HOW DO WE SAY *NO* IN TURKISH?: A CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF *hayır* AND *cık* IN TURKISH

Türkçede Nasıl "*hayır*" Deriz? Türkçede *hayır* ve *cık*'ın Derlem Tabanlı İncelenmesi[1]

Betül Bal-Gezegin[2]
Amasya University

Özet: Bu çalışma Türkçede bulunan *hayır* ve *cık* edimbilimsel belirleyicilerinin kullanımlarını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. *Hayır* bir kelime iken, *cık* ise *hayır* anlamında çıkarılan bir sesi temsil etmektedir. Bu çalışmada geleneksel anlamda İngilizcede *no* olarak kabul edilen bu iki edimbilimsel belirleyicilerinin dağılımları ve edimsel işlevleri incelenmektedirler. Bu belirleyicileri incelemek için Sözlü Türkçe Derlemi'nde (STD) anadili Türkçe olan konuşanlar arasında geçen doğal konuşma kayıtları kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar göstermektedir ki *hayır* ve *cık*'ın kullanımlarında sözdizimsel özellikler ve edimbilimsel benzerlikler ve farklılıklar bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Edimbilimsel belirleyici, Türkçe, hayır, cık, Edimbilimsel işlev, Sözlü Türkçe Derlemi (STD)*

Abstract: This study aims to investigate the use of two pragmatic markers in Turkish language: *hayır* and *cık*. *Hayır* is a word meaning *no*, whereas *cık* stands as a representation of a sound uttered with the intention of saying *no*. These two markers, which can be traditionally accepted as *no* in English, are analyzed in terms of their distributions and pragmatic functions as pragmatic markers. To examine these markers recordings of naturally occurring conversations among people whose L1 is Turkish are obtained from Spoken Turkish Corpus (STC). The results show that there are similarities and differences in the use of *hayır* and *cık* in terms of their syntactic properties and pragmatic functions.

Keywords: *Pragmatic markers, Turkish, hayır, cık, Pragmatic function, Spoken Turkish Corpus (STC)*

1. INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic markers (hereafter, PMs), also called discourse markers, have been extensively studied in pragmatics so far and even more studies seeking answers to various research questions on PMs continue to appear in the field (e.g. Aijmer, 2002; Müller, 2005; Lee-Goldman, 2011). *Yes* and *no* as PMs have attracted special attention in terms of their semantic and pragmatic functions, positions in an utterance or in a larger discourse, and their equivalents in different languages. In this study, the markers *hayır* and *cık* in Turkish, which can be traditionally accepted as the equivalent of *no* in English, are analyzed in terms of their distributions and functions as PMs. While PMs in the Turkish language have been the focus of some recent studies (e.g. Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 2006; Çubukçu, 2005; Özbek, 2000; Yılmaz 2004), they have not been investigated in spoken Turkish discourse yet. In Turkish, *hayır* is a word meaning *no*, whereas *cık* stands as a representation of a sound meaning *no*. In order to produce this sound, one places his tip of the tongue on the line where back of the upper front teeth meets with the palate. Releasing the tongue with some pressure leads to the production of this sound. This study is based on the analysis of naturally occurring conversations recorded among Turkish speaking people and the corpus used is the Spoken Turkish Corpus (STC) (Ruhi et al., 2012).

In the following sections of the paper, first pragmatic markers will be defined and explained with a reference to previous studies and the relevant theories followed in these studies. In the methodology section, the role and significance of conduction corpus-based studies in analyzing pragmatic markers is highlighted and the corpus used for this study is introduced. Then, the results of the analysis are provided with a discussion on the functions of *hayır* and *cık* in the fourth section. The summary of the study as well as its limitations and future directions are presented in the conclusion section of the paper.

2. PRAGMATIC MARKERS

Pragmatic markers have been analyzed under different terms. Such labels include 'discourse particle' (Schourup, 1999), 'pragmatic particle' (Östman, 1995, cited in Fraser, 1999), 'connective' (cf. Crystal & Davy, 1975; Blakemore, 1987; Bazzanella, 1990 'phatic connective') and discourse markers (Schiffrin, 1987) to name a few. It seems that the various terms used have been narrowed down to 'pragmatic markers' or 'discourse markers' in related studies today. Scholars like Fraser (1996) and Feng (2008) believe that the term 'pragmatic marker' should be used as an umbrella term because a discourse marker connects discourse segments but a PM does not necessarily have to function in this way. The diversity of the terms used is indeed a sign that these markers are multi-functional. There is still no agreement as to which elements should be regarded as PMs and which should not. Since it is believed that PMs have interactional functions rather than more textual functions, as in the case of discourse markers, in this paper the term PM is used as an umbrella term referring to "words or phrases […] which signal the potential communicative force of an utterance" (Norrick, 2012: 262).

Studies on PMs go back to as early as 1960s when scholars realized that there are certain types of words that can appear anywhere in a sentence and bear different functions (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen, 2004). Early studies published are "Modal particles in Russian and German" by Arndt (1960) and the study on French discourse markers" by Gülich (1970). These early studies,

considered as more traditional works, were followed by the pioneering work of Schiffrin (1987), which is regarded as the foundation for many works to follow on pragmatic markers. She describes these particles as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" (1982:31). It is noted that early studies emphasized the significance of PMs and made a call for future studies; however, they lacked descriptions of what these markers actually were and how they functioned in global discourse. As noted by Risselada and Spooren (1988), in the seventies, for example, the studies on PMs focused on single utterances and they were more semantic-based studies. More recent studies, on the other hand, intend to describe PMs in different languages, find patterns, analyze their functions and examine their theoretical framework in broader contexts, global discourse.

2.1. PREVIOUS STUDIES ON *NO* AND PMS LIKE *NO*

In a recent publication titled "*No* as a discourse marker" by Lee-Goldman (2011), it is highlighted that studies on *yeah* (Jefferson, 1984; Drummond and Hopper, 1993; Fuller, 2003; Tao, 2003, cited by Lee-Goldman, 2011) outnumber the studies on *no*. This is true especially for the English language. If one looks at the studies on *no*, it is seen that there are more studies on *no* and their equivalents in other languages as PMs, for example, in (Taiwan) Mandarin (e.g. Li and Thompson, 1981; Wang et. al, 2007). Previous studies on *no* which show that *no* has other functions than just negating a proposition put forward in a conversation dates back as early as the 1980s. For example, in his study on yes/no questions and answers given to these questions, Yadugiri (1986) finds that just saying *yes* or *no* to a "yes/no" question is pragmatically inadequate. Another study on a similar particle is by Burridge and Florey (2002), who study *yeah-no* as PMs in Australian English. Their study was a corpus-based and focused on the role of *yeah-no*. Their corpus included 16 hours of informal spoken language data. It is reported that there is no gender difference in the use of *yeah-no* and the location of these markers is significant (they can occur in all positions initially, internally, finally). It is found that they show different functions depending on their location. Schegloff (1992, 2001) also presents that *no* has other

pragmatic functions; for example, sometimes it is used to mark a transition away from non-serious discourse.

Studies of PMs such as *yes*, *no*, *yeah* are not limited to English language. For example, André (2005) conducts a study of French *oui non*. Her corpus consists of transcripts of work meetings. Her findings suggest that *oui non* functions in the same way English *yeah-no*. Yu (2004), on the other hand, investigates the various uses of the Chinese negative *meiyou* in spoken discourse. Although there are languages that have been studied in regard to their PMs *yes*, *no*, there are many other languages which have not been studied in this respect. Turkish is one of these languages because there is hardly any study which shows how equivalents of *no* are used in Turkish. This is why the present study can be considered as a starting point for further studies on PMs meaning *no* in Turkish.

2.2. THEORY

Depending on the research topic, context and the scope of the study, several theoretical approaches such as speech act theory (Brown and Levinson, 1987), discourse analysis (Schiffrin, 1987), the coherence approach (Redeker, 1990), Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986, 1995), the conversation analytic approach (CA) as in Schegloff and Sacks (1973), or Natural Semantic Metalanguage (Travis, 2006) have been applied in the study of PMs. In this study, the perspective from which *hayır* and *cık* will be examined follows that of Schiffrin (1987), who suggests that language always occurs in a context and is sensitive to that context, and that language is always communicative and in fact designed for communication (Schiffrin, 1987). According to Schiffrin (1987), PMs should be studied by looking at their functions, characteristics, semantic and grammatical status. That is why in her analysis she pays attention to the distribution of pragmatic markers in terms of their location within the discourse and its subunits, and also their co-occurrence with other linguistic elements (Schiffrin, 1987). Aijmer (2002) also follows a similar approach and suggests that PMs perform many pragmatic functions in discourse. Besides their functions, Aijmer also has dealt with the placement

issue, i.e. discourse markers at initial, medial or at the final position, which is one of the purposes of this study as well.

Based on Schiffrin's approach, this study will seek answers to these research questions:

1. What is the frequency of "*hayır*" and "*cık*" in the STC?
2. Where do they appear in an utterance?
3. What are the functions of *hayır* and *cık*?

While providing answers to these questions, comparisons of *hayır* and *cık* in terms of each question will be provided in the analysis.

3. METHODOLOGY: A CORPUS-BASED APPROACH

As it is the case in other fields of language studies, the availability of corpora has changed the face of pragmatics. Since the exploration of PMs requires a detailed analysis, studies on PMs in the past were not as frequent as they are today. However, with the emergence of corpus as a tool, more elaborative analyses of PMs in various languages have been conducted in the last two decades (e.g., Aijmer 2002; Ruhi 2011). Corpora have been crucial in the studies of pragmatics since they provide tools to analyze real language usage in a number of different registers. On the use of corpus, Baker (2006) suggests that

> complex calculations can be carried out on large amounts of texts, revealing linguistic patterns and frequency information that would otherwise take days or months to uncover by hand, and may run counter to intuition." (p. 2).

Working with data that can be described as natural is crucial in pragmatics studies. Its significance especially for the studies of discourse markers is highlighted by Fischer (2000), who argues that varying the communicative situation in an experimentally controlled way leads to differences in the occurrence and use of certain pragmatic markers. Therefore, she states that it is more appropriate to rely on corpora. This study investigates the use of the PMs *hayır* and *cık* in Turkish using a corpus of natural spoken language to analyze

the distribution and functions of these PMs. The corpus used, the Spoken Turkish Corpus (STC; includes face-to-face interactions as well as TV and radio broadcast, lectures, seminars in Turkish. For the purpose of this study, a publishable version of the corpus is used (See Ruhi, this issue, for a detailed description of STC).[3] The tool used to analyze STC for *hayır* and *cık* is EXAKT tool in EXMARALDA software.

4. RESULTS OF CORPUS ANALYSIS

The analysis will focus on three aspects of the target PMs; 1) frequency occurrences of *hayır* and *cık* in the corpus; 2) placement of these markers, and 3) their functions.

4.1 FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCES

A first search of the corpus with the help of the EXAKT tool in EXMARALDA software suite yielded 124 occurrences of *hayır* and 120 occurrences of *cık*. However, after a detailed analysis, irrelevant occurrences of these PMs such as *hayır* used in reported speech as seen in the excerpt below in which he complains that he does not like being commanded and forced to do things he does not want to do.

ISA000058:

ergenlik mergenlik meselesi değil bu. ((0.1)) benim üst…
bana ((inhales)) ((0.3)) şey yapmayın yani/ hadi şuraya gidiyoruz buraya gidiyoruz falan. ((inhales)) ya da ben **hayır** dediğimde bişey…

ISA000058:

"This is not a matter of puberty. ((0.1)) somebody above me…to me ((inhales)) ((0.3)) do not do this/something like let's go hither and thither. ((inhales)) or when I say **no** to something…"
Lexical items including *hayır* as a part of a word (e.g *hayırlısı*) were also omitted. The remaining number for *hayır* is 97, whereas it is 96 for *cık*.[4]

---

[3] Permission to use the publishable version of STC has been granted by Prof. Dr. Şükriye Ruhi. The author has also contributed recordings and transcriptions to STC.
[4] Statistical significance is not conducted in the analysis, given the small size of the corpus.

4.2 SYNTACTIC POSITION OF *HAYIR* AND *CIK*

Both *hayır* and *cık* are usually found in the initial position of an utterance. In terms of their location in an utterance, it is observed that both of these PMs can stand alone as an utterance. In other cases, they are followed by other units of the utterance. There are almost no cases where *hayır* and *cık* appears in utterance final position. *Hayır* and *cık* show difference in terms of their contextual domain. For example, no incidence of *cık* is found in news commentaries in radio broadcasts or a workplace conversation among colleagues, a lecture at a school, seminar, service encounters (restaurant, reception), at a hospital room between service providers and patients, and a TV documentary. In such contexts *hayır* was used. This leads to the conclusion that *cık* is found in more informal contexts; for example it is used frequently in family gatherings. However, *hayır* can be found both in formal and informal contexts.

4.3 FUNCTIONS OF *HAYIR*

When a detailed analysis of the concordances that were retrieved after the search in EXMARaLDA EXAKT was done, it was found that *hayır* has several different functions. As can be seen in Table 1 with sample excerpts from STC, these functions are: responding to a request for information, agreeing with a negative statement, disagreeing with a positive statement, *hayır* as a connective, answering a request, response to an offer or a command, and metalinguistic negation.

Table 1. Functions of *hayır*

Functions	Sample Excerpts
a) Responding to request for information	**(1)** Domain: *conversation between friends/neighbors* MUS000031: bunları telefondan mı çıkarttınız? BUR000030: • bak. yok. birkaçı **hayır**. MUS000031: 'Have you taken these out of the phone?' BUR000030: 'Look. No. Not a few of them.'

b) Agreeing with a negative statement	**(2)** Domain: *conversation between friends* OZG000035: t/ konserde çıkarmamış. AYS000071: **hayır** çıkarmadı da girerlerken ((01.)) gördüm. OZG000035: 'He had not taken off his (sunglasses) in the concert.' AYS000071:'No, he had not taken it off but I saw it while they were entering.'
c) Disagreeing with a positive statement	**(3)** Domain: *conversation between family members (mother-son talk)* ZEY000073: ne kadar basit şeyler bu istediklerin be oğlum. ISA000058: **hayır**. ZEY000073: 'How easy things all these you want, my son.' ISA000058: 'No.'
d) "hayır" as a connective	**(4)** Domain: *conversation between friends* MUS000518: ((name of an institution))'inkiler güzel olur. MUS000518: ben orda çalıştığım zaman güzel olurdu NIL000520: evet. SEN000519: güzel. NIL000520: **hayır**.‿ konusu da şey… MUS000518: '((name of an institution))'s are good. ' MUS000518: 'They were good when I used to work there NIL000520: 'Yes. ' SEN000519: 'Fine' NIL000520: 'No. Its topic is well…'
e) Response to a request, offer or a command	**(5)** Domain: *conversation between family members* HAL000098: uzun kollu • o • polo şey vardı ya. ‿onu giy. ONU000099: ((1.2)) **hayır**. ‿bi tane siyah v yaka şeyim olması lazım. HAL000098: 'long sleeve • that• polo thing. ‿ wear that one.' ONU000099: ((1.2)) 'no. ‿there should be a black v-necked thing.'

f) Metalinguistic negation	**(6)** Domain: *conversation between family members*
	HAL000098: deri ceket mi giyeceksin?
	ONU000099: ((0.3)) bilmem. ‿öyle mi giyeyim?
	HAL000098: ((1.3)) **hayır.** ‿ona göre ben de giyineceğim.
	HAL000098: 'Will you wear your leather jacket?'
	ONU000099: 'I don't know. Should I?'
	HAL000098: 'No. If so, I will get dressed accordingly.'

A very common function of *hayır* found in the corpus is to provide a response to a request for information. After the basic search was completed, samples of *hayır* as a response to something said were found. As seen in the excerpt (1) in the table above, the response to the question of whether BUR has taken the photos out of the telephone is formed by making use of *hayır*. There are also occurrences of the PM *hayır* functioning in the same way and standing alone, repeated more than one time or appearing with other elements, as in sample excerpts (7) and (8) below.

In (7), ISA and ZEY are talking about a movie. ZEY is trying to remember the name of a movie and ISA asks if the name of the movie is Beyaz Melek (White Angle). As a response to this question, ZEY says *hayır hayır*, which is a sample where *hayır* is repeated more than one time.

(7) STC 061_090622_00020

In excerpt (8), ZEY, a customer at a hotel, is talking to EYU, the receptionist. ZEY is expressing that she would like to leave her belongings and she asks if she has to pay for this service. As a response, EYU says *yok. hayır.* With the use of the marker *yok* which

is also a negation marker in Turkish, *hayır* is emphasized. This sample shows that there are occurrences of *hayır* where it is emphasized and stressed with the use of other elements.

(8) STC 061_090622_00020

The next function of *hayır* found in STC is agreeing with the negative statement uttered by a speaker. As seen in excerpt (2), although the first speaker does not ask a question but expresses his idea, the second speaker agrees with the speaker's negative statement by saying *hayır* in (9) below. By saying *hayır* AYS agrees with OZG's previous utterance. In another sample from STC below, SUK and ISA are talking about how a recorder is charged. SUK says that it works with batteries. ISA adds that there is no charging option via computer and as a response SUK agrees with ISA's negative statement by saying *hayır*, which means "I agree with you. No, it cannot be charged via computer."

(9) STC 021_090501_00013

In contrast with the agreeing function explained above, the third function of *hayır* is to show disagreement with what the first speaker says. It was observed in the analysis of samples including *hayır* functioning in this manner that disagreement is realized with the use of *hayır* after a positive statement. In excerpt (3) in Table 1, ISA, the son of ZEY, shows his disagreement by saying *hayır* to what his mother has just said.

Another function of *hayır* found in STC is its use as a connective. When a detailed analysis of EXAKT results was conducted, it was observed that there are conversations where *hayır* is used neither for responding to a request for information nor showing agreement or disagreement to a previous statement. It was found that in such interactions *hayır* is uttered for the purpose of shifting the topic, introducing a new statement. With the use of *hayır* in such cases, the speaker is making a smooth transition from the topic being discussed and s/he is introducing a new statement by adding to what has been said. In excerpt (4), MUS, NIL and SEN are discussing an event organized by an institution. MUS says that the organizations by the institution are good. NIL and SEN agrees with this statement. Then, MUS starts a new statement with *hayır* followed by his introduction of the organization's topic. With the use of *hayır*, he connects the previous statements on how good the organization is with the topic of the organization. This transition is realized with the use of *hayır* and *hayır* here does not have any relation to negation. Below (10) is another excerpt in which *hayır* functions in the same way. ATI, GUR and OKA are discussing tattoos. ATI says that one should get his tattoo done somewhere on one's body where is not always seen so that you do not get bored with it. OKA replies to this utterance by first agreeing by saying 'yes' and then he starts a new utterance beginning with *hayır*. He continues by saying that he does not get bored with his tattoo (because it is not seen). Again, *hayır* functions as a marker connecting what has been already said and a new statement.

(10) STC 085_090930_00130

[58]		
ATI000346 [v]		bi de dövmeyi görmediğin bi yere
GUR000348 [v]	sen de. _((short laugh))ˋ	
[59]		
ATI000346 [v]	yaptıracaksın ki sıkılmayacaksın.	
ATI000346 [c]	yaptırcen ki sıkılmıycan, ((fast))	
OKA000347 [v]		((0.1)) evet. ((0.4)) ya
[60]		
OKA000347 [v]	**hayır.** _bak. _ben bundan hiç sıkılmadım mesela. ((0.5))	

The next function of the PM *hayır* is observed when a command, offer or request is made by the first speaker. In excerpt (5) HAL's utterance *onu giy* 'wear that (shirt),' which could be a command or a suggestion is not accepted by ONU, who begins his response with *hayır*. It should be noted that this particular function of *hayır* has a notable characteristic to be mentioned; in such cases the second utterance is always latched to *hayır*. When this part of the conversation is listened again, it is realized that attaching *hayır* to the next statement in this way mitigates the refusal to the suggestion given.

The last function of *hayır* observed in STC is metalinguistic negation (Horn, 1985). In metalinguistic negation, the addressee rejects what the first speaker says and s/he offers a reason for the rejection. This is clearly seen in sample excerpt (6). HAL asks ONU if he is going to wear his leather jacket. As a response, ONU says he does not know and asks HAL whether or not he should wear his leather jacket. HAL uses *hayır* as a response and in HAL's utterance there is cancellation of an implicature derived by addressee.[5]

In the following, the functions of *cık*, the other PM analyzed for this study, are presented.

---

[5] Editor's note: In excerpt (6), ONU is co-constituting the implicature that HAL suggested that he wear his leather jacket, based on HAL's first turn question, 'Will you wear your leather jacket?' Metalinguistic negation has been studied mostly in the context of sentential negation. As is evident in the case in this excerpt, owing to possibility of cancelling prior implied meanings *hayır* requires further investigation in terms of metapragmatic negation (for very recent research see, e.g., Y. Ran. (2013). The metapragmatic negation as a rapport-oriented mitigating device. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 48, 98-111).

4.4. FUNCTIONS OF *cık*

There are three main functions of *cık* found in STC: Responding to request for information, disapproving of / disagreeing with the previous statement or situation, and as a pre-signal of a negative statement as can be seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Functions of *cık*

Functions	Sample Excerpts
a) Responding to request for information	(11) Domain: MUS000518: ‿bilmiyorum sen dinledin mi onları da? HUM000467: **cık˙** • dinlemedim. MUS000518: 'I don't know, have you listened to them?' HUM000467: '**cık˙** I haven't.'
b) Disapproval of / disagreement with the previous statement or situation	(12) Domain: *conversation between family members* ZEY000073: Allah korusun. ‿korkuyorum bir gün bu kıza zarar verecek. ‿istemeden düşürecek. ISA000058: **cık˙** ZEY000073: 'May God protect. I am afraid he will give harm to the girl. He will cause to her fall accidentally.' ISA000058: **cık˙**
c) Pre-signal of a negative statement	(13) Domain: *conversation between family members* ISA: ((0.2)) çünkü sen sürekli onunla vakit geçiriyorsun. ((1.3)) **cık˙** ((0.3)) ((first name, male)) düşürmez onu ya ISA: 'because you are always spending your time (with her). **cık˙**. ((first name, male)) won't drop her.'

The most frequent function of *cık* is providing a negative response to a question, as in the first function of *hayır* explained above. It is a quick response given to a yes/no question uttered by the initial speaker. It is observed that in most of the cases where *cık* is used for this purpose, the PM stands alone as a response as seen in excerpt (14) and there are

also samples where *cık* is used with other negation markers as seen in sample excerpt (15) below.

In ISA and ZEY's conversation in excerpt (14) below, ZEY asks ISA whether or not he has studied the book. ISA says *cık* as a response to this question, which means *no*.

(14) STC 061_090622_00020

In (15), in SEZ, SAL and MEL's conversation, SAL asks SEZ if she has been to their garden. SEZ as a response says *cık* together with *ı-ıh* which is another type of negation marker in Turkish language.

(15) STC 107_100210_00104

The second function of *cık* is its use to disagree with the previous statement and/or disapprove of the statement. Unlike the first function,

in this use of *cık*, it is not uttered after a question. As seen in excerpt (12) in Table 2, for example, ZEY tells ISA that she is worried that her younger son, '((first name, male))' will harm her baby girl by dropping her. ISA takes the floor and says *cık*, which is an indication that ISA disagrees with what ZEY utters and shows this disagreement by saying *cık*.

ZEY000073: 'May God protect. I am afraid he will give harm to the girl. He will cause to her fall accidentally.'

ISA000058: **cık˙**

While analyzing data, a pattern is found in terms of the location of *cık* in the statements also tells us about another function it has. It is observed that in some utterances *cık* occurs before a negative statement uttered by the speaker, and puts more emphasis on the following statement, which is negative. It is the speaker self-reflecting on the situation, as if making the assessment to self and then uttering the negative statement. For example, in excerpt (13) in Table 2, ISA is expressing his opinions on a topic he was discussing with his mother. They were talking about their concerns for his baby sister. His mother told him that her younger son was likely to give harm to the baby girl. ISA in this excerpt is showing his disagreement with this concern of her mother. He says *cık*, which is followed by the negative utterance that he will not cause to her fall.

ISA: 'because you are always spending your time (with her). **cık˙**. ((first name, male)) won't drop her.'

5. CONCLUSION

This paper started with a brief discussion of why the term 'pragmatic marker' is favored over 'discourse marker', which was followed by a review of previous studies on *no* as a pragmatic marker. Then studies on pragmatic markers like *hayır* are presented, which is followed by the explanation of the theory by Schiffrin (1987), which underlies the

theory followed in this study. Next, how the corpus-based data analysis is handled and information on STC were provided. In the result section, the analyses are given based on these three research questions:

> 1. What is the frequency of "*hayır*" and "*cık*" in the STC?
> 2. Where do they appear in an utterance?
> 3. What are the functions of *hayır* and *cık*?

It was found that there are 97 tokens of *hayır* and 96 tokens of *cık* in the publishable version of STC. It should be noted that in the corpus, there are many occurrences of *hayır* used in reported speech and all of these were eliminated from the analysis. In addition all of the *cık*s used as interjection are also eliminated. Both of these PMs are found mostly at the beginning of utterances. Both of them sometimes appear alone and at other times they co-occur with other negative markers as seen in excerpt (15), in SEZ, SAL and MEL's conversation. SAL asks SEZ if she has been to their garden. SEZ as a response says *cık* together with *ı-ıh* which is another type of negation marker in Turkish language.

(15) STC 107_100210_00104

As a response to the third research question, it was observed that both of these PMs have different functions in addition to basic common functions of responding to request for information in a negative

statement and disagreeing with a previous statement. The functions of *hayır* are:

a) Agreeing with a negative statement
b) Disagreeing with a positive statement
c) Answering a request, offer or a command
d) *hayır* as a connective
e) Metalinguistic negation

Cık, on the other hand, has these functions:

a) Responding to request for information
b) Disapproval of / disagreement with the previous statement or situation
c) Pre-signal of a negative statement

As a main difference in terms of functions, it is found that *cık* has a more emotive tone, and its function depends heavily on the topic. For example, it is noted that in conversations where people are complaining and showing their emotions and attitudes *cık* is used. Another main difference observed is *hayır*'s function as a connective. Many tokens of *hayır* which makes a transition by connecting the previous topic to the new were found. In addition, it is noticed that formality and informality also play an important role. *Cık* is used in more informal situations where the conversation takes place among people who are close, such as friends and family members. However, this is not the case for *hayır*.

As stated earlier, this study on pragmatic markers *hayır* and *cık*, follows Schiffrin's approach on pragmatic markers. According to this approach, PMs are believed to establish two types of coherence: Semantic and pragmatic. In order to reach a better understanding of PMs *hayır* and *cık*, they are analyzed dependent on their local contexts both semantically and pragmatically. In this way, it is found that they are characterized through some common features as well as different functions.

As also stated earlier, this study is an intra-lingual contrastive study of *hayır* and *cık* in Turkish. For a further study, a cross-linguistic comparison of *hayır*, and *cık* with *no* could be done in order to see whether there are differences and similarities in terms of the pragmatic functions. Another future study could be to examine the corpus for other markers which function for the same purpose as *hayır* and *cık,* such as y*ok/yoo* and *ı-ıh*.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

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

Aijmer, K. & Simon-Vandenbergen, A.-M. (2004). A model and a methodology for the study of pragmatic markers: The semantic field of expectation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1781-1805.

André, V. (2005). *Oui-non*: Une pratique discursive sous influence. *Marges Linguistiques,* 9, 195-213.

Arndt, W. (1960). Modal particles in Russian and German. *Word*, 16, 323–336.

Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.

Bazzanella, C. (1990). Phatic connective as interactional cues in contemporary spoken Italian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 629-647.

Blakemore, D. (1987). *Semantic constraints on relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Burridge, K. & Florey, M. (2002). 'Yeah-no He's a Good Kid': A discourse analysis of *Yeah-no* in Australian English. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 22, 149-171.

Büyükkantarcıoğlu, N. (2006). An analysis of Turkish interjections in the context of reactive idea framing. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23 (1), 19-32.

Crystal, D. (1988). Another look at well, you know … *English Today* 13, 47-49.

Çubukçu, H. (2005). Karşılıklı konuşmada destekleyici geri bildirim. *XVIII. Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri*, (pp. 289-304). Ankara.

Drummond, K. & Hopper, R. (1993). Some uses of yeah. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26, 203–212.

Feng, G. (2006). *A theory of conventional implicature and pragmatic markers in Chinese*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, The University of Reading.

Fischer, K. (2000). Discourse particles, turn-taking, and the semantics-pragmatics interface. *Revue de Sémantique et Pragmatique*, 8, 111-137.

Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics*, 6 (2), 167-90.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 931-952.

Fuller, J. M. (2003). The influence of speaker roles on discourse marker use. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 23-45.

Gülich, E. (1970). *Makrosyntax der Gliederungssignale im gesprochenen Französisch*. München.

Horn, L. (1985). Metalinguistic negation and pragmatic ambiguity. *Language*, 61, 121-174.

Jefferson, G., (1984). Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens 'yeah' and 'mmhm'. *Papers in Linguistics*, 17, 197-216.

Lee-Goldman, R. (2011). *No* as a discourse marker. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 2627-2649.

Li, C. N. & S. A. Thompson. (1981). *Mandarin Chinese. A functional reference grammar.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non-Native English discourse*. Amstordam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Norrick, N. R. (2012). Interjections. In G. Anderson & K. Aijmer (Eds.), *Pragmatics of society. Handbooks of pragmatics, Vol. 5* (pp. 243-291). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Östman, J-O. (1995). Pragmatic particles twenty years after. In B. Wårvik et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings from the Turku conference, Anglicana Turkuensia*, 14, 95-108.

Özbek, N. (2000). Yani, işte, şey, ya: Interactional markers of Turkish. In: A. Göksel & Kerslake, C. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics* (pp. 393-401). Wiesbaden, Harrosowitz.

Redeker, G. 1991. Review article: Linguistic markers of discourse structure. *Linguistics,* 29, 1139-1172.

Risselada, R. & Spooren, W. (1998). Introduction: Discourse markers and coherence relations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 131-133.

Ruhi, Ş. (2011, October). Sözlüksel ve edimbilimsel anlamı sözlü derlemden izlemek. Paper presented at *Doğan Aksan Çalıştayı*, 3 October 2011.

Ruhi, Ş., Eryılmaz, K. & Acar, M. G. C. (2012, May). A platform for creating multimodal and multilingual spoken corpora for Turkic languages: Insights from the Spoken Turkish Corpus. Paper presented at *the First Workshop on Language Resources and Technologies for Turkic Languages*, LREC 2012, İstanbul, 57-63. Retrieved from http://www.lrec-conf.org/ proceedings/ lrec2012/workshops/02. Turkic%20Languages%20Proceedings.pdf

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation, *Language*, 50, 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E. A. (2001). Getting serious: Joke! serious 'no'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 1945–1955.

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

Schourop, L. 1999. Tutorial. Discourse markers. *Lingua*, 107, 227-265.

Sperber, Dan & Deirdre, W. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Spoken Turkish Corpus http//stc.org.tr

Travis, C. E. (2006). The natural semantic metalanguage approach to discourse particles. In K. Fischer (Ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*, (pp. 219-241). Oxford: Elsevier.

Wang, Y.F., TSai, P.h., Ling, M.y. (2007). From informational to emotive use: meiyou ('no') as a discourse marker in Taiwan Mandarin conversation. *Discourse Studies*, 9 (5), 677-701.

Yadugiri, M.A. (1986). Some pragmatic implications of the use of yes and no in response to yes-no questions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 199-210.

Yılmaz, E. (2004). *A pragmatic analysis of Turkish discourse Particles: Yani, işte and şey* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). METU, Ankara.

Yu, A. J.-Y. (2004). *Discourse functions of negative meiyou in Taiwan Mandarin*. Unpublished MA thesis, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei.