEL Eli (Eds): *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers: London.

Erman, B (2001). Pragmatic Markers Revisited with Focus on You Know. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, pp 1337-1359.

Eslami-Raskh, Z (2005). Raising the pragmatic Awareness of language Learners. *ELT Journal* 59/3, pp 199-208.

Florez, M, A, C (1999). *Improving Adult English Language Learners' Speaking Skills*. Washinton, DC: Clearhouse for ESL Library Education, (Eric Document Reproduction Service, N°: EDO-LE-99-01).

Fraser, B (1988). Types Of English Discourse Markers. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 38, 19-33.

Fraser, B (1999). What are Discourse Markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, pp 931-952.

Fraser, B (2006). Towards a Theory of Discourse Marker. In Fischer, K (Eds): *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Elsevier Ltd.

Fung, L and Carter, R (2007). Discourse Markers and Spoken English: Native and Learner Use in Pedagogic Setting. *Applied Linguistics* 28/3:410-439, Oxford University Press.

Gairns, R and Redman, S (2002 a). *Natural English Intermediate Teacher's Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giuliana, D (2004). The Discourse Functions of I don't Know in English Conversation. In Aijmer, K and Stenström, A, B (Eds): *Discourse Patterns in Spoken and Written Corpora*, pp 157-171, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Halliday M, A, K and Hasan, R (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Pearson Education Limited, England.

Hansen, MBM (1997). Alors and Donc in Spoken French: A Reanalysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28, pp 153- 187.

Harmer, J (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Longman, Pearson Education Limited, England.

Harmer, J (2007). *How to Teach English*. Longman, Pearson Education Limited, England.

Hedge, T (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford University Press.

Jucker, A H and Ziv, Y (1998 b). Discourse Markers: Introduction. In Jucker, A, H and Ziv, Y (Eds) , *Discourse Markers, Descriptions and Theory* pp 1-12. Amsterdam: BENJAMINS John.

Knott, A (2000). An Algorithmic Framework for Specifying the Semantics of Discourse Relations. *Computational Intelligence* 16, pp 1-10.

Knott, A and Sanders, T (1998). The Classification on Coherence Relations and Their Linguistic Markers: An Exploration of Two Languages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30, pp 135-175.

Lazaraton, A (2001), Teaching Oral Skills. In Celce-Murcia, M (Eds): *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 3rd ed. pp 103-115. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Lenk, U (1995). Discourse markers and conversational coherence. In Wårvik, B, Tanskanen S.-K, and Hiltunen R. (Eds.). *Organization in Discourse. Proceedings from the Turku Conference*, pp. 341–352. Turku: University of Turku

Lenk, U (1998). *Marking discourse coherence, Functions of discourse markers in spoken English*. Tübingen: Narr.

Lewis, D (2006). Discourse Markers in English: A Discourse Pragmatic View. In Fischer Kerstin (Eds): *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, pp 43-59, Elsevier Ltd, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Louwerse, M M and Heather H M (2003). Toward Taxonomy of a Set of Discourse Markers in Dialog: a theoretical and computational Linguistic Account. *Discourse Processes* 35 (3).

Malmkjaer, K (1991). *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. Routledge Tailor and Francis Group, London and New York.

McCarthy, M (1998). *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Miller, J and Weinert, R (1998). *Spontaneous Spoken Language: Syntax and Discourse*. Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press.

Müller, S (2005). *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-Native English Discourse*. John Benjamin Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Müller-Hartmann, A and Schocker-Von Ditfurth, M (2004) *Introduction to English Language Teaching*, Stuttgart, Klett.

Murray, N (2010). Pragmatics, Awareness Raising, and the Cooperative Principle. *ELT Journal*, Volume 64/3, pp 293-301, Oxford University Press.

Nunan, D (1986). *Research Methods in Language Learning*, Cambridge University Press, UK.

Nunan, D (1993). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, England.

O'keefe, A; McCarthy, M and Carter, R (2007). *From Corpus to Classroom: Language Use and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R L (1999). Anxiety and the Language Learner: New Insights. In Arnold, J (Eds). *Effect In Language Learning*. pp 58-67 Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Paltridge, B and Starfield, S (2007). *Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language: A Handbook for Supervisors*. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, London and New York.

Pitts C S, Prost H J and Winters J J (2005). Quasi-Experimental Designs in Developmental Research: Design and Analysis Considerations. In Teti Douglas (Eds): *Handbook of Research Methods in Developmental Science*. pp 81-100, Blackwell Publishing LTD.

Pridham, F (2001). *The Language of Conversation*. Routledge.

Redekker, G (1991). Linguistic Markers of Discourse Structure. (Review of Discourse Markers by Schifffrin, D). *Linguistics* 29, pp 1139-1172.

Richards, J C (1990). *The Language Teaching Matrix*. Cambridge University Press, UK.

Richards, J C, Hull, J and Proctor, S (1997), *New Interchange: English for International communication*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J, Platt, J, and Platt, H (1992). *Longman Dictionary of language teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Sanders T J M and Noordman L G M (2000). The Role of Coherence and Their Linguistic Markers in Text Processing. *Discourse Processes* 29, pp 37-60.

Sanders, T, Spooren, W, and Noordman, L (1993). Coherence Relations in a Cognitive Theory of Discourse Representation. In : *Cognitive Linguistics* 4(2), pp 93-133.

Schifffrin, D (1985). Multiple Constraints on Discourse Options: A quantitative Analysis of Causal Sentences. In: *Discourse Processes* 8, pp 281-303,

Schifffrin, D (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Schifffrin, D (2001). Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning and Context. In Schifffrin, D and al (Eds): *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, UK.

Schmidt, R,W (2001). Attention. In Robinson, P (Eds): *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*. pp 3-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, L (1985). *Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation* New York: Garland.

Schourup, L (1999), Tutorial Overview: Discourse Markers. *Lingua* 107, pp 227-265.

Scovel, T (1978). The Effect of Foreign Language Learning, in: *A Review of the Anxiety Research, Language Learning* 28: pp 129-142.

Simon-Vandenberg, A M (2001). Analysing text and Discourse, A Report. *The European English Messenger*, x, pp 79-85.

Spielberger, C (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait anxiety inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Svartvik, J (1980). Well in Conversation. In Greebaum S, Leech G and Svartvic J (Eds). *Studies in English Linguistics* for Randolph Quirk. pp 167-177 London: Longman.

Taboda, M (2006). Discourse Markers as Signals (or not) of Rhetorical Relations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, pp 567-592.

Taglimonte, S,A (2006). *Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, D (1989). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

Tarone, E (2005). Speaking in a Second Language. In Hinkel Eli (Eds): *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, pp 485-502, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, London.

Thornbury, S (2005). Speaking: Awareness, Appropriation and Autonomy. In *English Teaching Professional*, issue 40, pp 11-13.

Thornbury, S (2008), *How to Teach Speaking*. Pearson Education Limited, England.

Thornbury, S and Slade, D (2006). *Conversation: From Description to Pedagogy*. Cambridge University Press, UK.

Trillo R J (2002). The Pragmatic Fossilization of Discourse Markers in Non-Native Speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, pp 769-784.

Trillo, J R (2006). Discourse Markers. In Jacob,L Mey (Eds): *Concise Encyclopedia of pragmatics*. pp 191-194, Elsevier Ltd. Oxford, UK.

Ur, P (1996). *A Course In Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.

Urgelles-Coll, M (2010). *The Syntax and Semantics of Discourse Markers: Continuum Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Van Lier, L (1995). *Introducing language awareness*. London: Penguin, England.

Vanderstoep, W S and Johnston, D ,D (2009). *Research Methods for Everyday Life: Blending Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Jossey-Bass, John Wiley and Sons, INC.

Weydt, H (2006). What are Particles Good for? In Fischer Kerstin (Eds): *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Elsevier Ltd.

Widodo, H, P (2006). Approaches and Procedures for teaching Grammar. In *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, Volume 5, N° 1, pp 122-141.

Willis, D (2003). Rules, Patterns and words: Grammar and Lexis In *English Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Willis, D and Willis, J (1996). Consciousness-raising activities. In Willis, D and Willis, J (Eds): *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*, Oxford: Heinemann, pp 63-76.

Woodley, A (2004). Getting and Analysing Quantitative Data. In: *Practitioner research and Evaluation Skills Training in Open Distance Learning*. Commonwealth Learning.

Yong, Y, Jingli, W and Zhou, C (2010). The Use of I Think by Chinese EFL Learners: A Study Revisited. In *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* (Bimonthly), Volume 33, N° 1, pp 3-23,

OTHER SOURCES

www.teaching English.org.uk

www.writewords.org.uk

www.wordcounttool.com

APPENDICES

Appendix N° 01

Data sheet on Discourse Markers

- Please read the following extracts (adapted from RICHARDS and al (1997)) from real language data and make yourself familiarised with what are defined as discourse markers in the survey.

Extract 1 (p17)

(The speakers are engaged in a discussion dealing with making wishes)

Brian: **So**, where are you working now, Terry?

Terry: **Oh**, I'm still at the bank. I don't like it though.

Brian: That's too bad. Why not?

Terry: **Well**, it's boring, **and** it doesn't pay very well.

Brian: I know what you mean. I don't like my job either. I wish I could find a better job.

Terry: **Actually**, I don't want to work anymore. I wish I had lot of money **so** I could retire now.

Brian: **Hmm**, how old are you, Terry?

Terry: **Uh**, twenty six.

Extract 2 (p14)

(This conversation is between members of a family who are looking for a flat to rent)

Mr. Dean: **So**, what do you think?

Mrs. Dean: **Well**, it has just as many bedrooms as the last apartment. **And** the living-room is huge.

Jenny: **But** the bedrooms are too small. **And** there isn't enough closet space for my clothes.

Mr. Dean: **And** it's not as cheap as the last apartment we saw.

Mrs. Dean: **But** that apartment was dark and dingy. **And** it was in a dangerous neighbourhood.

Mr. Dean: Let's see if the real estate agent has something else to show us.

Extract 3 (p40)

(This extract is from a conversation between two colleagues discussing the use of computer)

Daniel: **Hey!** Nice computer! What's this for?

Andrea: That's a modem. It's used to connect the computer to the phone line, **so** I can send faxes and access the Internet.

Daniel: **So**, can you go on-line **and all that?**

Andrea: **Yes. And** I use the World Wide Web for finding information on astronomy, movies –**just about anything**.

Daniel: Sports? Cars?

Andrea: **Uh-Huh. And** I can exchange information with people too. I belong to a chat group on astronomy.

Daniel: **Hum**. I just use my computer to write letters and reports.

Andrea: Why don't you get on the internet? It's not really expensive.

Daniel: Maybe I will. It sounds like fun.

Extract 4 (p86)

(This is from a conversation between two friends talking about unusual way people in India communicate)

Ron: Have you met Raj, the student from India?

Laura: **No**, I haven't.

Ron: **Well**, he seems really nice, **but** there is one thing I noticed. He moves his head from side to side when you talk to him. **You know**, like this.

Laura: Maybe it means he doesn't understand you.

Ron: **No**, I don't think so.

Laura: **Or**, it could mean he doesn't agree with you.

Peter: **Actually**, people from India sometimes move their heads from side to side when they agree with what you're saying.

Ron: **Oh, so** that's what it means.

What are discourse markers?

Some words and phrases help to develop ideas and relate them to one another. Furthermore, they function to organise and monitor the progress of a piece of written or spoken language. These kinds of words and phrases are often called discourse markers. We are familiar with conjunctions like: **firstly, secondly, and, or, so, therefore** in written language. In spoken language the most common include: **I mean, okay, well, so, actually, right, you know, anyway, and, 'cos**, etc. Generally, they mark openings (**well, right**) and closings of conversations (**Okay**), as well as boundaries of topics (**so, right**). They link up ideas in a talk and can reflect the attitude of the speaker's assessment of the conversation as being informal

Here is a summary of the main functions of the most frequent discourse markers found in real language data. They are extracted from Biber and al (2002: 450) and Fung and Carter (2007:392).

DMs	Main functions
Well	Tends to occur at the beginning of a turn or utterance. It signals interactively what the speaker plans to steer the dialogue. It indicates the speaker's mental thoughts. Usually, it prefaces a negative response and indicates inadequacy of an answer. It also introduces the topic of a conversation and can serve as a delaying device in conversation.
Alright/ Right/ Okay	Mainly occur at the beginning of an utterance and serve as a kind of spoken punctuation to mark the boundary of an exchange. They mark openings and closings of conversations.
So	It is used to indicate a summary or conclusion of what has been previously said.
And	It is used to mark continuation of speech.
But	It indicates a contrastive view point.
Like	It indicates a suggestion or an example.
You know	It is essentially a marker of information state. It implies that something is expected to be known both by the speaker and the hearer.
I mean	It is a speaker oriented marker to modify or clarify the speaker's own contribution.
'Cos	The informal form of 'because'. Normally, it is used to give explanations.
Yeah/ No/ Yes	They are brief responses to a previous remark by a different speaker. They are positive or negative. They are used to respond to questions, statements or directives.
Mhm/ Uh-huh/ Okay	They are used to let the other speaker know that the utterance is being understood and accepted.
Actually/ Really/ I think	They are used to reflect the speaker's attitude. E.g. indicating reinforcement.
Um/ Uh	They are hesitators or pause fillers signalling that the speaker is hesitating, and has not yet finished what he/she wants to say.
Oh	It is traditionally viewed as an exclamation or an interjection. When used alone, oh is said to indicate strong emotional states, e.g. surprise, fear or pain.

Appendix N° 02

A Sample Interview (Before instruction phase)

T: Why did you choose to study English language?

S: Um, I chose English because I like it. In the middle school, um, every day I have every day I have a good mark. I like it very much, it was my choice.

T: What would you have chosen if you did not have the chance to do English?

S: If I didn't have the choice to do English, I would have done German. I speak German very well. I studied it in the "lycee" because I was in foreign languages. I like both of them because I was in Germany, uh I participated in a, uh "concour", and I was accepted, and I stayed there for twenty one days. It was very good, we study, and in the afternoon, we do excursion and visit many towns. Everything is terrific.

T: What are your future plans after getting the degree?

S: I want to be a teacher at the university.

T: On what project are you working at the moment?

S: I chose the theme of pollution. Um, I didn't start yet working on it. I I'll look in the university library, and I don't know, uh in another library. If I don't find, I'll look in the internet or in EL-HAMA. we must have books and the internet.

T: And, what do you prefer, searching in books or in the internet?

S: Uh, both of them, but I prefer internet because it's very quickly.

Appendix N° 03

Questionnaire (Before instruction phase)

- Please, answer the following questions based on the interview done right now by choosing just one answer. Thank you for your cooperation

1- Have you realized whether you used discourse markers during the interview?

- a- Yes
- b- No
- c- Not sure

2- If yes, how many times you made use of them?

- a- Once
- b- Twice
- c- Three times
- d- Others

3- Do you use discourse markers purposefully or unconsciously?

- a- Purposefully
- b- Unconsciously
- c- Sometimes purposefully, sometimes unconsciously
- d- Not sure

4- Why did you use discourse markers during the interview?

- a- Situational anxiety
- b- Delay
- c- Inadequate English proficiency
- d- Summary
- e- Emphasis of my opinion
- f- Habit
- g- Others

Appendix N° 04

Comparison of texts

- Please read the following conversations by native speakers of English. The discourse markers have been highlighted in the original texts (Script A) whereas all the discourse markers are taken out in the deleted text (Script B). Try to compare the effects discourse markers have on the spoken exchange when they are present and when they are omitted.

(Here is an extract (taken from WILLIS, 2003,186) of a discussion between two people talking about their fear of heights).

Script A- Original text	Script B- Deleted text
1. CB: I don't particularly like heights. Erm. Heights, er, at the top of a mountain, or a hill, where it's possible to fall. Erm, the top of something like a lighthouse or something I don't mind, because there's a barrier around you. But heights where you think you may be able to fall. 2. BB: Yeah. I was okay until I had a rather nasty experience about er, height. Until then I was okay. I could go anywhere. But er, I was er, on a lighthouse actually. We were being taken round it. We went up all the stairs and to the light, er, room. And then the chap says 'Oh, come on. Right, we'll go out here.' I went through the door. And I was on this very very narrow little parapet ... 3. CB: Yeah. 4. BB: ... with a rail about – perhaps eighteen inches high ... 5. CB: Mm. 6. BB: ... and then a sheer drop of about a hundred feet or something. I was absolutely petrified. I've never been as scared like that before or since. 7. CB: That's very frightening. 8. BB: And, you know, I sort of edged round. I couldn't go back through the same door. I edged round and managed to find the other door. And that's it. Ever since then if I go up a ladder I'm scared stiff now. It really is, it's er, changed my whole life, you know. Absolutely frightening, that.	1. CB: I don't particularly like heights.. Heights, at the top of a mountain, a hill, where it's possible to fall. the top of a lighthouse I don't mind, there's a barrier around you. Heights where you think you may be able to fall. 2. BB:. Until I had a rather nasty experience about height. I could go anywhere. But, I was on a lighthouse. We were being taken round it. We went up all the stairs and to the light, room. Then the chap says ' come on. We'll go out here.' I went through the door. I was on this very narrow little parapet ... 4. BB: ... with a rail about – perhaps eighteen inches high ... 6. BB: ... then a sheer drop. I was absolutely petrified. I've never been as scared like that before or since. 7. CB: That's very frightening. 8. BB: I edged round. I couldn't go back through the same door. I edged round and managed to find the other door. That's it. Ever since then if I go up a ladder I'm scared stiff now. It really is, it's changed my whole life. Absolutely frightening, that.

(Here is a short extract (taken from WILLIS, 2003, 194) where two people are exchanging addresses).

Script A- Original text	Script B- Deleted text
1 DF: <i>Okay</i>. Can you give me your address? <i>And</i> your phone number? <i>And</i> I'll get it down here. 2 BG: Fifty-three ... 3 DF: <i>Yeah</i>. 4 BG: Cleveland Square. 5 DF: <i>Cleveland Square</i>. 6 BG: London west two. 7 DF: Is that the postcode, or —? 8 BG: <i>Yeah</i>. 9 DF: Just west two? 10 BG: <i>Yeah</i>. 11 DF: <i>All right</i>. Have you got a phone number? 12 BG: <i>Yes</i>, it's two six two 13 DF: <i>Two six two</i>— 14 BG: o six one nine. 15 DF: <i>o six one nine</i>. <i>So</i> it's <i>er</i>, Bridget Green, fifty-three Cleveland Square, London, west two, two s- and the phone number two six two, o six one nine. 16 BG: <i>That's right</i>.	1 DF: Can you give me your address? Your phone number? I'll get it down here. 2 BG: Fifty-three ... 4 BG: Cleveland Square. 6 BG: London west two. 7 DF: Is that the postcode, or —? 9 DF: Just west two? 11 DF: Have you got a phone number? 12 BG: It's two six two 14 BG: o six one nine. 15 DF: It's Bridget Green, fifty-three Cleveland Square, London, west two, two s- and the phone number two six two, o six one nine.

Appendix N° 05

Task N° 01 Spoken and written language: differences

(This task is adapted from WILLIS (2003.186))

Here is an extract from a discussion between two people talking about their fear of heights. It contains several features which are common in spoken English, but unusual or non existent in written English.

1. CB: I don't particularly like heights. Erm. Heights, er, at the top of a mountain, or a hill, where it's possible to fall. Erm, the top of something like a lighthouse or something I don't mind, because there's a barrier around you. But heights where you think you may be able to fall.
2. BB: Yeah. I was okay until I had a rather nasty experience about er, height. Until then I was okay. I could go anywhere. But er, I was er, on a lighthouse actually. we were being taken round it. We went up all the stairs and to the light, er, room. And then the chap says 'Oh, come on. Right, we'll go out here.' I went through the door. And I was on this very very narrow little parapet ...
3. CB: Yeah.
4. BB: ... with a rail about – perhaps eighteen inches high ...
5. CB: Mm.
6. BB: ... and then a sheer drop of about a hundred feet or something. I was absolutely petrified. I've never been as scared like that before or since.
7. CB: That's very frightening.
8. BB: And, you know, I sort of edged round. I couldn't go back through the same door. I edged round and managed to find the other door. And that's it. Ever since then if I go up a ladder I'm scared stiff now. It really is, it's er, changed my whole life, you know. Absolutely frightening, that.

- Look at the dialogue above and answer these questions:

1. Look at turns 1 and 2. There are several occurrences of *er* and *erm*. What function do you think these noises serve?
2. Why do the speakers say *something like a lighthouse or something; I sort of edged round*?
3. In turn 2 BB says, *I was okay until I had a rather nasty experience about er, height. Until then I was okay*. Why does he repeat himself?
4. Are there any words in turn 2 which you would not expect to find in written English?
5. What is unusual about the structure of the sentence, *The top of something like a lighthouse or something I don't mind*?
6. How many sentences are there in turn 1?
7. What is the verb in the last sentence in turn 8?
8. Is turn 6 grammatical?
9. At turns 3, 5 and 7, CB actually interrupts the narrative. Is she being rude?
10. It is often said that you should not start a sentence with *and* or *but*. How many sentences in this extract start with *and* or *but*? Why do you think this is?
11. What is unusual about the final sentence in turn 1?

Commentary on the task

Most of spoken discourse is composed in real time. Speakers are working out what they want to say and producing language at the same time. In this process they use some features of talk that cannot be used in written form. The aim of this task is to make students identify discourse markers and think about their use. Moreover, it aims at highlighting the differences between spoken and written language.

Appendix N° 06

Task N° 02 From spoken to written language

(This task is adapted from WILLIS (2003, 201))

1. CB: I don't particularly like heights. Erm. Heights, er, at the top of a mountain, or a hill, where it's possible to fall. Erm, the top of something like a lighthouse or something I don't mind, because there's a barrier around you. But heights where you think you may be able to fall.
2. BB: Yeah. I was okay until I had a rather nasty experience about er, height. Until then I was okay. I could go anywhere. But er, I was er, on a lighthouse actually. we were being taken round it. We went up all the stairs and to the light, er, room. And then the chap says 'Oh, come on. Right, we'll go out here.' I went through the door. And I was on this very very narrow little parapet ...
3. CB: Yeah.
4. BB: ... with a rail about – perhaps eighteen inches high ...
5. CB: Mm.
6. BB: ... and then a sheer drop of about a hundred feet or something. I was absolutely petrified. I've never been as scared like that before or since.
7. CB: That's very frightening.
8. BB: And, you know, I sort of edged round. I couldn't go back through the same door. I edged round and managed to find the other door. And that's it. Ever since then if I go up a ladder I'm scared stiff now. It really is, it's er, changed my whole life, you know. Absolutely frightening, that.

Rewrite BB's story as though it were part of a letter. Begin with the words:

I have been frightened of heights ever since I had a frightening experience a few years ago ...

Commentary on the task

This exercise aims at highlighting the differences existing between spoken and written languages. In order to produce a written version of the story, learners will have to do a lot of work on the spoken version. Obviously they will need to cut out *ers* and *erms*. They will change colloquial forms, like *I was okay* and *the chap*, to written forms, like *I was all right* or *I was not frightened* and *the man*. They will rewrite the ungrammatical form *I've never been as scared like that*. They will rewrite non-sentences, like *Absolutely frightening, that*. In making these adjustments they will be focusing on the differences between spoken and written language.

Appendix N° 07

Task N° 03 From written to spoken language

(This task is adapted from WILLIS (2003, 202))

You are going to read a story which appeared in a popular magazine. The first sentence is:

I never used to worry about heights until I had a rather frightening experience a few years ago.

The last sentence is:

Now I get nervous even if I have to go up a ladder.

Here are some of the words and phrases from the story:

Lighthouse keeper – small room – light – small door – parapet – low rail – eighteen inches – one hundred feet – much too frightened – back to the wall – other door – frightened of heights.

What do you think happened?

I never used to worry about heights until I had a rather frightening experience a few years ago. We were on holiday by the coast, and we went to look round a lighthouse. The lighthouse keeper took us to the top of the tower and into the small room where the light was. Then he showed us through a small door. Suddenly I found myself on a tiny narrow parapet. In front of me there was a low rail, about eighteen inches high, and beyond that a sheer drop of about a hundred feet. I was petrified. I was much too frightened to turn round to go back through the original door. I kept my back to the wall and inched my way round the parapet till I came to the other door, and back into the room. I have never been so frightened in all my life. Since then I have been terrified of heights. Now I get nervous even if I have to go up a ladder.

Commentary on the task

This is a prediction task after which a class discussion is encouraged before showing the written text. Like task 02, this is an attempt to highlight differences between spoken and written forms. Moreover, learners will make a comparison between the scripted text and the written one focusing their discussion on features which are common in spoken English, but unusual or non existent in written English.

Appendix N° 08

PRE -TEST

(This task is adapted from THORNBURY (2008, 51))

- Here is a succession of customers in a hardware shop, each of whom is buying an item whose name they do not know. Give the name of each object the speaker describes. Note down the fillers the speakers use. Why do you think they use them?

Speaker1: Well, it's...it's that stuff you need to put two different pieces together. For instance, two pieces of paper. You put that stuff on one bit of paper and stick the other paper on top of it, for example. Or, you can do that with leather as well, if your shoe gets broken, or you can do that with wood, and things like that.

Speaker2: it's a piece of material. Um...it's a square and it's soft and you use it to...after bath for drying yourself when you are wet.

Speaker3: it looks like little pieces of wood, very thin little pieces all in box and, er... at the tip there's a ...they are either black or red and it's something you use to light a fire or anything like that.

Speaker4: Er...I want...you put it on when it's hot and you buy it in a bottle, a plastic bottle and you put it on your body and it protects you from the sun.

Speaker 5: It's a machine for cleaning. You have a tube and it, er...it sucks the dust. It's a machine for cleaning the carpet.

Appendix N° 09

POST- TEST

(This task is adapted from THORNBURY (2008, 50))

Here are three people talking about smoking. Note down the fillers the speakers use.

Why do you think they use them? How necessary do you think they are?

1- Well, I do like it, I mean really I know I shouldn't, but um, you know how it is, if you have one and you want another it's um, it's a bit difficult to stop, really.

2- I think it's really um disgusting habit, really, and you know, you know if you're um in a restaurant or something and people start smoking, I think it's disgusting, basically, I think it's really awful.

3- Yeah, well I've been smoking now for, ooh I don't know, about 30 years or so I suppose, and I'm kind of giving up the next, and um actually it's been going on like that for ages and um you know when I, when I give up just put on all this weight. So I kind of give up, and then I get very depressed because I'm overweight, so I kind of um, so I talk it up again.

Appendix N° 10

Commentary on the task

- Here is a scripted text, extracted from the internet, of a video talk dealing with likes and dislikes presented to EFL learners. The aim of this task is to make students identify DMs and think about their use.

Like to do

1 –

Interviewer: Uh, what do you like to do for fun?

Joe: Uhm, that's a great question. I was just asking myself that the other day. Uhm, I really enjoy nature, uhm, going for drives, uh, in like, where the fall foliage is, or like hiking up in the mountains.

Interviewer: Driving and walking?

Joe: Yeah, hiking in the mountains, getting in touch with nature, and uh, I do, I love going to the movies, and basically the thing I like more than anything else is just sitting around with folks talking. That's what I like to do.

2 –

Interviewer: And what do you like to do for fun here in New York?

Marsha: Uh, movies, uh, shows, uhm, bars.

3 –

Interviewer: Hi.

Diane: Hi.

Interviewer: What, what's your name?

Diane: Diane.

Interviewer: Diane what?

Diane: I can't tell you that.

Interviewer: That's okay. And what are you doing out here on the street today?

Diane: Uhm, actually going back to work. I was shopping in Saks Fifth Avenue.

Interviewer: What did you go shopping for?

Diane: I didn't really go to buy anything, but I looked around, and I saw a dress that was on sale, and it caught my eye, so I bought it.

Interviewer: And so you bought it.

Diane: So I bought it.

Interviewer: That's great. And, uh, do you live here in New York?

Diane: Yes I do.

Interviewer: Where do you live?

Diane: I live on 68th Street.

Interviewer: Okay, and what did you say you did? Did you say what you did for a living?

Diane: No, I didn't say what I did. I'm in publishing.

Interviewer: Great.

Diane: Magazine publishing.

Interviewer: And what do you like to do for fun in New York?

Diane: What do I like to do for fun in New York? I like to get out of New York. I like to go to the country.

4 – Robin (male Robin)

Interviewer: What do you do?

Robin: What do I do? I basically, it's, I'm like a mailman, but I, I carry around a little computer thing, and I scan freight out, have people sign for it. You know, deliver like all paperwork, important documents, and stuff like that.

Interviewer: Uh-huh. So what do you have in your box here?

Robin: Oh, in here I have, I have all my building set up. This is how... I walk around with it, instead of carrying it all. I push a cart.

Interviewer: Uh-huh. What do you like to do for fun?

Robin: Uh, after work, I like to go home, relax, watch a little TV. When payday comes around on Friday, I like to go out and spend my money, you know, go out dancing or whatever.

5 –

Cathy: When you live in Manhattan, you leave, every weekend, when you can.

Interviewer: And what are you going to do on your next holiday?

Cathy: I'm not sure. I think on my next holiday I'll probably get married, and I'll be on my honeymoon.

Interviewer: Congratulations.

Cathy: Well, thank you.

Interviewer: That's wonderful. When are you getting married?

Cathy: Uh, we're planning September next year.

Interviewer: Beautiful. And what do you like to do for fun?

Cathy: I love to hike, I like to camp, I like to jog, I work out.

6 –

Interviewer: What do you like to do for fun?

Mrs. Provenzano: What do I like... Oh, I love the opera. I love the theatre.

7 –

Interviewer: What do you like to do for fun?

Minda: Uh, I like to go to movies, concerts, uh, out to dinner, socialize with friends and family.

8 –

Interviewer: And what do you like to do for fun?

Steven: Swim, swim and be outside. Anything outside.

9 –

Interviewer: Where are you from?

Melisson: New York.

Interviewer: And are you originally from New York as well?

Julie: Yes.

Interviewer: Yes?

Julie: Yes.

Interviewer: And what do you like to do for fun in New York?

Melisson: Hmmm, well I like to go out dancing, and I like to, uh, go to auditions, and I like to, uhm, go out to eat, and stuff like that.

10 –

Interviewer: Come on over here.

Eric: I grew up in Brooklyn.

Interviewer: That's beautiful. What's, what's your name?

Claire: My name is Claire.

Interviewer: Claire what?

Claire: Needell.

Interviewer: And how do you spell your last name?

Claire: N – E – E – D – E – L – L.

(Eric indistinct)

Interviewer: Would you intro... would you introduce me to your friend?

Claire: This is Eric Tobias.

Interviewer: And what do you do?

Claire: Uhm, I work at Pocketbooks, a publishing company.

Interviewer: Uh-huh, and what do you do, sir?

Eric: I work at Pocketbooks as well.

Interviewer: Great, and are you from New York?

Claire: Yes, I grew up in Westchester County, and I live in Manhattan now.

Interviewer: And do you... are you from New York?

Eric: I grew up in Brooklyn, New York.

Interviewer: All right. And, uh, what do you like to do for fun in New York?

Claire: Oh, God.

Eric: Jeez. That's a good expression "Oh Jeez". Uhm, what do we like to do? Uhm, I don't know, you might want to go running in Central Park, or bicycle riding, or, uh...

Claire: I don't know. I walk around a lot, go to the movies, eat, drink.

Eric: Mostly eat and drink I think a lot. Eat and drink a lot.

Claire: We spend money. You shop.

Interviewer: When you go shopping, what do you shop for?

Claire and Eric: Clothes.

Interviewer: That's it?

Eric: Yeah, clothes.

Interviewer: That's good. What...

11 -

Interviewer: What do you like to do for fun?

Jill: I don't have fun. I'm a law student, and all I do is study.

Interviewer: Studying, studying.

Part 2 – Do you like your job?

12 –

Interviewer: Do you like your job?

Erin: I love my job. It's great.

13 –

Interviewer: Do you like your job?

Declan: I do. I love it.

14 –

Interviewer: Do you like your job?

Pamela: Oh yes, I do like my job.

15 –

Interviewer: Do you like your job?

Shari: I hate it!

Appendix N° 11

Commentary on the task

- Here is a scripted text, extracted from the internet, of a video talk dealing with things done in the past presented to EFL learners. The aim of this task is to make students identify DMs and think about their use.

Yesterday

1 –

Interviewer: What did you do yesterday?

Dina: What did I do yesterday? Uhm, I was in school most of the day. I studied, I went to the gym and worked out, worked on my computer, watched a little TV. That was about it.

Interviewer: Great. All-American. Computer and workout.

Interviewer: And what did you do yesterday?

Danny: I went to work in the morning, and then I went to school in the afternoon, gym at night, and watched TV. Went to sleep. Interviewer: Okay. Great.

Dina: Not a very exciting day yesterday, huh? (Dina forgets to say "day")

Interviewer: Hey, it's busy, though, right?

2 –

Interviewer: What did you do yesterday?

Yale: Yesterday, yesterday, I taught yesterday. I teach school 2 days a week.

Interviewer: What do you teach?

Yale: I teach hands-on-science to children.

3 –

Interviewer: What's your name?

Asker: My name is Asker Lindsey.

Interviewer: And, uh, what did you do this morning?

Asker: Oh, this morning, I got up and ate and watched the news.

Interviewer: And, uh, what did you do yesterday?

Asker: Oh, yesterday, the same old thing.

Interviewer: You got up and

Asker: watched, watched television and the news.

4 –

Interviewer: What did you do yesterday?

Eddie: Yesterday, I did not do this, I slept in and played video games.

5 –

Interviewer: What did you do yesterday?

Charles: I rested, I read books, watched television, and went to sleep.

6 –

Interviewer: What did you do yesterday?

Mary: Oh, yesterday, I remained in the house and I cooked and I did some housework.

Interviewer: Very good. What did you do yesterday?

Henry: Oh, I put some things together to keep the house in order.

7 –

Matthew: This morning when I woke up?

Interviewer: Uh, yeah.

Matthew: I went back to sleep.

Interviewer: And then what did you do?

Matthew: I woke up, got dressed, my girlfriend picked me up, took me to work.

8 –

Interviewer: What did you do yesterday?

Maureen: I went to work.

Raphael: I went to work also.

9 –

Interviewer: What did you do yesterday?

Liz: I worked.

Mark: So did I.

10 –

Interviewer: What did you do yesterday?

Mia: We walked around the city and we went down to the Village, and we got some cappuccino. And, what else did we do?

Shauna: We went to Times Square, uh, we went to Rockefeller Center, uhm...

11 –

Interviewer: What did you do yesterday?

Rebecca: Yesterday, I attended a speech at Columbia University.

12 –

Interviewer: What did you do today?

Roberta: I went to work, came home, packed my suitcase, packed my travel case for my job, rested, and then caught a cab and came here.

Interviewer: That's pretty good. (*Speaking to cameraman:* OK, that's good.) Uh, what do you do?

Roberta: I'm a recruiter for Emory University. I recruit students to go to graduate school.

Interviewer: Oh, great, great. That's an interesting job.

13 –

Interviewer: What did you do yesterday?

Tony: Uh, let's see. I watched the football games yesterday.

14 –

Interviewer: Were you good at school?

Sharon: Yes.

Interviewer: What did you do when you left school?

Sharon: I started as an intern at an advertising agency and I stayed there for a number of years, and then I became an account representative for a steel company.

15 –

Interviewer: How about you, Regina? Were you good at school, in school?

Regina: Yeah. I was, I was definitely an overachiever at school, so...

Interviewer: And, uhm, what did you do yesterday, Regina?

Regina: Uhm, I went to my shrink, and I went to, uh, had a, had appointments with people that I'm working with, and, uh, went to, went to talk to a friend of mine, and

who is a publicist, and I'm working on a story with him. Then, uh, basically, went out for dinner, and then, uh, stayed home and watched television.

Interviewer: And what did you do yesterday, Phil?

Phil: I went to the library and did some research, and I, uh, walked around the city, 'cause I haven't been in the city for a few months. I moved out of New York, so I uh, visited some old neighborhoods, and uh, went out for dinner and went to bed.

16 –

Interviewer: Were you good at school?

Richard: Pretty good.

Interviewer: Were you good at school?

Vivian: Average, yeah.

Interviewer: What did you do when you left school?

Richard: Deliver babies.

Interviewer: What did you do when you left school?

Vivian: Uh, radio and television, telecommunications, and now in real estate.

Appendix N° 12

Commentary on the task

- Here is a scripted text, extracted from bbclearningenglish.com, of a video talk dealing with going home and national identity presented to EFL learners. The aim of this task is to make students identify DMs and think about their use.

Going Home and Your National Identity

This programme was first broadcast in 1999.

This is not an accurate word-for-word transcript of the programme.

Presenter: In "First Sight, Second Thoughts" – immigrants from many different countries and cultures, have given us an insight into life in Britain. And today we'll hear from everyone who's taken part in the series. They'll share thoughts on whether they'll return to their roots - to live in their motherlands and if that decision is affected by whether they now think of themselves as British.

Our first speakers today don't think they'll return home to live, although some of them would like to. Renate Thornton arrived in Wales in 1964 to join her husband, although she's no longer married.

Insert 1

This, returning to Germany. If financially I would be in the position, I think I would go back, yes. I still have friends and relatives in Munich. That makes an attraction for returning, and yes, well maybe it has something to do, particular, when you get older...returning to your roots (laughs).

Presenter: Now that she's older, Renate finds the idea of going back to Germany an attractive one, but she doesn't have enough money. Mushtaq Muhammad, a famous cricketer from Pakistan, arrived in Britain in 1958. Unlike Renate, finances aren't a concern for him and he visits Pakistan quite often. Mushtaq has enjoyed playing cricket for both Pakistan and in England. So does he now think of himself as British?

Insert 2

Oh! Very much so. I've been here for 35 years. Tremendous life.....I have enjoyed meeting people through cricket of course. I consider myself British, but I'm equally proud of being Pakistani as well, which of course, my roots are there and I feel proud that I'm here to represent good things about my country to these English people here. That we do come from a land which has got its own character, its got its own values, and I think some of them appreciate that.

Presenter: Mushtaq is proud to be a representative of Pakistan in Britain – because he believes he's helped people to understand more about the culture, what he calls 'the character', and values of Pakistan.

Andrew Zsigmond came to Britain a long time ago in 1957. He came as a refugee and doesn't have any plans to return to Hungary. He lives what he calls 'a dual existence' – he now thinks of himself as both Hungarian and British and believes it's good for his soul - it helps make him a better person.

Insert 3

I knew as soon as I married that I would have an English family and I was quite happy with that. But again...roots are roots and they cannot be forgotten. So, there is this sort of dual existence of British and a bit Hungarian. I think it's actually good for the soul, you know. It makes you think and you have to get on with both sides of your existence.

Presenter: Next we hear from Eid Ali Ahmed who now lives in Wales and has never been home since his arrival. The question of Eid Ali returning to Somalia is an emotional one for him, for two main reasons: Firstly, the conflicts in Somalia and secondly, because living in Wales for so long has changed him. Eid Ali now feels that he's Welsh, British - as well as a Somali, because a new culture, ethos – beliefs, and different ways of seeing things, have changed him over the years.

Insert 4

I'd like to visit and see my country again but I have to be realistic. I can't just say I'm going back to live, there, in Somalia permanently. But, what I can say is to visit there, see my people, see my roots and have a link you know. I'm a Somali, at the same time I'm in a way.....shall I say, Welsh, you know, British - both, I am. Because, I'm changed to some extent, you know. I've got new cultures, new ethos, new ways of seeing things. Therefore, I can't really say: "I will go back."

Presenter: Our next two speakers arrived in London as asylum seekers and are now refugees. They would both like to go home, but sadly, don't believe it's possible at the moment. Soon, we'll hear from Frank Ndjukende who came from Zaire, now known as the People's Democratic Republic of Congo, in 1990. But firstly, Mojtaba Amini who arrived from Iran in 1998.

Insert 5

These days, I'm thinking to go home but is a war in my country now. But, in my own knowledge I don't think that the war can finish today or tomorrow because it's a long story.

Presenter: Frank says that, in his opinion - what he calls his own knowledge - the war in his country won't be over for a long time. So he'll have to stay in Britain. And before that, we also heard how Mojtaba misses his family a great deal.

Our next two speakers would like to leave Britain but not for their own countries! Firstly, we'll hear from Dick Goan who moved to England in 1954 from Northern Ireland, one of the four countries that make up the United Kingdom. He'd like to retire to Spain – to live there when he's older, because he likes the Spanish people. He says they're laid back – they're easy to get along with.

Insert 6

I would love to retire to Spain. It's a lovely country for relaxing in and the people are very laid back...And regarding Ireland; I like going back there, I've got family back there and I go over to see them once a year.... maybe twice. I get too drunk over there, and I always come back with a sore head. But the people over there are fantastic as well. Even with the troubles they've got there.

Presenter: Although there are troubles - serious conflicts in Ireland, Dick enjoys going home to Northern Ireland for visits. However, he always comes back to England with what he calls a sore head - a headache from drinking too much alcohol! So Dick thinks it would be healthier for him to retire to Spain. Like Dick, our next speaker, Rajinder, would like to emigrate with his young family to another country - to improve his way of life. He came to live in England in 1977 but says half of his family – meaning lots of them – now live in Canada. So, Rajinder and his wife have discussed moving there. When they're older, however, they think they might retire to India.

Insert 7

We talk about it...that we might retire in India but who knows? That's a long time in the future and we might emigrate to somewhere else from here by then. Probably Canada because half of my family is in Canada now. They immigrated from India to Canada.

Presenter Our next speaker, Joao Abreu, has an unusual story. He moved to England in 1970 but recently, he and his wife retired to their home in Madiera, Portugal. However, they missed their family and so now, they spend time in both countries!

Insert 8

Since we left London in 1996, we feel a bit lonely because our three children are living in London. So, therefore, every year we come for a few months to stay with one of them.

Presenter Next, we hear from Yun who arrived in Britain in 1991 from China. Since she has left, China's changed a lot and Yun's not sure that she'd be able to 'catch up' with those changes - get used to living there again.

Insert 9

To be honest with you I don't really know, whether I'm going to stay here for the rest of my life. It depends on the jobs and my personal situation. So, I would like to go back but maybe it would be difficult because I've been here for so long and everything is changing very fast. I don't know whether I can catch up with all this changing.

Presenter Finally today, we'll hear from two women who would like to go home to share some skills they've learned in Britain. Firstly, Ana Silvia Rodriguez, who arrived in 1979, is studying homeopathy – an increasingly popular alternative to Western medicine. For example, if a certain type of tree makes a patient ill, they might be treated with small amounts of a substance from that tree.

Insert 10

One day, I hope to go back to Mexico and share my knowledge of homeopathy with people. Homeopathy treats patients with remedies that are similar to the symptoms of the patient.

Presenter Thanks to all our speakers today, and you for listening to "First Sight, Second Thoughts".

Appendix N° 13

Transcription Conventions

Transcription for Student Corpus and Interview	Explanation
Punctuation	. a full stop indicates a complete intonation unit. , a comma indicates a continuing intonation unit. ? a question mark indicates a question.
Speaker code	(S1), (S2), (S3), etc.
Unfinished word/single letter	= B=tr=indiv=
Unfinished sentence/repetition or false start	=.... Eg: = I don't =I didn't have time to do the work.
Non-verbal feature	(laughter) shows description of non verbal feature such as laughter.
Code switching	"....."

CANCODE Transcription conventions	Explanations
Punctuation	. a full stop indicates a complete intonation unit. , a comma indicates a continuing intonation unit. ? a question mark indicates a question.
Speaker code	(1), (2), (3), etc. (M) Indicates that the speaker's identity is unclear, but it is likely to be a male. (F) Indicates that the speaker's identity is unclear, but it is likely to be a female.
Interrupted utterance	+ marks an interrupted utterance Eg, (1) I would like + (2)right (1)+ to teach
Unfinished word/single letter	= B=tr=indiv=
Unfinished sentence/repetition or false start	Eg. = do you = do you like this?
Guess	(H)....(H) e.g (3) I think Poole (H) didn't that come in with (H) Bournemouth?
Unintelligible	(G?)
Transcriber's comment	(E)...(E) e.g. (E) Laughs (E)

سوف يختص هذا البحث في النظر في بعض جوانب قواعد المحادثة والمتمثلة في علامات الخطاب، وسيتطرق على وجه الخصوص إلى استخدام علامات الخطاب في الحديث من قبل طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية وكذا مدى تأثير مهام زيادة الوعي على تحسين مستوى الاستعمال لدى متحدثي الإنجليزية الجزائريين. في هذا السياق، سيتم دراسة حالة طلبة السنة الأولى LMD بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية على مستوى جامعة الجزائر 2.

في الواقع، تؤدي علامات الخطاب في اللغة الإنجليزية المنطوقة، على سبيل المثال "أنت تعرف، أنا أعني، حسنا، أنظر، لذلك، ولكن... إلخ"، وظيفة هامة في المحادثة. لقد كانت موضوع البحث في مجموعة من الدراسات التي تركز على الناطقين باللغة الإنجليزية المحليين والأجانب، كما أنها حظيت بالعديد من التسميات ومختلف التعاريف من قبل الكثير من الباحثين غير أنه لم تجر أية أبحاث فيما يتعلق بالطلبة الجزائريين المختصين في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. لذلك، تعتبر هذه الدراسة محاولة للرد على بعض المسائل المتصلة بمدى وعي الطلاب الجزائريين بهذه العلامات، استخدامها، فضلا عن العوامل المؤثرة على هذه الأخيرة. تبعا لذلك، تم اعتماد شبه بحوث تجريبية تتكون من مجموعتين من الطلاب في كل منها 20 طالبا ينتمون إلى السنة الأولى LMD بحيث تمثل المجموعة الأولى المجموعة التجريبية في حين تمثل المجموعة الثانية مجموعة المراقبة. ولقد تم إجراء التجربة في ثلاث مراحل تم خلالها اعتماد ثلاث أساليب في جمع البيانات المطلوبة. بعبارة أخرى، قمنا باستخدام اختبار مسبق واختبار أخير، مقابلتين، إضافة إلى استبيان.

ولقد كشفت الدراسة على تحسن ملحوظ في استخدام الطلبة لعلامات الخطاب في الحديث، غير أنه يلاحظ وجود تباين في وتيرة استخدام تلك العناصر المستهدفة بالمقارنة مع مدونة فرعية تخص الناطقين الأصليين بهذه اللغة والمتكونة من 460.050 كلمة، تم استخدامها كل من Fung و Carter (2007: 417)، هذه الأخيرة تم اختيارها من مدونة CANCODE التي تحوي على 5 ملايين كلمة مسجلة في حالا مختلفة من المحادثات الإنجليزية الفورية، لاسيما حالات المعاملات، البيداغوجيا، المحادثات الاجتماعية والمحادثات الخاصة. علاوة على ذلك، فقد أثبتت الدراسة أنه رغم تقدّم الطلبة على صعيد الحديث باللغة الانجليزية إلا أنّ مستواهم لم يرقى إلى مستوى الناطقين الأصليين بهذه اللغة. فضلا على ذلك، كشفت الدراسة عن وجود أربعة فئات من مستخدمي علامات الخطاب يستعملونها إما بوتيرة متزايدة، أو بوتيرة أقل، أو يسيؤون استعمالها، أو لا يستعملونها بتاتا. علاوة على هذا، برزت ثلاثة عوامل رئيسية تؤثر في استخدام الطلاب لعلامات الخطاب هذه لاسيما: حالة القلق أو التوتر الظرفي، الرغبة في التأخير، إضافة إلى عدم كفاية الكفاءة في اللغة الإنجليزية.