REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

METADISCOURSIVE INTERACTION IN THE MA THESES AND

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS OF THE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH

AND THE TURKISH SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH: THE CASE OF TRANSITION

MARKERS

Zehra KÖROĞLU

PhD DISSERTATION

ADANA / 2017

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

METADISCOURSIVE INTERACTION IN THE MA THESES AND
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS OF THE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH
AND THE TURKISH SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH: THE CASE OF TRANSITION
MARKERS

Zehra KÖROĞLU

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülden TÜM
Member of Examining Committe: Asst. Prof. Dr. Abdurrahman KİLİMCİ
Member of Examining Committe: Prof. Dr. Meral ATICI
Member of Examining Committe: Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN
Member of Examining Committe: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

PhD DISSERTATION

ADANA / 2017

To the Directorship of the Institute of Social Sciences, Çukurova University

We certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülden TÜM

Member of Examining Committee: Asst. Prof. Dr. Abdurrahman KİLİMCİ

Member of Examining Committee: Prof. Dr. Meral ATICI

Member of Examining Committee: Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN

Member of Examining Committee: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

I certify that this dissertation conforms to the formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences. …./…../2016

Prof. Dr. H. Mahir FİSUNOĞLU
Director of the Institute

ETİK BEYANI

Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Yazım Kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu tez çalışmasında;

- Tez içinde sunduğum verileri, bilgileri ve dokümanları akademik ve etik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi,
- Tüm bilgi, belge, değerlendirme ve sonuçları bilimsel etik ve ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu,
- Tez çalışmasında yararlandığım eserlerin tümüne uygun atıfta bulunarak kaynak gösterdiğimi,
- Kullanılan verilerde ve ortaya çıkan sonuçlarda herhangi bir değişiklik yapmadığımı,
- Bu tezde sunduğum çalışmanın özgün olduğunu,

bildirir, aksi bir durumda aleyhime doğabilecek tüm hak kayıplarını kabullendiğimi beyan ederim. 13/07/2017

Zehra KÖROĞLU

ÖZET

ANA DİLİ İNGİLİZCE OLAN VE OLMAYANLARIN YÜKSEK LİSANS VE DOKTORA TEZLERİNDEKİ ÜSTSÖYLEMSEL ETKİLEŞİM: BAĞLAÇLARIN DURUMU

Zehra KÖROĞLU

Bu araştırma, Ana Dili İngilizce Olan ve Olmayanların Yüksek Lisans ve Doktora Tezlerindeki Bağlaçların Kullanımını değerlendirmek amacıyla yapılmıştır. İngiliz Dili Eğitimi alanından, 2010-2014 yılları arasında, her bir gruptan rastgele seçilen ellişer yüksek lisans ve doktora tezinin (toplam 200 tez) giriş, bulgu ve tartışma, ve sonuç bölümlerindeki bağlaçların ve en sık kullanılan türlerinin karşılaştırılması amaçlanmaktadır. Sonuç olarak, bağlaçların incelenmesinin hem akademik metinlerde dilin kullanımının ve ediniminin daha iyi anlaşılmasında hem de kültürlerarası akademik yazımın eğitimi ve öğretiminde faydalı bir kaynak olacağı düşünülmektedir.

Bu araştırmada akademik metinlerdeki bağlaçların önemi betimsel olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Veriler WordSmith 5.0 Metin Analiz Programı kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Bağlaçların ve türlerinin yüzdelikleri, 1,000 kelimedeki frekansları ve kullanımları bakımından anlamlı bir farkın olup olmadığı Log-likelihood değerleri hesaplanarak yorumlanmıştır.

Çalışma bulguları, her bir grubun hem yüksek lisans hem de doktora tezlerinin incelenen bölümlerindeki bağlaçların kullanımının ve en çok tercih edilen bağlaç türündeki yüzdeliklerinin ve 1,000 kelimedeki frekanslarının farklı olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, ana dili İngilizce olmayanların tezlerinin, ana dili İngilizce olanlara göre, incelenen bölümlerindeki bağlaçların ve en çok tercih edilen türdeki bağlaçların az kullanımı veya fazla kullanımı açısından farklılık gösterdiği saptanmıştır. Sonuç olarak, ana dili İngilizce olmayanların hem yüksek lisans hem de doktora tezlerlerinde bağlaç kullanımına çoğunlukla eğilimli oldukları tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Üstsöylemsel etkileşim, derlem, derlem temelli, bağlaçlar, yüksek lisans tezleri, doktora tezleri, ana dili Türkçe olanlar, ana dili İngilizce olanlar

ABSTRACT

METADISCOURSIVE INTERACTION IN THE MA THESES AND DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS OF THE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH AND THE TURKISH SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH: THE CASE OF TRANSITION MARKERS

Zehra KÖROĞLU

Doctor of Philosophy, English Language Teaching
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Gülden TÜM
July 2017, 206 pages

This study has been conducted to evaluate the transition marker (TM) usage in the MA theses and doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English. The purpose is to compare the TM use and the most salient transition types in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections by both groups' randomly selected MA theses and PhD dissertations in the field of ELT between the years 2010 and 2014. Lastly, the study will both allow for a better understanding of language use and acquisition that occurs as a part of the production of the academic texts and will also be a guide for teaching and understanding of cross-cultural academic writing.

In this investigation, the importance of the TMs in the academic texts were evaluated descriptively. The WordSmith Tools 5.0 software was used in order to analyze the data. TMs and their types were analyzed in terms of percentages, frequencies per 1,000 words and they were interpreted by calculating the log-likelihood (LL) value whether there was a significant difference in their usage.

The results indicated that the frequencies, and frequencies per 1,000 words of the TM and the most salient transition type usage in the sections which were investigated of the MA theses and the doctoral dissertations were different. On the other hand, it was established that the overuse and the underuse of the TMs and their most preferred type had differed in the mentioned sections of the MA theses and the PhD dissertations written by the NSs of English from the TSs of English in the field of ELT.

As a result, it was determined that the TSs had a general tendency to use the TMs both in their MA theses and doctoral dissertations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Zehra KÖRĞLU
ADANA / 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

ABBREVIATIONS

ELT   : English Language Teaching

LL   : Log-likelihood

NSs   : Native Speakers

TSs   : Turkish Speakers

TM   : Transition Marker

TMs   : Transition Markers

ESL   : English as a Second Language

DDL   : Data Driven Learning

MA   : Master of Arts

PhD   : Doctoral Dissertation

MATS   : MA Thesis Written by the Turkish Speaker of English

MANS   : MA Thesis Written by the Native Speaker of English

MATS-INT   : Introduction Section of the MA Thesis Written by the Turkish Speaker of English

MANS-INT   : Introduction Section of the MA Thesis Written by the Native Speaker of English

MATS-RD   : Results and Discussion Section of the MA Thesis Written by the Turkish Speaker of English

MANS-RD   : Results and Discussion Section of the MA Thesis Written by the Native Speaker of English

MATS-CON   : Conclusion Section of the MA Thesis Written by the Turkish Speaker of English

MANS-CON   : Conclusion Section of the MA Thesis Written by the Native Speaker of English

PHDTS   : Doctoral Dissertation Written by the Turkish Speaker of English

PHDNS   : Doctoral Dissertation Written by the Native Speaker of English

PHDTS-INT   : Introduction Section of the Doctoral Dissertation Written by the Turkish Speaker of English

PHDNS-INT   : Introduction Section of the Doctoral Dissertation Written by the Native Speaker of English

PHDTS-RD   : Results and Discussion Section of the Doctoral Dissertation Written by the Turkish Speaker of English

PHDNS-RD   : Results and Discussion Section of the Doctoral Dissertation Written by the Native Speaker of English

PHDTS-CON : Conclusion Section of the Doctoral Dissertation Written by the Turkish Speaker of English

PHDNS-CON : Conclusion Section of the Doctoral Dissertation Written by the Native Speaker of English

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

The term corpus, derived from the Latin word for body, was first encountered in the 6th century to refer to a collection of legal texts called Corpus Juris Civilis (Francis, 1992, p. 17). It has preserved this initial meaning, a body of text; nevertheless, this definition is not entirely satisfactory for corpus linguists. According to one of the five definitions provided by the Oxford English Dictionary, a corpus is "the body of written or spoken material upon which a linguistic analysis is based". It results that a corpus is not just a collection of texts; it represents in fact "a collection of texts assumed to be representative of a given language, dialect, or another subset of a language, to be used for linguistic analysis" (Francis, 1982, p. 7; Francis, 1992, p. 17).

There have been arguments on the corpus linguistics whether it is a methodology or an independent branch of linguistics. McEnery and Wilson (1996) claimed that corpus linguistics is not a branch of linguistics in the same sense as syntax, semantics, or sociolinguistics which generally concentrate on describing/explaining some aspects of language. "In contrast, corpus linguistics is a methodology rather than an aspect of language requiring explanation or description" (McEnery & Wilson, 1996, p. 2). Tognini-Bonelli (2001) claimed that corpus linguistics goes well beyond this methodological role so far and it has become an independent discipline. McEnery, Xiao and Tonio (2006) agreed that corpus linguistics is a real domain research and has become a new research enterprise and a philosophical approach of linguistics theory. On the other hand, they maintained the idea that corpus linguistics is indeed a methodology rather than an independent branch in the same sense as phonetics, semantics, syntax, or pragmatics.

Different from these linguistics areas, corpus linguistics was not restricted to an aspect of a particular language, better, it could be employed to almost any areas of linguistics research. For instance, syntax could be examined using a corpus-based or non-corpusbased approaches (McEnery, Xiao & Tonio, 2006). Furthermore, Francis (1992) mentioned three main areas in which corpora have traditionally been used: lexicographical studies in the creation of dictionaries, dialectological studies and the creation of grammars. Leech (1992) stated that the focus of a study corpus linguistics is

on performance rather than competence, and on observation of language in use leading to theory rather than vice versa.

Another important reason was that traditionally, linguists had been strongly influenced by Chomsky's theory that corpora were inadequate whereas intuition was. Chomsky contested the concept of empiricism on which corpus linguistics had been based and offered a rationalist approach instead, supporting a sort of methodology by which 'rather than try and account for language observationally, one should try to account for language introspectively' (McEnery & Wilson, 1996, p. 6). Chomsky condemned corpus-based studies asserting that "Any natural corpus will be skewed…the corpus, if natural, will be so wildly skewed that the description would be no more than a mere list" (Chomsky, 1962, p. 159; Leech, 1991, p. 8). Chomsky, more interested in competence than performance, was against an approach that was foremost based on actual performance data. Nonetheless corpora research continued in spite of early criticisms, and it even strengthened due to technological advances in computer software. Now it is possible to process texts of several million words in length (Sinclair, 1991). Nelson (2000) pointed out that there were several reasons that were spoken in favour of using corpora in linguistics analysis: objectivity vs. intuition, verifiability of results (Svartvik, 1992; Biber, 1996), broadness of language able to be represented (Svartvik, 1992; Biber, 1995; Biber, Conrad & Reppen, 1994), access, broad scope of analysis, pedagogic – face validity, authenticity, motivation (Johns, 1988, Tribble & Jones, 1990), possibility of cumulative results (Biber, 1995), accountability, reliability, view of all language (Sinclair, 2000), just the forms were counted the initial corpora is mostly of written texts (Kennedy, 1992). At the present day of corpus linguistics, some researchers tend to focus on corpus compiling, others on methodology for text analysis and processing, and still others on corpus-based linguistic descriptions and the applications of such descriptions.

A corpus-based approach could bring benefits to learners both in terms of their language awareness and possibly also in their language acquisition (Boulton, 2009, p. 37). An increasing number of corpus-based analyses in language teaching has led language teachers and learners to see empirical descriptions of language use, identify the frequent patterns, and understand the usage of particular forms and words in different registers (Biber & Reppen, 2002). Research results suggested that a corpus-based approach suit more to learners with higher levels of proficiency and bring specific benefits in terms of the generation and reviewing of text (Boulton, 2009).

Researchers stated that transition markers (TMs) is one of the elements used by writers to encode the message in the form of a written text and the reader must use them to interpret the message given by the writer. Using TMs appropriately and correctly in written language is an important component of textual competence. When used adequately, they act as guideposts for the reader to perceive the text from the writer's perspective and to see shifts and changes in thought, comparisons, contrasts and countless other relational concepts (Dublin & Olshtain, 1980; Holloway, 1981; Sloan, 1983). Meyer et. al. (1980) suggested that the use of TMs help organize discourse representation and faster discourse segment processing. As stated by Virtanen (2004), appropriate and correct use of TMs is important because they indicate the kinds of thought processes involved in the text, and they invite the reader to construe particular logico-semantic relations between units of the text. Similarly, Zamel (1983) stated that TMs are very important in writing because they signal the relationship between ideas and affected the meaning that the writer is trying to convey. This helps understanding the thought of the writer clearly and affected the writing quality.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) note that conjunctive cohesive devices are not easily classifiable, they establish relation between meanings rather than grammatical units. They provide a semantic relation on 'how' elements are connected instead of simply marking 'which' elements are connected. Moreover, the spaces of TMs in linguistic units could vary from clauses to paragraphs and even longer discourse (Quirk et al., 1985; Hatch, 1992). Therefore, learners first need to familiarize individual TMs, then the type of units they normally occur, finally the distance they can span between units.

The correct use of TMs is important for two reasons: explicit signaling of connections and rhetorical purpose in terms of indications of attitude and emphases (McCarthy & Carter, 1994). Cook (1989) states that "language learners need to know both how and when to use them. Their presence or absence in discourse often contributes to style, and some conjunctions can sound very pompous when used inappropriately" (Tanko, 2004, p. 154). However, a number of studies have shown that the use of TMs is problematic for foreign language learners. One reason is that TMs are not always used and that they have to be used with discrimination. The other problem is that the use of TMs is sensitive to discourse type which might cause difficulty for learners. And the last issue is that TMs usage may vary across languages and not all languages mark TMs explicitly as in English (Altenberg & Tapper, 1998). Researchers indicate that learners need to increase their knowledge on different registers and learn

how to use TMs (Granger & Tyson, 1996; Tanko, 2004). The ability to write in a correct way is important to produce academic texts in English, and as Myles (2002) said this ability can not be naturally acquired, but it is usually learned through practices in instructional settings.

According to Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999), if no TM is used or if the wrong TM is used, the speaker or writer intention can be misunderstood. They stated that the use of TMs is particularly more important in reading than speaking because there are no paralinguistic cues (e.g., tone of voice) or extralinguistic cues such as gestures to help the reader understand the writer's intention. The reason is that readers may not have any background knowledge about the subject written, or they may fail to activate their schemata even if they have some background knowledge about the subject. Altenberg and Tapper (1998) also added that one more problem for foreign language learners is that the use of TMs tended to vary from one language and culture to another, thus "Languages do not provide identical sets of TMs, and some cultures do not seem to require overt marking of textual relations to the same extent as others" (p. 80).

Kaplan (1966) noted that the writing problems of ESL students are not only a byproduct of their transferring structural patterns from their native language, but are also due to transfer of rhetorical strategies. According to Kaplan, when such rhetorical strategies, brought in from the native culture, do not match audience expectations in the target culture, the ensuing writing fails to logically convey the message to the intended audience, namely, native speakers of the target language. Kaplan claimed that the reason for such failure in communication is that rhetorical structure, as well as the logic (in the popular, rather than the logician's sense of the word) upon which it is based, is culturally bound (1966, p. 2).

The present study attempts to investigate the use of TMs and their types in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections of the MA theses and doctoral dissertations. The aim is to examine the similarities and the differences between the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT. The reason of the selection of the TMs and their types as the linguistic elements to investigate in this study is their importance for the coherence and the cohesion of the academic texts.

1.2. Significance of the Study

English is the world's predominant language of research and the lingua franca of academic discourse and as Vold (2006) notes, novices as well as established researchers must be able to express themselves in English if they want to be fully accepted members of the international academic community. In other words, academic writers had to gain fluency to understand their discipline, to establish their careers, and to successfully navigate their learning and they also need to be aware of the rhetorical conventions used by professionals in the community in order to enter and to join the academic world (Swales, 1990; Hyland, 2006b).

Writing in a second language is thought to be influenced to some extent by the linguistic and cultural conventions of the writer's first language and this may influence how the writer organizes written discourse (discourse structure), the kind of script or scheme the writer uses, as well as such factors as topic, audience and paragraph organization (Knoy, 2000). A key to effective text production was conscious awareness of the rules and conventions of rhetorical functions of the target language (Faghih & Rahimpour, 2009). One aspect of such awareness is metadiscourse awareness. Since metadiscourse is an integral part of academic discourse and of particular importance at advanced levels of academic writing, there seems to be a crucial need for studies that investigate metadiscourse in research articles, particularly in the introduction section of the articles because introductions determine the winsomeness of the articles to a large extent. Therefore; it was commonly assumed that a writers' introduction, results and discussion, conclusion sections were crucial to the success of their texts. Writing these sections effectively could both get the interest of the readers and justify the way the research addresses an important gap in a specific field is of special significance in the highly competitive world of academic publication nowadays.

Transitions as one of the most widely used interactive metadiscourse resources (Burneikaitė, 2009) were used to arrange propositions in the text and involve the readers. According to Hyland (2005), TMs were mainly conjunctions and adverbial phrases which help readers interpret pragmatic connections between steps in an argument by marking additive, contrastive, and causative steps in the discourse. "Addition" adds elements to the argument and consists of items such as *and, furthermore, moreover, in addition,* and etc. "Comparison" marks arguments as twofold: similarity (*e.g., similarly, likewise, equally, correspondingly,* and etc.) or

difference (*e.g., in contrast, however, but, on the contrary, on the other hand,* and etc.). "Consequence relations" tell readers that either a conclusion is being drawn or justified (*e.g., therefore, consequently, in conclusion,* and etc.) or an "argument" is being countered (*e.g., admittedly, nevertheless, anyway, in case, of course,* and etc.).

Since TMs were integral parts of academic discourse and of particular importance at advanced levels of academic writing, there seemed to be a crucial need for studies that investigated TMs in academic texts, particularly in introduction, results and discussion, conclusion sections of the theses because they determined the winsomeness of the theses to a large extent. Therefore, the study will allow for a better understanding of language use and acquisition that occurs as part of the production of the academic texts.

On the other hand; pragmatics, the study of language in use, apparently makes a perfect match with corpus linguistics, which analyzes and describes the language use as realised in texts. It has been acknowledged that there is a strong relationship between TMs and pragmatic competence. Having pragmatic competence in target language has gained impetus according to the requirements of the new era. Native speakers of a language develop both formal and pragmatic tracks simultaneously by means of natural language contact although non-native speakers of a language develop both tracks through formal instruction. In addition, some scholars believe there exists a "significant intercultural variation in the rhetorical preference of writers" (Mauranen, 1993, p. 1). The influence of linguistic background and cultural traditions of non-native writers in English persists even when EFL writers attain a good command of a target language (Kaplan, 1966). TMs, as a subcategory of interactive resources, are considered among the essential elements in written context as they activate academic writing and pragmatic competence of the readers. Thus, the MA theses and the doctoral dissertations were analyzed and compared to find the use of the TMs among their introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections in terms of the frequency of the TMs. This is also a guide for teaching and understanding of cross-cultural academic writing.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

This particular corpus-based study focuses on

1. investigating the transition marker (TM) use of the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT.

2. investigating the transition marker (TM) use of the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) of the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT.

3. identifying the transition types forming the learner corpus in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT (e.g., Additive Transitions, Adversative Transitions, Causal Transitions, Sequential Transitions).

4. identifying the transition types forming the learner corpus in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT (e.g., Additive Transitions, Adversative Transitions, Causal Transitions, Sequential Transitions).

1.4. Research Questions

In this study the following research questions will be evaluated:

1. What are the differences in the use of the transition markers (TMs) of
   a. the introduction section in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?
   b. the results and discussion section in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?
   c. the conclusion section in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?

2. What are the differences in the use of the transition markers (TMs) of
   a. the introduction section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?
   b. the results and discussion section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?

c. the conclusion section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?

3. What are the most salient transition types in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT regarding

    a. the introduction section?

    b. the results and discussion section?

    c. the conclusion section?

4. What are the most salient transition types in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT regarding

    a. the introduction section?

    b. the results and discussion section?

    c. the conclusion section?

1.5. Operational Definitions

Academic English: A variety of English that refers to the language used by the educated and is needed to function at the university level and beyond (Uribe, 2008). The language of school-based learning and extended, reasoned discourse (Gersten et al., 2007).

Concordance: Referred as key word in context (KWIC), a list of all occurrences of a particular search term in a corpus, presented within the context in which they occur (Baker et al., 2006).

Corpus: A collection of naturally-occuring language text, chosen to characterize a state or variety of language (Sinclair, 1991). A principled collection of electronic texts usually stored on a computer and available for qualitative and quantitative analysis (O'Keffee et al, 2007).

Corpus Linguistics (CL): A linguistics methodology which is founded on the use of electronic collections of naturally occurring texts (Granger, 2002).

Dissertation: A disseration is a formal and lengthy discourse or treatise on some subject, especially one based on original research and written in partial fulfillment of requirements for a doctorate (Collins Dictionary, 2017).

Transition Markers (TMs): Transition markers are mainly conjunctions and adverbial phrases which help readers interpret pragmatic connections between steps in an argument by marking additive, contrastive, and causative steps in the discourse (Hyland, 2005).

Thesis: A thesis is a long piece of writing based on your own ideas and research that you do as part of a university degree (Collins Dictionary, 2015).

1.6. Limitations of the Study

The present study was limited to identifying the use of transition markers (TMs) in the MA theses and the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English between the years 2010-2014. Moreover, the study was merely limited to the theses and dissertations written in the field of ELT. Furthermore, the use of TMs were analyzed from only the introduction, the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections of the theses and dissertations mentioned.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Foreign Language Teaching

English is used as either an official language or a foreign language throughout the world. It has been preferred as a primary foreign language and made an imposed subject of study at schools. In the context of education, English is the medium of the world's knowledge (Crystal, 2003, p. 110) and English Language Teaching (ELT) is a major international enterprise.

In accordance with the changing paradigms in education in the 21st century, English has gained particular importance in a variety of components. First of all, in many parts of the world, it has become the medium of instruction in higher education. In other parts of the world, school children are "immersed" in English for educational purposes. With the internationalization of higher education, the need to use English has grown. Moreover, the internationalization of higher education has increased the online communication between learners and teachers. Interactions in the form of distance learning, and e-mail require the use of English. In addition, English has also become the language of academic publications throughout the world. It has been dominant in scientific publications since the 1980s; however, its prominence has increased even more in the last decades (Crystal, 2003, p. 112). Scholars who are expected to be proficient in English, have to write in English in order to get their papers published in an academic journal with an international readership. Similarly, in order to present a paper in an international organization, they have to be fluent in English (Crystal, 2003, p. 112).

With regard to English in educational contexts, the principal arguments put forward by researchers in English as Lingua Franca (ELF), a language that is adopted as a common language between speakers whose native languages are different, as well as others participating in the debate about the global presence of English, represent fundamental challenges to mainstream assumptions about the nature of the English language learning and teaching. As argued in ELF, it cannot be assumed that the purpose of learning English is to communicate with its "genetic" native speakers (Kachru, 1997).

2.2. Writing in a Foreign Language

English is the world's predominant language of research and scholarship. That is, English is the lingua franca of academic discourse and as Vold (2006) notes, novices as well as established researchers must be able to express themselves in English if they want to be fully accepted members of the international academic community. In other words, academic writers need to be aware of the rhetorical conventions used by professionals in the community in order to enter and to join the academic world (Swales, 1990). Academics, thus, have to gain fluency in the rhetorical conventions of the English language discourse to become or remain a member of the international academic community, to understand their discipline, to establish their careers, and to successfully navigate their learning (Hyland, 2006a).

The processing demands of writing in a foreign language lead to more enumeration and less argument across a wide range of cultural backgrounds. Differences in linker profiles are indices of different discourses, and this is consonant with the different profiles of disciplines. However, in a research it was found that writers of different cultural backgrounds but similar language proficiency and hence facing similar processing demands marked enumeration to different extents. So the difference might also be due to different cultural styles (Biber et al., 1999).

Furthermore; many writing types exist which have their own purpose. Some of the most common writing types are persuasive, descriptive, narrative, and expository writing. Persuasive writing convinces the reader of a belief or an opinion related to the topic. Descriptive writing provides the reader with a picture of a topic in order to make the reader visualize the information. Narrative writing describes an experience, event, or sequent of events in the form of a story. Expository writing provides factual information to explain or define the topic. Creative writing is a form of artistic expression which draws on the imagination to convey meaning through the use of imagery, narrative, and drama. In addition; argumentative, expressive, and comparison and contrast writings are some of the subcategories of the writing types. Argumentative writing is a form of persuasive writing that starts with a position opposed to the reader's position, and attempts to convince the reader of the truth of this position. Expressive writing is a form of creative writing that shares thoughts, ideas, and feeling on a topic. Comparison and contrast writing is a form of expository writing that shows the similarities and differences between two subjects. On the other hand; corpora can be considered as a

type of foreign language writing aid (Wakeman & Henderson, 2012). It allows learners to aquire the manner of sentence formation in the target language and enables effective writing (Yoon & Hirvela, 2004).

2.3. Corpus

The term "corpus" is the Latin for "body". Thus, it can be said that a corpus is any body of a text. In the language sciences, a corpus is a body of written or transcribed speech which can serve a basis for linguistics analysis and description (Kennedy, 1998). Sinclair (1994) defined "corpus" as "a collection of pieces of language that are selected and ordered according to explicit linguistic criteria in order to be used as a sample of language" (p. 2). In an earlier publication he had explained "corpus" as "a collection of naturally-occuring language text, chosen to characterize a state or variety of language" (Sinclair, 1991, p. 171). Charteris (2004) emphasized a corpus as "…any large collection of texts that arise from a natural language use; in a linguistic context, it is in contrast to other types of text that were invented specifically for illustrating a point about language" (p. 30). Hunston (2002) defined the term 'language corpus' as written, or spoken linguistic data collections, which are organized, or compiled with an aim to describe a specific pattern of a language, or present some varieties of a language. A corpus could also be expressed as a finite-sized body of machine-readable text representative of the language variety under examination.

A corpus consists of the natural and authentic language and natural texts which are scrupulously collected and organized (Biber, Conrad & Reppen, 1998). Tognini-Bonelli (2001) emphasized that the texts in a corpus are collected according to some explicit design criteria for a specific purpose from various resources, such as; newspapers, magazines, broadcasts and books. Therefore, a corpus may be domain-specific or general (Charteris, 2004). It was generally expected that a corpus constituted a standard reference for the language variety which it represented, which presupposed its wide availability to other researchers (McEnery & Wilson, 2001). Hunston (2002) claimed that corpora reflects natural language and are free of intuition, therefore; their findings can be applied in real life situations. Corpus is a dominant and a frequently used method to study linguistic variation. Corpora does not tell what to teach, but they can help make better decisions, and clarify reasons for teaching specific features (Gavioli & Aston, 2001). Corpus size is an important factor to consider for teachers and researchers. The

corpus does not serve to test a linguistic model but to create a linguistic model. As a result, if the corpus size is small it provides a small window on the language phenomenon and hence, the results will only provide a partial picture of its 'true' complexity. However, a large corpus will provide a full view of the phenomenon and thus will always be superior to a smaller corpus (Anthony, 2013).

2.4. History of Corpus

One of the first samples of corpus dates back to 1350s with Amarna letters. They form diplomatic archive of correspondance between the Egyptian administration, and its representatives written in Akkadian (Vikipedia, 2015). Biber et al. (1998) report that Johnson used a corpus of texts to create authentic examples of use for his dictionary in 1755, and a corpus was also used in the late 1800s in the construction of the first edition of the Oxford English Dictionary. McEnery and Wilson (2001, p. 3) described studies on child language in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that also used primitive corpora as a source of data.

Since then, various forms of corpus have been established in order to accumulate relevant data to certain subjects in numerous fields, whereas the seeds of corpus in the linguistic studies were sown in 1960 by Randloph Quirk and his colleagues with their project called "the Survey of English Usage", comprising one million words being used in everyday life. Later on, Henry Kucera and Nelson Francis arranged their works "Brown Corpus" in 1964 and "Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English" in 1967, which are known as the milestones of corpus linguistics (Baker, Hardie & McEnery, 2006, p. 50).

Bonelli (2012), in the *Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*, cited a previous work which classified the history of corpus linguistics into three "generations": from 1960 to 1980, there was no electronic material and corpora could contain up to a million words; from 1980 to 2000, the development of the scanner allowed researchers to build corpora of up to twenty million words; and 2000 to the present, in which advances in technology have allowed for virtually unlimited amounts of corpus data to be available. In short, the widespread improvements in technology have allowed corpus linguistics to literally explode as a field, and in turn, researchers are now able to observe patterns of language use within vast amounts of data that have not been observed before (Bonelli & Sinclair, 2006).

Corpora have innovated the study of language over the last decade (Chapelle, 2001, p. 21; Hunston, 2002). The innovation that began in the 1960s could be attributed to two main factors. As a first factor, the "early" corpora, while being constructed from a naturally occurring language, was not designed to be representative of the language. The early "modern" corpora, the Brown Corpus, on the other hand was created according to an explicit design with the aim of being representative of a particular language variety (Chapelle, 2001, p. 21; Hunston, 2002). The second factor for the corpus innovation was related to the way corpora were stored and analysed. Early corpora were paper-based. Sinclair (2006) described how Jesperson used to scribble on sheets of paper and post them in little drawers and pigeonholes in his desk when carrying out his studies on grammar. The modern corpus, in contrast, was almost electronic. The huge advances in computer technology over the last 50 years have allowed to store far more data than could have been conceived in the 1900s. It could be conjectured that the 500-million word Bank of English probably contained more electronic texts than all the electronic texts in the world in the 1960s (Jarvinen, 1994; Baker et al., 2006, p. 18). Biber et al. (1999) claimed that "the use of computer-based corpora provides a solid empirical foundation for general purpose language tools and descriptions, and enables analyses of a scope not otherwise possible" and that "corpus-based analyses of linguistic variation have provided fresh insights into previously intractable issues" (p. 257).

2.5. Corpus Linguistics

The term 'corpus linguistics' is the study of a language which presents 'real life' language use examples as well as using them to study that language (McEnery & Wilson, 1996). Farr's (2008) definition of corpus linguistics is broader as compared to McEnery and Wilson (1996). According to Farr (2008), it is an approach and has been used in many disciplines: e.g. dialectology, lexicography, sociolinguistics, language materials development, language therapies, speech technology, forensic linguistics, literary studies, language change and evolution, and grammar research. Granger (2002) defines it as a linguistic methodology founded on the use of electronic collections of corpora. According to Granger (2002), corpus linguistics is neither a new branch of linguistics nor a new language theory; it is a powerful methodology. Gries (2009) indicated that "Corpus linguistics is one of the fastest-growing methodologies in

contemporary linguistics" (p. 32). Corpus linguistics has been perceived as a sub-field of linguistics like the other areas of linguistic studies in sociolinguistics, pragmatics, semantics, and syntax. Moreover, it has also been applied as a methodology on research in applied linguistics and utilized as a reference tool for grammar books, dictionaries, and course books (Akbana, 2011). Corpora can also connect the cognitive science of linguistics and many other areas including sociolinguistics, teaching, grammar, and translation (O'Keeffe et al., 2007).

In terms of research on language, corpus linguistics is a source of evidence for improving descriptions of the structure and the use of languages, and for various applications, including natural language processing by machine or how to learn or teach a language. Corpus linguistics primarily is concerned with the description and of the nature, structure and use of language and with particular interests such as language acquisition, variation, and change. Nevertheless, corpus linguistics has developed a tendency within linguistics sometimes focusing on the lexis and lexical grammar rather than pure linguistics (Kennedy, 1998). Corpus linguistics deals with the principles and practice of using corpora in language study. The aim of corpus linguistics is to analyze and describe the language use as realised in texts. The influential work in the field of corpus linguistics was the "Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English" by Henry Kucera and Nelson Francis on the basis of the Brown Corpus in 1967 (Koteyko, 2006). McEnery and Wilson (2001), in their introductory work on corpus linguistics, note that the basic corpus methodology was widespread in linguistics in the early twentieth century. At the present day of corpus linguistics, some researchers tend to focus on corpus compiling, others on methodology for text analysis and processing, and still others on corpus-based linguistic descriptions and the applications of such descriptions (Biber et al., 1998).

2.5.1 Corpus Linguistics as Theory

A series of criticisms has been made of the corpus-based approach to linguistics. Chomsky (1966), for example, suggested that the corpus could never be a beneficial tool for a linguist because a linguist should model language competence rather than performance. He also claimed that corpus data could not distinguish wrong sentences from sentences which had not occurred yet, but intuition could distinguish which sentences were grammatically incorrect. Chomsky tried to emphasize that a corpus was

a collection of natural utterances which were externalized, so a corpus would be a poor guide to model linguistic competence (McEnery & Wilson, 1996). Chomsky (1966) also suggested that because language was infinite, a corpus, which was always finite, could not be representative of an infinite language.

The debate Chomsky created in linguistics was actually related to the distinction between empirical and rationalist theories, which left the decision to linguists whether to choose to look at natural data, or to look at artificial data in their study of language (McEnery & Wilson, 1996). A rationalist theory is basically a theory in which linguists make conscious judgments about artificial data in drawing conclusions about linguistics whereas an empiricist theory of language relies on natural data by mainly using a corpus (McEnery & Wilson, 1996). According to McEnery and Wilson (1996), Chomsky suggested that linguistics should be more rationalist and less empiricist. Another linguist who argued against the corpus-based approach to linguistics was Hockett (1948, as cited in McEnery & Wilson, 1996). Hockett (1948) claimed that a linguist working in the structuralist tradition should aim to explicate all utterances which were included in his corpus as well as explicating all utterances which were not included in his corpus, and non-corpus-based utterances should test corpus-based grammars to demonstrate their predictive power.

On the other hand, McEnery, Xiao and Tonio (2006) agreed that corpus linguistics was a real domain research and had become a new research enterprise and a philosophical approach of linguistics theory. Tognini-Bonelli (2001) also claimed that corpus linguistics had become an independent discipline. In addition; he expressed that "corpus linguistics has (…) a theoretical status" (p. 65). To characterise the relationship between corpus work and linguistic theories, the terms "corpus-based" and "corpus-driven" had come to be used for two extreme positions. In the corpus-based approach, the corpus "is used mainly to expound on, or exemplify, existing theories" (Tognini-Bonelli, 1994, p. 1, cited in Pearson, 1998). The corpus remains primarily a repository "used to validate existing categories or different applications, to test a tagger or a parser" (Tognini-Bonelli, 1994, p. 1, cited in Pearson, 1998). At one end it was found by Tognini-Bonelli (2001) that corpus-based linguists who

"adopt a 'confident' stand with respect to the relationship between theory and data in that they bring with them models of language and description which they believe to be

fundamentally adequate, they perceive and analyse the corpus through these categories and sieve the data accordingly" (p. 66).

By this way corpus data could lead to modifications or adjustments of a theory and/or is used as quatitative evidence. The corpus-driven approach is being increasingly adopted by researchers as a basis for refining linguistic theories. Within a corpus-driven approach the theoretical statements reflected the evidence that the corpus provides, and the methodological path could be described as "observation leads to hypothesis leads to generalisation leads to unification in theoretical statement" (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001, p. 85).

2.5.2. Corpus Linguistics as Methodology

The "corpus as method" approach (Hardie et al., 2010, p. 386) initially emerged at University College London and spread to Lancaster University as well as the universities of Oslo and Bergen. Scholars working within this tradition include Biber (2009), Biber et al. (1998), Leech (2011), McEnery (2009), McEnery et al. (2006), Quirk (1960), Quirk et al. (1985), Rissanen (2012), Hoffmann (2005) and Svartvik (1996). The main distinctive feature of this corpus-based approach in comparison to the corpus-driven approach is the conviction that the researcher is enable to "completely remove all pre-existing ideas about language before observing corpora" (Anthony, 2013, p. 142).

Corpus linguistics is based on statistical methods as well as on linguistic theories and, as with linguistics generally, on methodological principles of rigour, transparency and replicability (Fischer-Starke, 2009, p. 494). Despite the differences between the corpus-based and corpus-driven approach, they both share the same underlying characteristics as summarised by Biber et al. (1998) in that the analysis is emprical, based on corpora and computer software is used to make "qualitative, functional, and interpretations of quantitative patterns" (p. 4).

Since the 1950s, when corpus linguistics started to develop, it has been amazing to see the debates it has created among linguists. Some researchers, such as Kennedy (1998), Meyer (2002), Scott and Tribble (2006) said that corpus linguistics was a methodology; while others, such as Tognini-Bonelli (2001) and Mahlberg (2005) argued that it was closer to a new branch of applied linguistics. McEnery and Wilson (1996, p. 2), for example, stated that 'corpus linguistics is not a branch of linguistics in

the same sense as syntax, semantics, sociolinguistics and so on', and they claimed that corpus linguistics was a methodology that could be used in every area of linguistics.

On the other hand, McEnery, Xiao and Tonio (2006) perpetuated the idea that corpus linguistics was a methodology rather than an independent branch as phonetics, semantics, syntax, or pragmatics. Corpus linguistics was not restricted to an aspect of a particular language, it could be employed to almost any areas of linguistics research. For instance, syntax could be examined using corpus-based or non-corpusbased approaches (McEnery, Xiao & Tonio, 2006). Leech (1992, p. 106) described corpus linguistics as a methodology rather than a domain of study, but acknowledged that corpus linguistics was a "new research enterprise", and the computer "an 'open sesame' to a new way of thinking about language." Similarly, Partington (1998) presented corpus analysis not only as a "new technological device", but also as a "new philosophy for language description" (p. 1).

2.6. Corpus Analysis and Corpus-Based Research in Language Learning and Teaching

Corpus research in general has been growing since the 1960's and providing new insights into many areas of language structure and use, offering opportunities to examine the actual language use in a large scope of naturally occurring texts and to expand the scope of earlier investigations (Granger, 1998). Virtanen (1998) had pointed out that corpus analyses were useful for pilot studies. She also noted that corpus analysis methods could be used in combination with other methods of analyses for a more complete understanding and a more complex interpretation of the data. Biber, Conrad and Reppen (1998) stated that the characteristics of corpus-based research "result in a scope and reliability of analysis not otherwise possible" (p. 4). Biber et al. (1998) characterized four essential properties of corpus-based analysis:

1. It is empirical, analyzing the actual patterns of use in natural texts;
2. It utilizes a large and principled collection of natural texts, known as a 'corpus', as the basis for analysis;
3. It makes extensive use of computers for analysis, using both automatic and interactive techniques;
4. It depends on both quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques. It was claimed that a qualitative analysis could provide richness and prediction whereas

a quantitative analysis could provide statistically reliable and generalizable results (McEnery & Wilson, 1996).

In *How to Use Corpora in Language Teaching* (Granger, Hung & Petch-Tyson, 2002), Tsui (2004) outlined some of the prominent studies done in corpus linguistics which have explored the following four areas: lexical collocation, syntactic patterning, genre analysis, and discourse structure. These studies included analyses conducted with corpora such as the Brown Corpus (Kjellmer, 1994) and Carter and McCarthy's Spoken English Corpus (Carter & McCarthy, 1997).

A number of procedures were used to search a corpus, to recover information, or to organize, categorize or display the facts on languages were under investigation. The most basic format used in displaying information about linguistic elements in a corpus was obtained by the agency of listing and counting (Kennedy, 1998). The lists were generated and processed by software and analyzed in different kinds ranging from simple wordlists to more sophisticated analyses such as classic concordance formats. Hunston (2002) stated that "a corpus does not contain new information about language, but the software offers us a new perspective on the familiar" (cited in Evison, 2010, p. 122) and in order to gain this new perspective, the first analytical steps involved two related processes: the production of frequency lists and the generation of concordances. There was an increasing tendency towards using a software available to carry out such processes, from established commercial software such as WordSmith Tools (Scott 1999), Monoconc-Pro (Barlow, 2000) and Word Sketch Engine (Kilgarriff et al. 2004). By the use of these software, frequency lists and concordance were built on the very basic foundation in which electronic texts collections could be searched easily and rapidly.

Studies with more data and more variables were conducted and new kinds of classroom activities that actively engaged learners in the analysis of language were designed with the corpus approach. The contribution of corpus linguistics to foreign language teaching was related to the importance that it provided an empirical study of large databases of language (Conrad, 2005). Chambers (2010) claimed that the advances in the direct access to corpora by language teachers and learners have created the need to research pedagogic issues, including 'the types of corpora to be consulted, large or small, general or domain-specific, tagged or untagged'; the kinds of learning strategies to benefit from direct corpus consultation; and the means by which direct access to

corpora can be integrated into the language learning context (2010, cited in Cheng, 2010, p. 319).

Granger (2002) explained that learner corpus research had only been active since the 1980's. Before the field started to grow in popularity, corpus linguistics and second language research were not strongly connected at all. However, research in the field of corpus linguistics had proven that techniques used within corpus linguistics could be powerful tools for analysis (Granger, 2002).

2.7. Corpus Tools and Technology in Language Learning and Teaching

Many of the advantages of the corpus-based research are due to the use of computers. With the advancement of computer technology, specially designed computer programs were available to aid the traditional manual process of text analysis. Tools like collocation extractors and concordancers could contribute to the research process by helping to locate, search, and compute the frequency of particular patterns (Hsieh & Liou, 2008). Many concordance programs allow users to search on multiword phrases, words containing wildcards, tags or combinations of words and tags. Concordances can usually be sorted alphabetically (Baker, Hardie & McEnery, 2006) and provide richer sources of co-textual information than dictionaries. A selected word and portions of sentences including that word, called the Key-Word-In Context (KWIC), can be found via a concordancer. A concordance of a search can present many concordance lines for language learners to read and analyze (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004). As a powerful tool for corpus research, access software allows for establishing the frequency of words in specific or general corpora, for example; The Bank of English, and the regular linguistics patterns of words and their collocations as they appear within a large number of stretches of language, such as; concordance lines or citations, as well as finding the key words of a particular corpus (Deignan, 1999). Large database of natural language could be stored and analyzed to examine complex patterns of language use by computers. Moreover, the analysis with computers was more consistent and reliable (Hsieh & Liou, 2008).

According to Hunston (2002), the study of corpora through electronic software had "revolutionised the study of language and of the applications of language, over the past few decades" (p. 1). This 'revolution' could be explained by the fact that corpus access software enabled the analyst not only to identify and count categories, but also to "observe categories and phenomena that have not been noticed before" (Hunston,

2002). Many researchers and teachers have made concrete suggestions on how concordances and corpus-derived exercises could be used in the language teaching classroom, thus significantly "enriching the learning environment" (Aston 1997, cited in Römer, 2008, p. 112).

Especially since digital computers and corpus linguistics were introduced, new trends had started to occur in the field of EFL/ESL with an aim to help language teachers and learners understand real language descriptions and benefit from those descriptions in language learning and teaching. One of those trends, concordancing, has taken its place in language teaching as a new method. This method helps language learners study corpora with a computer program, such as a concordancer (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004). This format also enables the users to recognize the lexical or grammatical items that collocate with the key word. EFL learners and teachers could benefit from this information on lexical or grammatical patterns of real language (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004). The best documented work in the language teaching was that of Sinclaire and his colleagues at the University of Birmingham, under the auspices of the "Collins Cobuild English Project" (Sinclair, 1991). This Project employed a corpus running into several million words and its application had been in the area of dictionaries (Sinclair, 1987), grammars (Collins/University of Birmingham, 1990) and main course ELT syllabuses (Sinclair & Renouf, 1988; Willis & Willis, 1988). In parallel to this "Cobuild" work, concordancing techniques had also been applied in the classroom, both for materials production (Johns, 1988; Tribble, 1990) and for use as a learning tool by students themselves (Tribble, 1990; Stevens, 1991).

The other trend, DDL (Data Driven Learning), had also taken its place in language teaching. The idea of DDL was actually first proposed by Johns (1991) with an aim to implement concordancing materials in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). It is an approach which differs from traditional learning approaches in that it requires students to observe a particular phenomenon of a language presented by concordance lines and hypothesize how this phenomenon of a language works, and then understand whether the hypothesis is correct (Payne, 2008). Thus, a language learner who uses this approach is a researcher who has access to authentic linguistic data (Koosha & Jafarpour, 2006). Learners are not seen simply as gainers of knowledge, but as researchers studying the regular patterns of the language, and teachers should encourage learners to search without knowing what patterns they will discover (Hadley, 2002). DDL is a pedagogic continuity from a product approach, which presents the specific

aspects of language to the learners by exposing them to contexts, to a process approach in which DDL stimulates creativity and self-discovery learning among learners (Batstone, 1995). Moreover, corpora are widely acknowledged to be a valuable resource not only in linguistic research but also in the teaching and learning of languages. Applications based on corpus investigation are found in a number of different areas, namely; lexicography, translation, stylistics, grammar, gender studies, forensic linguistics, computational linguistics, and equally importantly, in language learning and teaching (Tognini-Bonelli 2001).

2.8. Applications of Corpora in Language Learning and Teaching

The contribution of corpora to the language learning environment had not developed for the last 50 years until the 1980s because researchers did not emphasize that corpora could have a beneficial influence on foreign or second language teaching and learning (Chambers, 2007). The use of corpora had also inspired debates among linguists since it was introduced into the field of foreign/second language teaching. After the article titled 'Spoken grammar: What is it and how can we teach it?' by McCarthy and Carter (1995) had been published, controversy among linguists about whether to apply corpora to language teaching or not took another form. They argued that examples of informal spoken English were more appropriate for designing classroom materials than the spoken English encountered in textbooks. In opposition to what they suggested, Prodromou (1996) expressed some concerns about the instant transferability of research conducted in the context of corpora to language classes without being sure whether or not they really met language learners' and language teachers' needs and expectations. He also emphasized that collaboration between researchers and teachers/materials developers was initially crucial before moving from the laboratory to the classroom. The controversy in the context of using corpora in language teaching later continued with Carter (1998) and Cook (1998). Carter (1998) stated that corpus linguistics was not a revolution, but the evolution of language teaching, and there should be more corpus description, particularly in international contexts. According to him, language description was not language teaching, but language teaching could benefit from better language descriptions. However, Cook (1998) argued that a corpus was a record of language behaviors and these patterns of behaviors could not lead us to see how language was organized in the mind, and how it

should be organized for language teaching. He also claimed that it was not well known whose language was recorded, and why such recording should be a model for language learners and teachers.

In the early 1990s, there had been an increasing interest in applying the corpus-based research to language pedagogy-teaching and learning of languages, after Johns (1986, 1991) suggested that the use of corpora in language learning could have numerous positive effects on EFL/ESL students' and teachers' way of describing a language (Hunston, 2002). Widdowson (1991) took issue with both the usefulness of corpora and the effectiveness of descriptions of corpora on language pedagogy. He also claimed that corpora in language teaching could provide language learners, teachers and researchers with important information about how language should be used. He suggested that they should regard language descriptions arising from corpora as factors to be considered rather than facts to be uncritically incorporated into language teaching. According to him, language teaching should be informed by the descriptions that were emerging from corpus linguistics, rather than determined by it (Widdowson, 1991). There were three ways for teachers to integrate corpus into their teaching. Firstly, they gathered data from corpus searches, prepared materials and had students work with these materials. Also, they could use online available corpora while teaching a specific language pattern. Moreover, teachers could create specialized corpora from authentic texts or student papers and had students analyze the data (Reppen, 2011). The use of corpora in language teaching has altered teacher and learner roles by reinforcing learner-centered methodologies, and changing the conception of teachers as sources of knowledge towards teachers as guides and facilitators, or even co-researchers. The benefit of such student-centered discovery learning was giving the students to access to the facts of authentic language use, and challenging them to make generalizations and observe patterns of language behavior (Gabrielatos, 2005). According to the literature, a large number of works which covered the issues related to corpora in language pedagogy had been produced (Mindt, 1997; Wichmann et al., 1997; Leech, 1997; Ketteman & Marko, 2002; Aston, 2001; Hunston, 2002; Granger et al., 2002; Sinclair, 2004; Aston et al., 2004; Nesselhauf, 2005; Scott & Tribble, 2006). In addition, at present there is numerous corpus-based reference works, such as dictionaries and grammars, available to learners and teachers.

There are two ways in which corpora can influence language teaching. The indirect applications center upon the researchers who are the provider of corpora for

language teachers, materials designers, and course developers, all of which use the evidence derived from corpora while designing courses for language classes or developing teaching materials for the field (Hunston, 2002). On the other hand, the direct applications center upon language learners and teachers who search and use corpora themselves in order to discover the specific patterns of language or the behavior of words (Bernardini, 2002). The next section focuses on the indirect applications of corpora in language teaching.

2.8.1. Indirect Applications of Corpora in Language Teaching

Even if most language teachers and learners have not heard of a corpus, they have been using the products of many corpus-based studies (McEnery, Xiao & Tono, 2006). Taking the needs of language teachers and learners into consideration, the COBUILD dictionaries, grammars, usage guides, and concordance samplers (Capel, 1993; Carpenter, 1993; Goodale, 1995; Sinclair et al., 1990; Sinclair et al., 1992; Sinclair et al., 2001) also present a variety of reliable information about the real use of English when compared to more traditional reference works and teaching materials. Even though most language teachers are unaware of what a corpus is and how a corpus can raise their awareness to provide meaningful input to language learners, a corpus can have some crucial effects on the design of dictionaries, textbooks, course books, and grammar books, all of which are used in language classes. Römer (2005) underlines that, teaching materials, and even course design can be affected by the results of a corpus-based investigation, and language teachers can make new decisions while introducing structures and new items to language learners.

According to Sinclair (2004), previous pedagogical descriptions which had not emerged from a corpus-based investigation could be evaluated in the light of 'new evidence', which is provided by corpus-based investigation (p. 271). In addition, in CLT (Communicative Language Teaching), the use of corpora could be a valuable source when language teaching syllabi are being designed. Those items could be introduced to the learners in order to help them come face to face with real communicative situations (Hymes, 1992). In addition, many corpus studies had indirectly affected communicative language teaching syllabi by presenting the most common items in actual language use. They also indirectly affected them comparing these most common patterns found in the corpus with the same items in traditional

teaching materials, for instance; course books, textbooks, and grammar books (Biber & Reppen, 2002; Knoch, 2004). Knoch (2004) conducted a study to determine which comparative constructions in English were most commonly used by native speakers, by collecting data from the British National Corpus, and whether most comparisons were followed by an explicit basis of comparison. The study compared the data from this corpus with textbooks, and the results showed that most textbooks did not present the full range of structures used by native speakers to compare or contrast. Biber and Reppen (2002) conducted a study which contrasted the presentation of information in six ESL grammar textbooks with empirical frequency findings based on corpus research done for the Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. They defined three case studies, each reflecting one of three major issues: grammatical features to include or exclude; the order of the grammatical topics; and specific words to include when illustrating a grammatical feature. The priorities of six ESL textbooks were compared to the frequency findings of the three case studies. In terms of including or excluding grammatical features, corpus-based analysis showed that the adjective role of nouns (e.g., glass window, patrol car) was less commonly acknowledged in textbooks than in the corpus, and textbooks seemed to include adjectives and participial adjectives for noun modification, considering nouns as less important in their adjective roles. In terms of the order of grammatical topics, they found that textbooks considered progressives as more important than they actually were in the corpus. In terms of including specific words to illustrate a particular grammar feature, they found that there was little consistency across textbooks guiding the selection of illustrative vocabulary, and most common lexical verbs (e.g., try, put, use, leave) were neglected by all textbooks. This study's results suggested that corpus-based analysis might inform language teachers and course book writers in the development of materials and in the choices that teachers make in language classrooms (Biber & Reppen, 2002). In the next section, direct applications of corpora in language teaching will be discussed in detail with an aim to understand how corpora have been directly integrated into language classes.

2.8.2. Direct Applications of Corpora in Writing Instruction

While indirect uses such as syllabus design and materials development were closely associated with what to teach, corpora had also provided valuable insights into how to teach. Leech's (1997) three focuses, direct uses of corpora included 'teaching

about', 'teaching to exploit', and 'exploiting to teach', with the latter two relating to how to use. Direct uses have been confined largely to learning at more advanced levels, for example, in tertiary education, whereas in general English language teaching, especially in secondary education, the direct use of corpora is 'still conspicuously absent' (Kaltenböck & Mehlmauer-Larcher, 2005).

There has been increasing interest in the use of corpora to improve language learners' writing skills, and researchers have begun to investigate how learners use corpora in L2 writing and error correction. Few studies have been conducted within the area of investigating L2 writers' attitudes toward corpus use in L2 writing (Yoon & Hirvela, 2004), and how corpus consultation may help learners correct their writing errors (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004; O'Sullivan & Chambers, 2006).

The study that involved corpus consultation in L2 writing was conducted by O'Sullivan and Chambers (2006). The study presented the second phase of a research project at the University of Limerick involving native speakers of English at both the masters and undergraduate levels who were given the opportunity to engage in corpus consultation in order to improve their writing skills in French. For the researchers, the study was motivated by the need to investigate the potential of corpora in the promotion of L2 writing skills in general and the role of concordance data as a means of assisting error correction (O'Sullivan & Chambers, 2006). To obtain results of the study, the researchers compared the essays that had been produced using traditional resources, such as dictionaries and grammar resources, with those corrected with the aid of a corpus. The researchers also analyzed the feedback and evaluation forms completed by the students in order to gain information on the types of errors corrected by the students. From the changes which resulted from consulting the corpus, the researchers established a system of classification of errors based on previous taxonomies (Corder, 1974; Ferris, 2002; James, 1998; Richards, 1994). This differs from the results of Yoon and Hirvela (2004) where students reported that they did not benefit from corpus use for grammatical errors. O'Sullivan and Chambers (2006) interpreted that namely prepositions and word choice appeared to be one of the most common sources of errors within the two categories due to native language interference between English and French.

In comparison to corpus use studies that have been conducted primarily with students, the study by Chon (2009) examined how online corpus consultation affected the writing performance of in-service teachers who could be considered advanced

learners of English. As a whole, the writing products indicated that the use of corpus consultation in writing did not automatically resolve all the language learners' problems, and this was due to various reasons involving training, different notions on learning grammar, and the lack of knowledge on consultation skills. The results implied that teacher-trainees would need to have their errors pointed out to them particularly in the initial stage of training so as to facilitate learners to use concordancers and find target lexico-grammar patterns that are used by native speakers (Chon, 2009). For the lexico-grammatical problems that occurred, it was observed that the value of the concordancer lied in the fact that it could make correct forms of the language; such as prepositions, more salient to the learner, and therefore potentially led to greater learning benefits. For word choice problems, the concordancer helped the learners, particularly compared to the dictionary, observe how the words should be used in the correct context, while providing learners with examples of words in multiple contexts as demonstrated by O'Sullivan and Chambers (2006). It should also be noted that it was through production, as writing, that learners had the opportunity to explore new forms and match them to communicants' expectations so that an error on a page was an important opportunity for learning (Swain, 1985, 1995). The study illustrated the importance of training in corpus consultation skills was not an automatic skill that learners could bring (Chon, 2009).

Many previous studies have attempted to determine the effectiveness of corpus-based activities, DDL, and concordances in EFL/ESL learners' performance in writing, with an emphasis on the use of concordancers. Gilmore (2009), for example, conducted a study in which intermediate proficiency level Japanese university students were required to use the British National Corpus and the COBUILD Concordance and Collocations Sampler in revising their writings. The study aimed to find out whether these tools could be effective tools for language learners to write second drafts of their writings. The results of the study revealed that 61% of the students' revised writings included more natural language (Gilmore, 2009).

Cortes (2004) analyzed a particular type of frequent word combination; such as lexical bundles, with the help of computer programs. Hyland and Tse (2005) examined the frequencies, forms, and functions of evaluative "that" in published research articles, master's theses, doctoral dissertations written by L2 students across six disciplines. They used concordance programs and qualitative analysis software for the analysis of the texts.

Another study which investigated the possible effects of using concordancers on language learners' revision of their writings was that of Gaskell and Cobb (2004). The researchers conducted a study to determine whether intermediate level Chinese students would be able to use concordancers to correct their writing errors. The researchers also aimed to find out whether learners would be able to use concordancers independently after the training. The results of the study showed that an accurate correction was found in the majority of the revised writings. The study also revealed that learners improved their writing by making use of concordancing to correct their errors (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004). Concordancers could also be applied in other fields of study to explore language; namely transition markers (TMs) which are the most widely used interactive metadiscourse resources (Burneikaitė, 2009).

2.9. Transition Markers

Transition markers (TMs) are referred as conjunctions (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), logical connectors (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1983), cohesive devices (Schiffrin, 1987) or discourse markers (Fraser, 1999). They are defined as "words or phrases whose function is to show some logical relationship between two or more basic sentences or between a basic sentence and a noun phrase" (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1983). Cohen (1984) mentions two different functions of TMs in that transitions enable the reader to recognize coherence relations faster and allows the reader to recognize coherence relations which could not be inferred in the absence of a TM. According to Hutchinson (2005), the use of a TM by the writer is optional in some cases whereas in others it is obligatory. Researchers (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Schiffrin, 1987; Moser & Moore, 1995; Kehler, 2002) emphasize that a TM might indicate more than one relation. They point out that since the correspondence between TMs and relations is not one-to-one, the writer has to decide which TM to use to signal a given coherence relation (Knott, 1996, p. 177). Knott (1996) asserts that "if people really do use coherence relations when processing texts, then it is likely that languages will develop ways of signaling these relations explicitly".

A TM is a cohesive device, partly based on lexico-grammatical devices but mostly based on grammar. It differs from substitution, ellipsis and reference, because its nature does not come from basic anaphoric relations. Conjunctive elements obtain their cohesive relations indirectly because they do not specify precise components. Their

cohesive nature derives from the meaning relations and supposition relations between the conjoined clauses. While it is quite easy to show or identify elliptical, substituted and referred elements contributing to text cohesion, clauses linked with a TM are not connected to each other sequentially and therefore, it is not easy to precisely select just two or more words or ties (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 227).

When writing, every paragraph should be clear and concise. Ideas should be sequenced and arranged both meaningfully and structurally. A writing paper should include not only the coherent features but also the cohesive ones. The study of TMs has received considerable attention in linguistics. They have been studied under various labels such as linkers, coordinators, discourse markers, pragmatic markers, discourse connectors, and many others. TMs play an important role in discourse as they are used as coordination to conjoin "different grammatical units: clauses, clause elements, words" (Leech & Svartvik, 1994, p. 264). They are cues that help the reader to interpret ideas in the way that the writer wants them to understand. TMs help to carry over a thought from one sentence to another, from one idea to another, or from one paragraph to another with words or phrases. And finally, TMs link sentences together smoothly so that there are no abrupt jumps or breaks between ideas. The terms conjunction and conjunctive devices derive from Halliday and Hasan's (1976) description of text-internal cohesion in English. They believed that TMs reflect the writer's positioning of one point in relation to another in creating a text. Generally speaking, TMs are the most common way of coordination and the most frequently used (Leech & Svartvik, 1994, p. 264; Greenbaum & Quirk, 1993, p. 263). TMs have been studied under numerous labels and have drawn much attention in the field of linguistics. They were treated as discourse markers by Schiffrin (1987) and a pragmatic class of lexical expressions by Fraser (1998, 1999) using the pragmatic framework. Other researchers (Rouchota, 1998; Blakemore, 1987) who worked within the Relevance Theory Framework treated them as pragmatic markers. In fact, within Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory, discourse conjunctions shall be interpreted by the 'linguistically encoded meaning'" and the contextual assumptions that were brought to the hearer (Rouchota, 1998, p. 12) while Halliday and Hasan (1976) treated them as "linguistic devices that create cohesion". TMs, as Caron (1994, p. 706) explained, are used "to express various kinds of relations between utterances". TMs have also been studied in terms of their grammatical features, functional features and discoursal functions (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 61; Ball, 1996;

Altenberg, 1996; Leech & Svartvik, 1994; Greenbaum & Quirk, 1993; Quirk et al., 1985; Chalker, 1996; Fraser, 1998, 1999).

2.9.1. Effect of Transition Markers on Sentence Processing and Comprehension

Some transition markers (TMs) are used mostly in spoken language, while others are more common in formal writing styles. Their specific meaning is determined by the context, their core meaning is procedural rather than conceptual (Fraser, 1999). They serve as directional guides for text receivers about how the incoming information should be interpreted and integrated with the preceding discourse segments (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Carpenter & Just, 1977), provide insight about the speaker's attitude to the content of the discourse (Swan, 1980), and indicate the relative importance of the ideas in the text (Jung, 2003). In other words, while coherence relation are an intrinsic part of cognitive representations, linguistic markers are a surface code that can facilitate the process of formation of coherent text representations (Sanders & Noordman, 2000).

Nippold et al. (1992) analyzed the use and understanding of logical connectives by English native speakers. The study indicated that the young adults outplayed the adolescents on both the reading and writing tasks. It was also revealed that 'therefore' and 'however' were easy whereas 'moreover' and 'conversely' were difficult for all the age groups. Nippold et al. (1992) claimed that the reason for this difference was the different frequencies of the logical connectives.

Millis and Just (1994) investigated the influence of connectives on text processing. The study illustrated that the presence of a connective 'because' increased the activation level of the first clause when placed between two clauses of a sentence. The study revealed that the presence of a connective decreased the reading time while helping understanding the whole sentence in a shorter time. It was also presented that connectives were effective in answering comprehension questions faster and more accurately (Millis & Just, 1994).

Murray (1997) argued that connectives would impact on-line processing to the extent that they signaled a text event that represented a departure from the continuity of the events stated in the text. The study revealed that sentences made after the additive or causal connectives mentioned text events continuous with the text whereas sentences made in response to adversative connectives led to discontinuous text events. The study

illustrated that adversative connectives required longer reading time on the sentence coming after the connective (Murray, 1997).

In Smith's (1999) study, students with English and Spanish language backgrounds read two sentences shown on a computer and they were asked to judge if the sentences made sense. The study indicated that reading and judgments proceeded fluently with 'therefore'. It also revealed that continuations with lexical connectives were read faster than those with clausal connectives and illustrated that different language backgrounds caused differences in performance on reading times and judgments (Smith, 1999).

Sander and Noordman (2000) analyzed the influence of relation type and explicit marking on reading tasks. The results of the analysis indicated that different relations would lead to different representations of the text. The study revealed that the processing time of the readers was shorter, and verification and recall were better when the relation was more complex than a simple additive relation. Another finding was that explicit marking of the relation led to faster processing. The researchers concluded that text processing relied on relations; different representations occured when the relations were different, and the effect was carried over time to recall (Sander & Noordman, 2000).

Degand and Sanders (2002) investigated the effect of connectives or signaling phrases on expository text comprehension in first (L1) and second language (L2). The study indicated that participants performed significantly better in their mother language than in their L2 and the implicit condition differed significantly from the explicit conditions whereas the explicit versions did not significantly differ from each other (Degand & Sanders, 2002).

Guzman (2004) studied the role of connectives in written discourse and whether they facilitated the maintenance of local coherence by allowing readers to form expectations about the nature of the unfolding text. The results revealed that connectives aid in the generation of reader expectations. Guzman (2004) stated that the presence of a connective was observed to provide a guide to the reader about the type of forthcoming information.

Soria (2005) analyzed the use of connectives in oral and written discourse production and comprehension in two experiments. In the first experiment, the data showed that comprehension declined when the connective was missing, which confirmed the hypothesis that connectives facilitated inferring the relation intended by the sender of the message. It was also found that the contrastive type showed the highest

decline whereas the additive type showed the lowest decline in comprehension. The second experiment investigated whether there was any significant difference between spoken and written language in terms of the kind of relations employed and lexical marking of the relations. Results of the experiment showed that connectives were generally more frequent in speaking than in writing, and that their use changed depending on the different classes of relations, with contrastive relations almost always marked. The data showed no significant difference between the spoken and written versions in terms of the type of relations used. It was found that most of the relations belonged to the consequential and additive types for both oral and written modality. The study showed that contrastive relations were generally little employed both in spoken and in written language (Soria, 2005).

A study was conducted by Sadeghi and Heidaryan (2012) to analyze the effect of teaching pragmatic discourse markers on EFL learners listening comprehension of Iranian Advanced EFL learners. Learners of English in the Payam-Noor University of Songhor Branch participated whose major was English Translation. For the purpose of teaching discourse markers, fourteen sessions were allocated. After an intervention period of twelve weeks, where the experimental group received strategy training in recognition of discourse markers in audio-texts, experimental and control groups again were tested through multiple choice questions in post-test stage, and their results were quantitatively compared. Based on analysis and description of data, results showed that the two experimental and control groups had a performance difference from each other in post-test and pre-test of this study. Multiple choice questions analyses provided developmental patterns of EFL participants with a listening comprehension proficiency increase (Sadeghi & Heidaryan, 2012).

To successfully comprehend a text, readers must be able to establish coherent representation of its meaning. Construction of coherent text representation presupposes an ability to identify coherence relations that bind discourse segments together. These relations can be implicit or marked by a variety of linguistic devices such as logical connectives and signaling phrases. While there has been a growing awareness among the teachers and EFL material writers about the important role that knowledge of marker words plays in comprehension of L2 discourse, there is only a limited number of suitable test designs that allow assessment of learners' understanding of these words. Vasiljevic (2013) indicated the major findings of the research on the role of discourse markers in text processing and presented two test formats that could be used to measure

students' understanding of conjunctions as text structure markers: a 'paraphrase' judgment task and text diagrams.

In Ang's (2014) study, a controlled test was carried out to analyze the way in which discourse markers affect the reading comprehension and reading speed of Chinese learners of English. In the study two groups of students (undergraduates and postgraduates) who minored in English as a foreign language were tested with four versions of a medical paper. Four versions were designed: a version without discourse markers, a version with micro markers, a version with macro markers, and a version with both micro and macro markers. A cloze recall test was used to measure the students' comprehension and reading speed. The results showed that macro markers played a helpful role in enhancing readers' reading comprehension and reading speed. It was concluded that Chinese teachers should place more emphasis on the instruction of discourse markers, especially macro markers (Ang, 2014). In the next section, the use of transition markers in the field of ELT and written production will be discussed.

2.9.2. Use of Transition Markers in the Field of ELT and Written Production

In writing, developing students' ability to use transition markers (TMs) is helpful in connecting the sentences effectively as well as paragraphs, showing the logical or semantic relations between the previous information, and facilitating readers' interpretation of the whole discourse effectively (Ali et al., 2012). The use of TMs also enables speakers or writers make the context more accessible to listeners or readers and constrain their interpretation of message through using TMs in communication (Swan, 2005). Accordingly, awareness of the use and practicality of TMs can immensely contribute to the overall quality of the discourse created by English language learners. Rahimi (2011) rightly points out that TMs constitute an essential component of communicative competence that they help learners produce fluent and meaningful discourse in English.

Horn (1969) attempted to find out whether the number of basic logical relationships could be contained in a limited list. She examined the paragraphs of a material published to be used in teaching reading to foreign learners. Horn mentioned that logical relationships could be contained in a limited list. She suggested that the procedure described had possibilities as a useful device for teaching the logical

relationships and they could be used as a teaching aid for reading comprehension (Horn, 1969).

McDevitt (1989) investigated the errors of students in the pre-degree English courses at the University of the South Pasific. The errors in the students' writings were analyzed and inaccurate use of linking devices were found which was one of the four main areas of error in addition to incomplete sentences, ungrammatical relationship between clauses, and repetition of grammatical component. The results indicated that students could not recognize the restraints and expectations created by linking devices (McDevitt, 1989).

Shi (1993) conducted a study with college students in the Indiana University of Pennsylvania. The study illustrated that low-rated essays included more conjunctions than high-rated essays, and that conjunctions in the low rated essays were "but" and "because" were observed to be the most frequent conjunctions following "and". The writers of high-rated essays used a great variety of conjunctions such as "consequently", "therefore", "however", "moreover". The results indicated that those students used a more complex system of semantic relationships. The study also presented that strategies such as reading, planning, and rehearsing had a great influence on coherence (Shi, 1993).

Tang and Ng (1995) analyzed the use of connectives in the ESL students' writings at the City University of Hong Kong. The results presented that science students used fewer connectives than arts students, and both group of students used a lot of resultive, listing, and contrastive connectives in their writing. The 10 most frequently used connectives found in the science group and the arts group were nearly identical. For the science group the connectives were: 'and', 'however', 'for example', 'since', 'because', 'so', 'as', 'therefore', 'besides', 'in fact'. For the arts group used: 'and', 'however', 'because', 'so', 'since', 'besides', 'as', 'that is', 'for example', 'therefore'. Tang and Ng's (1995) study indicated that 'and' was the most frequently used connective. According to them, students thought that 'and' was the simplest and easiest connective. They stated that "It can be used to join any sentences and the connection it makes is straightforward" (Tang & Ng, 1995).

Şuyalçınkaya (1995) investigated how the discourse markers improved the performance of students in report writing. The mean value of the experimental group was found to be significantly higher than the control group. As a result, the systematic

treatment of connectives had positive impact on the participants' report writing (Şuyalçınkaya, 1995).

Granger and Tyson (1996) analyzed the connective usage in the essays of the native and non-native EFL speakers of English. The study indicated that some connectives were overused and underused, and some semantic, stylistic and syntactic misuse were observed. The study revealed that learners did not use connectives that changed the direction of the argument, rather they used connectives for addition, exemplification and to emphasize a point. 'Moreover', 'indeed', 'of course', and 'for instance' were found to be the most overused connectives by the non-native speakers. Native learners used 'moreover' "to add a point rather than to add a final powerful argument to convince the reader of a particular point" (Granger & Tyson, 1996, p. 22). Connectives such as 'anyway' and 'so', which were frequently used in colloquial language, were frequently found in the essays of the native learners of English (Granger & Tyson, 1996).

Cho (1998) studied the relationship between the use of connectives by Korean learners of English as a foreign language and their length of study. It was observed that the length of study was related to the overall occurrence of the range of connectives produced, but it did not lead to a greater number of subordinators, which contributed to the syntactic complexity of a sentence. The study revealed that the length of study did not only affect correct uses but also incorrect uses of connectives. The researcher explained that the participants with 3 years of study used more connectives and they had not completed the acquisition of connectives. The incorrect uses included misuse, overuse, underuse, and grammatical errors. The group with 3 years of study made no error of underuse which was interpreted by the researcher as "this may suggest that length of study enhances students' awareness of when the sentences should be connected with the help of connectives" (Cho, 1998). The study indicated that when the the students studied longer, they tended to use connectives more. In addition, some errors were found to be more frequent with certain types of connectives. For instance, students tended to overuse 'and' and 'so'; incorrect use of 'but' was frequent, and grammatical errors occurred because of the incorrect use of 'because' (Cho, 1998).

Dülger (2001) analyzed the use of discourse markers in teaching writing. The effect of product-viewed and process-viewed writing courses was investigated. The results indicated that the number of discourse markers used in the essays written after the product-viewed courses increased after the process-oriented courses. The variety of

discourse markers used was also increased after taking process-viewed courses (Dülger, 2001).

Tickoo (2002) investigated how Vietnamese and Chinese learners of ESL used 'then' and 'after that'. It was found that 'then' and 'after that' were precisely used. The study revealed that tenseless first language (L1) had an effect on the use of temporal reference (Tickoo, 2002).

Bolton et al., (2002) studied the connector usage in the university students' writings. The results compared the data from the Hong Kong component (ICE-HK) and the British component (ICE-GB) of the International Corpus of English (ICE). The study illustrated that the most overused connective in Hong Kong data was 'so', and 'and'. As for the British data, 'however' and 'so' were the most overused. 'At any rate' had not been found in both ICE-HK and in ICE-GB; 'in any case' did not exist in ICE-HK and it was found only once in ICE-GB (Bolton et al., 2002).

Ting (2003) investigated cohesive errors in the writing of Chinese tertiary EFL students studying at the Centre for English Language Communication, National University of Singapore. The study indicated that errors in the use of adversatives and additives were more common than errors in using causals and temporals. There were no significant difference between the good and the poor essays in the number of cohesive errors in the four conjunction categories; Additives, Adversatives, Causals and Temporals. The most typical additive errors were concerned with redundant additives. The participants used them to show the reader that they were adding another point to the previously mentioned points. The study presented that the errors in the use of adversatives were caused by both intralingual interference. For instance, they used 'on the contrary' for 'however'. The study also indicated that some students could not use the order of cause-effect properly (Ting, 2003).

Leung (2005) compared the use of three major conjunctions; 'and', 'or', 'but'; by Chinese and American university students. According to the findings, the non-native students used fewer conjunctions and certain connectives more than the native speakers. The researcher claimed that the reasons for the overuse were the overemphasis put on certain connectives at schools and the first language (L1) transfer (Leung, 2005).

Choi (2005) analyzed the argumentative essays written in English by the non-native speakers of Korean and the native speakers of English. The essays varied regarding error types, textual organization, and cohesive devices; such as; conjunctions/logical connectives, reference, sequencers, certainty markers, lexical

cohesion. The results indicated that both the non-native and the native speakers used conjunctions and logical connectives most frequently in their essays (Choi, 2005).

Chen (2006) compared the use of conjunctive adverbials in the academic papers of advanced Taiwanese EFL learners. The results indicated that the advanced EFL learners used additive conjunctive adverbials while the professional writers most frequently used the adversative conjunctive adverbials (Chen, 2006).

Pretorius (2006) investigated the comprehension of logical relations in expository texts by the ESL students. The study revealed a strong relationship between the academic performance and ESL proficiency, and students' comprehension of logical relations. As academic performance increased, increased performance in comprehending adversative relations were found across the groups. The global adversative relations were conceived to be more challenging than the local adversative relations (Pretorius, 2006).

Ying (2007) analyzed the similarities and differences in the usage of discourse connectives such as; 'because', 'so', 'and' among the native speakers of English (NS), the non-native Chinese students (CNNS) and the non-native Japanese students (JNNS). The study revealed that 'and' was the most frequently used connective for all the groups. The JNNS and the CNNS used the additive and the causal forms of 'and' whereas the native speakers of English used a variety of 'and'. According to Ying (2007), this might reflect potential evidence for incomplete knowledge of how to use 'and' by the JNNS and the CNNS.

Paquot (2008) and Gilquin et al. (2007) demonstrated that learners lack the largely conventionalized ways of dealing with crucial functions, such as examplifying, summarizing, contrasting or expressing personal opinion. They overused a limited number of frequent English collocations and discourse markers, such as; 'for example', 'on the other hand', 'on the contrary'; but underused a whole set of typical EAP multiword sequences, such as; 'is an example of', 'as discussed'. This research had resulted in learner-corpus-informed writing aids that showed typical examples of native and learner writing and provided a rich semantic, syntactic, phaseological and stylistic description of the ways particular functions and concepts were lexicalized in academic English (Paquot, 2008; Gilquin et al., 2007).

Zhao (2009) attempted to find empirical evidence of the relationship between L2 learners' competence of lexical chunks and their language production. Through the multiple-choice chunk test and the writing test, the statistical analysis showed that

testees with a higher level of lexical chunks were prone to achieve higher scores in the writing test. It turned out that lexical chunks had a positive effect on L2 learners' language production. Lexical chunks seemed to play an important role in L2 learners' language acquisition. They served as the key to the fluency, idiomaticity, creativeness and orientation of language production, which should be given adequate attention and absolute priority in L2 learners' English instruction (Zhao, 2009).

Elahi and Badeleh (2013) investigated the distributions of the transitional markers in a corpus of articles related to the discipline of English Language Teaching. The articles were written in English by academic writers who were native speakers of English and Persian. It was revealed that the transitional markers belonging to the categories of "contrast" and "purpose" were more used by native writers and transitional markers belonging to the category of "comparison and similarity" were used almost equally by both groups of writers. Transitional markers belonging to the categories of "addition, time, result, place, example" and "summary and emphasis" were more used in the ELT articles written by Persian article writers. Moreover, it was indicated that a significant difference existed between the uses of the transitional markers in the two groups of the articles (Elahi & Badeleh, 2013).

Hamed (2014) analyzed the use of conjunctions in argumentative essays written by English as a Foreign Language students. Argumentative essays was collected in order to be investigated in terms of Halliday and Hassan's (1976) taxonomy of conjunction. Findings showed that the EFL students used the conjunctions inappropriately, and that the adversative conjunctions posed the most difficulty for the learners, followed by additives and causals. The findings of the study confirmed previous studies that learners of English as a foreign language had difficulty in using conjunctions in their writing (Hamed, 2014).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter outlines the research design, the data collection instruments, the data collection and analysis procedures used for data analysis. The main concern of this corpus-based study is to analyze and compare the usage of the transition markers (TMs) and their most salient types of the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections of the MA theses and doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT.

3.2. Research Design

The purpose of this particular corpus-based study is to investigate the transition marker (TM) use in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the randomly selected MA theses and doctoral dissertations (PhD) between the years 2010 and 2014. To achieve the purpose of the study, the transition types; such as additive transitions, adversative transitions, causal transitions, sequential transitions; forming the learner corpus in all three sections of these theses are identified. The TMs and their types were analyzed in terms of frequency and log-likelihood (LL) by means of comparing the data groups.

This study was designed as a descriptive study aiming to investigate the importance of the TMs in the academic texts. "Descriptive statistics gives numerical and graphic procedures to summarize a collection of data in a clear and understandable way …" (Jaggi, 2003, p. 1). Zamel (1983) stated that TMs were very important in writing because they signaled the relationship between ideas and affected the meaning that the writer was trying to convey. Boulton (2009) suggested that a corpus-based approach suits more to learners with higher levels of proficiency and brings specific benefits in terms of the generation and reviewing of text. Tognini-Bonelli (2001) defined the corpus-based approach as a methodology in which the corpus serves as an empirical basis where language researchers, learners and teachers saw real linguistic data prior to their assumptions and expectations.

Parallel to the design of the study, the quantitative research method was used. "Quantitative research is the numerical representation and manipulation of observations for the purpose of describing and explaining the phenomena that those observations reflect" (Wikipedia Encyclopedia, 2015 cited by Sukamolson, 2005, p. 2). "The obvious benefits of quantitative data are that the numerical form makes comparison easy, data are standardized, visible and amenable to the tests of classical survey statistics" (Cooper & Branthwaite, 1977 cited by Hart, 1987, p. 29). The current study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the differences in the use of the transition markers (TMs) of
   a. the introduction section in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?
   b. the results and discussion section in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?
   c. the conclusion section in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?

2. What are the differences in the use of the transition markers (TMs) of
   a. the introduction section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?
   b. the results and discussion section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?
   c. the conclusion section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT?

3. What are the most salient transition types in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT regarding
   a. the introduction section?
   b. the results and discussion section?
   c. the conclusion section?

4. What are the most salient transition types in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT regarding

   a. the introduction section?

   b. the results and discussion section?

   c. the conclusion section?

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

Two different instruments were used to collect the data for this study: a) the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT (see Appendix A), b) the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT (see Appendix B). Fifty MA theses and fifty doctoral dissertations (PhD) were randomly selected from each of the NSs and the TSs (totally 200 theses) between the years 2010 and 2014 to analyze and to compare the usage and the most salient types of the transition markers (TMs) in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections.

3.4. Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

Permission was obtained from the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English to analyze their MA theses and PhD dissertations. 162 permission e-letters were sent to their personal and university e-mails, and their Facebook. Among these TSs, 50 speakers of MA theses and 50 speakers of PhD dissertations gave permission via e-mail to the researcher. From these permissions, ten theses and ten dissertations were randomly chosen per each year.

The data collection period was between December 2015 to March 2016. The study covered twenty universities for the MA theses and eleven universities for the PhD dissertations offered in MA and PhD ELT programs throughout in Turkey. In addition, for the ELT programs in the United States twenty-four universities for the MA theses and thirty-one universities for the PhD dissertations were selected. To ensure the validity of the findings, only the theses and doctoral dissertations reporting empirical studies within the field of ELT were selected.

The corpora were constructed with the collection of the MA theses and the PhD dissertations available online. The data analyses included computer-supported analyses of these four corpora. First of all, these theses and dissertations of the TSs of English and the NSs of English were downloaded in pdf format, and then their introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections were extracted and saved as text files. All the other chapters, except the mentioned sections were excluded from the data. Accordingly, each set of corpus was uploaded to the programme of WordSmith Tools 5.0. Subsequently, the TMs were individually searched across each corpus. The data analysis procedure followed four phases for each corpus:

1. The analysis of the MA theses: The three sections in the theses of TSs of English and the NSs of English were searched in terms of TM usage. The identified TMs were evaluated for their frequency.

2. The analysis of the doctoral dissertations (PhD): The mentioned sections of these dissertations written by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were examined for the TM usage of their frequency.

3. The analysis of the most salient TM types in the MA theses: Frequency analysis for the three sections in the TSs of English and the NSs of English MA theses were searched in terms of the most salient TM types and their frequency.

4. The analysis of the most salient TM types in the PhD dissertations: The dissertations of the TSs of English and the NSs of English were searched in terms of the most salient TM types and their frequency for all three sections.

The WordSmith Tools 5.0 software was used in order to analyze the four corpora. Descriptive statistics such as frequency (percentages) were used to characterize the data and provide statistical information about the use and the types of the TMs. The frequency of a linguistic feature is relevant when compared with other features or across groups. In order to make these comparisons, normalized frequency should be discussed. Relative frequency can be determined by calculating the frequency of the construct per x number of words. Depending on the item being investigated and the convention in the literature, the researcher might choose to measure the number of instances per 100; 1,000; 10,000 or 1,000,000 words. This is called normalizing. Normalization not only allows researchers to compare linguistic features with one another, it also allows them to compare texts and corpora of differing lengths (Friginal & Hardy, 2014). Altenberg and Tapper (1998) and Tanko (2004) examined connectors' rate for per 10,000 words

across native and learner corpora. However, in Schlüter's (2006) corpus-based study, the verb phrases were analyzed per 1,000 words. Liu, Fang and Wei (2014) also reported on a quantitative study of the use of nominalizations across different English varieties which were calculated per 1,000 words in order to make comparisons of texts of diverse lengths possible. In this study, the usage of TMs and their types were analyzed according to their frequency per 1,000 words. To observe the frequencies of the TMs in four corpora, the identification of TMs and their types in every 1,000 words might give a clearer view of possible differences in total TM frequency in each corpus.

In addition to the frequency analysis, log-likelihood (LL) calculation was also used as the statistical analysis method to indicate the overuse which is referred as the higher frequency of occurrence, and the underuse which is defined as the lower frequency of occurrence for the analyzed data. When the expected relative frequency is lower than 5, most tests to measure statistical significance, such as chi-square, are unreliable, except for LL tests (Rayson & Garside, 2000, cited in Buysse, 2011). Wordsmith Tools Version 5.0 and Log-likelihood Calculator will be explained in detail.

3.4.1. Wordsmith Tools Version 5.0

Granger et al. (2009, p. 41) stated that among the learner corpus researches, the most popular, sufficiently versatile and powerful tool was WordSmith Tools allowing for sophisticated linguistic manipulations of the data. In the current study, the fifth version of Wordsmith Tools (Scott, 2008) had been used that was developed by Mike Scott (Version 1; Scott, 1996, Version 2; Scott, 1997, Version 3; Scott, 1999, Version 4; Scott, 2004). The user of WordSmith Tools could use them to find out how words were used in the selected texts and had integrated suite of programs in order to look at the uses of the words in these texts. Wordsmith Tools has three components: The Wordlist which provides a list of all the words or word-clusters in a text of alphabetical or frequency order. The second is Concord which is a concordancer that enables the user to observe any word or phrase in context. The third component is Keywords that the user can find the key words in a text. The tools have been used by many language teachers or students, and by researchers studying language patterns in many different languages all over the world that have been also used by Oxford University Press for their own lexicographic work in preparing dictionaries (Scott, 2010, p.2).

3.4.2. Log-likelihood Calculator

Log-likelihood (LL) is a test for statistical significance, similar to the Pearsons' Chi-square measure that is generally utilized in corpus analysis for collocation, keyword or frequency analysis. This test is sometimes called G-square or G score. In statistical analysis of texts, to test the frequency distributions, LL test is a reliable alternative to Pearsons' Chi-square (Dunning, 1993, cited in Ağçam, 2014). LL test considers word frequencies weighted over two different corpora. It measures higher or lower frequencies than expected. G2 score or LL is Log-likelihood value is as p value in Pearsons' Chi-square (McEnery, Xiao & Tono, 2006). Like Pearsons' Chi-square, LL compares the observed and expected values for two datasets. Observed values are actual frequencies extracted from corpora. On the other hand, expected values are the frequencies that one would expect if no factor other than chance were affecting the values. The greater the difference between the observed and the expected values, the less likely it is the difference has arisen by chance.

Dunning (1993) stated that the chi-squared value becomes unreliable when the expected frequency is less than 5 and possibly overestimates with high frequency words and when comparing a relatively small corpus to a much larger one. Dunning (1993) suggested the LL ratio as an alternative to Pearson's chi-squared test.

LL ratio measurement since it is calculated by constructing a contingency table is taken into account by many researchers in the corpus linguistics field. Rayson and Garside (2000) consider LL measurement for corpus comparison by frequency profiling. Scott (2001) also uses LL in his keywords procedure. Rayson et al. (2004) discuss the reliability of LL value against chi-squared statistic in word frequency comparisons. They conclude that, in order to extend applicability of the frequency comparisons to expected values of 1 or more, the use of the LL statistic was preferred rather than chi-squared statistic, at the 0.01% level (Rayson et al., 2004).

Rayson and Garside (2000) note that O1 and O2 refer to the observed frequencies of a particular item in Corpus O1 and O2, respectively and that %1 and %2 values show relative frequencies in the texts. The symbol (+) indicates overuse and (-) indicates underuse in O1 relative to O2. LL statistics had been extensively utilized in data analysis process of significant studies conducted in the field of corpus linguistics (Scott, 2011).

Rayson and Garside (2000) summarize the advantages of the log-likelihood ratio over the other measures. Firstly, LL values are directly comparable; secondly, LL is not as expensive to compute as Fisher's Exact test, and gives similar results for large sample sizes; thirdly, LL has been shown to be better 'in general' than the chi-squared test; and finally, the chi-squared statistic is an approximation to the LL for large samples. In spite of the complexity of the mathematics behind LL, there are many softwares and web sites that compute the value in seconds.

3.5. Ethical Considerations

As the theses and dissertations were gathered online, the submission of the results of the transition marker (TM) usage in the analyses of the MA theses and the doctoral dissertations (PhD) was assumed as the participants consent to be used in the study. The Turkish speakers (TSs) of English were assured that the survey will be kept strictly confidential and no responses would be linked to their names, e-mails, and their theses results.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter of the study presents the findings obtained from the MA theses and the doctoral dissertations (PhD) of the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT.

4.1. Introduction

This study aims at examining the frequencies and types of the transition markers (TMs) in the introduction, the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections of the MA theses and the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in terms of the use of the TMs (Appendix C). The data of this study consist of 50 MA theses and 50 doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the NSs in the USA; and 50 MA theses and 50 doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the TSs in Turkey.

A descriptive research design was applied and the data of the study were analyzed quantitatively by identifying the use and the most salient types of TMs. In the analysis of these MA theses and PhD dissertations in the field of ELT, WordSmith Tools 5.0 was used in order to obtain the data concerning the frequency of TMs. As a consequence of these analyses, the data collected from these instruments were analyzed and presented in tabular form in this Chapter.

4.2. Analysis of the Data

The data were obtained and analyzed from the introduction, the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections of the MA theses and the PhD dissertations written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English considering the differences in the use and the most salient types of the transition markers (TMs) in the field of ELT.

4.2.1. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Markers in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish speakers of English

The analysis for the use of the transition markers (TMs) was gathered through the MA theses of the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT. Table 1 indicated the overall frequency and log-likelihood (LL) analysis of the TMs in their theses.

Table 1

Overall Frequency and LL Analysis of the TMs in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

	TSs	NSs	LL Value
Corpus Size	1,754,429	1,177,474	
TMs (n)	26805	18983	**-31.98***
n per 1,000	15	16	
Frequency (%)	0.2	0.2	

n= raw frequency of TMs

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

 - indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

As observed from Table 1, the corpus size was higher for the MA theses written by the TSs of English (1,754,429) than the NSs of English (1,177,474). In addition, the total usage of the TMs in the introduction, the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections of the TSs of English theses was 26805 whereas the NSs of English used 18983 TMs. It was revealed that the TM usage in all three sections for the TSs was higher than those of the NSs' theses. The frequency of TMs in the groups was indicated by means of total number of TMs and proportion of TMs per 1,000. However, the total of the TMs by the NSs (16) of English per 1,000 was observed to be higher than the TSs (15) of English in all three sections. According to the overall frequency results, both groups used similar amount of TMs (0.2) in every 100 words in their MA theses' introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections.

In addition to the frequency analysis, to determine the difference between frequencies of the TSs of English and the NSs of English, and the significant values of

overuse or underuse for the TMs in the groups, LL calculation was applied. The LL value of the TSs of English displayed an underuse as -31.98 which was statistically significant when compared to the NSs of English MA theses in all three sections. For the MA theses, the differences between the use of the TMs in two groups were compared by their frequency separately for each section.

4.2.1.1. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Markers for the Introduction Section in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis and the log-likelihood (LL) calculation of the transition markers (TMs) for the introduction section in the MA theses written by the Turkish (TSs) speakers of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT were compared. The results were presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Frequency and LL Analysis of the TMs for the Introduction Section in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

	TSs	NSs	LL Value
Corpus Size	1,754,429	1,177,474	
TMs (n)	5357	3461	**+3.06***
n per 1,000	3	3	
Frequency (%)	0.03	0.03	

n= raw frequency of TMs

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

 - indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

In Table 2, both the corpora size and TM usage were higher for the TSs of English than the NSs of English in the introduction section of their MA theses. Furthermore, by means of frequency per 1,000 words, similar frequency results were obsered between the TSs (3) and the NSs (3). In addition, according to the frequency results, both the TSs (0.03) of English and the NSs (0.03) of English used the same amount of TMs in every 100 words in their introduction section of the MA theses.

To observe the difference betweeen frequencies of the TSs of English and the NSs of English, and the significant values of overuse or underuse in the groups, LL calculation was applied. The LL frequency indicated an overuse in the TMs of the TSs' MA theses' introduction section with an +3.06 LL value and there was a significant difference in the frequency of the TMs between the two groups' MA theses in the introduction section. The following sample sentences were obtained from two groups. MATS-INT refers to the introduction section of the MA theses written by the TSs, and MANS-INT refers to the introduction section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 1

[Such a case also causes changes in their attitudes **and** perceptions, **and** depending on their belief, they form different habits towards this course.]

Extracted from <MATS4-INT>

[This study **also** seeks to find out an answer to the question raised as a result of the researcher's observation through interviews with pre-service English language teachers and classroom observations during some practices: why teachers of English language generally become teachers who follow basic rules to teach and one or two techniques to empower learners with the language skills despite the training they get on the most effective, appropriate and various ways of teaching English.]

Extracted from <MATS5-INT>

[**Although** certain studies have been done on language teaching, students still encounter with certain difficulties.]

Extracted from <MATS18-INT>

[Multimedia learning vocabulary in EFL classroom can not replace the teacher, **but** it can improve and diversify the activities of the teacher, thereby increasing the performance of students.]

Extracted from <MATS45-INT>

[From the results of the mixed methods analysis, we investigate whether or not the course is achieving the desired learning outcomes in ESD, **and** identify the core strengths **and** weaknesses of the particular course under study.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS10-INT></div>

[Changes in technology and the ready availability of online resources have **also** instigated new discussions about language policy and the definitions of plagiarism in university composition classes.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS9-INT></div>

[**Although** there are not any similar studies to this current one, other studies that measure similar idea in different contexts will be described and discussed.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS24-INT></div>

[Learning a language can be so much fun, **but** it can also be very challenging and difficult.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS31-INT></div>

As indicated in the examples above, the TSs of English had used the TMs more frequently than the NSs of English in their MA theses' introduction section. A wide variety of TMs such as *"and, also, although, but"* had been used in the sentences of the TSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of TM usage in the theses of the TSs when compared to the NSs. In the next section, the frequency analysis of the TMs for the results and discussion section of both groups' MA theses were presented.

4.2.1.2. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Markers for the Results and Discussion Section in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The results of the frequency analysis of the transition markers (TMs) for the results and discussion section in the MA theses written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT were compared. The log-likelihood (LL) calculation was also illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3

Frequency and LL Analysis of the TMs for the Results and Discussion Section in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

	TSs	NSs	LL Value
Corpus Size	1,754,429	1,177,474	
TMs (n)	15670	10039	**+13.27***
n per 1,000	9	9	
Frequency (%)	0.09	0.09	

n= raw frequency of TMs

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

 - indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

The mostly used TMs in the MA theses' results and discussion section written by the TSs of English was observed in Table 3. In other words, the results indicated that the TMs used by the TSs of English (15670) were higher than the NSs of English (10039). Furthermore, both the TSs and the NSs' MA theses were similar in number per 1,000 words (9) and with a frequency of 0.09 TM usage in this section.

LL calculation was applied in addition to the frequency analysis for the TMs. In Table 3, the LL value of the MA theses' results and discussion section for the TSs of English revealed an overuse as +13.27. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in the frequency of the TMs between the two groups' MA theses in the results and discussion section. The following were the extracts randomly taken from two corpora. MATS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the MA theses

written by the TSs, and MANS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 2

[The participant with a score less than 63 was assumed to have a low integrative orientation; the scores ranging from 63 **and** 84 revealed a moderate level of integrative orientation, **and** a participant with a total score more than 84 demonstrated a high level of integrative orientation.]

Extracted from <MATS24-RD>

[They emphasize that it **also** poses a problem since she does not have enough time left to fulfill her other tasks as homework.]

Extracted from <MATS23-RD>

[**In contrast**, P6 made only written plans.]

Extracted from <MATS27-RD>

[In all the examples given above, the sentences are superficially well-formed in terms of grammar, **yet** they are not used in the discourse.]

Extracted from <MATS29-RD>

[The texts of ESL writers were also found to be less cohesive, employing a much lesser degree of support **and** detail for posited claims than the texts of NESs.]

Extracted from <MANS32-RD>

[Seeing as that the knowledge concepts in the instruction section are connected to the strategies that build students' skills or adapt teaching based on students' backgrounds, it is surprising that Teachers who rated the above strategy as very important did not **also** rate its corresponding area of knowledge as important.]

Extracted from <MANS4-RD>

[Textbooks for small group communication courses, **in contrast**, do incorporate basic communication concepts in their content, although the amount of space devoted to these concepts and the specific topics is inconsistent.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS48-RD></div>

[**Yet** his excessive concentration on English for academic purpose led to his loss of communicative competence of daily English along with his daily touch.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS14-RD></div>

The TMs were significantly more frequent in the MA theses' results and discussion section as the introduction section written by the TSs of English when compared to the NSs of English in the sentences exemplified above. A wide variety of TMs such as *"and, also, in contrast, yet"* had been used in the sentences of the TSs which could be an explanation for the TS of English tendency to use TMs in their MA theses. In the next section, the frequency analysis of the TMs for the conclusion section in the MA theses written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English were presented.

4.2.1.3. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Markers for the Conclusion Section in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis and the log-likelihood (LL) value of the transition markers (TMs) for the conclusion section in the MA theses written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT were compared. The results were diplayed in Table 4.

Table 4

Frequency and LL Analysis of the TMs for the Conclusion Section in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
Corpus Size	1,754,429	1,177,474	
TMs (n)	5778	5483	**-334.83***
n per 1,000	3	5	
Frequency (%)	0.03	0.05	

n= raw frequency of TMs

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

- indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

In Table 4, it was revealed that the total usage of the TMs in the conclusion section in the MA theses of the TSs' was 5775 whereas the NSs displayed 5483 TMs in their theses. However, by means of frequency per 1,000 words, the TMs of the TSs (3) was observed to be less than the NSs (5). In addition, in the conclusion section of the MA theses, the TSs (0.03%) of English used TMs less than the NSs (0.05%) of English.

Besides the frequency analysis, LL calculation was applied. The LL value for the TMs in the conclusion section of the MA theses between the TSs of English and the NSs of English revealed a high amount of underuse as -334.83 which was statistically significant as indicated in Table 4. The following were the examples taken from both groups. MATS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the TSs, and MANS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 3

[Teacher was the main source of knowledge **and** the student was only the receiver.]

Extracted from <MATS2-CON>

[The same test was **also** used as the delayed post-test which was administered to the freshmen five weeks after the experiment in order to test the retention.]

[**As a result**, the findings of the present study showed that the experimental group did not differ significantly from the control group; which eliminated possible influence of extra factors on the achievement of 5th grade young learners.]

[**On the other hand**, the findings of the present study suggest that the informative task promotes more self corrections than the argumentative and problem solving tasks, which was indicated as a statistically significant relationship by the chi-square test.]

[The inferential statistic data shows that there is no significant effect of question number (types of feedback) **and** rating for male **and** female students.]

[These finding **also** highlight that even though the tests look similar, the content, the manifestation, and the way the test is conducted are important matters which differentiate these two tests.]

[**As a result**, their memories may have been less clear when they attempted to recall each provision of feedback in order to estimate the number of times that they had been corrected.]

[**On the other hand**, according to this students' correct usage frequency count, his performance among the skills considerably dropped in three areas.]

Extracted from <MANS5-CON>

As presented above, the TM usage in the MA theses' conclusion section written by the TSs of English included the highest underuse rate among the speakers which might be a reflection of the NSs more formal writing style in English. The LL values of the frequency of TMs used in the three sections; including the introduction; the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections of the MA theses among the TSs of English and the NSs of English were illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5

LL Frequency of the TMs in MA Theses' Three Sections Among the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Sections	LL Frequency	Overused / Underused
Introduction	+3.06*	Overused in TSs
Results and Discussion	+13.27*	Overused in TSs
Conclusion	-334.83*	Underused in TSs

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

- indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

Consequently, as observed from Table 5, there was a significant overuse in the TMs in the MA theses' introduction (+3.06%) and results and discussion sections (+13.27%) of the TSs of English. Moreover, the TSs of English overused the TMs statistically more significant in the results and discussion section than the introduction section of the MA theses. However, the analysis of the MA theses' conclusion section indicated a significant underuse for the TSs (-334.83%) of English. In addition, the TSs of English results displayed the highest underuse of TMs in the conclusion section of the MA theses.

Considering the results given in the tables, in the MA theses of the TSs of English three sections; including the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections, it could be interpreted that they used a wide variety of TMs. Their corpus size and total TM usage were higher than the NSs of English. According to the overall frequency results, both groups used 0.2 TMs in every 100 words. There was a high overall TM usage per 1,000 words in all three sections in the NSs' MA theses. Hence, the LL frequency indicated the significant underuse in the MA theses for the TSs in these sections.

It is possible to state that the TM usage per 1,000 words and frequency of the TMs in the introduction section, and the results and discussion section in the MA theses by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were equal. On the other hand, in the conclusion section, the TSs (0.03%) used the TMs less frequently than the NSs (0.05%). Among all three sections, the results and discussion section included the most frequent and the most used amount of TMs in the MA theses of both groups. The high proportion of TM usage in this section could be an explanation of the significant overuse of TMs by the TSs of English when compared to NSs of English. Moreover, the significant underuse of the TMs in the TSs' MA theses conclusion section could be explained because of the frequency interval of the TMs used in between the groups. In the next section, the frequency analysis and the LL calculation of the TMs in the introduction, the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were presented.

4.2.2. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Markers in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The analysis for the use of the transition markers (TMs) was gathered through the doctoral dissertations (PhD) of the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT. Table 6 indicated the overall frequency and log-likelihood (LL) analysis of the TMs in their dissertations.

Table 6

Overall Frequency and LL Analysis of the TMs in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

	TSs	NSs	LL Value
Corpus Size	2,756,430	2,880,750	
TMs (n)	37206	34756	**+226.51***
n per 1,000	14	12	
Frequency (%)	0.1	0.1	

n= raw frequency of TMs

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

 - indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

As observed from Table 6, the corpus size in the PhD dissertations written by the TSs of English (2,756,430) was less than the NSs of English (2,880,750). The total usage of the TMs in the introduction, the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections of the TSs' dissertations was 37206. On the other hand, the NSs used 34756 TMs in the mentioned sections. The overall result also indicated that the TSs of English used the TMs more than the NSs of English in all three sections. The total of the TMs by the TSs (14) per 1,000 was observed to be higher than the NSs (12). However, both the TSs of English and the NSs of English used the TMs equally in every 100 words in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections of their doctoral dissertations.

In addition to the TM overall frequency analysis, to determine the difference between frequencies of both groups, and the significant values of overuse or underuse in the groups, LL calculation was applied. The LL value in the PhD dissertations of the TSs of English displayed a high amount of overuse as +226.51 which was statistically significant when compared to the NSs of English in all three sections. For the dissertations, the differences between the use of the TMs in two groups were compared by their frequency separately for each section.

4.2.2.1. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Markers for the Introduction Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis and the log-likelihood (LL) calculation of the transition markers (TMs) for the introduction section in the PhD dissertations written by the Turkish Speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT were compared. The results were presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency and LL Analysis of the TMs for the Introduction Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
Corpus Size	2,756,430	2,880,750	
TMs (n)	6764	6675	**+11.05***
n per 1,000	3	2	
Frequency (%)	0.03	0.02	

n= raw frequency of TMs

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

 - indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

In Table 7, the frequency of TMs in the groups was indicated by means of total number of TMs and proportion of TMs per 1,000. It was revealed that the TM usage in the introduction section for the TSs was slightly higher (6764) than those of the NSs (6675) in their dissertations. On the other hand, the total usage of the TMs of the TSs of English (3) per 1,000 words was observed to be higher than the NSs of English (2). In addition; it was indicated that the frequency of TMs in the TSs' PhD dissertations was 0.03 whereas it was 0.02 in the NSs' dissertations. According to the frequency results, the TSs of English used TMs more frequently than the NSs of English in every 100 words in their doctoral dissertations' introduction section.

LL calculation was applied to observe the difference betweeen frequencies of the NSs of English and the TSs of English, and the significant values of overuse or

underuse of TMs in the groups. The LL frequency of the TMs indicated an overuse in the introduction section with an +11.05 LL value for the PhD dissertations of the TSs and there was a significant difference in the frequency of the TMs between the two groups' doctoral dissertations (PhD) in the mentioned section. The following were the sentences taken from the TSs and the NSs. PHDTS-INT refers to the introduction section of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs, and PHDNS-INT refers to the introduction section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 4

[Vowels **and** consonants have been the basis of English pronunciation learning **and** teaching.]

Extracted from <PHDTS37-INT>

[Education is **also** an agent of change and at times education itself is used to transform these social constructs.]

Extracted from <PHDTS23-INT>

[**Thus**, the studies investigating vocabulary in terms of individual dimensions of vocabulary knowledge within the framework of lexical competence and performance are required in literature.]

Extracted from <PHDTS26-INT>

[**Therefore**, prior to discussing technical matters in education such as methodologies, techniques, course books, materials, etc., it seems that there is an absolute need to set and identify solid philosophies, which will also establish close connections with the findings and theories of psychology.]

Extracted from <PHDTS31-INT>

[The three issues identified by the authors that need to be addressed in higher education in the 21st century relative to ESL students are: ESL placement **and** program

configurations, identification **and** status of ESL students, **and** ESL classroom instruction.]

[The assessments should **also** be student directed and student influenced, such as developing a rubric for the work.]

[**Thus**, academic achievement could potentially improve with exposure to the arts at every grade level, especially the upper grades.]

[**Therefore**, because there is so much at stake with statewide assessments, the term *high-stakes testing* is used to describe these tests.]

As indicated in the examples above, the TSs of English used the TMs more frequently than the NSs of English in the doctoral dissertations of the introduction section. The TSs used a wide range of TMs such as *"and, also, thus, therefore"* in their sentences which might be an explanation of the high rate of TM usage in their dissertations when compared to the NSs. In the next section, the frequency analysis of the TMs in the results and discussion section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English were presented.

4.2.2.2. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Markers for the Results and Discussion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The results of the frequency analysis of the transition markers (TMs) for the results and discussion section in the PhD dissertations written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT were compared. The log-likelihood (LL) calculation was also illustrated in Table 8.

Table 8

Frequency and LL Analysis of the TMs for the Results and Discussion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
Corpus Size	2,756,430	2,880,750	
TMs (n)	21054	16474	**+780.65***
n per 1,000	8	6	
Frequency (%)	0.08	0.06	

n= raw frequency of TMs

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

- indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

In Table 8, the frequency of TMs in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) revealed that the TSs of English used 21054 TMs while the NSs of English used 16474 TMs in the results and discussion section. The results indicated that the TMs used in this section by the TSs were higher than the NSs of the doctoral dissertations (PhD). By means of frequency per 1,000 words, while 8 TMs were used by the TSs of English, the NSs of English used 6 TMs in this section. The frequency of TMs in the results and discussion section of the TSs' dissertations revealed 0.08 TMs and the NSs displayed 0.06 TMs per 100 words. According to the frequency results, the TSs of English used higher amount of TMs than the NSs of English in every 100 words in the results and discussion section of their doctoral dissertations.

LL calculation was applied in addition to the frequency analysis. The LL value of the TMs in the results and discussion section of the PhD dissertations between the TSs of English and the NSs of English revealed an overuse as +780.65. Moreover, the results indicated that there was a significant difference in the frequency of the TMs between the two groups' doctoral dissertations in the results and discussion section. Extracts from both corpora were illustrated in Example 5. PHDTS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs, and PHDNS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 5

[As explained in chapter 3, data analysis covers the processing of two-, three-, four-, five-, **and** six-word combinations frequently found in the spoken **and** written interlanguage of Turkish students learning English to gain insights into the spoken **and** written performance of Turkish EFL learners **and** to form a base in defining interlanguage characteristics of Turkish learners with respect to their both writing **and** speaking skills.]

Extracted from <PHDTS7-RD>

[**Also**, some of the dialogues consisted of conversations, usually initiated by the teacher, in which she asked questions to the participants based on the posts.]

Extracted from <PHDTS5-RD>

[**In addition**, learner comments about native teachers also suggest that learners consider native teachers' wide vocabulary knowledge as a crucial strength.]

Extracted from <PHDTS25-RD>

[**Thus**, in the study, the method of examination will be a kind of coursebook evaluation.]

Extracted from <PHDTS22-RD>

[In this sense, the notebooks acted as running records documenting what students had written about **and** how, toolboxes students could return to for useful strategies **and** lessons about writing craft, **and** repositories for the raw, unpolished materials for larger pieces.]

Extracted from <PHDNS15-RD>

[Preservice teachers' data **also** confirmed such a pattern.]

Extracted from <PHDNS16-RD>

[**In addition**, they expected the writing to be succinct and direct, using active voice and avoiding passive phrasing.]

Extracted from <PHDNS29-RD>

[**Thus**, the assumption was supported.]

Extracted from <PHDNS3-RD>

As presented in the extracts above, the TM usage in the results and discussion section of the PhD dissertations by the TSs included the highest overuse rate among the speakers which might be a reflection of the TSs more academic writing style in English. In the next section, the frequency analysis of the TMs for the conclusion section in the doctoral dissertations written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English were presented.

4.2.2.3. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Markers for the Conclusion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis and the log-likelihood (LL) calculation of the transition markers (TMs) for the conclusion section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT were compared. The results were indicated in Table 9.

Table 9

Frequency and LL Analysis of the TMs for the Conclusion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
Corpus Size	2,756,430	2,880,750	
TMs (n)	9388	11607	**-147.29***
n per 1,000	3	4	
Frequency (%)	0.03	0.04	

n= raw frequency of TMs

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

 - indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

As illustrated in Table 9, it was observed that the frequency of the TMs used by the TSs of English was 9388 whereas it was 11607 by the NSs of English in the conclusion section of their doctoral dissertations. There was an overuse in the NSs of English due to the frequency difference. In addition, the total usage of the TMs of the TSs (3) per 1,000 words was observed to be less than the NSs (4) and there was a frequency difference between the groups. The frequency per 100 words in each group also indicated a difference of the TMs used between the NSs of English (0.04%) and TSs of English (0.03%).

In addition to the frequency analysis, LL calculation was applied. The LL value of the TMs in the conclusion section of the PhD dissertations between the TSs of English and the NSs of English revealed a high amount of underuse as -147.29 which was statistically significant in Table 9. The following examples were extracted from the TSs and NSs. PHDTS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs, and PHDNS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 6

[The study set out to examine the effects of explicit **and** incidental teaching on intermediate-level subjects' learning of formal **and** semantic aspects of L2 collocations.]

Extracted from <PHDTS14-CON>

[**In addition**, being obsessed with fixed expressions may lead learners not to use their creativity in language.]

Extracted from <PHDTS15-CON>

[**Furthermore**, no studies were found related to the teaching of fallacies in ELT classes or even in reading classes in the native language.]

Extracted from <PHDTS3-CON>

[While some of the difficulties resolve themselves with time **and** experience for teachers **and** students, certain issues such as student distractions **and** online navigation behaviors can be particularly vexing, even detrimental to the classroom environment if unaddressed.]

Extracted from <PHDNS22-CON>

[**In addition**, naming lowercase letters and developmental spelling were the only pretests that correlated significantly with the nonword repetition pretest.]

Extracted from <PHDNS38-CON>

[**Furthermore**, the findings suggest culturally relevant teachers promote academic success by not accepting student failure and making students responsible for the academic success of their peers.]

Extracted from <PHDNS28-CON>

The TM usage in the conclusion section of the doctoral dissertations by the TSs of English included a high rate of underuse among the speakers as presented above. This could be an explanation for the NSs of English tendency to use TMs in their dissertations. The LL values of the frequency of TMs used in the three sections; including the introduction; the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections of the doctoral dissertations among the TSs of English and the NSs of English were illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10

LL Frequency of the TMs in the Doctoral Dissertations' Three Sections Among the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Sections	LL Frequency	Overused / Underused
Introduction	+11.05*	Overused in TSs
Results and Discussion	+780.65*	Overused in TSs
Conclusion	-147.29*	Underused in TSs

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

- indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

In conclusion, as observed from Table 10, there was an overuse in the TMs of the doctoral dissertations' introduction (+11.05%), and results and discussion sections (+780.65%) written by the TSs of English. In addition, the TSs overused the TMs statistically more significant in the results and discussion section than the introduction section of their dissertations. Moreover, the TSs' results displayed the highest overuse of TMs in the PhD dissertations' results and discussion section. However, the analysis of the conclusion section indicated an underuse for the TSs of English (-147.29%) in their dissertations.

Considering the results given in the tables, the doctoral dissertations of the TSs of English used a wide variety of TMs in their three sections; including the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections. The corpus size of the NSs of English was higher than the TSs of English. According to the overall frequency results, both groups used 0.1 TMs in every 100 words in all three sections. However, the TSs used

the TMs more than the NSs per 1,000 words in terms of total TM usage. Hence, the LL overall frequency indicated the significant overuse for the TSs of English in these sections.

It is possible to state that the TM usage, including their amount, frequency and usage per 1,000 words were high for the TSs of English in the introduction, and results and discussion sections of their PhD dissertations. Among all three sections, the results and discussion section included the most frequent and the most used amount of TMs in the doctoral dissertations of both groups. The high proportion of TM usage in the dissertations of the TSs could be an explanation of the significant overuse of TMs by the TSs when compared to NSs. On the contrary, the TMs had been underused by the TSs with -147.29 significant difference from the NSs because of the frequency interval of the TMs used in between the groups. In the next section, the results of the most salient types of the TMs in the introduction, the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections of the MA theses and the doctoral dissertations written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English were presented.

4.2.3. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Marker Types in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The transition marker (TM) types; including additive transitions, adversative transitions, sequential transitions, and causal transitions; were analyzed in order to investigate the most salient TM types in the MA theses written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT. Table 11 indicated the overall frequency and log-likelihood (LL) analysis of the TMs in their theses.

Table 11

Overall Frequency and LL Analysis of the TM Types in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types		TSs	NSs	LL Value
	Corpus Size	1,754,429	1,177,474	
Additive	TMs (n)	22027	14846	**-0.16***
	n per 1,000	13	13	
	Frequency (%)	0.13	0.13	
Adversative	TMs (n)	2798	2632	**-153.33***
	n per 1,000	2	2	
	Frequency (%)	0.02	0.02	
Sequential	TMs (n)	940	695	**-3.72***
	n per 1,000	1	1	
	Frequency (%)	0.01	0.01	
Causal	TMs (n)	1040	810	**-10.02***
	n per 1,000	1	1	
	Frequency (%)	0.01	0.01	

n= frequency of TM types

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

- indicated underuse of TMs in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

According to Table 11, among all the TM types, the total usage of the additive transitions for three sections, including; the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections in the MA theses written by the TSs of English were 22027 whereas it was 14846 for the NSs of English. In addition, the additives were used more than the adversative, sequential, and causal transitions by the TSs in the MA theses' three sections. It was revealed that the additive transition usage in all three sections for the TSs of English was higher than those of the NSs of English in their theses. By means of frequency per 1,000 words, the additive transitions for both groups were observed to be the highest in their MA theses. According to the frequency results, both the TSs and the

NSs used similar amount of transitions for four types in every 100 words in three sections of their theses. Although the causal and the sequential transitions for both groups displayed the same frequecies (0.01%) and proportion of TMs (1) per 1,000 words in all three sections of the MA theses, the sequential transitions contained the lowest number of TMs (695) by the NSs of English.

Besides the overall frequency analysis, LL calculation was applied. As indicated in Table 11, the LL value of the TM types in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections of the MA theses between the TSs of English and the NSs of English revealed an underuse which was statistically significant. Moreover, the most significant underuse was observed in the adversative transitions (-153.33) wheras the least LL value was obtained from the additive transitions (-0.16) in the MA theses of both groups. The differences between the TM types in two groups were compared by analyzing their frequencies separately for the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections.

4.2.3.1. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Marker Types for the Introduction Section in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the transition marker (TM) types for the introduction section in the MA theses written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT was compared. The results were presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Frequency Analysis of the TM Types for the Introduction Section in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs			NSs			overuse/underuse
	n	%	n/1,000	n	%	n/1,000	+ / -
Additive	4528	84.5	3	2956	85.4	3	+0.0
Adversative	465	8.6	0.3	328	9.4	0.3	+0.0
Sequential	198	3.6	0.1	94	2.7	0.1	+0.0
Causal	166	3.0	0.1	83	2.3	0.1	+0.0

n= frequency of TM types

%= percentage of TM types in total of words in groups

n/1,000= frequency of TM types per 1,000 words

(- / +)= difference between relevant value and value in TSs of English TM types per 1,000 words

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

- indicated underuse of TM types in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

As illustrated in Table 12, the most frequently used TM type in introduction section of the MA theses written by the TSs of English was the additive transitions with 4528 frequency and constituted the 84.5% of all the TM types. On the other hand, the most frequently used TM type by the NSs of English was also the additive transitions (2956). In addition, the NSs had the highest percentage (85.4%) in between the TM types in their theses' introduction section. Moreover, the four TM types for both the TSs and the NSs' theses were similar in number per 1,000 words in the introduction section. Consequently, when the frequencies of the TM types in the MA theses' introduction section used by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were compared, the results indicated that all the transition types were overused by the TSs of English. Below were the sample sentences taken from the TSs and the NSs. MATS-INT refers to the introduction section of the MA theses written by the TSs, and MANS-INT refers to the introduction section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 7

[In Foreign Language Teaching, within 4 basic language skills, reading **and** listening have been regarded as passive and receptive skills until 1980's whereas speaking **and** writing have been considered as active **and** productive skills.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS8-INT></div>

[It **also** gives information about the historical background of listening comprehension, factors that affect listening comprehension and components and stages of listening comprehension process.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS6-INT></div>

[**In addition**, rather than other skills, it seems as the most problematic exam type which causes anxiety.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS12-INT></div>

[Although the current study did involve the researcher teaching strategies explicitly, the researcher used strategies such as boldfacing **and** underlining **and** grouping the prepositions according to "rules" to help the students understand how to use prepositions.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS46-INT></div>

[Learners' attitudes are **also** perceived as affecting teacher-student relationships and having an impact on learning engagement.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS47-INT></div>

[**In addition**, words lose some of their meaning, original form, and style when translated, which cause ideas to lose their appeal.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS1-INT></div>

All four transition types had been overused in the introduction section of the MA theses by both groups as indicated in the examples above. The NSs of English had used the additive transition more frequently than the TSs of English. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as, *"and, also, in addition"* had been used in the sentences of both groups which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage.

In order to confirm the overuse / underuse revealed from differences of frequency per 1,000 words, LL calculation was applied. The LL frequency of TM types in the introduction section of the MA theses written by the TSs of English and the NSs of English was illustrated in Table 13.

Table 13

LL Frequency of TM Types for the Introduction Section in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
Additive	4528	2956	+1.37*
Adversative	465	328	-0.47*
Sequential	198	94	+7.93*
Causal	166	83	+4.94*

n= frequency of TM types

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

- indicated underuse of TM types in TSs of English relative to NSs of English

As observed in Table 13, the LL values of the TM types used by the TSs of English had indicated an overuse and a significant difference in the additive, the sequential, and the causal transitions. However, an underuse was observed in the adversative transitions in the introduction section of the MA theses written by the TSs of English. The highest overuse in the TSs' TM types was in sequential transitions with +7.93 and then in causal transitions with +4.94 LL value. The least overuse difference was in the additives with +1.37 LL value. In adversative transitions, the LL frequency revealed an underuse with -0.47 LL value and a significant difference in the MA theses' introduction section by the TSs of English. The TM types could be observed in the following examples extracted from the TSs and the NSs. MATS-INT refers to the

introduction section of the MA theses written by the TSs, and MANS-INT refers to the introduction section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 8

[**Thus**, taking the challenges of the previous literature and the demand presented in the section of problem statement into consideration, the present study extends the research into the use of another specific genre, master theses, which are continuosly produced in the academic written context but of which previous research has adressed neither the overall rhetorical and structural organisation or the sections nor the discursive factors behind the process of the production, ….]

Extracted from <MATS33-INT>

[It is obvious that collocations have an important role in using language, **so** learning them should be promoted in the classroom.]

Extracted from <MATS35-INT>

[In order to overcome this problem for good, it is better **and** more logical to help someone learn how to cope with problems **and** teach him/her the know-how.]

Extracted from <MATS30-INT>

[**Yet**, the same is not true of the research made on the corpus based study of relative clauses *which* pronoun in Turkish students' academic texts.]

Extracted from <MATS36-INT>

[**Thu**s, the central strategy for developing fluency is to provide extensive reading opportunities with manageable text, text within the reader's range.]

Extracted from <MANS49-INT>

[**So**, while student identity is an individual difference and highly variable between individuals, most people attending school at any level will incorporate a student identity into their social identity.]

Extracted from <MANS38-INT>

[This study was conducted in a college in a developing country in Southeast Asia **and** intended to discover how self-efficacy, goal orientation, learning strategies, **and** academic achievement in writing classes related to each other.]

Extracted from <MANS43-INT>

[**Yet**, as the prevalence of flashcards, vocabulary notebooks, software, and vocabulary quizzes suggests, it is an important part of studying English.]

Extracted from <MANS13-INT>

Among the TM types that were found in the TSs of English corpus, such as sequential, causal and additive transitions were overused, wheras the adversative transitions were underused in their MA theses. The significant overuses of the sequential, causal, and additive transitions might be a reflection of the TSs more academic writing style in English. In the next section, the analysis of the most salient types of the TMs; including these four transition types; in the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English were presented.

4.2.3.2. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Marker Types for the Results and Discussion Section in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the transition marker (TM) types in the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English

and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT was compared. The results were presented in Table 14.

Table 14

Frequency Analysis of the TM Types for the Results and Discussion Section in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs			NSs			overuse/underuse
	n	%	n/1,000	n	%	n/1,000	+ / -
Additive	12730	81.2	7	7486	74.5	6	+1
Adversative	1768	11.2	1	1567	15.6	1	+0.0
Sequential	476	3.0	0.3	405	4.0	0.3	+0.0
Causal	696	4.4	0.4	581	5.7	1	-0.6

n= frequency of TM types

%= percentage of TM types in total of words in groups

n/1,000= frequency of TM types per 1,000 words

(- / +)= difference between relevant value and value in TSs' TM types per 1,000 words

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

 - indicated underuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

In Table 14, the most frequently used TM type was the additive transitions with 12730 frequency and constituted the 81.2% of all the TM types in the TSs' MA theses' results and discussion section. Moreover, the most frequently used TM type by the NSs was also the additive transitions (7486) with 74.5%. Furthermore, the TSs had the highest percentage (81.2%) in between the TM types in the MA theses' results and discussion section.

The frequency of the additive transitions per 1,000 words in the TSs' theses was 7 as illustrated in Table 14. The difference between two groups (7-6) was 1. In other words, the additive transitions in the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the TSs of English had been used more than the NSs of English. Furthermore, when the frequencies were compared, TM types in these theses' mentioned section were observed that the additive, adversative, and sequential transitions were overused by the TSs. On the contrary, underuse was observed in only the causal transitions (-0.6). The following extracts were drawn from the corpora in concern. MATS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the MA theses

written by the TSs, and MANS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 9

[In this item, while 41.30% of teachers agree **and** 2.17% of teachers strongly agree with the statement, 31.52% of the teachers disagree **and** 3.26% of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement.]

Extracted from <MATS28-RD>

[First opinions about and suggestions for the EPOSTL and **also** its role in some aspects of teaching are addressed in the themes.]

Extracted from <MATS32-RD>

[Only 46% of the students agreed that they would enjoy taking another class with their NESTs as opposed to 42% who agreed they would do **so** with their NNESTs.]

Extracted from <MATS39-RD>

[The purpose of this study was to understand the connections academic peer leaders made between their peer leadership experience **and** their change in academic performance **and** skills.]

Extracted from <MANS17-RD>

[They **also** seemed to initially not take as many risks in their writing.]

Extracted from <MANS3-RD>

[**So** during the group work, students might keep silent even though they want to make some comments.]

Extracted from <MANS33-RD>

The frequently overused TM types in the MA theses' results and discussion section by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were additives. Likewise, the causal transitions appeared in the same groups were underused. A wide variety of additive transitions had been used in the sentences of both groups which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. LL calculation was applied in order to confirm the overuse / underuse revealed from differences of frequency per 1,000 words. Table 15 indicated the LL frequency of TM types in the results and discussion section of the TSs and the NSs' MA theses.

Table 15

LL Frequency of the TM Types for the Results and Discussion Section in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
Additive	12730	7486	+83.22*
Adversative	1768	1567	-63.68*
Sequential	476	405	-12.21*
Causal	696	581	-14.95*

n= frequency of TM types

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

- indicated underuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

According to Table 15, the LL values of the TM types of the TSs had indicated an overuse with a significant difference in the additive (+83.22) transitions. On the other hand; in the adversative, sequential, and causal transitions revealed an underuse and a significant difference was observed in the TSs' results and discussion section of the MA theses. The highest underuse in the TSs' TM types was in adversative transitions with -63.68 LL value. The least amount of underuse was revealed as -12.21 in the sequential transitions which was statistically significant in the TSs' MA theses' results and discussion section. The extracts obtained from each corpus was illustrated in Example 10. MATS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the TSs, and MANS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 10

[In this chapter the reliability of the scale will be given **and** the findings of the study will be presented **and** the analysis will be interpreted.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS11-RD></div>

[These participants were **also** able to use programs such as 'word' and 'power point' which were necessary to be able to carry out the tasks given to them.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS31-RD></div>

[The participating students in the two groups took the second pop-quiz after the unit 2 was covered through the stated goals and objectives, **but** it was administered at an unannounced date.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS14-RD></div>

[**However**, it should be noted that the results that have come out of this study, do not present the situation of the other primary schools in Turkey.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS37-RD></div>

[For the speaking test in the pretest to posttest comparison **and** in the pretest to delayed posttest comparison, a one-way ANOVA of the three groups found a statistical difference.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS42-RD></div>

[He **also** stated that each student draft that he grades, whether it is freshman composition, an upper level undergraduate course, or graduate course, all receive a reader's report with a fully developed response to the draft.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MANS21-RD></div>

[The interviewees were not asked this question, **but** none of the comments they volunteered when discussing the advantages of technology mentioned enhanced creativity.]

Extracted from <MANS39-RD>

[**However**, because the means of participants' collective growth in each treatment group are negative with regards to both learner attitudes and learner motivation, the results indicate that no positive growth occurred when examining the treatment group as a whole.]

Extracted from <MANS41-RD>

The two corpora more significantly overused the additive transitions; but underused the adversatives in the results and discussion section of the MA theses. This could be an explanation for both groups tendency to use additive transitions in their theses. In the next section, the analysis of the most salient types of the TMs; including sequential, additive, adversative, and causal transitions; in the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English were presented.

4.2.3.3. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Marker Types for the Conclusion Section in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the transition marker (TM) types for the conclusion section in the MA theses written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT were compared. The results were presented in Table 16.

Table 16

Frequency Analysis of the TM Types for the Conclusion Section in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs			NSs			overuse/underuse
	n	%	n/1,000	n	%	n/1,000	+ / -
Additive	4769	82.5	3	4404	80.3	4	-1.0
Adversative	565	9.7	0.3	737	13.4	1	-0.7
Sequential	266	4.6	0.2	196	3.5	0.2	+0.0
Causal	178	3.0	0.1	146	2.6	0.1	+0.0

n= frequency of TM types

%= percentage of TM types in total of words in groups

n/1,000= frequency of TM types per 1,000 words

(- / +)= difference between relevant value and value in TSs' TM types per 1,000 words

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

 - indicated underuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

As illustrated in Table 16, the most frequently used TM type in the MA theses' conclusion section by the TSs of English was the additive transitions with 4769 frequency and for the NSs of English it displayed a frequency of 4404. In addition, the TSs had the higest percentage (82.5%) in between the TM types of this section. However, the total of the additive transitions used by the NSs (4) per 1,000 words indicated the highest amount than the TSs (3). Similarly, the adversative transition usage in the NSs' (1) theses was also determined to be higher than the TSs (0.3). As the difference between two groups (3-4) was -1.0, the additive transitions in the TSs' MA theses' conclusion section had been observed to be used slightly less than the NSs per 1,000 words. Moreover, it was identified that the additive and the adversative transitions were underused by the TSs of English. The results also indicated that both the sequential, and causal transitions were equally overused by the TSs of English (+0.0). The following were the extracts randomly taken from two corpora. MATS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the TSs, and MANS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 11

[**In addition**, during the evaluation of the papers, we encountered some common interesting mistakes such as the perception of the idiomatic expressions.]

Extracted from <MATS16-CON>

[However, the word could be supported by both a photo and a video **at the same time** instead of using only one or the other.]

Extracted from <MATS48-CON>

[**In addition**, the small subject size served as a limitation; not all of the foreign languages that are offered by the ImPACT test were used during research.]

Extracted from <MANS6-CON>

[**At the same time** it could open the discussion about what it means to be a speaker of English in continental Europe and how this relates to a speaker's identity within the global context.]

Extracted from <MANS11-CON>

The sample sentences were given to display the underuse in the additive transitions, which were preferred in the MA theses' conclusion section by the TSs of English which might be a reflection of the NSs of English more formal writing style in English. In Table 17, the LL frequency of TM types in the conclusion section of the TSs and the NSs' MA theses was presented.

Table 17

LL Frequency of the TM Types for the Conclusion Section in the MA Theses Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
Additive	4769	4404	-231.26*
Adversative	565	737	-142.80*
Sequential	266	196	-0.98*
Causal	178	146	-3.20*

n= frequency of TM types

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

- indicated underuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

In Table 17, the LL values of the TM types of the TSs of English had indicated an underuse with a significant difference in all of the transition types; including additive, adversative, sequential, and causal transitions. The highest underuse for the TM types was in additive transitions with -231.26 LL value of the TSs' MA theses' conclusion section. The least amount of underuse was revealed as -0.98 in the sequential transitions which was statistically significant for the TSs' MA theses' conclusion section. The following were the examples taken from both groups. MATS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the TSs, and MANS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 12

[**In addition**, the first part of KPDS and ÜDS test vocabulary knowledge of the candidates.]

Extracted from <MATS7-CON>

[Also, the participant teacher, the researcher of the study **at the same time**, paid greater attention in teaching the two groups to help them achieve the goals and objectives of English lesson stated for the seven units in the first academic term…]

Extracted from <MATS14-CON>

[The teacher may answer the questions about the use of strategy, help them to realize clues when they get stuck, **but** never give the correct meaning.]

Extracted from <MATS18-CON>

[**However**, in this study online peer feedback or collaboration in terms of online comments to the electronic journals or the other artifacts in the e-portfolios were not allowed by the instructor of the course.]

Extracted from <MATS13-CON>

[**In addition**, educational administrators should enable ESL students to access Moodle site from multiple platforms.]

Extracted from <MANS18-CON>

[**At the same time**, many students found that the L1 was effective in contributing to reading comprehension.]

Extracted from <MANS37-CON>

[The content is there, **but** often times unorganized and difficult for us, as teachers, to determine learning.]

Extracted from <MANS19-CON>

[**However**, this fact should not exclude the L1 from the classroom.]

Extracted from <MANS16-CON>

While the TSs of English underused mostly the additive transitions *"in addition, at the same time"*, they secondly underused the adversatives *"but, however"* in their MA theses' conclusion section. This might be a reflection of the NSs of English more formal writing style.

Considering the overall results, the mostly used TM type was the additive transitions in all three sections of the MA theses written by both the TSs of English and the NSs of English. The corpus size for the TSs was higher than the NSs. The TSs of English used high amount of additive transitions in their MA theses in all three sections. In terms of total TM type usage, both groups used 0.13 additive transitions in every 100 words in the mentioned sections and the additives they used per 1,000 words were similar in their MA theses. According to the overall frequency, the sequential transitions were used the least in their MA theses. The LL frequency indicated that the TSs significantly underused all the transition types. Moreover, the additives were the most underused transition type in total.

In the introduction section of the MA theses, the TSs of English used the additives per 1,000 words less than the NSs of English. However, in this section, the TSs used them as frequently as the NSs. The additive usage regarding their amount, frequency and usage per 1,000 words were high for the TSs in the results and discussion, and conclusion sections of their MA theses. Among all three sections, the results and discussion section included the most frequent and the most used amount of additive transitions. The additive transitions were significantly overused in the results and discussion section more than the introduction section in the TSs' MA theses because of the high proportion of the additive transition usage. However, in the conclusion section of the TSs' MA theses, the additives were highly and significantly underused due to the frequency interval of both groups.

The usage of the other TM types; regarding the adversative, sequential, and causal transitions in the MA theses' introduction section written by the TSs of English; the sequential transitions were significantly overused and the adversatives were signifantly underused. In the results and discussion, and conclusion sections, the TSs

underused the adversatives, sequential, and causal transitions. However, the adversatives were signifantly underused by the TSs in the mentioned sections. In the next section, the analysis of the most salient types of the TMs; including sequential, additive, adversative, and causal transitions; in all three sections of the doctoral dissertations (PhD) for the NSs of English and the TSs of English were presented.

4.2.4. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Marker Types in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The transition marker (TM) types; including additive, adversative, sequential, and causal transitions were analyzed in order to investigate the most salient TM types in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) of the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT. Table 18 indicated the overall frequency and log-likelihood (LL) analysis of the TMs in their dissertations.

Table 18

Overall Frequency and LL Analysis of the TM Types in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types		TSs	NSs	LL Value
	Corpus Size	2,756,430	2,880,750	
Additive	TMs (n)	29838	29169	**+65.80***
	n per 1,000	11	10	
	Frequency (%)	0.11	0.10	
Adversative	TMs (n)	4413	3632	**+114.30***
	n per 1,000	2	1	
	Frequency (%)	0.02	0.01	
Sequential	TMs (n)	1861	997	**+304.83***
	n per 1,000	1	0.3	
	Frequency (%)	0.01	0.00	
Causal	TMs (n)	1094	958	**+16.02***
	n per 1,000	0	0	
	Frequency (%)	0.00	0.00	

n= frequency of TM types

Frequency= percentage of TMs in total of words in groups

+ indicated overuse of TMs in TSs relative to NSs

 - indicated underuse of TMs in TSs relative to NSs

According to Table 18, among all the TM types, the overall usage of the additive transitions for three sections, including; the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections in the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs of English were 29838 whereas it was 29169 for the NSs of English. In addition, the additives were used more than the adversative, sequential, and causal transitions in the TSs' dissertations' three sections. It was revealed that the additive transition usage in all three sections for the TSs was higher than those of the NSs in their dissertations. By means of frequency per 1,000 words, the additive transitions for both groups were observed to be the highest in their PhD dissertations. According to the frequency results, the TSs of English used

the additive, adversative, and sequential transitions more than the NSs of English in every 100 words in three sections of their dissertations. On the contrary, both groups' doctoral dissertations were similar in number per 1,000 words and with a frequency of 0.00 causal transition usage.

Besides the overall frequency analysis, LL calculation was applied. As indicated in Table 18, the LL value for the TM types in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections of the PhD dissertations between the TSs of English and the NSs of English revealed an overuse which was statistically significant. Moreover, the most significant overuse was observed in the sequential transitions (+304.83) wheras the least LL value was obtained from the causal transitions (+16.02) in the dissertations of both groups. The differences between the TM types in two groups were compared by analyzing their frequencies separately for the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections' doctoral dissertations.

4.2.4.1. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Marker Types for the Introduction Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the transition marker (TM) types for the introduction section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT was compared. The results were presented in Table 19.

Table 19

Frequency Analysis of the TM Types for the Introduction Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs			NSs			overuse/underuse
	n	%	n/1,000	n	%	n/1,000	+ / -
Additive	5711	84.4	2	5910	88.5	2	+0.0
Adversative	557	8.2	0.2	444	6.6	0.2	+0.0
Sequential	333	4.9	0.1	195	2.9	0.1	+0.0
Causal	163	2.4	0.1	126	1.8	0.0	+0.1

n= frequency of TM types

%= percentage of TM types in total of words in groups

n/1,000= frequency of TM types per 1,000 words

(- / +)= difference between relevant value and value in TSs' TM types per 1,000 words

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

 - indicated underuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

As illustrated in Table 19, the most frequently used TM type in the introduction section of the doctoral dissertations by the TSs of English was the additive transitions with 5711 frequency and constituted the 84.4% of all the TM types. On the other hand, the most frequently used TM type for the NSs of English was also the additive transitions (5910). In addition, the NSs had the highest percentage (88.5%) for the additives in between the TM types in their dissertations' introduction section. Moreover, the frequency and frequency per 1,000 words of the TM types in both groups PhD dissertations' introduction section were compared to identified the overuse or underuse.

Table 19 indicated that, the frequency of the additive, adversative, and sequential transitions per 1,000 words in the TSs of English and the NSs of English were equal. However, the frequency of the causal transitions for the TSs was higher than the NSs. All the TM types were overused in the TSs' doctoral dissertations' introduction section. The following were the sentences taken from the TSs and the NSs. PHDTS-INT refers to the introduction section of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs, and PHDNS-INT refers to the introduction section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 13

[Before describing the main analyses, the results of confirmatory factor **and** correlation analyses related to quantitative data **and** general descriptive information about both sets of data will be presented.]

Extracted from <PHDTS2-INT>

[It was **also** stated in the proceeding that teachers and the adminitrators' interests, perceptions, views and knowledge is at utmost importance.]

Extracted from <PHDTS13-INT>

[**In addition**, students being taught in practice classes may be the source of this stress as they are individually different; there may be disruptive behaviours caused by some unmotivated students.]

Extracted from <PHDTS17-INT>

[**Accordingly**, the study was delimited by the categories of determiners, articles, nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, verbs, word class and word order errors.]

Extracted from <PHDTS27-INT>

[A teacher would also put in the additional time needed to learn about each individual in the classroom; their likes **and** dislikes, their previous experiences, their family beliefs **and** values, **and** how they learned **and** felt about school.]

Extracted from <PHDNS1-INT>

[**Also**, data to address some of the research questions is based on self-reporting by teachers or students.]

Extracted from <PHDNS13-INT>

[**In addition**, while research indicates minimal differences, performances on the two tests may vary based on the mode by which it was administered (i.e., computer vs. paper-and-pencil).]

Extracted from <PHDNS2-INT>

[**Accordingly**, the present study explores those influential variables contributing to NNESTs' professional identity and examines whether those variables contribute to NNESTs' self-perceptions toward their professional roles.]

Extracted from <PHDNS45-INT>

The frequently overused TM types in the TSs of English and the NSs of English were additives. Likewise, the adversative, sequential, and the causal transitions appeared in the same groups were also overused. This could be an explanation for the TSs of English tendency to use all transition types in their PhD dissertations' introduction section. In order to confirm the overuse / underuse revealed from differences of frequency per 1,000 words, LL calculation was applied. The LL frequency of TM types in the introduction section of the TSs and the NSs' doctoral dissertations were presented in Table 20.

Table 20

LL Frequency of the TM Types for the Introduction Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
Additive	5711	5910	+0.28*
Adversative	557	444	+18.26*
Sequential	333	195	+42.84*
Causal	163	126	+6.52*

n= frequency of TM types

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

 - indicated underuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

As observed in Table 20, the LL values of the TM types of the TSs of English had indicated an overuse and a significant difference in all of the transition types including; the additive, adversative, sequential, and the causal transitions. The highest overuse in the TSs' TM types for the doctoral dissertations' introduction section was in sequential transitions with +42.84 LL value. The least overuse difference in the LL value was in the additives with +0.28 LL value. Extracts from both corpora were illustrated in Example 14. PHDTS-INT refers to the introduction section of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs, and PHDNS-INT refers to the introduction section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 14

[**Hence**, the appropriateness of considering the native speaker as the model in English language teaching has become questionable.]

Extracted from <PHDTS43-INT>

[**Therefore**, studies like the present one could constitute data for further research for the MNE to better the curricula of the English courses, coursebooks or the educational system in general.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <PHDTS18-INT></div>

[The concept is not new; **however**, systematic studies related to the identification of the anxiety levels of students for both general language learning anxiety and anxiety related to four language skills do not go back to more than two decades.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <PHDTS3-INT></div>

[**Although** there seems to be a shift from Web 1.0 to Web 3.0, their purposes are quite different and all of them are used in accordance with the purpose.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <PHDTS45-INT></div>

[The need for the current research was warranted given Internet's potential to facilitate students' vocabularies, and **hence** comprehension of a topic.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <PHDNS39-INT></div>

[In the case of errors of the second type, sometimes qualified candidates have a bad testing day, and **therefore** perform below their ability.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <PHDNS5-INT></div>

[**However**, such strategies have not necessarily addressed the specific challenges germane to the teaching and learning of writing as an essential language skill in its own right.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <PHDNS4-INT></div>

[**Although** all faculty inherently have teaching perspectives, many nursing faculty instructors have minimal comprehension of personal perspectives in teaching.]

Extracted from <PHDNS12-INT>

Among the TM types that were found in the TSs' corpus, all the types were overused, wheras; the adversative, and the sequential transitions were mostly overused in their doctoral dissertations' introduction section. The overuses of all the transition types might be a reflection of the TSs of English more academic writing style in English. In the next section, the analysis of the most salient types of the transition markers; including sequential, additive, adversative, and causal transitions; in the results and discussion section of the PhD dissertations for the NSs of English and the TSs of English were presented.

4.2.4.2. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Marker Types for the Results and Discussion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the transition marker (TM) types for the results and discussion section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT was compared. The results were illustrated in Table 21.

Table 21

Frequency Analysis of the TM Types for the Results and Discussion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs			NSs			overuse/underuse
	n	%	n/1,000	n	%	n/1,000	+ / -
Additive	16523	78.4	6	13465	81.7	5	+1
Adversative	2852	13.5	1	2034	12.3	1	+0.0
Sequential	978	4.6	0.4	424	2.5	0.1	+0.3
Causal	701	3.3	0.3	551	3.3	0.2	+0.1

n= frequency of TM types

%= percentage of TM types in total of words in groups

n/1,000= frequency of TM types per 1,000 words

(- / +)= difference between relevant value and value in TSs' TM types per 1,000 words

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

 - indicated underuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

In Table 21, the most frequently used TM type was the additive transitions with 16523 frequency and constituted the 78.4% of all the TM types in the doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section by the TSs of English. Moreover, the most frequently used TM type for the NSs of English was also the additive transitions (13465) with 81.7%. Furthermore, the NSs had the highest percentage (81.7%) for the additive transitions in between the TM types of the PhD dissertations' results and discussion section.

The frequency of the additive transitions per 1,000 words in the TSs was 6 as illustrated in Table 21. The difference between two groups (6-5) was 1. In other words, additive transitions in the doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section written by the TSs of English had been used more than the NSs of English. Furthermore, when the frequencies were compared between the groups TM types in the dissertations' results and discussion section, it was observed that all the transition types; including the additive, adversative, sequential and causal transitions; were overused by the TSs. In between these types, the highest overuse was indicated in the additive transitions for the TSs' PhD dissertations' results and discussion section. The following examples were extracted from the TSs and NSs. PHDTS-RD refers to the results and discussion section

of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs, and PHDNS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 15

[Bearing the problem, the students, **and** the context in mind, she found online portfolio application useful **and** applied it.]

Extracted from <PHDTS20-RD>

[It is **also** emphasized clearly that the teachers prefer to give both written and oral feedback as long as the time available is sufficient.]

Extracted from <PHDTS28-RD>

[**In addition**, within those 4,5 to 5,5 years, they have at least 3 semesters of educational training.]

Extracted from <PHDTS42-RD>

[**Moreover**, American group used six types whereas the Turkish participants used four types of downgraders.]

Extracted from <PHDTS34-RD>

[**Thus**, it is clear that one of the factors that motivates Turkish students to choose teaching as a career is to get a personal and/or professional satisfaction as a result of higher ideals.]

Extracted from <PHDTS19-RD>

[When the ten focal content teachers were asked about whether the ESL teacher was a resource to them, eight teachers reported that ESL support was typically relegated

to the subject area of language arts **and** reading, **and** content teachers needed to manage as best they could on their own.]

[Differential effects of different types of written feedback were **also** found from pretest to immediate posttest: the direct feedback had a greater effect than the indirect feedback on improving learners' ability to recognize and produce the past conditionals.]

[**In addition**, "cohesion" appeared to have a significant association with essay quality.]

[**Moreover**, what they had activated in their mind might not be overlapped between these stimuli in pair.]

[His understanding of synthesis writing is **thus** limited, which is probably the result of my explanation of discourse synthesis in my teaching and students' repeated practice of the synthesis essay in the form of integrating information from two texts.]

The mostly overused transition types in the TSs of English and the NSs of English were additives. The secondly overused type was the sequential transitions. Likewise, the adversative, and the causal transitions appeared in the same groups were also overused. This could be an explanation for both groups tendency to use all the transition types in their doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section. LL calculation was applied in order to confirm the overuse / underuse revealed from differences of frequency per 1,000 words. Table 22 indicated the LL frequency of the

TM types in the results and discussion section of the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs of English and the NSs of English.

Table 22

LL Frequency of the TM Types for the Results and Discussion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
Additive	16523	13465	+461.87*
Adversative	2852	2034	+0.00*
Sequential	978	424	+250.12*
Causal	701	551	+25.24*

n= frequency of TM types

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

- indicated underuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

As indicated in Table 22, the LL values of the TM types of the TSs had determined an overuse with a significant difference in the additive transitions. On the other hand; all of the TM types; including the additive, adversative, sequential, and the causal transitions revealed an overuse and a significant difference was observed in the TSs' results and discussion section of the doctoral dissertations. The highest overuse in the TSs' TM types was in the additive transitions with +461.87 LL value. The least amount of overuse was revealed as +0.00 in the adversative transitions which was statistically significant in the TSs' dissertations' results and discussion section. The TM types could be observed in the following examples extracted from the TSs and the NSs. PHDTS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs, and PHDNS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 16

[Since the conceptual metaphors detected fall into various themes, such as emotions, business, abstract entities, places, buildings, systems, devices, humans, activities, body, objects, language, money, **and** so many others, three main themes emerged namely, complex systems **and** entities, concrete inanimate entities **and** animate entities including the conceptual metaphors.]

Extracted from <PHDTS6-RD>

[It **also** should provide them with a pedagogical tool to handle the pedagogical, institutional and personal inhibitory factors that impede their developments towards a changed perspective.]

Extracted from <PHDTS29-RD>

[**In addition**, the participants were asked whether they agree with the idea that people in their country are very good at learning languages.]

Extracted from <PHDTS12-RD>

[Any profession asks for an ongoing unavoidable improvement due to various reasons such as technological advancements, new trends and scientific findings in the field, multidisciplinary approaches to a specific field, facilities-based innovations and **likewis**e, which demands an understanding of self-updating of the performer of the profession.]

Extracted from <PHDTS40-RD>

[**Therefore**, it can be asserted that native speakers' tendency regarding this conjunction is to pause for a considerably longer duration preceding it than following it.]

Extracted from <PHDTS35-RD>

[**Thus** an overall difficulty mean was obtained for each question type.]

Extracted from <PHDTS24-RD>

[**As a result**, an ANCOVA analysis is used to test whether sum of the corrected HOTS sub-factor scores from the two groups are statistically different from each other.]

Extracted from <PHDTS38-RD>

[The research design included analyzing the scale scores **and** normal curve equivalents in grade (six or seven) **an**d gender (male or female) in reading for the years 2005,2006, **and** 2007.]

Extracted from <PHDNS10-RD>

[Similar patterns were **also** adopted in teachers' self-learning.]

Extracted from <PHDNS19-RD>

[**In addition**, the limitations of the current study are discussed, followed by recommendations for future research.]

Extracted from <PHDNS14-RD>

[However, the findings from writing **likewise** do not indicate any significant differences between learning outcomes from the three instructional treatments.]

Extracted from <PHDNS24-RD>

[A t-test showed no difference across item type **therefore** no further analysis was administered.]

Extracted from <PHDNS26-RD>

[**Thus**, learner performance only on the pretest and the posttest was analyzed.]

Extracted from <PHDNS20-RD>

[**As a result**, the students were able to be language leaders in the classroom providing rich experiences for each other, as opposed to being language followers who relied on the teachers to provide language experiences for them.]

Extracted from <PHDNS27-RD>

The sentences from both groups highly overused the additive transitions. Similarly, the sequential transitions had the second highest overuse rate. Another overused type in the TSs of English doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section were the causal transitions. This might be a reflection of the TSs more formal writing style. In the next section, the analysis of the most salient types of the TMs; including sequential, additive, adversative, and causal transitions in the conclusion section of the PhD dissertations for the NSs of English and the TSs of English was presented.

4.2.4.3. Frequency Analysis of the Transition Marker Types for the Conclusion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the transition marker (TM) types for the conclusion section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT was compared. The results were illustrated in Table 23.

Table 23

Frequency Analysis of the TM Types for the Conclusion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs			NSs			overuse/underuse
	n	%	n/1,000	n	%	n/1,000	+ / -
Additive	7604	80.9	3	9794	84.3	3	+0.0
Adversative	1004	10.6	0.4	1154	9.9	0.4	+0.0
Sequential	550	5.8	0.2	378	3.2	0.1	+0.1
Causal	230	2.4	0.1	281	2.4	0.1	+0.0

n= frequency of TM types

%= percentage of TM types in total of words in groups

n/1,000= frequency of TM types per 1,000 words

(- / +)= difference between relevant value and value in TSs' TM types per 1,000 words

+ indicated overuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

 - indicated underuse of TM types in TSs relative to NSs

In Table 23, the most frequently used TM type in the conclusion section of the doctoral dissertations by the TSs of English was the additive transitions with 7604 frequency and for the NSs of English, it displayed a frequency of 9794. In addition, the NSs had the higest percentage (84.3%) in between the TM types in their dissertations' conclusion section. Table 23 also indicated that, the frequency of the additive, adversative and causal transitions per 1,000 words in the NSs and the TSs was equal. The sequential transition usage by the TSs was higher than the NSs and the difference between two groups (0.2-0.1) was +0.1. In other words, the sequential transitions in the TSs' PhD dissertations' conclusion section had been used 0.1 times more than the NSs. Consequently, when the frequencies of the TSs and the NSs' TM types in the doctoral dissertations' conclusion section were compared, the results indicated that all the transition types were overused by the TSs. The following extracts were drawn from the corpora in concern. PHDTS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs, and PHDNS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 17

[It is really important to understand the role of the use of language learning strategies **and** the strategy based instruction in foreign language learning **and** teaching.]

Extracted from <PHDTS49-CON>

[**Also**, vocabulary and grammar (morphology and syntax) are relatively rigid in English, but intonation is not.]

Extracted from <PHDTS37-CON>

[**In addition**, students reflected on their strategic planning and adjustments based on the feedback they received from their self-monitoring and self-evaluations.]

Extracted from <PHDTS46-CON>

[The participants mostly preferred familiarisers such as *Guys, Friends,* and *Everybody/Everyone* to address the given interlocutors, the popularity of which, **again**, was found to change according to the age of the interlocutors and also to the familiarity of the interlocutors.]

Extracted from <PHDTS10-CON>

[To accomplish this, Pearson Product-Moment correlations were conducted to analyze the relationships between the percentages of students eligible for free **and** reduced lunch, student absenteeism, school safety, school climate, **and** student achievement for 2006 to 2007, 2007 to 2008, **and** 2008 to 2009.]

Extracted from <PHDNS17-CON>

[This comparison will **also** provide insight into how the curriculum can be revamped to improve instruction thus ensuring increased success on the assessments.]

Extracted from <PHDNS46-CON>

[**In addition**, students who were retained were not accounted for in the sample; so it is unclear how retained students performed in comparison to students who were not retained.]

Extracted from <PHDNS21-CON>

[**Again**, consideration of the nature of each category engendered interesting observations.]

Extracted from <PHDNS35-CON>

Among the TM types that were found in the TS corpus, all the types were overused, wheras the sequential transitions were mostly overused in the doctoral dissertations' conclusion section. The overuses of all the transition types might be a reflection of the TSs of English more academic writing style in English. In order to confirm the overuse / underuse revealed from differences of frequency per 1,000 words, LL calculation was applied. In Table 24, the LL frequency of TM types in the conclusion section of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs of English and the NSs of English was analyzed.

Table 24

LL Frequency of the TM Types for the Conclusion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English

Types	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
Additive	7604	9794	-188.26*
Adversative	1004	1154	+0.00*
Sequential	550	378	+40.10*
Causal	230	281	-3.10*

n= frequency of TM types

+ indicated overuse of TM types in NSs relative to NSs

 - indicated underuse of TM types in NSs relative to NSs

According to Table 24, the LL values of the TM types of the TSs had indicated an underuse with a significant difference in the additive, and the causal transitions. The highest underuse in the TSs' TM types was in additive transitions with -188.26 LL value in their doctoral dissertations' conclusion section. On the contrary, the TSs had overused the adversative, and the sequential transitions. The highest amount of overuse was revealed as +40.10 in the sequential transitions which was statistically significant in the TSs' dissertations' conclusion section. The extracts obtained from each corpus was illustrated in Example 18. PHDTS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the PhD dissertations written by the TSs, and PHDNS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 18

[Further studies could **also** be conducted to evaluate how these two ethical code towards students is implemented by teachers in different contexts.]

Extracted from <PHDTS50-CON>

 [**Furthermore**, one should always bear in mind that the use of language learning strategies play a big role in foreign language learning, and researchers need to

devise appropriate approaches and techniques that would help teachers to motivate their students and to train them to use strategies that would facilitate their language learning.]

Extracted from <PHDTS49-CON>

[**Hence**, teachers should model the strategies and provide practise opportunities for these newly learned strategies.]

Extracted from <PHDTS44-CON>

[**Thus**, in spite of promising progress in the participants' academic lexical competence, they had some difficulties in academic lexical performance, especially in essay context.]

Extracted from <PHDTS26-CON>

[Learners **also** reported that the feedback they received from *Idiomobile* helped them decide which idioms are easier for them to learn and which sections they should practice as they take the quizzes, which in essence allowed the learners to develop learning strategies that are based on they feedback they got.]

Extracted from <PHDNS30-CON>

[**Furthermore**, in their responses to the questionnaire open-ended questions, many teachers expressed favorable attitudes toward oral errors and their correction.]

Extracted from <PHDNS44-CON>

[Administering a delayed posttest would have provided information regarding second language learners' ability to recall novel vocabulary in a second language, and **hence**, provide important information on whether storybook reading interventions, specifically whether any of the treatment combinations, led to maintenance of novel vocabulary in L2.]

Extracted from <PHDNS47-CON>

[Some of the issues still remain in how institutions report students with disabilities such as counting students in their main disability, counting them once, and **thus** students with multiple disabilities may not be captured.]

Extracted from <PHDNS41-CON>

The frequently underused transition types in the doctoral dissertations' conclusion section by the TSs of English were additives. This might be a reflection of the NSs of English more formal writing style. However, the sequential transitions appeared in the TSs were mostly overused.

Considering the overall results, it was identified that the most salient transition type was the additives in the PhD dissertations including; introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections. It is also possible to state that the additive transitions per 1,000 words of all three sections in the dissertations by the NSs of English and the TSs of English were higher than the other TM types. Also, the additives per 1,000 words in the results and discussion section were highly used by the TSs, where as they were used equally by both groups in the introducion, and conclusion sections. In addition, in the results and discussion section, the additive transition usage for both groups' doctoral dissertations were higher than the other sections. Furthermore, in the introduction section, the NSs (88.5%) used the additive transitions more frequently than the TSs (84.4%) in their dissertations. While the additives were frequently overused in all three sections of the TSs' PhD dissertations, they were highly overused in the results and discussion section. Although the additive transitions were overused by the TSs' doctoral dissertations in the introduction, and results and discussion sections according to the LL frequency results, they were underused in the conclusion section. In the next section, the frequency analysis of the additive transitions in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections of the MA theses and the PhD dissertations for the NSs of English and the TSs of English were presented.

4.2.5. Frequency Analysis of the Additive Transitions in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The most salient transition type; namely additive transitions, emerged from the frequency analysis of the MA theses of the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in all three sections; including the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections of these theses in the field of ELT were compared. The most frequently used additive transitions in the introduction section of the MA theses written by the NSs and the TSs were analyzed in the next section.

4.2.5.1 Frequency Analysis of the Additive Transitions for the Introduction Section in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions for the introduction section in the MA theses written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT was compared. The results were presented in Table 25.

Table 25

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Introduction Section of the TSs' MA Theses

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	298	5.5	0.2
and	4004	74.7	2.3
at the same time	10	0.1	0.0
besides	24	0.4	0.0
furthermore	36	0.6	0.0
in addition	102	1.9	0.1
likewise	2	0.0	0.0
moreover	46	0.8	0.0
similarly	6	0.1	0.0
Total	**4528**	**84.1**	**2.6**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As observed in Table 25, there were nine additive transitions which TSs used in their MA theses' introduction section. 84.1% of the total TM types in the same section of their theses included the frequently used additive transitions. Moreover, the frequent additive transitions such as *"and (4004), also (298), in addition (102)"* were used 2.6 times in every 1,000 words in the TSs' MA theses' introduction section. The following were the extracts randomly taken from the TSs of English. MATS-INT refers to the introduction section of the MA theses written by the TSs.

Example 19

[The phases of the model provide the best way of motivating **and** creating a mysterious atmosphere to help students start producing **and** increase their achievement.]

Extracted from <MATS9-INT>

[They can **also** use hardware and software efficiently and effectively in media productions.]

Extracted from <MATS1-INT>

[**In addition** to schooling, the use of language in a particular society, can affect, dominate and manipulate the people in intended ways and can help the maintenance of the power of the authorities.]

Extracted from <MATS25-INT>

All nine additive transitions had been frequently used in the introduction section of the MA theses by the TSs of English as indicated in the examples above. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as, *"and, also, in addition"* had been used in the sentences of the TSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. The most frequently used additive transitions in the introduction section of the MA theses written by the NSs of English were illustrated in Table 26.

Table 26

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Introduction Section of the NSs' MA Theses

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	224	6.4	0.2
and	2620	75.7	2.2
at the same time	13	0.3	0.0
besides	8	0.2	0.0
furthermore	22	0.6	0.0
in addition	53	1.5	0.0
likewise	1	0.0	0.0
moreover	11	0.3	0.0
similarly	4	0.1	0.0
Total	**2956**	**85.1**	**2.4**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As indicated in Table 26, the NSs used nine additive transitions in their MA theses introduction section and the total number of most frequently used additive transitions in the NSs was 2956 which covered 85.1 percent of all TM types. Furthermore, the most frequent additive transitions such as *"and (2620), also (224), in addition (53)"* were used 2.4 times in every 1,000 words in the NSs' MA theses' introduction section. When the TSs were compared with the NSs, the amount of additive transitions the TSs used were slightly more than the NSs per 1,000 words. There were three additive transitions identical that the TSs and the NSs used such as *"and (4004), also (298), in addition (102)"*. In addition, the TSs had used *"and"* 2.3 times in every 1,000 words whereas it was used 2.2 times per 1,000 words in the NSs' MA theses' introduction section as the most frequently used additive. For both groups, the additive transitions including *"also (0.2), at the same time (0.0), besides (0.0), furthermore (0.0), likewise (0.0), moreover (0.0), similarly (0.0)"* were used equally in this section. Besides, the only additive used more by the TSs than the NSs was *"in addition"*. The following extracts were drawn from the corpora in concern. MANS-INT refers to the introduction section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 20

[In particular, online chat allows for a dynamic exchange of information virtually in real time where participants can read **and** respond to messages immediately.]

Extracted from <MANS50-INT>

[This chapter will **also** describe the testing configuration.]

Extracted from <MANS45-INT>

[**In addition**, the game provides learners with opportunities to hear the correct pronunciation and to practice spelling.]

Extracted from <MANS1-INT>

As indicated in the examples above, all nine additive transitions had been frequently used in the introduction section of the MA theses by the NSs of English. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as *"and, also, in addition"* had been used in the sentences of the NSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. In order to analyze the significance of highly frequent additive transitions in the TSs' MA theses' introduction section, LL calculation was applied by comparing with the NSs. Table 27 presented the LL frequency of overused additive transitions in the MA theses written by the TSs of English in comparison with the NSs of English.

Table 27

LL Frequency of Overused Additive Transitions in the Introduction Section of the NSs and the TSs' MA Theses

Overused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
and	4004	2620	+1.02*
besides	24	8	+3.26*
furthermore	36	22	+0.12*
in addition	102	53	+2.34*
likewise	2	1	+0.06*
moreover	46	11	+11.39*
similarly	6	4	+0.00*

n= frequency of additive transitions

+ indicated overuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

In Table 27, the overuse of the additive transitions in the TSs' MA theses' introduction section had been analyzed according to the LL values. The highest LL value belonged to *"moreover"* which revealed +11.39 value and indicated a significant difference between the TSs of English and the NSs of English in terms of frequency. On the other hand, overused additive transitions such as *"besides (3.26), in addition (2.34), and (1.02), furthermore (0.12), likewise (0.06), similarly (0.00)"* revealed significant differences. The following were the sentences taken from the TSs. MATS-INT refers to the introduction section of the MA theses written by the TSs.

Example 21

[**Moreover**, this kind of person cannot easily accept knowledge as exact and secure; the process of seeking information brings security.]

Extracted from <MATS27-INT>

[**Besides**, reading is one of the first steps to enable learners language input, and an opportunity to understand the structure of target language.]

Extracted from <MATS22-INT>

[**In addition**, the goal of this study is to observe what kinds of CSs learners use in written and spoken interactions.]

Extracted from <MATS29-INT>

[Because of this **and** various reasons like commerce, education, tourism, or others that can change person to person, language teaching is gaining more **and** more importance nowadays.]

Extracted from <MATS17-INT>

[**Furthermore**, the repetitions can be customized according to the learners' needs.]

Extracted from <MATS15-INT>

[**Likewise**, some of them have just graduated from high school and their English may be fresh.]

Extracted from <MATS46-INT>

[**Similarly**, some websites that offer social activities and collaboration could be implemented in teaching and learning in order to catch up with the changes in technology.]

Extracted from <MATS10-INT>

The TSs of English had frequently overused *"moreover"* in their MA theses' introduction section as presented in the example above. In addition to *"moreover"*, a wide variety of additive transitions such as; *"besides, in addition, and, furthermore, likewise, similarly"* had been used which might also be a reflection of the TSs of English more academic writing style in English. LL calculation had been applied to analyze the underused additive transitions according to the frequency analysis. According to Table 28, the underused additive transitions in the MA theses' introduction section by the TSs of English in comparison with the NSs of English were indicated.

Table 28

LL Frequency of Underused Additive Transitions in the Introduction Section of the NSs and the TSs' MA Theses

Underused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
also	298	224	-1.63*
at the same time	10	13	-2.50*

n= frequency of additive transitions

+ indicated overuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

- indicated underuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

According to the LL frequency of underused additive transitions, *"also"* and *"at the same time"* revealed a difference in the MA theses' introduction section written by the TSs of English against the NSs of English in Table 28. The additive transition *"at the same time"* was significantly underused with +2.50 LL value more than *"also"* with -1.63 value which could be interpreted as it was not preferred by the TSs as much as the NSs' MA theses' introduction section. Example 22 provided the sentences taken from each corpus. MATS-INT refers to the introduction section of the MA theses written by the TSs, and MANS-INT refers to the introduction section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 22

[The conceptual message and rhetorical objectives appeal to linguistic knowledge **at the same time** to express the ideas correctly and appropriately, which may lead to cognitive overload.]

Extracted from <MATS4-INT>

[While performing his duties, he is **also** intensely engaged in learning.]

Extracted from <MATS15-INT>

[**At the same time**, the CCC is not quite as enthusiastic about electronic writing assessments, preferring that essays be hand graded.]

Extracted from <MANS39-INT>

[Given that this research involved a questionnaire, it was **also** limited by the capability of the participants to accurately interpret the questions.]

Extracted from <MANS44-INT>

The TSs of English underused mostly the additive transitions *"at the same time, also"*. This might be explained that the TSs had not used the mentioned additives as frequently as the NSs of English in their MA theses' introduction section. The results of the frequency analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions for the results and discussion section in the MA theses written by the TSs of English and the NSs of English was compared in the next section.

4.2.5.2. Frequency Analysis of the Additive Transitions for the Results and Discussion Section in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions for the results and discussion section in the MA theses written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT was compared. The results were presented in Table 29.

Table 29

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Results and Discussion Section of the TSs' MA Theses

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	1120	7.1	0.6
and	10852	69.2	6.1
at the same time	24	0.1	0.0
besides	209	1.3	0.1
furthermore	82	0.5	0.0
in addition	234	1.4	0.1
likewise	22	0.1	0.0
moreover	110	0.7	0.1
similarly	77	0.4	0.0
Total	**12730**	**80.8**	**7.0**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As observed in Table 29, the TSs of English used nine additive transitions in their MA theses' results and discussion section, and the total number of most frequently used additive transitions by the TSs was 12730 which covered 80.8 percent of all TM types. Furthermore, the frequent additive transitions such as *"and (10852), also (1120), in addition (234), besides (209), moreover (110)"* were used 7.0 times in every 1,000 words in the TSs' MA theses' results and discussion section. Extracts from the TSs

were illustrated in the following. MATS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the TSs.

Example 23

[In the Direct Method, the teachers aim to teach speech and listening comprehension, emphasize correct pronunciation, grammar, **and** conversational skills, **and** try to encourage the direct **and** spontaneous use of the language.]

Extracted from <MATS40-RD>

[As the handouts are prepared, appropriate descriptors taken from the ELP are **also** matched with the aims of the handouts by the teachers and these descriptors are put on one corner of the handout.]

Extracted from <MATS43-RD>

[**In addition**, if the participant corrects any grammatical mistake in his/her own contribution, this was identified as a self correction.]

Extracted from <MATS50-RD>

[In line with this purpose, **besides** minimum and maximum scores, means and standard deviations for each section in the English and Turkish versions of the questionnaire, the items of each section and the correlations of these items are presented through the tables.]

Extracted from <MATS34-RD>

[**Moreover**, some students explain what they will do after their opinions have changed.]

Extracted from <MATS49-RD>

As indicated in the examples above, all nine additive transitions had been most frequently used in the results and discussion section of the MA theses by the TSs of English. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as, *"and, also, in addition, besides, moreover"* had been used in the sentences of the TSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. The most frequently used additive transitions in the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the NSs of English were presented in Table 30.

Table 30

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Results and Discussion Section of the NSs' MA Theses

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	812	8.0	0.7
and	6471	64.4	5.5
at the same time	20	0.1	0.0
besides	23	0.2	0.0
furthermore	26	0.2	0.0
in addition	85	0.8	0.1
likewise	12	0.1	0.0
moreover	17	0.1	0.0
similarly	20	0.1	0.0
Total	**7486**	**74.0**	**6.3**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As illustrated in Table 30, the NSs of English used nine additive transitions in their MA theses' results and discussion section. The total number of most frequently used additive transitions by the NSs was 7486 which covered 74.0 percent of all TM types. Furthermore, the most frequent additive transitions such as *"and (6471), also (812), in addition (85)"* were used 6.3 times in every 1,000 words in the NSs' MA theses' results and discussion section. The amount of additive transitions the TSs used per 1,000 words was 7.0 whereas the NSs used 6.3. When the TSs were compared with the NSs, there were three additive transitions identical that the TSs and the NSs used

such as *"and (10852), also (1120), in addition (234)"*. Moreover, the TSs had used *"and"* 6.1 times in every 1,000 words whereas it was used 5.5 times per 1,000 words in the NSs' MA theses' results and discussion section as the most frequently used additive. The following extracts were taken from the NSs of English. MANS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 24

[Raw **and** standard scores were not compared; rather the equation was based on the pass/fail rates of the tests.]

Extracted from <MANS2-RD>

[An undergraduate research scholar **also** rated the same data.]

Extracted from <MANS7-RD>

[**In addition**, this research question allows me and other vocabulary materials designers to "market" materials in a way that focuses on design features that meet needs students know they have, e.g. to understand more academic words when they read them.]

Extracted from <MANS34-RD>

All nine additive transitions had been most frequently used in the results and discussion section of the MA theses by the NSs of English as indicated in the examples above. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as, *"and, also, in addition"* had been used in the sentences of the NSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. The LL calculation was applied in order to analyze the significance of highly frequent additive transitions in the MA theses' results and discussion section by the TSs of English and the NSs of English. Table 31 illustrated the LL frequency of overused additive transitions in the MA theses written by the TSs in comparison with the NSs.

Table 31

LL Frequency of Overused Additive Transitions in the Results and Discussion Section of the NSs and the TSs' MA Theses

Overused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
and	10852	6471	+57.22*
besides	209	23	+106.65*
furthermore	82	26	+12.44*
in addition	234	85	+25.56*
likewise	22	12	+0.34*
moreover	110	17	+44.0*
similarly	77	20	+16.85*

n= frequency of additive transitions

+ indicated overuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

In the MA theses by the TSs of English, the overuse of the additive transitions had been analyzed according to the LL values as presented in Table 31. The highest LL value belonged to *"besides"* which revealed +106.65 value and indicated a highly significant difference between the TSs and the NSs in terms of frequency in their MA theses' results and discussion section. On the other hand, overused additive transitions such as *"and (57.22), moreover (44.0), in addition (25.56), similarly (16.85), furthermore (12.44), likewise (0.34)"* revealed significant differences. Below were the sample sentences taken from the TSs. MATS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the TSs.

Example 25

[**Besides**, 11 participants (7,86 %) mark 'not sure'.]

Extracted from <MATS3-RD>

[The results of the qualitative analysis are presented under two titles, move analysis, which covers explanation **and** commentaries for each move identified in

CARS model, **and** step analysis, which is divided in three sub-titles **and** involves the presentation of the findings of textual analysis for each step of the moves.]

Extracted from <MATS33-RD>

[**Moreover**, they now give themselves a reward or treat when they do well in English.]

Extracted from <MATS41-RD>

[**In addition**, each item analyzed in its own context is explained in terms of its functional use and examples from both native and non-native corpora are provided and interpreted.]

Extracted from <MATS42-RD>

[**Similarly**, our data revealed that the participants sometimes produced sentences that are meaningful and acceptable in Turkish, but not in English, as they are not grammatically or socially appropriate in the TL.]

Extracted from <MATS29-RD>

[**Furthermore**, both schools are working in cooperation with the families of the learners with learning problems and the families are informed about the situation and progress of the learners monthly.]

Extracted from <MATS40-RD>

[**Likewise**, the second item refers to the teacher's enhancement of the students' motivation and again results in learning.]

Extracted from <MATS39-RD>

The TSs of English had frequently overused *"besides"* as presented in the sentences of the MA theses' results and discussion section. In addition to *"besides"*, a

wide variety of additive transitions such as; *"and, moreover, in addition, similarly, furthermore, likewise"* had been used which might also be a reflection of the TSs more academic writing style in English. In addition, to analyze the underused additive transitions according to the frequency analysis, LL calculation had been applied. According to Table 32, the underused additive transitions in the MA theses' results and discussion section by the TSs of English in comparison with the NSs of English were presented.

Table 32

LL Frequency of Underused Additive Transitions in the Results and Discussion Section of the NSs and the TSs' MA Theses

Underused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
also	1120	812	-2.79*
at the same time	24	20	-0.51*

n= frequency of additive transitions

- indicated underuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

As observed from Table 32, according to the LL frequency of underused additive transitions *"also"* and *"at the same time"* revealed difference in the MA theses' results and discussion section by TSs of English against the NSs of English. The additive transition *"also"* was significantly underused with -2.79 LL value more than *"at the same time"* with -0.51 value which could be interpreted as it was not preferred by the NSs as much as the TSs' MA theses in the results and discussion section. In Example 26, the sentences obtained from each corpus are illustrated. MATS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the MA theses written by the TSs.

Example 26

[The second section **also** presents the results of the second research question.]

Extracted from <MATS26-RD>

[For instance, the analyses of the practices and reflections of Tugce may have implied that inexperienced teachers and **at the same time** teachers who had their GPA above 3.00 were eager to use different materials and enriched their lessons with various kinds of activities.]

Extracted from <MATS5-RD>

[In addition to performing a paired samples *t*-test on word counts, qualitative data were **also** collected from the participants via the exit questionnaires.]

Extracted from <MANS20-RD>

[**At the same time**, native students think nonnative students' papers are easy to review because they are usually more problematic, while nonnative students tend to find it challenging to review native students' papers because they are sometimes regarded as good enough or hard-to-understand papers.]

Extracted from <MANS30-RD>

As illustrated in the examples above, the TSs of English underused mostly the additive transitions *"also, at the same time"*. This might be explained that the TSs of English had not used the mentioned additives as frequently as the NSs of English in their MA theses' results and discussion section. The results of the frequency analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions for the conclusion section in the TSs and the NSs' MA theses was compared in the next section.

4.2.5.3. Frequency Analysis of the Additive Transitions for the Conclusion Section in the MA Theses Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions for the conclusion section in the MA theses written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT was compared. The results were presented in Table 33.

Table 33

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Conclusion Section of the TSs' MA Theses

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	457	7.9	0.3
and	4028	69.7	2.3
at the same time	8	0.1	0.0
besides	45	0.7	0.0
furthermore	44	0.7	0.0
in addition	84	1.4	0.1
likewise	8	0.1	0.0
moreover	71	1.2	0.0
similarly	24	0.4	0.0
Total	**4769**	**82.2**	**2.7**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As indicated in Table 33, there were nine additive transitions which TSs of English used in their MA theses' conclusion section. 82.2% of total TM types in the TSs' MA theses' conclusion section included the frequently used additive transitions. Moreover, the frequent additive transitions such as *"and (4028), also (457), in addition (84)"* were used 2.7 times in every 1,000 words in the TSs' MA theses' conclusion section. The following extracts were drawn from the corpora in concern. MATS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the TSs.

Example 27

[In the second place, the implications of the study for the use of communicative tasks as supportive elements in language classrooms were presented **and** the findings were discussed from both researcher-teacher's **and** learners' perspectives.]

Extracted from <MATS20-CON>

[The results **also** signify that learners felt anxious about being assessed in writing and they felt anxious when they were exposed to the time constraint while writing in English before the wiki implementation.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS21-CON></div>

[**In addition**, some studies pointed that successful learners do not always show similarities in strategy use.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS44-CON></div>

All nine additive transitions had been frequently used in the conclusion section of the MA theses by the TSs of English as indicated in the examples above. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as, *"and, also, in addition"* had been used in the sentences of the TSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. The most frequently used additive transitions in the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the NSs of English were analyzed in Table 34.

Table 34

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Conclusion Section of the NSs' MA Theses

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	437	7.9	0.4
and	3760	68.5	3.2
at the same time	11	0.2	0.0
besides	7	0.1	0.0
furthermore	41	0.7	0.0
in addition	101	1.8	0.1
likewise	6	0.1	0.0
moreover	27	0.4	0.0
similarly	14	0.2	0.0
Total	**4404**	**79.9**	**3.7**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As illustrated in Table 34, the NSs of English used nine additive transitions in their MA theses' conclusion section and the total number of frequently used additive transitions in the NSs was 4404 which covered 79.9 percent of all TM types. Furthermore, the most frequent additive transitions such as *"and (3760), also (437), in addition (101)"* were used 3.7 times in every 1,000 words in the NSs' MA theses' conclusion section. The amount of additive transitions the NSs used per 1,000 words was 3.7 whereas the TSs used 2.7. When the TSs were compared with the NSs, there were three additive transitions identical that the TSs and the NSs used such as *"and (4028), also (457), in addition (84)"*. In addition, the TSs of English had used *"and"* 2.3 times in every 1,000 words whereas it was used 3.2 times per 1,000 words in the MA theses' conclusion section written by the NSs of English as the most frequently used additive. The following were the sentences found in the NSs of English. MANS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 28

[Each research question and its results will be answered according to the findings.]

Extracted from <MANS12-CON>

[In addition to these academic concerns, this study suggests that affective components like confidence and motivation are **also** affected by ESL students' oral reading proficiency.]

Extracted from <MANS22-CON>

[**In addition**, writing is about the process, so students should be encouraged to revise their papers before and after the grade has been assigned...]

Extracted from <MANS21-CON>

As indicated in the examples above, all nine additive transitions had been frequently used in the conclusion section of the MA theses by the NSs of English. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as, *"and, also, in addition"* had been used in the sentences of the NSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. In order to analyze the significance of highly frequent additive transitions in the MA theses' conclusion section used by TSs of English, LL calculation was applied by comparing with the NSs of English. Table 35 presented the LL frequency of overused additive transitions in the MA theses written by the TSs in comparison with the NSs.

Table 35

LL Frequency of Overused Additive Transitions in the Conclusion Section of the NSs and the TSs' MA Theses

Overused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
besides	45	7	+17.90*
moreover	71	27	+6.80*
similarly	24	14	+0.18*

n= frequency of additive transitions

+ indicated overuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

In Table 35, the overuse of the additive transitions in the TSs of English had been analyzed according to the LL values. The highest LL value belonged to *"besides"* which revealed +17.90 value and indicated a significant difference between the TSs and the NSs in terms of frequency in their MA theses' conclusion section. On the other hand, overused additive transitions such as *"moreover (6.80)"* and *"similarly (0.18)"* revealed significant differences. The sample sentences were illustrated in Example 29. MATS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the TSs.

Example 29

[**Besides**, it would be better to increase the number of subjects.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS38-CON></div>

[**Moreover**, there was a slight decrease in learners' anxiety level of writing English under time constraint.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS21-CON></div>

[That is, they have reported to pay attention to mechanics while writing in English and Turkish, **similarly** they have become successful in this component.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MATS34-CON></div>

As presented in the example above, the TSs of English had frequently overused all three additive transitions such as *"besides, moreover, similarly"* which might also be a reflection of the TSs more academic writing style in English. In addition, to analyze the underused additive transitions according to the frequency analysis, LL calculation had been applied. According to Table 36, the underused additive transitions in the MA theses' conclusion section by the TSs of English in comparison with the NSs of English were analyzed.

Table 36

LL Frequency of Underused Additive Transitions in the Conclusion Section of the NSs and the TSs' MA Theses

Underused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
also	457	437	-27.78*
and	4028	3760	-209.93*
at the same time	8	11	-2.42*
furthermore	44	41	-2.27*
in addition	84	101	-15.65*
likewise	8	6	-0.04*

n= frequency of additive transitions

- indicated underuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

According to the LL frequency of underused additive transitions in Table 36, *"and", "also"* and *"in addition"* revealed difference in the MA theses' conclusion section written by the TSs of English against the NSs of English. The additive transition *"and"* had the highest frequency as -209.93 and was significantly underused in the TSs' MA theses' conclusion section. The additive transition *"likewise"* was significantly underused with -0.04 LL value less than the other underused additive transitions. It was not preferred by the NSs as much as the TSs' MA theses' conclusion section. The following extracts were drawn from the corpora in concern. MATS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the TSs and MANS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the MA theses written by the NSs.

Example 30

[This current study was designed to investigate the Turkish equivalence, validity, and reliability of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale.]

Extracted from <MATS19-CON>

[Specifically, as Turkish learners might **also** tend to prefer relative pronouns *that* instead of *which*, the future researches on the relative pronouns such as *that, in which* could give us a broader picture of mother tongue influence.]

Extracted from <MATS36-CON>

[**In addition**, researchers should also search for the ways to overcome or reduce the anxiety level which will be an important step for the foreign language teaching area.]

Extracted from <MATS19-CON>

[**Likewise**, Table 6 and Table 7 include the frequencies and percentages of the total correct answers to similar situations, the former of which was drawn to measure the reading and understanding skills of the participants, whereas the latter of which was illustrated as to the speaking and practical skills.]

Extracted from <MATS16-CON>

[English language learners from participating in their children's education, **and** ways that primary level educators **and** schools can foster parent involvement.]

Extracted from <MANS25-CON>

[**Also** how students respond to active learning methods verses passive learning methods and what they feel helps motivates them to learn new vocabulary words.]

Extracted from <MANS23-CON>

[**In addition**, they highlighted their need for feedback.]

Extracted from <MANS15-CON>

[Critical self-reflection implemented in professional development feeds directly into critical perspectives knowledge; **likewise**, knowledge in critical perspectives may be the area in the teaching model that most contributes to a better teacher selfreflection.]

Extracted from <MANS4-CON>

The highest underused additive transition was *"and"* by the TSs of English; whereas the second underused additive was observed to be *"also"*. As presented above, *"in addition"* was the third underused additive. However, the least underused additive was *"likewise"*. This might be explained that the TSs of English had not used the mentioned additives as frequently as the NSs of English in their MA theses' conclusion section.

Considering the results given in the tables, it is possible to state that the nine additive transitions in the MA theses in all three sections were frequently used by the NSs of English and the TSs of English. In both groups, the amount of additive usage was observed to be the highest in the results and discussion section. In addition, it was also significantly used 7.0 times in the TSs, whereas it was observed 6.3 times in the NSs' MA theses mentioned section. The frequency of the additive transitions was higher for the NSs of English than the TSs of English in the MA theses' introduction section and consitituted the highest percentage. The highest amount of additives used in order were *"and, also, in addtion"* in all three sections. In between the additive transitions, *"and"* was mostly used in the mentioned sections of both groups' MA theses. In addition, it was significantly used 6.1 times in the TSs, whereas it was observed 5.5 times in every 1,000 words in the NSs' MA theses' results and discussion section. It constituted a higher percentage in the NSs' MA theses than the TSs' MA theses in the introduction section. In both groups, the usage of *"also"* was observed to be the highest in the results and discussion section. Similarly, it was significantly used per 1,000 words in both groups' MA theses in the same section. The additive transition *"also"* constituted a higher percentage in the NSs' MA theses than the TSs' MA theses in the results and discussion section. The other additive *"in addition"* had the highest amount of usage by the TSs in the results and discussion section, whereas it was used by the NSs the most in the conclusion section of their MA theses. It also constituted a higher percentage in the TSs' MA theses than the NSs in the introduction section.

Moreover, according to the LL frequency results, *"besides"* was significantly overused in the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections by the TSs. In between these sections, its usage was observed to be the highest for the TSs in the results and discussion section. The other highest overused additive transition in the same section was *"and"* in their MA theses. *"Moreover"* was overused in the introduction section of the TSs' MA theses. On the contrary, the TSs had the highest underuse value for *"and"* in the conclusion section among the three sections. In addition, the other highest underused additive in their MA theses' conclusion section was *"also"*. Furthermore, the additive transitions *"at the same time"* in the introduction, and *"also"* in the results and discussion sections were underused more significantly by the TSs. In the next section, the analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions in all three sections of the PhD dissertations for the NSs of English and the TSs of English were presented.

4.2.6. Frequency Analysis of the Additive Transitions in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The most salient transition type; namely additive transitions, emerged from the frequency analysis of the doctoral dissertations' all three sections; including the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT were compared. The most frequently used additive transitions in the introduction section of the PhD dissertations by the NSs and the TSs were presented in the next section.

4.2.6.1 Frequency Analysis of the Additive Transitions for the Introduction Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions for the introduction section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT was compared. The results were presented in Table 37.

Table 37

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Introduction Section of the TSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	383	5.6	0.1
and	5119	75.6	1.9
at the same time	8	0.1	0.0
besides	21	0.3	0.0
furthermore	22	0.3	0.0
in addition	90	1.3	0.0
likewise	9	0.1	0.0
moreover	41	0.6	0.0
similarly	18	0.2	0.0
Total	**5711**	**84.1**	**2.0**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As observed in Table 37, there were nine additive transitions which TSs of English used in their PhD dissertations' introduction section. 84.1% of total TM types in their dissertations' introduction section included the frequently used additive transitions. Moreover, the frequent additive transitions such as *"and (5119), also (383), in addition (90)"* were used 2.0 times in every 1,000 words in the TSs' doctoral dissertations' introduction section. The following were the sentences taken from the TSs. PHDTS-INT refers to the introduction section of the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs.

Example 31

[Because of the multiple-choice testing system in Turkey, students have started to read **and** write less **and** they cannot compose effective **and** persuading texts that reveal their thoughts about the 'real' issues of life.]

Extracted from <PHDTS4-INT>

[**Also**, the study is hoped to improve the pre-service English teachers' awareness of their competencies in terms of both learning and teaching.]

Extracted from <PHDTS30-INT>

[**In addition**, informal interviews with students revealed that planning and organizing studies proactively are the most common challenges the students faced.]

Extracted from <PHDTS46-INT>

As indicated in the examples above, all nine additive transitions had been overused in the introduction section of the doctoral dissertations by the TSs of English. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as *"and, also, in addition"* had been used in the sentences of the TSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. The most frequently used additive transitions in the introduction section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs of English were analyzed in Table 38.

Table 38

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Introduction Section of the NSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	308	4.6	0.1
and	5403	80.9	1.9
at the same time	14	0.2	0.0
besides	1	0.0	0.0
furthermore	52	0.7	0.0
in addition	107	1.6	0.0
likewise	3	0.0	0.0
moreover	15	0.2	0.0
similarly	7	0.1	0.0
Total	**5910**	**88.3**	**2.0**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As indicated in Table 38, the NSs of English used nine additive transitions in their doctoral dissertations' introduction section and the total number of most frequently used additive transitions by the NSs was 5910 which covered 88.2 percent of all TM types. Furthermore, the most frequent additive transitions such as *"and (5403), also (308), in addition (107)"* were used 2.0 times in every 1,000 words in the NSs' PhD dissertations' introduction section. The amount of additive transitions the TSs (2.0) used per 1,000 words was similar to the NSs (2.0). When the TSs were compared with the NSs, there were three additive transitions identical that the TSs and the NSs used such as *"and (5119), also (383), in addition (90)".* In addition, both groups had used *"and"* 1.9 times in every 1,000 words in their theses' introduction section as the most frequently used additive. The following extracts were drawn from the corpora in concern. PHDNS-INT refers to the introduction section of the doctoral dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 32

[This study will examine academic achievement **and** determine whether a relationship exists between academic achievement **and** risk factors that continue to plague the system's ability to flourish.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <PHDNS17-INT></div>

[Data collection **also** included students' keeping "humor diaries".]

<div align="right">Extracted from <PHDNS31-INT></div>

[**In addition**, dual language learners received higher scores on English narratives than on Spanish narratives.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <PHDNS40-INT></div>

All nine additive transitions had been overused in the introduction section of the doctoral dissertations by the NSs of English as indicated in the examples above. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as *"and, also, in addition"* had been used in the sentences of the NSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. In order to analyze the significance of highly frequent additive transitions in the TSs' PhD dissertations' introduction section, LL calculation was applied by comparing with the NSs of English. Table 39 illustrated the LL frequency of overused additive transitions in the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs in comparison with the NSs.

Table 39

LL Frequency of Overused Additive Transitions in the Introduction Section of the NSs and the TSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Overused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
and	383	308	+11.80*
besides	21	1	+23.26*
likewise	9	3	+3.41*
moreover	41	15	+13.72*
similarly	18	7	+5.51*

n= frequency of additive transitions

+ indicated overuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

In Table 39, the overuse of the additive transitions in the TSs of English had been analyzed according to the LL values. The highest LL value belonged to *"besides"* which revealed +23.26 value and indicated a significant difference between the TSs of English and the NSs of English in terms of frequency. On the other hand, overused additive transitions such as *"moreover (13.72), also (11.80), similarly (5.51), likewise (3.41)"* revealed significant differences. The following were the sentences taken from the TSs. PHDTS-INT refers to the introduction section of the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs.

Example 33

[**Beside**s, there are some doubts about the effective implementation of this theory in ELT.]

Extracted from <PHDTS9-INT>

[**Moreover**, educational professionals should take the interpretations, perceptions and feelings of the students and teachers about the SNSs and their implementation in the educational settings for educational purposes.]

Extracted from <PHDTS41-INT>

[The results will **also** indicate the probable impact of such strategy training programme on reading achievement.]

Extracted from <PHDTS44-INT>

[**Similarly**, in standardization sessions for the writing component of the courses, teachers' grades may sometimes vary drastically, which shows their different perceptions and expectations regarding what constitutes ―good writing.]

Extracted from <PHDTS21-INT>

[In addition, the motivation of learners and prolonged sick-leaves of the teachers and students **likewise** may have a detrimental effect on the collection and interpretation of the data.]

Extracted from <PHDTS47-INT>

As presented in the examples above, the TSs of English had frequently overused *"besides"*. In addition to *"besides"*, a wide variety of additive transitions such as *"moreover, also, similarly"* had been used. However, the least overused additive was *"likewise"* in their doctoral dissertations' introduction section. It is able to state that, this could be a reflection of the TSs' academic writing style in English. In addition, to analyze the underused additive transitions according to the frequency analysis, LL calculation had been applied. According to Table 40, the underused additive transitions in the PhD dissertations' introduction section by the TSs of English in comparison with the NSs of English were presented.

Table 40

LL Frequency of Underused Additive Transitions in the Introduction Section of the NSs and the TSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Underused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
and	5119	5403	-0.26*
at the same time	8	14	-1.40*
furthermore	22	52	-11.23*
in addition	90	107	-0.81*

n= frequency of additive transitions

- indicated underuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

According to the LL frequency of underused additive transition *"furthermore"* revealed difference in the introduction section of the PhD dissertations used by the TSs of English against the NSs of English in Table 40. The additive transition *"furthermore"* was significantly underused with -11.23 LL value more than *"at the same time"* with -1.40 value which could be interpreted as it was not preferred by the TSs as much as the NSs' doctoral dissertations' introduction section. Example 34 provided the sentences taken from each corpus. PHDTS-INT refers to the introduction section of the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs and PHDNS-INT refers to the introduction section of the doctoral dissertations written by the NSs.

.

Example 34

[**Furthermore**, it is assumed that most prospective English language teachers fail to appreciate humour in reading materials adequately.]

Extracted from <PHDTS11-INT>

[But **at the same time** as we articulate these segments, our pronunciation varies in other respects.]

Extracted from <PHDTS37-INT>

[**Furthermore**, the report explains that three out every five entering freshmen do not have the writing skills needed for success in college; therefore, many of them spend their first semester, or even their first year, in remedial writing classes.]

Extracted from <PHDNS25-INT>

[**At the same time**, when using concurrent verbal reports as a research tool, the issue of reactivity needs to be considered in SLA.]

Extracted from <PHDNS8-INT>

The TSs of English underused mostly the additive transition *"furthermore"*. The second underused additive was *"at the same time"*. This might be explained that the TSs of English had not used the mentioned additives as frequently as the NSs of English in their PhD dissertations' introduction section. The results of the frequency analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions for the results and discussion section in the doctoral dissertations by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were compared in the next section.

4.2.6.2. Frequency Analysis of the Additive Transitions for the Results and Discussion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions for the results and discussion section in the doctoral dissertations by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English in the field of ELT was compared. The results were presented in Table 41.

Table 41

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Results and Discussion Section of the TSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	1453	6.9	0.5
and	14347	68.1	5.2
at the same time	18	0.0	0.0
besides	76	0.3	0.0
furthermore	61	0.2	0.0
in addition	220	1.0	0.1
likewise	51	0.2	0.0
moreover	170	0.8	0.1
similarly	127	0.6	0.0
Total	**16523**	**78.1**	**5.9**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As observed in Table 41, the TSs of English used nine additive transitions in their doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section, and the total number of most frequently used additive transitions by the NNSs was 16523 which covered 78.1 percent of all TM types. Furthermore, the frequent additive transitions such as *"and (14347), also (1453), in addition (220), moreover (170), similarly (127)"* were used 5.9 times in every 1,000 words in the TSs' PhD dissertations' results and discussion section. Extracts from the TSs were illustrated in the following. PHDTS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs.

Example 35

[The chapter begins with the description of the data screening procedures carried out before running any analyses **and** proceeds with the presentation of the results of the preliminary analyses regarding the validity **and** reliability of the final versions of the data collection instruments developed **and** employed in the study.]

Extracted from <PHDTS39-RD>

[Such factors as educational system, environment and media may **also** play an important role in promoting autonomy.]

Extracted from <PHDTS33-RD>

[**In addition**, the items *Sir/Madam, Ma'am* and *Mister/Missus,* were perceived as appropriate by more than 65% of the participants.]

Extracted from <PHDTS10-RD>

[**Moreover**, nine of them state that they "agree" on the criterion.]

Extracted from <PHDTS48-RD>

As indicated in the examples above, all nine additive transitions had been overused in the results and discussion section of the doctoral dissertations by the TSs of English. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as, *"and, also, in addition, moreover, similarly"* had been used in the sentences of the TSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. The most frequently used additive transitions in the introduction section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs of English were identified in Table 42.

Table 42

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Results and Discussion Section of the NSs'
Doctoral Dissertations

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	1044	6.3	0.4
and	11976	72.6	4.2
at the same time	24	0.1	0.0
besides	5	0.0	0.0
furthermore	87	0.5	0.0
in addition	197	1.1	0.1
likewise	27	0.1	0.0
moreover	27	0.1	0.0
similarly	78	0.4	0.0
Total	**13465**	**81.2**	**4.7**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As illustrated in Table 42, the NSs of English used nine additive transitions in their doctoral dissertations' (PhD) results and discussion section. The total number of most frequently used additive transitions by the NSs was 13465 which covered 81.2 percent of all TM types. Furthermore, the most frequent additive transitions such as *"and (11976), also (1044), in addition (197), furthermore (87)"* were used 4.7 times in every 1,000 words in the NSs' doctoral dissertations' (PhD) results and discussion section. The amount of additive transitions the TSs used per 1,000 words was 5.9 whereas the NSs used 4.7. When the TSs were compared with the NSs, there were three additive transitions identical that the TSs and the NSs used such as *"and (14347), also (1453), in addition (220)".* In addition, the Ts had used *"and"* 5.2 times in every 1,000 words whereas it was used 4.2 times per 1,000 words in the NSs' doctoral dissertations' (PhD) results and discussion section as the most frequently used additive. The following extracts were taken from the NSs of English. PHDNS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the doctoral dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 36

[Given this background, the overall purpose of the present study was to investigate the ways in which interest **and** reading comprehension work together to predict achievement in an online introductory health care course.]

Extracted from <PHDNS32-RD>

[They will **also** continue to highlight the outcomes in teacher application and student learning that have occurred in an effort to motivate and support continued interest and involvement.]

Extracted from <PHDNS36-RD>

[**In addition**, prior to the task participants in both conditions showed relatively high pronunciation accuracy for the ten terms.]

Extracted from <PHDNS39-RD>

[**Furthermore**, it can be difficult for teachers to provide feedback that suits all expectations.]

Extracted from <PHDNS49-RD>

All nine additive transitions had been overused in the results and discussion section of the doctoral dissertations by the NSs of English as indicated in the examples above. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as, *"and, also, in addition, furthermore"* had been used in the sentences of the NSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. The LL calculation was applied in order to analyze the significance of highly frequent additive transitions in the TSs and the NSs' PhD dissertations' results and discussion section. Table 43 illustrated the LL frequency of overused additive transitions in the TSs of English in comparison with the NSs of English.

Table 43

LL Frequency of Overused Additive Transitions in the Results and Discussion Section of the NSs and the TSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Overused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
also	1453	1044	+86.55*
and	14347	11976	+331.25*
besides	76	5	+77.93*
in addition	220	197	+2.49*
likewise	51	27	+8.60*
moreover	170	27	+122.07*
similarly	127	78	+14.09*

n= frequency of additive transitions

+ indicated overuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

In the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs of English, the overuse of the additive transitions had been analyzed according to the LL values as presented in Table 43. The highest LL value belonged to *"and"* which revealed +331.25 value and indicated a highly significant difference between the TSs and the NSs in terms of frequency in their PhD dissertations' results and discussion section. On the other hand, overused additive transitions such as *"moreover (122.07), also (86.55), besides (77.93), similarly (14.09), likewise (8.60), in addition (2.49)"* revealed significant differences. Below were the sample sentences taken from the TSs. PHDTS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs.

Example 37

[In the analysis, the beginning **and** endings of Frames were determined; footings at frame transition points were defined, **and** starter, continuer, **and** terminal footings were analyzed.]

Extracted from <PHDTS1-RD>

[**Moreover**, the students were of the opinion that as non-native teachers shared the same first language with the students, they could easily switch to Turkish in their classes.]

Extracted from <PHDTS25-RD>

[It is **also** seen that Japanese EFL learners tend to use first person singular and plural pronouns more often than the native speakers and Turkish EFL learners.]

Extracted from <PHDTS36-RD>

[**Beside**s, the majority of them think that the way they learn English is good enough, as 80% disagree with the statement that they do not like the way they learn English.]

Extracted from <PHDTS12-RD>

[**Similarly**, it was found after the training that there was also concurrent change in beliefs and practices of trainees with regard to grammar instruction.]

Extracted from <PHDTS29-RD>

[**Likewise**, *expression of embarrassment* was not commonly preferred by the participants, as there was a one percent equal usage by both groups.]

Extracted from <PHDTS34-RD>

[**In addition**, 3 students wrote that vocabulary was a challenge for them.]

Extracted from <PHDTS23-RD>

The TSs of English had highly overused *"and"* as presented in the examples above. In addition to *"and"*, a wide variety of additive transitions such as *"moreover,*

also, besides, similarly, likewise, in addition" had been overused in the mentioned order which might also be a reflection of the TSs' more academic writing style in English in their doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section. In addition, to analyze the underused additive transitions according to the frequency analysis, LL calculation had been applied. According to Table 44, the underused additive transitions in the TSs' (PhD) dissertations' results and discussion section in comparison with the NSs were presented.

Table 44

LL Frequency of Underused Additive Transitions in the Results and Discussion Section of the NSs and the TSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Underused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
at the same time	18	24	-0.62*
furthermore	61	87	-3.52*

n= frequency of additive transitions

- indicated underuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

As observed from Table 44, according to the LL frequency of underused additive transitions *"at the same time"* and *"furthermore"* revealed difference in the doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section written by the TSs of English against the NSs of English. The additive transition *"furthermore"* was significantly underused with -3.52 LL value more than *"at the same time"* with -0.62 value which could be interpreted as it was not preferred by the TSs as much as the NSs' PhD dissertations' results and discussion section. In Example 38, the sentences obtained from each corpus are illustrated. PHDTS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs and PHDNS-RD refers to the results and discussion section of the doctoral dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 38

[**Furthermore**, the table also denotes that no statistically significant correlation between the process model and the achievement scores has been observed.]

Extracted from <PHDTS8-RD>

[For example there may be games; you know getting the attention of the students and **at the same time** teach some of things.]

Extracted from <PHDTS41-RD>

[**Furthermore**, the high standard error = 48.7 indicated that the model was not precise and had limited predictive ability.]

Extracted from <PHDNS2-RD>

[**At the same time**, these faculty members incorporated reflective pieces and course assignments to connect to teacher candidates' prior experiences.]

Extracted from <PHDNS16-RD>

The TSs of English underused mostly the additive transitions *"furthermore, at the same time"*. This might be explained that the TSs of English had not used the mentioned additives as frequently as the NSs of English in their doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section. The results of the frequency analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions for the conclusion section in the PhD dissertations by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were compared in the next section.

4.2.6.3. Frequency Analysis of the Additive Transitions for the Conclusion Section in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Native Speakers of English and the Turkish Speakers of English

The frequency analysis of the most frequently used additive transitions for the conclusion section in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English was compared. The results were presented in Table 45.

Table 45

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Conclusion Section of the TSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	673	7.1	0.2
and	6565	69.9	2.4
at the same time	17	0.1	0.0
besides	42	0.4	0.0
furthermore	40	0.4	0.0
in addition	125	1.3	0.1
likewise	10	0.1	0.0
moreover	102	1.0	0.0
similarly	31	0.3	0.0
Total	**7605**	**80.6**	**2.7**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As illustrated in Table 45, there were nine additive transitions which TSs of English used in their doctoral dissertations' conclusion section. 80.6% of total TM types in the TSs' PhD dissertations' conclusion section included the frequently used additive transitions. Moreover, the frequent additive transitions such as *"and (6565), also (673), in addition (125), moreover (102)"* were used 2.7 times in every 1,000 words in the TSs' doctoral dissertations' conclusion section. The following extracts were drawn from

the corpora in concern. PHDTS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs.

Example 39

[According to the findings of the confirmatory factor analyses **and** internal consistency reliabilities, each translated scale showed good convergent validity **and** acceptable scores according to fit indices **and** reliabilities.]

Extracted from <PHDTS2-CON>

[It is **also** advised to conduct some sessions like these in any institution at certain intervals as the profile of the students, their expectations and needs and the expectations of the institutions change over time.]

Extracted from <PHDTS21-CON>

[**In addition**, responses that are non-specific, overgenerous, prescriptive, unhelpful, inaccurate and inappropriate may discourage even a motivated student to benefit from the peer feedback process.]

Extracted from <PHDTS4-CON>

[**Moreover**, this criterion is not under the category of the main considerations of the teachers and the students in any of the three cases.]

Extracted from <PHDTS29-CON>

All nine additive transitions had been overused in the conclusion section of the doctoral dissertations by the TSs of English as indicated in the examples above. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as *"and, also, in addition, moreover"* had been used in the sentences of the TSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. The most frequently used additive transitions in the conclusion section of the PhD dissertations written by the NSs of English were analyzed in Table 46.

Table 46

Most Frequently Used Additives in the Conclusion Section of the NSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Additives	n	%	n per 1,000
also	603	5.1	0.2
and	8832	76.0	3.1
at the same time	19	0.1	0.0
besides	1	0.0	0.0
furthermore	66	0.5	0.0
in addition	187	1.6	0.1
likewise	15	0.1	0.0
moreover	29	0.2	0.0
similarly	42	0.3	0.0
Total	**9794**	**83.9**	**3.4**

n= frequency of additive transitions

%= percentage of additive transitions in transition marker types

As indicated in Table 46, the NSs of English used nine additive transitions in their doctoral dissertations' conclusion section and the total number of most frequently used additive transitions by the NSs was 9794 which covered 83.9 percent of all TM types. Furthermore, the most frequent additive transitions such as *"and (8832), also (603), in addition (187)"* were used 3.4 times in every 1,000 words in the NSs' PhD dissertations' conclusion section. The amount of additive transitions the NSs used per 1,000 words was 3.4 whereas the TSs used 2.7. When the TSs were compared with the NSs, there were three additive transitions identical that the TSs and the NSs used such as *"and (6565), also (673), in addition (125)".* Moreover, the TSs had used *"and"* 2.4 times in every 1,000 words whereas it was used 3.1 times per 1,000 words in the NSs' doctoral dissertations' conclusion section as the most frequently used additive. The following were the sentences found in the NSs of English. PHDNS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the doctoral dissertations written by the NSs.

Example 40

[Though the findings of this research are important for writing center work **and** theory, the methodology **and** research design employed have major implications for writing center research.]

Extracted from <PHDNS37-CON>

[English language learners **also** bring a variety of skills to the class and though they may all be at the same proficiency level, as were the students in this study, some are better writers than others and this is reflected in their work.]

Extracted from <PHDNS42-CON>

[**In addition**, administering both tests together will provide more valid, reliable results for fourth and fifth graders.]

Extracted from <PHDNS48-CON>

As indicated in the examples above, all nine additive transitions had been overused in the conclusion section of the doctoral dissertations by the NSs of English. A wide variety of additive transitions; such as *"and, also, in addition"* had been used in the sentences of the NSs which might be an explanation of the high rate of additive usage. In order to analyze the significance of highly frequent additive transitions in the TSs' PhD dissertations' conclusion section, LL calculation was applied by comparing with the NSs. Table 47 illustrated the LL frequency of overused additive transitions in the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs of English in comparison with the NSs of English.

Table 47

LL Frequency of Overused Additive Transitions in the Conclusion Section of the NSs and the TSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Overused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
also	673	603	+7.55*
besides	42	1	+51.94*
moreover	102	29	+46.38*

n= frequency of additive transitions

+ indicated overuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

In Table 47, the overuse of the additive transitions in the doctoral dissertations' conclusion section by the TSs of English had been analyzed according to the LL values. The highest LL value belonged to *"besides"* which revealed +51.94 value and indicated a significant difference between the TSs and the NSs in terms of frequency in their PhD dissertations' conclusion section. On the other hand, overused additive transitions such as *"moreover (+46.38)"* and *"also (+7.55)"* revealed significant differences. The sample sentences were illustrated in Example 41. PHDTS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the doctoral dissertations written by the TSs.

Example 41

[**Besides**, they should work out a plan -if necessary- to solve the problem.]

Extracted from <PHDTS40-CON>

[**Moreover**, nearly all of the prospective teachers believe that they can make use of various activities while planning their lessons.]

Extracted from <PHDTS30-CON>

[The chapter **also** includes the conclusions drawn from the data analyzed.]

Extracted from <PHDTS24-CON>

The TSs of English had frequently overused all three additive transitions such as *"besides, moreover, also"* as presented in the example above in their doctoral dissertations' conclusion section which might also be a reflection of the TSs' more academic writing style in English. In addition, to analyze the underused additive transitions according to the frequency analysis, LL calculation had been applied. According to Table 48, the underused additive transitions in the PhD dissertations' conclusion section by the TSs of English in comparison with the NSs of English were presented.

Table 48

LL Frequency of Underused Additive Transitions in the Conclusion Section of the NSs and the TSs' Doctoral Dissertations

Underused Additives	TSs	NSs	LL Frequency
	n	n	
and	6565	8832	-242.48*
at the same time	17	19	-0.04*
furthermore	40	66	-5.35*
in addition	125	187	-9.82*
likewise	10	15	-0.80*
similarly	31	42	-1.21*

n= frequency of additive transitions

- indicated underuse of additive transitions in TSs relative to NSs

According to the LL frequency of underused additive transitions in Table 48; *"and", "in addition", "furthermore"* and *"similarly"* revealed difference in the doctoral dissertations' conclusion section written by the TSs of English against the NSs of English. The additive transition *"and"* had the highest frequency as -242.48 and was significantly underused in the TSs' PhD dissertations' conclusion section. The additive transition *"at the same time"* was significantly underused with -0.04 LL value more than the other underused additive transitions. It was not preferred by the TSs as much as the NSs' doctoral dissertations' conclusion section. The following extracts were drawn from the corpora in concern. PHDTS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the

doctoral dissertations written by the TSs and PHDNS-CON refers to the conclusion section of the doctoral dissertations written by the NSs.

.

Example 42

[Most of the students who took the courses could not draw inferences or could not answer questions requiring inferencing skills **and** higher order thinking.]

Extracted from <PHDTS18-CON>

[**In addition**, the training that was given to the participant teachers would also be given to the participant students to collect more data about the implementation of ethical values towards students.]

Extracted from <PHDTS50-CON>

[**Furthermore**, field experience courses may start in the early years of education and designed in a longer period to involve prospective teachers more in practice.]

Extracted from <PHDTS42-CON>

[**Similarly**, writers should know not only the characteristics of readers but also their own and the personal process of writing they pass through while they are writing to know how to write, in other words to make linguistic and textual choices.]

Extracted from <PHDTS22-CON>

[**At the same time**, student EFL teachers were asked to keep diaries documenting their anxieties throughout the practicum process.]

Extracted from <PHDTS3-CON>

[This led to a conclusion other teachers, even within the same school, were possibly unaware of high-quality programs **and** practices they could have provided their

students **and** families that could have increased kindergarten reading achievement, thus setting kindergarten students on a trajectory for future academic success.]

Extracted from <PHDNS43-CON>

[**In addition**, a weekly test was given to both treatment and comparison groups on each of eight weekly stories and the accompanying vocabulary.]

Extracted from <PHDNS50-CON>

[**Furthermore**, such inconsistency can also be attributed to a limited experience of living or studying abroad among L2 learners.]

Extracted from <PHDNS18-CON>

[Other instructional methods were rated fairly **similarly** between student perspective on usefulness and faculty rating on frequency of use.]

Extracted from <PHDNS41-CON>

[The connection activity helps students link selected pieces of information from source texts and, **at the same time**, organize them in a logical way in a chart.]

Extracted from <PHDNS11-CON>

The highest underused additive transition was *"and"* by the TSs of English; whereas the second underused additive was observed to be *"in addition"*. As presented above, the other underused additives were *"furthermore, similarly"*. However, the least underused additive was *"at the same time"*. This might be explained that the TSs of English had not used the mentioned additives as frequently as the NSs of English in their doctoral dissertations' conclusion section.

Considering the results given in the tables, it is possible to state that the nine additive transitions in the doctoral dissertations in all three sections were frequently used by the NSs of English and the TSs of English. In both groups, the amount of

additive usage was observed to be the highest in the results and discussion section. In addition, it was also significantly used 5.9 times in the TSs; whereas it was observed 4.7 times in the NSs' PhD dissertations' mentioned section. The frequency of the additive transitions was higher for the NSs of English than the TSs of English in the doctoral dissertations' introduction section and consititued the highest percentage. The highest amount of additives used in order were *"and, also, in addition"* in all three sections. In between the additive transitions, *"and"* was mostly used in the mentioned sections of both groups' PhD dissertations. In addition, it was significantly used 5.2 times in the TSs' doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section, whereas it was observed 4.2 times in every 1,000 words by the NSs. In both groups, the usage of *"and"* was observed to be the highest in the results and discussion section. Furthermore, it constituted a higher percentage in the NSs' PhD dissertations than the TSs' dissertations in the introduction section. The usage of *"also"* was observed to be the highest in the results and discussion section. Similarly, it was significantly used per 1,000 words in both groups' doctoral dissertations in the same section. The additive transition *"also"* constituted a higher percentage in the TSs' PhD dissertations than the NSs' dissertations in the conclusion section. The other additive *"in addition"* had the highest amount of usage by both groups' doctoral dissertations in the results and discussion section. It was used more by the TSs than the NSs in the same section and constituted the same high percentage in both groups' PhD dissertations in the introduction, and conclusion sections. The other additive transitions *"moreover, similarly"* were also used by the TSs and *"furthermore"* was used by the NSs in the results and discussion section. In the conclusion section, *"moreover"* was used more by the TSs than the NSs. According to the LL frequency results, *"and"* was significantly overused in the results and discussion section by the TSs. The other highest overused additive transition in the same section was *"moreover"* in their doctoral dissertations. *"Besides"* was more significantly overused in the results and discussion section than the introduction, and the conclusion sections of the TSs' dissertations. On the contrary, the TSs had the highest underuse value for *"and"* in the conclusion section among the three sections. The other highest underused additive in their PhD dissertations' conclusion section was *"in addition"*. The additive transitions *"furthermore, at the same time"* were underused more significantly by the TSs' doctoral dissertations in the introduction, and results and discussion sections.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction

The aim of this corpus-based study was to find out for a better understanding of language use and acquisition that occurs as part of the production of the academic texts and will also be a guide for teaching and understanding of cross-cultural academic writing. In this corpus-based study, the frequency analysis, the usage of the transition markers (TMs) and their most salient types in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections in the randomly selected MA theses and doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the native speakers (NSs) of English and the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English in the field of ELT were investigated by means of quantitative and descriptive analyses. This study is significant in investigating the usage of TMs and their types in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections of the MA theses and doctoral dissertations. Another significance is that the NSs of English and the TSs of English have been comparatively analyzed in terms of TMs they have used in the mentioned sections of the theses and dissertations. For this reason, the results of the present study were supported from various dissertations, theses and articles that have investigated the connectives, their usage and types by the students and researchers. In this chapter it has also been discussed whether the present study had similar results with previously conducted studies in terms of overuse and underuse in the TMs and their types. The conclusions were also discussed as well as implications for language teaching and suggestions for further research.

5.2. Conclusion

In order to shed light to the problems of this present study, the evaluation of the transition marker (TM) usage and the most salient TM type in the MA theses and doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English were discussed. As highlighted by Hyland (2005), writers convey their ideas more effectively as they allow them to take an appropriate stance and accomplish their communicative purposes with the help of the discourse markers. These markers also help readers contextualize the text they read since they contribute to its comprehension. Moreover, it is emphasized that using metadiscourse

markers appropriately help writers interact with their readers, meet the communicative needs of them. These markers also guide them through the text they are engaged with, facilitate efficient communication by helping writers express their ideas and thoughts in a more organized way and allow them to infer meanings from the text. When the reasons of the results of the present study are searched for, it could be interpreted according to the evaluation of the TM usage in the MA theses that using a large variety of TMs by the TSs creates cohesion in their theses. Moreover, the frequency of TMs observed in the doctoral dissertations by the TSs indicate their writing performance since they organized their ideas and thoughts in an accurate way by using a large number of TMs. Furthermore, it could be interpreted that the use of additive transitions by the TSs in their theses and dissertations may reflect the cohesiveness and comprehension of their academic writing and provide them to convey their messages in an effective way to their readers. The additives may also contribute to the positive development of the TSs fluency in their writing and allow them to be effective writers. In the next section, the TM usage in the MA theses written by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were evaluated.

5.2.1. Evaluation of the Transition Marker Usage in the MA Theses Written by the Turkish Speakers of English and The Native Speakers of English

Regarding the MA theses' three sections of which are the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English, it could be interpreted that the TSs used a wide variety of transition markers (TMs). Their corpus size and total TM usage were higher than the native speakers (NSs) of English in all three sections. It can be stated that the difference between the TMs of the TSs of English and NSs of English in this present study might be stemming from the use of TMs in the MA thesis. According to the overall frequency results, both groups used 0.2 TMs in every 100 words in all three sections. However, the TSs used TMs per 1,000 words less than the NSs in the mentioned sections. Hence, the log-likelihood (LL) frequency indicated significant underuse for the TSs of English in these sections in total. Related with the overall findings, it could be interpreted that the TSs did not tend to make their aims visible in their theses and did not explicitly state their ideas through the use of the TMs.

The TM usage per 1,000 words and frequency of the TMs in the MA theses' introduction section, and the results and discussion section by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were equal. Among all three sections, the results and discussion section included the most frequent and the most used amount of TMs in the MA theses of both groups. The reasons for these markers were thought to be due to the different usage of TMs by them since both groups had a wide repertoir of TMs. Several studies have attempted to illustrate how conjunctions contribute to better understanding of written discourse. Some studies contended that there was a positive correlation between a number of cohesive devices and effective writing (Ferris, 1994; Field & Oi, 1992; Jin, 2001; Neuner, 1987). The results of this study also provide how cohesive devices such as TMs contribute effective writing.

The frequency of the TMs in the theses is very important and considered the major factor that affects the use of TMs. By means of frequency per 1,000 words, in the results and discussion section, the TSs used the TMs three times more than the other mentioned sections. However, the NSs used the TMs three times more in the results and discussion section than the introduction section, and approximately two times more than the conclusion section. The high proportion of TM usage in this section of the TSs could be an explanation of the significant overuse of TMs for the TSs of English when compared to the NSs of English. Supporting the studies claiming that cohesive devices affected the quality of text, Liu and Braine (2005) observed that there was a significant relationship between the number of conjunctions used and the quality of the argumentative writing created by the students. In the present study, the TSs used the TMs less than the NSs in the conclusion section. Moreover, this significant underuse of the TMs in the MA theses' conclusion section could be explained because of the frequency interval of the TMs used in between the TSs and the NSs. The NSs of English might be more cautious with their academic writing whereas the TSs of English could formally used the TMs in their writing since it is their target language. In other words, the NSs seemed to be more tentative in expressing themselves as in their native language they have no hesitation on the form of the language they use when compared to the TSs.

The results of the study suggested that with the significant use of TMs, the TSs create cohesion more in their MA theses since they apply more formal language rules or structures while producing written texts. Besides, the awareness of TM usage that contributes to the cohesiveness of the text should help the writers recognize the links

between the concepts and identify important information in the MA thesis. From the findings, it was hypothesized that the awareness of these TMs should significantly increase the academic writing performance and facilitate accurate comprehension of text. It could also be interpreted that the TMs were overused by the TSs could be due to the effective academic writing style they acquired or experienced during their learning process. In addition, it could be mentioned that the TSs could express the relative importance of their ideas in the theses more than the NSs since NSs naturally apply their mother tongue while establishing statements composing texts. Related to the findings, Sanders and Noordman (2000) indicated that conjunctions helped the reader construct representations. According to their study, it was explicit that the appropriate use of conjunctions contributed to the clarity and comprehensibility of a text. Upon consideration of the clarity and comprehensibility in the analysis of the MA theses, the same results are supported significantly especially in the introduction, and the results and discussion sections. Based on the results of this present study, it might be concluded that both groups' awareness of the importance of the TMs make their academic products more immersive.

In a study contributed by Martinez (2015), the use of conjunctions in the compositions of secondary education students were analyzed to clarify the relationship between conjunction density and writing quality, and to examine if there were any differences among the participants in terms of the frequency. The analysis of Martinez (2015) revealed little variety in the use of conjunctions and experience difficulty that participants had in using the adversatives and the additives. Related to the previous studies on conjunctions and types, which also support the present study, it could be concluded that in the overall analysis, TM variations are observed on additive transitions more than the sequential, causal, and adversative transitions by both groups. In the next section, the TM usage in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were evaluated.

5.2.2. Evaluation of the Transition Marker Usage in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Turkish Speakers of English and The Native Speakers of English

Doctoral dissertations are accepted as formal written texts produced by experts and they are required to have fulfilled academic masterpiece. Upon consideration the results of the present study, it could be revealed that the Turkish speakers (TSs) of

English used a wide variety of transition markers (TMs) in their doctoral dissertations' (PhD) three sections; including the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections. When the corpus size was taken account as a whole, it was observed that the size of the native speakers (NSs) of English was higher than the TSs of English. Upon the consideration of the overall frequency results, it was revealed that both groups used 0.1 TMs in every 100 words in all three sections. However, in terms of total TM usage per 1,000 words, the TSs used the TMs more than the NSs. Hence, the log-likelihood (LL) overall frequency indicated the significant overuse for the TSs of English in these sections. When the reasons of the overall results in this study were searched for, the frequency of the TMs in the PhD dissertations was observed as very important and also considered as the major factor affecting the use of TMs. Similarly, in a study conducted by Bunton (1999), the ways PhD students used metadiscourse markers in their thesis were investigated and the results of his study indicated that metadiscourse markers were facilitative supporting the results of this study and raising awareness in writing academic texts.

Concerning the TM usage, including their amount, frequency and usage per 1,000 words were high in the introduction, and results and dissussion sections of their PhD dissertations written by the TSs of English. Among all three sections, both groups' doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section included the most frequent and the most used amount of TMs. The TSs had the highest significant overuse in this section because of the high proportion of TM usage in the PhD dissertations. In accordance with the results, the TSs' awareness might also be raised about the significance of the wide range of TMs to establish and maintain a relationship with the readers, to express their ideas and point of view because the way they express their attitude in academic texts could be achieved through written discourse. Halliday and Hasan (1976) believed that TMs reflect the writer's positioning of one point in relation to another in creating a text. Generally speaking, TMs are the most common way of coordination and the most frequently used in academic writing (Leech & Svartvik, 1994, p. 264; Greenbaum & Quirk, 1993, p. 263). Nevertheless, the TSs of English used the TMs less than the NSs of English in the conclusion section. This significant underuse of the TMs in their PhD dissertations' conclusion section could be explained because of the frequency interval of the TMs used in between the groups. As a result, the TSs of English were more attentive with their academic text production whereas the NSs of English were more convinced in their writing. In other words, the TSs were more indecisive in expressing themselves

when compared to the NSs' doctoral dissertations. Similar results were observed as Intaraprawat and Steffensen (1995) analysed the use of metadiscourse markers in persuasive essays written by English as a second language (ESL) learners. The results of their study revealed a positive relationship between the use of metadiscourse markers and learners' writing quality. In relation with the results of the study, it could be claimed that the awareness facilitated comprehension with the presence of the TMs.

According to the present study it could be mentioned that the TM usage by the TSs facilitate the process of formation of coherent text representations. It could also be suggested that the TMs have a positive effect on L2 learners' language production and seem to play an important role in the doctoral dissertations of the TSs as valid and reliable samples of academic writing. In addition, it could be explained that the usage of the TMs was observed to provide a guide to the reader about the type of forthcoming information in the PhD dissertations. In the next section, the most salient TM type in the MA theses written by the TSs of English and the NSs of English were presented.

5.2.3. Evaluation of the Most Salient Transition Marker Type in the MA Theses Written by the Non-native Speakers of Turkish and The Native Speakers of English

Transition marker (TM) types are classified as the additive, adversative, sequential, and causal ones that play crucial roles in writing. Regarding these TM types, in the introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion sections of the MA theses written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English, it could be interpreted that they both used a wide variety of additive transitions since this type was used more than the adversative, sequential, and causal transitions. When the corpus size was taken into account, it was observed that the usage of TSs was higher than of the NSs. In other words, the TSs of English seem to have used high amount of additive transitions in all three sections in their MA theses. Both groups used 0.13 additive transitions in every 100 words in the mentioned sections and the additives they used per 1,000 words were similar in their MA theses in terms of the total transition marker (TM) type usage. The significance of the additive transitions could be underlied in the ability to use language in situationally appropriate ways which maintain discourse cohesiveness and effectiveness in academic writing. According to the overall frequency, the sequential transitions were used the least in their MA theses. The log-

likelihood (LL) frequency indicated that the TSs significantly underused all the transition types. Moreover, the adversatives were the most underused transition type in total by them. The reason of the TM type underusage in the corpora could be explained as the NSs have an adequate awareness of the different TM type usage as their mother tongue more than the TSs in their academic texts since they apply the types in their target language.

For the additives, it was clearly observed that the TSs of English used the additives per 100 words less than the NSs of English in the introduction section of the MA theses. However, the TSs used them as frequently as the NSs in this section. The additive usage regarding their amount, frequency and usage per 1,000 words were high for the TSs in the results and discussion, and conclusion sections of their MA theses. Among all three sections, the results and discussion section included the most frequent and the most used amount of additive transitions. The TSs had the highest significant overuse in this section because of the high possibility of proportion in the additive transition usage. Nevertheless, the TSs used the additives less then the NSs per 1,000 words in the conclusion section. Furthermore, the highest significant underuse of the additives was due to the frequency interval of both groups. It could be interpreted that the NSs explicitly guided the readers dramatically through their theses by the extensive use of additive transitions.

Based on the findings, the highest amount of additives used were *"and, also, in addition"* in all three sections. Among the additive transitions, *"and"* was mostly used in the mentioned sections of MA theses by both groups. In addition, it was significantly used 6.1 times by the TSs whereas it was used 5.5 times in every 1,000 words by the NSs in the results and discussion section of their MA theses. It constituted a higher percentage in the MA theses of the NSs than those of the TSs in the introduction section. Related with this result, the reasons could be as the NSs naturally utilize much more varieties that was familiar to them and the easy use of *"and"* to link their ideas. As they face this additive transition very often in their academic and daily life, they might be preferring to use it in their academic writing as well. On the other hand, the general reason of these results could be the fact that the TSs overgeneralise some of the TM types and ignore the other types when compared to the NSs. Likewise, as Schiffrin (1987) pointed out, "a*nd"* was the most frequently used discourse marker found in her study by the NSs and the TSs. Moreover, McCarthy (1991) focused more attention to how *"and"* functions in discourse that reflects its linguistic properties and found that

non-native Japanese and Chinese students have an incomplete knowledge of the discourse marker *"and"* or ignore to use the less common ones as reflected in this present study.

By means of the most salient additive transition analysis, the usage of *"also"* was obviously the highest additive transition used in the results and discussion section in the MA theses written by the TSs of English and the NSs of English. Similarly, it was significantly used in both groups' MA theses per 1,000 words in the same section. The additive transition *"also"* constituted a higher percentage in the NSs' MA theses than the TSs' MA theses in the results and discussion section. The other additive *"in addition"* had the highest amount of usage by the TSs in the results and discussion section whereas it was used by the NSs as the mostly used ones in the conclusion section of their MA theses. It also constituted a higher percentage in the TSs' MA theses than the NSs in the introduction section. In the light of the findings, it could be interpreted that the TSs were aware of the different relations that the additives may indicate in the results and discussion sections since they prove their opinions about their studies in a more concious manner. Indicating parallelism with their result, the other study carried out by Milton and Tsang (1993), the use of logical connectors in the native and non-native students essays were compared and found that half of the connectors in the list were overused in the non-native speaker corpus, which included items such as *"also", "first", "secondly", "lastly", "namely", "moreover", "furthermore", "regarding", "nevertheless", "although", "because",* and *"therefore"* in a misused or overused manner (Milton & Tsang, 1993). Another corpus-based study conducted by Narita, Sato, and Sugiura (2004) in order to investigate the use of logical connectors in the essays written by advanced Japanese EFL learners and native speakers of English indicated that connectors were not misused but significantly *"first, moreover, in addition"* and *"of course"* were overused as also stated and underlined in the study carried out by Milton and Tsang (1993).

Moreover, according to the LL frequency results of the current study, *"besides"* was significantly overused in the results and discussion, and the conclusion sections by the TSs. In between the MA theses sections, its usage was observed to be the highest for the TSs in the results and discussion section. The other highest overused additive transition in the same section was *"and"* in these theses. *"Moreover"* was overused in the introduction section of the MA theses by the TSs. On the contrary, the TSs had the highest underuse value for *"and"* in the conclusion section among the three sections. In

addition, the other highest underused additive in their MA theses was observed as *"also"* in the conclusion section. Furthermore, the additive transitions *"at the same time"* in the conclusion section, and *"also"* in the results and discussion sections were underused more significantly by the TSs, probably because of the reason for not aiming to prefer them frequently when compared to the NSs. No matter whether their different usage in the additives, it is observed that the use of a wide variety of additive transitions was applied by both groups in their MA theses, the reason of this fact could be due to their recognition of the formal usage of the language either as target language or native language. In addition, it could be explained that any type of the TMs and their usage was likely to provide a guide to the reader about the forthcoming information in the MA theses.

According to the usage of the other TM types, namely the adversative, sequential, and causal transitions in the introduction section of the MA theses written by the TSs of English, it was found that the sequential transitions were significantly overused and the adversatives were significantly underused. In the results and discussion, and conclusion sections, the TSs underused the adversative, sequential, and causal transitions. However, the adversatives were significantly underused by the TSs in the mentioned sections.

The results of the present study suggest that the additive transitions used in the MA theses assist the learners in connecting the sentences effectively, organizing the written discourse and the readers in constraining their interpretation of the message. Hence, the significance of additive transitions also underlines their ability, awareness, and preference to use language in situationally appropriate ways which make them maintain discourse cohesiveness, coherence and effectiveness in formal and informal writing. In the next section, the most salient TM type in the TSs of English and the NSs of English doctoral dissertations (PhD) were evaluated.

5.2.4. Evaluation of the Most Salient Transition Marker Type in the Doctoral Dissertations Written by the Turkish Speakers of English and The Native Speakers of English

Transition marker types that are dramatically important to combine thoughts in writing are classified as the additive, adversative, sequential, and causal. Regarding the results on these types taken part in the three sections of which are the introduction,

results and discussion, and conclusion in the doctoral dissertations (PhD) written by the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English, it was observed that all the TM types were significantly overused. In order to explain them in detail a wide variety of additive transitions were observed to be used more than the other types of transitions which are additive, adversative, sequential, and causal in the PhD dissertations by both groups. In terms of investigation for the corpus size, the findings indicated that the NSs used them in higher amount than the TSs. However, the TSs used the additive transitions more than the NSs regarding their amount, frequency and usage per 1,000 words in all three sections. The TSs used the additives 11 times in every 1,000 words whereas they were used 10 times in the doctoral dissertations by the NSs fluently. These results mentioned, are also supported by the study of Mohamed-Sayidina (2010), which was conducted to investigate the use of transition words and cohesive devices in English compositions and found that non-native speakers used more additive words than native speakers. According to the overall frequency of the PhD dissertations, the causal transitions were used the least in both groups because they are limited in number and they were exposed to certain types with few variations. The log-likelihood (LL) overall frequency indicated that the TSs significantly overused all the transition types. However, the most overused transition type in total was the sequentials realized as the reason for this fact might stem from the fact that TSs preferred *"therefore"* twice as much as the NSs in their dissertations, but mostly excluded the others.

In terms of the introduction section of their doctoral dissertations, additives per 1,000 words, it appears that the TSs of English and the NSs of English used them equally. However, the NSs used them more frequently than the TSs in the introduction, and the results and discussion sections. The additive usage, including their amount and usage per 1,000 words were high for the TSs in the results and discussion section of their PhD dissertations. The TSs had the highest significant overuse in this section because of the high proportion of the additive transition usage. Among all three sections, both groups used the highest amount of additive transitions in this section. In line with the results mentioned, the use of the additives might also have contributed to the positive development of fluency in both groups' writing and experience in effective writing. On the contrary, in between the groups, the NSs used the additives; regarding their amount, frequency and usage per 1,000 words more than the TSs in the conclusion section. Furthermore, the highest significant underuse of the additives for the TSs in the

conclusion section was due to the frequency interval of both groups in their doctoral dissertations. It could be interpreted that the NSs explicitly guided the readers more dramatically through their PhD dissertations by the extensive use of additive transitions than the TSs since they put their written texts naturally in their native language.

Regarding the results, *"and, also, in addition"* were the highest amount of additives used in all three sections. In the mentioned sections of both groups' PhD dissertations *"and"* was the mostly used additive transition. In addition, it was significantly used 5.2 times in the doctoral dissertations' results and discussion section written by the TSs of English whereas it was observed 4.2 times in every 1,000 words by the NSs of English. In both groups, the usage of *"and"* was observed to be the highest in the mentioned section. Furthermore, it constituted a higher percentage in the PhD dissertations by the NSs than the doctoral dissertations of the TSs in the introduction section. On the other hand, the usage of *"also"* was observed to be the highest in the results and discussion section. Similarly, it was significantly used per 1,000 words in both groups' PhD dissertations in the same section. The additive transition *"also"* had a higher percentage in the TSs' doctoral dissertations in the conclusion section than of the NSs. The other additive *"in addition"* constituted the highest amount of usage in the PhD dissertations in the results and discussion section by both groups. It was used more by the TSs than the NSs in the same section and had the same high percentage in both groups' doctoral dissertations in the introduction, and conclusion sections. The other additive transitions *"moreover, similarly"* were also used by the TSs and *"furthermore"* was used by the NSs in the results and discussion section. In the conclusion section, *"moreover"* was used more by the TSs than the NSs. As also highlighted in the study by Ma and Wang (2016), some connectors, such as *"moreover", "also"* were used quite frequently in students writing. In their study, the most frequently used connector in both non-native and native speakers corpora was *"and"*. Three connectors, *"moreover", "also", "and"* were used more frequently by the non-native speakers as also supported by our study. In another study carried out by Liu and Braine (2005), the use of cohesive features in argumentative writings indicated that undergraduate students could use lexical, reference and conjunction devices in their writing. However, some of the conjunction words such as *"and", "but", "or"* and *"so"* were used more frequently than other conjunction words or phrases like *"furthermore", "on the contrary", "moreover", "in addition"*. In Milton and Tsang's (1993) study, students seemed to use some connectors with about the same frequency as native

speakers. Allowing for some variation between the rates of occurence in the native speaker corpora, these words were given as *"and, actually, similarly, eventually, finally"* and *"anyway"*. Two connectors were used significantly less frequently: *"likewise"* and *"previously"*. The word *"likewise"* appeared more often in published texts than it did in the students' writing (Milton & Tsang, 1993). As stated in the present study, similar results were obtained related to the additive transition *"and"* which was also found to be used extensivly by both the TSs and the NSs.

According to the LL frequency results of the present study, *"and"* was significantly overused in the results and discussion section by the TSs. The other highest overused additive transition in the same section was *"moreover"* in their doctoral dissertations. *"Besides"* was more significantly overused in the results and discussion section than the introduction, and the conclusion sections of the TSs' PhD dissertations. On the contrary, the TSs had the highest underuse value for *"and"* in the conclusion section among the three sections. The other highest underused additive in their doctoral dissertations' conclusion section was *"in addition"*. The additive transitions *"furthermore, at the same time"* were underused more significantly in the PhD dissertations by the TSs in the introduction, and results and discussion sections. On the other hand, the TSs preferred to use the additive transition "*at the same time"* the least in their doctoral dissertations. Similarly, the findings of a corpus-based study conducted by Meisuo (2000) to investigate the use of cohesive devices in expository compositions revealed that they were inclined to overuse a variety of additives (*and, also, besides, in addition, moreover, furthermore*).

According to the present study, it can be concluded that the certain additive transitions used in the doctoral dissertations by both groups could be due to their experience and preference in their academic writing. In addition, it could be reflected that both groups reflect their attitude to the content of the discourse more fluently. It could also be emphasized that using TMs appropriately help writers interact with their readers and guide them through the text they are engaged with. Furthermore, it could be interpreted that the usage of TMs and their types provide coherence of the academic texts and allow writers to meet their ideas with the readers' understanding.

5.3. Implications for Language Teaching

Transition markers (TMs) are important tools that a writer can utilize to keep the reader jointed with the development and flow of information in a text. They serve as means of signalling to the reader the relationship between the current and preceding discourse. This comparative and detailed analysis has crucial importance in raising awareness of the academic writers who are either prospective teachers or/and researchers of English Language Teaching.

The current study has significance in the field of ELT because it gives an idea about how NSs and TSs, more specifically, the ELT department researchers use TMs in their MA theses and doctoral dissertations. The present study guides teachers and material developers since the results of the study give an idea about what should be taught about TMs in classrooms, in textbooks, and in other teaching materials.

The findings of the present research provide various pedagogical implications regarding the foreign language teaching and suggestions for language learners and teachers. The results of the current research prove to be useful in curriculum/syllabus more in detail about integrating TM into the academic foreign language writing courses or the other majors; increasing awareness of learners in the use of TMs and their functions within particular contexts; and maximizing the variation in TM usage considering different levels and needs of learners in different fields. This is because of the fact that the effectively used TMs and their most salient types in expressing and organizing ideas to convey messages fluently and clearly within texts. This study has revealed that explicit teaching of TMs and their types from corpus can be an efficacious alternative to make learners more proficient in their academic writing. With a corpus-based implementation, learners could be provided with several written materials whether authentic or semi-structured/structured ones including various linguistic patterns directly or indirectly presented within samples of numerous markers so that they could individually examine the use of TMs in different contexts.

Language learners could make use of these corpus-based materials and identify the differences of texts produced by either NSs or TSs, making up of learners' own writing could be particularly advantageous in this respect as it may offer them a higher level of engagement. Using this type of corpora in the classroom may help learners become aware of grammatical structures including in using the TMs in their writing,

and also contribute to a better understanding of the issues they face in their writing advancement.

When learners are exposed to TMs in an instructional setting, they must be taught that the choice of TMs has a vital role to make the relation explicit, and the differences of TMs given in a passage and sentences have semantic differences in oral and written language. Moreover, they should be informed that authentic texts and native speaker corpora used in lessons encourage appropriate and correct uses of TMs. This type of knowledge helps the learners become sensitive to the appropriate use of TMs in English writing. The teacher can give valuable feedback concerning the number of TMs used in learner texts as well as making explicit, relevant and effective comments based on particular instances taken from learner and academic texts. The learners should be made familiar with the different types of TMs in order to enable to make good variation. Also, in order to ensure that they make use of a wider repertoire of TMs in their academic texts and to prevent their use of limited types and their excessive use, it is also important to introduce the different types of markers with their alternatives apart from the markers that they consistently employ in their academic writings. In addition, providing TMs with their contextual information could be helpful for learners to better understand the functions of them that occur within their specific contexts.

In addition to the pedagogical implications, the instructors should teach conjunctive devices in complete texts rather than as isolated statements. EFL teachers could usefully present in class some academic texts with appropriately inserted TMs. They should include a variety of TMs in their writing classes within weekly schedule and they also should emphasize the TMs when teaching and in exams so that learners use the TMs accurately. Writing instructors should have an adequate awareness of the usage patterns of the TMs frequently used in English writing. They should emphasize both the explicit and implicit teaching of TMs as an integral part of writing courses offered to EFL learners. Peer revision groups could also be formed in order for learners to discuss the metadiscourse use of their peer's text or make judgment on the writer's intended meaning.

The awareness of metadiscourse could facilitate comprehension in that the reader approaches to a written text with an awareness of the discourse organization with the presence of certain kinds of resources including specifically TMs with other markers (Aidinlou & Vafaee, 2012; Camiciottoli, 2003; Intarapraw & Steffensen, 1995). Considering this, language teachers could also encourage learners to notice how TMs

are used in organization of reading texts in foreign language teaching in educational settings. Moreover, a focus on the metadiscourse studies previously conducted could be included in academic writing instruction to emphasize the practices typical of native and non-native writing (Burneikaitė, 2009).

5.4. Suggestions for Further Research

The present study provided a quantitative approach to the usage of transition markers (TMs) by means of comparing the Turkish speakers (TSs) of English and the native speakers (NSs) of English. In this research study, TMs had been compared between two corpora in terms of overuse and underuse. Similar studies in the future could emphasize the misused TMs in order to gain more detailed insight about the usage of transitions. Future research could evaluate the TMs considering their positions in the sentences they occurred. Further studies could also analyze other types of metadiscourse markers along with the transition markers in order to make comparisons between and/or among these markers. The scope of this study was limited to three sections, including; introduction, results and discussion, and conclusion. Analyzing the other sections of these corpora might provide a more comprehensive evaluation of the TM usage.

As the data of the present study was also limited to the corpus size of 200 MA theses and PhD dissertations written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English in the field of ELT between 2010-2014, a further research might involve investigating a corpus-based study with a larger number of MA theses and doctoral dissertations written prior to 2010 and after 2014 within interdisciplinary fields to a replicated research to observe whether there were similarities or differences in the usage of TMs in these fields. Further research could also be designed by considering these features and a study with a larger corpus comprised of different types of genres could be conducted. Thus, the use of TMs by the NSs with different origins might have a contribution to comparative analysis among different groups of the NSs of English and might be significant in the field of intercultural pragmatics. In addition to using a corpus including academic texts only in English, a parallel corpus in Turkish could also be combined and compared in a further research, which might explain possible uses of Turkish writers in English could be attributed to the nature of Turkish in terms of TMs. The analysis of the use of TMs in various levels of students' writing, as related to the corpus-based activities, could be suggested for further research. Language teachers

could also encourage students to notice how TMs were used in the organization of texts in foreign language teaching in educational settings. A further suggestion is that the academic texts compiled for the purposes of the study could be applied to language teaching as a pedagogic material in educational settings for the analysis of the TM usage in their contexts written by the NSs of English and the TSs of English. By this way, language learners could make use of the corpus and identify the differences between the native and non-native speakers.

According to the curriculum of the Ministry of Turkish Education, as English has started being taught in the elementary school, it is essential to teach students the importance of TMs in language classrooms by including them into the syllabus as a content and encouraging students' writing abilities from the beginning until the end of their higher education. The essence of TMs should not only be taught in advanced grades but also in beginner grades of English courses systematically and methodically appropriate to the level of learners. As a final suggestion, in recent years, as the classrooms are composed of multinational students in Turkey, it is of vital importance including the TMs to the syllabus of language classrooms to enable the students with different cultural and national background to express themselves explicitly and to accomodate easily in their new life in Turkey.

REFERENCES

Ağçam, R. (2014). *A corpus-based study on author stance in academic English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Çukurova University, Adana.

Aidinlou, N. A., & Vafaee, A. (2012). The effect of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers on Iranian EFL high school learners' reading comprehension. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 2*(6), 6210-6214.

Akbana, Y. E. (2011). *A Corpus-based study on L2 English hypothetical conditionals.* Unpublished master's thesis, Çukurova University, Adana.

Ali, S., Kalajahi, R., & Abdullah, N. (2012). Discourse Connectors: An Overview of the History, Definition and Classification of the Term. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 19*(11), 1659-1673.

Altenberg, B. (1996). Contrastive linking in spoken and written English. In G. Tottie & I. Bäcklund (Eds.), *English in Speech and Writing-A Symposium* (pp. 13-40). Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell International Stockholm.

Altenberg, B., & Tapper, M. (1998). The use of adverbial connectors in advanced Swedish learners' written English. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 80-93). London & New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Ang, Z. (2014). The effects of discourse markers on the reading comprehension and speed of chinese learners of English. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Studies, 2*(2), 27-49.

Anthony, L. (2013). A Critical look at software tools in corpus linguistics. *Linguistic Research, 30*(2), 141-16.

Aston, G. (2001). *Learning with corpora.* Bologna: CLUEB and Houston, TX: Athelstan.

Aston, G., Bernardini, S., & Stewart, D. (2004). *Corpora and language learners.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Baker, P., Hardie, A., & McEnery, T. (2006). *A glossary of corpus linguistics.* Edinburg: Edinburg.

Ball, W. J. (1996). *Dictionary of link words in English discourse.* London.

Barlow, M. (2000). *MonoConc Pro.* Houston, TX: Athelstan.

Batstone, R. (1995). Product and process: Grammar in the second language classroom. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. William (Eds.), *Grammar and the language teacher* (pp. 224-236). London: Prentice Hall.

Bernardini, S. (2002). Exploring new directions for discovery learning. In B. Kettemann & G. Marko (Eds.), *Teaching and learning by doing corpus analysis* (pp. 165-182). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Biber, D. (1995). *Dimensions of register variation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D. (1996). Investigating language use through corpus-based analyses of association patterns. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 1*(2), 171-197.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.* London: Longman.

Biber, D. (2009). A corpus-driven approach to formulaic language in English. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *14*(3), 275–311.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1994). Corpus-based approaches to issues in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 2*(15).

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English.* Harlow: Longman.

Biber, D., & Reppen, R. (2002). What does frequency have to do with grammar teaching? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24,* 199-208.

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

Bolton, K., Nelson, G., & Hung, J. (2002). A corpus-based study of connectors in student writing: Research from the International Corpus in Hong Kong (ICE-HK). *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 7*(2), 165-182.

Bonelli, E. T. (2012). Theoretical overview of the evolution of corpus linguistics. In A. M. O'Keeffe & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics* (pp. 14-27). London & NY: Routledge.

Bonelli, E. T., & Sinclair, J. (2006). Corpora. Teoksessa K. Brown (toim.): *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics.* pp. 206-220. Elsevier.

Boulton, A. (2009). Testing the limits of data-driven learning: language proficiency and training. *ReCALL, 21*(1), 37–54.

Bunton, D. (1999). The use of higher level metatext in Ph.D. theses. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*, 41-56.

Burneikaitė, N. (2009). Metadiscoursal connectors in linguistics MA theses in English L1 & L2. *KALBOTYRA*, *61*(3), 36-50.

Buysse, L. (2011). The business of pragmatics. The case of discourse markers in the speech of students of business English and English Linguistics. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 161, 10-30.

Camiciottoli, B. C. (2003). Metadiscourse and ESP reading comprehension: An exploratory study. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 15*(1), 28-44.

Capel, A. (1993). *Collins COBUILD concordance samplers 1: Prepositions.* London: Harper-Collins Publishers.

Caron, J. (1994). Connectives. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 2,* 706-707, Oxford: Pergamon.

Carpenter, E. (1993). *Collins COBUILD English guides 4: Confusable words.* London: Harper-Collins Publishers.

Carpenter, P.A., & Just, M. A. (1977). Integrative processes in comprehension. In D. LaBerge & J. Samuals (Eds.), *Basic processes in reading: perception and comprehension* (pp. 217-241). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Carter, R. (1998). Orders of reality: CANCODE, communication and culture, and reply to Guy Cook. *ELT Journal, 52*(1), 43-64.

Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1997). *Exploring spoken English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). *The grammar book: An EFLIESL teacher's course.* New York: Newbury House.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). USA: Newbury House/Heinle & Heinle.

Chalker, S. E. (1996). *English guides: linking words.* London: Collins Cobuild.

Chambers, A. (2007). Integrating corpora in language learning and teaching. *ReCALL, 19*(3), 249-251.

Chambers, A. (2010). What is data-driven learning? In A. O'Keeffe & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics* (pp. 345-358). London & NY: Routledge.

Chapelle, C. (2001). *Computer applications in second language acquisition: Foundations for teaching, testing, and research.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Charteris, B. J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis.* Hants: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Chen, C. W. (2006). The use of conjunctive adverbials in the academic papers of advanced Taiwanese EFL learners. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 11*(1), 113–130.

Cheng, W. (2010). What can a corpus tell us about language teaching? In A. O'Keeffe & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics* (pp. 319- 332). London & NY: Routledge.

Cho, Y. (1998). Use of connectives in writings by Korean learners of English. Retrieved October 23, 2015, from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED441348

Choi, J. (2005). *A contrastive analysis of argumentative essays written in English by Korean ESL students and by native English-speaking students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Chomsky, N. (1962). *Paper given at the 3rd Texas conference on problems of linguistic analysis in English (1958).* Austin: University of Texas.

Chomsky, N. (1966). Topics in the theory of generative grammar. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current trends in linguistics, 3,* (pp. 1-60). Den Haag, Mouton.

Chon, Y. V. (2009). The electronic dictionary for writing: A solution or a problem? *International Journal of Lexicography, 22*(1), 23-54.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, R. (1984). A computational theory of the function of clue words in argument understanding. In *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on computational linguistics* (pp. 251–258).

Collins Dictionary (2015). Retrieved November 22, 2015, from www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english-cobuild-learners/thesis

Collins Dictionary (2017). Retrieved July 15, 2017, from www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english-cobuild-learners/thesis

Collins/University of Birmingham. (1990). *Collins Cobuild English Grammar.* London: Collins.

Conrad, S. (2005). Corpus linguistics and L2 teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 393-409). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, G. (1998). The uses of reality: A reply to Ronald Carter. *ELT Journal, 52*(1), 57-63.

Cooper, P., & Branthwaite, A. (1977). Qualitative Technology: New Perspectives on Measurement and Meaning through Qualitative Research. 20th Market Research Society Annual Conference, March, 79-92.

Corder, S. P. (1974). Error analysis. In J. P. Allen & S. P. Corder (Eds.), *Techniques in applied linguistics* (pp. 122–154). London: Oxford University Press.

Cortes, V. (2004). Lexical bundles in published and student disciplinary writing: Examples from history and biology. *English for Specific Purposes, 23*(4), 379-423.

Degand, L., & Sanders, T. (2002). The impact of relational markers on expository text comprehension in L1 and L2. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 15,* 739-757.

Deignan, A. (1999). Corpus based research in metaphor. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 177-202). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dublin, F., & Olshtain, T. (1980). The interface of reading and writing. *TESOL Quarterly 14,* 353-363.

Dunning, T. (1993). Accurate Methods for the Statistics of Surprise and Coincidence. Computational Linguistics, 19(1), 61-74

Dülger, O. (2001). *The use of discourse markers in teaching writing.* Unpublished Masters Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.

Elahi, M., & Badeleh, M. T. (2013). A contrastive study on transitional markers in English language teaching research articles written by English and Persian academic writers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*(4), 839-844.

Evison, J. (2010). What are the basics of analysing a corpus? In A. O'Keeffe & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics* (pp. 122-135). London & NY: Routledge.

Faghih, E., & Rahimpour, S. (2009). Contrastive rhetoric of English and Persian written texts: Metadiscourse in applied linguistics research articles. *Rice Working Papers in Linguistics, 1,* 92- 107.

Farr, F. (2008). Evaluating the use of corpus-based instruction in a language teacher education context: perspectives from the users. *Language Awareness*, *17*(1), 25-43.

Ferris, D. R. (1994). Lexical and syntactic features of ESL writing by students at different levels of L2 proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(2), 414-420.

Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Field, Y., & Oi, Y. L. M. (1992). A comparison of internal conjunctive cohesion in the English essay writing of Cantonese speakers and native speakers of English. *RELC Journal*, *23*(1), 15-28. Retrieved February 4, 2017 from http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/003368829202300102

Fischer-Starke, B. (2009). Keywords and frequent phrases of Jane Austen's. *Pride and Prejudice. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *14*(4), 492–523.

Francis, W. N. (1982). Problems of assembling and computerizing large corpora. In S. Johansson (Ed.), *Computer corpora in English language research* (pp. 7-24). Bergen: Norwegian Computing Centre for the Humanities.

Francis, W. N. (1992). Language corpora B.C. In J. Svartvik (Ed.), *Directions in corpus linguistics* (pp. 17-32). Berlin: Mouton.

Fraser, B. J. (1998). Science learning environments: Assessment, effects and determinants. In B.J. Fraser & K.G. Tobin (Eds.), *International handbook of science education* (pp. 527–564). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Fraser, B. J. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(7), 931-952.

Friginal, E., & Hardy, J. A. (2014). *Corpus-Based Sociolinguistics: A Student Guide.* New York: Routledge.

Gabrielatos, C. (2005). Corpora and language teaching: just a fling or wedding bells? *TESL-EJ Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, *8*(4), 1-37.

Gaskell, D., & Cobb, T. (2004). Can learners use concordance feedback for writing errors? *System, 32*(3), 301-319.

Gavioli, L., & Aston, G. (2001). Enriching reality: language corpora in language pedagogy. *ELT Journal Volume*, *55*(3), 238-246.

Gersten, R., Baker, S.K., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P., & Scarcella, R. (2007). *Effective literacy and language instruction for English learners in the elementary grades: An IES practice guide.* DC: IES, Department of Education, Washington.

Gilmore, A. (2009). Using online corpora to develop students' writing skills. *ELT Journal, 63*(4), 363-372.

Gilquin, G., Granger, S., & Paquot, M. (2007). Learner corpora: The missing link in EAP pedagogy. In P. Thompson (Ed.), *Corpus-based EAP pedagogy,* Special issue of *Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 6*(4), 319-335.

Goodale, M. (1995). *Collins COBUILD concordance samplers 4: Tenses.* London: Harper-Collins Publishers.

Granger, S. (1998). *Learner English on computer.* London & New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Granger, S. (2002). A bird's eye view of learner corpus research. In S. Granger, J. Hong & S. Petch-Tyson (Eds.), *Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 3-33). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Granger, S., Dagneaux, E., Meunier, F., & Paquot, M. (2009). The International Corpus of Learner English. Version 2. Handbook and CD-ROM. Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses Universitaires de Louvain.

Granger, S., Hung, J., & Petch-Tyson, S. (2002). *Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Granger, S., & Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native EFL speakers of English. *World Englishes, 15,* 19-29.

Greenbaum, S., & Quirk, R. (1993). *A student's grammar of the English language.* Essex: Longman.

Gries, S. T. (2009). What is corpus linguistics? *Language and Linguistics Compass, 3*(5), 1225-1241.

Guzman, E. A. (2004). *The role of connectives in written discourse.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, State University of New York.

Hadley, G. (2002). Sensing winds of change: An introduction to data-driven learning. *RELC Journal, 33*(2), 99-124.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Hamed, M. (2014). Conjunctions in argumentative writing of Libyan tertiary students. *English Language Teaching, 7*(3), 108-120.

Hardie, A., & McEnery, T. (2010). On two traditions in corpus linguistics, and what they have in common. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *15*(3), 384–394.

Hart, S. (1987). The use of the survey in industrial market research. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *3(1),* 25-38.

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hockett, C. F. (1948). A note on 'Structure'. *IJAL, 14,* 269-271.

Hoffmann, S. (2005). *Grammaticalization and English Complex Prepositions: A Corpus-based Study*. London: Routledge.

Holloway, D. W. (1981). Semantic grammars: How they can help teach writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32,* 205-218.

Horn, V. (1969). Teaching logical relationships in written discourse. *TESOL Quarterly, 3*(4), 291- 296.

Hsieh, W. M., & Liou, H. C. (2008). A case study of corpus-informed online academic writing for EFL graduate students. *CALICO Journal, 26*(1), 28-47.

Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in applied linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchinson, B. (2005). *Modelling the similarity of discourse connectives.* Proceedings of the 27th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society (CogSci2005), July 21-23, Italy.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing.* Bodmin: MPG Books.

Hyland, K. (2006a). Disciplinary differences: Language variation in academic discourses. In K. Hyland & M. Bondi (Eds.), *Academic discourse across disciplines* (pp. 17- 45). Bern: Peter Lang,.

Hyland, K. (2006b). *English for academic purposes.* London and NewYork: Routledge.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2005). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics, 25*(2), 123-139.

Hymes, D. (1992). The concept of communicative competence revisited. In P. Martin (Ed.), *Thirty years of linguistic evolution. Studies in honour of Rene Dirven on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday* (pp. 31-57). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Intarapraw, P., & Steffensen, M. S. (1995). The use of metadiscourse in good and poor ESL essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4*(3), 253-272.

Jaggi, S. (2003). Descriptive Statistics and Exploratory Data Analysis. *Indian Agricultural Statistics Research Institute.* Retrieved May 24, 2015, from http://iasri.res.in/ebook/EB_SMAR/e-book_pdf%20files/Manual%20II/1-DescriptiveStatistics.pdf

James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis.* London: Longman.

Jarvinen, T. (1994). Annotating 200 million words: the Bank of English Project. *Proceedings of COLING-94, 1,* 565– 68, Kyoto.

Jin, W. (2001). *A Quantitative Study of Cohesion in Chinese Graduate Students' Writing: Variations across Genres and Proficiency Levels.* Paper presented at the Symposium on Second Language Writing at Purdue University West Lafayette, Indiana.

Johns, T. (1986). Micro-concord: A language learner's research tool. *System, 4*(2), 151-162.

Johns, T. (1988). Whence and whither classroom concordancing? In T. Bongaerts, P. de Haan, S. Lobbe, & H. Wekker (Eds.), *Computer applications in language learning* (pp. 9-33). Dordrecht: Foris.

Johns, T. (1991). Should you be persuaded: Two examples of data-driven learning. *ELR Journal, 4,* 1-16.

Jung, E. H. (2003). The role of discourse signaling cues in second language listening comprehension. *Modern Language Journal,* 87(4), 562-577.

Kachru, B. B. (1997). English as an Asian language. In M. L. S Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context.* Proceedings of the conference held in Manila on August 2–3, 1996 (pp. 1-23). Sydney: Macquarie Library Ltd.

Kaltenböck, G., & Mehlmauer-Larcher, B. (2005). Computer corpora and the language classroom: On the potential and limitations of computer corpora in language teaching. *ReCALL, 17,* 65-84.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language, 16,* 1-20.

Kehler, A. (2002*). Coherence, reference, and the theory of grammar.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Kennedy G. (1992). Preferred ways of putting things. In J. Svartvik (Ed.), *Directions in corpus linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kennedy, G. (1998). *An introduction to corpus linguistics.* London: Longman.

Kettemann, B., & Marko, G. (2002). Teaching and learning by doing corpus analysis. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Teaching and Language Corpora. Graz, 19- 24 July, 2000.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kilgarriff, A., Rychl, P., Smrž, P., & Tugwell, D. (2004). The sketch engine. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh EURALEX International Congress* (pp. 105–16). Lorient, France: Universite de Bretagne-Sud, Retreived October, 23, 2015 from http://nlp.fi.muni.cz/publications/euralex2004_kilgarriff_pary_smrz_tugwell/

Kjellmer, G. (1994). *A dictionary of English collacations based on the Brown Corpus.* Oxford Clarendon Press.

Knoch, U. (2004). A new look at teaching comparisons: A corpus-based study. *Journal of Language and Learning, 2*(2), 171-185.

Knott, A. (1996). *A data-driven methodology for motivating a set of coherence relations.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh. Retrieved October 27, 2015 from http://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/1842/583/3/1996-alik.pdf

Knoy, T. (2000). Overcoming Chinese colloquial habits in writing. *The Internet TSL Journal, 5*(2).

Koosha, M., & Jafarpour, A. (2006). Data-driven learning and teaching collocation of prepositions: The case of Iranian EFL adult learners. *Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 8*(4), 192-209.

Koteyko, N. (2006). Corpus linguistics and the study of meaning in discourse. *The Linguistics Journal, 1*(2), 131-154.

Leech, G. (1991). The state of the art in corpus linguistics. *English corpus linguistics: Studies* in Honour of J. Svartvik, K. Aijmer & B. Altenberg (Eds.), (pp. 8-29). London and New York: Longman.

Leech, G. (1992). Corpora and theories of linguistic performance. In J. Svartvik (Ed.), *Directions in Corpus Linguistics: Proceedings of Nobel Symposium, 82,* (pp. 125- 148). Berlin and New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

Leech, G. (1997). Teaching and language corpora: A convergence. In A. Wichmann, S. Fligelstone, T. McEnery & G. Knowles (Eds.), *Teaching and language corpora* (pp. 1-23). London: Longman.

Leech, G. (2011). The modals ARE declining: Reply to Neil Millar's "Modal verbs in TIME: Frequency changes 1923–2006". *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 14(2) (2009), 191–220. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *16*(4), 547–564.

Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1994). *A communicative grammar of English.* 2nd Ed. London: Longman.

Leung, C. (2005). *A comparison of the use of major English conjunctions by American and Hong Kong university students.* Unpublished Bachelor Thesis, Lunds Universitet.

Liu, M., & Braine, G. (2005). Cohesive features in argumentative writing produced by Chinese undergraduates. *System*, *33*(4), 623-636. Retrieved February 5, 2017 from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.02.002

Liu, Y., Fang, A. C., & Wei, N. (2014). A Corpus-Based Quantitative Study of Nominalizations across Chinese and British Media English. 28th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation (PACLIC 28), 101–110.

Ma, Y., & Wang, B. (2016). A corpus-based study of connectors in student writing: A comparison between a native speaker (NS) corpus and a non-native speaker (NNS) learner corpus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 5*(1), 113-118.

Mahlberg, M. (2005). *English General nouns. Studies in corpus linguistics 20.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/scl.20.

Martinez, A. C. L. (2015). Multimodal Communication in the 21st Century: Professional and Academic Challenges. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 212,* 42 – 46.

Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes, 12,* 3–22.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (1994). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teachers.* New York: Longman.

McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (1995). Spoken grammar: What is it and how can we teach it? *ELT Journal, 49*(3), 207-218.

McDevitt, D. (1989). How to cope with spaghetti writing. *ELT Journal, 43*(1).

McEnery, T. (2009). Keywords and moral panics: Mary Whitehouse and media censorship. In D. Archer (Ed.), *What's in a Word-list? Investigating Word Frequency and Keyword Extraction* (pp. 93–124). Surrey: Ashgate.

McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (1996). *Corpus linguistics.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (2001). *Corpus linguistics: An introduction.* Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

McEnery, T., Xiao, R., & Tonio, Y. (2006). *Corpus-based language studies: An advance resource book.* New York: Routledge.

Meisuo, Z. (2000). Cohesive features in the expository writing of undergraduates in two Chinese universities. *RELC Journal*, *31*(1), 61-95.

Meyer, C. F. (2002). *English corpus linguistics: An introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meyer, B. J. F., Brandt, D.M., & Bluth, G.J. (1980). Use of top-level structure in text: Key for reading comprehension in ninth-grade students. *Reading Research Quarterly, 16*(1), 72–103.

Millis, K. K., & Just, M. A. (1994). The influence of connectives on sentence comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language, 33*(1), 128-147.

Milton, J. C., & Tsang, E. S. C. (1993). A corpus-based study of logical connectors in EFL students' writing: directions for future research. In Pemberton, R., & Tsang, E. S. C. (Eds.) *Studies in Lexis*. Hong Kong: The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Language Center.

Mindt, D. (1997). Corpora and the teaching of English in Germany. In A. Wichmann et al. (Eds.), *Teaching and language corpora* (pp. 40- 50). London: Longman.

Mohamed-Sayidina, A. (2010). Transfer of L1 Cohesive Devices and Transition Words into L2 Academic Texts: The Case of Arab Students. *RELC Journal*, *41*(3), 253-266.

Moser, M., & Moore, J. (1995). Using discourse analysis and automatic text generation to study discourse cue usage. In *Proceedings of the 1995 Spring Symposium on Empirical Methods in Discourse Interpretation and Generation* (pp. 92–98).

Murray, J. D. (1997). Connectives and narrative text: The role of continuity. *Memory & Cognition, 25*(2), 227-236.

Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESL-EJ, 6*(2), A-1. Retrieved November 7, 2015, from

http://tesl-ej.org/ej22/a1.html

Narita, M., Sato, C., & Sugiura, M. (2004). *Connector usage in the English essay writing of Japanese EFL Learners*. Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation.

Nelson, M. (2000). *A corpus-based study of business English and business English teaching materials.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Manchester, Manchester.

Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Collocations in a learner corpus.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Neuner, J. L. (1987). Cohesive ties and chains in good and poor freshman essays. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *21*(1), 92-105.

Nippold, M. A., Schwarz, I. E., & Undlin, R. A. (1992). Use and understanding of adverbial conjuncts: A developmental study of adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 35*(1), 108-118.

O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M. J., & Carter, R. A. (2007). *From corpus to classroom: Language use and language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Sullivan, I., & Chambers, A. (2006). Learners' writing skills in French: Corpus consultation and learner evaluation. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15,* 46-68.

Paquot, M. (2008). Examplification in learner writing: A cross-linguistic perspective. In F. Meunier & S. Granger (Eds.), *Phraseology in foreign language learning and teaching.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Partington, A. (1998). *Patterns and meanings: Using corpora for English language research and teaching.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Payne, J. S. (2008). Data-driven south Asian language learning. Retrieved November, 23, 2015, from http://salrc.uchicago.edu/workshops/sponsored/061005/DDL.ppt

Pearson, J. (1998). *Terms in context.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pretorius, E. J. (2006). The comprehension of logical relations in expository texts by students who study through the medium of ESL. *System, 34*(3).

Prodromou, L. (1996). Correspondence. *ELT Journal, 50*(1), 88-89.

Quirk, R. (1960). Towards a description of English usage. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 40–61.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Starvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language.* London: Longman.

Rahimi, M. (2011). Discourse Markers in Argumentative and Expository Writing of Iranian EFL Learners. *WorldJournal of English Language, 1*(2), 68-78.

Rayson P., Berridge D., & Francis B. (2004). Extending the Cochran rule for the comparison of word frequencies between corpora. In Volume II of G. Purnelle., C. Fairon, & A. Dister (Eds.), Le poids des mots: Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Statistical analysis of textual data (JADT 2004), Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, March 10-12, 2004, (pp. 926 - 936), Presses universitaires de Louvain.

Rayson, P., & Garside, R. (2000). Comparing corpora using frequency profiling. In proceedings of the workshop on Comparing Corpora, held in conjunction with the 38th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2000). 1-8 October 2000 (pp. 1-6), Hong Kong.

Reppen, R. (2011). Using corpora in the language classroom. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (second edn.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1994). *Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman.

Rissanen, M. (2012). Corpora and the study of English historical syntax. In M. Kytö (Ed.), *English Corpus Linguistics: Crossing Paths* (pp. 197–220). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Rouchota, V. (1998). *Connectives, coherence and relevance. Current issues in relevance theory.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Römer, U. (2005). *Progressives, patterns, pedagogy. A corpus-driven approach to English progressive forms, functions, contexts and didactics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Römer, U. (2008). Corpora and language teaching. In A. Lüdeling & M. Kytö (Eds.), *Handbook on corpus linguistic*s (pp. 112-131). Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Sanders, T., & Noordman, L. (2000). The role of coherence relations and their linguistic markers in text processing. *Discourse Processes, 29*, 37-60.

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

Schlüter, N. (2006). How reliable are the results? Comparing corpus-based studies of the present perfect. Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 54(2), 135–148.

Scott, M. (1996). WordSmith Tools. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 0-19-458984-6.

Scott, M. (1997). WordSmith tools, version 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 0-19-459283-9.

Scott, M. (1999). *WordSmith tools.* Version 3, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scott, M. (2001). Comparing corpora and identifying key words, collocations, and frequency distributions through the WordSmith Tools suite of computer programs. In M. Ghadessy, A. Henry & R. Roseberry (Eds.) Small Corpus Studies and ELT (pp. 47-67). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Scott, M. (2004). WordSmith tools, version 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN: 0-19-459400-9.

Scott, M. (2008). WordSmith tools, version 5. Liverpool: Lexical Analysis Software.

Scott, M. (2010). WordSmith Tools, Version 5 Manual. Liverpool: Lexical Analysis Software. 2.

Scott, M. (2011). WordSmith Tools version 6. Liverpool: Lexical Analysis Software.

Scott, M., & Tribble, C. (2006). *Textual patterns: Key words and corpus analysis in language education.* Amsterdam & Phladelphia: Benjamins.

Shi, H. (1993). *The relation between freshman writing coherence and cohesion, functional roles and cognitive strategies.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Sinclair, J. (1987). *Collins COBUILD English language dictionary.* London: Collins.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. (1994). Corpus typology: A framework for classification. *EAGLES Document,* 1-18.

Sinclair, J. (2000). Lexical grammar. *Naujoji Metodologija, 24,* 191-203.

Sinclair, J. (2004). *How to use corpora for language teaching.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sinclair, J., Bullon, S., Krishnamurthy, R., Manning, E., & Todd, J. (1990). *Collins COBUILD English grammar.* London: Harper-Collins Publishers.

Sinclair, J., & Renouf, A. (1988). A lexical syllabus for language learning. In R. Carter & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary and language teaching.* London: Longman.

Sinclair, J. M. (2006). *Collins COBUILD advanced learner's English dictionary 5th edition.* Glasgow: HarperCollins.

Sinclair, J. M. et al. (1992). *Collins COBUILD English usage.* London: HarperCollins.

Sinclair, J. et al. (2001). *Collins COBUILD English dictionary for advanced learners.* London: HarperCollins.

Sloan, G. (1983). Transitions: Relationships among t-units. *College Composition and Communication, 34,* 447-453.

Smith, M. E. F. (1999). *Reasoning and the comprehension of clausal and lexical connectors: Integration of information across sentences by English language background and Spanish language background ninth-graders.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California.

Soria, C. (2005). Constraints on the use of connectives in discourse. In *Proceedings of SEM05, First International Symposium on the Exploration and Modelling of Meaning. Biarritz* (pp 153-161). 14-15 November 2005, France.

Stevens, V. (1991). Classroom concordancing: Vocabulary materials derived from relevant, authentic text. *English for Specific Purposes Journal, 10,* 35-46.

Sukamolson, S. (2005). Fundamentals of quantitative research. *Chulalongkorn University.* Retrieved from http://www.culi.chula.ac.th/Research/e-Journal/bod/Suphat%20 Sukamolson.pdf

Svartvik, J. (1992). Corpus linguistics comes of age. In J. Svartvik (Ed.), *Directions in Corpus Linguistics, Proceedings of Nobel Symposium 82 Stockholm,* 4-8 August 1991, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Svartvik, J. (1996). Corpora are becoming mainstream. In J. Thomas & M. Short (Eds.) *Using Corpora for Language Research* (pp. 3–13). Essex: Longman.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input and second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Sidelhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis. English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swan, M. (1980). *Practical English usage.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English Usage.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Şuyalçınkaya, K. (1995). *The role of discourse markers in improving writing a report.* Master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.

Tang, E., & Ng, C. (1995). A study on the use of connectives in ESL students' writing. *Hong Kong Journals Online, 7*(2), 105-122.

Tanko, G. (2004). The use of adverbial connectors in Hungarian university students' argumentative essays. In J. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to use corpora in language teaching* (pp. 157-181). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tickoo, A. (2002). On the use of 'then', 'after that' in the marking of chronological order: Insights from Vietnamese and Chinese learners of ESL. *System, 30,* 107-124.

Ting, F. (2003). An investigation of cohesive errors in the writing of PRC tertiary EFL students. *STETS Language and Communication Review, 2*(2).

Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus linguistics at work.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tribble, C. (1990). Using concordancing in an academic writing programme. *Paper presented at 24th Annual TESOL Convention.* San Francisco.

Tribble, C., & Jones, G. (1990). *Concordances in the classroom.* Harlow: Longman.

Tsui, A. B. (2004). What teachers have always wanted to know–and how corpora can help. In J. H. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to use corpora in language teaching* (pp. 39-66). John Benjamins.

Uribe, D. (2008). Characteristics of academic English in the ESL classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal, 14*(3). Retrieved November 23, 2015 from http://iteslj.org/

Vasiljevic, Z. (2013). Assessing learners' comprehension of logical connectives in L2 texts. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *3*(1), 7-16.

Virtanen, T. (1998). Developing a linguistic corpus for philanthropic fundraising texts. *Paper presented at The Indiana Center for Intercultural Communication and Center on Philanthropy* Roundtable. Indianapolis, Indiana University-Purdue University.

Virtanen, T. (2004). Point of departure: Cognitive aspects of sentence-initial adverbials. In T. Virtanen (Ed.), *Approaches to cognition through text and discourse* (pp. 79-97). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Vold, E. T. (2006). Epistemic modality markers in research articles: A cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 16*(1), 61 – 87.

Wakeman, S., & Henderson, K. (2012). Creative writing opportunities for students with significant cognitive disabilities – A PowerPoint presentation for professional development. *Modules Addressing Special Education and Teacher Education (MAST).* Greenville, NC: East Carolina University.

Widdowson, H. G. (1991). The description and prescription of language. In J. Atlatis (Ed.), *Georgetown university round table in language and linguistics. Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of the art* (pp. 11-24). Washington DC: Georgetown University.

Wikipedia. (2015). Text Corpus. Retrieved October 23, 2015 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Text_corpus

Willis, J., & Willis, D. (1988). *The Collins Cobuild English course.* London: Collins.

Wichmann, A., Fligelstone, S., McEnery, T., & Knowles, G. (1997). *Teaching and language corpora.* London: Longman.

Ying, S. (2007). An Analysis of Discourse Markers Used by Non-Native English Learners: Its Implication for Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Retrieved October 23, 2015 from

http://www.kuis.ac.jp/icci/publications/kiyo/pdfs/19/19_03.pdf

Yoon, H., & Hirvela, A. (2004). ESL student attitudes toward corpus use in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, pp. 257-283.

Yusuf, Y. Q. (2009). A corpus-based linguistics analysis on written corpus: Colligation of "to" and "for". *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *5*(2), 49-63.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 17,* 165-187.

Zhao, Y. (2009*). An empirical study of L2 learners' use of lexical chunks and language production.* Master's thesis, Kristianstad University College, Kristianstad, Sweden. Retrieved October, 23, 2015 from http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:229050/FULLTEXT01.pdf

APPENDIX 1

MA Theses in the Field of ELT

MA Theses (TR)	Year	University / Country of Theses
1. MATS1	2010	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
2. MATS2	2010	Gazi University / TURKEY
3. MATS3	2010	Gazi University / TURKEY
4. MATS4	2010	Boğaziçi University / TURKEY
5. MATS5	2010	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
6. MATS6	2010	Yüzüncü YılUniversity / TURKEY
7. MATS7	2010	Hacettepe University / TURKEY
8. MATS8	2010	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University / TURKEY
9. MATS9	2010	Yeditepe University / TURKEY
10. MATS10	2010	Pamukkale University / TURKEY
11. MATS11	2011	Boğaziçi University / TURKEY
12. MATS12	2011	Çukurova University / TURKEY
13. MATS13	2011	Yeditepe University / TURKEY
14. MATS14	2011	Pamukkale University / TURKEY
15. MATS15	2011	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
16. MATS16	2011	Trakya University / TURKEY
17. MATS17	2011	Ondokuz Mayıs University/ TURKEY

MA Theses (TR)	Year	University / Country of Theses
18. MATS18	2011	Pamukkale University / TURKEY
19. MATS19	2011	Abant İzzet Baysal University / TURKEY
20. MATS20	2011	Ondokuzmayıs University /TURKEY
21. MATS21	2012	Onsekiz Mart University / TURKEY
22. MATS22	2012	Hacettepe University / TURKEY
23. MATS23	2012	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
24. MATS24	2012	Çukurova University / TURKEY
25. MATS25	2012	Maltepe University / TURKEY
26. MATS26	2012	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
27. MATS27	2012	Atatürk University / TURKEY
28. MATS28	2012	Çağ University / TURKEY
29. MATS29	2012	Onsekiz Mart University / TURKEY
30. MATS30	2012	Çukurova University / TURKEY
31. MATS31	2013	Çukurova University / TURKEY
32. MATS32	2013	Atatürk University / TURKEY
33. MATS33	2013	Dokuz Eylül University / TURKEY
34. MATS34	2013	Gazi University / TURKEY
35. MATS35	2013	Çağ University / TURKEY
36. MATS36	2013	Gazi University / TURKEY
37. MATS37	2013	Trakya University / TURKEY
38. MATS38	2013	Maltepe University / TURKEY
39. MATS39	2013	Çukurova University / TURKEY
40. MATS40	2013	Gazi University / TURKEY

MA Theses (TR)	Year	University / Country of Theses
41. MATS41	2014	Sakarya University / TURKEY
42. MATS42	2014	Atatürk University / TURKEY
43. MATS43	2014	Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University / TURKEY
44. MATS44	2014	Ondokuzmayıs University / TURKEY
45. MATS45	2014	Anadolu University / TURKEY
46. MATS46	2014	Pamukkale University / TURKEY
47. MATS47	2014	Yeditepe University / TURKEY
48. MATS48	2014	Boğaziçi University / TURKEY
49. MATS49	2014	Bahçeşehir University / TURKEY
50. MATS50	2014	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University / TURKEY

MA Theses (US)	Year	University / Country of Theses
1. MANS1	2010	Eastern Oregon University / USA
2. MANS2	2010	Iowa State University / USA
3. MANS3	2010	University of Kansas / USA
4. MANS4	2010	Western Illinois University / USA
5. MANS5	2010	Florida Atlantic University / USA
6. MANS6	2010	Iowa State University / USA
7. MANS7	2010	Northern Michigan University / USA
8. MANS8	2010	Iowa State University / USA
9. MANS9	2010	Southwest Minnesota State University / USA
10. MANS10	2010	Oklahoma State University / USA
11. MANS11	2011	Oklahoma State University / USA
12. MANS12	2011	Northern Michigan University / USA
13. MANS13	2011	University of Southern California / USA
14. MANS14	2011	Michigan State University / USA
15. MANS15	2011	Colorado State University / USA
16. MANS16	2011	Eastern Oregon University / USA
17. MANS17	2011	Michigan State University / USA

MA Theses (US)	Year	University / Country of Theses
18. MANS18	2011	University of North Texas / USA
19. MANS19	2011	University of North Texas / USA
20. MANS20	2011	Saint Mary's College of California / USA
21. MANS21	2012	Oklahoma State University / USA
22. MANS22	2012	Northern Illinois University / USA
23. MANS23	2012	Minnesota State University / USA
24. MANS24	2012	Oklahoma State University / USA
25. MANS25	2012	Arizona State University / USA
26. MANS26	2012	University of Washington / USA
27. MANS27	2012	Northern Arizona University / USA
28. MANS28	2012	Iowa State University / USA
29. MANS29	2012	Arizona State University / USA
30. MANS30	2012	University of South Carolina / USA
31. MANS31	2013	Western Illinois University / USA
32. MANS32	2013	Mississippi State University / USA
33. MANS33	2013	Iowa State University / USA
34. MANS34	2013	Iowa State University / USA
35. MANS35	2013	Iowa State University / USA
36. MANS36	2013	Northern Michigan University / USA
37. MANS37	2013	Iowa State University / USA
38. MANS38	2013	Indiana University of Pennsylvania / USA
39. MANS39	2013	Indiana University of Pennsylvania / USA

MA Theses (US)	Year	University / Country of Theses
40. MANS40	2013	Southern Illinois University Carbondale / USA
41. MANS41	2014	Colorado State University / USA
42. MANS42	2014	Portland State University / USA
43. MANS43	2014	Illinois State University / USA
44. MANS44	2014	Oklahoma State University / USA
45. MANS45	2014	Iowa State University / USA
46. MANS46	2014	Iowa State University / USA
47. MANS47	2014	University of Toronto / USA
48. MANS48	2014	Indiana University of Pennsylvania / USA
49. MANS49	2014	Indiana University of Pennsylvania / USA
50. MANS50	2014	Indiana University of Pennsylvania / USA

APPENDIX 2

Doctoral Dissertations (PhD) in the Field of ELT

Doctoral Dissertations (PhD) (TR)	Year	University / Country of Dissertations
1. PHDTS1	2010	İstanbul University / TURKEY
2. PHDTS2	2010	Gazi University / TURKEY
3. PHDTS3	2010	Anadolu University / TURKEY
4. PHDTS4	2010	Mersin Üniversitesi / TURKEY
5. PHDTS5	2010	Gazi University / TURKEY
6. PHDTS6	2010	Anadolu University / TURKEY
7. PHDTS7	2010	Dokuz Eylül University / TURKEY
8. PHDTS8	2010	Anadolu University / TURKEY
9. PHDTS9	2010	Anadolu University / TURKEY
10. PHDTS10	2010	Dokuz Eylül University / TURKEY
11. PHDTS11	2011	Çukurova University / TURKEY
12. PHDTS12	2011	Çukurova University / TURKEY
13. PHDTS13	2011	Çukurova University / TURKEY
14. PHDTS14	2011	Çukurova University / TURKEY
15. PHDTS15	2011	METU / TURKEY
16. PHDTS16	2011	Dokuz Eylül University/ TURKEY
17. PHDTS17	2011	İstanbul University / TURKEY

Doctoral Dissertations (PhD) (TR)	Year	University / Country of Dissertations
18. PHDTS18	2011	İstanbul University / TURKEY
19. PHDTS19	2011	Gazi University / TURKEY
20. PHDTS20	2011	Hacettepe University / TURKEY
21. PHDTS21	2012	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
22. PHDTS22	2012	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
23. PHDTS23	2012	Gazi University / TURKEY
24. PHDTS24	2012	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
25. PHDTS25	2012	Gazi University / TURKEY
26. PHDTS26	2012	Hacettepe University / TURKEY
27. PHDTS27	2012	Yeditepe University / TURKEY
28. PHDTS28	2012	Gazi University / TURKEY
29. PHDTS29	2012	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
30. PHDTS30	2012	Anadolu University / TURKEY
31. PHDTS31	2013	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
32. PHDTS32	2013	Yeditepe University / TURKEY
33. PHDTS33	2013	Çukurova University / TURKEY
34. PHDTS34	2013	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
35. PHDTS35	2013	Çukurova University / TURKEY
36. PHDTS36	2013	Çukurova University / TURKEY
37. PHDTS37	2013	Çukurova University / TURKEY
38. PHDTS38	2013	İstanbul University / TURKEY
39. PHDTS39	2013	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
40. PHDTS40	2013	İstanbul University / TURKEY

Doctoral Dissertations (PhD) (TR)	Year	University / Country of Dissertations
41. PHDTS41	2014	Gazi University / TURKEY
42. PHDTS42	2014	Çukurova University / TURKEY
43. PHDTS43	2014	Atatürk Üniversitesi / TURKEY
44. PHDTS44	2014	Çukurova University / TURKEY
45. PHDTS45	2014	Onsekiz Mart University / TURKEY
46. PHDTS46	2014	Çukurova University / TURKEY
47. PHDTS47	2014	Middle East Technical University / TURKEY
48. PHDTS48	2014	Gazi University / TURKEY
49. PHDTS49	2014	Çukurova University / TURKEY
50. PHDTS50	2014	Mersin University / TURKEY

Doctoral Dissertations (PhD) (US)	Year	University / Country of Dissertations
1. PHDNS1	2010	Indiana University of Pennsylvania / USA
2. PHDNS2	2010	University of New York / USA
3. PHDNS3	2010	George Mason University / USA
4. PHDNS4	2010	University of Virginia / USA
5. PHDNS5	2010	Boston College / USA
6. PHDNS6	2010	Florida Atlantic University / USA
7. PHDNS7	2010	Georgia State University / USA
8. PHDNS8	2010	Indiana University of Pennsylvania / USA
9. PHDNS9	2010	The University of Arizona / USA
10. PHDNS10	2010	Georgetown University / USA
11. PHDNS11	2011	Georgia State University / USA
12. PHDNS12	2011	Northern Arizona University / USA
13. PHDNS13	2011	Northern Arizona University / USA
14. PHDNS14	2011	Columbia University / USA
15. PHDNS15	2011	Georgetown University / USA
16. PHDNS16	2011	Indiana University / USA
17. PHDNS17	2011	Georgetown University / USA
18. PHDNS18	2011	Alabama State University / USA

Doctoral Dissertations (PhD) (US)	Year	University / Country of Dissertations
19. PHDNS19	2011	Mississippi State University / USA
20. PHDNS20	2011	Indiana State University / USA
21. PHDNS21	2012	North Carolina State University / USA
22. PHDNS22	2012	California State University / USA
23. PHDNS23	2012	Arizona State University / USA
24. PHDNS24	2012	Argosy University / USA
25. PHDNS25	2012	The City University of New York / USA
26. PHDNS26	2012	Alliant International University / USA
27. PHDNS27	2012	Capella University / USA
28. PHDNS28	2012	Northern Arizona University / USA
29. PHDNS29	2012	Capella University / USA
30. PHDNS30	2012	Northern Arizona University / USA
31. PHDNS31	2013	Capella University / USA
32. PHDNS32	2013	New York University / USA
33. PHDNS33	2013	Barry University / USA
34. PHDNS34	2013	Alliant International University / USA
35. PHDNS35	2013	East Carolina University / USA
36. PHDNS36	2013	Florida International University / USA

Doctoral Dissertations (PhD) (US)	Year	University / Country of Dissertations
37. PHDNS37	2013	North Carolina State University / USA
38. PHDNS38	2013	Alliant International University / USA
39. PHDNS39	2013	Boston College / USA
40. PHDNS40	2013	Northern Arizona University / USA
41. PHDNS41	2014	Washington State University / USA
42. PHDNS42	2014	Arizona State University / USA
43. PHDNS43	2014	Northeastern State University / USA
44. PHDNS44	2014	Capella University / USA
45. PHDNS45	2014	Ball State University / USA
46. PHDNS46	2014	Clemson University / USA
47. PHDNS47	2014	Capella University / USA
48. PHDNS48	2014	Northern Arizona University / USA
49. PHDNS49	2014	Delta State University / USA
50. PHDNS50	2014	Capella University / USA

APPENDIX 3

Transition Markers

Additive	**Adversative**	**Sequential**	**Causal**
also	although	again	accordingly
and	but	consequently	as a result
at the same time	however	hence	so
besides	in contrast	therefore	
furthermore	nevertheless	thus	
in addition	on the contrary		
likewise	on the other hand		
moreover	still		
similarly	yet		

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL DETAILS

Name-Surname : Zehra KÖROĞLU
Date of Birth : 08.07.1979
Place of Birth : Ankara, Turkey
Phone (office) : +90 324 651 48 00
Email : zehrakoroglu@superonline.com; zehrakoroglu@gmail.com

EDUCATION

2011-2017 : PhD at Çukurova University, The Institute of Social Sciences, English
  Language Teaching Department, Adana.

2009-2011 : M.A at Çukurova University, The Institute of Social Sciences, English
  Language Teaching Department, Adana.

1999-2003 : B.A at Çağ University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, English Language
  Teaching Department, Yenice, Tarsus, Mersin.

1989-1998 : Özel Yükseliş Koleji, Söğütözü, Ankara.

1988-1989 : Bren-Mar Park Elementary School, Northern Virginia, USA.

1987-1988 : North Springfield Elementary School, Northern Virginia, USA.

1986-1987 : James Polk Elementary School, Northern Virginia, USA.

WORK EXPERIENCE

2016-   : Lecturer at Çağ University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of
  English Language Teaching, Yenice, Tarsus, Mersin.

2003-2016: Research assistant at Çağ University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences,
  Department of English Language Teaching, Yenice, Tarsus, Mersin.

CONFERENCE ATTENDED

"The First International Conference on Current Issues in Language Teaching", Çağ University, Yenice, Tarsus, Mersin, Turkey, 2007.

"The Self in Language Learning", Çağ University, Yenice, Tarsus, Mersin, Turkey, 2015.

"My Story in Practicum", Çağ University, Yenice, Tarsus, Mersin, Turkey, 2017.