

ISSN 2545 – 4439
ISSN 1857 - 923X

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

Institute of Knowledge Management

KNOWLEDGE



Vol. 34. 6.
Scientific Papers

HUMANITIES



KIJ

Vol. 34

No. 6

pp.1587 - 1815

Skopje, 2019

KNOWLEDGE



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

SCIENTIFIC PAPERS
VOL. 34.6

Promoted in Kavala, Greece
2019



KNOWLEDGE

International Journal Scientific papers Vol. 34.6

ADVISORY BOARD

Vlado Kambovski PhD, Robert Dimitrovski PhD, Siniša Zarić PhD, Maria Kavdanska PhD, Venelin Terziev PhD, Mirjana Borota – Popovska PhD, Cezar Birzea PhD, Ljubomir Kekenovski PhD, Veselin Videv PhD, Ivo Zupanovic, PhD, Savo Ashtalkoski PhD, Zivota Radosavljević PhD, Laste Spasovski PhD, Mersad Mujevic PhD, Nonka Mateva PhD, Rositsa Chobanova PhD, Predrag Trajković PhD, Dzulijana Tomovska PhD, Nedžad Korajlić PhD, Nebojsa Pavlović PhD, Nikolina Ognenska PhD, Baki Koleci PhD, Lisen Bashkurti PhD, Trajce Dojcinovski PhD, Jana Merdzanova PhD, Zoran Srzentić PhD, Nikolai Sashkov Cankov PhD, Marija Kostic PhD

Print: GRAFOPROM – Bitola

Editor: IKM – Skopje

Editor in chief

Robert Dimitrovski, PhD

KNOWLEDGE - International Journal Scientific Papers Vol. 34.6

ISSN 1857-923X (for e-version)

ISSN 2545 – 4439 (for printed version)

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD

President: Academic, Prof. Vlado Kambovski PhD, Skopje (Macedonia)

Vice presidents:

Prof. Robert Dimitrovski PhD, Institute of Knowledge Management, Skopje (Macedonia)

Prof. Sinisa Zaric, PhD, Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade (Serbia)

Prof. Venelin Terziev PhD, University of Rousse, Rousse (Bulgaria)

Prof. Mersad Mujevic PhD, Public Procurement Administration of Montenegro (Montenegro)

Prof. Tihomir Domazet PhD, President of the Croatian Institute for Finance and Accounting, Zagreb (Croatia)

Members:

- Prof. Aleksandar Korablev PhD, Dean, Faculty for economy and management, Saint Petersburg State Forest Technical University, Saint Petersburg (Russian Federation)
- Prof. Azra Adjajlic – Dedovic PhD, Faculty of criminology and security, Sarajevo (Bosnia & Herzegovina)
- Prof. Anita Trajkovska PhD, Rochester University (USA)
- Prof. Anka Trajkovska-Petkoska PhD, UKLO, Faculty of technology and technical sciences, Bitola (Macedonia)
- Prof. Alisabri Sabani PhD, Faculty of criminology and security, Sarajevo (Bosnia & Herzegovina)
- Prof. Ahmad Zakeri PhD, University of Wolverhampton, (United Kingdom)
- Prof. Ana Dzumalieva PhD, South-West University “Neofit Rilski”, Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria)
- Prof. Aziz Pollozhani PhD, Rector, University Mother Teresa, Skopje (Macedonia)
- Prof. Branko Sotirov PhD, University of Rousse, Rousse (Bulgaria)
- Prof. Branko Boshkovic, PhD, College of Sports and Health, Belgrade (Serbia)
- Prof. Branimir Kampl PhD, Institute SANO, Zagreb (Croatia)
- Prof. Baki Koleci PhD, University Hadzi Zeka, Peja (Kosovo)
- Prof. Branislav Simonovic PhD, Faculty of Law, Kragujevac (Serbia)
- Prof. Bistra Angelovska, Faculty of Medicine, University “Goce Delcev”, Shtip (Macedonia)
- Prof. Cezar Birzea, PhD, National School for Political and Administrative Studies, Bucharest (Romania)
- Prof. Cvetko Andreevski, Dean, Faculty of Tourism, UKLO, Bitola (Macedonia)
- Prof. Drago Cvijanovic, PhD, Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism, University of Kragujevac, Vrnjacka Banja (Serbia)
- Prof. Dusan Ristic, PhD Emeritus, College of professional studies in Management and Business Communication, Novi Sad (Serbia)
- Prof. Dimitar Radev, PhD, Rector, University of Telecommunications and Post, Sofia (Bulgaria)
- Prof. Daniela Todorova PhD, Rector of “Todor Kableshkov” University of Transport, Sofia (Bulgaria)
- Prof. Dragan Kokovic PhD, University of Novi Sad, Novi Sad (Serbia)
- Prof. Dragan Marinkovic PhD, High health – sanitary school for professional studies, Belgrade (Serbia)
- Prof. Daniela Ivanova Popova PhD, Faculty of Public Health and Sport, SWU Neofit Rilski, Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria)
- Prof. Dzulijana Tomovska, PhD, Dean, Faculty of Biotechnical sciences, Bitola (Macedonia)
- Prof. Evgenia Penkova-Pantaleeva PhD, UNWE -Sofia (Bulgaria)

-
- Prof. Fadil Millaku, PhD, Rector, University “Hadzi Zeka”, Peja (Kosovo)
 - Prof. Fatos Ukaj, University “Hasan Prishtina”, Prishtina (Kosovo)
 - Prof. Georgi Georgiev PhD, National Military University “Vasil Levski”, Veliko Trnovo (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Halit Shabani, PhD, University “Hadzi Zeka”, Peja (Kosovo)
 - Prof. Halima Sofradzija, PhD, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
 - Prof. Haris Halilovic, Faculty of criminology and security, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
 - Prof. Helmut Shramke PhD, former Head of the University of Vienna Reform Group (Austria)
 - Prof. Hristina Georgieva Yancheva, PhD, Rector, Agricultural University, Plovdiv (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Hristo Beloev PhD, Bulgarian Academy of Science, Rector of the University of Rousse (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Hristina Milcheva, Medical college, Trakia University, Stara Zagora (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Izet Zeqiri, PhD, Academic, SEEU, Tetovo (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Ivan Marchevski, PhD, Rector, D.A. Tsenov Academy of Economics, Svishtov (Bulgaria)
 - Doc. Igor Stubelj, PhD, PhD, Faculty of Management, Primorska University, Koper (Slovenia)
 - Prof. Ivo Zupanovic, PhD, Faculty of Business and Tourism, Budva (Montenegro)
 - Prof. Ivan Petkov PhD, Rector, European Polytechnic University, Pernik (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Isa Spahiu PhD, AAB University, Prishtina (Kosovo)
 - Prof. Ivana Jelik PhD, University of Podgorica, Faculty of Law, Podgorica (Montenegro)
 - Prof. Islam Hasani PhD, Kingston University (Bahrein)
 - Prof. Jova Ateljevic PhD, Faculty of Economy, University of Banja Luka, (Bosnia & Herzegovina)
 - Prof. Jove Kekenovski PhD, Faculty of Tourism, UKLO , Bitola (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Jonko Kunchev PhD, University „Cernorizec Hrabar“ - Varna (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Jelena Stojanovic PhD, High medicine school for professional studies “Hipokrat”, Bujanovac (Serbia)
 - Prof Karl Schopf, PhD, Akademie fur wissenschaftliche forchung und studium, Wien (Austria)
 - Prof. Katerina Belichovska, PhD, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, UKIM, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Krasimir Petkov, PhD, National Sports Academy “Vassil Levski”, Sofia (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Kamal Al-Nakib PhD, College of Business Administration Department, Kingdom University (Bahrain)
 - Prof. Kiril Lisichkov, Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, UKIM, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Lidija Tozi PhD, Faculty of Pharmacy, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Laste Spasovski PhD, Vocational and educational centre, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Larisa Velic, PhD, Faculty of Law, University of Zenica, Zenica (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
 - Prof. Lujza Grueva, PhD, Faculty of Medical Sciences, UKIM, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Lazar Stosic, PhD, Association for development of science, engineering and education, Vranje (Serbia)
 - Prof. Lisen Bashkurti PhD, Global Vice President of Sun Moon University (Albania)
 - Prof. Lence Mircevska PhD, High Medicine School, Bitola, (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Ljubomir Kekenovski PhD, Faculty of Economics, UKIM, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Ljupce Kocovski PhD, Faculty of Biotechnical sciences, Bitola (Macedonia)

-
- Prof. Marusya Lyubcheva PhD, University “Prof. Asen Zlatarov”, Member of the European Parliament, Burgas (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Maria Kavdanska PhD, Faculty of Pedagogy, South-West University Neofit Rilski, Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Maja Lubenova Cholakova PhD, Faculty of Public Health and Sport, SWU Neofit Rilski, Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Mirjana Borota-Popovska, PhD, Centre for Management and Human Resource Development, Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Mihail Garevski, PhD, Institute of Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Seismology, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Misho Hristovski PhD, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Mitko Kotovchevski, PhD, Faculty of Philosophy, UKIM, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Milan Radosavljevic PhD, Dean, Faculty of strategic and operational management, Union University, Belgrade (Serbia)
 - Prof. Marija Topuzovska-Latkovikj, PhD, Centre for Management and Human Resource Development, Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Marija Knezevic PhD, Academic, Banja Luka, (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
 - Prof. Margarita Bogdanova PhD, D.A.Tsenov Academy of Economics, Svishtov (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Mahmut Chelik PhD, Faculty of Philology, University “Goce Delchev”, Shtip (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Marija Mandaric PhD, Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism, University of Kragujevac, Vrnjacka Banja (Serbia)
 - Prof. Marina Simin PhD, College of professional studies in Management and Business Communication, Sremski Karlovci (Serbia)
 - Prof. Miladin Kalinic, College of professional studies in Management and Business Communication, Sremski Karlovci (Serbia)
 - Prof. Mitre Stojanovski PhD, Faculty of Biotechnical sciences, Bitola (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Miodrag Smelcerovic PhD, High Technological and Artistic Vocational School, Leskovac (Serbia)
 - Prof. Nadka Kostadinova, Faculty of Economics, Trakia University, Stara Zagora (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Natalija Kirejenko PhD, Faculty For economic and Business, Institute of Entrepreneurial Activity, Minsk (Belarus)
 - Prof. Nenad Taneski PhD, Military Academy “Mihailo Apostolski”, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Nevenka Tatkovic PhD, Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Pula (Croatia)
 - Prof. Nedžad Korajlic PhD, Dean, Faculty of criminal justice and security, University of Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
 - Prof. Nikolay Georgiev PhD, “Todor Kableshev” University of Transport, Sofia (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Nikolina Ognenska PhD, Faculty of Music, SEU - Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Nishad M. Navaz PhD, Kingdom University (India)
 - Prof. Oliver Iliev PhD, Faculty of Communication and IT, FON University, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Oliver Dimitrijevic PhD, High medicine school for professional studies “Hipokrat”, Bujanovac (Serbia)
 - Prof. Paul Sergius Koku, PhD, Florida State University, Florida (USA)
 - Prof. Primoz Dolenc, PhD, Faculty of Management, Primorska University, Koper (Slovenia)
 - Prof. Predrag Trajkovic PhD, JMPNT, Vranje (Serbia)
 - Prof. Petar Kolev PhD, “Todor Kableshev” University of Transport, Sofia (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Pere Tumbas PhD, Faculty of Economics, University of Novi Sad, Subotica (Serbia)

-
- Prof. Rade Ratkovic PhD, Faculty of Business and Tourism, Budva (Montenegro)
 - Prof. Rositsa Chobanova PhD, University of Telecommunications and Posts, Sofia (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Rumen Valcovski PhD, Imunolab Sofia (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Rumen Stefanov PhD, Dean, Faculty of public health, Medical University of Plovdiv (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Sasho Korunoski, Rector, UKLO, Bitola (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Sashko Plachkov PhD, Faculty of Pedagogy, University Neofit Rilski, Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Snezhana Lazarevic, PhD, College of Sports and Health, Belgrade (Serbia)
 - Prof. Stojan Ivanov Ivanov PhD, Faculty of Public Health and Sport, SWU Neofit Rilski, Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Snezana Stoilova, PhD, High Medicine School, Bitola, (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Stojna Ristevska PhD, High Medicine School, Bitola, (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Suzana Pavlovic PhD, High health – sanitary school for professional studies, Belgrade (Serbia)
 - Prof. Sandra Zivanovic, PhD, Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism, University of Kragujevac, Vrnjacka Banja (Serbia)
 - Prof. Shyqeri Kabashi, College “Biznesi”, Prishtina (Kosovo)
 - Prof. Trayan Popkochev PhD, Faculty of Pedagogy, South-West University Neofit Rilski, Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Todor Krystevich, Vice Rector, D.A. Tsenov Academy of Economics, Svishtov (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Todorka Atanasova, Faculty of Economics, Trakia University, Stara Zagora (Bulgaria)
 - Doc. Tatyana Sobolieva PhD, State Higher Education Establishment Vadiym Getman Kiyev National Economic University, Kiyev (Ukraine)
 - Prof. Tzako Pantaleev PhD, NBUniversity, Sofia (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Violeta Dimova PhD, Faculty of Philology, University “Goce Delchev”, Shtip (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Volodymyr Denysyuk, PhD, Dobrov Center for Scientific and Technological Potential and History studies at the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Ukraine)
 - Prof. Valentina Staneva PhD, “Todor Kableshkov” University of Transport, Sofia (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Vasil Zecev PhD, College of tourism, Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria)
 - Prof. Venus Del Rosario PhD, Arab Open University (Philippines)
 - Prof. Yuri Doroshenko PhD, Dean, Faculty of Economics and Management, Belgorod (Russian Federation)
 - Prof. Zlatko Pejkov, PhD, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, UKIM, Skopje (Macedonia)
 - Prof. Zivota Radosavljevic PhD, Dean, Faculty FORCUP, Union University, Belgrade (Serbia)
 - Prof. Zorka Jugovic PhD, High health – sanitary school for professional studies, Belgrade (Serbia)

REVIEW PROCEDURE AND REVIEW BOARD

Each paper is reviewed by the editor and, if it is judged suitable for this publication, it is then sent to two referees for double blind peer review.

The editorial review board is consisted of 45 members, full professors in the fields 1) Natural and mathematical sciences, 2) Technical and technological sciences, 3) Medical sciences and Health, 4) Biotechnical sciences, 5) Social sciences, and 6) Humanities from all the Balkan countries and the region.

CONTENTS

(CYBER) PUNK'S NOT DEAD – RICHARD MORGAN'S <i>ALTERED CARBON</i>	1603
Ana Kečan	1603
MODERNISM IN <i>MRS.DALLOWAY</i>	1609
Fatbardha Doko	1609
Hyreme Gurra	1609
Lirije Ameti	1609
THE DISCUSSION – AN INTERACTIVE LESSON IN LANGUAGE LEARNING	1615
Margarita Dimitrova	1615
A REFERENCE BOOK ON THE ASPECT OF BULGARIAN VERBS	1621
Antoaneta Pavlova	1621
FUNCTIONS OF THE PRAGMATIC MARKER <i>LIKE</i> IN ENGLISH AND HOW MACEDONIAN LEARNERS VIEW IT	1627
Marija Kusevska	1627
Biljana Ivanovska	1627
LANGUAGE TEACHING AT THE MEDICAL UNIVERSITY AND INSTRUMENTS FOR ACHIEVING EFFECTIVENESS.....	1633
Zlatina Zheleva	1633
Slavka Hristozova.....	1633
Rumyana Stoyanova	1633
THE ROLE OF SEMIOLOGY IN PUBLIC RELATIONS	1641
Sena Arif – Sheshum	1641
Kristina Nikolovska	1641
Dzunka Doncheva.....	1641
TYPES OF EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION	1645
Vesna Koceva	1645
THE ROLE OF THE INTERACTIVE LESSON WITH INTERDISCIPLINARY ASPECTS IN LITERATURE TRAINING.....	1651
Vasil Dimitrov	1651
THE PLACE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE RIDDLES IN EDUCATION IN TERMS OF LANGUAGE AND THOUGHTS	1659
Ümit Süleymani	1659
Mahmut Çelik	1659
NARRATIVE TEXTS IN THE TEACHING BULGARIAN TO FOREIGN STUDENTS AS A POSSIBILITY TO DEVELOP THE INTERCULTURAL AWARENESS AND COMPETENCE.....	1665
Mariya Genova	1665
Lidiya Kavrakova	1665
LEARNING THE PALKEN LANGUAGE AS AN OFFICIAL DIALECT OF THE BANATIAN BULGARIANS.....	1671
Penka Valcheva	1671
VULGARITY AND BEAUTY IN THE EXPRESSION OF FEMALE SEXUALITY IN LITERATURE AT DIFFERENT TIMES.....	1677
Evgeniy Kadiyski	1677
Zlatka Taneva	1677
WORD AND IMAGE.....	1683
Rumyana Lebedova	1683
ART AS A FACTOR IN THE PREVENTION OF AGGRESSION IN SCHOOL – THEORITICAL AND PRACTICAL ASPECTS	1689
Penka Marcheva	1689

FUNCTIONS OF THE PRAGMATIC MARKER *LIKE* IN ENGLISH AND HOW MACEDONIAN LEARNERS VIEW IT

Marija Kusevska

Goce Delchev University-Shtip, Republic of N. Macedonia, marija.kusevska@ugd.edu.mk

Biljana Ivanovska

Goce Delchev University-Shtip, Republic of N. Macedonia, biljana.ivanovska@ugd.edu.mk

Abstract: The study presented in this paper is a part of the research project “Developing cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics research and its practical implications” currently being implemented at Goce Delchev University in Shtip, Republic of North Macedonia. This project was partly motivated by the small number of studies in Macedonia on interlanguage pragmatics as well as by the growing need for development of new research methods. In compliance with the above, the objectives of the project are as follows: 1. increase of the pool of cross-cultural, intercultural, and interlanguage pragmatics studies; 2. development of modern methods for data collection and analysis; and 3. linking empirical research with educational and communication needs in the society. This paper in particular investigates the use of the pragmatic marker *like* by Macedonian learners of English. Two research questions have been posed: 1. What functions do MLE of English associate with *like*? and 2. How do they view speakers who use it? The standard for comparison for the first question is the native speakers’ usage of *like* as described in other studies. The second question was answered on the basis of an attitudinal questionnaire. The attitudinal questionnaire asked the participants to express their perception of *like* with respect to the age and gender of the speakers, formality of the situation, grammaticality, acceptability, distractiveness, and politeness of the utterances. They also rated users for fluency and their level of English. The participants were also asked to explain if they use *like* in a similar way and for what purposes as well as how they learned it. The attitudinal survey was adapted from Dailey-O’Cain (2000). The examples, however, are from my data. The participants of this study were 40 students of English enrolled at the Department of English language at Goce Delchev University, Shtip, age 19 to 25. Most of them were at B2, C1 or C2 level of English. All participants learned English for at least five years in primary school and four years at high school, which means they had English as a subject up to their graduation from high school. Very few of the students had been to an English speaking country. The findings of this investigation show that the pragmatic marker *like* is salient for the learners and that they use it in a similar way as native speakers. However, it is stigmatized and most learners view it negatively. Additionally, other factors that influence its usage were identified. Further research may investigate whether the use of *like* is influenced by the proficiency levels of English and whether a longer stay in an English speaking country influences the use of *like*. It would be also useful to investigate other pragmatic markers and see how they are used in learner English.

Keywords: interlanguage, pragmatic markers, functions, attitudinal questionnaire, fluency

1. INTRODUCTION

The study presented in this paper is a part of the research project “Developing cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics research and its practical implications”, which is currently being implemented at Goce Delchev University in Shtip, Republic of Macedonia. It focuses on the pragmatic marker *like* used by Macedonian learners of English (MLE) as in the example below:

OK, yes, but still we have to *like* think about the future of our country. If everybody left for ... *like* to live abroad or to work abroad *like*, what would be left here? Nothing to err work for or *like* live the err I don’t know. I have a cousin and he *like* moved abroad and we didn’t even see him *like* I don’t know for years and years. And you just *like* don’t have that connection no more.

The PM *like* is the most common innovative feature of modern English (Andersen, 2001; Blyth et al., 1990; Buchstaller and D’Arcy, 2009; Tagliamonte and D’Arcy, 2004; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999). Most of the studies of *like* deal with American data (Blyth et al, 1990; Fox Tree, 2006; Fuller, 2003; Jucker and Smith, 1998; Meehan, 1991; Miller and Weinert, 1995; Schourup, 1985; Tannen, 1986; Underhill, 1988). It tends to be associated with southern Californian teenage talk (Valley speak; Valley girls). It is believed that from there it spread to other English speaking countries as a result of extensive cross-cultural contact. Some in-depth research on *like* has also been done in Britain (Andersen, 2001; Cheshire, 2007; Dailey-O’Cain, 2000; Tagliamonte and Hudson, 1999), Canada (Tagliamonte and D’Arcy, 2004), as well as in Australia (Winter, 2002). An often cited study is also Buchstaller and D’Arcy (2009) who compared the usage of quotative *like* in the United States, England, and New Zealand.

The PM *like* is often stigmatized. In his corpus on narratives, Underhill (1988) calls the pragmatic use of *like* “ungrammatical in standard English”. The use of *like* as in *we hitch a ride out of there with uh this like one crazy like music major guy* is considered by many “to be superfluously sprinkled into talk, a bad habit best avoided” (Fox Tree, 2006: 723). Dailey-O’Cain’s study (2000) also showed that many people have negative opinions about *like*. The most common reason mentioned for disliking it is “the notion that it makes people sound uneducated or lazy” (Dailey-O’Cain, 2000: 70).

Most of the pragmatic markers are multifunctional. They can serve different pragmatic functions in different contexts, but they can also have several pragmatic features at the same time. Underhill (1988: 234) suggests that *like* functions as a marker of new information and focus as in *But then the first day of our skiing, you know we're gettin all excited to go skiing the first day it's like snowing ... blizzard snowing*. Andersen (2001) looks at it as a signal to the hearer that there is a non-identical resemblance relation between a linguistically encoded concept and the concept in the speaker’s thought and instructs the hearer to opt for a less-than-literal interpretation of the utterance. The taxonomies of most studies include approximation, exemplification, and quotative *like*. Andersen (2001) and Müller (2005) also include the function of *like* as a hesitational/ linking device while Müller (2005) and Beeching (2016) include the function of *like* to mark lexical focus. In addition, Andersen includes the function of metalinguistic focus, Müller includes the function of introducing an explanation and Beeching includes the function of hedging.

The function of the quotative *like* has also received significant attention (Andersen, 2001; Blyth et al., 1990; Beeching, 2016; Buchstaller and D’Arcy, 2009; Meehan, 1991; Tagliamonte and Hudson, 1999). *Be like* operates as a fixed unit which may be close in meaning to verbs of saying/thinking (Andersen, 2001). It cannot be omitted in this position and it is essential for the syntactic well-formedness of the utterance. Its function is to point to a thought produced by the speaker or someone else, and which may or may not have been verbally realised in an utterance: ... and then, and then Kevin came up to me and said erm [...] if you if you go and see Mark this afternoon erm he would *like* to speak to you, I was *like*, ‘He should come and speak to me’ (Andersen, 2001: 250). Although the quotative *like* may appear both in present and in past tense, it is more likely to convey the effects of historical present, such as adding vivacity and immediacy, demarcating authority, or structuring the discourse (Buchstaller and D’Arcy, 2009).

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

Like as a pragmatic marker is not taught in EFL classes but its frequency in learner conversation is surprising.

We pose two research questions here: 1. What functions do MLE of English associate with *like*? 2. How do they view speakers who use it? The participants of this study were 40 students of English enrolled at the Department of English language and literature at Goce Delcev University, Stip, Republic of North Macedonia. Their age ranged from 19 to 25. All participants learned English for at least five years in primary school and four years at high school, which means they had English as a subject up to their graduation from high school. Very few of the students had been to an English speaking country and had had a chance to learn English in an informal environment. Most of the participants were B2, C1 or C2 level. For the purpose of this part of the study attitudinal data were collected from the participants about their perception of *like* with respect to the age and gender of the speakers, formality of the situation, grammaticality, acceptability, distractiveness, and politeness of the utterances. They also rated users for fluency and their level of English. The participants were also asked to explain if they use *like* in a similar way and for what purposes as well as how they learned it. The attitudinal survey was adapted from Dailey-O’Cain (2000). The examples, however, were from my data.

3. FUNCTIONS OF *LIKE* IN ENGLISH

The functions of *like* can be classified in three groups: 1. as verb, noun, adjective, preposition, conjunction, and in fixed expressions; 2. as a pragmatic marker; and 3. as a quotative *be like*. The examples of *like* as a verb or a preposition are most common in the first group. As a verb, it is mostly used to talk about likes (*which I, I like very mu..., very much*) and dislikes (*I don't like possessive people*). The preposition *like* is used for comparison. In these structures it is often used with *be like*, *look like*, or *feel like*. Quite common are also the expressions with *like that* (*something like that/this; stuff like that/this*). *Like* as a conjunction is generally considered informal (Müller, 2005, p. 206). It appears with the meaning of *as* (*Like he said, they should be put in shelter*) and *as if* (*Well, I kind of feel like I need space and time when I am not with her*). Sometimes *like* is also used as a noun (*I won't get enough likes*).

In this paper, however, we are not interested in these meanings of *like*. We are here interested in the usage of *like* as a pragmatic marker. The functions of the pragmatic marker *like* are very different from those given above. Those given below are based on Andersen (2001), Müller (2005) and Beeching (2016).

I. Like and interpretive resemblance

Andersen (2001, p. 230) argues that “*Like* is a marker whose main contribution to utterance meaning is as a signal that the relation between an utterance and its underlying thought is not a one-to-one relation, but a relation of non-identical resemblance”. This meaning includes the following functions: 1. Approximation of a measurable unit; 2. Loose use of lexical expression; 3. Exemplification; and 4. Introducing an explanation. They can be paraphrased as *approximately, roughly, similar to, for example, virtually, as it were, so to speak, or so called*. The examples below illustrate the connection between the pragmatic marker *like* and loose use of language in the English interlanguage of Macedonian learners of English:

- (1) It's *like* five hundred euros I believe.
- (2) I haven't seen him, *like*, maybe, half a year.
- (3) They... were *like* speaking English I'm... I really... I was confused. That was the English department, but they didn't speak good English.
- (4) ... we waste a lot of time on our... our applications *like* Facebook or social media Instagram for instance but (mm-hmm)
- (5) That did not discouraged me to not go anywhere *like* I'll... I'll still wanna explore, but I l...
- (6) S2: And that's why they go there hmm... Creating possibilities for themselves and so many of them just go with a plan to stay there.
S1: Yes.
S2: Yes, they...
S1: Yes, *like* the United States.
- (7) Oh that's my dream *like* I would *like* to go to the United States.
- (8) No , I... I'm not judgmental about that, *like* it's your own body, you do
- (9) *like*, what would be left here?
- (10) And *like*, do you think that the problem is me, that I don't wanna spend that much time with them?

Approximation of a measurable unit refers to numeral phrases and other measurable units which represent rough representation of the quantity contained in the phrase. This category includes cases in which *like* precedes expressions of quantity, time period, or frequency. It's easier to process five hundred euros (1) than let's say 534 euros and it's more convenient to say half a year (2) than to go into precisely defining the number of months and days that she hasn't seen him. Example (3) is also a case of rough approximation but the material that is introduced is 'conceptually loose'. By saying that they were '*like* speaking English', she makes it explicit that the language they spoke was similar to English but she would not quite identify it as such. Examples (4) and (5) illustrate *like* as a pragmatic marker whose function is to suggest that the following noun phrases are to be understood as exemplifications of wider categories and the noun phrases that are preceded by *like* pick out one of a larger set of alternatives.

Like can also mark units that need to undergo the enrichment process, i.e. extension of the given information to make it more understandable. The speaker in (7) makes her dream more specific by adding I would *like* to go to the United States; not judgmental in (8) is made more specific with *it's your own body*. We were able to notice that not only did participants used *like* with explanations of certain expressions, but also with questions asking for explanations, opinions or additional information, as in (9) and (10).

II. Marking lexical focus

Another important function of *like* is to put the item that it accompanies in focus. Müller (2005, p. 221) notes that the scope of *like* in this function may be nouns, verbs, adverbs and adjectives. The following examples taken from my data illustrate the functions of *like* as focuser:

- (11) I don't agree with *like* poison, but at the end of the day I do agree that ...
- (12) But, that's, *like*, crazy, *like*, all the time ...
- (13) I don't wanna just sit here and, *like*, stare at you,
- (14) I see him *like* during the week just maybe in a couple of minutes
- (15) Yeah, but you were talking and then you were, *like*, just immediately shut down,
- (16) and in Chinese and they don't have an idea what that means and we find out that means something *like* really bizarre hhh
- (17) ... *like*, hell ...

The above examples illustrate that several Macedonian learners employed *like* before an expression which is clearly exaggerated, as in (16) and (17).

III. *Like* as a hesitational/ linking device

Like can occur in connection with planning difficulties and linguistic formulation of utterances. Müller (2005) refers to this function as ‘searching for the appropriate expression’ because it can be used when the speaker is thinking about what to say next. However, for *like* to be classified as an indicator of search, at least one other hesitational marker had to be present, such as filled and unfilled pauses (Müller, 2005, p. 2008). Andersen (2001) describes four distinct situations in which *like* can be used as a hesitational/linking device: false starts (18), cut-off utterances (19) and to provide a discourse link between syntactically or thematically distinct units of discourse (20). These functions are illustrated below with examples from our data:

(18) That’s *like* they... It w... I was hi.. It was hard for me to understand because hmm...

(19) Ye... Yes it was. *Like* hmm... (end of turn)

(20) I mean not get bored but hmm... I think hmm... Spending too much time *like* ... That’s when hmm... You start fighting and some things bother you and if you just give some time to... for things to cool out you... you don’t see each other for five, six, seven... A week or hmm... If you just see hmm... If you don’t see each other during the week, when you... you just you’re eager to see him in the weekend and you have the best time ever.

IV. Quotative *be like*

Quotative *be like* is used to represent thoughts and feelings. Sometimes, we can see lip movements, so that the person retelling the scene can assume speech, but often the “quotation” represents feelings, reactions, and thoughts.

(21) You know I’m *like*, ‘First I’ll finish college and settle hmm... Build my own life and then I’ll will talk about everything’

Macedonian learners used it more often with second and third person than with first person, and in both present and past tense:

(22) Because they’re *like*, ‘I’m gonna be cool; I’m gonna have tattooed something, a word or whatever’

(23) He was *like*, ‘No, imagine if you’re going for an interview or have some kind of a meeting, conference, whatever and you’re wearing

(24) when they’re all *like*, ‘you’re un-‘

In the examples below the speakers use *like* with a different reporting verb/phrase. In the first example the speaker introduces a question by explicitly naming it plus *like*. In the second one *like* is preceded by the reporting verb say.

(25) My question to you is *like*, do you agree that tattoos are unprofessional?

(26) I just say them to their face *like*, Do turn off your phone.

4. STUDENT’S PERCEPTION OF *LIKE*

Students’ perception of *like* was examined through an attitudinal questionnaire. The questionnaire required learners to express how they view users of *like* with respect to their gender, age, education, friendliness, politeness and formality. Additionally, they were asked to express their view of non-native speakers who use it with respect to fluency, destructiveness, grammaticality, level of English and politeness. Learners were asked to explain if they use the PM *like* and how they use it as well as how they learned it.

The results of this investigation show that the pragmatic marker *like* is salient for MLE. *Like* as a PM is not taught in EFL classes and it is not illustrated in EFL listening and reading materials. In the attitudinal survey students reported that they had learned it through media exposure especially movies, reality shows, interviews, You Tube videos, etc. No matter whether learners use or don’t use *like* in their speech, all students who did the survey are aware of it and most of them see it as a mark of informal communication (35). The attitudinal survey of our study showed that while most of the respondents (32) identify the usage of *like* with younger speakers, they do not clearly identify it with the gender of the speaker: 15 learners identify it with male speakers, 12 with female speakers, and 13 do not identify it with any of the genders. Accordingly there is no clear association with one or the other gender.

It is interesting that most of the learners have negative perception of the usage of *like*. They see native speakers who use it abundantly as unfriendly (25), not cheerful (24), uninteresting (24), impolite (31). As for education, 12 learners see the speakers using *like* uneducated while 19 said that they wouldn’t know. They find such conversations distractive (26) and difficult to follow (29). They see it as a marker of disfluency (24) and a low level of proficiency in English (30). Some of the reasons that they quoted for not using it were that they don’t like how it sounds; it shows uncertainty and it sounds impolite; it makes the conversation sound informal and ungrammatical; they try to make sentences clear so that it would be easier for the others to understand what they are saying; it sounds rough and it looks like you don’t have enough vocabulary and you are not fluent in English; using it too much can irritate the listener and make the atmosphere uncomfortable; also it sounds annoying. One of the respondents said that *like* users sound like gangsters and boast too much. It is interesting that the respondents in Dailey-O’Cain’s (Dailey-O’Cain, 2000) study also indicated an abundance of very strong negative opinions.

Only 6 of the students were really positive about the usage of the PM *like* in conversation and think that it helps them organize their speech, 19 said that they don't use it at all and 15 said that they sometimes or rarely use it. Learners find it useful to emphasize strong emotions or make the situation more interesting; to describe something; to formulate utterances when they are not sure what to say or how to express themselves and *like* gives them time to think; to link sentences; it makes talking easier, for example if you are confused, if you can't think of something or if you don't know the exact word or phrase. One of the respondent said that she uses it but not too often; only when she has so much to say she starts using it a lot. Most of the students who use it feel guilty about that and hope that they don't use it too often.

Previous studies of pragmatic markers showed that students with a higher proficiency in the learned language who are more acculturated to the L2 environment are more likely to use more discourse markers (Hellermann & Vergun, 2007; Polat, 2011). The usage of *like* in our data supports this finding. The findings from students' reports in the survey of their view of *like* suggest that there is a connection between frequency of use of *like* in learners' conversations and their attitudes towards this marker. The more positive they are, the more likely it is that they will use it more frequently. In spite of the high level of proficiency in English (C1 or C2), learners who took a very negative attitude of *like* and reported to find it annoying avoided using it in their conversations. Still, several learners who said that they don't use *like* actually used it in their conversations. This seems to be the case with some pragmatic markers even in our native language. They are socially stigmatized. Speakers tend to expose a negative attitude towards a certain marker and claim that they never use it.

5. CONCLUSION

The results of the present study provide new data on the usage of the PM *like* in the interlanguage of MLE. Our research confirms that the functions that they identify with *like* are similar to those used by native speakers. This is remarkable when we consider that *like* is not taught in the classroom. The study also indicates that *like* is one of those markers that is stigmatized by listeners. In spite of this, it is very frequent in the speech of both native and non-native speakers. Learners indicated several aspects of how it is useful for them, but most of them pointed out that it helps them organize their turn and deal with structural and conceptual uncertainty. This study also sheds light on how foreign language learners use all the resources around them in order to become more fluent and efficient in conversation. The B2+ learners have become autonomous in their learning. They are active observers of how language is used in communication, which helps them improve their communication.

The present study is by no means without its limitations, some of which may be addressed by future research. Further research may investigate whether the use of *like* is influenced by the proficiency levels of English and whether a longer stay in an English speaking country influences the use of *like*. It would be also useful to investigate other pragmatic markers and see how they are used in learner English.

REFERENCES

- Buchstaller, I., & D'Arcy, A. (2009). Localized globalization: A multi-local, multivariate investigation of quotative *be like*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13 (3), 291–331.
- Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation : a relevance-theoretic aproach to the language of adolescents* . Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Beeching, K. (2016). *Pragmatic markers: Meaning in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blyth , C., Recktenwald, S., & Wang, J. (1990). I'm like 'Say what?!': A new quotative in American oral narrative. *American Speech* 65 (3), 215-227.
- Cheshire, J. (2007). Discourse variation, grammaticalisation and stuff like that. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11 (2) , 155–193.
- Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2000). The sociolinguistic distribution of and attitudes toward focuser like and quotative like. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4 (1), 60-80.
- Fox Tree, J. E. (2006). Placing like in telling stories. *Discourse Studies* 8 (6), 723–743.
- Fuller, J. M. (2003). Use of Discourse marker like in interviews. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7 (3), 365-377.
- Hellermann, J., & Vergun, A. (2007). Language which is not taught: The discourse marker use of beginning adult learners of English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 157–179.
- Jucker, A. H., & Smith, S. W. (1998). And people just you know like 'wow': Discourse Markers as Negotiating Strategies. In A. H. Jucker, & Y. Ziv, *Discourse markers* (pp. 171-202). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Meehan, T. (1991). It's like 'What's happening in the evolution of like? *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 16, 37-51.

- Miller, J., & Weinert, R. (1995). The function of LIKE in dialogue. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23, 365–393.
- Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Polat, B. (2011). Investigating acquisition of discourse markers through a developmental learner corpus. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 3745–3756.
- Schourup, L. C. (1985). *Common discourse particles in English conversation*. New York/London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Tagliamonte, S., & D’Arcy, A. (2004). He’s like, she’s like: The quotative system in Canadian youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8 (4), 493-514.
- Tagliamonte, S., & Hudson, R. (1999). Be like et al. beyond America: The quotative system in British and Canadian youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (2), 147-172.
- Tannen, D. (1986). Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and Literary Narrative. In F. (. Coulmas, *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 311-332). Berlin/Amsterdam/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Underhill, R. (1988). Like is, like, focus. *American Speech* 63 (3), 234-246.
- Winter, J. (2002). Discourse quotatives in Australian English: Adolescents performing. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 22, 6–21.