

ARTICLE

Investigating EFL Learners' Use of Pragmatic Marker Combinations

Zhaoyi Pan 

Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia, Mahidol University, Nakhon Pathom 73170, Thailand

ABSTRACT

This research filled a gap by investigating the use of pragmatic marker (PM) combinations (PMCs) by advanced-level learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) from three Southeast Asian countries, namely Thailand, Indonesia, and Myanmar. The aim was to identify all the PMCs and all the types of the PMCs that the Thai, Indonesian, and Burmese advanced-level EFL learners used. The results revealed that three PMCs were used by all the participants from the three southeast Asian countries, namely the PMCs *but when*, *and when*, and *uh/um like*. Both the Thai and the Indonesian participants used the PMCs *and I think* and *uh/um I think* most often, whereas the Burmese participants used the PMCs *well I think* and *like uh/um* most frequently. The participants from the three southeast Asian countries used the same PMs as the first PM in the PMCs most often, namely the PMs *and*, *uh/um*, and *but*. In addition, the participants from the three southeast Asian countries used the same four PMs as the second PMs in the PMCs most often, namely the PMs *I think*, *uh/um*, *like*, and *when*. Both the Thai and the Indonesian participants used the juxtaposition type most often, while the Burmese participants used the composition sub-type in combination most frequently.

Keywords: Pragmatic Marker Combination; Pragmatic Marker; EFL Learners; Pragmatic Function; English Conversation

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Zhaoyi Pan, Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia, Mahidol University, Nakhon Pathom 73170, Thailand; Email: zhaoyi.pan@mahidol.ac.th

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 2 April 2025 | Revised: 1 May 2025 | Accepted: 4 May 2025 | Published Online: 10 May 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i5.9326>

CITATION

Pan, Z., 2025. Investigating EFL Learners' Use of Pragmatic Marker Combinations. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(5): 848–860. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i5.9326>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The significant roles of English pragmatic markers (PMs) in oral communication have been confirmed in different studies that have investigated their multiple functions when used by speakers of English as the first language (L1) and speakers of English as a second or foreign language (ESL or EFL) ^[1-4]. In addition, a series of studies has examined the PM combinations (PMCs) in L1 speakers' oral communications ^[5,6]. It was noted that PMs "tend[ed] to cluster or collocate" ^[7]. Haselow mentioned that PMs "frequently co-occur in natural speech in various languages," while Cuenca and Crible stated that the co-occurrence of PMs was "a relatively frequent phenomenon." ^[8,9]

In contrast to the studies of the PMCs used by L1 speakers, little research has focused on the use of PMCs by EFL learners. Although several studies have illustrated that EFL learners used fewer of the functions of PMs compared to L1 English speakers ^[10,11], no substantial evidence indicated that no PMC was used by EFL learners in oral communication. In addition, a functional analysis of the use of PMs by EFL learners sheds light on these EFL learners' use of PMs to manage the discoursal and interpersonal relationships in interactions ^[11]. Hence, the types of the co-occurrences of PMs, as determined by the functions of the individual PMs in a PMC ^[9], should be studied to examine how EFL learners use PMCs in oral communication. Moreover, recent studies have found that EFL learners with different L1 backgrounds may have their own patterns of using PMs in oral communication without adopting L1 English speakers' use of PMs as the norm ^[12]. Accordingly, whether EFL learners with different L1 backgrounds have the same patterns in the use of PMCs in oral communication is worth examining.

To bridge the research gap regarding EFL learners' use of PMCs, the present research involved EFL participants from southeast Asia who had advanced levels of English proficiency and three different L1 backgrounds, namely Thai (TH), Indonesian (IN), and Burmese (MM), to investigate how they used English PMCs in oral communication in English. This research first aimed to identify the PMCs that the advanced-level EFL learners with three different L1 backgrounds used in oral communication in English. The second aim was to identify the types of the PMCs that the advanced-level EFL learners with three different L1 backgrounds used in oral communication in English. The findings of this research revealed the patterns of use of PMCs by the advanced-level EFL learners with three different L1 backgrounds. Moreover, the study of these PMCs can increase the understanding of the EFL participants' use of PMs by providing "a better view of [PMs'] complex and highly multi-functional nature" ^[7]. The two research questions (RQs) are listed below.

RQ1. What are the PMCs that are used by Thai,

Indonesian, and Burmese advanced-level EFL learners?

RQ2. What are the types of PMCs that are used by Thai, Indonesian, and Burmese advanced-level EFL learners?

2. PMs and PMCs

2.1. PMs

PMs refer to "phonologically short items that have no or little referential meaning but serve pragmatic or procedural purpose[s]" ^[13]. Brinton further explained that the term PMs should be preferred because "it better captures the range of functions of [PMs]," indicating that a PMs' main use in oral communication should be studied at the pragmatic level ^[14]. Due to the characteristics of the multi-functionality of PMs in oral communication, the analysis of the functions of the different individual PMs as used by both L1 English speakers and EFL learners, such as the PMs *well* ^[15], *like* ^[16], *you know* ^[17], and the entire category of PMs ^[12], has been at the center of previous research. It was found that EFL learners used fewer of the functions of PMs compared to the L1 English speakers ^[4]. In addition, EFL learners used the functions of PMs at the discoursal level more often than they did those at the interpersonal, interactional, and cognitive levels. For example, Huang and Xiao et al. found that Chinese EFL learners used PMs such as *well* to manage the turn-taking ^[4,10], while they rarely used PMs to maintain interpersonal relationships, or to mark hesitation or mitigation. Pan studied the PMs that Thai EFL learners used and found that Thai EFL learners with different levels of English proficiency used PMs for transactional coherence more often than they did for interactional coherence ^[12].

This research adopted the core functional paradigm of PMs that Fung and Carter proposed for the following reasons ^[3]: First, the framework divides the functions of PMs into four domains, as illustrated in **Table 1** below.

These four domains comprehensively demonstrate the functions of PMs according to different levels, as shown in the four examples retrieved from the collected data in this research presented below. The PMs in the referential domain denote different connective purposes between the two discourses, as the PM *because* denotes the cause of the prior discourse in example (1). The structural domain is at the discoursal level, indicating the different types of turn-taking in interactions, such as the start of a new topic introduced by the PM *so* in example (2). The interpersonal domain pertains to the interpersonal functions of PMs, denoting different functions in interactions ^[14], such as the implication of a personal stance via the PM *I think* in example (3). Finally, the cognitive domain indicates the speaker's state of mind of during oral communication because the speaker has no time to prepare ^[6], as well as the indication of the thought process via the PM *well* in example (4).

Table 1. Four functional domains of PMs (Adapted from Fung and Carter) ^[3].

Functional Domains	Explanations	Examples
referential	indicating different types of the relationship between two discourses	addition: <i>and</i> contrast: <i>but</i> cause: <i>because</i> consequence: <i>so</i>
structural	indicating different types of the turn-taking in interaction	topic shift: <i>so, well</i> marking a new topic: <i>now</i> marking a conclusion: <i>anyway</i> indicating stance: <i>well, I think</i>
interpersonal	denoting different functions between interactants	responding: <i>Oh, OK, yeah</i> indicating common ground: <i>you know, you see</i>
cognitive	denoting the cognitive state of mind of the speaker primarily owing to the unplanned real-time spoken interaction	indicating the thinking process: <i>I think, well</i> marking a self-repair: <i>I mean</i> marking mitigation: <i>well, I mean</i>

(1) IN06: I didn't choose the left one, **because** I know it's wrong.

(2) MM12: **So** let's talk about our childhood then.

(3) IN17: **I think** I don't quite like this website.

(4) TH21: **Well** <pause / 2.3s> I [I kind of don't know how to say it.

The four domains of the functions of PMs in Fung and Carter's framework are also in line with the concept of PMs proposed by Brinton and by Crible and Blackwell in which PMs mainly have pragmatic purposes ^[3,13,18]. Accordingly, Fung and Carter's framework was deemed suitable for the analysis of the functions of the PMs in this research ^[3].

2.2. PMCs

PMCs refer to the linguistic phenomenon whereby two

or more PMs co-occur, such as *and if, well I mean* ^[5,9]. PMCs are also known as PM sequences and co-occurrences of PMs ^[8,19]. Recent studies of PMCs have attempted to identify the motivations for PMCs. The studies of some individual PMCs, such as *and so* and *and now* ^[20,21], revealed that L1 speakers' use of many PMCs was for discursual and interactional purposes, reflecting the significant role of the functions of individual PMs in PMCs ^[22]. Haselow also found that the first PM in a PMC usually had an interactional purpose in relation to a prior utterance and that the second PM had functions in other domains regarding the up-coming utterance ^[10]. Accordingly, Cuenca and Crible proposed a framework for types of PMCs, mainly by evaluating individual PMs' functions and scopes in PMCs, as shown in **Table 2** below ^[9].

Table 2. Types of PMCs (Adapted from Cuenca and Crible) ^[9].

Types	Sub-Types	Features	Examples
juxtaposition	-	different functions and scopes	<i>well if</i>
combination	addition	different functions, same scope compatible but distinct functions, same scope	<i>and actually</i> <i>but nevertheless</i>
	composition	one single function, same scope	<i>well I mean</i>

According to **Table 2**, there are two integration types of PMCs. When two individual PMs in a PMC have different functions, the PMC is the juxtaposition type in which both PMs have scope over different utterance units. If two individual PMs have the same scope over the utterance unit, the PMC is the combination type, of which there are two sub-types. The first sub-type is the addition sub-type, in which both PMs either have different functions or the functions of both PMs are compatible but distinct from each other. The composition sub-type refers to two individual PMs in a PMC having the same scope, and both functions merge to produce a single meaning. This framework provides comprehensive guidance for the study of the types of PMCs in terms of

functions and scopes, while prosody was also considered a reference in line with recent studies of PMCs in which the functions of the individual PMs in PMCs were regarded as playing a significant role when examining the co-occurrences of PMCs. Hence, it is suitable for this research.

Apart from the studies of the English PMs used by Thai EFL learners discussed in the section above, the investigation of the PMs used by EFL learners from different southeast Asia is limited. Pan and Rahayu et al. found that Indonesian EFL learners tended to use PMs with referential meanings in English conversations and presentations ^[12,23], such as *and, so*. Similar to Thai EFL learners, Indonesian EFL learners did not often use PMs for interpersonal or

cognitive purposes. However, Pan found that Indonesian EFL learners used PMs for thought processes and to mark self-repair in the cognitive domain more often than the Thai EFL learners did ^[12]. By contrast, little research has focused on Burmese EFL learners' use of PMs in oral communication. Hence, the findings of this research not only contribute to the exploration of the use of PMCs by EFL learners from Thailand, Indonesia, and Myanmar, but also further reveal the functions of PMs used by the EFL learners from these three southeast Asian countries since the types of PMCs must be determined by the identification of the functions of individual PMs in PMCs.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants and Data Collection

In total, 180 advanced-level EFL participants were involved in this research, including 60 Thai advanced-level EFL participants, 60 Indonesian advanced-level EFL participants, and 60 Burmese advanced-level EFL participants who were studying at ten different faculties at five universities in Bangkok, Thailand, during the data collection period. All the Indonesian and Burmese participants were international university students enrolled in different English programs at the universities during the data collection. The advanced English proficiency level was determined based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) ^[24]. Each participant was requested to submit their valid English score for an international English exam, such as IELTS, to confirm their eligibility. All the participants were in year one to year four at the undergraduate level and their average age was 20.7 during the data collection. They had all studied English in their own countries for an average of 13.2 years prior to the data collection, and no participant had studied English or had been a long-term resident in an English-speaking country before the data collection. Each participant's L1 was the official language of their countries, namely the Thai, Indonesian, and Burmese languages. The criteria for selecting the participants for this research aimed to ensure the homogeneity of the participants. Lastly, there were 112 males (62%) and 68 females (38%) involved in this research; however, gender was not a variable in this research.

The data collection, which lasted for approximately three months, took place in 2024. Each participant was requested to audio record a dyadic English conversation with another participant from the same country. All the participants consented to participate in this research prior to the data collection. Although the data collection was specifically for this research and should therefore be regarded as elicited data, some conditions were imposed on each pair before the audio recordings to ensure that the dyadic English conversations were as natural as possible. Each pair was given complete freedom to audio record any

dyadic English conversation that occurred in their daily lives, such as a chat in the dormitory, or a discussion of their assignments in a common study room on campus. The conversations were assumed to be challenging for each pair, since they did not usually use English to communicate. Hence, each pair was reminded to make the recordings whenever they felt ready. No preparation was allowed since the conversations should be naturally occurring. However, a limited amount of code-switching was allowed during the conversations when necessary. Each conversation was anticipated to last for approximately 30 minutes. The researcher finally received 30 dyadic English conversations produced by the Thai participants, 30 dyadic English conversations produced by the Indonesian participants, and 30 dyadic English conversations provided by the Burmese participants, accounting for a total of 90 dyadic English conversations with an average length of 26.6 minutes. The researcher used the ELAN Program to transcribe the spoken data ^[25]. The ELAN Program follows the Extensible Markup Language (XML) format illustrated in **Appendix A Table A1** and allows for multiple layers of annotations of audio recordings ^[25]. A learner corpus entitled "The Corpus of Pragmatic Marker Combinations by Southeast Asian Learners" (CPMCSAL) was built; it contained a total of 578,637 tokens, allocated as follows: 172,284 tokens provided by the Thai participants, 206,493 tokens provided by the Indonesian participants, and 199,860 tokens provided by the Burmese participants.

3.2. Data Analysis

Following the completion of the transcription, the next step was to identify all the PMCs. The concept of PMs proposed by Brinton ^[13,14], in line with the one proposed by Fung and Carter ^[3], was used for the identification, as in example (5) below.

(5) TH10: She's not evil, *but like* not so nice.

The words *but* and *like* in example (5) were identified as PMs since they are phonologically short lexical items and mainly play a role in the functional domain. The word *so* in example (5) was not a PM because its semantic meaning was an adverb in this utterance. Two coders identified all the PMCs and the inter-coder reliability was 0.795, suggesting high reliability. The coders discussed each discrepancy to reach agreement.

The second step was to identify the function of each PM in each PMC according to Fung and Carter's functional domains ^[3]. The contextual environment of the given PMC assisted in the identification based on the corpus-driven approach ^[7,11]. Two coders identified the functions of the PMs in all the PMCs and the inter-coder reliability was 0.767, suggesting high reliability. Each discrepancy was discussed by the coders to reach agreement.

The final step was to identify the types of all the PMCs based on Cuenca and Crible's framework ^[9]. Two coders

identified the functions of the PMs in all the PMCs and the inter-coder reliability was 0.938, suggesting high reliability. The coders discussed each discrepancy to reach agreement. The raw frequencies (RFs) and proportions (P in %) of each PMC in all the PMCs that were found in this research are presented quantitatively to answer both RQs.

Three comments regarding the identification of PMs and PMCs must be mentioned here. First, the focus in this research was solely on the co-occurrences of two PMs since the co-occurrences of more than two PMs were identified as redundancy, displaying disfluency, or an unusually long thought process [8,9,19], as example (6) demonstrates.

(6) MM03: *And uh like / like uh like* noodle with those shrimps.

The present research included the PM *uh/um* following the recent studies of this PM and filled pauses that considered both L1 English speakers and EFL learners [6,12,19,26,27]. Instead of regarding the word *uh/um* as filler without any functions as was the case in early research, Kirjavainen et al. found that it could “function like fully fledged linguistic items” when used by L1 English speakers [26]. Moreover, the PM *uh/um* not only had the function of marking a self-repair, but was also used as a planner to indicate a speaker’s planning or thought process due to the unplanned nature of real-time, spoken interactions [6,27]. Hence, it was included as a PM in this research. Finally, Cuenca and Crible did not include the PM *you know* because it was mainly used as the filler in their research findings [9]. By contrast, this research

included *you know* as a PM because many recent studies have provided evidence of its multiple pragmatic functions in oral communication [3,8,17].

4. PMCs Used by Participants

In total, 1,924 PMCs were found in the CPMCSAL, accounting for 0.3% of all the tokens in the corpus. **Table 3** illustrates the RFs of each PMC and the proportions (P in %) of each PMC of all the PMCs in the CPMCSAL, as well as the RFs of each PM that occurred in the PMCs and the proportions (P in %) of each PM in all the PMCs that were found in the CPMCSAL.

Table 3 shows that, in total, 30 PMCs were used by the advanced-level EFL participants from the three southeast Asian countries. The most frequently used PMC was the PMC *and I think* (RFs = 165 with 8.6%), followed by the PMC *uh/um I think* (RFs = 158 with 8.2%) and *and when* (RF s = 152 with 7.9%). In total, 17 PMCs were included in the 30 PMCs. According to **Table 3**, the PM that occurred most frequently in the PMCs that the participants used was the PM *I think* (RFs = 720 at 37.4%), followed by the PMs *uh/um* (RFs = 684 at 35.6%) and *and* (RFs = 529 at 27.5%). These three most frequently used PMs in the PMCs all occurred in the three most frequently used PMCs, indicating that the advanced-level EFL participants tended to use these three PMs to produce co-occurrences of the PMs in English conversations.

Table 3. PMCs in CPMCSAL.

PMCs	RFs	P (%)	PMs	RFs	P (%)
<i>and I think</i>	165	8.6	<i>I think</i>	720	37.4
<i>uh/um I think</i>	158	8.2			
<i>and when</i>	152	7.9	<i>uh/um</i>	684	35.6
<i>I think uh/um</i>	140	7.3			
<i>but when</i>	124	6.4	<i>and</i>	529	27.5
<i>and uh/um</i>	110	5.7			
<i>uh/um like</i>	105	5.5	<i>like</i>	416	21.6
<i>oh OK</i>	101	5.2			
<i>but I think</i>	95	4.9	<i>but</i>	305	15.9
<i>so I think</i>	89	4.6			
<i>and like</i>	83	4.3	<i>when</i>	276	14.3
<i>so if</i>	75	3.9			
<i>well I think</i>	73	3.8	<i>so</i>	166	8.6
<i>like uh/um</i>	70	3.6			
<i>yeah like</i>	62	3.2	<i>well</i>	144	7.5
<i>I mean uh/um</i>	57	3.0			
<i>but actually</i>	51	2.7	<i>oh</i>	113	5.9
<i>uh/um well</i>	44	2.3			
<i>like yeah</i>	38	2.0	<i>OK</i>	103	5.4
<i>but because</i>	35	1.8			
<i>and then</i>	19	1.0	<i>yeah</i>	100	5.2
<i>I mean like</i>	17	0.9			
<i>you know like</i>	15	0.8	<i>I mean</i>	88	4.6
<i>well like</i>	14	0.7			
<i>oh like</i>	12	0.6	<i>if</i>	80	4.2
<i>well I mean</i>	9	0.5			

Table 3. Cont.

PMCs	RFs	P (%)	PMs	RFs	P (%)
<i>I mean if</i>	5	0.3	<i>actually</i>	51	2.7
<i>well you know</i>	2	0.1	<i>because</i>	37	1.9
<i>OK so</i>	2	0.1	<i>then</i>	19	1.0
<i>well because</i>	2	0.1	<i>you know</i>	17	0.9
<i>all</i>	1924	100			

5. PMCs Used by Thai Participants

The Thai advanced-level EFL participants used a total of 458 PMCs in the 30 dyadic English conversations. **Table 4** illustrates the types of the PMCs that the Thai participants used, with each PMC's RFs and the proportion of each PMC of all the PMCs used by the Thai participants.

Table 4 reflects the phenomenon of the English PMCs that the Thai participants used; the juxtaposition type was used most often, with 237 RFs (51.7%). The addition sub-type, in combination with different functions of both PMs in the PMCs, was the second most frequent PMC that the Thai participants used, with 109 RFs (23.8%), while the composition sub-type in combination was the third most frequently used PMC by the Thai participants, with 103 RFs (22.5%). Only the PMC *but actually* belonged to the addition sub-type in which both PMs shared the same scope and had compatible yet distinct functions (RFs = 9). This shows that the Thai advanced-level EFL participants mainly used the PMCs for different functions and with scope over the utterances in English conversations.

In the juxtaposition type, the three PMCs that the Thai participants used most frequently were the PMCs *and when* (RFs = 41), *uh/um like* (RFs = 38), and *and like* (RFs = 36). The functions and the scopes over the utterances of both PMs in a juxtaposed PMC differed ^[9], as shown in the three examples below.

- (7) TH13 (00:12:06)
 <TH13 key="declaration">
 1 My friend just also stopped to see it.
 <TH14 key="question">
 2 Is it a real snake?
 <TH13 key="response" key="PMC">
 3 Yes, it is, **and when** it moved quickly to the [the near the road, we just shouted!
- (8) TH25 (00:18:39)
 <TH25 key="question">
 1 Why don't you ask teacher directly?
 <TH26 key="response" key="PMC">
 2 **Um** <pause / 2.7s> **like** directly, it's not polite.
- (9) TH08 (00:11:34)
 <TH08 key="question">
 1 Did you check this game already?
 <TH26 key="response" key="PMC">
 2 Yeah, it's just OK, **and like** easy, very simple and low-level to me.

In (7), the participants were discussing a snake that one participant and her friend had accidentally encountered on the road. After TH13 responded to the prior question with "yes, it is" in Line 3, she quickly used the PM *and* to indicate additional information in the referential domain, serving the entire utterance ^[12], followed by the PM *when* leading the clause immediately after it to indicate the temporal condition in the referential domain ^[28]. In (8), the participants were discussing the relationship between students and teachers. To answer the question in Line 1, TH26 first inserted the PM *um* with a 2.7-second unfilled pause. This pause was overtly longer than any of the other pauses between any random words uttered by TH26 in the given context, suggesting a thought process for the up-coming utterance in the cognitive domain ^[26]. The PM *like* followed the PM *um* and the unfilled pause with a repetition of the word "directly" uttered by the prior speaker TH25 in the question, reflecting the emphasis on this word by using the PM *like* ^[7,29]. Similar to the situation in (7), TH26 in (9) first responded to the prior speaker, followed by the PM *and* to indicate more information, serving the entire subsequent utterance. The PM *like* was used after the PM *and* to allocate focus to the word "easy" ^[7]. Both PMs in the PMCs in the three examples above had different functions and scopes over different utterances. Hence, they were identified as the juxtaposition type.

By contrast, the PM *and* was also used in the addition sub-type in combination with the PM *I think* to serve different functions but in the same utterance, as example (10) below demonstrates.

- (10) TH25 (00:27:43)
 <TH25 key="declaration">
 1 Yeah, this should be changed.
 <TH26 key="declaration" key="PMC">
 2 Yeah, it should, **and I think** it not only benefits us but the whole society.

In (10), the participants were discussing the change in the transportation system in Bangkok. In Line 2, TH26 first used "yeah" to echo the prior utterance. The PMs *and* and *I think* overtly served the same utterance, but had different functions. The PM *and* indicates additional information added to the prior agreement in the referential domain, whereas the PM *I think* indicates a personal stance regarding the benefit of the change in the transportation system in the cognitive domain. In fact, all the PMs *I think* that occurred in

the addition sub-type in combination (displayed in **Table 4**) had this function ^[30].

In contrast to the use of the PM *I think* to indicate a personal stance, the PM *I think* in the composition sub-type in combination was used in the cognitive domain with the PM *uh/um*, as both examples below demonstrate.

- (11) TH37 (00:17:46)
<TH37 key="declaration">
1 This plan may be not very good, not so perfect I mean.
<TH38 key="declaration" key="PMC">
2 *Um* <pause / 3.8s> *I think* <pause / 2.9s> we can change the middle part first, here.
- (12) TH39 (00:06:35)
<TH39 key="question">
1 What did you do after the club last week?
<TH40 key="response" key="PMC">
2 After the club, *I think* <pause / 4.5s> *uh* <pause / 3.1s> I went here, I don't know.
- In (11), the participants were discussing their plan for

an up-coming presentation. Both the PMs *um* and *I think* with long unfilled pauses suggest that TH38 was thinking about how to change the plan, as he stated "we can change the middle part first, here" after the PM *um I think* in Line 2. In (12), the use of the PMC *I think uh* with unfilled pauses indicates that TH40 was thinking about where he had gone after the club in response to the prior question in Line 1. Based on the contexts of both examples illustrated above, it may not be correct to evaluate the use of both PMCs as the EFL participants' disfluency because the use of both PMCs in the given contexts reflects the cognitive processes of the speakers: to think about the change in the plan in (11) and how to answer the question in (12) ^[12,19,27]. Moreover, the PM *I think* was found to be a PM that indicated thought processes in real-time spoken interactions in both L1 English speakers' and EFL learners' utterances ^[3,12,19]. Hence, both the PMs having the same functions led to the composition type of the PMCs illustrated above.

Table 4. Types of PMCs Used by Thai Advanced-Level EFL Participants.

Types	RFs	PM 1	PM 2 with RFs	P (%)
juxtaposition	77	<i>and</i>	<i>when</i> (41) <i>like</i> (36)	9.0 7.9
	42	<i>but</i>	<i>when</i> (25) <i>because</i> (17)	5.5 3.7
	38	<i>uh/um</i>	<i>like</i> (38)	8.3
	23	<i>so</i>	<i>if</i> (23)	5.0
	20	<i>yeah</i>	<i>like</i> (20)	4.4
	11	<i>I mean</i>	<i>like</i> (11)	2.4
	10	<i>oh</i>	<i>like</i> (10)	2.2
	8	<i>well</i>	<i>like</i> (8)	1.7
	8	<i>you know</i>	<i>like</i> (8)	1.7
	237	all juxtaposition		51.7
addition (same scope, different functions)	54	<i>and</i>	<i>I think</i> (54)	11.8
	36	<i>so</i>	<i>I think</i> (36)	7.9
	19	<i>but</i>	<i>I think</i> (19)	4.1
	109	all addition in combination		23.8
addition (same scope, compatible but distinct functions)	9	<i>but</i>	<i>actually</i> (9)	2.0
	9	all addition with compatible but distinct functions		2.0
composition in combination	48	<i>uh/um</i>	<i>I think</i> (48)	10.5
	39	<i>I think</i>	<i>uh/um</i> (39)	8.5
	8	<i>like</i>	<i>uh/um</i> (8)	1.7
	5	<i>and</i>	<i>uh/um</i> (5)	1.1
	3	<i>like</i>	<i>yeah</i> (3)	0.7
	103	all composition in combination		22.5
total	458			100

6. PMCs Used by Indonesian Participants

The Indonesian advanced-level EFL participants used a total of 963 PMCs in English conversations. **Table 5** illustrates the types of the PMCs that the Indonesian

participants used, with each PMC's RFs and the proportion of each PMC of all the PMCs that the Indonesian participants used.

The Indonesian participants used PMCs the most frequently of all the participants from the three southeast Asian countries. As was the case for the Thai participants,

the Indonesian participants used the juxtaposition type most often, with RFs of 372 (38.6%). By contrast, the Indonesian participants used the composition sub-type at the second highest frequencies, with RFs of 339 (35.2%). The addition sub-type with different functions of the PMs in the PMCs was used the third highest frequencies with RFs of 227 (23.6%), whereas the other addition sub-type was used the least, with RFs of 25 (2.6%). The most frequently used PMCs in the juxtaposition type were the PMCs *and when* (RFs = 81), *oh OK* (RFs = 73), and *but when* (RFs = 66). Compared to the Thai participants who did not use the PMC *oh OK*, the Indonesian participants used this PMC very frequently, as example (13) below demonstrates.

- (13) IN23 (00:28:24)
 <IN23 key="question">
 1 How so how [how should we manage it?
 <IN24 key="response" key="PMC">
 2 **Oh** <pause / 3.7s> **OK** we can probably finish this part using Python first.

The participants in (13) were solving a problem related to their studies while using their computers, as mentioned in the previous context. In Line 2, IN24 first used the PM *oh* to indicate a response to the prior question in the interpersonal domain. An unfilled pause occurred after the PM *oh*, indicating that IN24 was thinking about how to answer the question in Line 1^[6]. Subsequently, the PM *OK* was inserted in the following utterance in Line 2 to signal to the hearer that he knew the answer, marking the start of the new utterance^[12]. Accordingly, the PM *oh* played an interactive role to signal the speaker's understanding of the prior question while responding to it, indicating an interpersonal relationship^[8]. By contrast, the PM *OK* had a structural purpose in the up-coming utterance. Hence, the PMC *oh OK* was identified as the juxtaposition type with different functions and scopes over the utterances.

Compared to the Thai participants, the Indonesian participants used the PMC *and uh/um* much more often to display their thought processes, as example (14) below demonstrates.

- (14) IN30 (00:12:09)
 <IN30 key="question">
 1 Alright, you didn't play with your classmate also?
 <IN31 key="response" key="PMC">

- 2 No, I just <pause / 2.6s> do my own stuff <pause / 3.5s>, **and** <pause / 3.2s> **um** <pause / 2.8s> didn't wanna talk with them cause they don't understand me.

The participants in (14) were discussing their lives when they were attending high school. IN31 mentioned that she did not have any real friends in the previous context. After IN30 proposed the question in Line 1, IN31's tone showed hesitation and the speed of her lexical production was slower than it was prior to this co-text. These behaviors indicate that IN31 was thinking about what she was like in high school to answer the prior question. Unfilled pauses were found in the region of the PMC *and um*, indicating the thought process. As previous research findings indicated that the PM *and* not only indicated the addition of more information but also assisted the speaker to manage the utterances in unprepared spoken interactions^[12,22], the PMs *and* and *um* in this context had combined functions to indicate the speaker's plan for the up-coming utterance.

Compared to the Thai participants who only used the PMC *uh/um I think* to indicate thought processes, the Indonesian participants used it as the addition sub-type (RFs = 56) in which both the PMs had different functions, as shown in example (15) below.

- (15) IN19 (00:18:32)
 <IN19 key="declaration">
 1 I maybe need to ask the local people.
 <IN20 key="declaration" key="PMC">
 2 **Um** <pause / 3.8s> **I think** you can just Google.

In (15), IN19 had some problems with certain traditions in the Thai culture; thus, he intended to ask local Thai people about them, as stated in Line 1. Based on the audio recording, IN20 lengthened the sound of the PM *um* with a long unfilled pause, indicating that she was planning an up-coming utterance to respond IN19's concerns. Subsequently, she quickly provided her suggestion by using the PM *I think* to indicate her personal stance regarding IN19's concern. In contrast to the use of *um*, the speaker did not have any hesitations or pauses when initiating the utterance starting with the PM *I think*, indicating that the use of the PM *I think* was to express a personal stance^[3,23]. Hence, both the PMs *um* and *I think* had different functions while serving the same utterance.

Table 5. Types of PMCs used by Indonesian advanced-level EFL participants.

Types	RFs	PM 1	PM 2 with RFs	P (%)
juxtaposition	115	<i>and</i>	<i>when</i> (81) <i>like</i> (34)	8.4 3.5
	83	<i>but</i>	<i>when</i> (66) <i>because</i> (17)	6.9 1.8
	75	<i>oh</i>	<i>OK</i> (73) <i>like</i> (2)	7.6 0.2
	38	<i>so</i>	<i>if</i> (38)	3.9
	29	<i>yeah</i>	<i>like</i> (29)	3.0
	12	<i>uh/um</i>	<i>like</i> (12)	1.2
	6	<i>I mean</i>	<i>like</i> (6)	0.6

Table 5. Cont.

Types	RFs	PM 1	PM 2 with RFs	P (%)
juxtaposition	5	<i>well</i>	<i>like</i> (5)	0.5
	5	<i>you know</i>	<i>like</i> (5)	0.5
	2	<i>OK</i>	<i>so</i> (2)	0.2
	2	<i>well</i>	<i>because</i> (2)	0.2
	372	all juxtaposition		38.6
addition (same scope, different functions)	84	<i>and</i>	<i>I think</i> (84)	8.7
	56	<i>but</i>	<i>I think</i> (56)	5.8
	55	<i>uh/um</i>	<i>I think</i> (55)	5.7
	32	<i>so</i>	<i>I think</i> (32)	3.3
	227	all addition with different functions		23.6
addition (same scope, compatible but distinct functions)	12	<i>but</i>	<i>actually</i> (12)	1.2
	11	<i>and</i>	<i>then</i> (11)	1.1
	2	<i>well</i>	<i>you know</i> (2)	0.2
	25	all addition with compatible but distinct functions		2.6
composition in combination	91	<i>uh/um</i>	<i>I think</i> (36)	3.7
			<i>well</i> (29)	3.0
			<i>like</i> (26)	2.7
	78	<i>I think</i>	<i>uh/um</i> (78)	8.1
	74	<i>and</i>	<i>uh/um</i> (74)	7.7
	41	<i>like</i>	<i>yeah</i> (21)	2.2
			<i>uh/um</i> (20)	2.1
	29	<i>well</i>	<i>I think</i> (25)	2.6
			<i>I mean</i> (4)	0.4
	26	<i>I mean</i>	<i>uh/um</i> (26)	2.7
total	963	all composition in combination		35.2
				100

7. PMCs Used by Burmese Participants

The Burmese advanced-level EFL participants used a total of 503 PMCs in the 30 dyadic English conversations. Table 6 illustrates the types of the PMCs that the Burmese participants used, with each PMC's RFs and the proportion of each PMC of all the PMCs used by the Burmese participants.

Unlike both the Thai and Indonesian participants, the Burmese participants used the composition sub-type in combination most frequently, with RFs of 246 (48.9%) in almost half of the PMCs that the Burmese participants used. In addition, the Burmese participants actually used different PMCs as planners to plan the utterances in conversations, in which the PMC *well I think* was used most frequently (RFs = 48). However, not all the PMCs *well I think* were used as planners, as the example below demonstrates.

- (16) MM35 (00:17:24)
 <MM35 key="declaration">
 <MM35 key="irritating, rapid speed">
 1 You think it's OK for him to do this?
 <MM36 key="declaration" key="PMC">
 2 **Well I think** it's not that bad, cause he's actually didn't know her situation.

This was an interesting instance because the participants in (16) were reading a news article in which a man shouted at a young woman to demand that she gave her seat to an old lady. What he did not know was that the young woman had just been informed that she was seriously ill with cancer, resulting in her having no energy or inclination to give her seat away on the bus. Based on the irritated tone and the rapid speed of the utterance in Line 1, MM35 was annoyed at this man's behavior. To mitigate the potential tension that MM35 created at that moment, MM36 immediately used the PMC *well I think* to decrease MM35's irritation using the statement "it's not that bad," followed by providing a rational reason in Line 2. As both the PMs *well* and *I think* were found to have the functions of mitigators or hedges when the speaker detected tension^[2,15], the PMC *well I think* was used to decrease MM35's annoyance.

Thus, the Burmese participants used the juxtaposition type and the addition sub-type with different functions of PMs as the second and third most frequently used types of PMCs, similar to both the Thai and Indonesian participants. Examples included the PMCs *but when* (RFs = 33) in the juxtaposition type and the PMC *and I think* (RFs = 27) in the addition sub-type with different functions. Although the addition sub-type in which the co-occurring PMs had compatible yet distinct functions was also used least often,

the PMC *but actually* was used most often by the Burmese participants (RFs = 30) compared to the Thai (RFs = 9) and Indonesian participants (RFs = 12), as example (17) below demonstrates.

- (17) MM12 (00:10:45)
 <MM12 key="declaration">
 1 You wanna come with us for dinner?
 <MM11 key="declaration" key="PMC">
 2 Oh I really want to, *but actually* I must finish my assignment by tonight.

The use of the PMC *but actually* reflects type of PMC in which the first PM has a general meaning and the second PM has a specific meaning ^[7,31]. In (17), MM11 attempted to reject the invitation in Line 1. The first PM *but* denoted a general contrast to the prior utterance "oh I really want to," and the second PM *actually* reinforced the contrast to provide specification ^[1,9]. Hence, the functions of both the PMs *but* and *actually* had the same contrastive function, but their nuanced functions were distinct.

Table 6. Types of PMCs used by Burmese advanced-level EFL participants.

Types	RFs	PM 1	PM 2 with RFs	P (%)
juxtaposition	43	<i>and</i>	<i>when</i> (30) <i>like</i> (13)	6.0 2.6
	34	<i>but</i>	<i>when</i> (33) <i>because</i> (1)	6.6 0.2
	28	<i>oh</i>	<i>OK</i> (28)	5.6
	14	<i>so</i>	<i>if</i> (14)	2.8
	13	<i>yeah</i>	<i>like</i> (13)	2.6
	5	<i>I mean</i>	<i>if</i> (5)	1.0
	2	<i>you know</i>	<i>like</i> (2)	0.4
	1	<i>well</i>	<i>like</i> (1)	0.2
	140	all juxtaposition		27.8
addition (same scope, different functions)	27	<i>and</i>	<i>I think</i> (27)	5.4
	21	<i>so</i>	<i>I think</i> (21)	4.2
	20	<i>but</i>	<i>I think</i> (20)	4.0
	11	<i>uh/um</i>	<i>I think</i> (11)	2.2
	79	all addition with different functions		15.7
addition (same scope, compatible but distinct functions)	30	<i>but</i>	<i>actually</i> (30)	6.0
	8	<i>and</i>	<i>then</i> (8)	1.6
	38	all addition with compatible but distinct functions		7.6
composition in combination	57	<i>uh/um</i>	<i>like</i> (29)	6.0
			<i>well</i> (15)	3.0
			<i>I think</i> (8)	1.6
			<i>I mean</i> (5)	1.0
	56	<i>like</i>	<i>uh/um</i> (42)	8.3
			<i>yeah</i> (14)	2.8
			<i>I think</i> (48)	10.0
			<i>uh/um</i> (31)	6.2
	31	<i>I mean</i>	<i>uh/um</i> (31)	6.2
			<i>uh/um</i> (23)	4.6
	246	all composition in combination		48.9
total	503			100

8. Discussion

The research aim was to identify all the PMCs and the types of the PMCs that the Thai, Indonesian, and Burmese advanced-level EFL participants used in dyadic English conversations. All the PMCs and the types of the PMCs used by the Thai, Indonesian, and Burmese participants were presented in detail in **Tables 4–6**. In this section, the intention is to further investigate whether there were any patterns and/or differences in the use of PMCs by the participants from the three southeast Asian countries in order to understand their use of PMCs comprehensively. First,

Table 7 lists the ten most frequent PMCs that the Thai, Indonesian, and Burmese participants used. It also lists the six most frequently used PMs in the position of the first PM in a PMC, the six most frequently used PMs in the position of the second PM in a PMC, and the six most frequent PMs that occurred in the PMCs. The criteria for the cut-off point here are that the different lists in **Table 7** mainly include the 15 most frequently used PMCs and the ten most frequently used PMs in the PMCs that were found in the CPMCSAL listed in **Table 3**.

As shown in **Table 7**, only three PMCs were used by all the participants from the three southeast Asian countries,

namely the PMCs *but when*, *and when*, and *uh/um like*. It is noted that the Thai and Indonesian participants used the same six PMCs at high frequencies, which differed from the use of PMCs by the Burmese participants; these PMCs were *and I think*, *uh/um I think*, *and when*, *but when*, *I think uh/um*, and *uh/um like*. This was revealed by the different types of PMCs that the Burmese participants used, as they used more PMCs that included the PM *uh/um* as planners in the composition sub-type. By contrast, similar patterns could clearly be identified in the participants' use of individual PMs. The participants from the three southeast Asian countries used the same PMs as the first PM in the PMCs most often, namely the PMs *and*, *uh/um*, and *but*. In addition, the participants from the three southeast Asian countries used the same four PMs as the second PMs in the PMCs most often, namely the PMs *I think*, *uh/um*, *like*, and *when*. These six PMs were the most frequently used PMs in the PMCs listed in both **Table 3** and **Table 7**. In line with several previous studies, the PMs *and* and *but* were only used as the first PM in the PMCs in the referential domain to provide additional information or to indicate a contrastive relationship [9,12,21,28]. Both PMs are used frequently in different spoken genres [22,23], while the present research findings further established that both the PMs were frequently used as the first PM in the PMCs in the participants' utterances, while the PMs *I think*, *like*, and *when* tended to be used as the second PMs in the PMCs. This may have been due to their pragmatic functions concerning the daily English conversations used in this research, which are directly linked to the up-coming utterances, such as the indication of a personal stance via the PM *I think*, and the expression of the temporal condition indicated by the PM *when* [11,16,29]. Hence, the use of PMCs for different functions reflects functional and communicative purposes of EFL

learners [32]. From the functional sentence perspective, EFL learners tended to use certain PMCs, such as *and I think* and *uh/um I think* to routinize their different communicative purposes [32].

Two major differences in the use of the PMCs were found in the Thai, Indonesian, and Burmese advanced-level EFL participants' utterances. First, the Indonesian participants used a total of 31 PMs in the PMCs, and the Burmese participants used 26 PMs in the PMCs. The Thai participants used the least number of PMs in the PMCs, which was 20 PMs. Furthermore, the Indonesian participants used the PMCs at the highest frequencies, whereas the Thai participants used them the least. The Indonesian participants used more PMCs of the juxtaposition type, such as the PMCs *and when*, *oh OK*, and *but when* [23], more PMCs with the PM *uh/um* to indicate the thought process in the composition sub-type, and more PMCs that included the PM *I think* to indicate personal stances in the addition sub-type regarding the different functions of the individual PMs [12]. The Burmese participants used the PMCs in the composition sub-type most often, while the Thai and Indonesian participants used the PMCs in the juxtaposition type most frequently. These differences reflect the discrepancy in the use of the PMCs by the participants with different L1 backgrounds regarding both the frequencies and the types. In line with Pan's study in which the Indonesian EFL participants used PMs most often compared to the Thai and Chinese EFL participants [12], it appeared that the Indonesian EFL learners tended to rely on the PMs and PMCs for different pragmatic functions more often than the participants with other L1 backgrounds in English conversations did. By contrast, the Burmese participants relied on PMCs more for planning the utterances in oral communication compared to the other functions.

Table 7. Different frequencies of PMs and PMCs.

TH		IN		MM	
PMC	RFs	PMC	RFs	PMC	RFs
<i>and I think</i>	54	<i>uh/um I think</i>	91	<i>well I think</i>	48
<i>uh/um I think</i>	48	<i>and I think</i>	84	<i>like uh/um</i>	42
<i>and when</i>	41	<i>and when</i>	81	<i>but when</i>	33
<i>I think uh/um</i>	39	<i>I think uh/um</i>	78	<i>and uh/um</i>	31
<i>uh/um like</i>	38	<i>and uh/um</i>	74	<i>I mean uh/um</i>	31
<i>and like</i>	36	<i>oh OK</i>	73	<i>and when</i>	30
<i>so I think</i>	36	<i>but when</i>	66	<i>but actually</i>	30
<i>but when</i>	25	<i>but I think</i>	56	<i>uh/um like</i>	29
<i>so if</i>	23	<i>uh/um like</i>	38	<i>oh OK</i>	28
PM1	RFs	PM1	RFs	PM1	RFs
<i>and</i>	136	<i>and</i>	284	<i>and</i>	109
<i>uh/um</i>	86	<i>uh/um</i>	206	<i>but</i>	84
<i>but</i>	70	<i>but</i>	151	<i>uh/um</i>	76
<i>so</i>	59	<i>I think</i>	78	<i>like</i>	56
<i>I think</i>	39	<i>oh</i>	73	<i>well</i>	49
<i>yeah</i>	20	<i>so</i>	72	<i>I mean</i>	36
PM2	RFs	PM2	RFs	PM2	RFs
<i>I think</i>	157	<i>I think</i>	324	<i>I think</i>	143
<i>like</i>	131	<i>uh/um</i>	198	<i>uh/um</i>	127

Table 7. Cont.

TH		IN		MM	
PM2	RFs	PM2	RFs	PM2	RFs
<i>when</i>	66	<i>when</i>	147	<i>when</i>	63
<i>uh/um</i>	52	<i>like</i>	131	<i>like</i>	58
<i>if</i>	23	<i>OK</i>	73	<i>actually</i>	30
<i>because</i>	17	<i>if</i>	38	<i>OK</i>	28
all	RFs	all	RFs	all	RFs
<i>I think</i>	196	<i>uh/um</i>	404	<i>uh/um</i>	203
<i>like</i>	142	<i>I think</i>	402	<i>I think</i>	166
<i>uh/um</i>	138	<i>and</i>	284	<i>like</i>	114
<i>and</i>	136	<i>like</i>	172	<i>and</i>	109
<i>but</i>	70	<i>but</i>	151	<i>but</i>	84
<i>when</i>	66	<i>when</i>	147	<i>well</i>	64

9. Conclusion

The current empirical study revealed that the advanced-level EFL learners with different L1 backgrounds from the three southeast Asian countries used several of the same PMs in the co-occurrences in different types. Theoretically, this indicates that the participants with different L1 backgrounds used PMCs in English conversations for a range of purposes. Different uses of the PMCs were also identified, suggesting the diverse uses of the PMCs by the EFL learners with different L1 backgrounds, which echoes the results regarding the use of PMs in previous research ^[4]. In addition, the PMCs should be pedagogically concerned with the PMs in the process of teaching and learning English. Interview questions or English conversations can be used for assessing EFL learners' use of PMCs. Since this research only included participants from three southeast Asian countries and little research has focused on the PMCs used by EFL learners thus far, more research on the use of PMCs by EFL participants with different L1 backgrounds should be conducted.

Funding

This work did not receive any funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Institutional Review Board of Mahidol University with approval number [COA2025/084.1402].

Informed Consent Statement

Written informed consent has been obtained from the patient(s) to publish this paper.

Data Availability Statement

Data involved in this research are confidential due to the ethical concern.

Acknowledgments

I wish to extend my sincere gratitude to all the participants who have been involved in my several projects, including this research.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Table A1. XML Conventions.

<>	XML format for decoding information
[repetition of the same word
<pause />	longer pause
“ ”	the type of the utterance
key=	exhibition of the annotation

References

- [1] Buysse, L., 2020. 'It was a bit stressy as well actually'. The pragmatic markers actually and in fact in spoken learner English. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 156, 28–40. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.11.004>
- [2] Di Ferrante, L., 2021. Transitioning between small talk and work talk through discourse markers: evidence from a workplace spoken corpus. *Brno Studies in English*. 2, 7–30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5817/bse2021-2-2>
- [3] Fung, L., Carter, R., 2007. Discourse Markers and Spoken English: Native and Learner Use in Pedagogic Settings. *Applied Linguistics*. 28(3), 410–439. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm030>
- [4] Xiao, H.-Z., Dai, C.-Y., Dong, L.-Z., 2021. The development of interlanguage pragmatic markers in alignment with role relationships. *Pragmatics*. 31(4), 617–646. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.20013.xia>
- [5] Crible, L., Degand, L., 2021. Co-occurrence and ordering of discourse markers in sequences: A multifactorial study in spoken French. *Journal of*

- Pragmatics. 177, 18–28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.02.006>
- [6] Crible, L., Pascual, E., 2020. Combinations of discourse markers with repairs and repetitions in English, French and Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 156, 54–67. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.05.002>
- [7] Blanchard, M., Buysse, L., 2021. Like in Discourse Marker Combinations in Spoken Interaction. *Corpus Pragmatics*. 5(4), 463–485. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-021-00105-4>
- [8] Haselow, A., 2019. Discourse marker sequences: Insights into the serial order of communicative tasks in real-time turn production. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 146, 1–18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.04.003>
- [9] Cuenca, M.J., Crible, L., 2019. Co-occurrence of discourse markers in English: From juxtaposition to composition. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 140, 171–184. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.12.001>
- [10] Huang, L., 2018. A Corpus-Based Exploration of the Discourse Marker Well in Spoken Interlanguage. *Language and Speech*. 62(3), 570–593. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830918798863>
- [11] Öztürk, Y., Durmuşoğlu Köse, G., 2020. “Well (er) You Know ...”: Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native Spoken English. *Corpus Pragmatics*. 5(2), 223–242. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-020-00095-9>
- [12] Pan, Z., 2024. The Use of English Pragmatic Markers by Learners of English from Different Linguacultural Backgrounds. *Contrastive Pragmatics*, 1–28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/26660393-bja10120>
- [13] Brinton, L.J., 2008. *The comment clause in English: Syntactic origins and pragmatic development*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [14] Brinton, L.J., 2017. *The evolution of pragmatic markers in English*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [15] Aijmer, K., 2011. Well I’m not sure I think... The use of well by non-native speakers. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*. 16(2), 231–254. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.16.2.04aij>
- [16] Diskin, C., 2017. The use of the discourse-pragmatic marker ‘like’ by native and non-native speakers of English in Ireland. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 120, 144–157. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.08.004>
- [17] Vine, B., Holmes, J., 2023. Doing leadership in style: Pragmatic markers in New Zealand workplace interaction. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. 20(1), 1–27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2023-0001>
- [18] Crible, L., Blackwell, S.E., 2020. Introduction: Discourse-pragmatic markers in speech and sign. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 156, 24–27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.09.002>
- [19] Pan, Z., 2025. Thai EFL learners’ use of the discourse marker like in discourse marker combinations. *Ampersand*. 14, 100222. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2025.100222>
- [20] Koops, C., Lohmann, A., 2022. Explaining reversible discourse marker sequences: A case study of and and so. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 191, 156–171. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.01.014>
- [21] Shirtz, S., 2021. And now, co-occurrence and functionality of discourse markers on the Oregon Coast. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 185, 164–175. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.09.001>
- [22] Vickov, G., Jakupčević, E., 2020. Discourse Marker Clusters in the Classroom Discourse of Native and Non-Native EFL Teachers. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*. 19(3), 310–328. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.3.17>
- [23] Rahayu, T., Aziz, M., Permatasari, I., et al., 2021. Discourse Markers in EFL Student Presentations. *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Economics, Business and Social Humanities, ICONEBS 2020; November 4–5, 2020; Madiun, Indonesia*.
- [24] Council of Europe, 2020. *Common European Framework of Reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment-companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing: Strasbourg, France.
- [25] Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Language Archive, 2024. ELAN (MacOS Version) [Computer software]. Available from: <https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan>
- [26] Kirjavainen, M., Crible, L., Beeching, K., 2021. Can filled pauses be represented as linguistic items? Investigating the effect of exposure on the perception and production of um. *Language and Speech*. 65(2), 263–289. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00238309211011201>
- [27] Tonetti Tübben, I., Landert, D., 2022. Uh and Um as Pragmatic Markers in Dialogues: A Contrastive Perspective on the Functions of Planners in Fiction and Conversation. *Contrastive Pragmatics*. 4(2), 350–381. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/26660393-bja10049>
- [28] Cuenca, M.-J., Marín, M.-J., 2009. Co-occurrence of discourse markers in Catalan and Spanish oral narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 41(5), 899–914. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.08.010>
- [29] Ament, J., Páres, J.B., Pérez-Vidal, C., 2020. A study on the functional uses of textual pragmatic markers by native speakers and English-medium instruction learners. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 156, 41–53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.09.009>
- [30] Pan, Z., Aroonmanakun, W., 2022. A corpus-based study on the use of spoken discourse markers by Thai EFL learners. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*. 15(2), 187–213.
- [31] Lohmann, A., Koops, C., 2022. Pragmatic marker combinations: Introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 196, 1–5. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.04.005>
- [32] Lo, N.P.K., 2024. From Structuralism to Interpretation: Revisiting the Prague School’s Theoretical Legacy. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 6(6), 1029–1042. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i6.7477>