

The Use of Discourse Markers by Iraqi Secondary Schools Pupils

Dr Madeha Saif Aldin Saleh

Lecturer Khalid Nayef S

Dr. Najwa Yasin

Madehasaif73@gmail.com

Isky56027@gmail.com

umteba@gmail.com

استعمال مؤشرات الخطاب في كتاب اللغة الانكليزية في المدارس الثانوية

د.مد يحة سيف الدين صالح / جامعة تكريت / كلية التربية للبنات

/ جامعة تكريت د.نجوى ياسين اسماعيل

م.م خالد سالم نايف

Abstract

This research aims at investigating pupils' ability in using discourse markers which are identified in the English textbooks of secondary schools. Four texts are chosen from third intermediate class. The four texts are short stories of different topics.

This research hypothesizes that there are no statistical significant differences among Iraqi intermediate pupils' ability in using textual and interpersonal discourse markers.

After surveying ,collecting and analyzing data statistically, the research revealed that the higher frequent use of discourse markers is textual markers is better , i.e. pronouns .

Key Words: discourse , markers , textual , interpersonal and commentaries.

1. Introduction

Discourse markers are linguistic words or statements of various length which have realistic and propositional connotation. They are used to connect clauses or sentence basics and they can be seen in both spoken and written texts to facilitate the discourse. Each one of the discourse marker refers to specific meaning and an association among clauses (Ismail , 2012:1261).

Discourse markers are statements used to join sentences to what comes before or after and point towards a talker's point of view of what he is telling others. From linguistics point of view, they represent main purposes in discourses of numerous types or registers. As well as being linking elements, discourse markers relate sentences, clauses and paragraphs to each other.

"One of the most important roles of discourse markers, however, is to signal the types of relations a speaker perceives between different parts of the discourse" (Lenk 1997: 2).

Through syllabuses texts passages or conversations discourse, different types of discourse markers are used. This paper deals with the identifying

discourse markers , depending on Hyland and Tse's (2004) classification of discourse markers; interpersonal and textual markers. Discourse markers are expressions such as oh, well, you' know, ,and they are one set of linguistic items that function in cognitive, expressive, social, and textual domains. Although there were scattered studies of discourse markers in the early of 1980s, their study since then has abounded in various branches of linguistics and allied fields(Maschler and Schiffrin, 2015:189).

First attention in discourse markers periods started in 1970s. The first linguist who started to search and think about discourse markers is Longacre in (1976) .He is observed to be the first person who studies collection of words and forms which look strangely worthless at the first stage. He regarded them as flavour to any paragraph (Longacre: 1976). In line with this similarity, using a plenty of discourse markers in talk makes it tastes salty and spicy; using them less than needed, then we have an unflavoured conversation. It has been suggested that skilful use of DMs in talk is an important indicator of competency to determine native speakership. After all, it seems that having adequate amount of DMs in common conversation is the cause that make it runs easily and comprehensibly (Rangraz ,2014:2).

Discourse markers have a great effect on any texts in which they relate sentences and clauses. Moreover, they create logical connection among sentences .They concern with grammatical and lexical linking within a text or a sentence that holds a text together and gives it a sensible meaning .Discourse markers are very important aspect of academic learning , because it immediately affects the tone of writing and speaking .Also, discourse markers have a great role in texts since it links the events in a systematic logical way . Furthermore, readers find it easy to interpret the sequences of the actions and details within the whole paragraph. Readers may encounter complexity if they read a story or any literary text that does not include elements of discourse markers .They feel that the text is really vague.

The research aims at investigating pupils' ability to use discourse markers, and it is hypothesized that there are no significant differences among Iraqi intermediate pupils ability in using textual and interpersonal discourse markers.

2.1 Discourse Markers

Baker and Ellece (2011 : 34) Sometimes called discourse particles or pragmatic markers, the term is often used to refer to words or phrases that look to have no grammatical or semantic function, such as “*you know, like, oh, well, I*

mean, actually, basically, OK as well as connectives like *because, so, and, but* and *or*”.

Schiffrin (1987: 31) defines them as ‘sequentially dependent essentials which bracket units of talk’. While most discourse markers are ignored by recent grammars as having weak meanings or being ‘fillers’, they were later acknowledged (particularly by corpus linguists) as playing important roles in the organization of discourse and/or fulfilling pragmatic functions. For example, two functional classes of discourse markers, local markers like *I mean* which help to mark micro structures, for example, within a single topic, and global markers like *anyway*, which can be used to signpost transition from one topic to another. Jucker and Smith (1998: 197) make a different distinction between reception markers, which signal speaker reactions to information provided by someone else (*yeah, oh, ok, really*), and presentation markers, which modify information presented by the speaker (*like, you know, I mean*). Ruhlemann (2007: 121) makes a third distinction between present discourse markers (which would include the above examples) and presented-discourse markers (which are used to manage reported speech:

I go, she was like). Andersen (1998) has shown that contrary to some arguments discourse markers do adhere to grammatical and functional restrictions and cannot occur anywhere in an utterance.

The notion of discourse markers could be extended to refer to non-linguistic phenomena. For example, in speech, a rise in intonation could be used to specify the start of a new subject. In addition, in writing, discourse may be systemized with visual features like article spaces, subheadings etc. (ibid).

Discourse markers considered as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk” (Schiffrin, 1987: 31); Holker (1991:78-79) presents a detailed summary on discourse markers characteristics ,as follows:

“(1)Semantically they neither affect the truth conditions nor add anything to the propositional content of the utterance; (2) Logically they are related to the speech situation instead of the situation talked about; and (3) their purpose is emotive, expressive function rather than a referential denotive function”.

2.2 Classification of Discourse Markers

Hyland and Tse (2004:156-177) state that discourse marker categorized into different types which are essentially and eventually *interpersonal*, and one of their main aims is to convince the person who hears or reads a certain text.

Discourse markers have been divided into the purposeful headings of **Textual markers** and **Interpersonal**. From one hand *Textual Discourse Markers* denote to the association of discourse. They also fulfil an influential function and

attain a convincing effect, while from the other hand the *Interpersonal Discourse Markers* reveal the author's attitude to both the language elements of the paragraph and the future reader (Hyland and Tse ,2004:156-177).

2.2.1 Textual Markers

This type is subdivided into seven classes. Hyland and Tse, (2004:156-177). They are:

1- **logical markers** expresses meaning and form associations among discourse sections, and help to understand realistic relations. The sub-divisions of this type can be summed up as :

A- **Additive** for example (*furthermore, so , and...etc.*) The marker "*and*" includes logical and structural purposes ; because these purposes or aims may gather more than grammatical unit like : verbs , nouns , relative words or linking words , statements and the like, as well as logical or cohesive since the clarification of the whole connected utterance relies on the arrangement or mixture of both linking words. Moreover, "*and* ", can come before a talk for (explaining , indication and clarifying ideas of previous units). These discourse markers may have pragmatic influence which shows an utterer's or talker's continuance. Nevertheless, "*and*" cannot give evidence about what is being continual. The information is taken from the discourse form. Also it is used to indicate the speaker's continuation (Schiffrin, 1987: 150).

B- **Conclusive** deals with connection (*finally, at the end , in sum. . .*) of paragraphs.

C- **Adversative** is a word (*but, however. . .*)

D- **Causatives** are words like (*because , as a result, in this case, so*). As Schiffrin (1987:330) states "*because*" is uttered or written to denote to an association between 'cause and result' .

2- **Sequencers** can represent words that refer to certain locations of actions or events and the order of them (first, second, later, next and the like).

3-**Reminders** are words in which they mention previous parts of a certain paragraph in a text so as to begin discussion and to present in a simple way. e.g. (as....said)

4-**Topicalisers** denote several kinds of theme move to simplify the discussion. For example (now). Schiffrin (1987:241) clarifying the use of "*now*" to indicate a speaker's expansion in the text that includes an arranged structure . Moreover, using it to refer to the next information in the text.

5-**Code Glosses** such as (*in other words, that is, for instance, in this case*). They are used to clarify, restate, enlarge or characterize propositional content. Thus,

they indicate the writer's thoughts about the listener/reader information or capability to follow the discussion

6- **Illocutionary Markers** are markers that represent the function of act the writer intends through the text with some preceding expressions like (I back up this idea, I hope to convince. ...)

7- **Announcements** are markers which indicate the upcoming parts in the paragraph so as to make the reader/listener ready for future discussion (ibid.).

2.2.2 Interpersonal Discourse Markers

This Type of discourse markers can be sub-divided into many kinds (Hyland and Tse 2004:156), as follows:

- 1- **Hedges** indicate words or statements which refuse full promise to the statements displayed in the text. From a linguistic point of view, recognition verbs (*may, might, would*), they represent the probability of actions in a text like (*perhaps, maybe*).
- 2- **Certainty Markers** express full assurance to the speeches offered by the writer (*of course, naturally, certainly definitely*). It represents an event that the reader/listener recognizes that the hearer participates some awareness about specific Knowledge. (Schiffrin,1987:268).
- 3- **Attributors** are markers that achieve a dual purpose in paragraph. They refer to explicit basis of knowledge (*as the King of the Kingdom showed*) (ibid).
- 4- **Attitude Markers** which show the author's emotional values to the listener/reader and the component offered in the paragraph. According to linguistic value, these markers represent the following types:

A- **Denotic verbs**: (*must, have to. . .*)

B- **Attitudinal adverbs**: (*surprisingly. . .*)

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

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

- 5- **Commentaries** assist to found and repair relation with the hearers by means of **rhetorical questions** (*is this the right view?*), **direct appeals** (*dear listener, you*), **personalisations** (*I, you, he, she, your, my opinions*). These markers also refer to the development of connection between the text and the reader (ibid). Yumin (2007:22) mentions that the aim behind using the personal marker (*I*), is to reduce the space between the reader and writer, in social position and careers and it may involve both the speaker and the listener into the same field, and thus make the listeners feel near to the speaker and his place. This classification will be the model to be adapted in analyzing the data in this research.

3. Procedures.

3.1 Population and Sample of the Study.

The population consists of EFL Iraqi secondary pupils at third intermediate grade for boys in Tikrit city. The total number of third intermediate grade pupils' population is (210).

Since the research deals with third intermediate textbook short stories.it was logical and more preferable to choose pupils of the same class in order to apply the test . For that reason 45 pupils are chosen randomly form one of Tikrit Schools , from 'Al-Manahel Secondary School for Boys for the academic year 2015/2016.

3.2 Construction of the Test

After constructing the test which aims to measure pupils' use of discourse markers in writing paragraphs on the four short stories. The test has been given to experts to ensure its face validity. The test is administrated to 45 pupils of third intermediate class and it is out of 50 scores 25 scores for each question. The test involves two main questions and each question has two items require the answer by using pupils own simple language.

Later, the data is collected and analyzed statistically by using paired sample t-test formula and collecting the frequencies of discourse markers. An achievement test is designed as a tool of assessing the test taker's performance in order to confirm the hypothesis of the research and to achieve the aims. The test aims to follow only production level including two questions with two items for each one , twenty five scores are allotted to each question , as shown in Appendix (A).

3.2.1 Face Validity

Mousavi (1999:441) states that "Validity is the extent to which the interferences or decisions we make on the basis of test scores are meaningful, appropriate, and useful". Validity is defined by Brown (2003:22) as "the degree to which a test measures what it is meant to measure".

Mackey and Gass (2005:107) claim that face validity can be clarified as the familiarity of study tool and how simple it is to persuade a learner to be convinced that the test is indeed testing what it claims to test.

So as to ensure the face validity of the test, the items of the test have been exposed to jury members. The jurors agreed that the test items are suitable and

appropriate to achieve the aims they are assigned for, except some modifications which are taken into consideration.

3.2.2 Content Validity

It is the simplest and most significant form of validity to teachers. It can be explained as any effort to show the content of the test of a representative sample from the domain that is to be tested (Fulcher and Davidson , 2007: 6) .

To ensure content validity of the syllable of 3rd intermediate grade, the analysis of short stories is carried out according to the following steps to the content:

1. Four short stories will be analyzed.
2. A quantitative analysis will be conducted by giving each discourse marker a number and finding out the frequencies and percentage of its linguistic form and its discourse function.
3. The percentage formula is used to find out the frequencies scope of discourse markers.
4. For more precision and simplicity, all data is presented in the form of tables.
5. Discourse markers are categorized into two main parts Textual Discourse markers and Interpersonal Discourse Markers ,as shown in tables (1) and (2).The frequencies of these two categories are counted .
6. Analyzing pupils' achievement in the selected tests, by surveying discourse markers in the test designed for the same purpose.

Table (1)

Textual Function Discourse Markers

sq	Function	Discourse marker	Frequency	%Perc.
1	logical markers	And , furthermore , also	52	68.42 %
	a- Additive			
	b- Adversative	But , however	4	5.26 %
	c- Conclusive	Finally , last ,	2	2.63%
	d- Causatives	So , because , as a result	1	1.31%
2	Sequencers	First , secondly , next , then	9	11.84
3	Reminders	Said , asked , he/she thought	2	2.63
4	Topicalisers	Now	0	0.00%

5	Code glosses	That is , in other words , for instance	0	0.00%
6	Illocutionary markers	Indirect speeches	6	7.89%
7	Announcements	For notifying	0	0.00%
Total			76	

Table (2)

Interpersonal Function Discourse Markers in the Four Texts

sq	Function	Discourse marker	Frequency	Perc.
1	Hedges	May, might, would, probably ,can	7	6.70%
2	Certainty markers	Of course, sure, certain, undoubtedly ,in fact, you know	1	0.9 %
3	Attributors		0	0.00%
4	Commentaries	personalisers	95	89.62%
5	Attitude markers a-denotic verbs	should , have to, must, need	1	0.9%
	b-attitudinal adverbs	suddenly ,Surprisingly ,	1	0.9%
	c-adjectival constructions	It is hard , it is difficult	1	0.9%
	d-cognitive verbs	I guess, my opinion , I think , I believe	0	0.00%
Total			106	

After analyzing data ,it has been noticed that the highest values are belong two types of discourse markers the first one is logical markers .The value is 68.42 % ,and the examples of these markers which are (And , furthermore , also) as shown in table (1) .

Whereas, the second higher value as table (2) shows, is for commentaries personalisers where the frequency is 95 and the percentage is 89.62% . Examples of personalisers are different types of pronouns

3.2.3 Reliability

Reliability is defined by Mckay (2008:114) as “the consistency of the scores that teachers and assessors give to learners”. It is found out that the test is reliable and the reliability value is 0.81 according to the test-retest method .

3.3. Pilot Administration

Pilot administration aims at "trying out of materials before publication or further developments in order to determine their suitability or effectiveness and to determine the reactions of teachers and learners to the materials" (Richards and Schmidt , 2002: 137).

So as to guess the suitable time necessary as well as having an impression about the necessities of the achievement test that will be administrated , ten pupils have been chosen from the involved population of secondary school pupils and subjected to the test on the 10th of April 2017 . Results indicate that the instructions of the given questions are acceptable and the average time required to third intermediate pupils to answer those questions range around 45 minutes.

3.3.1 Difficulty Level and Discrimination Level

Madsen (1983: 183) states that “discrimination power formula has been used to measure the discrimination power of the achievement test items, furthermore, difficulty level formula has been used to measure the difficulty level of the achievement test questions”.

The difficulty level is regarded acceptable if it is between 0.90 -0.30. whereas the discrimination power is higher than 0.30 .This value is satisfied . On other hand, “if the value of item discriminatory power is less than 0.30, the item is weak and it needs to be changed in this case” (ibid).

It has been found that all the test items have satisfied values , as shown in Table (3):

Table (3)
Discrimination Power and Difficulty Level

Question	item	DL	DP
1	A	0.42	0.40
	B	0.41	0.63
2	A	0.52	0.58
	B	0.47	0.42

3.4 Description of Student's Book

Teaching English in Iraq had followed the structural approach since seventies of the last century .Recently a new syllabus “ English for Iraq” is taught and introduced in secondary schools. The current research deals with identifying discourse markers which are involved in third intermediate textbook “English for Iraq “.

The textbook includes six major units which contain situations and texts for teaching the four skills language learning. Moreover, it contains four short stories in units 1 , 3 , 5 , and 7 .Whereas , the other two units are review units .

The four short stories are analyzed to investigate and identify discourse markers and list them according to their categorization.

4.1 Analysis of Discourse Markers of the 1st Short Story Entitled:

“The Lucky Customer”

The Lucky Customer is a story of a little boy whose name was “Kareem” hopes to be a famous poet. One day he went to a bookshop and the owner informed him that there was a prize for costumer number 50 , and the little boy was lucky to have this prize . The prize was to meet the famous poet *Al-Nawab* .

Table (4) below lists the discourse marker and the function of the linguistic form in the first short story “The Lucky Customer”:-

Table (4)
Discourse Markers in the Story of

Sq.	Discourse Marker	Function	Frequency
1	As	Time/sequence	3
2	And	Conjunction	11
3	After	Sequence	2
4	While	Sequence	1
5	Now	Time	1
6	Yes	Agreement	1
7	What	Enquiring	2
8	First	Sequence	2
9	That	determining	1
10	Least	Guessing	1
11	Very	Stress	3
12	Most	Quantity	1
13	Finally	Sequence/Time	1
14	When	Time	1
15	All	Elaborative	2
16	Suddenly	Sequence	1
17	Any	determining	1
18	Latest	Sequence	1
19	There	Place	2
20	Pronouns	Commentaries: personalisations	20
21	May ,might , can ,could	Hedges	2
22	Must , have to	Attitude markers	2
23	Preposition (between , next, under	Placement of the subject	3
	Total		65

The second short story which is entitled “**Things Happen in Nature for a Reason**” is about a pregnant deer which is in trouble of facing three dangers (fire in the forest, a hunter, and a hungry lion). She submits her life to her fat and her faithfulness in God made her refuse negative thoughts and focus on giving birth to a healthy fawn. Finally, the three dangers were disappeared or vanished in a

second when lightning suddenly strikes the hunter making him release the arrow towards the lion and the rain put out the fire slowly.

Table (5)

Discourse Markers in the Story of "Things Happen in Nature for a Reason"

Sq.	Discourse Marker	Function	Frequency
1	And	Conjunction	8
2	At the moment	Time	2
3	Or	Choose among things	3
4	On one handon the other	Comparing	1
5	Some	Quantity	1
6	Always	Frequency	1
7	Suddenly	Sequence/time	2
8	What	Conjunction / object	4
9	Where	Conjunction/ place	2
10	Which	Conjunction/ object	1
11	That	Conjunction /	2
12	When	Conjunction/ time	1
13	So	Textual / sequence relevance	1
14	Any	Determination	2
15	All	Elaborative	1
16	Also	Addition	1
17	Too	Comparing/similarity	1
18	Most	Quantity	1
19	Next	Sequencer	1
20	Pronouns: all the types	Commentaries: personalisations	30
21	Preposition (between , next, under	Placement of the subject	5
22	I am sure , of course,	Certainty	0
23	But , for	Conjunction/reaction adversative	1
24	Must / have to	Denotic verbs	0
	Total		71

The third short story which is entitled “A Powerful Lesson for Everyone”. Table (6) below lists the discourse marker and the function of the linguistic form in the this short story .

Table (6)

Discourse Markers in the Story of “ A Powerful Lesson for Everyone”

Sq.	Discourse Marker	Function	Frequency
1	And	Textual /Conjunction	15
2	Some	Quantity	3
3	Every	Determining	5
4	After	Textual/Sequence	1
5	When	Expressing time	2
6	While	Textual/consequential	1
7	Very	Textual /Stress	3
8	What	Enquiring	1
9	Next	Textual/Sequence	1
10	But	Conjunction/ response reaction	2
11	All	Elaborative	1
12	Yes	Confirmation	1
13	No	Disagreement	1
14	That	Determining	1
15	For	Conjunction	1
16	Pronouns	Commentaries: personalisations	27
17	Must / have to	Denotic verbs	0
18	Preposition (between , next, under	Placement of the subject	6
	Total		82

The following analysis of the fourth short story entitled “Life is Like a Cup of Coffee”. Table (7) below lists the discourse marker and the function of the linguistic form in the first short story “Life is Like a Cup of Coffee”:-

Table (7)

Discourse markers in “Life is Like a Cup of Coffee” Text

Sq.	Discourse Marker	Function	Frequency
1	Who	Person	1
2	That	Determine/extra-information	2
3	And	Conjunction /filler	14
4	When	Sequencer	1
5	Soon	Time	1
6	Some	Determine	3
7	For	Conjunction	
8	All	Elaborative	2
9	While	Sequencer	1
10	Only	Determine	2
11	Most	Quantity	1
12	Just	Limitation	2
13	But	Conjunction/disagreement	1
14	Now	Topicaliser	1
15	Pronouns	Commentaries: personalisations	18
16	Because	Sequence / relevance	0
17	Therefore	Inferential/ consequential	0
18	Preposition (between , next, under , in ,from	Placement of the subject	15
	Total		56

After surveying each short story separately, it has been detected that the higher frequency in the existence of discourse markers is on the behalf of the third story entitled “A Powerful Lesson for Everyone” and the frequency is 82, and under percentage value 29.0 %, as shown in table (7).Whereas the first is 23.72% , the second is 25.91 ,and the last one is 18.97 which is the lowest value .

Pronouns are widely spread than other types of discourse markers because the subjects and objects in the sentences are the main constituents.

4.2 Test Analysis

After using the paired sample t-test formula in calculating third intermediate pupils' performance in textual and interpersonal markers. The following findings have been found:-

- 1- Pupils mean score in using textual markers is 5.1 ,with 3.8 standard deviation .Hence , the computed t-value is 9.08 which is higher than interpersonal value .As shown in table(8).So there are significant differences among Iraqi intermediate pupil's ability in using textual and interpersonal discourse markers.
- 2- Third intermediate pupils didn't use and cover all the types of the discourse markers .Most of the pupils use conjunction and sequencer discourse markers because the texts are stories and they include various events. These events need to be mentioned in a logical sequence.
- 3- Third intermediate pupils use discourse markers in sequences (and , prepositions of place , after , ...) more than once in their paragraphs.
- 4- It has been noticed that pupils have neglected using announcements , Certainty markers , Commentaries , and Hedges .
- 5- A high percentage of the pupils of third class used logical markers (but , because , also , and , oretc.). Because this kind of markers is used in simple language performance and it is easy to be mentioned within such kind of paragraphs .Also other types of markers need higher intelligence to be incorporated .

Table (8)

T-Value , Standard Deviation and level of Significance of Interpersonal and Textual Discourse Markers

N	Discourse Marker	compute d T-value	mean	SD	Tabulated T-value	DF	Significance
45	Interpersonal	6.5	0.7	0.72	2.02	44	0.05
	Textual	9.08	5.1	3.8			

3.4 Discussion of the Results

After surveying the four short stories , it has been noticed that there are equality among the four stories in the existing of the categories of the discourse markers .

The highest rate was belong to the additive discourse marker “ and ” in the four stories. While all the other markers didn’t exceed five times in their frequency such as (some , every , what , and that).

Concerning the other types of discourse markers , they are found once or twice in the texts to link the actions of the stories in order to lead to better harmony among sentences and paragraphs .

As far as the story of “the Lucky Customer “ is concerned ,it is found out that the sequence discourse markers are used more than the other types , for instance (first , later , after that , now , as , finally) .Using these markers facilitate narrating the events happened to the boy who visited the bookstore .

The percentage of textual discourse markers is higher than the interpersonal discourse markers in the texts of the four short stories .The reason is interpersonal markers are used in novels and plays more than short and simple stories ,moreover interviews and political or media speeches .Then, the narration will need more expressions of interpersonal discourse markers and pauses which companied with pragmatic intended meanings for the discourse.

Through surveying the writings of students of third intermediate ,it has been noticed that the students don’t write long sentence and this lead to unsuitability to put linking words or words of relative clause or conjunction like *but* , *and* , *where* , *so* , *that* and so on.

5. Conclusion

After analyzing the results, the following conclusions are summed up as follows:

- 1- Pupils’ performance in textual markers is better than interpersonal markers.
- 2- The order of the frequency of the discourse markers as :
 - a- Commentaries: personalisations (i.e. Pronouns).
 - b- Additive like (*and* and *also*)
 - c- Sequence such as (*after* , *before* , *then* ,*next* ...etc.)
- 3- The other types of discourse markers are repeated few times (once to five times only) in whole the text of each short story .
- 4- The first short story “ the lucky customer “ has more sequence discourse markers than the other three stories.

- 5- The achievement of the pupils in using discourse markers is weak and they higher percentage is belong to logical markers .i.e. most of the pupils used logical markers more than other types of discourse.
- 6- According to the simplicity of the textbook, it has been noticed that short stories in the level of intermediate classes don't require specific types of discourse markers and textual markers are regarded more preferable in writing short stories for low level students or intermediate classes.
- 7- Pupils of third intermediate didn't used to write long sentences, so they can't use different kind of discourse markers that require larger texts or paragraphs.

Appendix A
The Test

Q1/ A : write a summary about the story of

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

B: In this short story there is a character called Karim. What does Karim want to be in the future ? And what about you ? why?

.....
.....
.....
.....

Q2/A write a summary about the story of *things happen in the nature*

.....
.....
.....

B: what are you going to do ? If you were instead of the deer .

□ استعمال مؤشرات الخطاب في كتاب اللغة الانكليزية في المدارس الثانوية

د.مديحة سيف الدين صالح / جامعة تكريت / كلية التربية للبنات

د.نجوى ياسين اسماعيل / جامعة تكريت

م.م خالد سالم نايف

المستخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى تقصي ادائي طلبة المدارس الثانوية في استخدام المؤشرات الخطابية الموجودة في منهج اللغة الانكليزية في المدارس الثانوية . تم اختيار اربع نصوص من كتاب الثالث متوسط . هذه النصوص هي عبارة عن قصص قصيرة تشمل مواضيع مختلفة .
تفترض الدراسة انه لا يوجد فرق دال بين اداء طلبة الثالث متوسط في استعمال انواع المؤشرات الخطابية .

بعد عرض و جمع البيانات وتحليلها احصائيا , توصلت الدراسة الى ان اداء الطلبة في المؤشرات النصية كان افضل و اعلى نسبة من المؤشرات الخطابية كانت للنوع التعليقي او التفسيري الشخصي مثل الضمائر .
كلمات مفتاحية: الخطاب , المؤشر , النصي , الشخصي , التعليقي

References

- Brown , H. Douglas (2003) **Language Assessment : Principles and Techniques** . London: Pearson Ltd.
- Baker , Paul and Ellece , Sibonile (2011) **Key Terms in Discourse Analysis**. London :Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Fulcher, G. and Davidson, F. (2007) **Language Testing and Assessment** . London : Routledge .
- Ismail, H. M., 2012. Discourse Markers in Political Speeches: Forms and Functions, *Journal of College of Education for Women*, 23/4: 1260-1278.
- Holker, Klaus. (1991). Franzosisch: Partikelforschung [Research on French particles]. *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik [Lexicon of Romance Linguistics]*, 6 Tubingen: Niemeyer, 77-88.
- Hyland,K., & Tse, P. (2004). "Metadiscourse in academic Writing: A Reappraisal". **Applied Linguistics**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jucker A., H. & Ziv, Y. 1998. *Discourse Markers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Lenk, Uta (1997). "Discourse markers". In: *Handbook of Pragmatics*. (Eds.) J. Verschueren, J.-O. Ostman, J. Blommaert, and C.Bulcaen. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Longacre , R. E. (1976) *An Antomy of Speech Notions* .UK : The Peter de Ridder Press.
- Mackey , Alison and Gass , Susan M. (2005) **Second Language Research**. New Jersey :Lawrence Erlbaum Associates,Publishers.
- Madsen, H. (1983) **Techniques in Testing**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maschler ,Yael and Schiffirin , Deborah (2015) *Discourse Markers Language , Meaning , and Context* <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290444810>
- Masood , Rangraz (2014) *The Uses of the Discourse Markers 'well', 'you know' and 'I mean' in News Interviews* . Linkoping University Department of Culture and Communication 120 ECT Master's Programme Language and Culture in Europe.
- McKay , lee S. and Hornberger, Nancy H.(2008) **Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching** .Cambridge : Cambridge University Press .
- Mousavi , Seyyed A.(1999) **A Dictionary of Language Testing** . (2nd ed).Tahran : Rahnmaa Publications .

Rangraz , Masood (2014) The Uses of the Discourse Markers ‘well’, ‘you know’ and ‘I mean’ in News Interviews . Linköping University. Department of Culture and Communication 120 ECTS Master’s Programme Language and Culture in Europe.

Richards ,Jack .C.; Platt ,John and Platt , Heidi (2002) **Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics** . Essex Longman Group UK limited.

Ruhlemann, C. (2007). **Conversation in Context. A Corpus-Driven Approach.** London and New York :Continuum,

Schiffrin, Deborah. (1987). Information and participation: *Y’know* and *I mean*. *Discourse markers*. (pp. 267-293). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yumin , Cheng (2007) . “An Analysis of Style feature of Inaugural Speeches Given by American Presidents Based on the Functional .Theory of Han Lide” Thesis of a master .Tai Yuan Science University .