Discourse markers in EFL classrooms: A corpus-driven research

Havva Zorluel Özer [a] * ID , Zuhal Okan [b] ID

[a] Çukurova Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Adana 01330, Türkiye
[b] Çukurova Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Adana 01330, Türkiye

Abstract

This study aims at determining discourse markers used by Turkish teachers and native teachers in EFL classrooms and comparing these items in terms of variety and frequency. To reach the objectives of the present study, two seperate corpora were compiled through audio-recordings collected from two Turkish and two native EFL teachers' lectures. AntConc (2014), a specific concordance program designed for text analysis, was utilized in the analysis of the corpus data. Corpus-driven research results indicated that Turkish teachers used 29 different discourse markers and native teachers used 37 different discourse markers in their classroom discourse. It was also seen that Turkish teachers underused most discourse markers compared to native teachers in EFL classrooms. In the light of these findings, notable implications were suggested for English language teaching.

Keywords: Classroom discourse; corpus; discourse markers

1. Introduction

Foreign language learning has become a mainstream in today's world and many people know at least one language other than their first languages. Not surprisingly, many approaches have been brought to foreign language learning and teaching throughout the years. One of these approaches is Communicative Competence (CC) on which the theoretical foundation of the current study is based. Within CC framework, pragmatics and discourse analysis have gained paramount significance in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT). Discourse and pragmatic knowledge are interrelated concepts as discourse deals with "language in use" (Gee, 2014, p. 18) while the latter concerns the "abilities for creating and interpreting discourse" (Bagaric & Mihaljevic-Djigunovic, 2007, p. 99). Both are considered as vital aspects of CC since discourse knowledge enhances pragmatic competence and pragmatically competent speakers are able to communicate effectively in a language by producing contextually appropriate utterances in given situations. To this end, discourse analysis provides an opportunity for language learners to be exposed to authentic interactions and gain awareness about the

---

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +90-322-338-6084
  E-mail address: hzorluel@cu.edu.tr
This study is a part of the first author's master's thesis "Discourse Markers in EFL Classrooms: A Corpus-Driven Research" presented to Çukurova University, Social Sciences Institute.

variability in one's linguistic choices. Among the most highlighted linguistic elements occuring in discourse analysis studies are discourse markers (DMs), the main focus of the present study.

Discourse markers are lexical items such as *oh, well, but, you know, I mean, actually, and, okay* etc. which have various functions notably serving as connective elements of speech. Fung & Carter (2007) state that according to a corpus analysis conducted by Allwood in 1996, DMs are represented among top 10 word forms in native speakers' spoken discourse. Due to the significance of DMs in native speakers' spoken discourse, a substantial body of research has been devoted to the study of DMs with an emphasis on the learner use in an English as A Foreign Language (EFL) context (Sankoff et al., 1997; Trillo, 2002; Hellermann & Vergun, 2007; Fung & Carter, 2007; Liao, 2008; Aşık & Cephe, 2013; Bu, 2013; Liu, 2013; Aysu, 2017). Some of these studies concentrated on the comparative use of DMs by native speakers and foreign language learners (Trillo, 2002; Fung & Carter, 2007; Aşık & Cephe, 2013). Some gave emphasis to the impact of various factors such as gender and style on the use of DMs by foreign language learners (Sankoff et al., 1997; Hellermann & Vergun, 2007; Liao, 2008; Bu, 2013). These studies revealed the restriction in the use of DMs by foreign language learners in their spoken discourse. As a result, further studies suggested teaching DMs explicitly to EFL learners (Rahimi & Riasati, 2012; Sadeghi & Heidaryan, 2012; Jones & Carter, 2014). In addition, empirical research has shown the efficacy of teachers' use of DMs on EFL learners' comprehension skills (Flowerdew & Tauroza, 1995); Eslami & Eslami-Rasekh, 2007). Walsh (2011) emphasizes the significance of DMs occuring in educational context as in the following :

> Words such as *right, ok, now, so, alright* - typically discourse markers - perform a very important function in signalling changes in the interaction or organisation of learning. They function like punctuation marks on a printed page: consider how difficult it would be to read a newspaper without punctuation. The same applies in a classroom if teachers fail to make appropriate use of transition markers. This important category of discourse markers enables teachers to guide learners through the discourse, hold their attention, announce a change in activity, signal the beginning or end of a lesson stage. Crucially, they help a class 'stay together' and work in harmony (p.7).

As Yang (2011) states, educational research on DMs in classroom discourse is mainly restricted to second / foreign language learners, and there is an obvious gap in literature examining DMs in teacher talk. Available research on DMs and foreign language teachers focused on exploring the attitudes of EFL teachers towards the use of DMs in EFL classrooms (Fung, 2011; Kalajahi & Abdullah, 2012; Aşık, 2015), and few research concerned describing the DMs occuring in teacher talk in the context of EFL classroom (Demirtaş, 2004; Ding & Wang, 2015).

The scarcity of research on the use of DMs in teacher talk makes the current study significant since this study provides a comparative analysis of DMs used by Turkish EFL teachers and native EFL teachers in their classroom discourse. The significance of our study can also be attributed to its implications for the field of ELT because it provides us with an understanding of whether Turkish EFL teachers in this study can model the use of these extracurricular lexical items which are not taught explicitly in foreign language classrooms.

1.1. Literature review

An extensive body of research has been devoted to the study of DMs since 1980s when Schiffrin presented a detailed report of expressions *and, because, but, I mean, now, oh, or, so, then, well* and *y'know* in 1987. Schiffrin' s (1987 as cited in Schiffrin, 2004) analysis of DMs is based on a sociolinguistic perspective in which she views discourse as both a "unit of language" and a "process of social interaction" (p. 56). Thus, she refers to DMs as social interaction organizers with particular linguistic characteristics which are pivotal to discourse coherence. According to Schiffrin (1987 as

cited in Schiffrin, 2004), DMs can be operationally defined as "sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of talk" (p. 57) which may be derived from various word classes including conjunctions such as *and, but, because, or, so* ; interjections such as *oh*, adverbs such as *now, well, then*, and lexicalized phrases such as *y'know* and *I mean*.

Fraser (1988, 1996, 1999, 2009) is one of the most prolific on the topic as revealed by his various publications on DMs. Contrary to Schiffrin's broad definition of DMs with a focus on discourse coherence, Fraser (1999) provides a restriction within a pragmatic approach and defines DMs as

> a pragmatic class, lexical expressions drawn from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbials and prepositional phrases. With certain exceptions, they signal a relationship between the segment they introduce, S2, and the prior segment, S1. They have a core meaning, which is procedural, not conceptual, and their more specific interpretation is negotiated by the context, both linguistic and conceptual. There are two types: those that relate aspects of the explicit message conveyed by S2 with aspects of a message direct or indirect, associated with S1; and those that relate the topic of S2 to that of S1 (p. 950).

As can be seen from the description above, Fraser narrows the term to a subclass of pragmatic markers. In his report published in 1988, Fraser regarded a sentence as having two separate meanings, namely, content meaning and pragmatic meaning. Content meaning concerns state of affairs about which a speaker is talking , while pragmatic meaning indicates what messages the speaker intends to convey directly, and pragmatic markers are the linguistic devices through which pragmatic meaning is conveyed. In the report, Fraser divided pragmatic markers into three subclasses including basic, those which signal the force of the basic message; commentary, which signal a speaker comment on the basic message and parallel pragmatic markers, which signal a distinct message accompanying the basic message. Fraser (1988) considered DMs as a type of commentary pragmatic markers which "signal a comment specifying the type of sequential discourse relationship that holds between the current utterance … and the prior discourse" (p. 22).

In Blakemore's (2006) view, if the term DM is analyzed in detail, it can be suggested that the term 'discourse' requires a discourse level analysis of the lexical expressions considered as DMs and 'marker' requires an analysis of the meanings of these expressions in terms of what they signal rather than what they describe. She states that there is not a certain list of DMs in English or another language; however, the lack of such a list does not necessarily mean that it is a trivial area to study because DMs contribute to the organization of discourse and discourse coherence, providing connection between the elements of discourse.

Despite such terminology variations, when analyzed syntactically it is observed that DMs share common characteristics such as connectivity, optionality, non-truth conditionality, weak clause association, initiality, orality and multi-categoriality (Schourup, 1999). In this research, we set connectivity, optionality, non-truth-conditionality and multi-categoriality as criteria to decide whether a linguistic item can be considered as a DM as it occurs within Turkish and native EFL teachers corpora. We do not give emphasis to initiality as a criterion for DM status in our research since we concern the lexical items in the medial and final positions in this study as well. We do not need to set orality as a criterion either, since our data are already based on spoken language.

Most research pertaining to DMs in EFL context has been devoted to the investigation of DMs used by EFL learners. Some studies were carried out to investigate the role of various factors in foreign language learners' use of DMs. Hellermann & Vergun (2007) examined the use of DMs *well, you know* and *like* as they occured in classroom interaction and in home interviews. To reach the objectives of the study, they analyzed the language data gathered from 17 beginning adult learners of English residing currently in the US with no former instruction on English language. Then, they

searched for an explanation into which learners used the above DMs to what degree. They found that the participants who tended to use DMs more frequently were the more proficient ones in English language and they saw that these learners were also the ones spending more time in the US and the ones who were more acculturated to the target language.

Liao (2008) and Bu (2013) carried out two similar studies to discover variations in the use of DMs *yeah, oh, you know, like, well, I mean, ok, right* and *actually* by Chinese speakers of English. In the former study, the participants were 6 Chinese graduate students studying and working as international teaching assistants in the US while 30 Chinese university students who were 15 female and 15 male students similar in age, education, proficiency level participated in the latter study. To understand the role of gender and social contexts in the use of DMs by Chinese speakers of English, the researchers focused on two social settings, namely, classroom discussions and individual interviews. Both studies revealed that females tended to use DMs more frequently than males and all participants used DMs more in interviews than in classroom discussion.

Some of the research pertaining to DMs was conducted with a comparative basis to explore the use of DM variations between native and nonnative speakers of English. Fung & Carter (2007) and Aşık & Cephe (2013) compared the use of DMs by Hong Kong EFL learners and Turkish speakers of English respectively with that of native speakers of English. Both studies revealed the restriction in the use of DMs by nonnative speakers of English since it was found that neither Hong Kong EFL learners nor Turkish speakers of English could use DMs as variably and frequently as native speakers. Both studies also indicated that nonnative speakers used DMs with a less variety of functions than native speakers.

Among few research regarding the use of DMs by EFL teachers is Demirtaş's (2004) study conducted in a local context to identify the functions of DMs *well, I mean, you know, now, okay, so, because, but, and, or, allright, actually, anyway*, used by two Turkish EFL teachers in foreign language classrooms. It was found that the teachers used DMs for a variety of functions such as showing contrast, topic shifting, pause filling, exemplification and showing relation etc. Still, this study did not explain the variety and frequency of DMs occuring in nonnative EFL teachers' classroom discourse. A relevant study was conducted by Ding & Wang (2015) who examined the use and functions of DMs by native and Hong Kong EFL teachers in primary and secondary school settings. Results revealed that Hong Kong teachers of English tended to use DMs more frequently compared to native teachers of English. Qualitative analyses indicated that both groups of teachers used DMs for the purposes of developing interactional relationships with the students and constructing coherent classroom discourse.

1.2. Research questions

In this study, we aim at determining DMs used by Turkish and native teachers in EFL classrooms and comparing these items in terms of variety and frequency. In accordance with the purposes of the study, following research questions are aimed to be answered in this research :

1. Which DMs do Turkish teachers use in EFL classrooms?
2. What is the frequency level of DMs used by Turkish teachers in EFL classrooms?
3. Are there any differences between the DMs used by Turkish and native teachers in EFL classrooms?

2. Method

The pedagogy of corpus in foreign language learning and teaching has been emphasized and practiced by many specialists and researchers in the field (Conrad, 1999; Bernardini, 2004; Tognini-Bonelli, 2004; Tsui, 2004; Biber et al. , 2006; Moreno et al., 2006; Can, 2009; Huang, 2011; Şahin-Kızıl & Kilimci, 2014; Şimşek, 2015; Yangın-Ersanli, 2015). According to Cheng et al. (2003), "Corpus linguistics is the study of language through corpus-based or corpus-driven research" (p.174). The present research is descriptive in nature based on a corpus-driven approach to answer our research questions which aimed at describing and comparing the variety and frequency of DMs used by Turkish and native teachers in EFL classrooms. This study was conducted from a corpus-driven approach since we did not turn to a tagged corpus which could have resulted in a loss of information (McEnery et al. , 2006). Instead, we compiled our own corpora which consisted of Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus and Native EFL Teachers Corpus by transcribing the audio-recordings collected in the lectures of two Turkish and two native EFL teachers.

The courses given by two Turkish and two native teachers in this study, level of the students, duration of audio-recordings, total word counts which emerged from the transcriptions of the audio-recordings collected from the teachers' lectures and corpus size are given in Table 1 which presents the description of the two corpora compiled in this study:

Table 1. Description of Turkish and native EFL teachers corpora

Corpus Name	Teachers	Course Name	Level	Duration (in hours)	Total Word Count	Corpus Size
TURKISH	T_1	Main course	Elementary	4	13366	24265
	T_2	Main course	Pre-intermediate	4	10899	
NATIVE	NT_1	General English	Elementary	4	9892	21361
	NT_2	General English	Pre-intermediate	4	11469	

In Table 1, it has been illustrated that Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus consists of two Turkish teachers' four-hour Main Course lecture recordings at elementary and pre-intermediate levels. The table shows that T_1 produced 13366 words and T_2 produced 10899 words in four class hours making a corpus size of 24265 words in total. Further, it can be seen that Native EFL Teachers Corpus consists of two native teachers' four-hour General English lecture recordings at elementary and pre-intermediate levels. NT_1 produced 9892 words and NT_2 produced 11469 words in four class hours making a corpus size of 21361 words in total.

2.1. Sample / Participants

To reach the objectives of the current study, convenience sampling was employed in the process of selecting participants who were two Turkish EFL teachers working at the School of Foreign Languages in Çukurova University and two native EFL teachers working at a language school in London. To avoid any revelation of the participants' identity, teachers were coded as Teacher $_1$ (T_1), Teacher $_2$ (T_2), Native Teacher $_1$ (NT_1) and Native Teacher $_2$ (NT_2) throughout the study.

T_1 and T_2 are two male Turkish teachers who are 40 and 48 years old respectively. They are working at the School of Foreign Languages in Çukurova University, Turkey. Both teachers have received ELT training and post-graduate degrees in teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL). T_1 holds an MA (Master of Arts) degree and T_2 holds a PhD. in ELT. Both teachers are experienced teachers of English who have been teaching English for over 10 years. T_1 teaches English to 25 elementary level students including 23 Turkish and 2 Syrians with an average of 18 years of age. T_2 teaches English to 30 pre-intermediate level students including 29 Turkish and 1 Syrian with an age range between 18 and 24.

NT_1 and NT_2 are two male native teachers who are 50 and 41 years old respectively. They are working at a language school in London. Both teachers are from United Kingdom with English as their native language. They both possess graduate degrees in an English language related subject receiving a training in ELT. NT_1 has a CELTA (Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults) and NT_2 has a DELTA (Diploma in English Language Teaching to Adults). NT_1 is an inexperienced teacher having a teaching experience under four years; while NT_2 is an experienced teacher who has been teaching English for over 10 years. NT_1 teaches English to 18 elementary level students including 10 Turkish, 6 Italian and 2 Spanish with an age range between 17 and 23. NT_2 teaches English to 16 pre-intermediate level students including 6 Turkish, 5 Italian, 4 Spanish and 1 Ukranian with an age range between 18 and 25.

2.2. Instrument(s)

Audio-recordings collected from the lectures of Turkish and native EFL teachers were the main data collection tools employed in this study. The audio-recordings were later transcribed and turned into texts to compile a research corpus.

2.3. Data collection procedures

Before the compilation process of our research corpus, we asked for teachers' consents to take part in our study since their lectures were to be audio-recorded and analyzed later by the researcher. Three Turkish EFL teachers gave their consents to take part in the study on condition that they record their lectures themselves. However, among those three, we involved two of them in our study since one teacher's audio-recordings were not qualified enough to transcribe. As for the native EFL teachers, three teachers gave their consents for their lectures to be audio-recorded by the researcher on condition that their identities were kept confidential throughout the study. Yet, we included two of them in our study because of the same reason that occured with Turkish EFL teachers. Collection of audio-recordings took two months in total and we collected a 16-hour-lesson record from the lectures of two Turkish and two native EFL teachers. A 4-hour-lesson record was collected from each teacher. Afterwards, we transcribed these audio-recordings with a selection of the teachers' discourse leaving the students' out. Transcription process took another one month. Then, the transcriptions were brought together and turned into texts to compose our corpus data which were analyzed according to the descriptions in the data analysis section.

2.4. Data analysis

For the analysis of our corpus data, we first read all the transcripts twice and identified each lexical item functioning as a DM in the classroom discourse of Turkish and native EFL teachers. Then, we utilized AntConc (Version 3. 4. 4) , a freeware concordance program designed by Anthony (2014), to analyze the frequencies of these lexical items diagnosed as DMs. Through the concordance tool which displays research results in a Keyword in Context (KWIC) format, we were able to examine the

frequencies of DMs occurring in Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus and Native EFL Teachers Corpus. The KWIC format also allowed us to see DMs line by line in their contexts which helped us considerably in the process of distinguishing DMs from other word classes. We read each line carefully in the light of our preset criteria to distinguish DMs from other word classes and came up with an overall frequency at the end. Eventually, because of the difference in the size of two corpora (Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus size : 24265, Native EFL Teachers Corpus size : 21361) we employed Log-likelihood (LL) statistics to compare the frequencies of DMs occurring in the two corpora.

3. Results

The Results section presents the study's findings. Results should be clear and concise. The overall frequency distribution of DMs in Turkish and native EFL teachers corpora is given in Table 2:

Table 2. Overall frequency distribution of discourse markers in Turkish and native EFL teachers corpora

	TURKISH	NATIVE
Corpus Size	24265	21361
Discourse Markers (f)	1120	2293
T/t Ratio (%)	4.62	10.73
Number of Discourse Markers	29	37

F= raw frequency of discourse markers
T/t (type/token) Ratio= percentage of discourse markers (types) in total words (tokens)

Table 2 shows that Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus size is 24265 which is larger than Native EFL Teachers Corpus size with 21361 words in total. In the table, it is seen that 29 different DMs are used by Turkish teachers and 37 different DMs are used by native teachers in EFL classrooms. The table reveals that Turkish teachers use a less variety of DMs when compared to native teachers in foreign language classrooms. The overall frequency of 29 DMs determined in Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus is 1120 which composes 4.62 % of the total word count. 37 DMs determined within Native EFL Teachers Corpus has a raw frequency of 2293 which is 10.73 % of the total words in the corpus. Table 2 indicates that Turkish teachers tend to use DMs less frequently in their classroom discourse when compared to native teachers. Because of the difference in the sizes of the two corpora, log-likelihood values are calculated to make a reliable comparison between the frequencies of DMs in Turkish and native EFL teachers corpora.

Log-likelihood calculation result is given in Table 3 where we can see the overall and relative frequencies of DMs along with their occurrences per 1000 words in Turkish and Native EFL teachers corpora:

Table 3. Log-likelihood ratio of discourse markers in Turkish and native EFL teachers corpora

	TURKISH			NATIVE			LL Ratio (*p<0.05)
Corpus Size	24265			21361			
Discourse Markers	(O1)	%	n per 10000	(O2)	%	n per 1000	
	1120	4.62	46.1	2293	10.73	107.34	-574.85

O1 is observed frequency in Corpus 1
O2 is observed frequency in Corpus 2
% value shows relative frequency in the text
+ indicates overuse in O1 relative to O2
- indicates underuse in O1 relative to O2

Table 3 presents the overall and relative frequencies of DMs in Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus and Native EFL Teachers Corpus which are respectively 1120/4.62 and 2293/10.73. It is seen that DMs are used 46.15 times per 1000 words in Turkish corpus while they are used 107.34 times per 1000 words in the native one. The LL ratio ($p<0.05$) indicates that there is a significant underuse of DMs in Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus when compared to the native corpus with a -574.85 value.

In Table 4, the raw frequencies of each DM in the two corpora and the LL calculation results are given to compare the use of DMs by Turkish and native teachers, and find overuse and underuse status in Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus compared to native corpus.

Table 4. Frequencies of discourse markers in Turkish and native EFL teachers corpora

Discourse Markers	TURKISH (f)	NATIVE (f)	LL Ratio (*p<0.05)
alright	85	16	+43.35
right	56	27	+6.99
okidoki	2	0	+2.53
I believe	1	0	+1.26
I guess	1	0	+1.26
yes	131	106	+0.42
you mean	2	1	+0.22
I mean	8	7	+0.00
see	3	3	-0.02
maybe	11	11	-0.09
for example	18	18	-0.15
cos	2	3	-0.35
really	19	22	-0.77
in fact	3	5	-0.79
because	18	23	-1.42
you know what	0	1	-1.52

to begin with	0	1	-1.52
though	0	1	-1.52
anyway	1	5	-3.45
let me see	0	3	-4.55
you see	0	3	-4.55
then	5	14	-5.66
look	0	4	-6.07
you know	11	25	-7.52
kind of	0	5	-7.59
well	5	19	-10.59
or	11	30	-11.74
listen	0	8	-12.14
by the way	0	8	-12.14
now	25	52	-13.43
I think	15	38	-13.47
like	0	9	-13.66
actually	1	21	-25.00
and	167	249	-28.41
but	52	116	-33.85
oh	0	28	-42.50
just	5	68	-73.07
okay	346	633	-125.94
yeah	41	239	-181.32
so	75	471	-372.65
TOTAL	1120	2293	-574.85

f= raw frequency of discourse marker
+ indicates overuse in Turkish relative to Native
- indicates underuse in Turkish relative to Native

Table 4 presents the comparative findings of Turkish and native EFL teachers corpora in terms of DMs use with a basis on their LL ratios to indicate whether the relevant DM is overused or underused in Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus compared to Native EFL Teachers Corpus. In Table 4, it is seen that Turkish EFL teachers in this particular study use 29 different DMs *-alright, right, okidoki, I believe, I guess, yes, you mean, I mean, see, maybe, for example, cos, really, in fact, because, anyway, then, you know, well, or, now, I think, actually, and, but, just, okay, yeah, so-* in their classroom discourse. Of these 29 DMs, Turkish teachers overuse eight items *-alright, right, okidoki, I believe, I guess, yes, you mean, I mean-* with an LL ratio ranging from +43.35 to +0.00 when compared to native teachers in foreign language classrooms. The DM with the highest LL ratio is *alright* which occurs 85 times within Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus and 16 times in Native EFL Teachers Corpus. The least overused DM by Turkish teachers is *I mean* which has been used eight times by Turkish teachers and seven times by native teachers.

Turkish teachers are found to underuse 32 DMs – *see, maybe, for example, cos, really, in fact, because, you know what, to begin with, though, anyway, let me see, you see, then, look, you know, kind of, well, or, listen, by the way, now, I think, like, actually, and, but, oh, just, okay, yeah, so-* with an LL ratio ranging from -0.02 to -372.65 when compared to native teachers in EFL classrooms. The least underused DM is *see* which has been used three times by both groups of speakers. The highest underuse in DMs is in *so* with 75 hits in Turkish and 471 hits in native EFL teachers corpora. Of these 32 DMs, it is seen that Turkish teachers haven't used *you know what, to begin with, though, let me see, you see, look, kind of, listen, by the way, like* and *oh* in their classroom discourse.

The table further reveals 37 different DMs used by native teachers in EFL classrooms: *alright, right, yes, you mean, I mean, see, maybe, for example, cos, really, in fact, because, you know what, to begin with, though, anyway, let me see, you see, then, look, you know, kind of, well, or, listen, by the way, now, I think, like, actually, and, but, oh, just, okay, yeah, so*. It is seen that native teachers haven't used three DMs -*okidoki, I believe, I guess*- in their classroom discourse while these are rarely used by Turkish teachers. Overall, corpus-driven research results reveal that there is a significant underuse of DMs in Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus compared to native corpus.

In addition to the comparative findings regarding the frequencies of individual DMs in two corpora, the most frequently used 10 DMs in each corpus have been determined. Table 5 lists raw frequencies and type token ratios of 10 DMs which are most frequently used in overall DMs by Turkish teachers in EFL classrooms:

Table 5. Most frequently used 10 discourse markers in Turkish EFL teachers corpus

Discourse Markers	f	T/t %	N per 1000
okay	346	30.89	14.25
and	167	14.91	6.88
yes	131	11.69	5.39
alright	85	7.58	3.50
so	75	6.69	3.09
right	56	5.00	2.30
but	52	4.64	2.14
yeah	41	3.66	1.68
now	25	2.23	1.03
really	19	1.69	0.78
TOTAL	997	89.01	41.08

f= raw frequency of discourse marker in Turkish EFL teachers corpus

T/t %= percentage of discourse marker in overall discourse markers in Turkish EFL teachers corpus

Table 5 shows that *okay* has the highest frequency with 346 hits composing 30.89 % of the overall frequency of DMs in Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus. *Okay* has been found to be used 14.25 times per 1000 words. The other DMs in the top 10 list with highest frequencies within the corpus are *and, yes, alright, so, right, but, yeah, now* and *really*. The table shows that the total frequency of these most frequently used 10 DMs by Turkish teachers is 997 which composes 89.01% of the overall DMs in Turkish corpus. Top 10 DMs in Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus have been used 41.08 times per 1000 words. Some instances of the most frequently used DMs within Turkish EFL Teachers Corpus can be seen in the following excerpt :

*T: Who is Catherine? She is, **yes,** she is, **yeah,** Paul's sister. **Right.** Good. **And** who is Claire? Who, who is Claire? Sally's friend from work. İşten arkadaşı. İş arkadaşı, from work. İş arkadaşı. Beraber çalıştıkları. **Okay. And** who is Andrew? Let's look at this pronunciation. Andrew, huh? Andrew. **Alright, good. So,** Andrew is Sally's boyfriend. Very nice, **okay.** Let's listen **and** let's answer the questions.*

Furthermore, Table 6 presents raw frequencies and type token ratios of 10 DMs which are most frequently used in overall DMs by native teachers in EFL classrooms:

Table 6. Most frequently used 10 discourse markers in native EFL teachers corpus

Discourse Markers	f	T/t %	N per 1000
okay	633	27.60	29.63
so	471	20.54	22.04
and	249	10.85	11.65
yeah	239	10.42	11.18
but	116	5.05	5.43
yes	106	4.62	4.96
just	68	2.96	3.18
now	52	2.26	2.43
I think	38	1.65	1.77
or	30	1.30	1.40
TOTAL	2002	87.30	93.72

f= raw frequency of discourse marker in native EFL teachers corpus
T/t %= percentage of discourse marker in overall discourse markers in native EFL teachers corpus

Table 6 indicates that *okay* has the highest frequency with 633 hits composing 27.60 % of the overall frequency of DMs in Native EFL Teachers Corpus. *Okay* has been used 29.63 times per 1000 words. The other DMs in the top 10 list with highest frequencies within the corpus are *so, and, yeah, but, yes, just, now, I think* and *or*. The table shows that the total frequency of these most frequently used 10 DMs by native teachers is 2002 which composes 87.30% of the overall DMs in native corpus. Top 10 DMs in Native EFL Teachers Corpus have been found to be used 93.72 times per 1000 words. The following excerpt presents some examples of the most frequently used DMs within Native EFL Teachers Corpus:

*NT: **Alright. So,** umm, **okay. So,** look at, umm, we are going to start today by looking at six D which is about, umm, this man, who works for Nintendo. He designs, he makes Super Mario and other games. **So,** this is page fifty four. **Yeah. And,** sixty, **yeah. Okay. And,** umm, **to begin with, just,** let us have a look at the question number one. **And,** umm, does he play a lot of video games? Number seven? Does he play a lot of video games? Very often? **Oh,** he doesn't play video games very often. **So,** he makes video games, he designs video games, **but** he doesn't play video games very often, **okay.***

Research results reveal that *okay* is the most frequently used DM in both Turkish and native corpora. Table 5 and Table 6 show that DMs *and, yes, so, but, yeah, now* are among the most frequently used 10 DMs in both Turkish and native corpora. In addition to these seven DMs, *alright,*

right and *really* are among the top 10 DMs used by Turkish teachers while *just, I think* and *or* are presented in native teachers' top 10 list.

4. Discussion

Empirical research proved the role of teachers' using DMs in improving students' lecture comprehension skills (Flowerdew & Tauroza, 1995; Eslami & Eslami-Rasekh, 2007). Still, most research on DMs in language classrooms is restricted to language learners with few exceptions. Due to insufficiency of research on the use of DMs by teachers in EFL context, the discussion of this corpus-driven research findings is based on Ding & Wang's (2015) study as well as studies regarding the use of DMs by learners of English.

In their study investigating the use of DMs by native and Hong Kong teachers of English in primary and secondary schools, Ding & Wang (2015) found that although local EFL teachers in general used more DMs than native EFL teachers, there was a variation between the primary and secondary school settings. While native teachers tended to use more DMs in primary schools, Hong Kong teachers used more DMs in secondary schools. In this vein, what Ding & Wang's study revealed partially conflict with our findings in the present study as we found that Turkish teachers of English significantly underused DMs compared to native teachers. Further, in Ding & Wang's (2015) study, native teachers of English were seen to most frequently use *okay, so, and, right, yes, now, but, oh, just* and *yeah* in their classroom discourse. Mostly in line with Ding & Wang's (2015) study, our findings showed that *okay, so, and, yeah, but, yes, just, now, I think, or* were the most frequently used 10 DMs in native EFL teachers' classroom discourse respectively. In Hong Kong EFL teachers' corpus, *okay, right, and, now, so, yes, um, just, but, yeah* occured as the top 10 DMs respectively. Similarly, *okay, and, yes, alright, so, right, but, yeah, now, really* were listed as the most frequent 10 DMs in Turkish EFL teachers' classroom discourse. According to both Ding & Wang's (2015) study and our study, *okay* is the most frequently used DM by native, Turkish, and Hong Kong teachers of English in the classroom discourse. These findings indicate that there are both similarities and differences between Ding & Wang's (2015) study and our study. The differences may be attributed to the differences in the contexts of the two studies considering that the former was conducted at primary and secondary school settings in a Hong Kong EFL context, while the latter was conducted to examine the DMs used by teachers working with students at older ages in the settings of a language school in London and in school of foreign languages at a public university in Turkey. Further research is necessary for a better understanding of the differences across contexts in the use of DMs by teachers of English.

Considering the research devoted to the study of DMs used by learners of English (Trillo, 2002; Fung & Carter, 2007; Liao, 2008; Aşık & Cephe, 2013), we can view these studies as compatible in that they highlight the limited use of DMs by foreign language learners in their spoken discourse. Researchers generally attributed the insufficient use of DMs by EFL learners to a lack of instruction on DMs in language teaching materials and in EFL classrooms. Researchers also pointed to a lack of natural language input in language classrooms and suggested further research on the occurence of these linguistic devices in teacher talk. In fact, it was seen that Turkish EFL teachers who participated in this study significantly underused most DMs (21 out of 29) with a less variety compared to native teachers. Considering the lack of practice with native speakers, how could language learners be expected to use DMs effectively unless they are exposed to these authentic samples of language in their classrooms? All in all, classroom is the only place where EFL learners are exposed to the target language most of the time.

5. Conclusions

This study aimed at determining DMs used by Turkish teachers in EFL classrooms and comparing these items with that of native teachers in terms of variety and frequency. A corpus driven approach was implemented for the objectives of the study. Audio-recordings from the lectures of the two Turkish teachers were collected to compose a corpus of Turkish EFL teachers' classroom discourse. Audio-recordings were also collected from the lectures of two native teachers to compile a corpus of native EFL teachers' classroom discourse. The analysis of the two corpora revealed that Turkish teachers used DMs with a less variety compared to native teachers in EFL classrooms. Turkish teachers in this study were found to use 29 different DMs which were seen to be *okay, and, yes, alright, so, right, but, yeah, now, really, because, for example, I think, maybe, or, you know, I mean, just, then, well, in fact, see, cos, okidoki, you mean, actually, anyway, I believe* and *I guess* in order of their raw frequencies from the highest to the lowest within Turkish corpus. And, native teachers in the present study used 37 different DMs which were listed as *you know what, to begin with, though, let me see, you see, look, kind of, listen, by the way, like* and *oh* in addition to the above 29 DMs, except for *okidoki, I believe* and *I guess*, used by Turkish teachers. Corpus-driven research results also revealed that Turkish teachers significantly underused most DMs compared to native teachers in EFL classrooms. Among 29 DMs used by Turkish teachers, 21 items -*see, maybe, for example, cos, really, in fact, because, anyway, then, you know, well, or, now, I think, actually, and, but, just, okay, yeah, so*- were underused compared to native teachers. Taking previous research into account which highlights the restriction of EFL learners in the use of DMs in their spoken performance, an emphasis is given to the role of language teachers in modelling the use of these lexical items in foreign language classrooms. However, the underuse of DMs by Turkish EFL teachers in this study suggests notable implications for English language teaching.

First of all, the considerable difference in frequency between the use of DMs by Turkish and native teachers in EFL classrooms highlights the necessity of raising nonnative English language teachers' awarenesses towards the significance of DMs in the spoken discourse of native speakers. In pre-service EFL teacher education programs, pre-service teachers can be informed about the implementation of corpus-based activities in their language classrooms since corpus-based activities introduce the language learners with the ways of analysing real language data occuring in specific contexts (Bernardini, 2004; Şimşek, 2015). Moreover, this study recommends some important implications for the pedagogical aspects of ELT. The involvement of DMs in the syllabuses of foreign language teaching curriculums is desirable as previous research revealed the impact of teaching DMs on the use of DMs by foreign language learners which implies that DMs have a teaching value (Rahimi & Riasati, 2012; Sadeghi & Heidaryan, 2012; Jones & Carter, 2014). In addition, findings of the current study suggest implications for material development in the field of foreign language teaching. Discourse markers seem to be the neglected aspects of language in most language teaching materials. Since language teaching materials are expected to represent samples of authentic language, it is important that they include instances of DMs which are natural elements of language. Material writers can benefit from corpus based examples to provide samples of language naturally occuring in native speakers' discourse. As also suggested by many specialists and researchers in the field, the application of corpus examples in foreign language teaching can reveal general patterns found in large compilations of actual language collected from native speakers in a particular context in a real world (Tognini-Bonelli, 2004; Tsui, 2004; Biber et al. , 2006; Moreno et al., 2006; Can, 2009).

The main limitation of this study is the small number of participants which restricts the generalizability of the findings to the particular context of this study. We do not claim that differences between the use of DMs by the participants of this study reflect differences between Turkish and native teachers. As a result, we suggest that further research should be conducted with a larger sample

to make reliable generalizations about the use of DMs by Turkish and native teachers in EFL classrooms.

References

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.

Anthony, L. (2014). *AntConc* (Version 3. 4. 4), [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University, Available from : http://www.laurenceanthony.net/

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 and Science*, *7*(1), 132-138.

Bagaric, V. & Mihaljevic-Djigunovic, J. (2007). Defining communicative competence. *Metodika*, *8*(1), 94-103.

Bernardini, S. (2004). Corpora in the classroom : An overview and some reflections on future developments. In: Sinclair, J. M. (Ed.), *How to Use Corpora in Language Teaching*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia : John Benjamins.

Biber, D. , Conrad, S. & Reppen, R. (2006). *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use.* Cambridge : Cambridge.

Blakemore, D. (2006). Discourse markers. In: Horn, L. R. & Ward, G. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford : Blackwell.

Bu, J. (2013). A study of the acquisition of discourse markers by Chinese learners of English. *International Journal of English Studies*, *13*(1), 29-50.

Can, C. (2009). İkinci dil edinimi çalışmalarında bilgisayar destekli bir Türk öğrenici İngilizcesi derlemi : Icle 'nin bir altderlemi olarak Ticle. *Dil* , *144,* 16-34.

Cheng, W. , Warren, M. & Xun-feng, X. (2003). The language learner as language researcher: putting corpus linguistics on the timetable. *System*, *31*, 173-186.

Conrad, S. M. (1999). The importance of corpus-based research for language teachers. *System*, *27*(1), 1-18.

Demirtaş, E. (2004). *Yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin kullandıkları söylem belirteçleri ve bağlamlaştırma ipuçlarının işlevleri.* Master's Thesis, Yıldız Technical University, Istanbul.

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.

Eslami, Z. R. & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2007). Discourse markers in academic lectures. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9*(1), 22-38.

Flowerdew, J. & Tauroza, S. (1995). The effect of discourse markers on second language lecture comprehension. *SSLA*, *17*, 435-458.

Fraser, B. (1988). Types of English discourse markers. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, *38*(1-4), 19-33.

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

Fraser, B. (1999). Discourse markers. *Lingua*, *107*, 227-265.

Fraser, B. (2009). An account of discourse markers. *International Review of Pragmatics*, *1*, 293-320.

Fung, L. (2011). Discourse markers in the ESL classroom: A survey of teachers' attitudes. *Asian EFL Journal*, *13*(2), 199-248.

Fung, L. & Carter, R. (2007). Discourse markers and spoken English: Native and learner use in pedagogic settings. *Applied Linguistics, 28*(3), 410-439.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London & New York : Routledge.

Hellermann, J. & Vergun, A. (2007). Language which is not taught: The discourse marker use of beginning adult learners of English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*, 157-179.

Huang, L. (2011). Language learners as language researchers: The acquisition of English grammar through a corpus-aided discovery learning approach mediated by intra- and interpersonal dialogues. In: Newman, J. , Baayen, H. & Rice, S. (Eds.), *Corpus-based Studies in Language Use, Language Learning, and Language Documentation*, NY : Rodopi.

Jones, C. & Carter, R. (2014). Teaching spoken discourse markers explicitly: A comparison of III and PPP. *International Journal of English Studies*, *14*(1) , 37-54.

Kalajahi, S. A. R. & Abdullah, A. N. (2012). Perceptions of Iranian English language teachers towards the use of discourse markers in the EFL classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(10) , 2002-2010.

Liao, S. (2008). Variation in the use of discourse markers by Chinese teaching assistants in the US. *Journal of Pragmatics.* doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2008.09.026

Liu, B. (2013). Effect of first language on the use of English discourse markers by L1 Chinese speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *45*, 149-172.

McEnery, T. , Xiao, R. & Tono, Y. (2006). *Corpus-Based Language Studies : An Advanced Resource Book.* London & New York : Routledge.

Moreno, C. P. A. , Chambers, A. & O'Riordan, S. (2006). Integrating a corpus of classroom discourse in language teacher education: The case of discourse markers. *ReCALL*, *18*(1), 83-104.

Rahimi, F. & Riasati, M. J. (2012). The effect of explicit instruction of discourse markers on the quality of oral output. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, *1*(1), 70-81.

Sadeghi, B. & Heidaryan, H. (2012). The effect of teaching pragmatic discourse markers on EFL learners' listening comprehension. *English Linguistics Research*, *1*(2) , 165-176.

Sankoff, G. , Thibault, P. , Nagy, N. , Blondeau, H. , Fonollosa, M. & Gagnon, L. (1997). Variation in the use of discourse markers in a language contact situation. *Language Variation and Change*, *9*, 191-217.

Schiffrin, D. (2004). Discourse markers: Language, meaning and context. In: Schiffrin, D. , Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. E. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Schourup, L. (1999). Discourse markers, *Lingua*, *107*, 227-265.

Şahin-Kızıl, A. & Kilimci, A. (2014). Recurrent phrases in Turkish EFL learners' spoken interlanguage: A corpus-driven structural and functional analysis. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *10*(1), 195-210.

Şimşek, T. (2015). *The use of linking adverbials in academic writing of Turkish EFL learners: A corpus-based classroom implementation on the priming of contrastive adverbials*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Çukurova University, Adana.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2004). What teachers have always wanted to know – and how corpora can help. In: Sinclair, J. M. (Ed.), *How to Use Corpora in Language Teaching*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia : John Benjamins.

Tognini - Bonelli, E. (2004). Working with corpora : Issues and insights. In: Coffin, C. , Hewings, A. & O'Halloran, K. (Eds.), *Applying English Grammar*. London : Arnold.

Trillo, J. R. (2002). The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *34,* 769-784.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse : Language in Action.* London & New York : Routledge.

Yang, S. (2011). Investigating discourse markers in pedagogical settings: A literatüre review. *ARECLS*, *8*, 95-108.

Yangın-Ersanli, C. (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.

İngilizce sınıflarında söylem belirleyicileri: Derlem yönlendirmeli bir araştırma

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı yabancı dil olarak İngilizce sınıflarında Türk öğretmenler ve İngilizce anadil konuşucusu öğretmenler tarafından kullanılan söylem belirleyicilerini belirlemek ve bunları çeşitlilik ve frekans açısından karşılaştırmaktır. Söz konusu çalışmanın amaçlarına ulaşabilmek için, iki Türk ve iki İngilizce anadil konuşucusu öğretmenlerin derslerinden toplanan ses kayıtlarından elde edilen çevriyazılara dayanarak iki farklı derlem oluşturulmuştur. Derlem verisinin analizinde metin analizi için dizayn edilen AntConc (2014) adlı özel bir tanıklı dizin programı kullanılmıştır. Derlem yönlendirmeli araştırma sonuçları, sınıf içi söylemlerinde Türk öğretmenlerin 29, İngilizce anadil konuşucusu öğretmenlerin 37 farklı söylem belirleyicisi kullandığını göstermiştir. Ayrıca, Türk öğretmenlerin çoğu söylem belirleyicilerini İngilizce anadil konuşucusu öğretmenlere göre daha az kullandığı görülmüştür. Bu bulguların ışığında, İngiliz dili eğitimi için dikkate değer çıkarımlar önerilmiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Sınıf içi söylem; derlem; söylem belirleyicileri

AUTHOR BIODATA

Havva ZORLUEL ÖZER received her Master's Degree in 2017 from Çukurova University in English Language Teaching. Her research interests include second language writing, literacy education and corpus linguistics.

Zuhal OKAN holds a Ph.D from the University of Kent, Canterbury. She is currently a Professor of English in Çukurova University, English Language Teaching Department. Her research interests include discourse analysis, educational technology and teacher education.