DEVELOPING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN ACADEMIC DISCUSSIONS (IN THE EXAMPLE OF 10th -11th GRADES)

Eshbo'riyeva Aziza Muhiddinovna

Abstract: *The development of pragmatic competence—the ability to use language effectively in context—is a critical aspect of communicative proficiency in academic settings. This article explores how 10th and 11th-grade students develop pragmatic competence through structured academic discussions in English language classrooms. Focusing on key pragmatic functions such as turn-taking, hedging, requesting clarification, and expressing agreement or disagreement, the study investigates how these skills can be taught, measured, and fostered in real classroom settings. The research draws on both qualitative and quantitative data gathered from classroom observations, student interviews, and discourse analysis. The findings indicate that explicit instruction, collaborative learning strategies, and authentic discussion tasks significantly enhance students' ability to navigate academic discourse pragmatically. Moreover, the study identifies challenges students face in managing politeness, appropriateness, and contextually sensitive expressions in discussions. The article concludes with pedagogical recommendations for integrating pragmatic awareness into secondary school curricula to better prepare students for academic success and intercultural communication. This study contributes to a growing body of research advocating for a more nuanced and practical approach to teaching language functions beyond grammar and vocabulary.*

Key words: *Pragmatic competence; academic discussions; communicative competence; English as a Foreign Language (EFL); secondary school education; discourse strategies; turn-taking; classroom interaction; 10th and 11th-grade learners; pragmatic instruction*

Аннотация: *Развитие прагматической компетенции — способности эффективно использовать язык в контексте — является критически важным аспектом коммуникативной компетентности в академической среде. В этой статье рассматривается, как ученики 10-х и 11-х классов развивают прагматическую компетентность посредством структурированных академических дискуссий в классах английского языка. Сосредоточившись на ключевых прагматических функциях, таких как очередность, хеджирование, запрос разъяснений и выражение согласия или несогласия, исследование изучает, как эти навыки можно преподавать, измерять и развивать в реальных условиях класса. Исследование опирается как на качественные, так и на количественные данные, собранные в ходе наблюдений за классом, интервью со студентами и анализа дискурса. Результаты показывают, что явное обучение, стратегии совместного обучения и аутентичные задания для обсуждения значительно повышают способность учащихся прагматично ориентироваться в академическом дискурсе. Кроме того, в исследовании определяются проблемы, с которыми сталкиваются*

"O'zbekistonda yangi uyg'onish – Uchinchi Renessans: Ilm-fan taraqqiyotida yoshlarning o'rni" mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasining maqolalar to'plami

1-qism

ученики при управлении вежливостью, уместностью и контекстно-чувствительными выражениями в обсуждениях. Статья завершается педагогическими рекомендациями по интеграции прагматической осведомленности в учебные программы средней школы для лучшей подготовки учащихся к академическому успеху и межкультурному общению. Это исследование вносит свой вклад в растущий массив исследований, выступающих за более тонкий и практичный подход к обучению языковым функциям, выходящий за рамки грамматики и лексики.

Ключевые слова: *Прагматическая компетентность; академические дискуссии; коммуникативная компетентность; английский как иностранный язык (EFL); среднее школьное образование; стратегии дискурса; очередность; взаимодействие в классе; учащиеся 10-х и 11-х классов; прагматическое обучение*

Introduction

In recent years, the notion of pragmatic competence has gained increased attention in the domain of second language acquisition, especially in educational contexts where learners are expected not only to master linguistic forms but also to use them appropriately in varying communicative situations. Pragmatic competence, often described as the ability to use language effectively and appropriately in context, is fundamental for students engaging in academic discussions, particularly at higher stages of secondary education. Among 10th and 11th-grade learners, this competence plays a pivotal role in shaping their success in classroom discourse, exams, and broader academic participation.

The global trend toward communicative language teaching (CLT) has foregrounded the importance of teaching beyond mere grammatical accuracy. However, while vocabulary acquisition and syntactic control are well-integrated into most language syllabi, pragmatic competence remains underrepresented. In classroom settings, especially in non-native English-speaking countries, many students can construct grammatically correct sentences yet struggle to convey intended meaning or respond appropriately in interactions, particularly in academic discussions. These communicative gaps often stem from a lack of awareness of pragmatic conventions such as politeness strategies, speech acts, discourse markers, and turn-taking norms.

Academic discussions, as a genre, involve a series of interrelated skills that go beyond information exchange. These include asking for and giving opinions, challenging ideas respectfully, supporting arguments with evidence, and using hedging devices to soften assertions. Students must manage these acts while aligning with social and cultural expectations, all of which require a high level of pragmatic sensitivity. Thus, the ability to participate meaningfully in academic dialogue is not only a linguistic skill but also a social and cognitive one.

This paper investigates the development of pragmatic competence in English academic discussions among 10th and 11th-grade students. The selection of this age group is intentional: at this stage, learners are cognitively mature enough to engage in complex reasoning and discussion yet still forming habits and competencies that will influence their

"O'zbekistonda yangi uyg'onish – Uchinchi Renessans: Ilm-fan taraqqiyotida yoshlarning o'rni"
mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasining maqolalar to'plami
1-qism

academic and professional futures. Furthermore, in many educational systems, the 10th and 11th grades are crucial for preparing students for standardized assessments, university entrance exams, and other high-stakes evaluative contexts where oral and written communication is essential.

The objectives of the study are threefold. First, it aims to identify specific pragmatic functions frequently encountered in academic discussions. Second, it explores how these functions are manifested—or underdeveloped—in secondary students' spoken English. Third, it seeks to determine the extent to which classroom instruction can effectively develop pragmatic awareness and skill.

The rationale for focusing on pragmatic competence in academic discussions is grounded in both pedagogical necessity and sociocultural relevance. In increasingly globalized and multilingual academic environments, students who lack pragmatic fluency may be perceived as impolite, uncooperative, or unclear—regardless of their grammatical proficiency. By fostering pragmatic competence, educators can help bridge these cultural and communicative gaps, enabling learners to engage more confidently and competently in academic settings.

In this study, classroom-based intervention and observation are used to uncover patterns, challenges, and growth in students' pragmatic performance. The research is supported by theoretical frameworks from pragmatics, discourse analysis, and language education, and contributes to the ongoing discourse about how to make language learning more authentic, socially grounded, and communicatively effective. By examining real-life classroom interactions and analyzing the effects of targeted teaching strategies, this article offers valuable insights for teachers, curriculum designers, and educational policymakers seeking to enhance the communicative competence of high school learners.

LITERATURE ANALYSIS AND METHODOLOGY

The concept of pragmatic competence has evolved substantially within the field of applied linguistics over the past few decades. First introduced by Thomas (1983) and expanded upon by Bachman (1990), pragmatic competence is now widely accepted as a core component of communicative competence, involving the ability to comprehend and produce contextually appropriate language. Unlike grammatical or lexical competence, pragmatic competence concerns the social use of language—how utterances align with speaker intentions, listener expectations, and cultural norms. Its development is especially critical in academic settings, where discourse is structured, purposeful, and collaborative.

Numerous studies have underscored the importance of pragmatic competence in second language acquisition (SLA). Kasper and Rose (2002) argued that while learners often acquire grammar and vocabulary through exposure and instruction, pragmatic knowledge—particularly sociopragmatic norms and discourse management strategies—requires more deliberate pedagogical intervention. They emphasized the limitations of traditional language instruction that fails to address the subtleties of speech acts, turn-taking behavior, or the implicit rules of conversational appropriateness. Similarly, Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) found that even advanced EFL learners often struggle with the

"O'zbekistonda yangi uyg'onish – Uchinchi Renessans: Ilm-fan taraqqiyotida yoshlarning o'rni"
mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasining maqolalar to'plami
1-qism

pragmatic dimensions of language, resulting in communication breakdowns despite high linguistic proficiency.

In the context of academic discussions, several pragmatic skills become particularly relevant: initiating discussion, responding to questions, seeking clarification, expressing disagreement politely, and using discourse markers to structure ideas. These functions are central to successful classroom interaction and academic collaboration, yet they are rarely emphasized in standard curricula. Research by Zarei and Mohseni (2014) highlighted that explicit instruction in discourse markers and speech acts improved learners' ability to engage in coherent and contextually appropriate conversations. Their findings suggest that awareness-raising activities and focused practice can effectively build students' pragmatic competence.

Theoretical frameworks such as the Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969) and Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) have been foundational in understanding the pragmatics of interaction. Speech Act Theory posits that language functions through actions such as requesting, apologizing, asserting, and suggesting. These actions carry specific intentions and require listeners to infer meaning based on context. Grice's maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner provide further insight into how participants in a discussion manage meaning, coherence, and implicature. In academic settings, these frameworks explain how students use language not only to convey content but to negotiate roles, express politeness, and manage disagreement.

In recent years, classroom-based research has explored the integration of pragmatic instruction in language teaching. Ishihara and Cohen (2010) developed instructional models that combine pragmatics with real-world tasks and reflective learning. They advocate for contextualized role-plays, video analysis, and peer feedback as effective means of developing pragmatic awareness. Moreover, Taguchi (2011) emphasized the importance of cognitive and processing factors in pragmatic development, noting that learners benefit from repeated exposure to authentic discourse and scaffolding that bridges linguistic form and pragmatic function.

At the secondary education level, however, studies remain limited, especially those focusing on non-native English contexts. A notable exception is the work of Nguyen, Pham, and Pham (2019), who conducted an intervention study among high school students in Vietnam. Their research demonstrated that structured pragmatic activities, when integrated into regular lessons, led to measurable improvements in learners' ability to manage academic conversations, including expressing opinions, building arguments, and resolving conversational conflicts.

In Uzbekistan and other Central Asian educational contexts, pragmatic competence is gaining attention as curricula shift toward more communicative approaches. However, many textbooks and teacher training programs continue to prioritize formal grammar over functional language use. This gap poses challenges for learners preparing for global academic and professional environments where discourse norms differ from local communicative patterns. Scholars such as Jalolov (2021) have called for greater

"O'zbekistonda yangi uyg'onish – Uchinchi Renessans: Ilm-fan taraqqiyotida yoshlarning o'rni"
mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasining maqolalar to'plami
1-qism

incorporation of discourse-based and pragmatics-oriented materials in national English curricula, particularly in upper secondary grades.

In summary, the literature suggests that pragmatic competence is an essential yet underemphasized component of academic communication, particularly in EFL contexts. Effective development of this competence requires explicit instruction, context-rich activities, and sustained practice. While much research has focused on university-level learners, there is a growing recognition of the need to begin this instruction earlier, during the formative years of secondary education. The current study builds on this foundation by focusing specifically on 10th and 11th-grade students, aiming to provide empirical data and pedagogical insights for enhancing pragmatic fluency in academic discussions.

This study employs a mixed-methods research design to investigate the development of pragmatic competence in academic discussions among 10th and 11th-grade students. The rationale for this approach lies in the dual necessity of capturing both quantitative performance data and qualitative insights into learners' communicative behavior. By combining discourse analysis with pre- and post-instruction assessments and participant observations, the research aims to comprehensively evaluate how pragmatic competence can be developed through targeted pedagogical interventions in secondary education settings.

Research Context and Participants

The study was conducted in two urban secondary schools located in Uzbekistan, where English is taught as a foreign language. A total of 62 students participated, with 31 from 10th grade and 31 from 11th grade. All students had at least five years of formal English instruction and were considered intermediate-level (B1-B2 CEFR) based on internal school assessments. Two English teachers, both with more than 8 years of teaching experience and certified in communicative language teaching (CLT), facilitated the instructional component of the study.

To maintain ethical standards, informed consent was obtained from students, parents, and school administrators. The anonymity of all participants was preserved through coded identifiers. The study received approval from the university's ethical review board.

Research Design

The study was conducted over an 8-week period and divided into three primary phases: diagnostic assessment (Week 1), intervention (Weeks 2–7), and post-assessment (Week 8). During the diagnostic and post-assessment stages, students were asked to participate in structured academic discussions on familiar school topics (e.g., environmental protection, technology in education, social media and youth). These discussions were recorded and transcribed for analysis.

The intervention consisted of a series of pragmatic-focused lessons integrated into the regular English curriculum. Each weekly session (90 minutes) introduced a specific pragmatic feature essential for academic discussion, including:

- Turn-taking and floor management
- Politeness strategies (e.g., indirectness, hedging)
- Expressing agreement/disagreement

"O'zbekistonda yangi uyg'onish – Uchinchi Renessans: Ilm-fan taraqqiyotida yoshlarning o'rni"
mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasining maqolalar to'plami
1-qism

☐   Requesting clarification and reformulation

☐   Using discourse markers and meta-language

Instructional methods included role-play, model dialogues, peer interaction, reflective journaling, and teacher feedback. Authentic video examples from academic seminars, TED talks, and student debates were used to illustrate key pragmatic norms.

Instruments and Data Collection

The study utilized both quantitative and qualitative instruments:

• Pre- and Post-Discussion Tasks: Students were recorded in small groups (3–4 members) discussing academic topics. The transcribed data was analyzed using a coding scheme based on speech act theory and discourse analysis (e.g., identification of hedging devices, politeness markers, turn initiations, discourse connectives).

• Pragmatic Competence Rubric: Adapted from Taguchi (2011), the rubric rated students on five dimensions: clarity of intention, appropriateness of formality, use of discourse markers, effectiveness of turn-taking, and politeness strategies. Each dimension was scored on a 5-point scale.

• Student Surveys: Pre- and post-intervention surveys captured self-perceptions of pragmatic competence, communicative confidence, and perceptions of classroom interaction.

• Teacher Field Notes: Teachers maintained reflective logs on student participation, observed changes in discourse behavior, and effectiveness of activities.

• Focus Group Interviews: Conducted with 10 selected students post-intervention to gather deeper qualitative insights into their learning experiences and perceived challenges.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data from the rubric scores and surveys were analyzed using SPSS. Paired-sample t-tests determined whether differences between pre- and post-intervention scores were statistically significant. Qualitative data from transcriptions, interviews, and teacher notes were analyzed thematically using grounded theory principles. Recurring patterns in student utterances, such as repeated use of certain hedges or turn-taking strategies, were categorized to evaluate the extent of pragmatic development.

Triangulation across multiple data sources ensured reliability and validity of findings. Member-checking was conducted with student participants to verify interpretation accuracy.

Limitations

While the design of the study provides a comprehensive picture of pragmatic development, limitations include the relatively short duration of the intervention and the sample size restricted to two schools. Additionally, observer effects may have influenced students' behavior during recorded sessions. Nonetheless, the methodology offers a replicable model for future studies and contributes valuable data on pragmatic instruction at the secondary level.

RESULTS

The data collected from the various instruments—rubric-based evaluations, pre- and post-task transcripts, surveys, field notes, and focus group interviews—yielded rich insights

"O'zbekistonda yangi uyg'onish – Uchinchi Renessans: Ilm-fan taraqqiyotida yoshlarning o'rni"
mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasining maqolalar to'plami
1-qism

into how 10th and 11th-grade students developed pragmatic competence over the course of the intervention. The results are presented in three primary categories: (1) quantitative improvement in pragmatic features, (2) qualitative discourse analysis of student interactions, and (3) student self-perception and teacher observations.

1. Quantitative Improvement in Pragmatic Features

The comparison of rubric scores from the pre- and post-intervention discussion tasks revealed statistically significant improvements across all five dimensions of pragmatic competence. The most notable gains were observed in turn-taking management and the use of discourse markers.

Turn-taking and Floor Management: Mean scores increased from 2.9 to 4.1 (out of 5), indicating improved ability to enter, hold, and yield conversational turns without overlaps or interruptions.

Politeness Strategies: The use of hedging expressions, such as "I think," "maybe," or "it could be argued that," increased, leading to a rise in politeness strategy scores from 2.5 to 3.9.

Discourse Markers: Students displayed a broader repertoire of connectors ("however," "on the other hand," "in my opinion"), with scores improving from 2.7 to 4.3.

Clarity of Intention: The ability to express positions clearly and explicitly increased, particularly in discussions requiring justification of opinions.

Appropriateness of Formality: Though the smallest increase, the improvement from 3.0 to 3.8 showed better control over academic register and tone.

Paired-sample t-tests for each rubric dimension confirmed that the changes were statistically significant at $p < 0.01$, confirming the effectiveness of the intervention.

2. Qualitative Analysis of Student Discourse

Transcriptions of academic discussions were analyzed to identify changes in the use of pragmatic features. Prior to the intervention, student dialogues exhibited abrupt transitions, minimal politeness strategies, and little cohesion. Typical utterances lacked discourse structure, such as "I don't agree" or "Yes, but not good," with rare use of markers to guide interlocutors or soften disagreement.

After the intervention, students began employing expressions such as:

"That's an interesting point, but I would argue that…"

"Can I add something here?"

"Could you please clarify what you mean by 'social impact'?"

"While I understand your perspective, I see it a bit differently…"

These utterances reflect not only increased syntactic complexity but also awareness of social norms in academic communication. Students showed improved use of backchanneling (e.g., "I see," "uh-huh," "right") and turn-yielding strategies ("Do you want to continue from here?"), which facilitated smoother discussion dynamics.

Another striking observation was students' increased confidence in expressing disagreement. Initially, most learners avoided challenging peers' opinions or used direct refutations. By the end of the intervention, disagreement was commonly mitigated through

"O'zbekistonda yangi uyg'onish – Uchinchi Renessans: Ilm-fan taraqqiyotida yoshlarning o'rni"
mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasining maqolalar to'plami
1-qism

polite strategies such as conditional constructions and indirectness ("I'm not entirely sure I agree with that idea").

3. Student Self-Perception and Teacher Observations

Student surveys revealed a marked increase in perceived communicative confidence. On a Likert scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), statements such as "I feel confident participating in group discussions in English" saw mean ratings rise from 2.8 to 4.2. Similarly, "I know how to express disagreement politely in English" improved from 2.4 to 4.0.

Focus group interviews supported these findings. Students expressed appreciation for learning "how to speak without sounding rude," "how to join a conversation politely," and "how to make your opinion clear." Several participants emphasized the value of role-playing exercises and real-life video examples in helping them understand how native speakers manage discussions pragmatically.

Teacher field notes also corroborated these improvements. In early sessions, instructors frequently had to intervene to balance turn distribution and reframe inappropriate or unclear responses. By the sixth week, however, students initiated topic shifts independently and negotiated meaning collaboratively without teacher assistance. One teacher remarked, "The students were not only speaking more but were listening more attentively, showing respect for others' views and building on them."

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study confirm the central hypothesis that pragmatic competence in academic discussions among 10th and 11th-grade learners can be significantly developed through targeted and contextually grounded instruction. While students at this level often possess sufficient grammatical and lexical knowledge to participate in conversations, their ability to do so appropriately, persuasively, and collaboratively depends on their mastery of pragmatic functions. These include, but are not limited to, managing conversational turns, expressing agreement or disagreement politely, using hedging to soften claims, requesting clarification, and structuring discourse through appropriate markers. The improvement observed across these dimensions reinforces the view that pragmatic competence is not a peripheral linguistic feature but a core communicative skill essential for effective academic performance.

This study contributes to a growing body of pedagogical and theoretical research advocating for the explicit inclusion of pragmatic instruction in secondary-level EFL classrooms. In many educational contexts, particularly where English is taught as a foreign language, classroom interaction tends to emphasize form-focused instruction, with relatively little attention paid to the nuances of language use in social and academic contexts. Consequently, students may leave school with an incomplete communicative repertoire, capable of constructing grammatically correct sentences but unable to navigate real-life interactions with fluency, appropriateness, or intercultural sensitivity. The results of this study suggest that these limitations can be addressed through well-structured, scaffolded, and reflective learning practices focused on the pragmatics of communication.

"Oʻzbekistonda yangi uygʻonish – Uchinchi Renessans: Ilm-fan taraqqiyotida yoshlarning oʻrni"
mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasining maqolalar toʻplami
1-qism

Another major implication of this study is the pedagogical value of combining authentic materials, role-play activities, and metapragmatic awareness. Students responded particularly well to lessons that included videos of native speakers, simulations of academic panels or debates, and opportunities for peer feedback. These methods allowed learners not only to practice new discourse behaviors but also to reflect on their use and the social expectations they embody. The increase in both self-reported communicative confidence and observable pragmatic performance supports the notion that effective learning occurs when students can directly link form to function in meaningful contexts. This also validates instructional approaches grounded in communicative language teaching (CLT), constructivist interaction, and sociocultural learning theory.

From a curriculum design perspective, the findings underscore the necessity of embedding pragmatic development goals into national and local English syllabi. While many current programs emphasize the four language skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking), few make explicit reference to pragmatic or discourse competencies, particularly in formative assessment criteria. If education systems aim to produce globally competent graduates, especially in countries participating in international academic exchanges or standardized assessments, then pragmatic competence must be given due weight. Curriculum reform efforts should include pragmatic learning outcomes, teacher training in discourse analysis, and the provision of resources that reflect authentic language use in educational and professional environments.

Furthermore, the study highlights the need for ongoing teacher professional development. Many EFL teachers are unfamiliar with the theoretical underpinnings of pragmatics or lack the pedagogical tools to teach it effectively. Workshops, in-service training, and classroom-based research initiatives can help bridge this gap, equipping teachers with strategies to identify, model, and reinforce pragmatic norms. Teacher agency is also crucial—when instructors are empowered to adapt materials, facilitate critical discussion, and assess discourse pragmatics, student outcomes improve.

Despite the strengths of this study, limitations remain. The relatively short duration of the intervention, the small sample size, and the limited geographic scope restrict the generalizability of the findings. Future research could extend this model across diverse educational contexts, incorporate longitudinal designs, and explore the integration of digital platforms (e.g., discussion forums, online debates) to further scaffold pragmatic development.

In conclusion, this research affirms the critical role of pragmatic competence in academic discussion and demonstrates that secondary students are capable of acquiring it when provided with intentional, context-rich instruction. By prioritizing this aspect of communicative competence, educators can better prepare learners for academic success, intercultural dialogue, and effective participation in a globalized knowledge economy. As the boundaries between local and international academic settings continue to blur, the development of pragmatic fluency is not merely an enhancement to language learning—it is a prerequisite for meaningful, respectful, and impactful communication.

"O'zbekistonda yangi uyg'onish – Uchinchi Renessans: Ilm-fan taraqqiyotida yoshlarning o'rni"
mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasining maqolalar to'plami
1-qism

REFERENCES

1.   Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.

2.   Bachman, L. F. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford University Press.

3.   Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatics and Language Learning, 9, 23–43.

4.   Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics: Speech acts (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

5.   Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet. Pearson Education.

6.   Jalolov, J. (2021). Integrating pragmatics into Uzbek EFL curriculum: Challenges and perspectives. Uzbek Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5(2), 45–59.

7.   Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic development in a second language. Blackwell Publishing.

8.   Nguyen, M. T., Pham, T. N., & Pham, H. L. (2019). Enhancing pragmatic competence in high school EFL learners: An intervention study. Language Teaching Research, 23(3), 336–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817729747

9.   Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.

10.   Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31, 289–310. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000018

11.   Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics, 4(2), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91

12.   Zarei, A. A., & Mohseni, F. (2014). The effects of explicit teaching of discourse markers on EFL learners' writing performance. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98, 1256–1260. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.543