
The Impact of Discourse Markers on the Understanding of Secondary School Lessons

Ghazala Hussein Mohamad

Abuissa Educational College

Zawia University – Libya

Introduction

Interest in learning English has increased to such an extent that English is now considered to be an international language. In this circle, where English is mainly used for learning purposes, (EAP henceforth) plays a very important role. Therefore, EAP has increasingly expanded so that currently it forms an important part in the curricula for all learning fields at secondary school. Secondary school lesson, as one type of secondary school discourse, is an important part of most school fields worldwide. The ability to comprehend secondary school lessons in English is thus an important need for secondary school students, specialized in English language.

Generally, secondary school listening contains long stretches of talk and the listeners don't have the opportunity of engaging in the facilitating functions of interactive discourse, so it places high demands upon listeners. To succeed, they must learn to identify relationships among units within discourse such as main ideas, supporting ideas, examples, etc.

Empirical research has further outlined an additional important feature that differentiates authentic lesson discourse from written texts or scripted lessons. An authentic lesson is often structured in the form of incomplete clauses. This organizational structure is signalled by the use of a group of pointers or cue phrases technically termed as "discourse markers". These markers generally work at two levels. On one hand, there are macro-level discourse markers, which signal the major transitions and emphasis in the lesson. They include starters, e.g. "what I'm going to talk about today" and Meta

statements, e.g. "I want to mention two types of". On the other hand, there are signals such as well, so, ok which serve as pause or hesitation fillers. These are called micro-level discourse markers or the lower-order markers of segmentation and inferential connections.

Some researchers have the features of lessons (e.g. Brown and Yule, 1983; McCarthy and Carter 1994; McCarthy 1991) (repetitions, paraphrases, rate of speech, authenticity, and syntactic complexity) that might aid FL learners' comprehension. However, the role of discourse markers in aiding listening comprehension has not been fully explored yet in Libya.

Additionally, while several researchers have studied discourse markers from the descriptive and contrastive perspectives, there is a relative lack of experimental work on this topic. In a modest attempt to fill the gap in research, this study investigates the effects of the use of discourse markers on secondary school listening comprehension of secondary school students in Libya. This study is based on the premise that the knowledge derived from such research will provide insight that can facilitate the secondary school listening comprehension.

Problem of the study

When students attend a lesson they may already have some background knowledge of the subject and be able to predict some of the content, not least from its title. However, at this point problems may develop. The main problems can be summarized within three major areas:

- 1- Decoding, i.e. recognizing what has been said;
- 2- Comprehending, i.e. understanding the main and subsidiary points;
- 3-Taking notes, i.e. writing down quickly, briefly and clearly the important points for future use.

Research in EAP has begun to show that non-native speakers of English have much difficulty in secondary school listening. Non-native speakers often lack familiarity with spoken discourse structure, various styles of delivery and the accent itself brings its own particular and potential areas of difficulty. Students are required to concentrate on and understand long stretches of discourse. These stretches of talk are normally indicated by the use of various discourse markers.

It is, therefore, assumed that some Libyan English learners at ALwehda Secondary School for social science and languages face difficulties in understanding lessons.

Significance of the study

With the status of English as an international language and the expansion in the use of English, an increasing number of foreign language learners are engaged in learning pursuits that require them to listen and comprehend a great amount of English input.

Secondary school lessons, as one type of secondary school discourse, are an important part of most fields worldwide. The ability to comprehend secondary school lessons in English is thus an important need. Therefore, there is a need for investigating the processes underlying performance in a lesson delivered in English within a secondary school environment. The study is justified on the grounds that the knowledge derived from this investigation can provide guidance for teachers, education, instructional materials and curriculum development.

Spoken discourse, due to its spontaneity and the elusive nature of its analysis, is probably the mode of communication where the description of social and cognitive relationships needs a great deal of elaboration and investigation. In ordinary speech, speakers and hearers have little time at their disposal to process speech and to construct text structure, i.e., the coherent mental representation of the language that is being exchanged. In this respect, discourse markers are essential points in the mental map of linguistic relationships. In other words, discourse markers can influence this mental representation which is intimately linked to the notion of coherence. The relations that hold between the subparts or spans of a string of discourse can apply between segments as well as clauses, or between larger segments such as lessons.

For many years there has been an ongoing debate about the relative effect of discourse markers on language processing. While the debate has dealt principally with reading comprehension, it has also been important in the literature on listening.

This study investigates the influence of discourse markers on the understanding lessons by Libyan secondary school learners. It is hypothesized that discourse markers are of particular interest because they constitute an aspect of the language not taught in the classrooms. They are likely to be a good indicator of the extent to

which students understand a lesson. That is, the researcher seeks to establish whether a high degree of awareness of the use of discourse markers can be influential in promoting successful understanding of lessons. The research is important for pedagogy, because such research has clear implications for the design of syllabuses strategies and classroom materials as well as learning strategies.

Objectives of the study

Secondary school listening is a vast subject, and little is known in hard statistical terms of the effects of specific linguistic features on lesson comprehension. Most studies on lesson comprehension in EFL contexts have focused on one of two areas; either note-taking or discourse markers and organization. Discourse markers help to present information in a clear, convincing and interesting way in an effort to promote acceptance and understanding.

The purpose of the study is, therefore, to examine the influence of discourse markers on the understanding of lessons by Libyan learners at ALwehda Secondary School for social science and languages studying English specialization.

Questions of the study

Whichever style of lecturing is adopted, the lesson will normally make use of various devices in order to indicate to listeners (students) the relative importance of the ideas and information contained in the talk. These devices, or cues, are usually of three types:

- Prosodic features (stress, intonation, pauses, etc.)
- Subordinating syntactic structures (e.g. relative clauses, noun complements, other subordinate clauses, etc.)
- Lexical discourse markers (e.g. topic markers, to begin with, topic shifter, the other thing is that, summarizers, to sum up, etc.)

In addition to these, there can be “vocal underlining” (i.e. varying the pace, pitch, and volume of speech). A teacher’s voice can signal meaning as effectively as words can. The body movements can also be used to emphasize various points, in particular, the use of hand gestures. However, the main concern of the study will be investigating how different categories of discourse markers affect the degree to which foreign learners understand lessons.

The researcher divides the markers into two types:

- Macro markers: (i.e. higher-order markers signalling major transitions and emphasis in lesson);
- Micro markers (i.e. lower-order markers of segmentation and inter-sentential connection.)

Consequently, the researcher suggests that without being aware that these lexical markers are signalling important functions in the lesson discourse, foreign learners would not be expected to understand a lesson fully and effectively.

This discussion has led the researcher to ask two questions:

1. What is the effect of the use of macro markers on the understanding of lessons by Alwehda Secondary School students studying English specialization?
2. What is the effect of the use of micro markers on the understanding of lessons by Alwehda Secondary School students studying English specialization?

Defining discourse markers

Here are some of the definitions of discourse markers:

- Shiffrin (1987) proposes that, theoretically, discourse markers are a functional class of verbal and non-verbal devices which provide contextual coordination for ongoing talk. (Eslami and Eslami, 2007, 2)
- She considers the conjunctive items such as now, well, the representatives so and you know, the segmenting marker right to be discourse markers that perform important interpersonal and text-building functions.
- Biber (1988) defines discourse markers as elements "Which are typical of speech and which are rare outside of conversational genres"? (McCarthy and Carter, 1994, 7)
- He also argues that a very high level of ellipsis is typical of the grammar of spoken mode, whereas a feature such as passive verbs and non-finite clauses are felt more likely to occur in written mode.

McCarthy (1991) mentions:

"when we look at a lot of natural spoken data, we find the basic conjunctions and, but, so and then much in evidence, and used not just to link individual utterances within turns, but often at the beginning of turns, ...linking back to an earlier turn of the ...speaker, or else marking a shift in topic or sub-topic. In this sense, the conjunctions are better thought of as discourse markers, in that they

organize and “manage” quite extended stretch of discourse.” (McCarthy, 1991, 49)

- Coulthard (1992) describes discourse markers as:
- “A reasonable homogeneous group that tends to be realized by simple linguistic expressionsthat have become simplified because they correspond to constructs that are in continual use when we process text”. (Coulthard, 1992, 45)
- In his description of elements that can function as discourse markers, Coulthard enumerates coordinators, subordinators, conjunct adverbs and phrases that take sentential complements (e.g. it follows that, it may seem that).

With regard to the meaning, Fraser (1999) summarizes several characteristics of discourse markers, as follows:

- They do not constitute a separate syntactic category;
- Their meaning is procedural not conceptual;
- Every individual discourse marker has a specific core meaning. (Trillo, 2001, 529)

Sankoff et.al (1997) suggests that:

“As lexical items that relate to discourse rather than to syntax or semantics, discourse markers are of three major types: discourse coordinators, interaction markers, and punctures”. (Sankoff et.al, 1997, 159)

According to Sankoff et.al, discourse markers tend to have the following properties:

1. They do not enter into construction syntactically with other elements of the sentences.
2. The propositional (intended) meaning of the sentence does not depend on their presence.
3. They are subject to semantic bleaching as compared with their source forms.
4. They undergo great phonological reduction than their source forms.
5. They are articulated as part of smoothly flowing speech production except for the hesitation forms (e.g. uh) that generally signal word searchers.

With regard to lessons, Strodt-Lopez (1991) claims that discourse markers are important features of lessons that maintain audience-speaker rapport and may in fact clarify the speaker’s orientation to the main points. (Eslami and Eslami, 2007, 5)

Discourse markers as semantic relations

Halliday and Hasan (1976) suggest that there is one specific type of semantic relation that is crucial for creating coherence within and between segments of discourse. One element is interpreted by reference to another. Discourse markers contribute greatly to the way in which the meaning of discourse segments is interpreted. When the interpretation of a string in the discourse, requires making reference to some other string, we better search for discourse markers. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, 11)

The following example illustrates the points we have been making concerning the function of discourse markers as semantic relations. It shows how the use of the temporal marker “Next” helps the listener, reader to realize that this marker represents different semantic relations in different discourse segments.

- a) First, he took a piece of string and tied it carefully round the neck of the bottle. Next, he passed the other end over a branch and weighted it down with a stone.
- b) First, he has no experience of this kind of work. Next, he showed no sign of being willing to learn.

In (a), the marker “Next” is used in a sequential sense. In other words, the relation between the theses of the two successive sentences that is their relation in external terms, as content-may be simply one of sequence in time: the one is subsequent to the other. This temporal relation is expressed in one of its simplest forms: Next.

In (b), the temporal marker “Next” represents the internal type of relation in which the successively is not in the events being talked about in the enumeration of points in an argument is clearly shown by the strong tendency to anticipate a sequence of points by the use of the cataphoric conjunction. First, as Halliday and Hasan (1976) put it “These internal....temporal relations are (temporal) in the sense that they refer to the time dimension that is present in the communicative process. The communication process is certainly a process in real time; but it is [different] from the time dimension of the process of the external world that forms the content of communication. Hence this is felt to bea metaphorical extension of the concept of time as in the one ofexternal processes. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, 265)

Therefore, it is the semantic relation presented by discourse markers that make it fairly easy to be extended still further into meanings that are not really temporal.

It is clear that whichever marker we decide to use is a signal of what is to be taken as the framework within which what we want to say is to be understood.

School listening-definition and importance

Secondary school listening involves listening and speaking tasks in secondary school classes according to Flowerdew (1995); it has its own characteristics, and places special demands upon listeners. To be a successful listener, a student needs relevant background knowledge, the ability to distinguish between important and unimportant information and appropriate skills like note-takingetc. (Huang, 2004, 2)

Richards (1993) has also neatly summarised the micro-skills needed for secondary school listening. These are produced below.

Micro-skills: secondary school listening

1. Ability to identify purpose and scope of the lesson.
2. Ability to identify relationships among units within discourses (e.g., major ideas, generalization, hypotheses, supporting ideas, examples, etc.)
3. Ability to identify the role of discourse markers in signalling structure of a lesson (e.g., conjunctions, adverbs, etc.)
4. Ability to infer relationships (e.g., causes, effects, conclusion)
5. Ability to recognize key lexical items related to the subject / topic.
6. Ability to deduce meaning of the words from context.
7. Ability to recognize markers of cohesion.
8. Ability to recognize function of intonation to signal information structure (e.g., pitch, volume, pace, key)
9. Ability to detect attitude of speaker toward subject matter.
10. Familiarity with different lecturing styles: formal, conversational, etc.
11. Familiarity with different registers: written versus colloquial.
12. Ability to recognize irrelevant matter: jokes, digressions, meanderings.
13. Knowledge of classroom conventions (e.g., turn taking, clarifications, requests, advice, instructions.)

Furthermore, secondary school listening plays a very important role in a student's learning success. It plays an even more important role

than secondary school reading or secondary school aptitude. (Jordan, 1997, 180)

Studies on the effect of discourse markers on FL lesson comprehension

Several studies have discussed the positive effects of the presence of discourse markers in lessons. The most pioneering research in this area is the study conducted by Chandron and Richards (1986). This study has examined the ways in which different categories of discourse markers affect how well foreign secondary school students understand school lessons, and specifically, the effects of macro markers and micro markers (functioning as fillers, indicating links between sentences). The researchers concentrated on lessons in the reading style. They found that lesson read from a written text will usually lack the links of macro-markers found in more conversational style of lessoning. A lesson which uses more macro-markers is likely to be easier to follow. On the other hand, an over-use of micro-markers possibly detracts from the overall coherence of the lesson. For the curriculum and materials developer and for 12 learners the macro-markers probably constitute a relevant focus for classroom activities and instructional materials. (Jordan, 1997, 184) Dicarrico and Nattinger (1988) built on the research by Chauldron and Richards and investigated lessons from a variety of disciplines delivered in the styles of lessoning, though the main concern was the conversational style. They use an informal lexical phrase approach. They confined their study to macro-markers, or macro-organizers, as they preferred to call them. They concluded that foreign students “would not be expected to know that these lexical phrases, macro-organizers are signalling important functions in the lesson discourse”. (Jordan, 1997, 187)

Consequently, they suggest that more emphasis needs to be placed on teaching these markers.

Williams (1992) has found that the presence of more global discourse markers and phrases which signal a change in topic or point of emphasis appears to aid recall in lessons. Similarly, McDonald (2000) has concluded that the presence of lower level discourse markers, i.e. words that speakers use to mark relationships between chunks of discourse, such as so, well, ok, now ...aid comprehension. (Eslami and Eslami, 2007:3)

Grice (1975) sees that language is based on a form of cooperation among the speakers. The cooperative principle is a kind of tacit agreement by speakers (teachers) and listeners (students) to cooperate in discourse. (Grice, 1975, 58)

According to Grice (1989), a speaker makes discourse markers when he conforms to cooperative principle. Hearers try to workout what a speaker means. (Grice, 1989, 31)

Hiroaki Tanaka (1997) held an investigation into whether the speaker's (teacher) process of deriving discourse implicates from the phrase "in other words" and the listeners (student) process of interpreting the speaker's intent are the same. An analysis of the inferential function of "in other words" and the listener's understanding of speaker's implicates demonstrates pragmatic significance when the listener's interpretation and speaker's intent do not coincide. Tanaka concluded that in spite of the potential for listeners to misconstrue the speaker's intent, discourse markers retain coherence since both participants share the same cognitive environment. (Tanaka. H, 1997, 367)

Richards (1980) recorded that non-fluent non-native speakers tend to pay too much attention to the surface meaning of utterances. He further speculated that this affects the language directed toward language use more explicit markers of illocutionary force in speaking to non-native speakers than in speaking to other native speakers. (Richards, J, C, 1980, 213-222)

Scope of the study

The specific research area of investigation in this study is the understanding of lessons by Zawia Secondary School students of EFL. Lesson of comprehension is examined in terms of its being influenced by the presence or absence of macro and micro discourse markers.

Methodology

The participants in the study were 30 EAP secondary school students for the year 2012-2013. They were third year students majoring in learning English as a foreign language at Alwehda Secondary School for social science and languages at Zawia city. All the participants were Libyan native speakers of Arabic. They were enrolled in language laboratory courses which were part of the curriculum or students majoring in English. These

courses were designed to improve the listening comprehension of students.

The reason for choosing students from this learning discipline is to ensure a certain level of language proficiency (intermediate) required for discourse markers to be noticed and to recognize their facilitating effect.

The methods used for collecting data in the study were two tests of listening comprehension. Each test included 50 items checking for both global and local understanding. The test was designed and administrated to both groups of subjects. The type of data collected in the study was subjects' scores on the multiple choices, true/false and cloze questions. Therefore, the dependent variable was scored on multiple choices, true/false and cloze questions, whereas the independent variable was micro and macro markers in secondary school lessons. Each lesson was followed by 4-5 multiple choice, true/false and cloze questions which tapped into actual inferential and global understanding of the lessons. The subjects were provided with a set of instructions on how to do the questions were read by the teacher (researcher). The time allotted for each group to take the test was 30 minutes.

Data for the study

Two secondary school texts were used for this study. The texts were selected from the materials that students typically encounter in their classes. Only one version of each lesson was used. The two versions of the lessons differed in the amount of discourse markers used. The version of the first lesson which included discourse markers served as the baseline. The scripted text of this version was examined by the researcher to make sure that the text has an appropriate number and type of discourse markers. The version of the second lesson served as the altered version. Here, a great amount of discourse markers which were necessary for the prepositional content of the lessons, such as the framers, temporal conjunctives and logical connectors were deliberately removed for the purpose of the study. Therefore, the baseline version was judged as more user friendly and more informal in tone, whereas the altered version as dry and stiff. Finally, the two versions were scripted taking special care to make them resemble a speech. Full texts of the two versions listed in appendices A and B with discourse markers in the base version italicised.

Procedure

The participants were randomly divided into two groups: experimental and control. Each group consisted of 15 students. The lesson with more discourse markers was delivered to the control group (group 1) and the one without was delivered to the experimental group (group 2).

The first lesson on “listening skill” and the second on “How to give a good speech” Both lessons were taken from the book “Developing Reading Skills, Intermediate”.

The two extracts were analysed in terms of quality and quantity of discourse markers found in them. The analysis and classification of discourse markers used in the study were based on functional criteria, drawing both on the analysis of lesson and the study of different classifications proposed from a functional perspective (Dudley Evans and

Jhon, 1998; Taurza, 2001). Both macro and micro discourse markers (Chaudron and Richards 1986) were identified and used in the classification adopted in this study. These are listed in the two tables below.

Table (1) Micro markers used in the study

Function	Marker
Segmentation	Well; ok; yes; and; also.
Temporal	While...; when...; eventually; first; second; finally; then (and then); as you listen...; by now; at the moment; at the same time; the next step is to ...; the last step is to...; right now; the first thing to do is.
Causal	Therefore; because; in order to; so.
Contrast and Comparison	However; but; or; only; similarity.
Choice	Or; in either case.
Emphasis	Actually; of course; in fact; already; as we already said; as you probably know.

Table (2) Macro markers used in the study.

Function	Marker
----------	--------

Global organizers	
Topic starter	What we're going to talk about today is something you probably know; something about.
Topic shifter	But the problem here is that...; the other thing is that...; this is not the end of the story.
Summarizers	In this way; at this point, our discussion comes to an end; To sum up; and that's all we have to talk about today.
Local organizers	
Exemplifiers	For example; such as.
Relators	We'll see that; this means that.
Evaluators	It's really very interesting that...; the surprising thing is that; it goes without saying that...

Data analysis methods

From a statistical point of view, when studying numerical data of various sorts, particularity score, the two things we will be most interested in are the extent to which the data are similar and the degree to which the data differ. The most frequently employed measured of similarity is the mean (symbolized by \bar{X}). On the other hand, the most important measure of dispersion is the standard deviation (SD) (Brown 1988; Nunan 1992). Therefore, these two statistical procedures were used to analyse the data collected from the study.

First, the score of the two groups were compared using the mean which is the average of a set of score obtained by adding the individual scores together and divided by the total number of scores. Then, the standard deviation was used to measure the degree to which the two sets of scores varied in relation to their means. The standard deviation is calculated by deducing the mean

from each individual score, squaring the resulting figures to get rid of the minus signs, adding these together and dividing by the number of scores minus one.

Dividing by one less than the number of score is a correction for the fact that the variability of scores for the fact that the variability of scores for a single group of subjects tends to be less than the variability for all possible scores.

This gives us the variance. By obtaining the square root of variance we arrive at the standard deviation. Armed with information about means and standard deviations, we can analyse and compare numerical data in ways which are not possible with raw scores, i.e. the actual scores obtained on the two tests.

Although there was a difference between the mean scores of the two groups, we were not yet entitled to say that the difference indicated that the samples had been drawn from two different populations. The question we needed to settle statistically was the probability that the two samples had been drawn from two different populations or from the same population. First, we calculated the standard error (SE) for both groups by dividing the SD for each groups by the square root of the number of subjects. Knowing these figures, the researcher can try to know out how close our sample means are likely to be the population mean from which they were drawn.

We can then conclude that the population means will be within two standard errors of the sample means. This is what is known as the Range. Lastly, a t-test was used to compare the means of the two groups which is calculated like this:

$$T = \frac{\text{mean} - \text{variance}}{\frac{SD}{\text{square of number of scores}}}$$

Results

The tables and figures below illustrate the results of statistical analyses for the scores of listening comprehension tests.

Table (3) Calculating the performance mean and standard deviation of the control group

Score (out of 100)	Score– mean	Squares of figures in 2 nd column
98	12.2	148.84

68	-17.8	316.84
80	-5.8	33.64
96	10.2	104.04
96	10.2	104.04
90	4.2	17.64
92	6.2	38.44
72	-13.8	190.44
78	-7.8	60.84
90	4.2	17.64
84	-1.8	3.24
92	6.2	38.44
82	-3.8	14.44
72	-13.8	190.44
98	12.2	148.84

(X) $1,288 / 15 = 85.8$

The sum of the squares / (number of scores minus 1):

$1427.8 / (15-1) = 94.18$

Variance = 94.18

Standard deviation = (square root of variance) = 9.70

Standard error = SD/ square root of the number of subjects =

$9.70/3.8=2.5$ Range = $X + (SE \times 2) = 85.8 + (2.5 \times 2) = 80.8 + (2.5 \times 2) = 80.8 - 90.8$

$$t = \frac{X - Mo \text{ (variance)}}{\frac{SD}{\text{square of number of scores}}}$$

$$= \frac{85.8-94.18}{\frac{9.70}{3.8}} = 83.24$$

Table (4) calculating the mean and standard deviation of the experimental group

Score (out of 100)	Score – mean	Square of figures in 2 nd column
66	16.2	262.44
46	-3.8	14.44
28	-21.8	475.24
33	-16.8	282.24
68	18.2	331.24
37	-12.8	163.84
62	12.2	148.84

44	-5.8	33.64
68	18.2	33.64
73	23.2	538.24
37	-12.8	163.84
66	16.2	262.44
37	-12.8	163.84
28	-21.8	475.24
55	5.2	27.04
		3376.2

$$(X) 748 / 15 =$$

$$49.8$$

The sum of the squares / (number of scores minus 1) =

$$3674 / (15-1) = 243.9$$

$$\text{Variance} = 243.9$$

$$\text{Standard deviation} = (\text{square root of variance}) = 15.6$$

$$\text{Standard error} = \text{SD} / \text{square root of number of subjects}$$

$$= 15.6 / 3.8 = 4.10$$

$$\text{Range} = X + (\text{SE} \times 2) = 49.8 + (4.10 \times 2)$$

$$= 41.6 - 50$$

$$= \frac{49.8 - 243.9}{\frac{15.6}{3.8}} = 45.68$$

As shown in the two tables above, there is a significant difference between the performances of the two groups. Out of the maximum score of 100, the mean scores were 85.8 for the control group and 49.8 for the experimental group. The difference between the two means was significant at 36.0. The results of the t-test analyses for the listening comprehension show that with a 0.36 level significance the researcher can reject the null hypothesis that there could be no statistically significant difference between the two groups. The results of the T-test analyses also show that we can formulate the alternative hypothesis that there would be significant difference between the performances of the two groups. In other words, Group (1) participants who listened to the lesson with discourse markers outperformed Group (2) participants who listened to the lesson without discourse markers.

Discussion

The statistical analysis of the mean scores and the use of standard deviation produced evidence that the lesson containing discourse markers was more comprehensible than the lesson without.

In general, the results of this study lend further support to the hypothesis that discourse markers have positive influence on comprehension. The better performance of the control group could be linked to the greater presence of the two types of discourse markers, macro and micro, (e.g., frame markers / person markers, and glosses).

In conclusion, this study has revealed the facilitative effect of discourse markers in the comprehension of lessons in a foreign language. The findings show that how the secondary school content should be delivered to the students is of high significance. And that content of lessons should be considered how best they could assist students to cope with the learning system of education faster and better.

Recommendations

The researcher will try to summarize a set of recommendations widely cited in the literature relating to secondary school lesson comprehension:

1. The teacher should speak a little more slowly, clearly and loudly when delivering a lesson.
2. The teacher should plan, prepare and structure every lesson. He can vary the pace of lessons and breakup the content into accessible units.
3. The teacher should make the lesson understandable by the use of explanation, emphasis, recapitulation of the main points and relating examples to current examples and applications.
4. The teacher is advised to use formal and easy language and avoid using colloquial and slang expressions as much as possible.
5. The teacher should explain the unclear concepts and terms.

With regard to discourse markers, practical implications of this study would suggest that they may be used to contribute to instructional actions to be undertaken in different teaching contexts.

1. Students should be made aware of the presence, importance and facilitating effect of discourse markers for secondary school comprehensions.

2. From the textual viewpoint, students can be asked to identify instances of frame markers and starters and predict the content of the lesson.
3. Attention to logical connectives will help students analyses the speaker's (teacher) line of reasoning and rhetorical strategies.
4. (References, substitution, ellipsis, conjunctions ... etc.) These markers can help students identify the macro structure and also encourage them to retain and build newly acquired knowledge.

References

- 1- Eslami, Z.R. &Eslami – Rasekh, A. (2007). Discourse marker in academic lectures. <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi-mOFCR/is-ai-n>.
- 2- McCarthy, M & Carter, R. (1994). Language as discourse: Perspectives for Language teaching. New York. Longman Inc.
- 3- McCarthy, M (1991). Discourse analysis for Language teachers Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 4- Coulthard, M. (1992). Advances in spoken discourse analysis. Routledge. London.
- 5- Trillo, J.R. (2001). A mathematical model for the analysis of variation in discourse. Journal of Linguistics, 37.
- 6- Sankoff, G., Thibault, P., N., Blondeau, H, fonollosa, M. & Gagnon, L (1997). Variation in the use of discourse markers in a language contact situation. Language variation and change.
- 7- Richards, J.C. (1980). "TESOL Quarterly, 14.
- 8- Grice, Herbert Paul. (1989). Studies in the way of words. Cambridge Mass, Harvard University Press.
- 9- Tanaka, Hiroaki, (1997). In other words and conversational implicature pragmatics.
- 10- Jordan, J.J. (1997). English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 11- Eslami, Z.R &Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2007). Discourse Marker in academic Lectures. <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi-mOFCR/is-ai-n6124565>

- 12- Huang, J. (2004). Voices from Chinese students: professors' use English affects academic listening. College student Journal [on – line serial], 38 (2). Findarticles.com. 08 Dec. 2007.
- 13-Halliday, M.A.K & Hasan, R. (1976) Cohesion in English. Pearson Education Limited. London. Longman.