

REBUPLIC OF TURKEY
ISTANBUL MEDENIYET UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

The Use of Discourse Markers
in High School EFL Learners' Speech and Writing

Master's Thesis

BÜŞRA YILDIRIM

JULY 2022

REBUPLIC OF TURKEY
ISTANBUL MEDENIYET UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

The Use of Discourse Markers
in High School EFL Learners' Speech and Writing

Master's Thesis

BÜŞRA YILDIRIM

SUPERVISOR

ASSOC. PROF. DR. ÖZGE CENGİZ ALKAN

JULY 2022

BİLDİRİM

Hazırladığım tezin tamamen kendi çalışmam olduğunu, akademik ve etik kuralları gözeterek çalıştığımı ve her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi taahhüt ederim.

İmza

Büşra Yıldırım

Danışmanlığını yaptığım işbu tezin tamamen öğrencinin çalışması olduğunu, akademik ve etik kuralları gözeterek çalıştığımı taahhüt ederim.

Doç. Dr. Özge Cengiz Alkan

İMZA SAYFASI

Büşra Yıldırım tarafından hazırlanan ‘The Use of Discourse Markers in High School EFL Learners’ Speech and Writing’ başlıklı bu yüksek lisans tezi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalında hazırlanmış ve jürimiz tarafından kabul edilmiştir.

JÜRİ ÜYELERİ

İMZA

Tez Danışmanı:

Doç. Dr. Özge Cengiz Alkan

.....

Kurumu: İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi

Üyeler:

Prof. Dr. Selami Aydın

.....

Kurumu: İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi

Hamide Çakır Sarı

.....

Kurumu: Niğde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 26/07/2022

ABSTRACT
THE USE OF DISCOURSE MARKERS
IN HIGH SCHOOL EFL LEARNERS' SPEECH AND WRITING

Yıldırım, Büşra

Master's Thesis Program, Department of Foreign Language Education, English
Language Education

Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özge Cengiz Alkan

July 2022. 119 pages.

Discourse markers have been textual elements that contribute to cohesion and authenticity of language use. Though there are some studies on the discourse marker use of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners in university settings, there is almost no study examining the discourse marker use of high school EFL learners both in spoken and written databases in an online setting. The purpose of this descriptive study is twofold: To determine the types and frequencies of discourse markers used by high school EFL learners in speech and writing and the functions of these discourse markers based on Fung and Carter's (2007) classification. 19 students, 14 females and 5 males, from two private high schools participated in the study. First, the participants watched a silent animation. Later, their oral and written descriptions of the story were collected through online individual sessions. Recordings of the speaking tasks took 59.6 minutes in total and 2.57 minutes per student. The written data was collected via Google Forms. Du Bois's (1991) transcription conventions were adopted to transcribe the spoken data. The ten most common discourse markers both in the spoken and written databases were analyzed in terms of type, frequency, and function. The findings showed that students uttered more words and discourse markers in the spoken database than in the written database. The ten most frequent discourse markers in the spoken language are *and, then, but, so, just, I think, like, because, first(ly), and yeah* whereas they are *and, but, then, because (of), just, so, first(ly), finally, actually, and I think* in the written language. Taking the results of the analysis into account, this study is believed to contribute to the understanding of discourse marker use in the EFL context.

Key Words: Discourse, Discourse Markers, EFL Learner Talk, EFL Learners' Writing



ÖZET

YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENEN LİSE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN SÖZLÜ VE YAZILI DİLDE SÖYLEM BELİRLEYİCİSİ KULLANIMLARI

Yıldırım, Büşra

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

Bilim Dalı

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Özge Cengiz Alkan

Temmuz, 2022. 119 sayfa.

Söylem belirleyicileri, bağlaşıklığa ve dilin gerçeğe uygun şekilde kullanımına katkıda bulunan metinsel öğelerdir. Üniversite bağlamında yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenenlerin söylem belirleyicisi kullanımını inceleyen çalışmalar olmasına karşın, lise düzeyindeki öğrencilerin çevrimiçi ortamda hem sözlü hem de yazılı veride söylem belirleyicisi kullanımlarını inceleyen neredeyse hiçbir çalışma bulunmamaktadır. Bu betimsel çalışmanın amacı yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen lise öğrencilerinin söylem belirleyicisi kullanımının türlerini ve sıklıklarını sözlü ve yazılı veride incelemek, ayrıca Fung ve Carter'ın (2007) sınıflandırmasını temel alarak bu belirleyicilerin işlevlerini ortaya koymaktır. Çalışmaya iki özel liseden 14 kız ve 5 erkek olmak üzere 19 öğrenci katılmıştır. Önce katılımcılar sessiz bir film izlemiş, daha sonra ise izletilen bu filmin sözlü ve yazılı olarak anlatılması istenmiştir. Sözlü ve yazılı veri, bireysel çevrimiçi oturumlarla toplanmıştır. Sözlü veri toplamda 59 dakika 6 saniye ve öğrenci başına ortalama olarak 2 dakika 57 saniye sürmüştür. Yazılı veri ise Google Formlar aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Kayıtların çevriyazısı sürecinde Du Bois (1991) temel alınmıştır. Sözlü ve yazılı veri tabanındaki en yaygın 10 söylem belirleyicisi tür, sıklık ve işlev açısından incelenmiştir. Öğrencilerin sözlü veride, yazılı veriye oranla hem daha fazla sözcük hem de daha fazla söylem belirleyicisi kullandıkları saptanmıştır. Sözlü verideki en yaygın on söylem belirleyicisi *ve, daha sonra, ama, bu yüzden, sadece, bence, gibi, çünkü, ilk önce, ve evet* iken yazılı verideki en yaygın on söylem belirleyicisi *ve, ama, daha sonra, çünkü, ilk önce, son olarak, aslında, ve bence* olarak ortaya konmuştur. Bu çalışmanın bulgularının, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce bağlamında söylem belirleyicisi kullanımının anlaşılmasına katkıda bulunacağı düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Söylem, Söylem Belirleyicileri, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğrenenlerin Konuşmaları, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğrenenlerin Yazıları



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis has been a demanding process that I went through with the sincere help of the people around me. Words cannot explain how grateful I am to those who supported me during this challenging period.

First and foremost, I owe my gratitude to my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özge Cengiz Alkan for her invaluable feedback and endless motivation. It would not have been possible to accomplish this thesis without her expertise. Thank you for paving the way for me whenever I lost it hocam!

Additionally, I would like to thank my thesis committee members, Prof. Dr. Selami Aydın and Asst. Prof. Dr. Hamide Çakır Sarı for their constructive feedback and valuable insight. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Asst. Prof. Dr. Ferdane Denkçi Akkaş for teaching me how to reflect on my classroom practices during my master's education.

I also owe my thanks to my lovely students for volunteering to participate in this study as they knew that the data they provided would be of great help to me!

I am also grateful to my friends Yasin Kuzdağ, Banu Betül Tanış, and Ayşe Kapukaya for encouraging me to pursue a master's degree and never leaving my questions unanswered.

Besides, I would like to thank TÜBİTAK (Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) for supporting this study financially as a part of the 2210-A National Scholarship for Master's Students Program.

Finally yet importantly, I am indebted to my beloved husband Ersin Yıldırım for his love and support from the very beginning of this journey!

TABLE OF CONTENT

BİLDİRİM	iii
İMZA SAYFASI.....	iv
ÖZET.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.2. Purpose of the Study.....	2
1.3. Research Questions	2
1.4. Significance of the Study	2
1.5. Limitations of the Study	3
CHAPTER II.....	4
2.1. Text, Cohesion, Coherence	4
2.2. Discourse	6
2.2.1. Discourse Definitions	6
2.2.2. Discourse Competence	6
2.2.3. Spoken and Written Discourse	7
2.3. Conversation Analysis.....	9
2.4. Discourse Analysis	12
2.5. Discourse Markers.....	18
2.5.1. Conjunctions	22
2.6. Conclusion.....	36
CHAPTER III	37
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	37
3.1. The Use of Discourse Markers in Various Fields	37
3.2. Discourse Markers in EFL/ESL Settings in the World	39
3.2.1. Discourse Markers in Reading and Listening Comprehension	39

3.2.2. Discourse Markers in EFL Classroom Interaction, Teacher Talk, and Lectures.....	40
3.2.3. Studies in Written Context.....	42
3.2.4. Studies in Spoken Context.....	44
3.3. Discourse Marker Studies in the Turkish Context	46
3.3.1. Studies in the Written Context in Turkey	46
3.3.2. Studies in the Spoken Context in Turkey	48
3.3.3. Studies on the Discourse Marker Use in Teacher Talk and Perception in the Turkish Context	50
3.3.4. Studies Analyzing Discourse Marker Use in the Turkish Language.....	50
3.4. Conclusion.....	52
CHAPTER IV	53
METHODOLOGY.....	53
4.1. Setting.....	53
4.2. Participants	53
4.3. Data Collection and Procedures	54
4.4. Data Analysis	54
CHAPTER V.....	56
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	56
5.1. Findings	56
5.1.1. Overall Findings	56
5.1.2. DM Use According to Fung and Carter's (2007) Model.....	58
5.1.3. Findings Regarding the Spoken Data	59
5.1.4. Findings Regarding the Written Data	65
5.2. Discussion	71
CHAPTER VI	81
CONCLUSION.....	81
6.1. Summary of the Study	81
6.2. Pedagogical Implications and Suggestions	82
6.3. Suggestions for Further Research.....	83

REFERENCES.....	85
APPENDICES	98
Appendix 1: Du Bois’s (1991) Transcription Conventions.....	98
Appendix 2: Background And Language Attitude Survey.....	99
Appendix 3: Participants’ Answers to Questions Regarding Attitude Towards Language	102
Appendix 4: Informed Consent Form	103
Appendix 5: Approval of the Ethical Council.....	104
ÖZGEÇMİŞ	105



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Planes of Talk from Schiffrin (1987: 316)	24
Table 2. Maschler's Classification of DMs [Adapted from Maschler (1994: 350-351)]	27
Table 3. Redeker's Classification of DMs [Adapted from Redeker (1990: 372-374)]	28
Table 4. Fraser's (1996) Categorization of DMs.....	31
Table 5. Brinton's (1996) Categorization of Pragmatic Functions of DMs (Castro, 2009: 61-73).....	32
Table 6. Fung and Carter's (2007: 418) Categorization of DMs	34
Table 7. Participants	53
Table 8. Total Word Count.....	57
Table 9. All the DMs Occurred in the Spoken Data.....	57
Table 10. DMs Occurred in the Written Data	58
Table 11. The Categories and Functions and Overall DMs According to Fung and Carter's (2007: 418) Model.....	59
Table 12. DMs Used by Each Learner in Speech.....	60
Table 13. The Functions (Categories) and Frequencies of the DMs in the Spoken Data	61
Table 14. DMs Used by Each Learner in Writing.....	66
Table 15. The Functions (Categories) and Frequencies of the DMs in the Written Data	67

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CA	: Conversation Analysis
DA	: Discourse Analysis
DMs	: Discourse Markers
ELT	: English Language Teaching
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ESL	: English as a Second Language
IRE	: Initiation-response-evaluation
IRF	: Initiation-response-feedback
L1	: First Language
L2	: Second Language
SLA	: Second Language Acquisition
S1	: First Segment
S2	: Second Segment

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Language learning is a unique journey for each learner and it is, at the same time, a must in today's world. In settings, such as Turkey, where not all the students have a chance to interact with native speakers, there has to be more emphasis on language skills and how to improve them. Considering that, the requirements of this journey have been investigated from different perspectives in various academic settings. The studies on four essential skills to be acquired during this process constitute an important part of English Language Teaching (hereafter ELT) research. These skills are divided into two main categories as *receptive* and *productive* skills.

As the subcategories of productive skills, *speaking* and *writing* have always been crucial to learners since they are the means via which they will be demonstrating their language proficiency. Belhabib (2015) argues that these skills are especially crucial in the English as Foreign Language (hereafter EFL) context since they require both oral and written production of vocabulary. Hossain (2015) discusses the importance of these two skills stating that they provide the learners with an opportunity to imitate real-life conditions in a classroom environment and measure how far the learners progress in learning requirements. Olshtain and Cohen (1991) suggest that it is essential to have *communicative competence*, which refers to learners' capacity to comprehend and utilize language properly, for one to say that s/he is proficient in a language. Emphasizing the importance of speaking skills, Qureshi (2007) mentions the specific advantages of improving such as feeling good when sharing ideas, gaining a deeper insight into communication, and also attracting an audience.

From a linguistic point of view, one of the most contemporary ways of analyzing learners' spoken and written language production is *discourse analysis* (hereafter DA). Starting from the second half of the twentieth century with Harris (1952), various researchers defined this broad term (see Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Cook, 1989; Renkema, 2004; Paltridge, 2008). When the contribution of DA to language use and learning is understood, *discourse markers* (hereafter DMs) have also been the subject of many studies, especially starting with Schifffrin's (1987) description and categorization, which was followed by other researchers (see Redeker, 1990; Maschler, 1994; Brinton, 1996; Fraser, 1996; Fung and Carter, 2007). DMs have also been the subject of a great deal of research in ESL (English as Second Language)/EFL settings when analyzing and comparing native and non-native speech and writing as they help make language production more authentic (e.g., Trillo, 2002; Fung and Carter, 2007; Ünaldı, 2013). The more students need authenticity, the more emphasis on DMs will be witnessed in today's globalized world where people need to learn a foreign language more than ever.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

The aim of this study is twofold: To reveal the DM use of high school EFL learners and its frequency in written and spoken language and to determine the functions of DMs.

1.3. Research Questions

This study will try to answer the following questions:

1. What are the types and frequencies of discourse markers in EFL high school learners' speech and writing?
2. What are the functions of the discourse markers used by the learners?

1.4. Significance of the Study

Even though there are studies conducted on the use of DMs in spoken and written language separately, there is no study comparing the use of DMs in spoken and written data collected from the learners in the Turkish context. Most of the previous research was solely on the use of DMs in written data and the number of studies on the use of DMs in spoken data was also limited. Moreover, an important number of these studies

were conducted in preparatory classes in private or state university settings or with students in English Language Teaching (hereafter ELT) departments. On the other hand, the setting of the present study is two high schools, namely a younger learner group when compared to the previous studies. It was also conducted via an online platform during online education as a consequence of the Covid-19 Pandemic restrictions, which might have a leading role for future studies as it had to be conducted online. Considering all the aforementioned points, this study aims at filling a gap in DM research in the Turkish EFL context.

1.5. Limitations of the Study

This study was conducted with only 19 students, who have more or less a similar educational and socio-cultural background, in two private high schools during the pandemic restrictions and online education. Conducting a similar study in a different setting might yield different results. Also, speaking and writing in an online setting might have affected the language use of the participants either positively or negatively. Besides, the short silent animation used in the scope of this study might have affected the use of certain DMs and different results might have been obtained with a different visual content. Lastly, carrying out this study with a different DM classification might result in different findings since some of the language elements that are treated as DMs in other research settings are not included in the classification adopted in the current study.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter presents some basic concepts such as text, cohesion, coherence, the historical background for discourse, spoken and written discourse, conversation analysis (hereafter CA), DA, DMs, conjunctions, and DM categorizations.

2.1. Text, Cohesion, Coherence

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 1) define a *text* as a “unit of language in use” in their frequently-referred and important book. Prior (2003) clarifies that it is possible to use text as a term in a wider context as it points out diverse cognitive and verbal depictions of language components without paying attention to whether it is written or not and affirms that in addition to their producers and context, it is also vital to examine content and organization of texts. McCarthy (1991) emphasizes the fact that reading a text is an intricate process as the reader is required to comprehend the elements that cater to its unity, which depends on both the receiver and the writer. Schiffrin (2001) argues that the capacity to make sense of a text is also a part of *communicative competence*, through which meaning is conveyed and discourse is organized. Halliday and Hasan (1976) add that how to make sense of these elements depends on one another.

Additionally, *texture* refers to the elements that create a text, and being one of them, *cohesion* consists of language elements used by its native speakers unwittingly and it occurs by relying on both grammatical structures and vocabulary (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Renkema (2004) argues that cohesion is the relation between the elements of a text and it can be recognized in discourse. Cook (1989) further argues that cohesion is important both in speech and writing; however, the kind of discourse and whether it is spoken or written have an impact on how to opt for linguistic elements that create it. Paltridge (2008) points out that foreign language learners will benefit from it in writing

as it gives a text its unity and conformity. McCharty (1991) explains that cohesion is not only a feature of written language but also a property of speech.

Redeker (1990) points out that coherence is about both how ideas are combined in terms of their meaning and how speakers or writers achieve this pragmatically. Widdowson (2008) explains that coherence refers to how the sentences and their parts associate to provide *propositional development* and explains that sentences do not demonstrate separate *propositions*; what makes them relevant is the degree to which they draw on propositions expressed by other sentences. Renkema (2004) discusses that coherence explains a connection that is created with the elements that are not part of a text and with the information that is presumably known by the receiver. Blakemore (2006) points out that contrary to cohesion, coherence is a *cognitive notion* and though it is still disputed, language users benefit from it when making sense of utterances. Brown and Yule (1988) state that syntactic structure analysis has been employed in language investigation; however, it is mistaken to consider that it is the sole source of our understanding. Exemplifying it with some extracts, the researcher argues that even though a sentence is grammatically well-formed it does not necessarily mean that we can understand it; or the opposite is also true, which means that though we cannot evaluate them in terms of well-formedness, we can still understand some linguistic units even though they are not given in full sentences. The information that we already have is about coherence.

Furthermore, *cohesive devices* and their *anaphoric* and *cataphoric* presentations are signaled in texts (Widdowson, 2011). DMs and conjunctions, which will be explained in the following parts of this chapter, are some of these devices. Paltridge (2008) declares that they are used by native speakers unconsciously and language learners should be taught them explicitly as they will contribute to their language learning process. As Cook (1989) asserts, learners sometimes tend to think that these elements might be used via word-for-word translation and cohesive elements are not seen as essential as grammar forms in the language teaching field as they were seen as a matter of style, which should not be the concern of advanced learners only. Halliday and Hasan (1976) add that it is deceitful to assume text as a bigger version of a sentence, and *cohesion* and *coherence* are the key elements in its analysis.

2.2. Discourse

2.2.1. Discourse Definitions

Before defining discourse analysis, it is important to uncover the term *discourse* as it has been used by different researchers in a wide range of fields. Renkema (2004) indicates that what makes discourse worth paying attention to is that it is interested in how sentences and articulations come together. Halliday and Hasan (1976) refer to *discourse structure* as an accepted structure above the sentence itself. With a similar perspective, Cook (1989) points out the two distinct aspects of language to be studied: One is investigated separately to teach reading and writing while the other inspects conversation and its coherency, which is named discourse. Likewise, Coulthard (1975) argues that discourse is more than structurally-good sentences. Widdowson (2008) declares that language users supply the receivers with the highest possible number of hints they think to be required for their planned message to be conveyed via discourse and they also benefit from the world knowledge and language use. Cook (1989) asserts that discourse benefits from grammar when required but this is not always the case. *Discourse study* is defined by Renkema (2004) as a field examining the link between form and function in oral communication. In addition to these studies, some of the earlier researchers also focus on *metadiscourse* which was defined by Hyland and Tse (2004) as a medium helping in communication, backing the writer's perspective, and creating a connection with the receiver.

2.2.2. Discourse Competence

According to Chomsky (1965), *competence* refers to what a language learner knows, while *performance* refers to what s/he actually utters. Therefore, to make sense of both written and spoken discourse, language users need to be able to interpret messages and be aware of them when they articulate language. Bhatia (2004) describes *discursive competence* as the method of analyzing speech and text through culture-specific methods. Adopting a similar perspective, Paltridge (2008) specifies that *textual competence* is the capacity to generate and make sense of texts that have meaningful contexts; and expanding this definition the researcher also states that in addition to these features, *discursive competence* also refers to the ability to interpret the features, outside of the text, which are required to maintain the conversation effectively.

McCarthy (1991) argues that when discourse is created by language users, what they also do is to structure sentences; and how they contribute to the larger unity of the text and how they opt for language elements in sentences are also about the considerations regarding discourse. To sum up, how to form and interpret discourse are important skills, and language learners should be made aware of them to make their utterances more authentic. According to Canale (1983), discourse competence is a part of communicative competence and it refers to the ability to bring grammatical structures and semantics together to create written and spoken texts that are tied together.

2.2.3. Spoken and Written Discourse

After understanding what DA means, it is also important to analyze both spoken and written discourse since the way DA deals with them is far from the previous approaches. McCarthy (1991) mentions that DA is a large area and it requires the interpretation of spoken and written discourse supra-sententially. More specifically, giving examples from spoken and written data, Barton (2003) argues that the utterances in spoken language differ in terms of the level of vocabulary, sentence structure, and connective elements but the researcher also adds that this may not be the case for all spoken and written language pieces as academic lectures might be more organized while informal letters may include expected features of spoken language since language use, from DA perspective, is more about the functions of utterances. McCarthy and Carter (1994) point out that there is a conventional way of dividing language as spoken and written and teachers also call themselves teaching either of them. The researchers further state that this division should be more than just the differences between speech and writing as there are also other factors to be considered such as linguistic forms and the context in which they are produced. On the other hand, it was also explained by Paltridge (2008) that though both writing and speech are organized, there is a difference: Considering the spontaneous nature of speech there is more room for uncompleted sentences and even though one can also encounter such structures in writing, it generally refers to completed language production.

Some of the earlier studies are also interested in how text and talk have some common or unexpected elements. Tannen (1982) asserts that the distinctness between spoken and written discourse focuses more on register and genre rather than the expected

differences. Halliday (1989) explains that spoken discourse is also as organized as written discourse and the relation between utterances is more pervasive. Leander and Prior (2003) state that it is possible to start a text with spoken instructions such as brainstorming or homework instructions by a teacher while speech also adopts texts as a reference point as in speakers' notes or a teacher's lesson plan. McCarthy (1991) emphasizes that despite the basic differences such as thinking time, spoken and written language have common features as both language forms rely on their contexts to some extent. Cook (1989) further argues that spoken discourse, as an informal type, is something that modern-day language learners need as they have a chance to see other countries and meet foreigners while they assume that it is, at the same time, the most difficult skill to be acquired considering its spontaneous and colloquial nature. With an interesting point of view, Leander and Prior (2003) point out that we are inclined to see writing as a more solitary action and consider speech as more of an ordinary activity that is part of daily life; however, what we assume bewilderingly is that we also have figures of talking people in literary texts such as novels or journals. Differently, Paltridge (2008) points out that while content words accumulate on certain individual clauses in writing, this is the opposite for speech where they are inclined to pervade.

Additionally, employing language teaching perspective, Cook (1989) points out that even though spoken discourse was previously thought to be less organized, there are some organized examples such as the ones in educational or courtroom settings. Moreover, Leander and Prior (2003) exemplify that the main purpose of writing advertisements is to perform them verbally while a note paper exchanged between students aiming at telling them what to say to another person is actually a written form of talk. McCarthy (1991) also suggests that the *implicitness* or *explicitness* of the message in spoken and written contexts relies more on the receiver and the content than the discourse type itself. As Paltridge (2008) clarifies, it is not right to assume written discourse to be just transcribed form of talk since both of them exhibit what they want to signal distinctively in line with their purposes despite their mutual dependency on grammatical structures. Leander and Prior (2003) summarize that regarding generating and apprehension of language, speech and writing are intertwined.

Atkinson (1990) discusses that spoken discourse was analyzed philosophically, psycholinguistically, and also sociolinguistically while emphasizing the need for such an analysis for written discourse and introducing this kind of approach to written texts while still stating the need for further studies, the researcher states the need to have a categorization of written discourse elements in terms of their functions taking how they contribute to the texts cognitively, socially and contextually into account. McCarthy (1991) points out that we are inclined to work with language rules regarding written discourse, in which linguistic elements are found to be neatly described; on the other hand, spoken discourse might include the forms that would not be admitted if occurred in writing and can be noticed via transcriptions. Finally, as explained by Paltridge (2008), Biber (1988) indicates that despite the lack of absolute difference between speech and writing, the distinction is more dimensional where language elements are inclined to accumulate also depending on text type and genre.

2.3. Conversation Analysis

To analyze a wide range of data, DA needs to be intertwined with other disciplines and benefit from them. When it comes to conversation analysis (hereafter CA), it is important to mention Chafe's (2001) description of conversation as the specific activity of human beings in which they structure a continuing item employing dynamic participation and mutual effect including some flaws. With a similar point of view, Hymes (1962) explores that it is not likely to think that language and its social context are separable. Furthermore, Hymes's (1967: 20-25) model of analysis named the SPEAKING Model refers to *setting or scene, participants or personnel, ends, art characteristics, key, instrumentalities, norms of interaction or interpretation, and genre*, which might be counted as important components of conversation. To clarify, *setting* refers to the time and place in which speech occurs; *participants or personnel* refers to hearers and speakers; *ends* refer to aims and conclusions; *art characteristics* refer to what is said and how this is done; *key* refers to the factors in identifying the manner of the speaker; *instrumentalities* refer to means and differences among languages; *norms of interaction or interpretation* refers to certain features involved in speech and common rules; *genre* refers to types of speaking. Analyzing repetition in conversation, Tannen (1987: 235) argues that, rather than the perspective introduced

by *generative grammar*, human conversation is “less in our control, more imitative and repetitious, more automatic”.

Sacks et al. (1974) examine how turn-taking mechanisms are employed in conversations and they discover two conversational components: *Turn-conversational component*, *turn-allocational component*, and rules. *Turn-conversational component* refers to the *unit-types*, namely phrases, clauses, sentences, and other lexical elements that the speaker employs to compose a turn in a conversation. On the other hand, *turn-allocational component* refers to two methods: The ones that give the next turn via which the present speaker opts for the next one and the other one refers to the method via which the next turn is given by the choice of speakers. Additionally, the rules regarding conversational mechanisms with the help of which turns are built and *conversational gap* and *overlap* are reduced. Considering their roles in conversation, Sacks and Schegloff (1973: 295) describe *adjacency pairs* with the following features: They have “two-utterance length, adjacent positioning of component utterances, and different speakers producing each utterance”. Additionally, Widdowson (1978) argues that speaking is a component of *reciprocal exchange* and speakers’ and hearers’ actions are a part of it, which makes speaking a skill that is both *receptive and productive*. The researcher also mentions the nature of speaking as being both *aural* and *vocal*. The former describes an activity of the auditory system while the latter refers to involvement of other signals apart from voice, namely elements of body language.

Considering the shift in the language teaching field from the traditional teaching of grammar to the communicative approach, there has been an increased emphasis on conversation, which causes its elements to be under investigation. Being one of them, *speech acts* were essentially used to point out the fact that performing actions is a part of language use and the essence of conversation is a kind of *cooperative action* (Levinson, 2017). According to Austin (1962), *speech acts* were grouped into three: *Locutionary*, *illocutionary*, and *perlocutionary*. *Locutionary acts* explain what the utterance literally refers to in the real world; *illocutionary acts* refer to the action, such as naming, taken by uttering them; *perlocutionary acts* describe the resulting impact of the speech act. Searle (1969) also states that speaking is fulfilling an action in line with rules. Taking a step further, criticizing the previous models Searle (1979)

categorizes illocutionary acts into five: *Assertives*, *directives*, *commissives*, *expressives*, and *declarations*. *Assertives* include verbs such as *suggesting*, *concluding*, and swearing that help the user mention a case or the accuracy of a statement. *Directives* ask the hearer to do something and they encompass verbs such as *requesting*, *advising*, and *begging*. *Commissives* commit the user to perform a future action and consist of verbs such as *vowing* and *promising*. *Expressives* are employed to demonstrate the emotional state of the user with verbs such as *condoling*, *deploring*, and *thanking*. Finally, *declarations* bring about an adjustment in the real world through verbs such as *firing* or *baptizing*.

In addition, Grice (1989) states that making input properly, at the part where it develops, through acknowledged target or flow of the talk in conversation goes under the title of *the cooperative principle*. Namely, it describes how people jointly and dynamically generate a piece of conversation in which they engage. Likewise, the researcher clearly introduces what is required by the cooperative principle via four conversational maxims: *Quantity*, *quality*, *relation*, and *manner*. *Quantity* refers to the fact that information should neither be less nor more explanatory; *quality* explains that what is said should be true. In *relation* maxim, the need for utterance relevancy is emphasized. Finally, *manner* points out that vagueness should be avoided and one should try to be as concise as possible. Moreover, *conversational implicature*, as a part of discourse, was described as going beyond the literal meaning of the words, which is an example of *the violation of maxims* (Grice, 1989).

In their review article, Sert and Seedhouse (2011) explain that CA aids us in understanding how learning and language competence are created in conversation by indicating the nature of talk in the language learning process and the way language is learned through interaction. Also, Walsh and Sert (2019) argue that it is possible to understand the learning process entirely by analyzing how people engaging in interaction behave, what they utter, and the effect of the learning strategy that they employ; and the researchers emphasize that the way teachers use language in classrooms, the content of classroom interaction and combining it with actions play a more significant role than the methods that are adopted and materials presented, which demonstrates the importance of being a *reflective teacher*, namely being aware of one's classroom talk and practices. Finally, stating the principles offered by Seedhouse

(2005), Sert (2015) argues that the first one of them, which explains the organized nature of talk, disagrees with what is offered within the Chomskian way of language analysis, namely the perspective that language occurs naturally; and the researcher also describes the second principle as that classroom turn-taking is shaped by context and both learners and teachers make use of it and design their contributions accordingly.

2.4. Discourse Analysis

DA has been an emergent field starting from the second half of the twentieth century. As defined briefly by Cook (1989) DA is the investigation of elements that provide *discourse coherence*. Unlike the Chomskian view of language, DA considers many different aspects of language such as its users, how they are related in the given context, shared knowledge, and culture. Van Dijk (1977) argues that though it seems like a discipline emerging in the twentieth century, it is even possible to date it back to ancient times as a measurement of good speech and through DA, former structural views were questioned and new perspectives on spoken and written language were introduced. Today, it is one of the most up-to-date ways of analyzing speech and writing, especially with the increasing significance of the *communicative approach* in the language teaching field as DA emphasizes textuality. What it means for language teachers and learners is that they can benefit from the new perspective brought by DA.

As a prominent researcher in the field, Harris (1952) emphasizes the difference between the *descriptive approach* to language and DA stating that while DA allows an analyst to bring in a good deal of information on the function of each different element in a text, text structure, and type, descriptive linguistics only deals with the role of these elements in the sentence structure. Cook (1989) states that sentence linguistics and DA are the two ways of language analysis and rather than the structural approach offered by the former, the latter inspects language occurring in different contexts with a good variety of perspectives. With a similar point of view, McCarthy (1991) also clarifies that some of the ways of analyzing grammatical units of language are linguistically based, while the others are more about the context. DA is interested in this second approach. Harris (1952) further acknowledges that the investigation of language elements in a specific text solely addresses that text itself and even though it is not possible to comprehend what a text means, one can still disclose how it composes

that meaning. Van Dijk (1977) also argues that the development of DA happened to be at the same time as in the social sciences and early work by the researchers in those fields has an impact on the expansion of DA as a new field.

Additionally, Coulthard (1975) points out that while taking sentence structure into account, DA addresses how sentences form texts to comprehend the contribution of grammatical units to their meaning and how contextual elements support the decision-making process of language users. Salkie (2001) emphasizes that DA is interested in how sentences perform in the unity of texts while grammar is interested in sentence organization. Besides, Blakemore (2001) mentions that it is not even right to compare Chomskian linguistics and DA as their areas of investigation are different, which means that while the former focuses on the semantic demonstration of language that is not sufficient for analysis, the latter is interested in the ways of language analysis except grammar. Chafe (2001) clarifies the distinction between sounds and the ideas that are conveyed with their help and argues that it is what keeps language improving. In the scope of a survey article analyzing the literature, Coulthard (1975) mentions that DA deals with the elements above the sentence in spoken and written language production. Mentioning the vagueness of the term itself, Stubbs (1983) states that it is used to explain language use by looking at it with a wider perspective, which means that rather than the sentences, it focuses on the social use of language or written data. Cook (1989) points out that to understand how the elements of language are meaningfully combined we should focus on the users of it and the different settings where it occurs rather than the traditional rules of grammar.

McCarthy (1991) describes DA as the connection between language and the context in which it is used. Additionally, Chimombo and Roseberry (1998) state that it primarily helps the reader in identifying the texts and what makes them meaningful. Adopting a similar point of view, Barton (2003) defines DA as an approach to investigate how text analysis benefits from certain language elements in different settings, contexts, and organization of language by employing different research methodologies. Furthermore, as stated by Paltridge (2008), DA investigates how the rapport between language users affects language production and the effect language use has on social identities and relationships. As Barton (2003) explains, DA is a way of analyzing language by inspecting its organization for language users in sentence

and supra-sentence levels, in various contexts and texts, with different aims, and by looking at different factors that affect language use. McCarthy (1991) states that DA conducts this analysis by examining all sorts of data both written and spoken from the daily use of language in conversations to the formal use. Paltridge (2008) also clarifies that we use specific ways of saying and organizing them in spoken and written contexts across specific cultural and linguistic settings. Considering all these neat definitions, one can express that DA has a lot to offer us about the nature of language and its acceptability, which makes it an issue to be paid attention to in the language teaching field as well.

From a holistic point of view, Van Dijk (1977) states that sociolinguistics, speech act studies, the role of grammar in the text, and the emergence of psycholinguistics were also the subjects of DA studies in the 1970s and as neatly reported by the researcher this approach to language occurred simultaneously with the changes in other disciplines. Nunnan (1998) argues that in grammar teaching, a new *organic approach* that brings a new perspective in light of DA will help the learners in achieving desired language outcomes by balancing conventional grammar teaching methods and what DA offers, namely how to use them in different contexts. Stating the difference between CA and DA, Levinson et al. (1983) explain that they differ from each other because DA adopts methodology, theoretical norms, and conventional concepts while CA is discretely experimental.

In brief, DA has been a field of investigation questioning language use both in written and spoken contexts. As suggested by McCarthy (1991), though DA is not a way of language instruction, it provides teachers with great insight into the language, which includes conventional linguistic elements such as grammar but also means something greater and more related. As it examines how language users create coherence and cohesion and how receivers benefit from what is offered by DA, it also has been, and should even be more of, a field of investigation in ESL/EFL fields to understand how native and non-native speakers form what they utter, whether there are any differences between them, and what can be done to make learners' speech more *authentic*.

2.4.1. Classroom Discourse

Considering what it means for the investigation of spoken and written language, it is possible to say that DA offers language teachers and learners a good deal of opportunities for *authentic language production*. According to McCarthy (1991), though it is impossible to provide the learners with a completely natural talk, it is significant for them to feel that they also take part in authentic practices. This approach has become popular with the increasing importance of *communicative language teaching* in ESL/EFL fields, especially after the term *communicative competence* was emphasized by Hymes (1972). In this sense, Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001) present that the purpose of language education is to make learners take part in conversations and the way of doing this is to engage learners in sample talks that are related to the context of teaching. Cook (1989) states that as DA investigates how language elements in different contexts make sense and provide unity for the users and as a growing research area it offers solutions to the obstacles in the language learning process. McCarthy (1991) explains that DA does not assert to be a way of language teaching; however, it provides the professionals with a method of investigating language from a point of view through which language is analyzed with higher relevancy as well as examining traditional linguistic elements. Likewise, Cook (1989) points out that frequent neglect of cohesion in language teaching results in learners' inclination to utter unrelated sentences. Furthermore, Adger (2001) points out that DA has attracted researchers from the ESL field and one of its interest areas has been classroom interaction. Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001) suggest that until the 1950s, sentence-based models dominated the ESL/EFL fields, which make the teaching and classroom applications *decontextual* and it caused many previous learners to be ineffective communicators as a result of their lack of *discourse awareness* even though they were able to form sentences and consequently, with the current approaches, text and discourse have become more of a focal point. As Cook (1989) further mentions, language instructors may notice that even though learners create links between sentences rather than looking at larger discourse, DA will help understand why students cannot accomplish this *rhetorical effect*.

From a different point of view, Adger (2001) explains that DA has also been effective in detecting the academic inefficacy of the students whose cultural background is not the same as the teacher and school's prevalent culture. Contrary to daily conversations,

Leander and Prior (2003) emphasize that classroom DA might be problematic as it is mostly composed of teacher talk rather than that of students. Moreover, Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001) argue that it would not be right to adopt the communicative approach excluding DA as it is expected to help teachers and learners in their choice of language by offering them different conditions in which language production may occur.

Furthermore, McCarthy (1991) points out that as DA offers us knowledge of text organization and creation from words and sentences to their broader analysis in discourse, it will be beneficial in creating materials and classroom practices that are more realistic. Furthermore, Olshtain and Celce-Murica (2001) assert that DA and pragmatics offer two ways of language analysis which make them essential in language teaching: *Intended and interpreted meaning*; while *intended meaning* is interested in how sentences follow one another, *interpreted meaning* is concerned with the reception of factors such as social setting and language performance. Along with them, Cook (1989) mentions that pragmatic analysis of language is essential in ESL/EFL for two reasons: *Function* and *form* are handled distinctively and knowledge of how they are connected helps learners identify and therefore, create context.

Jakobivits and Gordon (1974) also argue that the base for language teaching context must be communication and material developers may use the perspective that DA offers in various ways. As Coulthard (1975) clarifies, what learners worry about is not grammatical conformity; they need to understand how functions correlate, which results in the fact that they should know more about certain elements in communication. Similarly, McCarthy (1991) mentions that grammar surely attaches sentences and helps create discourse; however, knowledge of grammar is not sufficient to comprehend the functions of language elements without regarding their discourse. As summed up by Olshtain and Celce-Murica (2001), language instructors should not confine themselves as being solely teachers and philologists and they should also be interested in the social aspect of language by taking DA into consideration.

According to Mehan (1979), students need to have the ability to reply properly in the teaching environment since the nature of classroom talk is different from daily conversation as teachers already have the answers to their questions and they aim to

check whether students grasped the knowledge; and with this in mind, the researcher offers a three-part structure to analyze classroom conversation that includes *initiation*, *reply*, and *evaluation*, which was previously offered by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). *Initiation* refers to the questions asked mostly by the teacher; *reply* refers to the answers given by the learner; *evaluation* refers to the feedback provided by the teacher. Moreover, Seedhouse (1996: 23) presents the important issues and conflicts that differentiate classroom talk and daily language critically and emphasizes that classroom conversation is a kind of discourse itself and should not be regarded as less than any other kind by arguing that it is an “institutional variety of discourse produced by a speech community or communities convened for the institutional purpose of learning English, working within particular speech exchange systems suited to that purpose”. Olsthtain and Celce-Mauria (2001) further state that once a language classroom operates as a *discourse community* where teachers and learners create discourse applications via which they advance to reach the target of making students better at foreign language *competence* and *performance*. It was also discussed by Bardovi-Harlig (1996) that the primary aim of a language teacher is to make learners more aware of the pragmatic aspect of language rather than only applying traditional techniques and provided that the learners are aided in coming up with culturally-fitting methods of paying compliments or saying farewell, it will be possible for them to stimulate their own capabilities to be examined pragmatically.

Nystrand et al. (2003) state that conventional proposals of classrooms are inclined to ignore that a good teacher vitalizes the learning process by involving students in questioning actively rather than teaching conventionally by telling the materials by heart and, though authenticity is a significant aspect, teachers should be aware of the timing and placement of authentic questions. It was also revealed by the researchers that teachers are more careful about what they teach and what students grasp than how they form discourse, which is unlucky as classroom discourse has an impact on how and what students receive as teachers are not knowledgeable about the connective elements in discourse as a result of previous little interest in this area as a part language teaching research. Also, Cullen (1998) claims that analyzing teacher talk regarding solely communicativeness is not sufficient as it neglects the characteristics of classroom context; and it is possible to render authenticity a significant part of teacher

talk but one still should keep in mind that it is also a tool to bring the learners to a final desired outcome. Likewise, Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001) argue that a mutual target is also one of the features of the classroom environment as a discourse community along with shared knowledge, behavior rules, mutual language and environment, and group culture.

Furthermore, Cazden (2001) approaches classroom discourse as a *scaffolding* and *reconceptualization tool* adopted in classrooms and exemplifies *scaffolding* in different settings such as homes, classrooms, and curriculums. Besides, *reconceptualization* is described as “recontextualizing of whatever phenomena are being discussed” which was also analyzed in terms of its applications in homes and at schools as mentioned in Cazden (2001: 72). Erickson (1996) further affirms that classroom talk is more than dialogue(s) in terms of its organization and emphasizes the role of *cadential patterns*, which define the rhythm in the organization. As presented by Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001), classroom interaction has three kinds: The one among students and teachers and between students themselves, exercises via teaching material, and examples of reflection on the content that has been acquired. Finally, emphasizing the need for further research, it was also explained by Wells (1993: 33-35) that by combining *activity theory*, a sociocultural theory that focuses on understanding human activities’ organization offered by Leonitev (1981) as cited by the researcher, and discourse theory demonstrating that they go with each other, it was discussed that teachers are required to provide students with demanding tasks with the aim of keeping them on track of learning and initiate the *IRF* (initiation-response-feedback) structure which will result in a response from learners and provide a starting point for the “next cycle of teaching and learning spiral”.

2.5. Discourse Markers

With the increased attention, especially starting in the last two decades of the 20th century, DM research has been a significant part of both the linguistics and language teaching field. Adopting a different perspective from the previous research on cohesion, Halliday and Hasan (1976), Schiffrin (1987), Fraser (1990, 1998), and many others focused more on the relationship between sentences and how markers serve this purpose. Schiffrin (1987) argues that DMs form a bigger linguistic category than

conjunctions and take part in discursive coherence. Being aware of the fact that the contribution of DMs to a text will make both the learners and teachers gain a deeper understanding of them, resulting in more naturalistic language production. Schourup (1999) adds that as the pragmatic analysis of linguistic elements has started attracting researchers, previously neglected utterances such as *well* and *you know* are encountered more. Blakemore (2006) discusses that DMs form a diversified category standing out in discourse through their contribution and the meaning to which they refer. To clarify, Schiffrin (1987: 31) argues that DMs are “sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of talk”. Fraser (1999: 950) states that DMs demonstrate “a relationship between the segment they introduce, S2 and the prior segment, S1 ” and defines them as a “pragmatic class, lexical expressions drawn from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbials, and prepositional phrases”. Analyzing the difference between his perspective and some others’, the researcher mentions that there are still a bunch of questions to be answered in this field (Fraser, 1999). Blakemore (2006) also affirms that DMs are not only described by looking at their semantic content but also according to their role in creating discursive connections.

Schiffrin (2001) asserts that how DMs are studied depends on several factors such as where the researcher starts the study, how s/he defines them, and the way of analysis; and with the aim of having a unified methodology, the researcher tries to explain how they occur in speech besides being a unit of language. Additionally, Blakemore (2006) argues that as a result of lack of agreement, DMs were also referred to as *pragmatic markers*, *discourse particles*, *discourse connective*, *discourse operators*, and *cue markers*, all of which refer to the same functional unit. Schiffrin (2001) further expresses that what DMs offers is not limited to their linguistic features, or the social context in which they are in use, of these commonly used elements, it includes the discursive competence of language users who adopt them keeping the various functions they have in mind. Therefore, as suggested by Blakemore (2006), these elements should be analyzed discursively rather than syntactically as what DMs demonstrate is more crucial than what they actually mean in the scope of DA.

To be more precise, analyzing literature, Schourup (1999: 230-234) claims that DMs have the following characteristics: *Connectivity*, *optionality*, *non-truth conditionality*, *weak clause association*, *initiality*, *orality*, and *multi-categorality*. While *connectivity*

is seen as the most prominent DM function, it is not enough to differentiate DMs from other connectors that operate at the syntactic level as discussed by the researcher. *Optionality* refers to the fact that if a DM is not included in a sentence, there is no change in terms of grammatical correctness. Furthermore, *non-truth conditionality* explains that DMs do not change whether what the sentence offers is true or not. According to the researcher, these three features are generally seen as significant ones, while the next four of them are not always considered crucial. By referring to the previous work in the field, Blakemore (2006) argues that DMs are somewhere on the pragmatic aspect of the semantics-pragmatics line as they do not add to the *truth-conditionality* of a given clause.

When it comes to DM meaning, Schourup (1999) declares that DM categorization does not have a huge impact on it and adds that the assumption that DMs have only one *core meaning* has been challenged and whether DMs' granted core meanings can be collected together is not certain regardless of the fact that they can be regulated by discourse, especially when increasing data is taken into consideration. The researcher emphasized the two facts that DMs are prone to have meanings that might go well in each different context and that the listeners are already prepared to interpret them depending on the context wherever they are uttered (Schourup, 1999).

Furthermore, Müller (2005) affirms the general compromise that DMs serve the users pragmatically and demonstrate the *pragmatic competence* of the users by questioning when and how non-native users acquire DMs. Analyzing the literature and frequency of some DMs in terms of their roles in second language acquisition (hereafter SLA) based on a corpus, the researcher also declares that as there are numerous studies on the language acquisition of native or bilingual speakers of English, it is crucial to analyze how non-natives, or learners, acquire them (Müller, 2005). Blakemore (2006) further points out that DMs have more than one function and they should be re-examined taking the linguistic and pragmatic meaning they possess into account. In her bilingual study between Hebrew and English, Maschler (1994: 334) claims that DMs are "the type of metalingual expressions that occurs at verbal-activity boundaries, rather than metalanguage being a subcategory of DMs".

Like-mindedly, Jucker (1993) mentions the absence of an admitted list regarding DMs and the fact that their *polyfunctionality* is one of the challenges needed to be faced when defining DMs. Lenk (1998) also defines them as *oral elements* that the speakers employ with the aim of leading other conversationalists' comprehension in line with their point of view and what is added to the conversation by emphasizing the significance of DMs when it comes to speakers' mutual construction of comprehension. Supporting his point of view from Schifffrin (1987) and Aijmer (2002), the researcher also argues that DMs develop sense regarding their functions in terms of the index and they offer connections in the context through which an utterance is grasped (Lenk, 1998). Furthermore, Aijmer and Stenström (2004) assert that *discourse patterns* and DMs can differentiate in various disciplines and text types adding that DMs such as *anyway, well, I mean, I think, and you know*, which are not handled grammatically, are encountered in spoken English.

Moreover, Horne et al. (1999) state that the *prosodic*, namely regarding larger language functions such as rhythm and intonation, DM features are crucial cues that are often vaguely represented as the very same vocabulary can also be related to distinct discourse functions. Sankoff et al. (1997) point out that DMs are attached importance as they are an aspect of language that is not instructed in the classroom and claim that mastery of DMs can only be accomplished through contact with native speakers concluding that the best L2 learners in the scope of their study were, at the same time, the ones who also managed to use the DMs that native speakers used. Andersen (2001) used the term *pragmatic marker* instead of DM to avoid confusion as DMs are sub-categories of pragmatic markers according to Fraser's (1996) categorization and that they have functions beyond creating *textual unity* and *coherence*. The researcher adds that pragmatic markers' interpretation depends on a "conceptually meaningful unit" and is different from the previous studies, the researcher argues that pragmatic markers have *propositional meaning* and supports this view with examples; but, similar to the previous studies, he approves the multifunctional nature DMs possess. (Andersen, 2001: 42).

Moreover, Biber et al. (1999: 140) define DMs as words or phrases that do not have a tight connection with the utterances and aid in keeping the communication going; and they discuss that DMs are inseparable and whether they should be accepted as elements

of “clause or extra-clause units” is still unsettled. Likewise, Fung and Carter (2007: 411) state that DMs are “intra-sentential and supra-sentential linguistic units which fulfill a largely non-propositional and connective function at the level of discourse”. From a different perspective, Bolinger (1989) explains that *intonation contours* and *discourse markedness* will mostly concur and he is interested in the contribution of intonation to discourse by exemplifying that though it is not always the case as there might be changes in different emotional situations or through accents, the discourse particles in the middle of the sentences are inclined to adhere to pitches in mid-sentences as well. In the scope of a review article, Alami (2015) clarifies that the last three decades have witnessed an increased interest in DMs and they have been approached distinctively in a good variety of contexts with different terminology. Finally, Schifffrin (2001) asserts that in today’s English, the analysis of vocabulary and language use has started to adopt or has been adopting a pragmatic aspect with what DMs offer in terms of form and function both historically and with present-day lexical basis.

2.5.1. Conjunctions

Conjunctions and DMs are sometimes thought to be almost the same linguistic category. However, DMs form a broader linguistic categorization and it will be beneficial to indicate what they refer to in the light of previous research since DMs and some fixed expressions play a crucial role in a text. Researchers in the field of DA, as they have done it for other grammatical elements that help create cohesion, also examined the conjunctions regarding their roles in DA, their categorizations across languages, and their contributions to reading comprehension, speaking, and writing skills. Halliday and Hasan (1976) explain that *conjunctive elements* assert what they mean by assuming the existence of other factors to be considered in discourse and what they follow is systematically connected to the previous elements via conjunctions. Martin and Rose (2007: 115) explain that conjunctions investigate “interconnections between processes-adding, comparing, sequencing, or explaining them” as they connect events and information and classify them as follows: *Addition*, *comparison*, *time*, and *consequence*. Renkema (2004) affirms that also known as *connectives*, conjunctions illustrate the relationship between the sentences in a text and what the nature of this relationship is. Along with them, Paltridge (2008) points out that the use

of conjunctive elements is a way of linguistic contribution to texts and they comprise a critical part of knowledge about discourse depicting it in terms of speech and writing. McCarthy (1991) explains that rather than referring backward or onward, conjunctions demonstrate continuity in texts and it is challenging to classify linguistic elements that serve as conjunctions in English. Halliday and Hasan (1976) further express that the relationship created by conjunctions is not only about being sensible indicating a general kind of connection between sentences and add that there are many possible ways of interpreting conjunctions. What can be inferred from this statement is that the researchers do not mention a bigger categorization and they rather compare conjunctions with other forms of cohesive elements arguing that they are distinct from others as they form a “systematic relationship between sentences” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 320).

Differently, some of the researchers have adopted a wider perspective also clarifying where DMs are located in cohesive relations, especially after the increased interest in DMs following Schiffrin (1987). According to Georgakopoulou and Goustos (1998), when determining whether an element is a DM or not, its role in discourse development is considered, namely its function on a global level and its sequencing function. It is possible to infer that this statement reveals the difference between a conjunction, the role of which between sentences is emphasized also by the previous researchers, and a DM. With a different perspective, Fielder (2008) states that rather than being two opposite categories; DMs and conjunctions operate through a continuum. Lastly, Fraser (1999) argues that DMs are taken from conjunctions, prepositional phrases, and adverbs. It means that DMs form a bigger category.

2.5.2. Categorization of Discourse Markers

As DMs are linguistic elements consisting of many different word groups, they have been classified in various ways by different researchers in various settings depending on the data or the perspective they possess. Renkema (2004) claims that it is not easy to draw a line between how DMs function semantically and pragmatically. Creating one of the earliest neat categorizations, Schiffrin (1987) suggests finding mutual aspects to come up with a taxonomy for DMs. To do that, it is required to explore exceptionally diverse categories of utterances and other language sources benefitted

as DMs, as explained by the researcher. The researcher also states that what builds coherence is the rapport between the following elements in discourse and she categorizes *planes of talk* according to DMs' functions as follows: *Information state*, *participation framework*, *ideational structure*, *action structure*, and *exchange structure*. Schiffrin's (1987) categorization is clearly explained in Alami (2015) as follows: DMs that go under the title of *the exchange structure* include markers that have a role in turn-taking, which consists of *well*, *and*, *but*, *or*, *so*, and *y'know*; *the action structure* focuses on how speech acts are located, including *oh*, *well*, *and*, *but*, *so because*, and *then*; *the ideational structure* refers to how ideas are connected containing *well*, *and*, *but*, *or*, *so*, *because*, *now*, *then*, *I mean*, *y'know*; *the participation framework* refers to how the speakers and listeners are involved in conversations in distinct ways, comprising of markers *oh*, *well*, *so*, *now*, *I mean*, and *y'know*; *information state* explains the cognitive aspect of discourse including how to handle knowledge, meta-knowledge, and organization, consisting markers *oh*, *well*, *so*, *because*, *then*, *I mean*, and *y'know* as shown in Table 1 which is taken from Schiffrin (1987).

Table 1. Planes of Talk from Schiffrin (1987: 316)

Information State	Participation Framework	Ideational Structure	Action Structure	Exchange Structure
Oh	Oh		Oh	
Well	Well	Well	Well	Well
		And	And	And
		But	But	But
		Or		Or
So	So	So	So	So
Because		Because	Because	
	Now	Now		
Then		Then	Then	
I Mean	I Mean	I Mean		
Y'know	Y'know	Y'know		Y'know

According to Schiffrin (1987), *oh* primarily functions to point out transitions under the information state category; however, *oh* also has a function in the participation framework as it indicates the conversationalist with specific receptive and productive abilities. Besides, *oh* goes under the action structure category because it signals some actions such as clarifications projected to administer the transition in information state categorization (Schiffrin, 1987). Furthermore, the researcher argues that the main function of *well* goes under the participation framework categorization since it ties the user to the conversation. It is also used with functions that make it a part of the information state, the idea structure, and the action structure categories as the participants of it can answer anything during the flow of conversation that impermanently interrupts their anticipations or a request. Finally, since *well* is adopted at the beginning of turns in conversations, it also goes under exchange structure categorization (Schiffrin, 1987).

The main function of all the conjunctive structures is under the ideational structure category. However, they serve other purposes as well. For instance, *and* and *but* are also employed to mark continuation of speech and contrast respectively, which make them a part of the action structure. This is also the case for *because* and *so* as complementary markers. Next, *or* and *so* go under exchange structure as both of them have roles in turn-transitions as they serve to mark the option for hearers and point out the change between participants. Despite their roles in the exchange structure category, their pragmatic functions of indicating continuation and contrast provide them with the roles in turns. The researcher further adds that *because* and *so* also have roles under the information state category thanks to their functions to mark affirmations and deductions.

Besides, despite their main functions in the idea structure category, *now* and *then* have other roles as well. First, *now* goes under the participation framework category as it points out speakers' interest to the next part of the talk. Second, *then* is a part of the information state and the action structure categories as it serves to mark affirmed requests. Additionally, *y'know* and *I mean* are under the information state and participation framework categories. Since *y'know* functions to concentrate on the

knowledge provided by the hearer its main role is in the information state category. As *I mean* addresses speaker orientation, its primary role is in the participation framework category. In addition to these, *y'know* and *I mean* go under the idea structure category with their functions of marking how a proposition occurs centrally in the text structure and focusing on speakers' propositions' meanings. Lastly, the reason why *y'know* is also under the exchange structure is that it serves to mark possible transitions in conversationalists' participation. To sum up, the researcher clearly states that though they seem different from each other some certain DMs such as *now* and *I mean* may be a part of the same categorization whereas seemingly similar DMs such as *now* and *then* may be under different categories (Schiffrin, 1987).

Employing Becker's (1998) classification, Maschler (1994) investigates how DMs are switched in bilingual communication and within this categorization, DMs in switching are classified both in Hebrew and English according to their contexts as follows: *Interpersonal, referential, structural, medial, and silential* which are indicated in Table 2.

Table 2. Maschler's Classification of DMs [Adapted from Maschler (1994: 350-351)]

Interpersonal	Referential	Structural	Medial	Silential
Perception Verbs (<i>Look, Listen, Believe me, etc.</i>)	Deictics (<i>Now, Here</i>)	Conjoining or Disjoining Verbal Activities (<i>And, Also, And also, etc.</i>)	Realizing New Information (<i>Oh</i>)	Avoiding Silence (<i>Uh</i>)
Conforming Expressions (<i>Yeah, True, Right, etc.</i>)	Causal (<i>Because</i>)	Introducing Side Activities (<i>By the way, Just, etc.</i>)	Explaining Oneself (<i>I mean, Meaning</i>)	
Verbs of Saying (<i>Tell me, I'll tell you, Let's put it this way, etc.</i>)	Consequential (<i>So</i>)	Organizing the Order of Verbal Activities (<i>First of all, First, Just a second, etc.</i>)	Taking Time to Process Information (<i>Uh</i>)	
Disagreement (<i>No, Now</i>)	Contrastive Expressions (<i>But, On the contrary, etc.</i>)			
Including a Morpheme referring to Addressee (<i>Wait a sec, Try, Let's</i>)	Digressive (<i>By the way</i>)			
Avoiding Silence (<i>Uh</i>)	Concessive (<i>All Right, True, Right</i>)			

The first category includes *perception verbs, confirming expressions, verbs of saying, disagreement, including a morpheme referring to the addressee, and avoiding silence*. The second category consists of *deictics, causal, consequential, contrastive, digressive, and concessive* expressions. The third category encompasses markers regarding *conjoining or disjoining verbal activities, and organizing the order of verbal activities*. The fourth category embodies markers related to *realizing new information, explaining oneself, and taking time to process information*. Finally, the fifth category is only about *avoiding silence*.

Furthermore, Redeker (1990) asserts that the relationship between language elements and their context might be *ideational, rhetorical, and sequential* and takes the most powerful cohesive links as the basis in her study: *Markers of ideational and the pragmatic structure*. While the former has subcategories of *simple connectives, semantically rich connectives, and other adverbials*, the latter includes *pragmatic uses of conjunctions, interjections, and comment clauses* as illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3. Redeker's Classification of DMs [Adapted from Redeker (1990: 372-374)]

Markers of Ideational Structure	Markers of Pragmatic Structure
Simple Connectives (Simple relative pronouns and their alternatives)	Pragmatic Uses of Conjunctions (Conjunctions that serve pragmatically going beyond their semantic use)
Semantically Rich Connectives (Conjunctions and adverbial connectives that occur only at the beginning of clauses)	Interjections (The structures that were used at the beginning or at the end of the utterances such as <i>oh, all right, ok, anyway, etc.</i>)
Other Adverbials (Some anaphoric adverbials that occur in the middle or at the end of clauses)	Comment Clauses (Current speakers' own additions such as <i>you know</i>)

Additionally, Fraser (1996) affirms that sentence meaning has two aspects: *Propositional content and pragmatic markers*. According to the researcher, as a sub-

category of pragmatic markers, DMs are classified as follows: *Topic change markers*, *contrastive markers*, *elaborative markers*, and *inferential markers*. *Topic change markers* refer to the markers that the speaker utters to deviate from the present topic and this category includes the following markers: *Back to my original point*, *before I forget*, *by the way*, *incidentally*, *just to update you*, *on a different note*, *parenthetically*, *put another way*, *returning to my point*, *speaking of X*, *that reminds me* (Fraser, 1996: 339).

Contrastive markers, on the other hand, refer to the structures demonstrating that the upcoming linguistic unit will be refusing or in contrast with the previously uttered unit, including *all the same*, *anyway*, *but*, *contrariwise*, *conversely*, *despite (this/that)*, *even so*, *however*, *in any case/rate/event*, *in spite of (this/that)*, *in comparison (with this/that)*, *in contrast (to this/that)*, *instead (of doing this/that)*, *nevertheless*, *nonetheless*, *(this/that point) notwithstanding*, *on the other hand*, *on the contrary*, *rather (than do this/that)*, *regardless (of this/that)*, *still*, *that said*, *though*, *yet* (Fraser, 1996: 340). Elaborative markers include DMs indicating that the next unit will have the markers that will rectify the previous one, consisting *above all*, *also*, *alternatively*, *analogously*, *and*, *besides*, *better*, *by the same token*, *correspondingly*, *equally*, *for example/instance*, *further/furthermore*, *in addition*, *in any case/event*, *in fact*, *in other words*, *in particular*, *indeed*, *likewise*, *more accurately*, *more importantly*, *more precisely*, *more specifically*, *more to the point*, *moreover*, *on that basis*, *on top of it all*, *or*, *otherwise*, *similarly*, *that is*, *to cap it all off*, *too*, *what is more*.

Finally, the inferential markers include DMs illustrating that the upcoming utterance will have a resulting potential and this category comprises of the following DMs: *Accordingly*, *after all*, *all thing considered*, *as a consequence*, *as a logical conclusion*, *as a result*, *because of this/that*, *consequently*, *for this/that reason*, *hence*, *in this/that case*, *it can be concluded that*, *it stands to reason that*, *of course*, *on this/that condition*, *so*, *then*, *therefore*, *thus*. Furthermore, Fraser (1999: 950) mentions broadly that coming from different categories, DMs have basically two types as well: The ones that connect the “explicit message conveyed by S2 with aspects of a message associated with S1” and also the ones that connect the “topic of S2 to that of S1”.

According to Brinton (1996: 38), DMs, referred to as *pragmatic markers* by the researcher, have both *textual* and *interpersonal functions*; and in *the textual mode* speakers organize utterances to create cohesive texts while the *interpersonal mode* focuses on “speaker's attitudes, evaluations, judgments, expectations, and demands, as well as of the nature of the social exchange, the role of the speaker and the role assigned to the hearer”. As clearly demonstrated by Castro (2009), in Brinton’s (1996) classification, the DMs that have textual functions are: *Opening frame markers*, *closing frame markers*, *turn takers (turn givers)*, *fillers/turn keepers*, *topic switchers*, *information indicators*, *sequence/relevance markers*, *repair markers*. On the other hand, *the interpersonal functions* of DMs are as follows: *Response/reaction markers*, *back-channel signals*, and *confirmation-seekers/face-savers*. Functions of these markers with the adapted version from Castro (2009) will be demonstrated in Table 5.

Table 4. Fraser's (1996) Categorization of DMs

Topic change markers	Contrastive markers	Elaborative markers	Inferential markers
Back to my original point, Before I forget, By the way, Incidentally, Just to update you, On a different note, Parenthetically, Put another way, Returning to my point, peaking of X, That reminds me		Above all, Also,	
	All the same,	Alternatively,	
	Anyway, But,	Analogously, And,	
	Contrariwise,	Besides, Better, By	Accordingly, After
	Conversely, Despite (this/that), Even so,	the same token,	all, All thing
	However, In any	Correspondingly,	considered, As a
	case/rate/event, In	Equally, For	consequence, As a
	spite of (this/that), In	example/instance,	logical conclusion,
	comparison (with	Further(more), In	As a result,
	this/ that), In	addition, In any	Because of
	contrast (to	case/event, In fact,	this/that,
	this/that), Instead (of	In other words, In	Consequently, For
	doing this/that),	particular, Indeed,	this/that reason,
	Nevertheless,	Likewise, More	Hence, In this/that
	Nonetheless,	accurately, More	case, It can be
	(this/that point)	importantly, More	concluded that, It
	Notwithstanding, On	precisely, More	stands to reason
	the other hand, On	specifically, More to	that, Of course, On
	the contrary, Rather	the point, Moreover,	this/that condition,
	(than do this/that),	On that basis, On top	So, Then,
	Regardless (of	of it all, Or,	Therefore, Thus
	this/that), Still, That	Otherwise,	
	said, Though, Yet	Similarly, That is,	
		To cap it all off,	
		Too, What is more	

Table 5. Brinton's (1996) Categorization of Pragmatic Functions of DMs (Castro, 2009: 61-73)

	Function	DM Class	DMs
Textual Functions	To initiate discourse, including claiming the attention of the hearer	Opening Frame Marker	<i>So; Ok; Now</i>
	To close discourse	Closing frame Marker	<i>Ok, Right, Well</i>
	To aid the speaker in acquiring or relinquishing the floor.	Turn takers. (Turn givers)	<i>Um, Eh, And</i>
	To serve as a filler or delaying tactic used to sustain discourse or hold the floor.	Fillers Turn keepers	<i>Ok, Well, Now</i>
	To indicate a new topic or a partial shift in topic.	Topic switchers	<i>And, Because, So</i>
	To denote either new or old information	Information indicators.	<i>So, And, And then, Because</i>
	To mark sequential dependence.	Sequence/relevance Markers	<i>Well, I mean, You know, Like</i>
	To repair one's own or others' discourse.	Repair markers	<i>Well, I mean, You know, Like</i>
	Subjectively, to express a response or a reaction to the preceding discourse including also back-channel	Response/reaction markers	<i>yeah, oh, ah, but, oh yeah, well, eh, oh really?</i>

Interpersonal Functions	signals of understanding and continued attention while another speaker is having his/her turn.	Back-channel Signals	<i>mhm, uh</i> <i>huh, yeah</i>
	Interpersonally, to effect cooperation or sharing, including confirming shared assumptions, checking or expressing understanding, requesting confirmation, expressing difference or saving face (politeness).	Cooperation, agreement marker	<i>ok, yes, yeah, mhm</i>
		Disagreement Marker	<i>but, no</i>
		Checking understanding markers	<i>ah, I know, yeah,</i>
		Confirmation-seekers	<i>mhm, yes</i>
		Face-savers	

On the other hand, Fung and Carter (2007) express that they employ Schifffrin's (1987) multifaceted perspective and Aijmer's (2002) interpersonal point of view and also adopt Maschler's (1994, 1998) categorization stating that despite the multifunctionality of some structures, DMs can be categorized as follows: *Interpersonal, referential, structural, and cognitive markers*.

The *interpersonal* category includes markers that are adopted to indicate commonly known information and various responses such as approval. The markers in the *referential* category aim to indicate how previous and forthcoming structures are related. DMs in the *structural* category help organize the discourse flow. Finally, the *cognitive* category includes DMs that illustrate the mental condition of the speakers. DMs and the categorization of Fung and Carter (2007) are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Fung and Carter's (2007: 418) Categorization of DMs

Interpersonal	Referential	Structural	Cognitive
Marking shared knowledge: <i>See, You see, You know, Listen</i>	Cause: <i>Because, Cos</i> Contrast: <i>But, and, Yet, However, nevertheless</i>	Opening and closing of topics: <i>Now, OK/ Okay, Right/Alright, Well, Let's start, Let's discuss, Let me conclude the discussion</i>	Denoting thinking process: <i>Well, I think, I see, And</i>
Indicating attitudes: <i>Well, Really, I think, Obviously, Absolutely, Basically, Actually, Exactly, Sort of, Kind of, Like, To be frank, to be honest, Just, Oh</i>	Coordination: <i>And</i> Disjunction: <i>Or</i>	Sequence: <i>First, Firstly, Second, Secondly, Next, Then, Finally</i>	Reformulation/Self-correction: <i>I mean, That is, In other words, What I mean is, To put it in another way</i>
Showing responses: <i>OK/okay, Oh, Right/Alright, Yeah, Yes, I See, Great, Oh Great, Sure, Yeah</i>	Consequence: <i>So</i>	Topic Shifts: <i>So, Now, well, And What about, How about</i>	Elaboration: <i>Like, I mean</i>
	Digression: <i>Anyway</i>	Summarizing opinions: <i>So</i>	Hesitation: <i>Well, Sort of</i>
	Comparison: <i>Likewise, Similarly,</i>	Continuation of topics: <i>Yeah, And, Cos, So</i>	Assessment of the listener's knowledge about the utterances: <i>You know</i>

Moreover, Schourup (1999: 234) stresses the *multi-categoriality* of DMs asserting that they are free from being syntactically classified and they form a diversified category explaining that the efforts to determine the framework for DM categorization were interested in the ways of classifying them functionally rather than grammatically. Müller (2005) also analyzes *so*, *well*, *you know*, and *like* in terms of their functions, functional categories, non-DM functions, and also with quantitative analysis, which consist of non-linguistic and linguistic factors.

In addition to the studies in the field of discourse, metadiscourse is also a part of earlier research. In their model of academic *metadiscourse*, Hyland and Tse (2004: 167) mention the significance of “distinguishing metadiscourse from the propositional content of a text” creating a larger conception and that *metadiscourse* presents how texts are created academically by writers who try to persuade the reader by also considering coherence. The researchers have two main categories regarding the sources for markers: *Interactional* and *interactive* (Hyland and Tse, 2004) and while the former refers to how readers are connected to the text by being alarmed by the writers’ point of view, including *hedges*, *boosters*, *attitude markers*, *engagement markers*, *self-mentions*, the latter explains elements employed by the writers to create the way they want their text to be comprehended, namely how to organize discourse consisting the following markers: *Transitions*, *frame markers*, *endophoric markers*, *evidentials*, *code glosses*.

In conclusion, as it is easily understood by the above-mentioned classifications and researchers’ perspectives, DMs are categorized according to different research settings serving different purposes. Along with this, almost all the researchers acknowledge that there is a need for an extensive body of research in the field. Schourup (1999) states concisely that DM categorization is an issue yet to be resolved and even more different categorizations sometimes have common features at the minimum level. Finally, Blakemore (2002) points out that the previous studies on DMs have been interested in how to categorize them and there is still a lack of agreement on even what to count as DMs in any language; and the existing taxonomies are mostly descriptive, which leaves the future researchers with a great deal to investigate for.

As Schourup (1999) explains, the previous research focuses on the pragmatic roles of DMs rather than their grammatical categorization and adds that they are formed consisting of elements that are linked in terms of their functions. Again, Schifffrin (2001) points out that considering the previous research, it is challenging to create a solid understanding of what to opt for as DM. Schourup (1999) further discusses that there is no agreement on how to categorize DMs, whether they create a consolidated classification in terms of grammatical functions, their semantic features, and the way they connect the linguistic elements.

2.6. Conclusion

As illustrated within the present theoretical framework, DA poses great significance in ESL/EFL fields. The categorization of DMs, one of the most crucial aspects of DA research, is an issue yet to be settled. The researchers in the field constituted their categorizations from different perspectives either depending on their data or context, regarding educational trends in their time, the need for foreign language teaching contexts, and even sociological requirements. Considering the most common DMs that were detected in the spoken and the written data, the model offered by Fung and Carter (2007) that specifies an inclusive categorization with diverse DMs was determined as a basis to be adopted in the analysis of the current research data in terms of DM functions. The choice of this model is data-driven, namely, the model of Fung and Carter (2007) includes the DMs that are investigated in this study.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter begins with DM use in various fields such as translation and political speech contexts. It, then, investigates the studies in ESL/EFL settings, and finally, focuses on DM use in the Turkish Language.

3.1. The Use of Discourse Markers in Various Fields

As an undeniably important part of textuality, DMs have been the subject of studies in various contexts. Some of these contexts stated in this part of this literature review are conversation, translation and interpretation, political speeches, spontaneous writing, planned speech, occupational, comparative linguistics, and languages other than English.

DM use in conversation settings constitutes an important part of studies on DMs. Lenk (1998) analyzed the structuring functions of *however* and *still* both in British and American conversations from London-Lund-Corpus and Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English. Aiming at answering the question of how people who engage in conversations comprehend each other, the researcher found that structural items used by the speakers create a more extensive category than the DM categorization by Schiffrin (1987). Furthermore, Vanda and Péter (2011) looked into how *you know* and *I mean* were employed by different genders in televised interviews. Contrary to the presumption that women use DMs more than men, the findings of this study revealed that the occurrences of the previously mentioned DMs in both genders were at a similar rate.

Researchers also inspected how DMs are approached in translation and interpretation fields. Hale (1999) examined how court interpreters treated DMs and revealed that they generally disregarded or mistranslated them. Potential causes of this inclination

were analyzed, and solutions were offered in the scope of the study. Additionally, emphasizing the challenges in DMs' translation, Chaume (2004) studied how *now*, *oh*, *you know*, *you see*, *look*, and *I mean* occurrences in a cult movie were translated from English to Spanish. The researcher affirmed that these language fragments were not included in the target language to have a concisely translated text and also the target texts were found to be less cohesive than the source texts even though the receivers were able to compensate for the exclusions with different linguistic strategies.

In the political context, Ismail (2012) analyzed the use of DMs in the speech of the former President of the USA, Barack Obama according to the categorization suggested by Hyland and Tse (2004). It was concluded that DMs were used as a means of social interaction and to affect the public in different ways. Ali et al. (2020) examined Benazir Bhutto's speeches that were delivered between 1989 and 1997 in terms of the use of hedges and boosters using Hyland's (1996) notion of metadiscourse. They observed that *hedges* occurred more often than boosters and offered a better understanding of rhetorical devices used in political speeches.

Fox Tree (2015) studied the functions of DMs in spontaneous online writing. In her two-fold study, the researcher both described the functions of DMs *such as like*, *well*, and *you know* in online discussions and other settings; and they were also compared concerning their use in spontaneous speech and writing revealing that despite their different occurrence rates, DMs had resembling use in various fields; however, they also had certain communicative features which prevent them from being interchangeable. From a different point of view, DM use in planned speeches has also been noteworthy. 150 TED talks' transcripts from science, entertainment, design, technology, global issues, and business were examined in terms of the occurrence rate of *macro markers* by Uicheng and Crabtree (2018). Whether DM use depends on the field was questioned in the scope of the study. The researchers stated that the genre of the talk was not a variable affecting the use of DMs. Concerning interpersonal *metadiscourse markers* and the *appraisal framework* of the reporter, the language use of 11 YouTube videos from BBC on Corona Virus was investigated by Firdaus and Shartika (2021). It was observed by the researchers that the argument delivered by the speaker was signaled by the existence of interpersonal metadiscourse markers aiming

at transferring a message and they also illustrated how the speakers tried to engage the listeners and formed what they want to say.

Farouq (2019) examined the use of DMs in annexes of the International Civil Aviation Organization, which forms a legal language context. Employing Hyland and Tse's (2004) classification, the researcher revealed that DMs occurred with their textual functions, not the interpersonal functions, which shows that they have an important effect on the structure and organization of a text. Han et al. (2020) inspected the use of DMs in nurse-patient interactions when nurses use their first language (L1) or second language (L2). The researchers had two hypotheses: Occurrences of DMs in L1 would be more common than in L2 and *discourse-shift markers* would be used more often in L1 than L2. It was concluded that the first hypothesis was supported by the data collected in the scope of this study, which might have suggestions for training programs designed to improve the L2 skills of health practitioners.

DM use was also studied in comparative studies analyzing different languages. Fraser and Malamud-Makowski (1996) examined and compared the use of English and Spanish contrastive DMs. It was found that they resembled a lot in terms of what they introduced in conversations. Focusing on French Belgian and Catalan Sign Language in terms of DM (palm up and same gestures) use of speakers, Gabarró-López (2020) aimed at finding whether their use was affected by age or educational background. DMs in argumentative context were found to have more than one function and these functions were most common among these languages. As DM use in both sign languages was revealed to be *idiosyncratic*, the two variables, namely age and educational background, were demonstrated not to affect the DM use of the speakers.

As illustrated above, DMs have been analyzed by different researchers in different contexts, all of which have a lot to contribute to the field. Considering how DM use affects language production, it has also been investigated in ESL/EFL settings from various perspectives, which will be presented with different research examples in the following sections of this chapter.

3.2. Discourse Markers in EFL/ESL Settings in the World

3.2.1. Discourse Markers in Reading and Listening Comprehension

Flowerdew and Tauroza (1995) examined the effect of DM use on listening comprehension in an L2 classroom. Following a different study pattern from the general research type, the researcher exposed the experimental group to a lecture with no DMs while the control group received the lecture without any change. Employing different measurement procedures (scale for understanding, true-false questions, and summary), the researcher revealed that DMs have an important effect on the comprehension of the lecture. Eslami and Eslami-Rasekh (2007) inspected the effect of DMs on the overall understanding of classroom discourse. Two different groups of EFL students in a university listened to lectures differing from each other in quantity and variety of DMs. The group that received the audio including a higher number of DMs was revealed to have a better understanding of the lecture, which is an important indicator of their importance both for the practitioners and the material developers.

In the Spanish EFL context, Martínez (2009) investigated the impact of DMs on EFL learners' reading comprehension in a university setting. In her three-fold study, the researcher questioned the relationship between reading comprehension and DM use and whether the relationship between learner aptitude, age, gender, and inclusion or exclusion of DMs affected reading comprehension. The results of the study demonstrated that the group of the participants receiving the text including DMs had a statistically better understanding of the content. In another empirical study aiming at finding the impact of DM use on EFL learners' reading comprehension skills, Al-Qahtani (2015) carried out his research with 70 lower-level secondary school Saudi EFL learners. While the experimental group received an intervention program, the control group had a regular lesson plan. Both the pre and post-test results and the correlation analysis between DM knowledge and performance in reading activities revealed that explicit instruction of DMs improved the learners' reading comprehension skills.

3.2.2. Discourse Markers in EFL Classroom Interaction, Teacher Talk, and Lectures

Castro (2009) investigated the frequency and functions of DMs in classroom interaction with a non-native EFL teacher whose native language is Spanish. It was found that the teacher used 61% of all DMs, while students' DM use constituted 39%

of the total number. Also, the teacher and the students used *and* more than the other DMs. The researcher concluded that in addition to their textual and interpersonal functions, DMs support the flow of the classroom discourse and might help create it. Another study comparing the DM use of the native and non-native lecturers was also conducted in the Iranian context by Eslami et al. (2012). Analyzing five different lectures from both groups in line with Bellés-Fortuño's (2006) taxonomy, the researchers concluded that the Iranian lecturers used DMs more than the native lecturers. Additionally, *micro-markers* were found to be the most common category rather than *operators*, which had different interpretations for classroom discourse.

Shahbaz et al. (2013) inspected the use of DMs by non-native professors of English in the Chinese context and their native correspondents. The most prevalent DMs used by both groups, namely *so*, *and*, *but*, *ok*, *well*, and *right*, were analyzed by transcribing 15 of both native and non-native professors' lectures. It was revealed that there were differences between the DM use of the professors. To be more precise, while some of the DMs, namely *so* and *and*, were used by the non-native lecturers, their pragmatic functions were limited. Besides, *ok*, *well*, and *right* were found to be used unfittingly. There were also differences in the talk of non-native professors in terms of DM use. As it can be inferred from these results, advanced learners of English might also have insufficient use of DMs, which stresses the importance of explicit teaching of all DM functions in teacher training programs.

Ding and Wang (2015) investigated the use of DMs by native and non-native English teachers in Hong Kong. Employing CELT (Corpus of English Language Teaching), 24 lessons, twelve of them from both groups, were analyzed comparing the use of native and non-native teachers. The researchers explored that the most common DMs used by both groups of teachers were the same: *Okay*, *so*, *and*, *right/alright*, and *now*. On the other hand, native teachers were found to overuse *okay*. They were also inclined to use DMs more than the native teachers in general, possibly because they needed more time for information processing as they were also using *um* much more than the native teachers. According to the researchers, the idiosyncratic nature of DM use should also be kept in mind.

Vickov and Jakupcevic (2017) analyzed Croatian EFL teachers' DM use in classroom settings with primary and secondary school learners. The study had two focal points: The frequency of DMs and the functions of the most frequent ones. The results demonstrated that teachers used DMs that were especially needed in terms of classroom management and they used similar DMs when interacting with both primary and secondary school students. Additionally, even though a good number of types of DMs occurred in teacher talk, the most frequent ones (*ok, so, and, and mhm /aha*) were found to constitute more than half of the total DM use. Finally, it was concluded that DMs contributed a lot to classroom discourse.

3.2.3. Studies in Written Context

Martinez (2002) examined DM use in the writing tasks of advanced level EFL learners whose first language (L1) is Spanish. Questioning their use and types, the researcher concluded that DMs were used commonly and properly. Another result of the study was that the participants used DMs more frequently in their L1 than L2 and the number of DMs used by the participants differed, which may lead to the question of whether it depends on the proficiency level of the learners and may be subject of future research as mentioned by the researcher. Additionally, Jalilifar (2008) analyzed 598 descriptive compositions of Iranian EFL students in two universities in terms of DM use adopting Fraser's (1999) categorization of DMs. The DM categories that were used by the speakers respectively were *elaborative, inferential, contrastive, causative, and topic relating markers*. It was also revealed that the better the quality of composition is the more appropriately DMs were used in it. Considering the differences between groups of students, it was revealed that DMs were used more frequently by graduate students.

In another study in the Iranian context, Aidinlou and Mehr (2012) investigated the effect of explicit DM instruction on the students' writings in a language institute in Tabriz. Multiple-choice activities including different DM options were applied to the students and both the control group and the experimental group were asked to choose the best option. Following that, the experimental group was exposed to explicit correction of their DM use and was introduced better options too. Post-tests revealed that explicit teaching increased DM use, which leads to better quality writing tasks. Questioning what DMs were used and whether there was a relationship between DM

use and the writing quality in line with Fraser's (1999) classification, Modhish (2012) studied the composition writings of Yemeni EFL learners. Examining 50 essays written by the participants, the researcher revealed that apart from the *topic relating markers*, there was no positive correlation between writing quality and the number of DMs. The researcher concluded that the DM categories were used in the same frequency order as the study conducted by Jalilifar (2008), which was mentioned above.

Croatian primary and secondary school learners' DM use in writing output was examined by Vickov (2011) employing Swan's (2005) and Fraser's (1999) categorizations. The analysis of the writing tasks of 200 participants indicated that they used DMs insufficiently and with less variety than required. Tehrani and Dastjerdi (2012) investigated the effect of DM use in lectures on the writings of the EFL students in a language institute in Isfahan. In two groups, 10 of the 20 advanced-level EFL learners received a lecture with DMs included, while the rest received it with no DMs. After that, statistical analysis of cohesive elements in the related writing tasks demonstrated that the group of learners exposed to DMs also used them more resulting in cohesively better texts.

Employing Fraser's (1999) taxonomy, Alghamdi (2014) described the use of DMs in narrative and argumentative writings of 15 native and non-native undergraduate EFL learners questioning whether there is a correlation between DM frequency and variety and the quality of writings. It was revealed that there was no major discrepancy in terms of DM use. In both groups, *elaborative*, *contrastive*, and *reason markers* were used more than the other classifications. Furthermore, non-native speakers were found to overuse DMs, which is an indicator of writing quality. In the Indonesian context, Rahayu and Cahyono (2015) conducted a study with 55 undergraduate ELT students examining the frequency, types, and accuracy of DMs in 275 expository essays written by adopting different methods, namely exemplification, comparison and contrast, classification, process and cause and effect analysis, adopting both Fraser's (1999) and Halliday and Hasan's (1976) DM categorizations. The researchers concluded that the DMs used by the participants were also used in EFL contexts a lot because they were simple to use. However, the most common mistake with DMs was their incorrect use in the wrong relationship. On the other hand, *elaborative markers* were more

commonly found in exemplification, comparison and contrast, and classification essays while *inferential markers* occurred more frequently in process and cause-effect analysis essays. Finally, certain DM types in each category were detected to be used more frequently than the others.

In the Malaysian ESL context, DM use in 50 paragraphs written by tertiary level students with a lower level of English proficiency was inspected by Ab Manan and Raslee (2017). The results of the study demonstrated that the most frequent category of DMs was *elaborative markers*, which consists of 73% of overall DM use, followed by *temporal markers* (13%), *contrastive markers* (8%), and *implicative markers* (6%). It was also concluded that *and* and *because* were overused while some other DMs, such as *however*, were misused. In the ESL context in Dubai, randomly chosen essays of six ninth-grade students, who were explicitly taught about DMs before, were analyzed by Al-khazraji (2019). Both proper and improper DM use and a positive relationship between DM use and essay quality were detected by the researcher.

3.2.4. Studies in Spoken Context

Comparing the pedagogic sub-corpus of CANCODE (Cambridge and Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in English) and an interactive classroom discourse corpus from Hong Kong in terms of DM use of the speakers, Fung and Carter (2007) revealed that there were significant differences between the two groups. While learners of English used DMs with referential functions, they had limited use of other markers. On the other hand, native speakers of English used DMs with a wider spectrum of functions. Buysse (2010) conducted a study with Flemish undergraduate students and inspected their use of DMs in informal interviews. Investigating the use of most previously studied DMs, namely *so*, *well*, *you know*, *like*, *kind of/kinda/sort of*, and *I mean*, the researcher concluded that students, whose native language is Dutch, used DMs differently than their native peers. For instance, they did not tend to use interpersonal markers as they are used in informal settings as non-native students do not generally have such opportunities during their language learning progress.

In their experimental study, Sadeghi and Ramezan Yarandi (2014) aimed to understand whether the instruction of DMs affected EFL learners' fluency in the Iranian context. Their findings demonstrated that the experimental group, receiving DM training, used

them more frequently than the control group even though there are some mistakes and overuse of DMs. Considering the time required to utter a DM and the fact that fluency of a learner is also about the time spent, DM use cannot be a dependent in this sense. However, the learners in the experimental group were found to form better texts in terms of coherence. In a three-fold study in the Saudi EFL context, Alraddadi (2016) analyzed the use of DMs by 41 EFL female learners, DMs that presenters uttered after the instruction, and lastly the effect of the instruction method on the use of DMs, namely presentation-practice-production (PPP) and task-based language teaching (TBLT) methods. It was found that both of the methods increased the participants' use of DMS evenly, which helped the learners to make more coherent presentations. On the other hand, according to the results of the delayed post-test, the group receiving instruction with the TBLT method performed better; which shows the enduring positive effect of this method.

In their two-fold study, Tavakoli and Karimnia (2017) examined both the DM use of advanced EFL learners and the potential effect of gender on their use. Employing two different classifications by Fraser (1999) and Fung (2003), data was collected through lesson observations. The researchers concluded that the participants used interpersonal DMs more than the other categories. While the most frequent elaborative DM was *and*, the most prevalent contrastive DM was found to be *but*. The only topic-related DM used by the participants was *by the way*. Lastly, *sure* was the most common interpersonal DM in the learner corpus. Moreover, female participants used all categories of DMs more than males. Khojastehrad (2012) mentioned that, unlike native speakers, L2 learners are not prone to use hesitation markers sufficiently. Keeping this in mind, the researcher conducted a study with Iranian university students in the Malaysian context. Focusing on the distribution of DMs of hesitation in an oral L2 test, it was disclosed by the researcher that they occurred in the middle of the sentences the most, which might signal that the students have less difficulty with planning what to say than keeping the conversation going.

In another study conducted in the Saudi EFL context, Al-Yaari et al. (2013) investigated the DM use of public and private school students to determine their type and frequency comparing them with native speaker use. With the participation of 200 students from 10 different schools research corpus was created utilizing classroom

recordings. The results of the study demonstrated that *and*, *but*, and *also* were the most frequent DMs used by the learners, which was in line with the previous studies that assert learners' DM use is less frequent. Considering the significance of DMs in talk, Trillo (2002) analyzed the pragmatic fossilization of DM use in native and nonnative adults and children's speech by comparing these different categories. In this corpus-driven study, the researcher acknowledged that in second language learning, pragmatic and grammatical aspects of a foreign language occur at different developmental rates, which might be a consequence of not being exposed to native talk. Additionally, as the data analysis indicated, non-native children would also be able to acquire pragmatic functions of DMs as much as native children, which points out the importance of this aspect of language and the need to render it an important part of the language teaching curriculum. Furthermore, Norrick (2001) analyzed how *well* and *but* function in oral storytelling and revealed that their functions in this context were distinct both from their literal meaning and their functions in other sorts of contexts: They had a role in transfer between different parts of the literary texts, led the listeners to the primary order in case of deviation and interference, and helped the audience in redirecting the main teller to the anticipated organization of the narrative telling.

3.3. Discourse Marker Studies in the Turkish Context

3.3.1. Studies in the Written Context in Turkey

Dülger (2007) investigated the DM use of 76 second-grade ELT students in a state university and analyzed students' papers in terms of the diversity and number of DMs. The researcher concluded that students' use of DMs increased by 31.25 % following process-viewed courses, which showed that process-viewed courses contributed to the discourse perception of the students. Additionally, the diversity of DMs increased by 55.67 % following the aforementioned courses. Another study conducted in the Turkish EFL context by Ünaldı (2013) aimed at inspecting the overuse of two different DMs: *I think* and *in my opinion*. Comparing Turkish and native use through two different corpora, the researcher analyzed the 161 first-year engineering students' written productions in a state university context. It was revealed that Turkish EFL learners were inclined to overuse *I think* and it coincides with function words. *In my opinion* was revealed to be used more frequently by Turkish EFL learners as well. It

was also interpreted by the researcher that while this study sheds light on whether these phrases' overuse fulfills certain pragmatic functions or a transfer from spoken language, there is still a need for further research, also with a different writing prompt. Employing Fraser's (1999) categorization, Aysu (2017) analyzed the use of DMs in the writings of 104 students in a state university prep class, which was a part of their exam schedule and it was uncovered that elementary-level students employed 180 DMs, the most common of which were found to be *and*, *but*, *because*, *then*, *so*, *also*, *too* and *still* respectively as indicated through analysis via AntConc program. According to the aforementioned findings, the total number of DMs fitted in 4 different categorizations and were given respectively regarding the number of DMs they include: *elaborative markers*, *contrastive markers*, *causative markers*, and *inferential markers*.

Babanoğlu (2014) analyzed the pragmatic markers in the writing tasks of Turkish EFL students aiming at examining how they used structures that are characteristics of speech by employing three different corpora from Turkish and Japanese contexts and also essays that natives wrote. The researcher declared that the Turkish EFL learners were prone to use spoken language characteristics, which might negatively affect their academic texts. Focusing on the cohesive devices in writing texts collected through an academic writing course in a Turkish state university setting, Ersanlı (2015) compared this data with a native corpus and it was concluded by the researcher that Turkish language learners remarkably overused cohesive devices in the academic writing context suggesting the need for increased learner awareness in terms of corpora use.

Akbaş (2014) analyzed the MA dissertations of Turkish natives both in English and Turkish in terms of metadiscourse markers in line with Hyland and Tse's (2004) categorization and it was revealed by the researcher that despite some similarities, there were significant differences, such as *self-mentions*, which were not found in Turkish texts. Between the languages under investigation, this finding indicates less *authorial involvement* in Turkish texts, which was also inferred to result from the fact that writers were affected by their native culture. Emphasizing the difficulty of writing argumentative paragraphs in a second language, Hatipoğlu and Algı (2018) analyzed the argumentative paragraphs of novice language learners in terms of metadiscourse

markers and the researchers concluded that the problematic nature of metadiscourse markers or lack of explicit teaching may result in students' overuse or inappropriate use, which demonstrates the importance of making these structures an important part of language teaching programs.

Yüksel and Kavanoz (2018) examined the academic writings of university-level language learners by comparing them with a British Corpus, namely British Academic Written English (BAWE), and they concluded that *textual metadiscourse markers* were employed less often than *interpersonal metadiscourse markers*. The results of the study also indicated that rather than a first language background, experience has an impact on *pragmatic competence*. Baltacı (2019) analyzed the cause paragraphs of preparatory class students both in Turkish and English at a private university in terms of cause marker use, and it was explained by the researcher that there was a transfer from students' native language, which was Turkish, to English and the categorization of most commonly used cause marker categories also differed between languages.

Finally, adopting Hyland's (2005) classification, Sancak (2019) investigated the use of *metadiscourse devices* in terms of function and frequency, the reasons for the students to use or avoid them, and whether explicit teaching has an important effect on their use in a preparatory class in a Turkish state university context. It was concluded that *transitions* were the most prevalent type of metadiscourse devices employed by the students; particular devices, namely *and*, *but*, *because* were found to form most of the transition use; the learners tended to imitate the devices in teaching materials, which clarifies that the type of writing material had an impact on the type of the devices employed by the students. The researcher also stated that students' preferences for certain metadiscourse devices stemmed from both feeling insecure about using new ones and their beliefs in lack of instruction on the use of these devices and suggested focusing more on these *interactive devices* in writing instruction by presenting them in various contexts.

3.3.2. Studies in the Spoken Context in Turkey

Büyükkarcı and Genç (2009) investigated the use of *and* by identifying its functions in monologues and the characteristics that will differentiate it from its sentence functions. The researchers explained that *and* functions both as a DM and conjunction

in the spoken data and emphasize the need for more focus on DMs for the learners to sound more natural. Besides, Aşık and Cephe (2013) examined the use of DMs in the transcription of Turkish undergraduate ELT students' presentations by comparing them with the DM use of native speakers gathered in the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE) corpus employing Schiffrrin (1987), Brinton (1996), Fraser (1999), Müller (2005) and Fung and Carter's (2007) models. Investigating the frequency of DMs, the researchers concluded that they are used less frequently and diversely, which reveals the need for more emphasis on DMs in the EFL context.

Öztürk (2018) analyzed the use of most common DMs, namely *so*, *like*, *you know*, *I mean* and *well* in informal speech in a university setting with the students of an ELT department by comparing them with native use via Louvain Corpus of Native English Conversations (LOCNEC); and examined the DM use and speaker fluency relationship. The researcher declared that DMs' textual functions were used more by Turkish ELT students than native speakers; while this is the opposite for their conversational functions. Besides, the relationship between DM use and fluency was found to be moderate and significant. Using two different corpora, namely the Turkish sub-corpus of The Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage (LINDSEI-TR) and LOCNEC, to investigate the DM use of Turkish EFL learners and that of native speakers, Kızıl (2021) revealed that Turkish EFL learners did not use DMs sufficiently when compared to native use, which results in less natural-sounding and also less confident language production.

Being one of the most commonly used markers, *I think* was studied in terms of frequency of its use and functions in LINDSEI-TR and LOCNEC by comparing native and nonnative use by Can and Yakut (2018) disclosing that the use and functions of *I think* varied across groups, such as its usage as a *shield*, though there is not a significant overall distinction. Besides, Akbaş and Bal-Gezegin (2022) investigated the functions of *okay* as a DM in Mathematics lectures of undergraduate students at an English medium university in Turkey and the researchers found that *okay* was used to involve students and facilitate classroom interaction. The results of the study also demonstrated that *okay* was used to declare that a piece of important information is about to be

explained and to signal that an important concept is about to be translated by the lecturer.

3.3.3. Studies on the Discourse Marker Use in Teacher Talk and Perception in the Turkish Context

In a university setting, Özer and Okan (2018) inspected the use of DMs in lecture transcriptions of two nonnative Turkish lecturers and their native counterparts via the AntConc (2014) text analysis program. Intending to analyze how diversely and frequently they were used; the researchers concluded that native teachers used 37 different DMs in total, while this number was found to be 29 for nonnative lecturers, 21 of which were also underused as mentioned by the researchers. As teacher talk is one of the most prominent factors that affect the learners' language use, the findings are crucial in terms of this issue.

Aşık (2015) investigated the viewpoint of 104 EFL instructors from seven different state universities considering their essential role in language teaching and learning. In this quantitative study, the researcher applied a questionnaire revealing that teachers generally have a positive approach to DMs. On the other hand, whether American, British or local use of DMs should be encouraged stayed unclear. However, in terms of their classroom representation and some other aspects such as teacher talk, the researcher emphasizes the need for further research in various EFL contexts with an increased number of participants. Lastly, Demirtaş (2004) investigated the DM use and *contextualization cues* of two different teachers in a preparatory school of a state university via transcriptions and their analysis; and the researcher found that teachers employed commonly used DMs (*well, I mean, you know now, okay, so, because, but, and, or, alright, actually, and anyway*) with different purposes, namely *showing contrast, topic shifting, pause filling, exemplification, showing relation*, and etc., to serve their conversational strategies.

3.3.4. Studies Analyzing Discourse Marker Use in the Turkish Language

Filling the gap by analyzing the use of DMs in the Turkish narrative context, Furman and Özyürek (2007) focused on the use of *interactional DMs* in oral narratives of 60 children and 20 adult native Turkish speakers. As DMs, *şey, yani, and işte* which respectively mean *uuhh, I mean, and y'know* were analyzed in the scope of this

research. It was revealed by the researchers that children and adults used DMs differently in terms of function and frequency. To exemplify this, *şey* was found to be used with similar frequency at all age levels, while the other two DMs were used less frequently by the children group, the reason behind which was concluded to be their multifunctionality. Moreover, even if they are used with the same frequency through age groups, their function varied. The study also demonstrated that the acquisition of DMs starts in early childhood.

Another study with 78 Turkish native preschool children was conducted by Köymen and Küntay (2013). The researchers analyzed the use of opposition markers in semi-naturalistic interactions of the children with their peers. The two DMs under investigation (*ya* and *ki*) were examined both qualitatively and quantitatively. The results of the study showed that these two most common *adversative DMs* in Turkish were used to serve different purposes. To make it clearer, *ya* was employed to intensify the opposition, while *ki* was used to diminish the effect of the opposition. Additionally, the researchers emphasized that the reason behind this variation was likely to be due to the functional mobility of the DMs, which is an important indicator of children's acquisition of *discourse competence*. Analyzing various functions of interjections in the Turkish language taking *reactive idea framing* in an informal setting as a basis of her study, Büyükkantarcıoğlu (2006) reveals that this variety is possible through the cognitive mechanisms of the language users. According to the message of the utterer, the researcher develops a kind of framing and assigns function for it in mind, some of which are also implied and have certain cultural aspects. Therefore, how these structures are answered has a role in the flow of conversation and this whole process is nonarbitrary.

Çakır (2017) focused on the use of *yani* in classroom interaction between Turkish teachers and seventh-graders through video recordings and transcriptions. The factors affecting the use of *yani* were revealed to be gender, age, and teachers' experience and it was also used at the beginning of turns in conversation aiming at functioning in *clarifying information*, *bringing together themes*, and *binding*. Emphasizing the fact that they are rarely studied in the Turkish context, Gönen (2011) conducted a research on neo-humean analysis of *ama* and *fakat* as DMs by also inspecting their positions in a sentence and through different text types. Their most common function was found to

be *cause and effect relations*, especially its subcategories: *Contrast*, *violated expectation*, and *denial of preventer*. However, as the researcher mentions, there is a need for further investigation of their functions in discourse. Finally, Çakır-Sarı (2020) analyzed the DM use of 8 Turkish Language teachers who were teaching students from grade 7 by recording 16 lessons in the scope of a cross-sectional research. The findings of this study revealed that age, gender, and experience are the variables affecting the DM use of the teachers.

3.4. Conclusion

As it can obviously be seen from the literature review above, there have been numerous studies in the world that analyze DM use in different settings and especially its significance in terms of language teaching. When it comes to the studies in Turkey, most of them focused on analyzing written data. There are also studies investigating spoken discourse; however, there are not enough studies, especially in informal settings. Also, many of these studies were conducted in university settings. Different from the general tendency, the present study investigates both written and spoken data collected from the students that are oral and written versions of a narrative. What is more, this study analyzes the DM use of a younger student group, namely 9th, 10th, and 11th graders in two high school settings. As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic restrictions, the current study had to be conducted online, which also differentiates it from the general research type and tendency. With this in mind, Fung and Carter's (2007) model of DMs was adopted in the scope of this research. This choice is data-driven as the first ten most common DMs both in the spoken and written databases were included in this model.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

4.1. Setting

This study aims at describing the use of DMs both in the spoken and written language of high school students in the Turkish EFL context. It was conducted during the online teaching period as a result of Covid-19 restrictions. It included high school students who were studying at two private high schools in Turkey, one of which was an Anatolian high school and the other was a science high school. They were 9, 10, and 11th graders. 9th graders and 10th graders were having English classes at B1, B2, and B2+ levels. Since the beginning of the pandemic, all the students had been receiving online education. Besides, the students were using *High Note 2, 3, and 4* books by Pearson Education.

4.2. Participants

19 students, 14 females and 5 males, who were also students of the researcher, volunteered to be a part of this study. 8 students from each 9th and 10th grades participated in the study, while this number was 3 for the 11th graders as demonstrated in Table 7.

Table 7. Participants

	9 th Grade	10 th Grade	11 th Grade	Total
Female	7	6	1	14
Male	1	2	2	5
Total	8	8	3	19

Participants were also asked some questions about their backgrounds and attitude toward language learning. (Please see Appendix 3 for students' answers).

4.3. Data Collection and Procedures

The data of this study was collected during pandemic restrictions and online education in the first semester of the 2020-2021 academic year. Individual sessions with the participants were conducted on Zoom, one of the most popular platforms in that period and they were recorded by the researcher. During the sessions, students were asked to watch a silent animated movie and share the story both verbally and in written form as if they had been sharing the story with someone who had not seen it before. The name of the movie is La Boite (The Box) and it is about an old and lonely man and a mouse building up a lasting friendship after a difficult beginning (access via: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=20evunLzSgk&t=146s>). The students watched the silent animation which was approximately a 7-minute-long content and none of them wanted to watch it again. It was also all the students' first time encountering this animation. Finally, they were asked to complete a background questionnaire, which included questions regarding their personal information and attitudes towards language (Please see Appendix 2).

The researcher preferred the participants to watch a silent movie as she did not want their language production to be affected by any verbal content. In this way, their language production was more naturalistic and away from being manipulated by other factors. Another factor that made the researcher choose that certain silent animation was the possible vocabulary that the participants would need when they were completing the task. She found it to be suitable for their vocabulary level and age group. The spoken data was transcribed by the researcher. The participants provided their answers to the Background and Language Attitude Survey and their writing tasks through Google Forms. Furthermore, the methodology of this study was approved by the Ethical Council of the Education Faculty. As the participants were under the legal age, their parents signed the approval and consent form.

4.4. Data Analysis

Transcriptions have always been vital to discourse research as they make language solid and easier to analyze for discourse researchers. Even though they lack some

features of spoken language, Leander and Prior (2003) argue that transcriptions offer the researchers a lot since they represent a printed version of language use and make them ready for investigation and thinking. Considering that, Du Bois's (1991) conventions were adopted during the transcription of the speaking parts of the 19 individual sessions with the participants, with a special emphasis on pauses and code-switching. Besides, the written data was collected through Google Forms. Each database was analyzed in terms of DM use according to Fung and Carter's (2007) model and the first ten most frequent DMs in both databases were analyzed in terms of their functions and frequencies. Some excerpts from the transcribed data will be shared below to exemplify DM use. The next chapter will also include samples for each function in a detailed way. The excerpts from both spoken and written databases exemplify DM use.

The functions of *and* and *then* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (1-2):

- (1) He is in the living room **and** he is watching kitchen. (Continuation of topics)
- (2) But the mouse don't accept don't doesn't <xx> doesn't accept the uhm biscuits ee **then** the old man try to.. magic tricks for impress the mouse. (Marking sequence)

The functions of *but* and *so* from our written database are shown in bold below in (3-4):

- (3) He gave bread to rat again **but** the rat didn't take it. (Marking contrast)
- (4) He didn't want it die **so** he fed it. (Marking consequence)

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.1. Findings

5.1.1. Overall Findings

The aim of the current study is to describe the DM use of high school EFL learners both in spoken and written language. In this respect, the present study aims at answering the following research questions:

1. What are the types and frequencies of discourse markers in EFL high school learners' speech and writing?
2. What are the functions of the discourse markers used by the learners?

The study was conducted in a private Anatolian and a science high school in Turkey. 19 students, 5 males and 14 females, from grades 9,10, and 11 took part in it. Online individual meetings administered with the participants were recorded and transcribed by the researcher. The recordings of the speaking tasks took 59.6 minutes in total and 2.57 minutes per student. The transcribed spoken data was found to include 4061 words. Participants were also asked to produce the same content in writing. Their writing tasks which were collected through Google Forms consist of 3085 words. Following that, these recordings were examined in terms of DM use, their frequencies, and functions according to Fung and Carter's (2007) model. Table 8 shows the total word count in speech and writing, which signals that the participants tended to produce more words in their speech.

Table 8. Total Word Count

	Female	Male	Total
Speech	3303	758	4061
Writing	2541	544	3085

The first ten most common DMs adopted by the participants in their speech are *and*, *then*, *but*, *so*, *just*, *I think*, *like*, *because*, *first(ly)*, and *yeah* respectively. They were uttered 482 times in total and Table 9 presents a detailed explanation of the DMs in the spoken data.

Table 9. All the DMs Occurred in the Spoken Data

DM Type	Frequency
<i>And</i>	227
<i>Then</i>	73
<i>But</i>	59
<i>So</i>	26
<i>Just</i>	24
<i>I think</i>	22
<i>Like</i>	19
<i>Because</i>	16
<i>First (ly)</i>	8
<i>Yeah</i>	8
TOTAL	482

As Table 10 demonstrates, the first ten most frequent DMs that are used by the students in their writing tasks include *and*, *but*, *then*, *because (of)*, *just*, *so*, *first(ly)*, *finally*, *actually*, and *I think*. They were explored to be employed 274 times by the students in total.

Table 10. DMs Occurred in the Written Data

DM Type	Frequency
<i>And</i>	125
<i>But</i>	44
<i>Then</i>	36
<i>So</i>	19
<i>Because (of)</i>	15
<i>Just</i>	14
<i>First (ly)</i>	11
<i>Finally</i>	6
<i>Actually</i>	2
<i>I think</i>	2
TOTAL	274

5.1.2. DM Use According to Fung and Carter's (2007) Model.

The DMs that were found to occur in both spoken and written data of this study were analyzed according to their functions within the framework of the model offered by Fung and Carter (2007: 418). Therefore, the DMs under investigation in the present study are: *And*, *then*, *but*, *so*, *just*, *I think*, *like*, *because*, *first(ly)*, *yeah*, *finally*, and *actually*. The DMs and their functions are given in Table 11.

Table 11. The Categories and Functions and Overall DMs According to Fung and Carter's (2007: 418) Model

DM Type	DM Category	Function
<i>And</i>	Referential	Coordination
	Structural	Continuation of Topics
	Cognitive	Denoting thinking Skill
<i>Then</i>	Structural	Sequence
<i>But</i>	Referential	Contrast
<i>So</i>	Referential	Consequence
		Topic Shifts
	Structural	Summarizing Opinions
<i>Just</i>	Interpersonal	Indicating Attitudes
<i>I think</i>	Interpersonal	Indicating Attitudes
	Cognitive	Denoting thinking Process
<i>Like</i>	Interpersonal	Indicating Attitude
	Cognitive	Marking Elaboration
<i>Because</i>	Referential	Cause
<i>First (ly)</i>	Structural	Sequence
<i>Yeah</i>	Interpersonal	Showing Responses
	Structural	Continuation of topics
<i>Finally</i>	Structural	Sequence
<i>Actually</i>	Interpersonal	Indicating Attitudes

5.1.3. Findings Regarding the Spoken Data

Table 12 indicates the first ten most common DMs and their frequencies. The first 14 students are females while the last 5 of them are males. The left column shows all the 19 students and the hyphens signal that students didn't use those DMs.

Table 12. DMs Used by Each Learner in Speech

	DM Type										Total
	<i>And</i>	<i>Then</i>	<i>But</i>	<i>So</i>	<i>Just</i>	<i>I think</i>	<i>Like</i>	<i>Because</i>	<i>Firstly</i>	<i>Yeah</i>	
S₁	8	5	2	1	2	-	1	-	-	3	22
S₂	26	1	2	-	-	-	4	1	-	-	34
S₃	14	2	6	5	1	-	-	-	2	-	30
S₄	10	6	6	-	1	3	4	1	-	2	33
S₅	12	4	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	18
S₆	7	3	6	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	18
S₇	15	4	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	23
S₈	36	16	5	-	12	2	-	-	-	-	71
S₉	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	9
S₁₀	7	13	3	1	2	4	6	2	2	1	41
S₁₁	36	2	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	44
S₁₂	16	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	20
S₁₃	8	2	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	15
S₁₄	5	5	4	-	-	5	4	2	-	-	25
S₁₅	11	1	5	4	-	7	-	3	-	-	31
S₁₆	2	1	2	3	-	-	-	-	2	-	10
S₁₇	3	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	9
S₁₈	4	5	1	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
S₁₉	3	1	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	10

As the results of the function analysis reveal *interpersonal, referential, structural, and cognitive DMs*, namely all the categorizations in the aforementioned model, exist in our spoken database. *Interpersonal markers* have two main functions: To indicate attitudes and to show responses. *Referential markers* point out cause, contrast, coordination, and consequence. *Structural markers* indicate opening/closing of topics, sequence, topic shifts, summarizing opinions, and continuation of topics. Lastly,

cognitive markers serve to denote thinking process and mark elaboration. The first ten most common DMs in the spoken data and their functions and frequencies are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. The Functions (Categories) and Frequencies of the DMs in the Spoken Data

DM Type	Function (Category)	Frequency
<i>And</i>	Continuation of Topic (Structural)	144
	Coordination/Continuation of Topic (Referential/Structural)	37
	Coordination/Denoting thinking process (Referential/Cognitive)	23
	Continuation of Topic/ Denoting thinking process (Structural/ Cognitive)	23
<i>Then</i>	Marking sequence (Structural)	73
<i>But</i>	Marking Contrast (Referential)	59
<i>So</i>	Marking Consequence (Referential)	21
	Marking Topic Shift (Referential)	4
	Summarizing Topics (Structural)	1
<i>Just</i>	Indicating attitude (Interpersonal)	24
<i>I think</i>	Denoting thinking process (Cognitive)	12
	Indicating Attitude (Interpersonal)	10
<i>Like</i>	Marking Elaboration (Cognitive)	13
	Indicating Attitude (Interpersonal)	6
<i>Because</i>	Marking cause (Referential)	16
<i>Firstly</i>	Marking Sequence (Structural)	8
<i>Yeah</i>	Showing response (Interpersonal)	4
	Continuation topics (Structural)	4
TOTAL		482

And, as the most common DM in the spoken data, was uttered 227 times by the participants in their speech. It functions as a marker to denote thinking process that makes it one of the cognitive markers. Its other functions are continuation of topic and coordination, which makes it also a structural and referential DM. Also, the repetitions in the spoken data were excluded from the number of occurrences. When differentiating between the functions, special attention is paid not only to the examples from the previous research but also to the intonation of the participants where *and* occurred in a sentence. The examples of students' use of *and* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (5-8):

(5) Mice didn't want to eat the crackers so he e: act like he eat it **and** think it is delicious. (continuation of topics)

(6) The mouse in the house in the trap in the box little box. **And** uhm then they are being friends but the mouse is still scaring from him (coordination/continuation of topic)

(7) S: ...as i see he gave a cereal probably.

T: m-hm, [m-hm]

S: **A:nd** uhm the mouse didn't eat it (coordination/ denote thinking process)

(8) The rat slowly goes around the..uhm furnitures **a:nd** climbs up to an bin bag. (continuation of topics/denote thinking process)

According to the results of the analysis, *then* occurred 73 times in the spoken data, which makes it the second most common DM in the database of the present study. According to the model, *then* serves as a sequence marker that is one of the structural markers. The examples of students' use of *then* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (9-10):

(9) But he is not it is like a uhm good trap not trap uhm like he is trying to be nice to the mouse **then** I think they are being friends (marking sequence)

(10) Uhm the old man uhm love the mouse and feed it.. **then** the mouse and old man just become friends or something like that (marking sequence)

Occurring 59 times, *but* is the third most common DM in the spoken data pointing out contrast that is one of the referential markers. The examples of students' use of *but* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (11-12):

(11) Uhm he is acting like he is sleeping **but** he is not actually sleeping he put some uhm he put something uhm onto his dress (marking contrast)

(12) He gives it to the rat again. **But** the rat didn't accept it...(marking contrast)

As the results reveal, *so* was used 26 times by the students with three main functions: To show consequence, topic shifts, and summarize topics. As the fourth common DM in our spoken database, the examples of students' use of *so* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (13-15):

(13) He uhm heard a uhm cat noise **so** uhm he take the trap back (marking consequence)

(14) OK. **So**, I am going to start over. I will share a story with you. (marking topic shift)

(15) Actually the mouse just wants to be free and.. **so** they love each other. (summarizing topics)

Being used 23 times, *just* is revealed to be the fifth most common DMs in the spoken data. In line with the model, it serves to indicate attitudes as a part of interpersonal markers. The examples of students' use of *just* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (16-17):

(16) He was **just** pretending for the mouse and then that's it. (indicating attitude)

(17) He **just** looks the box and then take a piece of uhm piece of bread (indicating attitude)

Occurring 22 times, *I think* was found to be the sixth most common DM in the learners' speech. It has two different functions: Indicating attitudes and denoting thinking process. The examples of students' use of *I think* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (18-19):

(18) Um and then he gave him.. e water and the bread **I think** ee he throw them into the box ee. (denoting thinking process)

(19) He is trying to be nice to the mouse then **I think** they are being friends (indicating attitude)

As a result of the analysis, it was explored that *like* was used 19 times by the students, which makes it the seventh most common DM in our spoken database. It occurred only in the spoken data. The students use it to elaborate their utterances and indicate attitude. Therefore, it serves both as a cognitive and an interpersonal marker. The examples of students' use of *like* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (20-21):

(20) I think there is a perception **like** in the mouse he thinks it thinks uhm the old man will hurt him but... (marking elaboration)

(21) Then older man **like** be sad but then he fed him with another method (indicating attitude)

As a causal marker under the referential category, *because (of)* is used 16 times by the students and is the eighth most common DM. Though *because of* is not followed by a sentence, some of the students used it instead of *because* in our data and started a full sentence following the preposition *of*. Even though it is not grammatically acceptable, they were also included as DMs considering that the students are aware of their pragmatic function which is marking cause. The examples of students' use of *because (of)* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (22-23):

(22) He try to give the mouse food and e: water but the mouse don't want the food **because** he is angry (marking cause)

(23) I think he the mouse loves the man.. **because of** he didn't threw him out... (marking cause)

As the ninth most common DM in our database, *first(ly)* was uttered 8 times by the students in their speech. It functions as a marker of sequence that is a subcategory of the structural markers in the flow of discourse. The examples of students' use of *first(ly)* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (24-25):

(24) **First**, mouse didn't want these foods but then, after a while, man started doing funny things to mouse and they created a bond (marking sequence)

(25) **Firstly**, e: there is a man and I think he feels uncomfortable about the uhm can I say mouse (marking sequence)

Yeah was used 8 times by the students in their narratives. In line with the model employed in the scope of this study, it serves both to show response and to open/close topics. While the first one is a subcategory of interpersonal markers, the second is one of the structural markers. Though it was not previously planned, students' utterances of *yeah* when answering or reacting to the researcher were also included in the frequency list as one of its functions is to show response. Even though the spoken database of the present study is made up of monologues uttered by the students, it is at the same time an answer to the researchers' questions, which makes their monologues very long parts of dialogues. Therefore, the researcher decided to add this function as well. The examples of students' use of *yeah* from our spoken database are shown in bold below in (26-27):

(26) S:... we saw that the guy is actually not asleep we are just.. uh..
wait I forgot

T: pretend

S: **yeah**, he was just pretending for the mouse and then that's it.
(showing response)

(27) When he took the food the mouse.. and then **yeah** and lastly, we saw that the guy is actually not asleep... (opening/closing topics)

5.1.4. Findings Regarding the Written Data

According to Fung and Carter's (2007) DM classification, the ten most frequent DMs occurring in the written data are shown in Table 14 with their frequencies and they are *and*, *but*, *then*, *so*, *because*, *just*, *first (ly)*, *finally*, *I think*, and *actually* respectively. The left column shows all the 19 students the first 14 of whom are females and the last 5 are males while the hyphens signal that students didn't use those DMs.

Table 14. DMs Used by Each Learner in Writing

	DM TYPE										Total
	<i>And</i>	<i>But</i>	<i>Then</i>	<i>So</i>	<i>Because</i>	<i>Just</i>	<i>First(ly)</i>	<i>Finally</i>	<i>I think</i>	<i>Actually</i>	
S ₁	1	4	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	7
S ₂	13	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	15
S ₃	7	4	1	3	1	8	1	-	-	-	25
S ₄	10	3	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	17
S ₅	6	2	3	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	15
S ₆	5	3	2	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	16
S ₇	4	4	1	2	1	-	1	1	-	-	14
S ₈	23	2	11	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	37
S ₉	1	4	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	8
S ₁₀	7	2	6	-	1	4	2	-	1	-	23
S ₁₁	16	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19
S ₁₂	5	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	9
S ₁₃	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
S ₁₄	3	3	5	-	3	-	1	1	1	-	17
S ₁₅	5	2	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	10
S ₁₆	4	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
S ₁₇	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	5
S ₁₈	6	1	2	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	13
S ₁₉	3	3	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	10

The findings of the written data showed that DMs from three categories of the model occurred in our database, which are *interpersonal*, *referential*, and *structural* markers.

Indicating attitude is the only function that is a part of the *interpersonal* markers. From the *referential* markers category, DMs with the functions of marking cause, contrast, coordination, and consequence were adopted by the students. Finally, the *structural* markers that occurred in our written database are used to signal sequence, summarize opinions, and continue topics. Their function and frequency list is given in Table 15.

Table 15. The Functions (Categories) and Frequencies of the DMs in the Written Data

DM Type	Function (Category)	Frequency
<i>And</i>	Continuation of Topics (Structural)	113
	Marking Coordination/ Continuation of Topics (Structural/ Referential)	12
<i>But</i>	Marking Contrast (Referential)	44
<i>Then</i>	Marking Sequence (Structural)	36
<i>So</i>	Consequence (Referential)	16
	Summarizing Opinions (Structural)	2
	Continuation of Topics (Structural)	1
<i>Because</i>	Marking Cause (Referential)	15
<i>Just</i>	Indicating Attitude (Interpersonal)	14
<i>First(ly)</i>	Marking Sequence (Structural)	11
<i>Finally</i>	Marking Sequence (Structural)	6
<i>Actually</i>	Indicating Attitude (Interpersonal)	2
<i>I think</i>	Indicating Attitude (Interpersonal)	2
TOTAL		274

Excluding its use at the sentence level, it was explored that *and* is the most common DM in our written database, just as it was in the speech. It was used 125 times by the participants embodying mainly two different functions: 113 of the *and* markers were used to indicate solely the continuation of the topic while 12 of them had both the functions of coordination and continuation of topic by having a more obvious role in the conversation flow. To make the distinction clear, the examples of students' use of *and* from our written database are shown in bold below in (28-29):

(28) It slowly goes to the kitchen **and** climbs up the bin bag.
(continuation of topic)

(29) Old man makes funny things to make mouse eat the bread crumbs. **And** finally mouse eats it. But it is still angry to him.
(coordination/continuation of topic)

Different from the spoken database where it was the third most frequent DM, *but* was found to be the second most common DM in the written database. It was used 44 times by the students with the contrastive function, which was a sub-category of referential markers. The examples of students' use of *but* from our written database are shown in bold below in (30-31):

(30) He didn't want it die so he fed it, gave water to it **but** the rat didn't accept them cause he was a bit angry to the man. (marking contrast)

(31) Then he decided to put it to outside **but** he heard a cat noise and took the box back to home.

Then was revealed to be the third most common DM in our written database as it is adopted 36 times by the students. The examples of students' use of *then* from our written database are shown in bold below in (32-33):

(32) One night the mouse was looking for a food **then** he saw the man sleeping with scraps on his chest. (marking sequence)

(33) It ate the cookies and left **then** the old man opened his eyes so we learned that he was aware of the rat (marking sequence)

So was explored to be the fifth most common DM in the writing tasks of the participants with a frequency of 20 times. It goes under referential and structural categorization and under these categories, it is used to mark consequence, summarize opinion and continue topics. It was used 17 times as a consequence marker, two times to summarize opinions, and once to continue topics. The examples of students' use of *so* from our written database are shown in bold below in (34-36).

(34) He hears a cat planning to attack to mouse **so** he gets mouse back into his house and tries to feed him. (marking consequence)

(35) While the man is sleeping, the mouse comes to the man. And eats the bread crumbs on the old man's clothes. **So** the mouse gets close to man. That means now they can be friends. (summarizing opinions)

(36) She kept for one of them for eating and went away from him but then he opened his eyes and smiled. **So**, he didn't sleep, he pretended to sleep from the beginning. (continuation of topics)

As the fourth most frequent DM in our written database, *because(of)/cause* was revealed to occur 15 times in students' writing tasks. The previously mentioned grammatically-unaccepted form of *because of* also occurred in writing and was included in the total number. Being one of the referential markers, it serves as a marker to present a cause relationship. The examples of students' use of *(be)cause (of)* from our written database are shown in bold below in (37-38):

(37) But he cares about mouse **because** he hears a cat noise from outside and he changes his mind, gets the mouse inside again. (marking cause)

(38) But the rat didn't accept them **cause** he was a bit angry to the man. (marking cause)

Occurring 13 times in the written data of the present study, *just* is categorized as a marker indicating attitude as a subcategory of interpersonal markers. The examples of students' use of *just* from our written database are shown in bold below in (39-40):

(39) Then he open the trap and they **just** look each other. (indicating attitude).

(40) But the thing he was not sleeping he was **just** pretending for the mouse. (indicating attitude)

The sixth most common DM, *first(ly)* occurred 11 times in our written database. Being one of the structural DMs, it functions to indicate the sequence in students' written language use. The examples of students' use of *first(ly)* from our written database are shown in bold below in (41-42):

(41) There is short film that I really like, I want to tell you what happening in the film. **Firstly** there is a man who feel uncomfortable about the mouse. (marking Sequence)

(42) He gave water and a bread particle. **First**, the mouse doesn't trust man to eating the bread. Man acts like he is eating the bread. (marking sequence)

Unlike the spoken database where it is not among the 10 most frequent DMs, *finally* is the seventh most common DM in the written database by being adopted 6 times. Under the structural categorization, it only serves to indicate the sequence in discourse flow. The examples of students' use of *finally* from our written database are shown in bold below in (43-44):

(43) There was some crumbs on his neck. And the mouse ate them. **Finally** they were happy. (marking sequence)

(44) And the mouse ate them. **Finally** they were happy. (marking sequence)

The result of the analysis revealed that *actually* occurred two times in the students' writing tasks serving as a marker to indicate attitude of the user, a subcategory of interpersonal markers. The examples of students' use of *actually* from our written database are shown in bold below in (45-46):

(45) But he couldn't because he **actually** loved the mouse and he did magic tricks for impress the mouse for fed it. (indicating attitude)

(46) But while mouse doing all of that old man was **actually** awake and did that on porpoise to fed it. (indicating attitude)

Lastly, one of the mutual DMs in both the written and the spoken data, *I think* was used two times by the students in their writing tasks. Different from spoken data where *I think* has two functions, both instances in the written database are used to indicate the attitude of the speaker, which makes it one of the interpersonal markers. The example of students' use of *I think* from our written database are shown in bold below in (47-48):

(47) But mouse thinks he is sleeping normally old man trying to be good then they are being friends **I think** in the first way mouse is little bit prejudice to the man. (indicating attitude)

(48) While he is doing that he is hearing a cat voice at the moment then **I think** he thought that cat will eat the mouse (indicating attitude)

The mutual DMs both in the written and spoken databases are: *And, then, but, so, just, because, first(ly), and I think*. In other words, eight of the most common ten DMs in both databases are mutual. The ones that are only used in the spoken language are *like* and *yeah* which are expected forms of daily talk while *finally* and *actually* are among the 10 most frequent DMs used in the written language. Though the students used *and* and *then* both in their speech and writing, it was not included in our database as it is not stated in the adopted model of this study. However, there are some studies such as Brinton (1996) that treat *and then* as an inseparable utterance. While the decision is made whether to include *and* and *then* separately in our data or not, the participants' intonation was considered. However, this was not possible in the written database.

5.2. Discussion

In the scope of the present study, the use of DMs by high school EFL learners in spoken and written language is analyzed aiming at answering the previously stated research questions. The findings of this study reveal noteworthy results in terms of the DM use of the learners and the functions of these DMs. Similar studies are also conducted in the EFL context as referred to in the literature review of the study; however, there are some reasons that differentiate this study from the previous research.

Firstly, this study is conducted in a high school setting while most of the previous research is carried out in university settings (see Flowerdew and Tauroza, 1995; Eslami and Eslami-Rasekh, 2007; Martinez, 2009; Eslami et al. 2012; Shahbaz et al. 2013; Martinez, 2002; Jalilifar, 2008; Alghamdi, 2014; Rahayu and Cahyono, 2015; Ab Manan and Raslee, 2017; Buysse, 2010; Alraddadi, 2016; Dülger, 2007; Ünalı, 2013; Aysu, 2017; Ersanlı, 2015; Akbaş, 2014; Hatipoğlu and Algi, 2018; Yüksel and Kavanoz, 2018; Baltacı, 2019; Sancak, 2019). On the other hand, Ding and Wang (2015), Vickov and Jakupovic (2017), and Vickov (2011) conducted their studies in primary and secondary school contexts. Additionally, Trillo (2002) examines the DM

use of children and adults together while Tehrani and Dastjerdi (2012) analyze the DM use of an adult group between the ages of 25-40. On the other hand, some of the earlier researchers investigate the DM use of learners who are more or less in the same age group as the participants of the present study (see Al-Qahtani, 2015; Aidinlou and Mehr, 2012; Al-khazraji, 2019; Fung and Carter, 2007; Al-Yaari et al., 2013)

Secondly, the current study examines both the written and spoken language of the EFL learners, unlike many other previous studies that focus only on one of these skills. There are many studies which examine DM use in written language (see Martinez, 2002; Jalilifar, 2008; Aidinlou and Mehr, 2012; Vickov, 2011; Tehrani and Dastjerdi, 2012; Alghamdi, 2014; Rahayu and Cahyono, 2015; Ab Manan and Raslee, 2017; Alkahzraji, 2019; Dülger, 2007; Ünaldı, 2013; Aysu, 2017; Babanoğlu, 2014; Ersanlı, 2015; Akbaş, 2014; Hatipoğlu and Algı, 2018; Baltacı, 2019; Sancak, 2019). On the other hand, fewer number of studies focus on spoken data (see Fung and Carter, 2007; Buysse, 2010; Sadeghi and Ramezan Yarandi, 2014; Alraddadi, 2016; Tavakoli and Karimnia, 2017; Al-Yaari et al., 2013; Trillo, 2002; Norrick, 2011; Büyükkarcı and Genç, 2009; Aşık and Cephe, 2013; Öztürk, 2018; Kızıl, 2021; Can and Yakut, 2018; Akbaş and Bal-Gezegin, 2022).

Finally, some of the previous studies investigate only one or several DMs whereas our study analyzes the ten most common DMs in both spoken and written contexts (Fox Tree, 2014; Norrick, 2001; Ünaldı, 2013; Büyükkarcı and Genç, 2009; Can and Yakut, 2018; Akbaş and Bal-Gezegin, 2022). Additionally, different from the present study, a great deal of the previous research adopts Fraser's (1999, 2004) categorization (see Ab Manan and Raslee, 2007; Jalilifar, 2008; Modhish, 2012; Vickov, 2012; Alghamdi, 2014; Rahayu and Cahyono, 2015; Aysu, 2017).

Considering the research questions, the similar and distinct aspects of the findings of the present study will be linked to the pertinent studies in the field.

Research Question 1: What are the types and frequencies of discourse markers in EFL high school learners' speech and writing?

As a result of the analysis of DM use in student speech, *and*, *then*, *but*, *so*, *just*, *I think*, *like*, *because*, *first(ly)*, and *yeah* are revealed to be the first ten most common DMs.

There are both similarities and differences between these findings and those of the preceding researchers.

Just as our study, Ismail (2012) reveals that *and* is the most common DM in political speech context. It is explored to be the most common DM in Fung and Carter (2007) and Al-Yaari et al. (2013) as well. In Tavakoli and Karimnia (2017), *and* is found to be the most common elaborative marker. It is also the second most common DM in Aşık and Cephe (2013). Additionally, Büyükkarcı and Genç (2009) focus only on the functions and frequency of *and* in their spoken database exploring its use both as a DM and conjunction. The second most common DM in our study, *then* occurs in some of the previous studies with different frequencies (see Ismail, 2012; Aşık and Cephe, 2013; Alraddadi, 2016; Tavakoli and Karimnia, 2017). Differently, it is not among the most frequent DMs in Fung and Carter (2007) and Al- Yaari et al. (2013).

Just as in our study, *but* is the third most common DM in Ismail (2012) in the political speech context. It is the second and the third most common DM in Fung and Carter (2007) and Al-Yaari et al. (2013) respectively. In Tavakoli and Kariminia (2017), *but* is also the most frequent contrastive DM. It is also the fifth most common DM in Aşık and Cephe (2013). In Uicheng and Crabtree (2018) *but* occurs adjacent to other elements of a DM such as *but the question is* and *but my point is*. The fourth most common DM in our study, *so* is among the DMs occurred in the data analyzed in the scope of some earlier studies that have different purposes (see Ismail, 2012; Fung and Carter, 2007; Buysse 2010; Alraddadi, 2016; Tavakoli and Karimnia 2017; Öztürk, 2018). In Uicheng and Crabtree (2018), it was also found to be a part of macro-markers such as *so I realized that*. Besides, it is the third most common DM in Aşık and Cephe (2013).

Just, the fifth most common DM in this study, occurs in the data investigated in Fung and Carter (2007) and Aşık and Cephe (2013). In Uicheng and Crabtree (2018), it is a part of macro-markers such as *just imagine that*. Besides, being the sixth most common DM in this study, *I think* is unraveled to be among the DMs under investigation in the previous research (see Aşık and Cephe, 2013; Tavakoli and Kariminia, 2017; Fung and Carter, 2007; Uicheng and Crabtree, 2018; Can and Yakut, 2018).

Like, the seventh most common DM in the scope of the present study, is also a part of some of the earlier studies (see Tavakoli and Karimnia, 2017; Alraddadi, 2016; Buysse, 2010; Fung and Carter, 2007; Öztürk, 2018). The eighth most common DM in this study, *because* is a part of the earlier studies (see Tavakoli and Karimnia, 2017; Fung and Carter, 2007; Ismail, 2012). In Uicheng and Crabtree (2018), it is explored to be a part of the macro markers such as *that is/ this is because*. Besides, it is the ninth most common DM in Aşık and Cephe (2013).

The ninth most common DM in this study, *first(ly)* is also a part of the databases of the some of the earlier studies (see Alraddadi, 2016; Fung and Carter, 2007; Aşık and Cephe, 2013). The last most common DM in the spoken database of the current study, *yeah* is also explored to be used by the participants of some of the previous studies (see Tavakoli and Karimnia, 2017; Fung and Carter, 2007; Aşık and Cephe, 2013).

With a different point of view regarding DMs in spoken discourse, Sadeghi and Ramezan Yarendi (2014) and Alraddadi (2016) reveal that explicit teaching of DMs has an influence on fluency and increases the use of DMs respectively. From another perspective, Fung and Carter (2007), Al-Yaari et al. (2013), Aşık and Cephe (2013), Kızıl (2021) compare native and non-native DM use and they explore that non-native speakers use DMs less frequently. Similarly, Buysse (2010) discovers that DMs with interpersonal functions are rarely used by learners when compared to native speakers.

Analysis of the use of DMs in the written language of the EFL learners reveals that the most common DMs are *and*, *but*, *then*, *so*, *because (of)*, *just*, *first(ly)*, *finally*, *actually*, and *I think* respectively. There are both similarities and differences between these findings and those of the preceding researchers.

Just as revealed in this study, Farouq (2019) states that *and* is the most common additive marker in the civil aviation context. It is explored by some earlier researchers that *and* is the most common DM in their data (see Martinez, 2002; Ab Manan and Raslee, 2017; Aysu, 2017). Babanoğlu (2014) unravels that *and* is the most common DM in the academic writing tasks of the students in terms of the use of speech-like features. In Ersanlı (2015), *and* is also among the most common cohesive devices in non-natives' written data. Similarly, in Vickov (2011) and Al-khazraji (2019), *and* is between the overused DMs. In Rahayu and Chayono (2015), it is explored that *and* is

the third most common DM as a result of their analysis. Just as in this study, *but* is found to be the second most frequent DM in Rahayu and Cahyono (2015) and Aysu (2017). In Alghamdi (2014), it is also among the recurring DMs that are employed by native speakers and it is also one of the DMs with limited use in the non-native speakers' writing tasks. Similarly, *but* is the fourth most common DM according to the analysis by Martinez (2002). Vickov (2011) states that *but* is the overused DM in the *contrastive category*.

Then is the third common DM in the present study just like Farouq (2019). It is also the fourth, fifth, and sixth most common DM in Aysu (2017), Martinez (2002), and Rahayu and Cahyono (2015) respectively. It is also among the implicative DMs in Ab Manan and Raslee (2017). The fourth most common DM in our study, so is the most common DM in Farouq (2019). It also occurs in some of the preceding research (see Martinez, 2002; Ersanlı, 2015; Ab Manan and Raslee, 2017; Ersanlı, 2015). It is the second and fifth most common inferential marker in Rahayu and Cahyono (2015) and Aysu (2017) respectively.

The fifth most common DM in our study, *because* is explored to be the second and third most common DM in Farouq (2019) and Aysu (2017) respectively. It also occurs in the databases of some of the earlier research (see Martinez, 2002; Baltacı, 2019). It is the most common inferential marker in Rahayu and Cahyono (2015). It is also the second most common *elaborative* DM in Ab Manan and Raslee (2017). The sixth most common DM in this study, *just* is not part of the databases of the studies that are carried out in the written context and referred to in the literature review of the present study.

The seventh most common DM, *first(ly)* is among the *temporal* DMs in Ab Manan and Raslee (2017) and Farouq (2019). Similarly, *first of all* is a part of the learner corpus in Ersanlı (2015). *Finally*, the eight most common in our data also occurs in Yüksel and Kavanoz (2018) and Farouq (2019).

Actually, the ninth most common DM in the current research is also a part of Fox Tree (2015). Lastly, the tenth most common DM in the written database of the current study is *I think* and it is also one of the DMs under investigation in Ünalı (2013). *I think* is

disclosed to be the second most common speech-like feature in academic writing tasks in Babanoğlu (2014).

Comparing written and spoken databases in terms of DM use, some differences and similarities are worth mentioning. To begin with, *and* is the most common DM both in the written and the spoken databases of the current study. However, the second most common DM differs between these databases, which is *then* in the spoken database while it is *but* in the written database. *So* is the fourth most common DM both in the spoken and written databases. While two of its functions as marking consequence and topic shifts are the same in both databases, it is used to summarize opinions in the spoken database and to continue topics in the written database. Regardless of their ranking, it is inferred that the first four of the most common DMs are the same both in the written and spoken databases.

Because is the fifth most common DM in the written data whereas it comes after *just*, *like*, and *I think* in the spoken data. These three DMs might actually be among the expected features of speech. Additionally, *just* occurs in the written data following *because* in terms of frequency whereas *like* does not occur in the written data. Though it is not in the scope of this study, students might be using it to fill the gaps in their speech and as this sort of use of *like* might be signaling informal native speech. *I think* is also a part of both databases. However, while it only serves to indicate attitude in both databases, it also serves to denote thinking process in speech. *First(ly)* is among the most common DMs in both databases; however, *finally* is examined only in the written database as it is not among the first ten most frequent DMs in the spoken data. The reason why it does not occur that often in the spoken database might be due to its organizational function. Lastly, *yeah* is among the most frequent DMs only in the spoken data whereas *actually* is among the first ten most common DMs in the written data. However, as they are used by a limited number of participants and much less frequently than the others, it is hard to draw a precise conclusion from these findings.

From a different perspective in written discourse, Aidinlou and Mehr (2012) and Tehrani and Dastjerdi (2012) reveal the positive effect of explicit DM teaching on students' writing tasks. With a different starting point, Alghamdi (2014), Ersanlı (2015), and Akbaş (2014) compare native and non-native use in the written context.

Likewise, Dülger (2007) finds out that the students' DM use increase in terms of number and diversity following explicit instruction.

Research Question 2: What are the functions of the discourse markers used by the learners?

Investigation of the DM functions in the spoken database reveals that the students use *and* to continue and coordinate topics and to denote thinking process; *then* to mark sequence; *but* to mark contrast; *so* to mark consequence, mark topic shift, and summarize topics; *just* to indicate attitude; *like* to mark elaboration and indicate attitude; *I think* to denote thinking process and indicate attitude; *because* to mark cause; *firstly* to mark sequence; *yeah* to show response and open/close topics respectively according to Fung and Carter's (2007) model of DMs.

Similar to the functions of denoting thinking process and continuation of topics respectively, Castro (2009) asserts that some of the functions of *and* are to serve as fillers and to mark sequence/ relevance. The most common function of *and* in our study is continuation of topics and likewise, in Büyükkarcı and Genç (2009) its function is called *linking*. Just as the current study, *then* serves as a sequencer in Ismail (2012) and Alraddadi (2016). Marking contrast in the current study, *but* also functions as an adversative marker in Ismail (2012) and Tavakoli and Karimnia (2017). Summarizing topics, indicating topic shift, and marking consequence in our study, *so* is used as a causative marker in Ismail (2012). Just like the current study, it is multifunctional in Buysse (2010). It is also among inferential markers in Tavakoli and Karimnia (2017). Some of the functions of *so* in our database are similar to the functions that are explored by Öztürk (2018). The function of indicating result is similar to marking consequence in our study; introducing a summary function is also almost the same as its summarizing topics functions in our study; the function of introducing the next sequence is also comparable to its function as indicating topic shift. Indicating attitude and marking elaboration in the current study, *like* is also one of the interpersonal markers in Tavakoli and Karimnia (2017). It is also used to give examples in Alraddadi (2016). Besides, there is also a similarity between the functions of *like* in Öztürk's (2018) and our spoken database. Its function in our database as marking elaboration is similar to that of the researcher's as introducing an explanation. *I think* that indicates

attitude and denote thinking process in the current study, serves as a *topic related* DM in Tavakoli and Karimnia (2017). It also indicates attitude in Can and Yakut (2018). Marking cause, *because* occurs as a reason marker in Tavakoli and Karimnia (2017) and as a causative marker in Ismail (2012). Just as in the present study, *first(ly)* has a sequencing function in Alraddadi (2016). Finally, *yeah* shows responses and open/close topics in this study and it is an interpersonal marker in Tavakoli and Karimnia (2017).

With the examination of the DM functions in the written database following Fung and Carter's (2007) model, it is found that the students use *and* to continue topics and mark coordination; *but* to mark contrast; *then* to mark sequence; *so* to mark consequence, summarize opinions and continue topics; *because* to mark cause; *just* to indicate attitude; *first(ly)* to mark sequence; *finally* to mark sequence; *actually* to indicate attitude; *I think* to indicate attitude respectively.

Marking coordination and continuation of topics, *and* also indicates a relationship between two sentences and serves as an additive marker in Martinez (2002) and Farouq (2019) respectively. Besides, *and* is an elaborative marker in Rahayu and Cahyono (2015) and Ab Manan and Raslee (2017). *But* is found to be the second most common DM in our written database and whereas in Jalilifar (2008), Modhish (2012), and Ab Manan and Raslee (2017) contrastive markers are found to be the third most common category. Just as in our written database, the contrastive category is found to be the second most common DM category also in Alghamdi (2014). Just as the present study, *then* serves to mark sequence in Martinez (2002). On the other hand, it is a causative marker in Farouq (2019). It is also an inferential marker in Rahayu and Cahyono (2015) and an implicative DM in Ab Manan and Raslee (2017). Marking consequence, summarizing opinions, and continuing topics in the current study, *so* is a causative marker in Farouq (2019). It is also used to indicate a causal relationship between sentences in Martinez (2002). *So* is among elaborative and inferential DMs in Ab Manan and Raslee (2017) and Rahayu and Cahyono (2015) respectively. Just as in our study, *because* signals a causal relationship in Farouq (2019) and state reasons in Martinez (2002). It is an inferential and elaborative marker in Rahayu and Cahyono (2015) and Ab Manan and Raslee (2017). *First(ly)* that marks sequence in our study is a temporal DM in Ab Manan and Raslee (2017). It is an additive marker in Farouq

(2019). Marking sequence in the current study, *finally* is a conclusive marker in Farouq (2019). *Actually* indicates attitude in the present study and is used in non-sarcastic disagreement in Fox Tree (2015).

Unlike speech, cognitive DMs (*like* and *and*) are not found in the written database. This might be due to the fact that the two cognitive DMs and their functions in the spoken database are denoting thinking process and elaboration. Elaboration is found to be a function of *like*, which is not one of the DMs under investigation in the written database. Also, the other cognitive function belongs to *and*, which is referred to as denoting thinking process and it is not something to be measured in the written database as previously stated, such decisions are made by looking at the way students utter *and*, namely whether they extend the way they utter the words or not.

Furthermore, investigation of DM use especially with a younger learner group is thought to fill a gap in the EFL research field in Turkey as DMs are crucial in many different aspects. At this point, it is also worth mentioning the existence of the research emphasizing the significance of DMs in comprehension of listening and writing, the flow of classroom discourse, and classroom management. Flowerdew (1995) and Eslami and Eslami-Rasekh (2007) reveal the positive effect of DM use on listening comprehension and Martinez (2009) and Al-Qahtani (2015) reveal the same finding in reading comprehension as well. Castro (2009) and Vickov and Jakupovic (2017) declare the importance of DMs in classroom discourse and classroom management respectively. The studies comparing native and non-native teacher talk such as Eslami et al. (2012), Shahbaz et al. (2013), Ding and Vang (2015), and Özer and Okan (2018) are also of great importance considering the huge impact of teacher talk on the learners' language acquisition.

In addition to the DM studies in the Turkish EFL context, there are also studies focusing on DM use in the Turkish Language. Furman and Özyürek (2007), Köymen and Küntay (2013), Çakır-Sarı (2017, 2020) investigate DM use in the spoken context by employing different perspectives. On the other hand, Gönen (2011) analyzes certain DMs in the written context.

Finally, even though it is not in the scope of this study, there is an obvious difference in DM use in terms of gender. Even though there are not enough participants to draw

a conclusion, it is found that female participants tend to use more varied DMs and with a higher frequency rate when compared to the male students Just as in Tavakoli and Karimnia (2017) who reveal that female participants use all the categories of DMs more than male participants.

This chapter focuses on certain aspects of the current study that differs it from the previous research, answers the research questions, explains the similarities and differences between this study and previously conducted DM studies, states the possible reasons why there are some differences in terms of DM use between the spoken and written databases, reveals the functions of the DMs investigated in the scope of this study, explores some other differences, and includes a collection of the studies on DM use in the Turkish Language as well.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

6.1. Summary of the Study

This study aims at examining the DM use of high school EFL learners and the functions and frequencies of DMs according to the model of Fung and Carter (2007). With this regard, the following research questions are addressed in the scope of this study:

1. What are the types and functions of discourse markers in high school EFL learners' speech and writing?
2. What are the functions of the discourse markers used by the learners?

The pertinent studies in the field were analyzed in order to define terminology and comprehend the nature of the previous studies. The present study was carried out at two private high schools in Turkey. 19 participants, 14 females and 5 males, from grades 9, 10, and 11 took part in it. Individual online sessions were recorded and the speaking tasks were transcribed while the written data is collected through Google Forms. The speaking tasks lasted 59 minutes 6 seconds and in total and 2.57 minutes per student. Both written and spoken data were analyzed in terms of DM use according to the classification created by Fung and Carter (2007). The frequency and functions of DMs were explored. The total number of words in speech is 4061 while this number is 3085 in their writing tasks.

In line with the results of this analysis, it was explored that the spoken database includes more words and more DMs than the written database. The most common DMs in the spoken data are: *And, then, but, so, just, like, I think, because, firstly, and yeah*. On the other hand, the most common DMs in the written data are: *And, but, then,*

so, because, just, first(ly), finally, actually, and I think. 482 DMs occur in the spoken database whereas this number is 274 for the written database. There are DMs under each category of Fung and Carter's (2007) model in the spoken data while cognitive DMs were not found to be among the ten most common DMs in the written database and the possible reasons for that regarding characteristics of these structures were explained. Namely, these structures might be expected forms of speech or the way they were uttered was not possible to be measured in the written database unlike what was done for the spoken data. Also, the reason why this model is adopted is that all the DMs in both databases of the current study have a role in this categorization.

The functions of the DMs in the spoken data are as follows: *And* functions to mark continuation of topic, coordination/continuation of topic, coordination/denoting thinking process, continuation of topic/ denoting thinking process; *then* and *firstly* mark sequence; *but* marks contrast, *so* marks consequence and topic shift and summarizes topics; *just* indicates attitude; *like* marks elaboration and indicates attitude; *I think* denotes thinking process and indicates attitude; *because* marks cause; *yeah* shows response and continue topics. Additionally, the functions of the DMs in the written data are as follows: *And* continues topics and marks coordination/continuation of topics; *but* marks contrast; *then, first(ly), and finally* mark sequence; *so* marks consequence, summarizes opinions, and continue topics; *because* marks cause; *just, actually, and I think* indicates attitude. There are 313 structural, 160 referential, 71 cognitive, and 44 interpersonal markers in the spoken database. On the other hand, there are 181 structural, 91 referential, and 14 interpersonal markers in the written database. The similar and distinct aspects of the present study and the previous studies are given and the significant aspects of the present study are explained.

6.2. Pedagogical Implications and Suggestions

Considering the previous research, both teachers and students will greatly benefit from DM use. As revealed by Sadeghi and Ramezan Yarendi (2014) and Alraddadi (2016), explicit DM instruction has a positive impact on speaker fluency and increases DM use respectively in the spoken context. Tehrani and Dastjerdi (2012) declare that explicit DM teaching has a positive effect on DM use just as Dülger (2007) indicates that explicit DM instruction increases the frequency of DM use. There are also studies

comparing native/non-native talk (see Fung and Carter, 2007; Al-Yaari et al., 2013; Aşık and Cephe, 2013) and they conclude that non-native speakers use DMs less frequently. It can be inferred that these findings emphasize the need for emphasis on this aspect of language use, namely DM use. Therefore, material developers and/or instructors might benefit from DMs when preparing lesson content, curricula, or the materials to be used in EFL classrooms. Making explicit DM instruction a part of teaching content might result in more authentic language use.

Furthermore, as indicated by the results of the analysis, non-native teachers use DMs less frequently such as in Shahbaz et al. (2013) and Özer and Okan (2018). As the teachers' language use is one of the fundamental sources of language use of the learners, DM use should be a part of teacher training, ELT, and foreign language education programs. When teachers are aware of the nature and significance of DMs, they will inevitably affect the language use of the EFL learners. Lastly, even though it is not in the scope of this study, five students who use the native-like speech feature of *like* as a DM choose the highest frequency of exposure to authentic native content such as TV series, songs, and movies in the background and language attitude survey. Therefore, when preparing teaching materials, the authenticity of the content might also be considered.

6.3. Suggestions for Further Research

Conducting a study on the use of DMs in an online setting under the Covid-19 Pandemic restrictions was a challenging task. Therefore, the teaching environment was not convenient for explicit teaching of DMs. Another study might be conducted in a face-to-face environment or after explicit DM instruction as the DM use of the students might be affected by being online either positively or negatively. Furthermore, though it is not in the scope of this study, some DMs and fillers *uhm/um* co-occur at times as students mostly tend to use these features rather than prolonging their utterances. So, the nature of this co-occurrence might also be studied. Researchers such as Fox Tree (2015) focus on the use of such fillers as DMs.

A similar study might also be conducted with an increasing number of participants to draw more extensive generalizations. Another study might be conducted with an even number of male and female students to determine whether gender is a variable in DM

use. Also, teachers' and students' use of DMs might be investigated collectively to reveal whether there is a relationship between the DM use of these two groups and if there is, the nature of this relationship might be examined. A different study might also be conducted by comparing native and non-native DM use in both spoken and written contexts. A different visual content might also result in different DM use as well. Furthermore, a study with a similar methodology can also be carried out by comparing L1 and L2 DM use in both spoken and written databases. A DM study including certain speaking tasks that require a specific kind of language use such as debate or presentations might also be carried out. Lastly, similar studies with different age groups such as younger learners or adults might also yield different results.



REFERENCES

- Ab Manan, N. A., & Raslee, N. N. (2017). Describing the Use of Discourse Markers by ESL Learners in Writing. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 4(3), 101-106.
- Adger, C. T. (2001). 25 Discourse in Educational Settings. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 503.
- Aidinlou, N. A., & Mehr, H. S. (2012). The Effect of Discourse Markers Instruction on EFL Learners' Writing. *World Journal of Education*, 2(2), 10-16.
- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a Corpus* (Vol. 10). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Aijmer, K., & Stenström, A. B. (2004). (Eds.), *Discourse Patterns in Spoken and Written Corpora* (Vol. 120). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Akbaş, E. (2014). Are They Discussing in The Same Way? Interactional Metadiscourse In Turkish Writers' texts. In *Occupying Niches: Interculturality, Cross-Culturality and Aculturality In Academic Research* (pp. 119-133). Springer, Cham.
- Akbaş, E., & Bal-Gezegin, B. (2022). Exploring the Functions of Okay as a Discourse Marker in an English-Medium Instruction Class. In *English as The Medium of Instruction in Turkish Higher Education* (pp. 233-256). Springer, Cham.
- Alami, M. (2015). Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers: A Review of Related Literature. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 3(3), 1-10.
- Alghamdi, E. A. (2014). Discourse Markers in ESL Personal Narrative and Argumentative Papers: A Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(4), 294-305.

- Ali, A., Rashid, A., & Abbas, S. (2020). Metadiscourse Markers in Political Discourse: A Corpus-Assisted Study of Hedges and Boosters in Benazir Bhutto's Speeches. *Global Social Sciences Review*, 5(3), 56-63.
- Al-Khazraji, A. (2019). Analysis of Discourse Markers in Essays Writing in ESL Classroom. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 559-572.
- Al-Qahtani, A. A. (2015). The Effect of Explicit Instruction of Textual Discourse Markers on Saudi EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension. *English Language Teaching*, 8(4), 57-66.
- Alraddadi, B. M. J. (2016). The Effect of Teaching Structural Discourse Markers in an EFL Classroom Setting. *English Language Teaching*, 9(7), 16-31.
- Al-Yaari, S. A. S., Al Hammadi, F. S., Alyami, S. A., & Almaflehi, N. (2013). Using English Discourse Markers (EDMs) by Saudi EFL Learners: A Descriptive Approach. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 1(2), 1-26.
- Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistic Variation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Aşık, A. (2015). Discourse Markers in EFL Setting: Perceptions of Turkish EFL Teachers. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10(7), 941-950.
- Aşık, A., & Cephe, P. T. (2013). Discourse Markers and Spoken English: Nonnative Use in the Turkish EFL Setting. *English Language Teaching*, 6(12), 144-155.
- Atkinson, D. (1990). Discourse Analysis and Written Discourse Conventions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 57-76.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Aysu, S. (2017). The Use of Discourse Markers in the Writings of Turkish Students of English as a Foreign Language: A Corpus Based Study. *Journal of Higher Education & Science/Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 7(1), 132-138.
- Babanoğlu, M. P. (2014). A Corpus-Based Study on the Use of Pragmatic Markers as Speech-Like Features in Turkish EFL Learners' Argumentative Essays. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 186-193.
- Baltacı, H. Ş. (2019). Cause Markers in L1 and L2 Cause Paragraphs: Turkish vs. English. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 7(1), 155-167.

- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and Language Teaching: Bringing Pragmatics and Pedagogy Together. *Pragmatics and Language Learning. Monograph Series*, 7, 21-39.
- Barton, E. (2003). Linguistic Discourse Analysis: How the Language in Texts Works. In *What Writing Does and How It Does It* (pp. 63-88). London: Routledge.
- Belhabib, I. (2015). *Difficulties Encountered by Students in Learning the Productive Skills in EFL Classroom and the Relationship between Speaking and Writing: Case of First Year LMD Students at Abou Bekr-Belkaid*. Doctoral thesis, University of Tlemcen, Tlemcen, Algeria.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View*. London: A&C Black.
- Biber, D. (1991). *Variation Across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., Finegan, E., & Quirk, R. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (Vol. 2). London: Longman.
- Blakemore, D. (1992). *Understanding Utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Blakemore, D. (2001). Discourse and Relevance Theory. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 100-118). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers* (Vol. 99). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blakemore, D. (2006). Discourse Markers. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 221–240). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bolden, G. B. (2006). Little Words That Matter: Discourse Markers “so” and “oh” and The Doing of Other-Attentiveness In Social Interaction. *Journal of Communication*, 56(4), 661-688.
- Bolinger, D., & Bolinger, D. L. M. (1989). *Intonation and Its Uses: Melody In Grammar and Discourse*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1998). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press..

- Buyse, L. (2010). Discourse Markers in the English of Flemish University Students. In *Pragmatic Perspectives on Language and Linguistics: Speech Actions in Theory and Applied Studies* (pp. 461-484). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Büyükkantarcioglu, S. N. (2003). Critical Discourse Analysis as a Tool for the Achievement of Ideological Equivalence in Translation. *Çeviribilim ve Uygulamaları*, (13), 1-23.
- Büyükkarcı, K., & Genç, B. (2009). Discourse Markers: The Case of and in the Speech of Turkish Speakers of English. *Linguistics Journal*, 4(2), 40-50.
- Çakır Sarı, H. (2020). Türkçe Öğretmenlerinin Söylem Belirleyicisi Kullanımı. *Dil Dergisi*, 171(1), 75-90.
- Çakır, H. (2017). Türkçe Derslerinde Söylem Belirleyicisi Olarak ‘yani’nin İşlevleri The Function of yani as Discourse Marker in Turkish Lessons. H. Ülper (Ed.), *Türkçe Eğitimi Güncel Araştırmaları içinde*. Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Can, C., & Yakut, İ. (2018). A Corpus-Driven Approach To I Think As A Pragmatic Marker In Native and Non-Native Discourse. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 6(5), 210-229.
- Can, Y. C., & Yakut, İ. A. (2018). Corpus-Driven Approach to I Think as A Pragmatic Marker in Native and Non-Native Discourse. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 6(5), 210-229.
- Canale, M. (1983). From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. *Language and communication*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Castro, C. M. C. (2009). The Use and Functions of Discourse Markers in EFL Classroom Interaction. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, (11), 57-77.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning* (pp. 53-79). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chafe, W. (2001). The Analysis of Discourse Flow. In Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 673–687). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Chaume, F. (2004). Discourse Markers in Audiovisual Translating. *Journal Des Traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal*, 49(4), 843-855.

- Chimombo, M., & R. Roseberry. (1998). *The Power of Discourse: An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthard, M. (1975). Discourse Analysis in English-a Short Review of The Literature. *Language Teaching*, 8(2), 73-89.
- Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher Talk and The Classroom Context. *ELT Journal*, 52(3), 179-187.
- Demirtaş, E. (2004). *Yabancı Dil Öğretmenlerinin Kullandıkları Söylem Belirteçleri ve Bağlamlaştırma İpuçlarının İşlevleri*. An Unpublished Master's Dissertations, Yıldız Teknik University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Ding, R., & Wang, L. (2015). Discourse Markers in Local and Native English Teachers' Talk in Hong Kong EFL Classroom Interaction: A Corpus-Based Study. *International Journal of Language & Linguistics*, 2(5), 65-75.
- Du Bois, J. W. (1991). Transcription Design Principles for Spoken Discourse Research. *Pragmatics*, 1(1), 71-106.
- Dülger, O. (2007). Discourse markers in writing. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (18), 257-270.
- Erickson, F. (1996). Going for the Zoen: The Social and Cognitive Ecology of Teacher-Student Interaction in Classroom Conversation. *Discourse, Learning, and Schooling*, 29-62.
- Ersanlı, C. Y. (2015). Insights from a Learner Corpus as Opposed to a Native Corpus about Cohesive Devices in an Academic Writing Context. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 3(12), 1049-1053.
- Eslami, Z. R., & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2007). Discourse Markers in Academic Lectures. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(1), 22-38.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Simin, S. (2012). North-American and Iranian EFL Lecturers' Use of Discourse Markers: The Cross-Cultural Aspects. In R. Pishghadam (Chair), *The 1st Conference on Language Learning & Teaching: An Interdisciplinary Approach (LLT-IA)*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. Retrieved from http://confbank.um.ac.ir/modules/conf_display/conferences/llt/2.pdf.

- Farouq, S. (2019). Investigating Discourse Markers in the Annexes of the International Civil Aviation Organization. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 37(1), 77-90.
- Fielder, G. E. (2008). Bulgarian Adversative Connectives: Conjunctions or Discourse Markers. *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining*, 79-98.
- Firdaus, A., & Shartika, M. (2021, April). Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers and Appraisal Portrayed in BBC'S Corona Virus News Report. Atlantis Press, Paris.
- Flowerdew, J., & Tauroza, S. (1995). The Effect of Discourse Markers on Second Language Lecture Comprehension. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17(4), 435-458.
- Fox Tree, J. E. (2015). Discourse Markers in Writing. *Discourse Studies*, 17(1), 64-82.
- Fraser, B. (1990). An Approach to Discourse Markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(3), 383-398.
- Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic Markers. *Pragmatics*, 6, 167-190.
- Fraser, B. (1998). Contrastive Discourse Markers in English. *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*, 301-326.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are Discourse Markers?. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 931-952.
- Fraser, B., & Malamud-Makowski, M. (1996). English and Spanish Contrastive Discourse Markers. *Language Sciences*, 18(3-4), 863-881.
- Fung, L., & Carter, R. (2007). Discourse Markers and Spoken English: Native and Learner Use in Pedagogic Settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 410-439.
- Furman, R., & Özyürek, A. (2007). Development of Interactional Discourse Markers: Insights from Turkish Children's and Adults' Oral Narratives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(10), 1742-1757.
- Gabarró-López, S. (2020). Are Discourse Markers Related to Age and Educational Background? A Comparative Account Between Two Sign Languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 156, 68-82.

- Georgakopoulou, A., & Goutsos, D. (1998). Conjunctions Versus Discourse Markers in Greek: The Interaction of Frequency, Position, and Functions in Context. *Linguistics*, 36(5), 887-917.
- Golkova, D., & Hubackova, S. (2014). Productive Skills in Second Language Learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 143, 477-481.
- Gönen, S. İ. K. (2011). A Neo-Humean Analysis of Turkish Discourse Markers "ama" and "fakat". *Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences*, 15(1).
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Hale, S. (1999). Interpreters' Treatment of Discourse Markers in Courtroom Questions. *Forensic Linguistics*, 6, 57-82.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1989). *Spoken and Written Language*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman
- Han, Y., Segalowitz, N., Khalil, L., Kehayia, E., Turner, C., & Gatbonton, E. (2020). Do Nurses Use Discourse Markers Differently when Using Their Second Language as Opposed to Their First while Interviewing Patients?. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 76(2), 91-113.
- Harris, Z. S. (1952) Discourse Analysis. *Language*, 28, 1-30.
- Hatipoğlu, Ç., & Algi, S. (2018). Catch a Tiger by the Toe: Modal Hedges in EFL Argumentative Paragraphs. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 957-982.
- Horne, M., Hansson, P., Bruce, G., Frid, J., & Filipsson, M. (1999). Discourse Markers and the Segmentation of Spontaneous Speech - The Case of Swedish men 'but/and/so'. *Working papers/Lund University, Department of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 47, 123-139.
- Hossain, M. I. (2015). *Teaching Productive Skills to the Students: A Secondary Level Scenario*. Doctoral Dissertation, BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: A Reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177.
- Hymes, D. (1967). Models of Interaction of Language and Social Setting. *Journal of Social Issues*, 33(2), 8-28.

- Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. London: Penguin.
- Hymes, D. H. (1962). The Ethnography of Speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and Human Behavior* (pp. 15-53). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Ismail, A. I. H. M. (2012). Discourse Markers in Political Speeches: Forms and Functions. *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, 23(4), 1261-1278.
- Jakobovits, L. A. & Gordon, B. (1974). *The Context of Foreign Language Teaching*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Jalilifar, A. (2008). Discourse Markers in Composition Writings: The Case of Iranian Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *English Language Teaching*, 1(2), 114-122.
- Jucker, A. H. (1993). The Discourse Marker Well: A Relevance-Theoretical Account. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19(5), 435-452.
- Khojastehrad, S. (2012). Distribution of Hesitation Discourse Markers Used by Iranian EFL Learners During an Oral L2 Test. *International Education Studies*, 5(4), 179-187.
- Kızıl, A. Ş. (2021). Discourse Markers in Learner Speech: A Corpus Based Comparative Study. *Dil Eğitimi ve Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(1), 1-16.
- Köymen, B., & Küntay, A. C. (2013). Turkish Children's Conversational Oppositions: Usage of Two Discourse Markers. *Discourse Processes*, 50(6), 388-406.
- Leander, K., & Prior, P. (2003). Speaking and Writing: How Talk and Text Interact In Situated Practices. In *What Writing Does and How It Does It* (pp. 207-244). Routledge.
- Lenk, U. (1998). Discourse Markers and Global Coherence in Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(2), 245-257.
- Levinson, S. C. (2017). Speech acts. In *Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 199-216). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, S. E., Rabiner, L. R., & Sondhi, M. M. (1983). An Introduction to the Application of the Theory of Probabilistic Functions of a Markov Process to Automatic Speech Recognition. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 62(4), 1035-1074.

- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Martínez, A. C. L. (2002). The Use of Discourse Markers in EFL Learners' Writing. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 15(4), 123-132.
- Martínez, A. C. L. (2009). Empirical Study of the Effects of Discourse Markers on the Reading Comprehension of Spanish Students of English as a Foreign Language. *International Journal of English Studies*, 9(2), 19-43.
- Maschler, Y. (1994). Metalanguaging and Discourse Markers in Bilingual Conversation. *Language in Society*, 23(3), 325-366.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers* (Vol. 65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (1994). *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*. Routledge.
- Mehan, H. (1979). 'What time is it, Denise?': Asking Known Information Questions in Classroom Discourse. *Theory into Practice*, 18(4), 285-294.
- Modhish, A. S. (2012). Use of discourse markers in the composition writings of Arab EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 5(5), 56-61.
- Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-Native English Discourse* (Vol. 138). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Norrick, N. R. (2001). Discourse Markers in Oral Narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(6), 849-878.
- Nunan, D. (1998). Teaching Grammar in Context. *ELT Journal*, 52(2), 101-109.
- Nystrand, M., Wu, L. L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S., & Long, D. A. (2003). Questions in Time: Investigating the Structure and Dynamics of Unfolding Classroom Discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 35(2), 135-198.
- Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1991). Teaching Speech Act Behavior to Normative Speakers. In Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Olshtain, E., & Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 707-724). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

- Ozer, H. Z., & Okan, Z. (2018). Discourse Markers in EFL Classrooms: A Corpus-Driven Research. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(1), 50-66.
- Öztürk, Y. (2018). *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-Native Spoken English: A Corpus-Based Comparison of Turkish and British University Students' Employment of Discourse Markers in Informal Interviews*. Doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University, Turkey.
- Paltridge, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Prior, P. (2003). Tracing Process: How Texts Come into Being. In *What Writing Does and How It Does It* (pp. 173-206). London: Routledge.
- Qureshi, I. A. (2007). The Importance of Speaking Skills for EFL Learners. *Department of English, Alama Iqbal Open University, Pakistan*.
- Rahayu, T., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2015). Discourse Markers in Expository Essays Written by Indonesian Students of EFL. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(2), 21-29.
- Redeker, G. (1990). Ideational and Pragmatic Markers of Discourse Structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(3), 367-381.
- Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Sadeghi, B., & Ramezan Yarandi, M. R. (2014). Analytical Study on the Relationship between Discourse Markers and Speaking Fluency of Iranian EFL Students. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 2(2), 101-123.
- Salkie, R. (2001). *Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Sancak, D. (2019). *The Use of Transitions, Frame Markers and Code Glosses in Turkish EFL Learners' Opinion Paragraphs*. Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Sankoff, G., Thibault, P., Nagy, N., Blondeau, H., Fonollosa, M. O., & Gagnon, L. (1997). Variation in the Use of Discourse Markers in a Language Contact Situation. *Language Variation and Change*, 9(2), 191-217.

- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up Closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4).
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers* (No. 5). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (2001) 'Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning, and Context', in D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H.E. Hamilton (eds) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Malden, MA: Blackwell, 54-75.
- Schourup, L. (1999). Discourse Markers. *Lingua*, 107(3-4), 227-265.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (1996). Classroom Interaction: Possibilities and Impossibilities. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 16-24.
- Sert, O. (2015). *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Sert, O., & Seedhouse, P. (2011). Introduction: Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics. *Novitas-Royal*, 5(1).
- Shahbaz, M., Sheikh, O. I., & Ali, M. S. (2013). Use of Discourse Markers by Chinese EFL Professors: A Corpus-Based Study of Academic Lectures by Natives and Non-Natives. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(5), 80-89.
- Sinclair, J. McH. & R.M. Coulthard. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse. The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language* (Vol. 4). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tannen, D. (1982). Oral and Literate Strategies in Spoken and Written Narratives. *Language*, 58(1), 1-21.
- Tannen, D. (1987). Repetition in Conversation as Spontaneous Formulaicity. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 7(3), 215-244.,
- Tavakoli, M., & Karimnia, A. (2017). Dominant and Gender-Specific Tendencies in the Use of Discourse Markers: Insights from EFL learners. *World*, 7(2).

- Tehrani, A. R., & Dastjerdi, H. V. (2012). The Pedagogical Impact of Discourse Markers in the Lecture Genre: EFL Learners' Writings in Focus. *Journal of language Teaching and Research*, 3(3), 423.
- Trillo, J. R. (2002). The Pragmatic Fossilization of Discourse Markers in Non-Native Speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(6), 769-784.
- Uicheng, K., & Crabtree, M. (2018). Macro Discourse Markers in Ted Talks: How Ideas Are Signaled to Listeners. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 55, 1-31.
- Unaldi, I. (2013). Overuse of Discourse Markers in Turkish English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Learners' Writings: The Case of 'I think' and 'in my opinion'. *The Anthropologist*, 16(3), 575-584.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. Addison-Wesley Longman
- Vanda, K. H., & Péter, F. B. (2011). Gender Differences in the Use of the Discourse Markers You Know and I Mean. *Argumentum*, 7, 1-18.
- Vickov, G. (2011). Discourse Marker Research in Spoken EFL. *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Splitu*, (4), 271-289.
- Vickov, G., & Jakupcevic, E. (2017). Discourse Markers in Non-Native EFL Teacher Talk. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(4), 649-671.
- Walsh, S., Sert, O. (2019). Mediating L2 Learning Through Classroom Interaction. In: Gao, X. (eds) *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Springer International Handbooks of Education. Springer, Cham.
- Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 5(1), 1-37.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2008). *Teaching Language As Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2011). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yüksel, H. G., & Kavanoz, S. (2018). Dimension of Experience: Metadiscourse in the Texts of Novice Non-Native, Novice Native and Expert Native Speaker. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(3), 104-112.



APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Du Bois's (1991) Transcription Conventions

Untimed pause:	...
Laugh:	@
Terminative intonation:	.
Continuative intonation:	,
Appeal intonation:	?
Comment:	((WORDS))
Overlap:	[]
Truncated intonation unit:	--
Codeswitching:	<L1 WORDS L1>
Micropause:	..
Lengthening:	:

Appendix 2: Background and Language Attitude Survey

22.02.2021

Kişisel Bilgi Formu

Kişisel Bilgi Formu

* Required

1. Ad ve Soyad: *

2. E-posta: *

3. Sınıf: *

Mark only one oval.

☐ 9

☐ 10

☐ 11

☐ Other: _____

4. Babanın eğitim düzeyi nedir? Lütfen sadece bir seçeneği işaretleyin. *

Mark only one oval.

☐ Hiçbir eğitim almadı.

☐ İlkokul

☐ Ortaokul

☐ Lise

☐ Üniversite

5. Annenin eğitim düzeyi nedir? Lütfen sadece bir seçeneği işaretleyin. *

Mark only one oval.

☐ Hiçbir eğitim almadı.

☐ İlkokul

☐ Ortaokul

☐ Lise

☐ Üniversite

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1m0Q1Rpj2B696tfkRrMeyqlbyP-7Ox2Or0bJg_N6jWo/edit

1/3

6. Kaç yıldır İngilizce öğreniyorsun? *

1 point

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ 1-3 yıl
- ☐ 3-5 yıl
- ☐ 5-7 yıl
- ☐ 7-9 yıl
- ☐ 9-11 yıl
- ☐ Other: _____

7. İngilizce dışında bildiğin ya da öğrenmekte olduğun bir dil varsa belirtir misin? *

8. Yabancı bir ülkede iletişim kurma konusunda güçlük çekmeyeceğimi düşünüyorum. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Çok zorlanacağımı düşünüyorum.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	İyi bir şekilde iletişim kurabileceğime inanıyorum.

9. Yabancı dil konusunda yeteneğim olduğumu düşünüyorum. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Bence yetenekli değilim.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yetenekli olduğumu düşünüyorum.

10. Yabancı dil öğrenmeyi seviyorum *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Sevmiyorum.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Çok seviyorum.

11. İngilizce dizi film izlerim. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Nadiren izlerim./ İzlemem.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Sıklıkla izlerim.

12. İngilizce şarkılar dinler misin? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Nadiren dinlerim./Dinlemem.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Sıklıkla dinlerim.

13. İngilizce kitap okuyor musun? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Nadiren okurum./Okumam.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Sıklıkla okurum.

Katılımın için teşekkürler!

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Appendix 3: Participants' Answers to Questions Regarding Attitude Towards Language

Questions	Points				
	5	4	3	2	1
I think I won't have any difficulty communicating when I'm abroad.	3	11	4	1	-
I think I'm gifted with language learning.	2	8	6	3	-
I like learning languages.	12	4	3	-	-
I was TV series/movies in English.	14	4	1	-	-
I listen to songs in English.	16	3	-	-	-
I read books in English.	3	6	3	5	2

Appendix 4: Informed Consent Form

“İngilizce Öğrenen Lise Öğrencilerinin Sözlü ve Yazılı Dilde Söylem Belirleyicisi Kullanımları (The Use of Discourse Markers Written and Spoken Language of High School EFL Learners)” adlı yüksek lisans tez çalışması, lise öğrencilerinin sözlü ve yazılı dilde söylem belirleyicisi kullanımını belirleme amacıyla planlanmıştır. Çalışmanın Mart 2021-Mayıs 2021 tarihleri arasında yapılması planlanmaktadır. Karma yöntem kullanılarak yapılacak çalışmada lise öğrencilerine ulaşılması hedeflenmiştir. Ölçek ve anket soruları için sizden 40 dakika ayırmanız beklenmektedir. Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacına ulaşması için sizden beklenen, bütün soruları eksiksiz, kimsenin baskısı veya telkini altında olmadan, size en uygun gelen cevapları içtenlikle verecek şekilde cevaplamanızdır. Bu formu okuyup onaylamanız, araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz anlamına gelecektir. Ancak, çalışmaya katılmama veya katıldıktan sonra herhangi bir anda çalışmayı bırakma hakkına da sahiptir. Bu çalışmadan elde edilecek bilgiler tamamen araştırma amacı ile kullanılacak olup kişisel bilgileriniz gizli tutulacaktır; ancak verileriniz yayın amacı ile kullanılabilir. Eğer araştırmanın amacı ile ilgili verilen bu bilgiler dışında şimdi veya sonra daha fazla bilgiye ihtiyaç duyarsanız araştırmacıya şimdi sorabilir, eposta [busra.sezer.bs@gmail.com] veya telefon numaramdan [+905350283717] ulaşabilirsiniz.

“Aydınlatılmış Onam Formu”ndaki tüm açıklamaları okudum. Bana, konusu ve amacı belirtilen araştırma ile ilgili yazılı ve sözlü açıklama, aşağıda adı belirtilen kişi tarafından yapıldı. Araştırmaya gönüllü olarak katıldığımı, istediğim zaman gerekçeli veya gerekçesiz olarak araştırmadan ayrılabilceğimi ve kendi isteğime bakılmaksızın araştırmacı tarafından araştırma dışı bırakılabileceğimi biliyorum. Söz konusu araştırmaya, hiçbir baskı ve zorlama olmaksızın kendi rızamla *katılmayı kabul ediyorum*.

...../...../20..

Çalışmaya katılan bireyler 18 yaş altında olduğu ve yasal salahiyeti olmadığı için, kendilerine ve vasisine çalışma hakkında gerekli bilgiler verilerek velisinin/vasisinin onamı/onayı alınacaktır.

Açıklamaları Yapan Araştırmacının Unvanı, Adı Soyadı ve İmzası Büşra Yıldırım
Gönüllünün Adı / Soyadı / İmzası / Tarih
Yasal Temsilcinin Adı / Soyadı / İmzası / Tarih

Appendix 5: Approval of the Ethical Council



ÖZGEÇMİŞ

KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

Adı Soyadı: Büşra Yıldırım

Uyruğu: TC

EĞİTİM

Derece	Kurum	Mezuniyet Yılı
Lisans	Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, İngilizce Mütercim Tercümanlık Scuola Superiore Per Interpreti e Traduttori Di Milano (Erasmus)	2016
Yandal	Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih	2016
Yüksek Lisans	İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi	2022

İŞ TECRÜBESİ

Tarih	Kurum	Görev
2016-2017	İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi	İngilizce Okutmanı
2017	Tübitak Marmara Teknopark	TTO Uzmanı
2018-2019	Kavram Okulları	İngilizce Öğrt.
2019-2022	İstek Okulları	İngilizce Öğrt.

YABANCI DİLLER

İngilizce	İleri Seviye
İtalyanca	Orta Seviye