MEESO
OPEN ACCESS
http://dx.doi.org/10.18095/meeso.2018.19.1.02
Modern English Education, **Vol. 19, No. 1, Spring 2018**

Analysis of the Discourse Marker *Well* in High School Practical English Conversation Textbooks

JeeHee An
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

An, JeeHee. (2018). Analysis of the discourse marker *well* in high school practical English conversation textbooks. *Modern English Education, 19*(1), 16-28.

This paper investigates the discourse marker (DM hereafter) well in five high school practical English conversation textbooks used in the 7th curriculum revised in 2009 in Korea. The DM well is a topic that has been studied by many linguists. This study divided the subcategories of well into seven functions that were frequently discussed and examined wells in practical English conversation textbooks: face threat mitigation marker, frame marker, insufficiency marker, opinion marker, quotative marker, repair marker, and turn management marker. As a result, turn management markers showed the highest frequency in practical English conversation textbooks, followed by face threat mitigation markers, insufficiency markers and opinion markers, respectively. On the other hand, the quotative marker and the repair marker were not found in the textbooks at all. It is a natural phenomenon that learners who learn English as a foreign language make mistakes during conversation and correct the mistake. Therefore, by presenting various functions of the DMs such as the repair marker, the learners will be able to use them in actual conversation.

[discourse marker/English conversation/textbooks/
담화표지/영어회화/교과서]

Received 14 December 2017
Revised 26 January 2018
Accepted 12 February 2018

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Secondary

JeeHee An
Department of English Linguistics
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107, Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 02450
Tel: (02) 2173-2266
Email: jeeheean@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Discourse Markers (DMs) have received a lot of attention in pragmatics (Fraser, 1990; Levinson, 1983; Müller, 2005; Schiffrin, 1987). There are several other definitions for DMs. Schiffrin defined the DMs as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 31). Schourup (1985) said a DM is "a linguistic item" representing the moment when a speaker says to be involved in what he or she thinks (p. 26). According to Redeker (1990), DMs are used to signal there is a connection to the utterance to "the immediate context" (p. 372). Fraser (1990) defined DMs are "expressions such as *now, well, so, however,* and *then,* which signal a sequential relationship between the current basic message and the previous discourse" (p. 383).

DMs have the same meaning but are used in various terminologies, which are discourse particles (Aijmer, 2002; Schourup, 1985), discourse connectives (Blakemore, 1992), pragmatic markers (Andersen, 2001; Brinton, 1996; Fraser, 1996; Watts, 1988), and pragmatic operators (Ariel, 1994, 1998). Depending on the linguists, DMs have various definitions and functions as well as terminology. However, it seems apparent that most linguists studying DMs agree that DMs contribute to the pragmatic implications of speech and play an important role in speakers' pragmatic competence (White, 2014).

Proper usage of DMs is generally one of the main goals of learning English conversation skills in a foreign context. It is important for English as a foreign language (EFL hereafter) learners to understand how to use DMs correctly to make their English sound smooth and natural. According to Svartvik (1980), improper use of DMs such as *well* in conversation can lead to unfortunate consequences for successful communication than grammatical mistakes can do. Also, there are some arguments that teachers should examine discourse and apply it in their teaching (McCarthy, 1991). With a deeper understanding the proper use of DMs, teachers can help students understand English communication better and improve their English proficiency. It is necessary to present conversations as natural as possible in textbooks; moreover, it is important to verify whether the functions of DMs are well presented in English textbooks in Korea.

Unlike the DM *well* with various functions in native speakers' discourse, the functions of *well* did not seem to vary in Korean textbooks in the past. For example, a cursory examination of the DM *well* in five practical English conversation textbooks reveals that the functions of *well* are limited to only three cases (see APPENDIX for five textbooks): (i) when insufficient answers followed, (ii) when the speaker shifted the topic, and (iii) when the speaker wanted to indicate that he or she is currently thinking (J. H. Koo, 1995; M. K. Lim, 2014). In this situation, it is meaningful to examine the functions of *well* in discourse in the current English textbooks.

The aim of this paper is to examine whether *well* in the practical English conversation textbooks presents various functions in the same way as well in the native speakers' discourse presented by linguists. For this purpose, I will first try to find the conversations that have the token *well* in them, and then analyze the functions of the DM *well* in practical English conversation textbooks in the 7th education curriculum revised in 2009 in Korea. In order to establish the research focus, there are two research questions:

1) What functions of *well* exist in high-school practical English conversation textbooks?
2) How are the functional categories of *well* in practical English conversation textbooks in Korea different from *well* in native speakers' discourse proposed by linguists?

II. PREVIOUS STUDIES

1. The Discourse Marker *Well*

There are numerous studies on the DM *well,* which is one of the most frequently used markers following *yeah, oh,* and *and* (Aijmer, 2013; Bolinger, 1989; Jucker, 1993; Lakoff, 1973; Owen, 1981; Schiffrin, 1987; Schourup, 1985, 2001; Svartvik, 1980). In addition, *well* was studied in several perspectives including the Cooperative Principle, Politeness Theory and Relevance Theory.

Well is discussed in terms of cooperative principle like other DMs such as *so, anyway, actually, still, after all*, and the like (Lakoff, 1973). For example, Levinson (1983) argued that the speaker uses *well* when "the speaker is aware that he is unable to meet the requirements of the maxim of quantity in full" (p. 162). Grice (1975) argued that a kind of "cooperative principle" should work in order to interpret the words of others in communication (p. 45). In relation to Grice's maxim of quantity, the speaker precedes *well* when he or she thinks that he or she provides insufficient information about the question that he or she has received (Schiffrin, 1987).

Levinson (1983) described *wells* in the preferred and dispreferred structures[1] as follows: "Dispreferred seconds are marked by various kinds of structural complexity: (a) after some significant delay; (b) with some preface marking their dispreferred status, often the particle well; and (c) with some account of why the preferred second cannot be performed" (p. 307). According to the findings in this study, the preferred structure is non-marked because it is a natural structure, whereas the non-preference structure is an undesirable structure, so it is marked and predominantly prefaced to *well*.

Given that the dispreferred second is marked with *well*,

1 Here, the preferred structure and the dispreferred structure are not psychological concepts which mean the individual taste of the speaker or listener. Rather, it is a structural concept close to a linguistic concept (Levinson, 1983). For example, it is a structural concept that is natural for the other party to agree to a request or proposal.

well can be explained in terms of politeness. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness plays an active role in strengthening, maintaining and protecting face. Politeness is a compensation measure to offset the destructive efforts of the face threatening act (FTA hereafter). The Politeness Theory consists of three concepts: face, FTA and polite strategies.[2] In relation to the politeness strategy, the DM *well* signals that there will be a FTA in the following of an utterance and mitigates it (Jucker, 1993; Owen, 1981).

Well as a discourse marker can also be explained in the light of the Relevance Theory. The Relevance Theory explains the interpretation of speech as a concept of relevance based on the basic assumption of human cognition that wants to draw attention to information related to oneself (Sperber & Wilson, 1986). This is in line with the aspect of insufficiency proposed by Lakoff (1973). She asserted that the respondents seemed to use *well* when they knew that they did not directly provide the information the questioners wanted to know. This generalization implies that there are two main situations that cannot be answered starting with *well*. The first is when the answer is given directly. The second is when the questioner does not construct the answer to the question from the perspective of providing the information he or she is seeking. In the end, we can see that *well* is not used when a complete answer is provided or when information that is not relevant to the question is provided.

Jucker (1993) used Sperber and Wilson's (1986) Relevance Theory as a frame to describe the functions of the DM *well.* Sperber and Wilson assume that people have intuitions of relevance: they can consistently distinguish relevant from irrelevant information. Jucker argued that the Relevance Theory is the only theory that explains the uses of *well* in "human communication" (Jucker, 1993, p. 435). He said even though *well* is distinctively used, and each use is related to the essential meaning. The DM *well* is a sort of "signpost" (p. 435) which gives a direction where the following utterance should be processed. It is used when the previous utterance is "not the most relevant" (p. 440) to the next utterance.

Jucker (1993) categorized *well* into four functions: "(1) a marker of insufficiency; (2) a face-threat mitigator; (3) a frame making device indicating a topic change or introducing direct reported speech; and (4) a delay device" (p. 483). He reinterpreted the examples which were previously studied by Lakoff (1973), Owen (1981), Quirk, Greebaum, Leech, & Svartvik (1985), Svartvik (1980), Schiffrin (1987) and Watts (1988). He hypothesized that *well* prefaces in direct reported speech when the speaker of the current utterance and the speaker of the original utterance are the same. He argues that all uses of *well* are explained in a relevant context.

In addition to the Relevance Theory, the DM *well* is explained in terms of the accomplishment of conversational "coherence."

> *Well* can (i) be an interjection, filler, particle, hesitator, and initiator, (ii) begin turns, (iii) be a preclosing device, offering an opportunity to return to an earlier topic or to open a new one, (iv) shift talk toward topics of mutual concern, (v) preface insufficient answers to questions, and (vi) preface disagreements and dispreferred moves (Schiffrin, 1987, p, 102)

Schiffrin (1987) explained *well* based on the frame of question and answer pairs. *Well,* as a response marker, appeared more frequently after WH-questions than yes-no questions. In yes-no questions, *well* seldom preceded when respondents gave confirmation (4%) or negation (1%). Rather, *well* preceded other options (48%).

2. Discourse Markers in English Textbooks in Korea

Among the analysis of the DMs in English textbooks in Korea, the studies of J. H. Koo (1995), B. Y. Sul (2010), and M. K. Lim (2014) are noteworthy. J. H. Koo (1995) analyzed the frequency and functions of the DMs in the speaking and listening scripts of high school English textbooks in the 6th curriculum based on Schiffrin's (1987) classification. Schiffrin (1987) analyzed DMs with respect to *oh, well, and, but, or, so, because, now, then, y'know,* and *I mean.* She concluded that the use of DMs is extremely limited in the textbooks. The use of DMs in the textbooks was very low as a whole, and the DMs did not represent various functions.

J. H. Koo (1995) showed important implications through her study. When EFL learners in Korea understand the meaning of the discourse in the dialogue, in general, they interpret it with the help of surrounding discourse contexts and situations. However, it is difficult to grasp the discourse context in textbooks. This study reveals the importance of teaching the functions of the DMs, which can play a major role in a conversation.

B. Y. Sul (2010) compared and analyzed four kinds of high school English conversational textbooks based on the revised curriculum in 2007 and four kinds of ELT textbooks of similar level according to Schiffrin's (1987) classification. In high school practical English conversation textbooks, according to her data, it appeared that *and* and *but* were very frequently used, followed by *oh* and *well. Y'know* and *I mean* showed relatively low frequency; on the other hand, *I mean* was not used at all in two conversation textbooks. In the ELT textbooks, the frequency was high in the order of *and, but, well* and *oh* respectively. The results found that *well* was preferred to *oh* in authentic

2 The first concept is face, a public image that all members want to claim for themselves. The second basic concept of politeness is the face threatening act. The FTA is a violation of the need to maintain the listeners' self-esteem. If we threaten or are about to threaten someone's positive or negative face, regardless of our intentions, we must apply politeness strategies to minimize FTAs. The last basic concept of politeness, the politeness strategy, is an attempt to repair or supplement the FTA to the positive and negative public self-image in any way when performing an action. There are two types of politeness strategies: negative and positive politeness strategies.

native conversations.

B. Sul's (2010) study cannot be generalized about the aspect of the DMs used in all English textbooks in Korea. Likewise, the analysis results of four kinds of ELT textbooks cannot be generalized to other ELT textbooks. However, this study is meaningful in that it examines the functions and characteristics of practical English textbooks and discusses the future direction of English education in Korea related to spoken discourse.

M. Lim (2014) compared and analyzed four high school advanced English conversation textbooks and four EFL textbooks according to Parrot's (2002) classification.[3] In her study, *well, you know,* and so were the most frequent DMs in both sets of textbooks. Through this study, teachers can confirm two facts. First, in high school advanced English conversation textbooks and EFL textbooks, the types of the DMs with high and low frequency were similar.

Second, the DMs used in EFL textbooks were used less frequently than the DMs used in advanced English textbooks when Parrot's (2002) classification was applied, but more various DMs were used. For example, in EFL textbooks there appeared various DMs such as *listen, um, hmm, yeah, cool, really, oh, huh, ha, wow, look, mmm, uh-oh* and *hey*. Her research is significant in that, unlike previous studies, it has shown that high school advanced English conversation textbooks used in public education have attempted to use diverse DMs as in EFL textbooks.

The studies on the DMs in textbooks are mostly based on the previous DM classification framework proposed by individual linguists, mainly Schiffrin (1987). This seems to be a good way to quantitatively analyze the overall DMs. However, it seems that there are not many studies on the DMs in English textbooks in Korea based on the functions of the DMs presented by various linguist. Here, one of the most frequently used DMs in five practical English textbooks is selected and its functions are identified based on the functions presented by various linguists.

III. METHOD

1. Data Selection

The purpose of this study is to investigate whether high school practical English conversation textbooks in Korea present diverse uses of *well* as a DM. The newly revised curriculum has been applied since 2009 in the English curriculum. Practical English conversation textbooks focus on speaking and listening contents for communication purposes, unlike other English textbooks such as general English textbooks, and English reading and writing textbooks, due to the nature of practical conversational textbooks. Therefore, practical English conversation textbooks were selected because they are likely to include the most diverse and realistic examples of conversation. In addition, as shown in Table 1, this study intends to improve the reliability of the results by analyzing all five types used in the 7th curriculum.

TABLE 1
Five High School Practical English Conversation Textbooks

Textbooks	Lead Author	Publisher
High School Practical English Conversation	Ahn, Byunghyu	Chunjae
High School Practical English Conversation	Lee, Chanseung	Neungyule
High School Practical English Conversation	Lee, Minho	Kyohak
High School Practical English Conversation	Park, Joonun	YBM
High School Practical English Conversation	Park, Yoonhee	Kumsung

2. Data Analysis

As mentioned earlier, most of the DM studies analyzing English textbooks in Korea are based on the analysis of several DMs in the framework presented by linguists such as Grice (1975), Brown and Levinson (1987), and Sperber and Wilson (1986). This study is distinct from other studies because it selects one discourse marker and analyzes its functions more thoroughly. In order to determine one specific DM to be analyzed, first, all the dialogues of five kinds of practical English conversation textbooks, including sample dialogues and audio scripts, were typed on the computer by the researcher. The corpus to be analyzed contains 40,845 words and 462 tokens, and the numbers of words and tokens in five textbooks are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Numbers of Words and Tokens in Practical English Conversation Textbooks

	Chunjae	Kumsung	Kyohak	Neunyule	YBM	Total
Words	4,344	10,759	8,410	5,898	11,434	40,845
Tokens	52	112	99	54	145	462

3 Parrot (2002) divided DMs into four categories:
(1) textual DMs: first of all, besides, though, say, I mean
(2) conversation management DMs: well, ok, right, you know, I mean, actually, anyway, so
(3) preparatory DMs: sorry, but, frankly, I'm afraid
(4) attitude DMs: unfortunately, sadly, thank god

Using Mono-Conc Pro 2.2 program, frequency was searched by entering ten DMs that many linguists recognize as DMs. Among them, non-DMs were excluded from the study. For example, *well* is not a DM when it is used as a noun or an adverb, and *like* is not a DM when it is used as a verb. The overall frequency of the DMs in practical English conversation textbooks are presented in Table 3 with their token frequencies.

TABLE 3
Frequency of the DMs in Practical English Conversation Textbooks

Discourse Markers	Token Frequency
well	101
now	17
you know	14
all right	12
kind of	6
ah	3
I mean	2
like	1
anyway	1
ok	1

As shown in the above table, the DM *well* was overwhelmingly frequent, and therefore, it is considered that it would be meaningful to conduct a detailed analysis of the functions of the most frequently used DM in English textbooks. Through literature review, seven functions of *well* were classified based on the functions of *well* shared by a lot of linguists and they are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Functions of the DM *well*

Functions of the DM *well*	
Face threat mitigation marker	
Frame marker	Discourse initiation marker
	Topic shift marker
	Conclusive marker
Insufficiency marker	
Opinion marker	
Quotative marker	
Repair marker	
Turn management marker	Turn maintaining marker
	Turn taking marker

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the frequency of the functions of *well* in five practical English conversation textbooks in Korea are shown in the following table.

TABLE 5
Functions of the DM *Well*

		Chun jae	Kum sung	Kyo hak	Neung yule	YBM	Total
Face threat mitigation marker		2	3	6	1	5	17 (16.8%)
Frame marker	Discourse initiation marker	3	0	0	0	0	3(3%)
	Topic shift marker	2	1	0	4	0	7(6.9%)
	Conclusive marker	0	2	5	0	0	7(6.9%)
Insufficiency marker		2	2	4	1	4	13(12.9%)
Opinion marker		3	3	4	0	2	12(11.9%)
Quotative marker		0	0	0	0	0	0(0%)
Repair marker		0	0	0	0	0	0(0%)
Turn management marker	Turn maintaining marker	1	17	3	2	2	25(24.8%)
	Turn taking marker	3	5	7	0	2	17(16.8%)

As seen in Table 5, turn management marker was the most frequently used marker, followed by face threat mitigation marker and insufficiency marker. On the other hand, quotative marker and repair maker did not appear at all. Each marker will be analyzed in the following sections.

1. Face Threat Mitigation Marker

A face threat mitigation marker is the DM preceding the FTA.[4] It signals that the listener's face will be threatened, and at the same time mitigates the threat. The DM *well* is known as a preface to a dispreferred response. Levinson (1983) stated the preferred structure is non-marked because it is a natural structure, whereas the non-preference structure is an undesirable structure, so it is marked and predominantly prefaced to *well*. According to Jucker (1993), *well* is used when there is a problem at the interpersonal level, such as when the speakers or the hears' face is threatened.

Owen (1981) also points out that *well* mitigates some kind of confrontational situation. For example, *well* is prefaced to disagreements, rejected requests or rejected proposals. In this function, *well* is used in the second pair part where the proposal or request is rejected.

4 Face threatening act is one of the three concepts which consist of politeness theory (Brown and Levinson, 1987): face, FTA and polite strategies. The FTA is a violation of the need to maintain the listeners' self-esteem.

(2) (Owen, 1981, p. 109)[5]
1 A: can I just see them
2 → B: um ***well*** I'm not allowed to to do that

In (2), the respondent responds by threatening the face of the interlocutor. The DM *well* sends a signal and alleviates this potential conflict. Immediate rejection of the proposal is likely to be considered as an act that damages the other's face. Without *well* in Example (2), A's face would have been more damaged. In this situation where collisions can occur, however, the tension can be relaxed by using *well*.

Well as a face threat mitigation marker is also found in high school practical English conversation textbooks.

(3) (Kyohak, 2009, p. 84)
M1: Good morning, sir. How can I help you?
M2: Well, I'd like to get my haircut.
M1: OK. Men's haircuts are $20, but we offer a very special service today. It's only $30 for a cut, shampoo, and style. Would you like today's special service?
→ M2: *Well*, I have an interview today, so I'm not interested in the special service.

In (3), M1 offers a more expensive service with shampoo and styling rather than regular haircut. M2 rejects politely, in the sixth line, using *well,* saying that he is not interested in special services because he has an interview. If M2 did not use the DM *well,* and refused immediately, in this situation, the M1, who proposed the special service to M2, might have been uncomfortable and embarrassed. Through this conversation, it can be seen that the use of *well*, which alleviates the face impairment of the other person, keeps the conversation going smoothly.

Another example is shown below.

(4) (Neungyule, 2009, p. 131)
M: Hey, Kate did you decide where you want to go?
W: Oh, I have no idea. Is there any place you'd recommend?
M: Sure. How about going to tourist attractions like Myeong-dong and Dongdaemun?
→W: ***Well***, I heard those places are crowded, and I don't like places with lots of people.

In the example above, the man and the woman are talking about places to go sightseeing. The man offers tourist attractions, but the woman does not accept his invitation. In line five, the woman carefully rejects the man's suggestion by using the DM *well*. Here, *well* is the face threat mitigation marker that alleviates the face damage while giving a signal that the woman may damage man's face in the following utterance. *Well* as a face-threat mitigation marker was secondly most used after *well* as a turn management marker, 17 times (16.8%) of the total 101 tokens.

2. Frame Marker

A frame marker is a marker that forms a frame of discourse. These markers have three main functions, which are to initiate a discourse, to change the topic of the discourse, or to conclude the content of the discourse.

1) Discourse Initiation Marker

As a discourse initiation marker, *well* marks the beginning of a conversation, a turn or a story (Cuenca, 2008; Heritage, 2015; Müller, 2005; Norrick, 2001; Schourup, 2001). Innes (2010) studied *well* in the courtroom and reported that it functions to "raise a new issue and begin a story" (p. 104). All of these *wells* have appeared in the first pair parts (FPPs hereafter). Heritage (2015) studied *well* that appeared in ordinary conversation for about 24 hours, and he categorized new topic start and topic shift into one function, new topic start. In his data, 118 (16%) out of a total of 748 times, *well* appeared to function as a new topic start.

The discourse initiation marker does not always appear in the first utterance. Here is an example of *well* as the discourse initiation marker.

(5) (Norrick, 2001, p. 853)
A: something I want to go back to.
I acquired an absolutely magnificent sewing machine by foul means.
Did I tell you about that?
B: No.
→A: ***Well*** when I was doing freelance advertising, the advertising agency that I sometimes did some work for rang me

After confirming that A did not talk about a new sewing machine in the previous conversation, *well* is used when a new story begins at line 5. In Example (5), *well* did not appear in the initial utterance, but it also appeared in the FPP.

Well as the discourse initiation marker appeared only in one practical English conversation textbook.

5 (2) is an example showing a case in which permission is not granted for a request, and the following two examples are examples showing disagreement of the listener's utterance and rejection of the listener's proposal.

A: they must worry about you though Eddie, don't they, your Mum and Dad, when you're doing all these jumps
→B: er ***well*** they always come to all the shows

A: what about coming here on the way or or doesn't that give you enough time
→B: ***well*** no I'm supervising here

(6) (Chunjae, 2009, p. 53)
M: ***Well.*** Mike's test result don't show anything serious.
W: Oh, that's good! Can I take him home?
M: No, I'd like to keep him here for one night.
W: Is it OK if I stay with him?

In the above Example (6), *well* appears at the first utterance and is a prefaced to Mike's test result. Here *well* draws the attention and signals that the new story is about to begin. In the practical English conversation textbooks, 3 (3%) instances of the topic initiation marker were found in the total of 101.

2) Topic Shift Marker

A topic shift marker is similar to the topic initiation marker in that it starts a new topic, but it differs from the topic initiation marker in that it finishes the previous topic. Aijmer (2013) refers to the transition of *well* associated with a contextualization cue as follows: "It signals a change of topic or speech act according to an agenda or an 'interpretative frame', that is the use of *well* can be explained with regard to background knowledge about the activity" (p. 35).

Here is an example of a talk show with *well* as the topic shift marker in a practical English conversation textbook.

(7) (Neungyule, 2009, p. 64) W: host, M: guest
W: Good evening. This is Ricky. Allow me to present the five-star top chef, Mr. Charles Kim from Korea. Please introduce yourself, Mr. Kim!
M: Hello. My name is Charles Kim, and I'm the chef from Kim's Café. I used to be a chef at a five–star hotel restaurant in New York City.
***
W: Wow. Thank you for choosing us for your first talk show.
M: It's my pleasure. It's quite an experience to be on your show.
W: ***Well***, we've got some questions. What's your favorite food at home? Two viewers asked that question on our board.

The woman introduces the guest of the day and naturally allows the man to participate in the conversation, a typical opening of a talk show. The man introduces himself to the audience and the two greet each other. In line 9, while finishing the previous topic, greeting, *well* as a topic shift marker was used to move to the new topic, men's favorite food. Here, *well* concludes the previous topic and signals that a new topic will be introduced. *Well* functioning as a topic shift was found to appear 7 times (6.9%) out of the total of 101 *wells* in the practical English conversation textbooks.

3) Conclusive Marker

A conclusive marker is the marker that concludes the conversation about the subject that has been discussed. The conclusive function of *well* was mentioned in the studies analyzing the narrative discourse. Norrick (2001) stated that "*well* may be oriented toward the end of an oral narrative as a summary coda" (p. 854). One example he presented is as follows.

(8) (Norrick, 2001, p. 854)
Pamela: It sure is nice to have a boy and a girl. I tell you
Teddy: Yeah, yeah.
Jim: Yeah.
Vera: {laugh}
Pamela: We won't have to show them anything.
Jim: [Right right.]
Vera: [That's right.]
Jim: ***Well*** I think y'know here were two sisters
who didn't have a brother
and two brothers who didn't have a sister
and I think the idea was an exchange of [a kind]
Vera: [You were] being an educator.
Jim: Yeah.

In line 8, Jim refers to the desirability of siblings of different genders, where *well* summarizes the story that was going on and anticipates the next step in narrative organization. The most appropriate description of *well* includes the function of coda as a DM that plays an important role in the narrative organization (Norrick, 2001).

Müller (2005), who analyzed the use of DM between native discourse and non-native discourse, analyzed the conclusive function of *well*. According to his data, conclusive *well* was used only by Germans and not by native English speakers at all. Also, when using the conclusive *well*, the summary of the previous discourse did not seem to be essential to non-native speakers.

Let us take a look at the example of conclusive *well* in a practical English conversation textbook.

(9) (Kyohak, 2009, p. 114)
M: Hi, Sophia. how are you doing these days?
W: Not so good.
M: Why? What's the matter?
W: I have a really bad cold. I've been sick since last week.
M: Oh, no. I'm sorry to hear that.
W: I'm taking medicine, but it doesn't seem to be doing any good.
M: That's because you are walking around. I think you should go home and stay in bed.
M: That's what the doctor said.
W: ***Well,*** you should listen to him.

In (9), the man and the woman talk about a woman's bad health condition. The man finishes the discourse with some advice that the woman should listen to the doctor in line 10, which is preceded by *well*. This *well* concludes the previous discourse, but does not summarize the entire discourse. Conclusive *well* was used 7 times (6.9%) out of 101 instances of *well* in practical English conversation textbooks.

3. Insufficiency Marker

An insufficiency marker is the marker used by respondents when the answer to the question is not direct and is considered insufficient. The meaning of the DM *well* indicates a negative connotation that something is not done correctly in the discourse, such as the insufficiency of response (Lakoff, 1973), the lack of coherence (Schiffrin, 1987), and the divergence from the optimal relevance (Jucker, 1993). According to Norrick (2001), *well* indicates "the following contribution is undesirable or inadequate in some way" (p. 852). Lakoff (1973) found that *well* is used when the answer is indirect because the respondents do not directly give the information requested by the questioner and because the respondents feel "some sort of insufficiency" in their response (p. 463).

Schiffrin (1987) looked at *well* based on a coherent approach, where *well* was used as a device to achieve consistency when the content of the following discourse was off-topic from the preceding discourse and was not consistent. The following is a relevant example.

(10) (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 106)
Zelda: Are you from Philadephia?
→ Sally: ***Well*** I grew up uh out in the suburbs. And then I lived for about seven years up in upstate New York. And then I came back here t'go to college.

In (10), Zelda asked Sally a yes-no question of whether she was from Philadelphia, and Zelda would have assumed that Sally would respond with a binary choice. Sally, however, unexpectedly replied without answering yes or no and explained her growth process by prefacing *well*. This is in line with Lakoff's (1973) assertion that respondents use *well* when they do not provide a direct answer to the questioner, and Schiffrin's (1987) claim that DM is used when there is a lack of coherence in discourse.

Consider the following example from a practical English conversation textbook:

(11) (Kumsung, 2009, p. 124)
Jinsu: I heard some holidays in America aren't celebrated on the actual day but on the closest Monday.
Nancy: Yes, that's true. In America, Martin Luther King Day is the third Monday in January, but his actual birthday is January 15th.
***
Jinsu: In Korea, we also have Memorial Day, but its date is always June 6th. Do other countries also have Monday holidays?
→ Nancy: ***Well,*** I don't know about most other countries, but I do know England and Canada also have some.

In Example (11), Jinsu and Nancy talk about holidays in America and Korea. In line 10, Jinsu asks Nancy for other countries with Monday holidays like American holidays. Nancy knows that the Labor Day in England and Canada is on the first Monday in September, but she does not know about holidays in other countries. Therefore, she feels that she is not able to provide a direct answer to Jinsu's question and her answer is insufficient. In this context, the insufficiency marker *well* prefaces her reply.

Below is another example where the insufficiency marker appears.

(12) (YBM, 2009, p. 176)
W: What are you writing?
M: It's a registration form for an application contest.
W: You mean you are developing a new application? What is it?
→ M: ***Well,*** I haven't finished organizing my thoughts yet, but it's basically about a calendar.
W: A calendar? What's special about it?
M: It shows the holidays of many other countries.
W: What a great idea!

In Example (12), the woman asks about the application the man is working on. In line 4, however, the man cannot provide a sufficient and accurate answer to the woman's question because he had not yet sorted out his thoughts on the application. As such, *well* is used when it is recognized that the speaker will not be able to provide sufficient answers to questions he or she has received. In the present corpus, 13 (12.9%) out of 101 *wells* were found to be an insufficiency marker.

4. Opinion Marker

An opinion marker is the marker that the speaker uses before the utterance of his or her opinion, such as agreement, disagreement, evaluation, or suggestion. This function was mentioned by Innes and Aijmer (2013). Innes (2010) studied *well* used in the courtroom and divided the functions of *well* into "neutral, agreement, disagreement, and evaluative" (p. 107). Among them, the disagreement *well* showed the highest frequency, and it seemed that the disagreement *well* that she mentioned contained the function of insufficiency marker or face threat mitigation marker.

Aijmer (2013) mentioned *well* as the opinion marker as follows.

> *Well* signals that the speaker has considered whether what has just been said is good or bad, whether the information in the preceding text is sufficient, whether it meets expectations before taking a stance by either agreeing or disagreeing with the previous speaker or by expressing an opinion on what has been said. (p. 37)

She regarded this function of *well* as "involvement" and subcategorized it into four functions: agreement, disagreement, evaluation, and "feedback to a preceding question" (p. 37). Here is one example that precedes disagreement.

(13) (Aijmer, 2013, p. 40)
B: Oh quite yes
C: No it's the it's the wrong side anyway
→ A: ***Well*** it's not that far away
B: Yes I think it is

In practical English conversation text books, w*ell* was used when making a suggestion to the other participants in the conversation.

(14) (Kyohak, 2009, p. 30)
M: So, Sophia, tell me a little about yourself.
W: Oh, I guess that I'm an outgoing person. I like doing things with people. What about you?
***
M : What kind of music do you like?
→ W : ***Well***, I enjoy K-pop.

In (14), *well* in the sixth line precedes the answer to the other's question and her positive attitude toward K-pop. Also, *well* precedes a suggestion as shown below.

(15) (YBM, 2009, p. 27)
Boy: Is it possible to get to the concert hall on time?
Girl: I don't think so. Taking a taxi was a big mistake.
→ Boy: ***Well***, why don't we transfer to the subway?
Girl: Okay, let's get off at the nearest subway station.

In the example above, the boy and the girl talk about how to go to the concert hall. In the third line, the boy suggests another means of transportation to the girl, which is preceded by *well*. By using *well*, the boy forms a nuance that he suggests to the girl not coercively but carefully. *Well* as an opinion marker appeared 12 times (11.9%) out of 101 *wells* in the practical English conversation textbooks.

5. Quotative Marker

A quotative marker is the marker that precedes when a quotation is introduced, whether it is direct or indirect. It was mentioned by Svartvik (1980), Schiffrin (1987), and Jucker (1993). Svartvik argued that *well* can be used as a signal to simply indicate the beginning of direct speech, and functions like a quote in writing. Quotative *well* can also perform "the same functions as a turn-opener in regular conversations between two or more participants" (p. 175).

Schiffrin (1987) argued that an orientation shift occurs when the speaker exhibits a self-response. The second of the three cases she mentioned is explained as follows. "*Well* marks the orientation shifts created by reported speech, i.e. talk whose original time, place, and possibly author is concurrent with the ongoing conversation" (p. 124). Looking at her data, the quotation *well* seems to be used before both direct (16), and indirect (17) reported speech.

(16) (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 124)
And I said em 'Would you like to have another baby?' He says,
→ 'Now?' I said, 'Yeh:!' And he says, '***Well*** I don't know'

(17) (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 125)
And uh now that the — her father's not a twin, and his mother's not
→ a twin. But the twins in the family say ***well*** they were so surprised that of all the people, that she had the twins.

The reported speech has the function of the speaker performing the previous utterance in its original form and expressing it as if it happened in the present. As in Example (16), using *well* with direct quotation marks makes it easier to move the frame and repeat previous utterances.

Jucker (1993) considered the quotative marker as a frame marker in that it is used to "introduce the reported direct speech" (p. 446) and separate the discourse unit. He counted all direct reported speech in a 90-minute interview. He confirmed that the speaker tended not to use *well* when quoting other people's words. He said that when quoting others, the subjects are different and the difference is obvious, so there is less need for additional signals.

Although the terminologies are somewhat different, quotative function of *well* has been analyzed through various native speakers' discourse, but it has never been found in practical English conversation textbooks.

6. Repair Marker

A repair marker is the marker that is used before repairing one's own or another's utterance. Repair is one of the most important concepts in conversation analysis. Schegloff (2007) defines repair as "efforts do deal with trouble-sources or repairable-marked off as distinct within the ongoing talk" (p. 101). There are four types of repair depending on who initiates and who repairs and they are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6
Four Types of Repair (Schegloff, 2007, p. 101)

	Self-initiated	Other-initiated
Self-repair	Self-initiated self-repair	Other-initiated self-repair
Other-repair	Self-initiated other-repair	Other-initiated other-repair

According to Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), self-initiated self-repair is the most preferred repair type, while other-initiated other-repair is the most dispreferred type that potentially can be a FTA.

Schiffrin (1987) noted that repair is a speech activity in which speakers replace previous information, with the speakers' focusing on the previous information. Repairs therefore perform "information transitions" (p. 74) so that the speakers can adjust their orientation before responding to the next conversations. Svartvik (1980) described "use of *well* in its framing function [...] as editing marker from self-correction" (p. 175) in his article.

Müller (2005) referred to the repair marker as rephrasing or correcting. He compared and contrasted the DM *well* in native discourse with that in non-native discourse. In his data, most cases were corrections in situations where the first expression was not compatible with the following expression. In other words, if the first expression is true, then the next one could not be true. Consider the following examples where the *well* is used as a repair marker.

(18) (Müller, 2005, p. 112)
176 and then they go outsi=de,
177 they say that--
178→ ***well*** he says that tomorrow he'll engage &
179 & them in some sort of a .. job,

(19) (Müller, 2005, p. 112)
91 they sit down and they h- have this game &
91a & of .. uh cards.
92 Charlie Chaplin um ... decides to shuffles,
93 → ***well*** is chosen to shuffle,

The above two examples show the cases where *well* is used as the repair marker in his data. As in (18), there is the case where the truncation comes after the wrong expression, and the repair marker *well* is right behind the truncation. However, there are the cases where truncation is not necessary, as in (19).

Well as the repair marker has never appeared in high school practical English conversation textbooks. This is in contradiction to the fact that because non-native speakers do not speak English fluently compared to native speakers, there could be many situations in which they make mistakes and make corrections in the discourse, and that it is expected to be represented in the textbooks. Repair is not a desirable action but a face threatening action in ordinary discourse. Due to the nature of the textbooks, the authors of the textbooks seem to think that the ideal dialogue should be presented. However, it appears necessary to show some less desirable situations, such as repair, in order to teach more natural discourse to Korean students who do not speak English as their first language.

7. Turn Management Marker

Turn management marker is the marker that functions to take or maintain turn in conversation. This includes the turn taking marker, which precedes a simple and short answer to the question or suggestion presented by the other person, and the turning maintaining marker, which keeps one's turn in line with long answers or explanations.

1) Turn Maintaining Marker

Well is used to maintain the new turn in discourse. Svartvik (1980) and Jucker (1993) focused on the delay function of *well*, and Svartvik noted, "*Well* can also be used as a temporizing or delaying tactic" (p. 171). In his example, the speaker uses *well* when he or she wants to say more and does not want to give up his or her turn yet. In this case, the same word or phrase is repeated, or a pause or delay occurs.

According to Aijmer (2013), "*Well* is a powerful projection device pointing forwards to the next turn or discourse unit" (p. 34). *Well* as a turn maintaining marker occurs frequently before long descriptions or narratives as in the following example.

1 (20) (Aijmer, 2013, p. 34)
2 B: So uhm So he's going to punch the details into a <unclear word>
3 screen <,>
4→ A: ***Well*** <„> if there's anything if there's anything in one of the
5 letters that I think is vaguely chatty I'm obviously David I'm not going to give him any of the personal stuff am I <„>

In many cases in conversation, as in line 3, *well* is followed by a pause. Also, speaker A tried to keep his or her turn by repeating the phrase *if there's anything*.

On the other hand, practical English conversation textbooks deal with written discourse. Thus, although pause is not indicated, it can be seen that *well* precedes long descriptions and narratives:

1 (21) (Kumsung, 2009, p. 31)
2 W: What are the popular free time activities in your country, Benson?
3→ M: ***Well***, Canada is a very cold country with snow in the winter,
4 so skiing is a popular activity. In the summer, people love to go swimming. How about in your country, Klara?

In line 2, the man maintains his turn by preceding the long description with *well*. There was no repetition of words or phrases here. The frequency of the turn maintaining function was the highest with 25 times (24.8%) out of 101 *wells*.

2) Turn Taking Marker

Speakers sometimes respond to the question with *well* even if it is not followed by long descriptions, pauses or hesitation. Rather, *well* can be preceded by a short answer and it is a turn taking marker. There seems to be much more research on *well* leading to insufficient answers than studies on *well* preceding simple and clear answers (Lakoff, 1973; Aijmer, 2013).

1 (22) (Lakoff, 1973, p. 456)
2 A: What time is it?
→ B: ***Well*** three o'clock.

Lakoff (1973) analyzed Example (22), explaining that "it seems that *well* is used in case the respondent knows he is not giving directly the information the questioner sought" (p. 458) and that *well* is an insufficiency marker. In (22), however, B seems to provide a sufficient answer to A's question. In this case, it would be desirable to consider *well* as having another function, that is, a function of taking a turn at the same time as the feedback of A's question.

Practical English conversation textbooks also showed the turn taking function of *well* in the following example.

1 (23) (Kyohak, 2009, p. 64)
2 M: What are you doing these days?
→ W: ***Well***, I'm learning how to play the guitar.

Well in the second line is followed by a short, simple answer. This *well* signals that the woman is aware that she has received her turn, and that she would give her feedback soon. *Well* as the turn-taking marker appeared 17 times (16.8%) out of 101 *wells* in the practical English conversation textbooks. In addition to the turn maintaining marker, the turn management marker appeared 42 times, confirming that practical English conversation textbooks show a lot of markers related to turn.

V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to verify whether the discourse in English textbooks used in the Korean high school reflects the various functions of *well* as in the native speakers' discourse. In order to confirm this, the study analyzed five practical English conversation textbooks based on the seven functions of *well* which many linguists commonly suggested. In the analysis of the results so far, the turn management marker including the turn taking marker and the turn maintaining marker showed the highest frequency, followed by the face threatening mitigation marker and the insufficiency marker. In contrast, the repair marker and the quotative marker did not appear at all in practical English conversation textbooks.

Schiffrin (1987) regards *well* as a marker of response, and refers to three cases of self-response, two of which are self-repair and reported speech.[6] Thus, practical English conversational textbooks adequately show the discourse that includes *well* related to taking or maintaining the turn, but it seems that textbooks do not adequately represent the discourse that includes *well* related to the self-response, such as self-repair or quotative marker. Also, the other repair, which corrects the other person's utterance, does not appear in the practical English textbooks in Korea because it creates an undesirable situation pointing out the mistake of the other person. If two functions of *well*, the repair marker and the quotative marker, are presented in the textbooks to be revised later, it will help EFL learners to learn and use more diverse functions of the DMs.

This study analyzed the functions and frequency of *well* in practical English conversation textbooks. It is not easy to generalize the results of this study because it has the following limitations in the process and analysis of research. It is not as natural as spoken discourse because this study analyzed written discourse only. For example, there is no pause as in the spoken discourse, no back channel signal like uh-huh, and no hesitation like umm. This study is intended to confirm whether the actual English conversation textbooks used in Korean high schools represent the correct use of the DMs; therefore, it seems that research on written discourse is also meaningful.

In further studies, it is necessary to confirm whether the fact that the repair marker and the quotative marker do not show that the comparison with the functions of *well* in the EFL textbooks is due to the characteristic of the written discourse or the characteristic of the textbook composed by non-native authors. Also, it is necessary to analyze the functions of *well* in the discourse with pause and tone through analysis of the discourse of non-native speakers. The scope of the study can be expanded by comparing and analyzing *well* used in various types of institutional talk such as classroom talk, telephone conversation, and talk show.

REFERENCES

Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particles*: *Evidence from a corpus.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Aijmer, K. (2013). *Understanding pragmatic markers: A variational pragmatic approach*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ariel, M. (1994). Pragmatic operators. In R. E. Asher (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 3250-3253). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Ariel, M. (1998). Discourse markers and form-function correlations. In A. H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse markers: Description and theory* (pp. 223-259). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Blakemore, D. (1992). *Understanding utterances. An introduction to pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bolinger, D. (1989). *Intonation and its uses: Melody and grammar in discourse*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cuenca, M. J. (2008). Pragmatic markers in contrast: The case of *well*. *Journal of Pragmatics, 40*(8), 1373-1391.

Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(3), 931-952.

Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics, 6*(2), 167-190.

Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. Morgan. (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics. 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Heritage, J. (2015). Well-prefaced turns in English conversation: A conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics, 88*, 88-104.

Innes, B. (2010). "Well, that's why I asked the question sir": Well as a discourse marker in court. *Language in Society, 39*(1), 95-117.

6 According to Schiffrin (1987), "First, well occurs with self-repairs (p. 123). Second, well marks the orientation shifts created by reported speech (p. 124). Third, well occurs with reflexive frame breaks" (p.125).

Jucker, A. H. (1993). The discourse marker well: A relevance-theoretical account. *Journal of Pragmatics, 19*(5), 435-452.

Koo, Jeong-Hee. (1995). *An analysis of discourse markers in conversation in textbooks: Oh, well, now, then, y'know, I mean, and, but, or, so, and because*. Unpublished master's thesis, Yonsei University, Seoul.

Lakoff, R. (1973). Questionable answers and answerable questions. In B. B. Kachru, R. B. Lees, Y. Malkiel, A. Pietrangeli, & S. Saporta. (Eds.), *Issues in linguistics. Papers in honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*. (pp. 453-467). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lim, Min-Kyung. (2014). *A study of discourse markers in advanced high school conversation textbooks and commercial conversation textbooks*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hanyang University, Seoul.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Norrick, N. R. (2001). Discourse markers in oral narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(6), 849-878.

Owen, M. (1981). Conversational units and the use of 'well...'. In P. Werth (Ed.), *Conversation and discourse* (pp. 99-116). London: Cromm Helm.

Parrot, M. (2002). *Grammar for English language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Redeker, G. (1990). Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(3), 367-381.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361-382.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis. Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, L. C. (1985). *Common discourse particles in English conversation*. New York: Garlang.

Schourup, L. C. (2001). Rethinking well. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(7), 1025-1060.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sul, Bun-Young. (2010). *A study on the discourse markers in high school English conversation textbooks and ELT books*. Unpublished master's thesis, Chonnam National University, Chonnam.

Svartvik, J. (1980). *Well* in conversation. *Studies in English Linguistics for Randolph Quirk, 5,* 167-177.

Watts, R. J. (1988). A relevance-theoretic approach to commentary pragmatic markers: the case of *actually, really and basically. Acta Linguistica Hungarica, 38*, 235-260.

White, A. (2014). Discourse markers in task interaction: A comparison between Korean EFL learners and native speakers. *Modern English Education, 15*(4), 1-22.

APPENDIX

High School Practical English Conversation Textbooks

Ahn, Byung-Kyu, Oh, Yun-Ja, Kim, Ae-Soon, Choi, Hee-Jung, & Kim, A. D (2009). *High school practical English conversation.* Seoul: Chunjae.

Lee, Chan-Seung, Lee, Yun-Jung, Lee, Hye-Kyung, Yang, Hyun, Kim, Ji-Hyun, & Sun, Jung-Ah. (2009). *High school practical English conversation.* Seoul: Neungyule.

Lee, Min-Ho, Nam, Tael-Hyun, Lee, Won-Il, Kim, Han-Na, Nam, H. M., & Voort, V. (2009). *High school practical English conversation.* Seoul: Kyohak.

Park, Joon-Un, Choi, Sung-Hee, Choi, Sun-Young, Choi, Ji-Young, Paek, Ji-Won, Oh, Dong-Soo, Choi, Song-E, Kang, Ae-Jin, Kim, Eun-Young, Kim, Ha-Young, Paek, Ji-Sook, & Kim, Jin-Soo. (2009). H*igh school practical English conversation.* Seoul: YBM.

Park, Yoon-Hee, Kim, Sun-Woong, Park, Myung-Gwan, Kang, Gyung-Ran, Hong, Sung-Hyun, Seo, Jung-Hwan, & Harp, A. (2009). *High school practical English conversation.* Seoul: Kumsung.