

Use of Discourse Markers by Chinese EFL Professors: A Corpus-Based Study of Academic Lectures by Natives and Non-natives

Muhammad Shahbaz^{ab*}, Omar Islam Sheikh^c, Muhammad Shahbaz Ali^d

^a Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

^b School of Foreign Languages, Northeast Normal University, Changchun, China

^c Head of English Department, Govt. Allama Iqbal College, Sialkot, Pakistan

^d MPhil. Scholar, Lahore Leeds University, Lahore, Pakistan

shahbazasian@uog.edu.pk

Abstract

This paper reports a study that examines the use of discourse markers (DMs) by non-native professors of English in China and compares their use with their counter parts, native professors of English. In this study, six DMs: *'so, and, but, ok, well and right'* are specifically analyzed as these DMs appear most frequently among the talk of native and non-native professors. Fifteen lectures of five native and non-native professors were recorded and transcribed to build a small corpus of linguistic lectures. The results show that there is good deal of discrepancy in the functional use of DMs by the Chinese professors. Although, non-natives have acquired the use of some DMs like *'so'*, and *'and'*, their use of these DMs is limited and lacks pragmatic functions. Mostly, other DMs like *'ok, well and right'* are inappropriately used in the talks of Chinese professors. We have studied the professors with highly advanced language skills but the results confirm the previous research which demonstrates that non-native learners of English have limited proficiency in the use of DMs. Based upon the findings; we provide some implications for second language learning in general, and for foreign language teaching in particular.

Keywords: Applied Linguistics, Discourse Markers, Teachers' talk, Foreign Language Teaching, Pragmatic Functions.

1. Introduction

Since the 1980's research on DMs has aroused great interest from scholars in second language acquisition (SLA) and much research has been done in the field of discourse studies (e.g. Schiffrin, 1987; Fraser, 1990; Blakemore, 1987; Norrick, 2001). The scholars in the field have used different terms such as "sentence connectives" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976), "pragmatic devices" (Vande Kopple, 1985), "pragmatic formatives" (Fraser, 1987), "pragmatic markers" (Schiffrin, 1987; Fraser 1990, 1997), "discourse operators" (Redeker, 1991) and "discourse markers" (Hansen, 1998; Blakemore, 2002; Lewis, 2011) to name only a few.

The fact that different researchers have used different terms for this category of language hints at the multifaceted functions performed by DMs in the organization of native speakers' spoken discourse. DMs play a fundamental role in spoken interaction (Carter and McCarthy, 2006). DMs are defined differently by researchers as they look at DMs from different perspectives. One of the classic definitions is provided by Schiffrin (1987) who explained DMs as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" (p. 31); later she elaborates these definitions of DMs as "proposing the contextual coordinates within which an utterance is produced and designed to be interpreted" (p. 315). According to Fraser (1999), DMs belong to the grammatical category of words and signal a relationship between the two segments of speech, having a procedural meaning in the given context. For the purposes of this study, we can define DMs as words having pragmatic functions in speech and without DMs there is no change in the lexical meaning of the sentence.

DMs are ranked among the ten leading word forms in the discourse (Allwood, 1996) while a DM is used after every 1.5 second in any on-going speech of native speakers (Luke, 1987). Therefore, such a frequent category of words requires special attention of the non-native professors (NNS) if they really want to bring a positive change in their personal and their students' abilities to communicate with the various speakers of English across the globe.

In fact, much has been said about the use of DMs in text and little focus has been given to speech in the foreign language context. Again, although there is some research (Yeung, 2009; Liao, 2009) focusing on the use of DMs by learners' of English, little attention is paid to the implementation of DMs by EFL teachers in classroom. Therefore, it would be of great help to study the actual data from the classroom to describe the real situation. We believe, this study will yield results and provide implications for foreign language learners and teachers in general and EFL teachers in particular. Lectures of native professors (NS) and NNS have been compared and discussed to find out similarities and differences with respect to the use of DMs in the classroom. Specifically, this study addresses the following research questions:

- a) What are the similarities and differences between NSs and NNSs in the use of DMs?
- b) To what extent are pragmatic functions utilized by the NNSs?

In what follows, we review the current research literature where we will point out the importance of DMs in foreign language learning and teaching. Then we describe the data and methods. And finally we report the findings and discuss their implications.

2. Prior research on DMs and NNS

Many scholars (Oxford, et al., 1989; Spada, 2007; etc.) in the field of SLA suggest that learning and teaching of second or foreign languages should be communication-orientated. Therefore, for good communication, small categories of words like DMs should, in fact, not be neglected. As Svartvik (1980) notes,

if a foreign language learner says five sheeps or he goed, he can be corrected practically by 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 to etc, but a native speaker cannot pinpoint an 'error' (cf. also Hellermann and Vergun, 2007).

A great deal of research has been conducted on the use of DMs by NS of English. Recently, however, the focus has started to shift and the research into the use of DMs by NNS is also becoming popular, since researchers and educators have come to realize the importance thereof- for communicative competence. For example, Yeung (2009) examined a corpus of Hong Kong Chinese learners' formal English writing which displayed a high incidence of *besides*. The learners' use of *besides* is confined in meaning and function, and is often without the rhetorical force of argument which is an important characteristic of the NS corpora. Fung and Carter (2007) compared the DMs from a corpus of spoken British English with those found in a corpus of classroom discourse in Hong Kong. Their results demonstrated that the use of DMs by the NNS is limited and lacks pragmatic functions. Trillo (2002) pointed out that children who are NS or NNS obtain the patterns of DMs in a similar manner but, the NNS adults go through a process of fossilization due to lack of instruction.

The above mentioned studies focus on NNS in contexts where English is a foreign language. However, the results might be different if the NNS have the opportunity to communicate with NS in an English speaking country. Liao focused on the English discourse of six Chinese teaching assistants and found that although NNS have, to some extent, acquired native-like use of DMs, their adoption of these DMs is limited. In addition, they displayed a discrepancy from the NS in the usage of these lexical items as well as their individual functions (2009:1326). The corpus-driven approach of Hellermann and Vergun (2007) showed that more proficient students use more of the typical DMs and that these students are more acculturated to the native English country. Fuller (2003a) has also analyzed the use of DMs by NS and NNS in different social contexts and mentioned that NNSs use DMs in a set pattern.

3. Theoretical Framework

There are four major theoretical approaches to the phenomenon of DMs in the field of linguistics. Schiffrin (1987) uses an interactional sociolinguistic approach to the study of DMs (Lee, 2003). Schiffrin proposes that DMs provide contextual coordinates for utterances (Schiffrin, 1987: 326). Blakemore (1987, 1992) provides another theoretical perspective on DMs, which is situated within the framework of relevance theory. The third approach to the study of DMs is related to research in the field of discourse coherence. Knot and Dale (1994) and Sanders, Spooren and Noordman (1992) also provide different accounts of discourse coherence. The final important approach is provided by Fraser (1988, 1990, 1996a, 1997, 1999, 2006, and 2009b). In his work, he focuses on what DMs are and what their grammatical status is in the language. In contrast with Schiffrin, who suggests that paralinguistic features and non-verbal gestures are possible DMs, Fraser considers a DM as a linguistic expression only and presents his grammatical-pragmatic perspective (Fung and Carter, 2007) on DMs. Important characteristics of a DMs as generalized by Fraser are as follows: [See Fraser (1999) a for detailed discussion].

- (a) It has a core meaning which can be enriched by the context;
- (b) It signals the relationship that the speaker intends between the utterance introduced by the DM and the foregoing utterance;
- (c) It relates two discourse segments and does not contribute to the propositional meaning of either segment.

As one of the most impressive and forceful advocates of studying DMs in a grammatical-pragmatic approach; Fraser conducted a systematic study on DMs and developed his own theory in a series of papers. He believes that DMs do have syntactic features but that these words display rich pragmatic functions in discourse. As Fraser points out, "it is difficult to see how a subset of conjunctions, adverbials, and prepositional phrases could be cobbled together to form a syntactic category" (1999:944). His grammatical-pragmatic approach emphasizes the linguistic or syntactic status and properties of DMs. Hence, we have adopted this approach to investigate the phenomenon of DMs in our study.

4. Data Collection and results

4.1 Participants

The participants of this study are five professors of English in China. Two of the participants are NS of English while three of them are Chinese EFL professors. Much literature on DMs focuses on young learners of English but little attention is paid to the highly advanced speakers. Therefore, here we have chosen the professors who are considered to be fully developed in their abilities of L2 learning and teaching. Table 1 provides demographical information for the participants of the study.

Table 1: The demographical information of the Participants

N1 and N2 are the natives while T1 has her masters' degree from an English speaking country. T2 stayed in native country for research purposes and has contact with the NS. A special case is T3 who has studied for his PhD and afterwards taught English to natives students for many years. All the participants have more than 25 years experience of teaching and NNS are hypothesized to be capable of using language in a highly advanced manner.

As far as the selection of the participants is concerned, the NS are selected because they are the only available source to which the authors have access in China. Their choice is made because much research on DMs (particularly in China) has focused on the written (newspapers) or on data from internet in different contexts and little attention is paid to the first hand classroom oral data. The criteria for the NNS are their stay in English speaking country along with their experience and qualification. Staying in a native country might have helped them to develop their abilities in a native-like manner by learning the use of word categories like DMs. T3 provides a variation which will be helpful for us to understand the importance of contact with NS and culture to all the foreign language learners in general and foreign language teachers in particular.

4.2 Data collection

Fifteen lectures were audio-recorded and transcribed for the purpose of this study. Three lectures of 90 minutes (90*3=270 minutes) were delivered by each of the five professors. So, the data contains more than 1450 minutes recordings comprising 136487 words. The researcher remained in the classroom (NNS class) during the lectures to observe the teacher (like intonation, gestures, stress) which became helpful during the transcription process. All the recordings were transcribed by the first author carefully with the help of software Transcriber 1.4.6. These transcriptions were later checked by co-authors to identify any mistakes.

Firstly, a frequency count of the DMs was made and then the most frequently occurring DMs were taken into consideration for further analyses. The total tokens (table 2) of the words were counted and those tokens which were not used as a DM subtracted from the group number. Fuller's (2003a) two criteria for DMs were adopted to decide whether the selected tokens function as DMs in the discourse where they occur. Firstly, there is no change in the semantic relationship between the parts that are connected by DMs in an utterance. Example 1 below further explains the determination of words as DMs, where the words in bold type-face are not considered DMs:

- 1) a) N1: ...the things like time **and** space **and** color and pitch and smell....
- b) N1: ...we are doing **ok** for time here.
- c) N2: It seeks in **so** far as possible to explicate language structure, that is grammar,
- d) N2:what is in fact quite **well** established tradition of corpus linguistics,
- e) T1: and then, my journey wasn't **so** bad.
- f) T2: you know but...but, the use of **but** makes the meaning of sentence quite different,
- g) T3: you see, Miller may not be **right** with his conclusion.

From 1 (a-g), we can see that the words "and, ok, so, well, so, but and right" are not used in a sense related to DMs. We will find the application of words as DMs in the examples given in the following sections.

4.3 Results

Table 2: DMs use in Native Professors' talk

The results regarding the six DMs in NS' talk are summarized in Table 2 above. Table 2 demonstrates the use of DMs by NS in a detailed manner. There is a good deal of regularity in the application of DMs by both the teachers. Although N2 uses more DMs, the difference between the two professors is minor and represents the stylistic features of speech. We will compare and discuss them in detail with the NNS' use of DMs as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: DMs used in the Non-native Professors' talk

As far as the NNS are concerned, their use of these lexical expressions is inconsistent in functions and often problematic. We will have a detailed comparison of NS and NNS in Section 5.

5. Discussion

The frequency of DMs in the academic lectures of both the NS and NNS show that DMs are an important part of classroom discourse. The importance of DMs for interaction cannot be overlooked; however, the misuse or overuse of these small words creates serious barriers in the learning of a second or foreign language. Figure 1 is a demonstration of the major differences and similarities in the utilization of DMs by the NS and NNS in the classroom setting.

Figure 1: Similarities and differences of DMs among professors

Figure 1 with the help of chart bars provides a clear picture of the contrastive study of DMs use in the lectures. From Figure 1, it is apparent that NNS have great fluctuation in the usage of DMs. Another important factor is that every NN professor appears to be more adept in different DM.

In order to see the linguistic choices of DMs made by NS and NNS, the frequency count (Graph1-6) for each of the studied DM is done. This frequency count will also help us to have a close look at the phenomenon of fossilization. We can find the pragmatic functions performed by these DMs in the lectures. To analyze the pragmatic functions 30 tokens of each DM were randomly selected from both NS and NNS. For this purpose, we will study each DM separately and in a detailed manner.

5.1 So

The most frequently occurring DM in the lectures of the NS is 'so'. The two prominent functions performed by *so* in the NS lectures are as an inferential marker (Fraser, 2009a) and topic developer or topic initiator (Johnson, 2002). The use of *so* in example 2 defines its role as an inferential marker as the speaker is talking about the construal of a phenomenon and telling that one can explain one and the same thing with the help of different lexical expressions. *So* here serves as a link to the ongoing talk.

2) N1: The elements that profile entities or things are nouns; the ones that profile relationships are clauses. **So**, you see a connection with grammar right away.

Another important function of *so* which is established in the NS talks is topic initiator. We can see this clearly in 3.

3) N2: **So**, what I want to talk about today are.... basically on this morning, are these three questions:

The NNS also apply *so* for both the above mentioned functions at times but often they use it in a set pattern and pragmatic functions differ from the NS. A close look at data tells us that *so* is most appropriately used DM among all the studied DMs, however, we can still find overuse and misuse of it in the speech.

4) T1: **So** it means nothing can occur in vacuum, ok, **So**, its... things can not extend in isolation. **So**, text... I think text or, we say, ah, we use the word sign, ok, or semiotic.

T1 shows a great deal of discrepancy in the application of *so* as compared to the NS. We can find a number of examples which represent the formulaic use of *so* by T1. The other two EFL professors also have variations but by and large they remain close to the NS. Graph 1 below will make the point further clear. Although T3 has lived in a native community for a longer period of time, still, his talks have significantly low number of *so* as a DM.

Graph 1: Frequency of DM *so*

Graph 2: Frequency of DM *And*

5.2 And

And appears most frequently after *so* in our studied data. Both the NS apply the DM *and* quite consistently to organize their speech. Two major roles of *and* can be easily figured out from the lectures of NS. *And* as a DM helps to continue the ongoing speech or build a relation (Schiffrin, 1987) with the previous text. The other function is as turn-initial coordinator (Biber et al., 1999). This turn-initial position may well be referred as functioning as the topic change or at least a deviation from the original discussion. These functions can be seen in example 5).

5) a) N2: In other words, everybody has ideas about language **and** these ideas may be based what I'll call a 'folk theory' of language.

b) N1: **And** the point is that the meaning of a linguistic expression is going to rely on some set of cognitive domains.

NNS have also employed *and* in their discourse much the same way as used by the NS. However, at times, their application of *and* is formulaic and it seems that they are not fully aware of the importance that should be given to the pragmatic functions DMs.

6) a) T1: **And** then we have purpose, communication purpose. **And** then both the speaker and hearer can understand the purpose or the goal of human communication...**And** then...

b) T3: **And** we go to Carroll again ...what processes we go through and what we do, ok, for Carroll. **And** then so far what we've been talking about the--- **and** the nature of language, the psychological mechanisms, **and** then the language acquisition.

Although the application of *and* by T1 and T3 is satisfactory (numbers), the use of *and* in 6a and 6b tells us that at times the NNS seem missing the pragmatic functions. For example, 6b would still have been coherent without *and* used after Carroll. In spite of the fact that T2 has used DM *and* quite appropriately, his competency about the pragmatic roles of *and* is still in question and has limitations. Again the 86 tokens of *and* used by T2 as DM are less than one fourth of the tokens used by NS which is a significant difference. Graph 2 above makes the picture very much clear.

5.3 But

But is the third DM in our list. It is used most frequently after 'so' and 'and' in our data. One major function of *but* in our data of the NS can be termed as signalling the contrast (Foolen, 1991; Fraser, 2006) between the S1

and S2. However, this contrast works at two levels: 1) contrasting actions and 2) contrasting ideas (Schiffirin, 1987).

7) a) N1: So this presupposes previous domains. **But** this also presupposes like orientation, **but** also presupposes liquid, the notion of spatial inclusion...

b) N1: **But** I said earlier... cognitive linguistics is that language is not an independent module of the mind **but**, in fact, is based in general cognitive abilities.

In 7b both the functions of *but* can be viewed clearly. The word *but* at the start of the 7b works as a contrasting factor between the two actions as the speaker is hinting at the words previously spoken by him. The second *but* in the middle of the sentence is used to contrast abstract concept of cognitive abilities.

8) a) T1: So that plagiarism is big offense in academic area. **But** sometimes you plagiarize, ok unconsciously, **But**. And then it becomes your idea,. So this is quite normal. **But**, so,

b) T2: generally speaking it's a new field of study **but** it does not really have a long history

NNS' uses of DM *but* are quite varied. They lack a true understanding of the pragmatic functions of this small word. The *but* in 8b is noticeably misused by the T2. There is no contrast in sentence 1 and sentence 2 for which *but* should be used here. As Graph 3 below demonstrates that T1 has used the least number of tokens of *but* in 1000 words. However, the important point to note is that even that less frequent use of DM *but* by T1 has lot of problems with it. Both in pragmatic functions and frequency only T3 seems to have gained enough competence to use it while the other two professors really find it difficult to draw upon it correctly in most situations.

Graph 3: Frequency of DM *But*

Graph 4: Frequency of DM *Ok*

5.4 **Ok**

Levin and Gray (1983) explain *ok* that "with variations in stress, loudness, and prosody, *OK* communicates many emotional meanings". The functions of *ok* vary depending on its position in the discourse. In the NS lectures *ok* performed the pragmatic functions of acknowledging the preceding utterance (Stenstrom, 1994) and of displaying understanding (Condon and Claude, 2001). Both these functions can be seen in 9a and 9b respectively.

9) a) N2: How you construe them, as the figure-ground organization is an aspect of that. --- **Ok**. Another important cognitive ability is that many concepts....

b) N1: Sometimes there are just real reasons to be totally vague about things, **Ok**. Obviously, almost always it's true--- that something has happened, **Ok**.

In contrast to the NS, the NNS represent a higher discrepancy in the application of *ok* as a DM. *Ok* performs many functions in the speech of the NS and NNS seem prey to this usage. They have learned using it but there are a number of occasions where we can find the misuse and overuse of *ok*. T2 and T3 show some good command over *ok*, only occasionally making misuses of it according to the context. On the other hand, T1 has used the token of *ok* 4 to 7 times higher than the NS. She does use it appropriately at occasions but extensive overuse makes it look superfluous and formulaic. We can see this clearly in 10 below:

10) T1: Now, what is mosaic, **Ok**, It is kind of, ah similar to, Ah, Intermingle **Ok**, **Ok**, conversation **Ok**, Mosaic means, but I think you have find the word mosaic. **Ok**...

From Graph 4 we can witness that T1 used 27 tokens of *ok* as compared to 4 and 7 tokens of N1 and N2 respectively. T2 and T3 also employed a high number of tokens. This exercise might account for the apparent simple nature of *ok* which can be deceptive for the NNS.

5.5 **Well**

In our studied data, both the NS utilize *well* to make their speech coherent and easily understandable. Two functions of *well* utilized by the NS in their lectures are as a delay device (Fuller, 2003b) and to mitigate face-threat (Jucker:1993) caused by personal questions.

11) a) N2: No doubt about that. But if you like, **well**, ok, it sounds rather arrogant to say, **well**, that he went wrong.

b) N1: Neither elaborate anything salient within the other but they can still be combined. How? **Well...**, their trajectors can be identified.

c) T3: **Well**, let's talk about similarities and differences between psycholinguists and linguists; similarities first of all, **well**, they are both social sciences, and not really, I mean, **well**, probably psycholinguists would regard him or herself as a natural scientist.

NNS make use of DM *well* in a manner which is greatly different from the NS. T2, by and large, remains close to the NS in the application of *well* in his speech. However, there is not a single token of *well* in the lectures of T1 used as a DM. On the contrary, T3 has used *well* into his speech three times more than the NS. The excessive use makes his speech sound monotonous and formulaic. Even if *well* is not misused in 11c, still, it is frequently used. The frequency count of tokens per 1000 words in Graph 5 will help us understand the usage of *well* in the studied data.

Graph 5: Frequency of DM *Well*

Graph 6: Frequency of DM *Right*

5.6 **Right**

In the studied data, one pragmatic function for which NS have made the use of *right* in their lectures is self-monitoring as discussed by Tang (2010). Schlee (2004, 2008) demonstrated that *right* is used in everyday speech as a transition marker; but in the classroom its use is different because fewer turns are taken by students and much of the speech is done by the teacher himself/herself. So, at times, teachers want to make sure about the truthfulness of their speech and for this purpose they utilize the words like *right* to make their speech self-confirmatory. The *right* in 12a and 12b below helps us to understand this.

- 12) a) N1: Do you start with a whole line and break it? No, you probably drew it that way to begin with, *right*.
b) N2: Ditransitive, a sentence with two objects: a subject-verb-object-object... like buy me a present, *right*.

Pragmatically, NNS have used *right* in quite the same way as have been used by NS. They all use it as a self-confirmatory device; however, there is a great deal of variation which can be witnessed from Graph 6 above. T1 employs less than one token of *right* in 1000 words and this is quite close to NS. T3 exercised 6 tokens of *right* which is at least double the usage by NS and six times higher than T1. Still, T1 and T3 are fine to some extent. But when we look at the usage of *right* by T2, we really sense a problem there. His 32 tokens look more like a formulaic application of the *right*. It appears to be habitual for him and he seems fully unaware of the overuse of it. His use of *right* is also higher than all the other DMs in our studied data. A set pattern of *right* is clearly there in 13.

- 13) T2: In pragmatics, analysis is different from semantic analysis, *right*, so ah generally, *right*, I hope, *right*, you would learn how to make pragmatic analysis, ah, *right*.

6. Conclusion

We have done an analysis to find out the misuse and overuse of DMs by NNS. Our study supports the previous research that: 1) non-natives use DMs in a set pattern (Fuller, 2003a) as the NNS in studied data depict a pattern in the use of DMs and mostly opt for one and the same DM time and again; 2) non-natives choose different DMs in comparison to natives (Muller, 2005) as there are limited number of tokens of *ok*, *well* and *right* by the NS, however, NNS utilize these most frequently; 3) individual functions of these words differ from natives (Liao, 2009) as we have discussed that the pragmatic functions of DMs are different in two groups. As far as the phenomenon of fossilization is concerned, the results suggest that NNS do become a prey to the process of linguistic fossilization. However, longitudinal research studies are required to further prove the fossilization of this small but important category of words.

We have attempted to delineate the functions and patterns of a group of DMs in lectures of EFL professors in China. Distinctive features have been described and variation in patterns of use between NS and NNS has been singled out for comparison. DMs have always been a problematic issue in second language acquisition, not only to Chinese learners of English, but also to non-native learners of other languages. Our comparison of DMs shows that if we wish to find fewer problems in communication, we need to know about functions of DMs from different perspectives including stylistic, semantic, and pragmatic. Pragmatic point of view should be given due importance in the teaching of foreign languages. Students should be provided with the knowledge of DM functions in both speech and text. For this purpose, special attention should be paid to the training and guidance of foreign language teachers. In short, teachers, policy makers and government officials should realize the importance of FL teacher training courses and due attention should be given to deal with this sophisticated issue.

Acknowledgements

The first author is thankful to China Scholarship Council and Ministry of Education Pakistan for an award of scholarship for PhD studies (2009-12) during which the author collected data for this study.

References

- Allwood, J. (eds.) 1996. Activity Based Studies of Linguistic Interaction. Gothenburg Papers in Theoretical Linguistics S 20. Department of Linguistics, Göteborg University.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, Longman.
- Blakemore, D. 2002. Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. 2006. Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide. Spoken and Written English: Grammar and Usage, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Condon, S., & Claude, C. 2001. Talk about talk in face-to-face and computer-mediated interaction. In: Nemeth, E. (ed.), Cognition in Language Use: Selected Papers from the 7th International Pragmatics Conference, Vol. 1. International Pragmatics Association, Antwerp.
- Foolen, A. 1991. Polyfunctionality and the semantics of adversative conjunctions. *Multilingua* 10/1-2, 79-92.
- Fraser, B. 1987. Pragmatic formatives, in: Verschueren, J. & Bertuccelli-Papi, M. (eds.). The pragmatic perspective (pp. 179-194). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Fraser, B. 1988. Types of English discourse markers. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 38 (14), 19-33.
- Fraser, B. 1990. An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14 (3), 383-398.
- Fraser, B. 1996a. Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics* 6 (2) 167-190.
- Fraser, B. 1997. Contrastive discourse markers in English. In Jucker, A. & Ziv, Y. (eds.) *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory* (pp. 301–326). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fraser, B. 1999. What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 31 (7), 383-95.
- Fraser, B. 2006. Towards a theory of discourse markers. In Fischer, K. (ed.), (pp. 189-204) Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Fraser, B. 2009a. Topic orientation markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41 (5), 892-98.
- Fraser, B. 2009b. An account of discourse markers. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 1 (2), 293-320.
- Fuller, J. M. 2003a. Discourse marker use across speech contexts: a comparison of native and non-native speaker performance. *Multilingua* (22), 185-208.
- Fuller, J.M. 2003b. The influence of speaker on discourse marker use. *Journal of Pragmatics* (35), 23-45.
- Fung, L., & Carter, R. 2007. Discourse markers and spoken English: native and learner use in pedagogic settings. *Applied Linguistics* 23 (3), 410-39.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. Longman, London.
- Hansen, M. M. 1998. The semantic status of discourse markers. *Lingua* 104 (3-4), 235-60.
- Hellermann, J., & Vergun, A. 2007. Language which is not taught: The discourse marker use of beginning adult learners of English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (1), 157-79.
- Johnson, A. 2002. So...?: pragmatic implications of so-prefaced questions in formal police interviews. In: Cotterill, J. (ed.), *Language in Legal Process* (pp. 91-110). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Jucker, A. H. 1993. The discourse marker well: a relevance-theoretical account. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19 (5), 435-52.
- Knott, A., & Dale, R. 1994. Using linguistic phenomena to motivate a set of coherence relations. *Discourse Processes* 18 (1), 35-62.
- Lee, Chun-hee. 2003. The Use of the Discourse Marker say in Conversational English. *SNU Working Papers in English Language and Linguistics* 2, 133-156.
- Lewis, M. D. 2011. A discourse-constructional approach to the emergence of discourse markers in English. *Linguistics*, 49 (2), 415–443.
- Levin, H. & Gray, D. 1983. The Lecturer's Ok. *American Speech* 58 (3), 195-200.
- Liao, S. 2009. Variation in the use of discourse markers by Chinese teaching assistants in the US. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41 (7), 1313-28.
- Luke, K. K. 1987. 'The establishment of common ground in natural conversation: The case of the utterance particle LA in Cantonese'. Paper read at the 1987 International Pragmatics Conference, Antwerp.
- Muller, S. 2005. *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Norricks, N. R. 2001. Discourse markers in oral narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33 (6), 849–878.
- Oxford R, Lavine R. Z & Crookall D. 1989. *Language Learning Strategies, the Communicative Approach, and their Classroom Implications*. *Foreign Language Annals* 22 (1), 29-39.
- Qun, Z. 2009. Fossilization of “so” as a discourse marker in cross-cultural communication. *US-China Foreign Language Volume* 7 (8), (1-5).
- Redeker G. 1991. Linguistic markers of discourse structure. *Linguistics* 29 (6), 1139-72.
- Sanders, T. J.M, Spooren, W.P.M & Noordman, L.G.M. 1992. Toward a taxonomy of coherence relations. *Discourse Processes* 15 (1), 1-35.
- Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Schleef, E. (2008). Gender and academic discourse: global restrictions and local possibilities. *Language in Society* 37: 515-538.
- Schleef, E. 2004. Gender, Power, Discipline, and Context: On the Sociolinguistic Variation of okay, right, like, and you know in English Academic Discourse. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 48, 177-86.
- Spada, N. 2007. *Communicative Language Teaching: Current Status and Future Prospects*. In Cummins and Davison (eds.) *International Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 271-278). Springer US.
- Stenström, A-B. 1994. *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction*. Longman, London & New York.
- Svartvik, J. 1980. Well in conversation. In: Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (Eds.), *Studies in English Linguistics for Randolph Quirk*. Longman, London, pp. 167–177.
- Tang, C. 2010. Self-Monitoring Discourse Markers in Classroom: Monologue Narratives. *Concentric: Studies in Linguistics* 36.1, 105-131.
- Trillo, J.R. 2002. The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (6), 769-84.
- Vande, K. 1985. Some exploratory discourse on Metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication* 36, 82-93.

Yeung, L. 2009. Use and misuse of 'besides': A corpus study comparing native speakers' and learners' English. System 37 (2), 330-42.

Dr. Muhammad Shahbaz is currently serving as an Assistant Professor in English Department at University of Gujrat, Pakistan. He has 8 years' experience of teaching and his research interests include applied linguistics, foreign language learning and teaching, language classroom practices, individual differences, ELT, and TESOL. He has publications in international journals and he has presented his work in different national and international conferences.

Mr. Omar Islam Sheikh is the head of English department at Govt. Allama Iqbal College Sialkot, Pakistan. He is Ph.D. scholar and his areas of interests are language teaching and pragmatics.

Mr. Muhammad Shahbaz Ali is M.Phil scholar and currently serving as a language teacher trainer and areas of interest include ELT, educational linguistics and individual differences.

Tables

Table 1

N= Native Teacher; T= Non-native Teacher

Professors	Gender	Age	Teaching exp.	Qualification	Years in Native Country
N1	Male	62	36	PhD	-
N2	Male	59	32	PhD	-
T1	Female	56	28	PhD	3
T2	Male	55	27	PhD	3
T3	Male	56	28	PhD	14

Table 2


Here, L1, L2, L3= Lectures, TT=Total recorded tokens, As DM=Selected as DMs

DMs	N1					N2				
	L1	L2	L3	TT	As DM	L1	L2	L3	TT	As DM
SO	167	153	171	491	401	187	169	196	552	455
AND	177	173	186	536	382	170	181	162	513	384
BUT	110	127	90	327	244	59	91	92	242	190
OK	44	69	19	132	119	61	63	105	229	222
WELL	21	27	19	67	62	26	55	47	128	118
RIGHT	17	24	22	63	56	21	23	41	85	76
Total	1264					1445				

Table 3


DMs	T1					T2					T3				
	L1	L2	L3	TT	As DM	L1	L2	L3	TT	As DM	L1	L2	L3	TT	As DM
SO	139	161	122	422	403	112	92	88	292	271	87	98	99	284	248
AND	161	178	265	604	408	74	70	59	203	86	145	164	139	448	273
BUT	35	53	45	133	93	43	50	50	143	119	65	80	73	218	189
OK	207	246	221	674	674	73	69	61	203	200	106	119	110	217	213
WELL	03	04	09	16	0	48	56	36	140	130	88	99	84	271	267
RIGHT	18	04	08	30	22	307	223	276	806	721	32	150	67	249	160
Total	1600					1527					1350				

Figure 1




Graphs


Graph 1: Frequency of DM *so*




Graph 2: Frequency of DM *And*




Graph 3: Frequency of DM *But*




Graph 4: Frequency of DM *Ok*



Graph 5: Frequency of DM *Well*



Graph 6: Frequency of DM *Right*



This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

