OPUS▶

Journal of Society Research

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Textual Analysis of Turkish Advice Letters in the Construction of a Persuasive Agony Aunt

Suhan Akıncı Oktay [1]

[1] Dr., Hacettepe University, Ankara/ Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0002-2393-4629
E-Mail:
suhanoktay@hacettepe.edu.tr

Corresponding Author:
Suhan Akıncı Oktay

Abstract

As a representative form of popular culture, the continuation of advice letters written by the agony aunts in newspapers can demonstrate society's needs. Despite its commonality in everyday life, advice can be termed as a 'complex and interesting speech act' (Hyland and Hyland 2012) since sometimes it does not end in one sentence like other speech acts (e.g., requesting, apologies and thanking) (Trosborg 1995). Based on data from a collection of 100 advice letters written by the Turkish agony aunt gathered from the years 2020-2021, a textual meta discursivee analysis of advice letters is conducted to evaluate the types and frequencies of textual markers to find out how the agony aunt utilizes these textual elements to put forward her arguments. The findings reveal that 1) logical markers are extremely essential for persuading advice seekers and 2) adversatives and additives are necessary for providing a logical basis when advising advice seekers. The paper concludes by indicating that textual markers are essential for persuading advice seekers and potential readers when giving advice.

Keywords: *Advice Letters, Logos, Logical Markers, Additives, Adversatives, Writer-Responsible Texts, Reader-Responsible Texts, Textual Markers.*

Öz

Popüler kültür temsilcisi olarak, öğüt mektuplarının gazetelerde Güzin abla tarafından yazılmaya devam edilmesi toplumun ihtiyaçlarının göstergesi olabilir. Günlük hayatta yaygın olmasına rağmen, öğüt 'kompleks ve ilginç' bir söz eylemdir (Hyland and Hyland 2012) çünkü bazen diğer söz eylemler (örneğin rica, özür ve teşekkür) gibi bir cümlede bitmeyebilir (Trosborg 1995). 100 öğüt mektubundan elde edilen verilere dayanarak öğüt mektuplarının metinsel meta söylem analizi yapılarak, Güzin ablanın argümanlarının nasıl ortaya koyulduğu tartışılmaktadır. Bulgular, 1) öğüt mektuplarında metinsel belirteçlerin kullanımında farklılıklar gözlemlendiğini ortaya koymaktadır. 2) öğüt arayanları ikna etmek için mantıksal belirteçler son derece önemlidir. Öğüt isteyenlere öğüt verirken mantıklı bir temel sağlamak için karşıtlık bağlacı ve ekleyici bağlaçlar gereklidir. Makale, öğüt verirken öğüt arayanları ve potansiyel okuyucuları ikna etmek için metinsel işaretlerin gerekli olduğunu belirterek sona ermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Öğüt Mektupları, Logos, Mantıksal Belirteçler, Yazar Sorumlu Metinler, Okur Sorumlu Metinler, Metinsel Parametreler.*

Introduction

With the invention of newspaper print culture, advice columns (i.e., advice letters) have been one of the key elements of popular culture (Hendley 1997). However, recently together with the appearance of online communication, electronic advice data became available and researchers started investigating electronic advice data extensively as well (Bates Figueras 2020; Locher 2013). In Turkey, the advice letter history in Turkish starts in the 1960s with Güzin Sayar and proceeds from 1998 till the present with Güzin Sayar's daughter Feyza Algan. Güzin Sayar's daughter, Feyza Algan, is prolonging his mother's mission of advice-giving. Thus, Turkish advice history has witnessed two agony aunts. Advice letters in Turkish started appearing online as well. Despite its commonality in everyday life, it is termed as a 'complex and interesting speech act' (Hyland and Hyland 2012) since sometimes a piece of advice may not even end in one sentence like other speech acts (e.g., requesting, apologies, and thanking) (Trosborg 1995). For example, it is possible to thank simply by using 'Thank you' and apologize through 'I am sorry' but there can be many forms of advice. The advice can be realized in several ways such as through the use of markers of unreality, conditional clauses, and tentativeness through the use of hedges like perhaps, maybe and possibly, imperatives, modals, questions inviting introspection and action (Leech 2014; Yılmaz 2022; DeCapua and Denham 2007; Hudson 1990 Locher 2006). On one side while you are offering advice for the benefit of the other person, on the other side it may mean that you are giving importance to your own opinion more than anything else (Leech 2014). Thus, this makes advice a face-threatening speech act (Brown and Levinson 1987: 65) and for that reason, it is utilized with rhetorical facilities depending on the contextual parameters of the situation concerning advice. As mentioned previously, advice may be given in a long letter rather than one sentence. This makes advice worth studying to determine the metadiscursive boundaries.

Coined first by Zelling Harris in 1959, the term metadiscourse refers to the writer's and reader's way of representing the text in terms of personalities, attitudes, and assumptions (Hyland 2005). According to Hyland (2005), the writer and the reader interact with each other while the text is produced. Hyland mentions that "Metadiscourse is the cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers as members of a particular community" (Hyland 2005: 37). This definition allows researchers to study different genres to understand how they function in discourse.

Dafouz-Milne makes a distinction between two macro functions of metadiscourse: textual and interpersonal. The former refers to the textual organization and the latter refers to the writer's stance towards the content and the potential reader (Dafouz-Milne 2003: 97) and demonstrates how the writer engages with the reader in argumentation (Neff-van Aertselaer & Dafouz-Milne, 2008).

Majority of the research in metadiscourse centers around academic genre (e.g., Abdi et al., 2010; Bunton 1999; Dahl, 2004; Hyland, 1998; Hyland 2005a; Hyland, 2005b; Hyland & Tse, 2004; Mauranen, 1993b; Vande Koople, 1985). Similarly, according to Adel (2018) academic genres as regards metadiscourse received too much interest from researchers. Other scholars applied metadiscourse to different genre types as well. Some studies highlight the importance of Daily speech (Schiffrin 1987), textbooks (Crismore 1989), oral narratives (Norrick 2001), scientific discourse (Crismore and Farnsworth 1990), advertisement texts (Fuertas-Olivera et. al. 2001), company annual reports (Hyland 1998b), university students texts (Hyland 2000), argumentative essays (Ho and Li 2018), hotel manager's review response (Ho 2020), workplace request emails (Ho 2018), policy documents (Ho 2016). As can be observed metadiscourse carries importance for uncovering different types of texts and their underlying rhetorical structure. It is due to this reason that the study of different genres and their meta-discursive structure can reveal important

aspects of genres in particular and culture in general.

Review the letters of advice

A large body of literature has dealt with advice as a speech act. The studies compared advice-giving practices of native speakers of English and ESL/EFL participants from Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Indonesian, Arabic, Spanish, Turkish, Iranian and others to understand how advice differs structurally and pragmatically in a cross-cultural context (Hinkel 1994, 1997; Tavakoli & Tavakoli 2010; Nida 2020; Hosni 2020; Feng 2015; Babaie & Shahrokhi, 2015; Baca 2011; DeCapua & Findlay-Dunham, 1993; Yılmaz 2022). These studies, however, attempted to make the comparison between native and non-native languages to identify advice-giving practices of different languages and cultures.

When it comes to advising letters which are defined 'as a form of communication including suggestions, recommendations, and pieces of information to receivers' (Yang 2021), it can be observed that they have not been studied extensively like requests, apologies, and refusal letters (Kimoga 2010; Richard and McFadden 2016; Ho 2010; Ho 2018). Advice letters could deal with a range of problems from relations to marriages. They are seen as private spaces in public institutions (Philips 2008). A large-scale study was conducted by Locher (2006) on advice letters. She studied the content structure of advice letters, relational work in advice letters, identity construction of the advice-giver, and problem letters of advice seekers. Similarly, Morrow (2012) examined Japanese online advice-giving tendencies in the internet discussion forum. By doing a discursive move analysis, he finds that assessment and advice were the building blocks of communication. Yang (2021) studied a different form of Chinese advice letter called 'changyi shu' which appears in a form of unsolicited advice written by governments, hospitals and schools during the COVID-19 pandemic to call for immediate action in terms of metadiscourse. The study compares how government and hospital official letter writer's engagement with staff and citizen letter recipients. However, the textual

organization of these letters needs to be studied to uncover how the advice giver interacts with the advice seekers to reveal the dynamics of advice-giving in such columns. The next sections will provide a detailed account of the textual markers of advice letters.

Methodology

Data

The data comprises of 100 advice letters gathered from the online website (www.hürriyet.com) from the years 2020-2021. All the letters published in the aforementioned years were taken into the corpus. The total number of words in advice letters written by the agony aunt was 18357 within a 100-advice text.

Data Collection

In order to find out the textual markers in the corpus, advice letters were read many times and examined carefully. Second, the contexts of the textual markers were determined to observe the functions these markers fulfill.

Data Analysis

In order to analyse textual markers of advice texts Dafouz-Milne's (2008) taxonomy was used. In addition, since examples are from Turkish, textual markers were employed which gave rise to the compilation of other studies in Turkish. In table 1, the eclectic taxonomy adapted from Dağ Tarcan (2019), Güçlü (2020), Uluçay and Hatipoğlu; Göksel and Kerslake (2005); Şen (2019) can be observed:

Table 1. Categorization of Textual markers adapted from Dağ Tarcan 2019, Güçlü 2020, Uluçay and Hatipoğlu, Göksel and Kerslake 2005

Macro category	Functions	Examples
Logical Markers	Express semantic relationships between discourse stretches	Ve (and), -(y)a/ile, da 'and', da 'too' bile 'even' 'and what's more' 'and also' and what…'
Sequencers	Mark particular positions in a series	Bu yazı, bu köşe, bu durum (This article, this column, this situation)

Reminders	Refer back to previous sections in the text	Benim yazılarımı okuyorsan (If you are following my column…)
Topicalisers	Indicate topic shifts	-e göre (according to me..), -e bağlı olarak
Code Glosses	Explain, rephrase or exemplify textual material	Reformulators Bu demek, diyorum ki, diğer bir deyişle, anlamına gel-, tanımla-, the use of parentheses Exemplifiers Gibi, vb. vs.(etc.), mesela/örneğin
Illocutionary markers	Explicitly name the act the writer performs	Umarım (I hope), öneririm (I recommend), kutlarım (I congratulate), kutlamak (I celebrate), tebrik etmek (I congratulate), teşekkür etmek (I thank), tavsiye etmek (I recommend), dilerim (I hope), kusura bakma (I apologise)
Announcements	Refer forwards to future sections in the text	Aşağıda belirtildiği gibi "as stated", bölümlerde "below", aşağıdaki "the below", bir sonraki "the next", ilerleyen "in the nexts sections"

Table 1 demonstrates the categories (Logical markers, sequencers, reminders, tropicalizes, code glosses, illocutionary markers, announcements) that were identified and then, the contextual and pragmatic functions were determined and classified accordingly. The analysis of the quantitative data was done manually.

Under the textual metadiscourse heading there are seven categories that have been summarised in Table 1. The first of these categories is logical markers that express relations between main clauses while helping the readers to form pragmatic connections by guiding them through the text. They signal additive (ve (and), zaten (besides)) , adversative (ama (but), ancak (however)) and conclusive (bu nedenle (because of this) relations in the text. The second category is the sequencers that mark particular positions in a series. The sentence 'ondan sonra sen dönmüşsün evine' (Y18) 'After that you returned back home (Y18)' is an example that guides the reader to follow the actions happening in the text. Reminders refer back to previous sections in other

parts of the text by retaking an argument, amplifying it or summarising some of the previous argumentation (Dafouz-Milne 2007: 98). In the following sentence the agony aunt utilizes a reminder to indicate the points that she and the advice seeker share:

Ama kayınvalide gelin sürtüşmesi filmlere, karikatürlere, fıkralara konu olmuştur, **bildiğin gibi**. (Y17)

But the mother-in-law and bride controversy has been subject to movies, cartoons and anecdotes, **as you know.** (Y17)

In the example, by using the reminder 'as you know' to the advice seeker refers to the shared values of each other to strengthen solidarity (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Tropicalizes indicate topic shifts for guiding the reader to follow the argument. This extract from our corpus is an example of a topic shift:

Sorunuza gelince, bana göre evli ya da evlilik dışı ilişkilerde en ciddi sorun, cinselliği sadece fiziksel yönden değerlendirmek, sevgi, aşk, duygu yönünü görmezden gelmektir. (Y70)

As for your question, in my opinion, the most serious problem in married or extramarital relationships is to evaluate sexuality only from the physical side, ignoring love, affection and emotional side of it.

The agony aunt starts by general overview and evaluates the advice seeker's situation by the topicaliser 'as for your question'. Code gloses explain, rephrase or exemplify textual material. Following Hyland (1998b:443) Dafouz-Milne included parentheses and colons as examples of code glosses. The related example from the corpus is as the following:

Sevgili kızım, bu genç adam seni tehdit etmiyor, sana şiddet uygulamıyor, seni beraber olmaya zorlamıyor. (Tabii, eğer benden saklamıyorsan.) My dear daughter, this young man does not threaten you, does not use violence against you, does not force you to be together. (Of course, if you're not hiding it from me). In this example sentence from the corpus, the adviser mentions her comments but in the parentheses section of the sentence she reflects her hesitation about the unreality of the conditions.

Illocutionary markers name the act the writer performs in the text (Dafouz-Milne 2007: 98). By using this marker, the writer makes specific to readers the function he is performing. However, some writers refrain from using these markers because they think that they are being speculative about their reports or their message is on wishes and predictions (Vande Kopple 1985, 91). On the other hand, the agony aunt utilizes these markers to form personal boundaries. She shows her stance in the text as in the example from the corpus:

Prof. Dr. Osman Müftüoğlu hocamızın önerdiği yöntemi denemeni **tavsiye edebilirim**. (Y8)

I **can recommend** you to try the method suggested by Prof.Dr. Osman Müftüoğlu (Y8)

Announcements refer forwards to future sections in the text in order to prepare the reader for prospective argumentation examples include 'as will be seen below'. Since advice texts did not mention about upcoming material, there was no announcement in our corpus.

Results and Discussions

The main focus of this study was to uncover the textual markers in advice letters and this section of the study provides a general distribution of the main categories of textual markers in Turkish advice letters. In the following sections, the frequently employed textual markers, their contextual parameters and the pragmatic functions they fulfill will be identified and discussed through Table 2. The results are explained in two categories as quantitative and qualitative.

Quantitative Results

The quantitative results are based on the descriptive statistics in the context of the markers in the advice letters. The total number and the percentage of the markers are used in the tables to indicate the distribution of the textual markers (Table 2) and the distribution of logical markers (Table 3) in the letters. These statistical analyses are meaningful in the meta discourse studies in linguistics (Hyland, 2005; Hyland and Jiang 2022;)

Table 2. Overall distribution of the textual categories in advice letters

Textual markers	Function	Number	% Total Textual markers
Logical markers	Express semantic relationships between discourse stretches	712	67.6%
Code glosses	Explain, rephrase or exemplify textual material	156	14.8%
Topicalisers	Indicate topic shifts	96	9.1%
Sequencers	Particular positions in a series	55	5.2%
Illocutionary markers	Explicitly name the act the writer performs	28	2.6%
Reminders	Express semantic relationships between discourse stretches	5	0.4%
Announcements	Refer forwards to future sections in the text	0	0
Total		1052	100

The total number of words in advice texts was 18.357 and the total number of advice letters was 100 and the total number of textual markers used in advice texts by the agony aunt was 1052. As can be observed from table 2, the most frequently employed textual marker in advice texts. The logical markers make up 67.6% of the advice text. Logical markers are like prints for the reader to follow; in that they show how the writer combines ideas and how he settles his argument structure as well as how the writer thinks (Hyland 2005: 50). What is more, they mark 'semantic and structural relations between discourse stretches' (Dafouz-Milne 2003: 97) 'form links between arguments and ideas by explicitly marking semantic relations (Mur Duenas, 2007: 37) and show readers pragmatic connections of additive (and, furthermore…), adversative (but, however…), conclusive (finally, at last…) and consecutive (so, as a result. . .) ties in the text. This above finding is consistent with the study conducted by Dafouz-Milne (2003) who examined Spanish and British newspaper opinion columns and found that logical markers were standing out in terms of textual orientation. The results of the current study also comply with the findings of Yang (2021), who compared government and hospital advice letters and found that governments utilise frames (sequencers) and transition markers (logical markers) to rationalise and implement their arguments to citizens than hospitals. Hyland (2005: 74) compared CEO's letters and directors' reports. His analysis revealed that CEO's letters were employing these markers more frequently than directors' reports since in CEO's letters the reader

is expected to grasp the reasoning of the writer. However, it is interesting to indicate the importance of these markers not only for non-academic genres but also for academic genres. Hyland (2005: 55), for instance, asserts the importance of these markers for academic discourse in forming an academic argument. For instance, in a study conducted by Hyland (2005) on postgraduate dissertations transitions were used prominently to mark boundaries within academic discourse. Dağ Tarcan (2019) studied academic articles from different disciplines (i.e., psychology, history, sociology, educational sciences, philosophy, linguistics and tourism). Adopting Hyland's (2005) framework as a basis for her study, she found that history and linguistics disciplines were employing logical markers more frequently than other disciplines.

When other textual markers are considered, they did not occur significantly since their frequency of use was low in the corpus. Code glosses which explain, rephrase or exemplify textual material were employed by 14.8% (number=156) in the corpus. Topicalisers indicate topic shifts and their frequency is 9.1% (number=96). Sequencers that mark particular positions in the texts were employed 5.2% (number=55) in advice texts. Illocutionary acts name the act the writer performs is utilised 2.6% (number=28) in advice texts. Reminders which express semantic relationships between discourse stretches occur 0.4 % (number=5). Announcements which refer to future sections in the text are not utilised at all in advice texts since advice texts are not long and do not include sections like academic texts. Therefore, it is pertinent to discuss and highlight the functions of logical markers in the context of advice letters in Turkish through examples.

Logical markers and their functions in advice letters

According to Hyland (2005: 75), writers make the argument structure more prominent by using logical markers. Logical markers appear with different labels in metadiscourse studies: logical

connectors (Vande Kopple 1985: 9), connectors (Mauranen 1993a, 1993b), logical connectives (Crismore et al. 1993; Hyland 1999, 2000), text connectors (Bunton 1999) and transitions (Hyland, 2005; Hyland and Tse 2004). In connection with logos (i.e., the appeal to reason), logical markers are known to mark internal connection within discourse (Hyland 2005: 55), guiding the readers through the parts of the texts, creating cohesive ties that bring logic and help the reader to follow. Writers minimize the processing efforts of the readers by providing the line of argument (Abdi 2010).

When the writer does not appeal to reason and uses a low number of logical markers, the reader has to make a greater effort to decode the writer's ideas and grasp the semantic relationship between different parts of the text (Mur Duenas 2007: 50). Nevertheless, belonging to specific language communities, every text displays different practices to communicate with its readers (Venuti 2000).

However, according to Mauranen (1993), these markers "are not only superfluous, but the sign of a poor writer" (1993:8) in the Finnish school system. The scarce use of these markers might be an indication of respecting the readers and leaving that textual processing to them which is connected to politeness and face considerations. Therefore, people from different cultural backgrounds usually develop different practices of writing which in turn creates different concerns about politeness and face issues (Hinds 1987). While some cultures use connectives scarcely, other cultures may prefer to help the reader to follow the text and employ them abundantly. Thus, for this specific genre, the agony aunt shares her opinion and these markers provide support for her arguments (Yang 2021) by showing the logical boundaries in the text. Similarly, in CEO's letters logical markers were used frequently since the writer wanted to project his reasoning to the readers (Hyland 2004). From this result, it can be considered that logical markers have an important place in the Turkish writing community. As argued by Yang (2021), when the readers change from staff to citizens, the authors used higher rates

of logical markers than when designing a text for staff which means that authors pay attention to the organization of the text more when readers are citizens who can vary in educational and social backgrounds. The agony aunt justifies her advice with these markers when she is presenting her positive and negative evaluations (Locher 2006:184) when she is dealing with the problems of advice seekers. Since the anonymous readers of advice letters can have different educational and social backgrounds, she attempts to make those readers understand and think about the advice she is offering to them (Locher 2006:184).

Logical markers can mark additive, adversative and conclusive relations. Since logical markers were employed more frequently than other metadiscursive markers, types and frequencies of logical markers found in advice texts will be examined and discussed through tables in the following section of the study.

Table 3. Subcategories of Logical Markers found in Advice Texts

LOGICAL MARKERS	NUMBER	FREQUENCY
Adversatives	293	41.1
Additives	255	35.8
Conclusives	132	18.5
Total	712	100

The total number of words in advice texts written by the agony aunt was 18357 within a 100-advice text and the total number of logical markers utilised by the agony aunt was 712. According to table 3, adversatives and additives occurred nearly in equal percentages (41.1%, 35.8 %). While the conclusive form was 18.5 % of the data. Adversatives signal a turning of the discourse in a contrary direction (Göksel and Kerslake 2005: 519). Adversatives are employed when writers are in need of confronting two ideas that the second one modifies the first (Mur Duenas 2007: 46). Additives 'signal the addition of a new item without changing the direction of the discourse' (Göksel and Kerslake 2005: 512). What is more, they signal parallelism and continuation (Mur Duenas 2007: 43) and expand discourse by adding elements to discourse (Hyland 2005: 50). They also indicate a progressive rhetorical style signaling that clauses proceed with arguments and examples (Neff-van Aertselaer & Dafouz-Milne, 2008). The results of the study support directors' reports where

additives were used prominently since they were simple texts composed of defined items like the company's principal activities, details of directors and a summary of trading results (Hyland, 2004: 77). Observed from this perspective, advice letters could be labeled as simple. On the other hand, the frequent use of adversatives in these texts signals that they cannot be labeled as simple texts. This finding supports CEO's letters where adversatives were used frequently to form exceptions to general situations, to show deviations and to change strategies through new demands. According to Hyland (2004: 77), these kinds of topics require the high use of adversatives to argue on different aspects of topics. Since advice letters can change the social norms of a culture (Philips 2008: 97), they are powerful rhetorical creations that participate in the making and remaking of culture (McRobbie 1996: 392). Thus, in doing so they use language as a tool to communicate with their newspaper readers. In addition, they are private spaces which are appearing in a public space. This means that these letters could use language with caution to prevent possible criticisms.

The frequent use of adversatives may be attributed to the fact that while the agony is arguing a personal problem of the advice-seeker, she prefers to use contrary arguments which can be challenging for the reader to grasp. When the sentence marks the end of some process or series of processes conclusive markers are employed. This sense is expressed by items such as finally, at last, in the end and eventually (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 263). It can be said that these markers do not occur significantly in advice texts (18.5%).

As mentioned previously, in the study conducted by Dafouz-Milne (2003), logical markers were used more frequently than other metadiscursive markers. In addition, while Spanish editorial writers used additives, English writers preferred to use adversatives. That can be related to the construction of argumentation differently in different communities. Spanish writers prefer adding positive warrants and building the argumentation in the same direction. English writers, on the other hand, use adversatives frequently and move through discussing the pros and cons of the idea. In addition to this study, another study by Mauranen

FAKAT (but, although)	0
YALNIZ(but)	0
GENE DE (and yet, still and nevertheless)	0
Total	293

(1993a, 1993b) found that Finns move progressively by adding evidence for providing claims to the ideas while Anglo-American writers argue by providing the pros and cons of an idea in a retrogressive fashion. In advice texts, the Turkish agony aunt employs additive markers more frequently than other markers. She moves in a similar direction by adding information to her remarks.

Mur Duenas (2007) also examined English and Spanish research articles and found that connectors were more common in English research articles than in Spanish. She defines English texts as writer-responsible texts, while they can be reader-responsible texts (Hinds 1987) as well. She also asserts from her study that the two types of writing imply different readerships (national versus international). The international text is written for different readerships and builds arguments on contrasts while the nationally written text proceeds by connectors in a different direction. Therefore, it is possible to indicate that advice texts have national readership since the text proceeds by connectors rather than contrasts.

Since the most frequently employed logical markers were adversatives and additives in our corpus, it is pertinent to elaborate on the types of adversatives and additives respectively. Table four shows the types of adversatives employed by the agony aunt:

Table 4. Types of Adversatives in advice texts

ADVERSATIVES	Number
AMA (but)	170
ANCAK (however)	28
YİNE DE (nevertheless)	18
OYSA (Kİ) (however)	11
TAM TERSİNE (on the contrary)	7
BUNA KARŞIN/RAĞMEN/ MUKABİL (In spite of)	5
OLSA DA (although and nevertheless)	4
AKSİ HALDE/AKSİ TAKTİRDE (on the contrary)	3
PEKİ (but, okay, alright)	2
DİĞER TARAFTAN (YANDAN) (on the other hand)	1
LAKİN (but, however)	0
ŞU VAR Kİ (there is also this/that)	0
ÖTE YANDAN (on the other hand)	0
NE VAR Kİ (however)	0
KEZA (likewise, also and as well)	0
TAM AKSİ (on the contary)	0
DİĞER TARAFTAN (on the other hand)	0
BENZER ŞEKİLDE (similarly)	0
AYNI ŞEKİLDE (In the same way)	0
AYNI ÖLÇÜDE (in the same way)	

Qualitative Results

In this part of the results, the qualitative results deal with the specific logical markers in the quantitative analysis in the advice letters.According to table four, the adversative *ama* (but) was the most frequently employed marker since it was used 170 times in advice texts. The agony aunt uses adversatives with more forms of variety than additives in that there are four types of adversatives and two types of additives used by the agony aunt. Though it is Arabic in origin, it is defined as the 'least alien marker in shape'. (Lewis 2000: 209). The popularity of the use of this marker indicates that pragmatically *ama* (but) is central to forming contrastive meanings and violated expectations (Doğan 1994: 204). Serving as a disclaimer in language, *ama* (but) prevents trouble that can rise from communication (Overstreet and Yule 2001). In a study conducted by Ercan (2019: 308-317) *ama* (but) was used as a mitigation strategy to prevent directness or opposing tentatively to utterances in Turkish daily discourse. The conducted studies on discourse markers also report the use of *but* as a highly occurring marker (Abal 2016; Altunay 2009; Bahaziq 2016; Dumlao and Wilang 2019; Kurtul 2011; Yin 2015; Özdamar 2020; Çakır Sarı 2020). Though less frequently used; this marker was used by students who were learning Turkish as a second language in persuasive texts as well (Esmer 2018). This finding means that this marker was taught to these students by Turkish instructors regardless of context and that they learned to actively use them in daily communication. An example from the data is as the following:

(1)

Sana akıl vermeye çalışırım, öğüt veririm ama "boşan ya da devam et evliliğine" diyemem. Çünkü sonuçta bu senin hayatın. (16 Nisan 2020)

'I will try to give my mind to you, I'll give you a piece of advice, *but* I can't say a divorce or

continue your marriage. Because after all, this is your life.' (16 April 2020)

In example (1), the advice-seeker wanted advice from an elder person about her marriage. Although Turkish culture welcomes older people who give advice, the agony aunt refrains from fulfilling this expectation of the advice-seeker. She doesn't prefer negative interpretations. Therefore, this is similar to Ercan's (2019) study where she found that Turkish daily discourse frequently employs *ama* (but) as a mitigation strategy to avoid directness and protect the interlocutor's face by doing so. She does not give voice to potentially sensitive topic like marriage and divorce.

Among the remaining adversatives *ancak* (however), *yine de*, and *oysa* (ki), were also employed quite often. The use of various forms of adversatives may indicate the display of argumentation and the agony aunt's trial to advise people about their personal problems.

In table four, *ancak* (but) was used less frequently than *ama* (but). Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 520) also state that *ancak* (but) has a restricted occurrence than *ama* (but). Nevertheless, it was still used 28 times in advice letters. When this marker is employed, 'inability, failure, obligation or a disadvantageous situation' is expressed (Göksel and Kerslake 2005: 520).

 (2)

Elbette bir genelleme yapmamak lazım ancak kadınlar ne kadar duygusalsa, erkeklerden önce şefkat, sevgi ilgi beklerlerse, erkekler de yapı olarak önce cinsellik düşünür. (9 Temmuz 2020)

'Of course, we should not generalize, but the more emotional women are, the more they expect affection, love and attention from men, because of their structure men think of sexuality more.'(9 July 2020)

In this example, the agony aunt says a generalization cannot be done before the adversative *ancak* (but), but then in the following sentence she contrasts women's and men's behavior by indicating the contrast via the adversative *ancak* (but) which indicates the importance of what is coming after the adversative. Therefore, she in a way contrasts with what she says next by generalizing men and women and their behavior in life.

Ancak şunu da sormaktan kendimi alamıyorum, erkeklerin bu ilkelliği ne zaman bitecek?

In our corpus *yine de* (yet, but even though) was used 18 times. It can be translated contextually like even though, yet or but. Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 520) state the use of yine de/gene de with ama. This use is seen in example (3).

 (3)

Eşinin işi gücü olabilir ama yine de sana bir şekilde mutlaka yardımcı olabilmeli.(30 Eylül 2020)

'Your spouse may have a job, but even though he should still be able to help you in some way.' (30 September 2020)

As can be seen from example (3), the agony aunt puts forward her opinion by admitting that the husband has a job in the first sentence but in the second sentence after using *ama yine de* (but even though) she states that the man must help her. She states that even though the husband can have duties to fulfill, he must help to the advice seeker.

In our data, *oysa* occurs 11 times in advice letters. *Oysa* is translated as whereas/however into Turkish and indicates contrasts between two states of affairs (Göksel and Kerslake 2005: 521). When it is found at the beginning of the sentence, it is translated as 'yet''but' (Lewis, 2000: 213). This marker does not look forward but backward (Lewis 2000: 213). This is expressed in example (4) where the agony aunt indicates to the advice seeker that the topic of marriage contrasts with men's way of thinking. She evaluates the advice seeker's situation by showing her what she did about marriage and what men do not like by using the conjunction *oysa* (however) as an indicator of contrast.

 (4)

Sen ise sürekli "evlenme" konusunu açmış olmalısın. Oysa, erkekleri en çok rahatsız eden konu bu işte.(15 Nisan 2020)

'You must have brought up the subject of 'marriage' all the time. However, this is the issue that bothers men the most.' (15 April 2020) In our corpus, additives were employed as well. Table 5 shows the types of additives in advice letters:

Table 5. Types of Additives in advice texts

ADDITIVES	Number
VE (and)	206
ZATEN (Besides)	20
ÜSTELİK (In addition)	8
-DIĞI/ OLDUĞU GİBİ (as well as)	6
BUNUN YANINDA/-IN YANINDA (In addition to)	5
YİNE (also)	3
AYNI ZAMANDA (In addition)	2
AYNI ŞEKİLDE (In addition)	1
BUNUN DIŞINDA (In addition)	1
BUNUN YANISIRA/-IN YANISIRA (In addition /to)	1
-DIĞI/ OLDUĞU KADAR (as well as)	1
-CAĞI GİBİ (as well as)	1
TOTAL	255

According to the table, *ve* (and) was used 206 times in advice letters. *Ve* (and) additive marker helps to bind coordinating sentences to one another. By doing this, an expansion of information takes place in which discourse proceeds forward. In addition, the use of this marker can be attributed to the existence of parallel constructions in Semitic languages (i.e., Koranic cultures) (Hatipoğlu and Algı 2016) (Kaplan 1966). Another reason why the agony aunt prefers to use this marker remarkably frequently could be due to its simplicity and ease of use (Ho 2018). This finding is supported by Esmer (2018) who studied persuasive texts written by students learning Turkish as a foreign language. Students who were learning Turkish as a foreign language used additive *ve* (and) more than other markers. Other studies support the use of the additive marker 'and' as well **(**Abal 2016; Altunay 2009; Bahaziq 2016; Dumlao and Wilang 2019; Kurtul 2011; Yin 2015, Özdamar 2020). In Kurtul's (2011), Aysu's (2017) and Özdamar's (2020) studies, *ve* (and) was the most frequently used conjunction in Turkish. It is also interesting to see that *ve* conjunction was used more frequently in social sciences than in physical sciences (Sarıkaya 2020).

 (5)

Sen akıllı bir kızsın, bundan sonra daha seçici olacaksın ve en doğru olanı yapacaksın, eminim. (11 Haziran 2020)

'You are a clever girl, from now on you are going to be more selective and you are going to do the right thing, I'm sure.' (11 June 2020)

In example (5), linking two clauses together the conjunction *ve* (and) adds information to the preceding clause. In the sentences being selective and doing the right things are linked together as advice. Therefore, the agony aunt is making additions to her arguments.

 (6)

*Aslında kaygılanmak, günlük hayatta sorunlarla baş edebilmek için gereklidir. Anksiyete bozukluğu ise kaygı duygusunun bir tehlike yokken kendini göstermesi, uzun süre devam etmesi **ve** çok güçlü hissedilmesidir ki böyle bir durum söz konusuysa tedavi gereklidir. Anksiyetesi olan kişiler çoğu kendilerini kontrol edemez **ve** sakinleşemez. Anksiyetede sürekli devam eden tedirginlik vardır **ve** bilinçaltında devamlı kendini hissettirir. Panik atakta kişi kendini saldırıya uğramış ve tehlikede hisseder, kalbi hızlı atar **ve** nefesi kesilir.(31 Temmuz 2020)*

'In fact, worrying is necessary to cope with problems in daily life. Anxiety disorder, on the other hand, is when the feeling of anxiety manifests itself when there is no danger. In many cases, these strong feelings persist for a long time, therefore treatment is required. Many people with anxiety cannot control themselves and cannot calm down. Anxiety is a source of constant subconscious uneasiness. During a panic attack, the person feels as if he is in danger, his heart beats fast and his breathing stops.' (31 July 2020)

As can be observed from example (6), the additive *ve* (and) aids the continuation of discourse. By the addition of this marker, it seems that the agony aunt is evaluating the problem of the advice seeker through a long discourse with four additives. This can be a manifestation of showing solidarity and interest by discussing the problem of advice seeker (Brown and Levinson 1987).

Another additive marker that was employed in advice letters with low frequency compared to the previous marker was *zaten* (besides) which was used 20 times in our corpus. English equivalent of this marker could be "already, in actual, anyhow, in any rate, besides" depending on context (Corcu 2006: 2). It marks old information (Corcu 2006: 3). It has several functions ranging from topic closure, topic extension to contrast indicating (Corcu 2006:

2). In addition, *zaten* has a similar sense with *ayrıca* (Zeyrek et.al. 2012). Example (7) illustrates the use of *zaten* for marking an additive relation in advice letters:

(7)

Anne ve babanın senin sorunlarını basit bir ergenlik sorunu olarak görmeleri doğal. Birçok aile bunu yapıyor zaten. (31 Temmuz 2020)

'It's natural for your parents to see your problems as a simple puberty problem. Besides many families are doing this.' (31 July 2020)

In this example, the agony aunt in the previous sentence before the additive marker justifies that ' many families are evaluating such things as simple puberty problems. As an expansion of the topic to what she says the additive marker *zaten* (besides) generalizes what parents do about their children.

(8)

Genellikle sahte ve yüzeysel ilişkiler bunlar. Asla samimi olmayan, klasik, kalıplaşmış sözlerden ve yazışmalardan ibaret beraberlikler olarak kabul ederim ben bu yakınlaşmayı. Bu nedenle fazla sürdürmemekle çok iyi yapmışsın. Zaten sen çok gençsin ve böyle gereksiz bir beraberliğe ihtiyacın yok. Akıllı bir genç kız olduğunu satırlarından anlamak mümkün. Beni şaşırtan da bu zaten. Mektubundaki sözcükler, 18 yaşındaki bir genç kızın sözcükleri değil.Sanki yaşını başını almış olgun biri gibi yazmışsın. (25 Ağustos 2020)

'Usually, these are fake and superficial relationships. I will consider such correspondences as never sincere; they are classical and stereotyped relations. So, you did well by not continuing it too much. Besid**e**s, you are very young and you do not need such an unnecessary relationship. It is possible to understand from your lines that you are a smart young girl. Besid**e**s, this is what surprises me. The words in your letter are not the words of an 18-year-old girl. You have written as if you were a mature person who had reached a mature age.'(25 August 2020)

In this example, the agony aunt justifies what the advice seeker did about the relationship she had. She makes an addition to the topic by saying that the advice seeker is very young and she does not need such a relationship. She finds two rational ideas by the additive marker *zaten* (besides). By saying that she is surprised about the maturity of this 18-year-old girl and she in a way indicates that

she contradicts her thoughts about the advice seeker.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to uncover the textual aspects of advice letters by the agony aunt which, to the best of the author's knowledge, has not yet been studied from a metadiscursive perspective. This paper makes both theoretical and methodological contributions. First, this paper examines textual markers of communication in advice letters. Therefore, it broadens the scope of metadiscursive studies from academic discourse to the non-academic arena. Second, the paper applies a metadiscursive framework to a non-English context. Therefore, it indicates the applicability of the framework to a non-English language. Third, if we think that adviser persona changes the social norms inside a culture (McRobbie 1996). This study could help researchers to better understand how these norms are reshaped by the use of language which is a manifestation of the power of popular culture on society. Although lay people are not aware of the effects of such popular texts in changing the norms of a culture, researchers could be able to understand the power of metadiscourse. The results of the study indicate that the agony aunt used logos in her attempts to persuade advice seekers through her advice (Hyland 2005). This demonstrates the agony aunt's use of language while giving advice. The study could have macro and micro perspectives. At the macro level, it was observed that other genres (i.e.opinion columns, government and hospital advice letters, CEO'S letters, directors' reports, postgraduate dissertations and academic articles) made extensive use of these markers as well as advice letters. Other markers (Code glosses, Topicalisers, Sequencers, Illocutionary markers, reminders and announcements) were less frequent in advice texts. At a micro level, among the logical markers, adversatives and additive markers were more frequently used than conclusives. This result indicates the importance of these markers as logical boundaries of arguments. It is not solely sufficient to define the functions of these markers in grammar but the contextual and genre-based differences give clues about how they function in

discourse. The results of this study indicate that advice texts are seemingly simple but structurally complex texts including all the norms and arguments in a society.

References

Abdi, R., Rizi, M. T., & Tavakoli, M. (2010). The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse. Journal of Pragmatics, 42(6), 1669-1679.

Abal, Sema. 2016. *Receptive and productive knowledge of discourse markers: A case study of ELT prospective teachers* (Master's Thesis). Ankara: Gazı University MA Thesis, Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12602/188057

Ädel, A. (2018). Variation in metadiscursive 'you' across genres: From research articles to teacher feedback. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 18, 777–796. http://dx.doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.4.0037

Altunay, Dilek. 2009. *Use of connectives in written discourse: A study at an ELT department in Turkey.* Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi dissertation

Aysu, Semahat. 2017. The use of discourse markers in the writings of Turkish students of English as a foreign language: A corpus based study. *Journal of Higher Education and Science.* 7 (1), 132-138. DOI: 10.5961/jhes.2017.191

Babaie, S., & Shahrokhi, M. (2015). A cross-cultural study of offering advice speech acts by Iranian EFL learners and English native speakers: Pragmatic transfer in focus. English Language Teaching. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n6p133

Baca, E. (2011). Pragmatic competence: The case of advice in second language acquisition (SLA) abroad [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Arizona State University.

Bahaziq, Afnan. 2016. Cohesive devices in written discourse: a discourse analysis of a student's essay writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9, 112-119. DOI:10.5539/elt.v9n7p112

Bates, Figueras. 2020. Mitigation in discourse: Social, cognitive and affective motivations when exchanging advice. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 119-133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.12.008

Bro Penelope & Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* [Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4]. Cambridge: CUP.

Bunton, David.1999. The use of higher level metatext in Ph.D. theses. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, 41-56.

Crismore, Avon 1989. *Talking with readers: Metadiscourse as rhetorical Act*. New York: Peter Lang.

Crismore, Avon. & Rodney Farnsworth. 1990. Metadiscourse in popular and professional science discourse. In Walter Nash (Ed.), *The Writing Scholar: Studies in Academic Discourse*. 118-36. Newsbury Park, CA: Sage.

Çakır, Sarı Hamide.2020. Türkçe öğretmenlerinin söylem belirleyicileri kullanımı. *Dil Dergisi.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi. 75-90. https://doi.org/10.33690/dilder.648838

Corcu, Demet 2006. Analysis of Discourse Particles in Relation to the Information Structure of Texts & Dialogues: Examples from Turkish. *Conference on Austronesian Linguistics.* 1-7. https://semanticsarchieve.net. (accessed 9.8.2022)

Dafouz, Emma Milne. 2008. 'The Pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: A Cross-linguistic Study of Newspaper Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 40. 95-113. Doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2007.10.003

Dağ Tarcan, Özlem.2019. *Sosyal bilimler alanında yazılan Türkçe bilimsel metinlerde kullanılan üstsöylem belirleyicileri*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi dissertation

Dahl, T. (2004). Textual metadiscourse in research articles: A marker of national culture or of academic discipline. Journal of Pragmatics, 36(10), 1807-1825.

 a, A., & Findlay-Dunham, J. (2007). The pragmatics of advice giving: Cross-cultural perspectives. Intercultural Pragmatics, 4(3), 319-42. https://doi.org/10.1515/IP.2007.016

DeCapua, A., & Findlay-Dunham, J. (1993). Strategies in the discourse of advice. Journal of Pragmatics, 20(4), 519–530. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(93)90014-G

Duenos, Pilar Mur.2007. 'Same genre, same discipline; however, there are differences: a cross-cultural analysis of logical markers in academic writing'. In Christopher Williams and Denise Milizia (eds.).4. 37-53.*ESP Across Cultures*. Foggia: Italy

Doğan, Gürkan. 1994. Ama Bağlacına Edimbilimsel Bir Bakış. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 195-205.

Dumlao, Remart Padua Wilang, Jeffrey Dawala Wilang. 2019. Variations in the use of discourse markers by L1 and L2 English users. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 202-209. doi: 10.17509/ijal.v9i1.15206

Esmer, Elçin.2018. Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrenciler tarafından üretilen ikna metinlerinde üstsöylem belirleyicilerinin kullanımı. *Dil Eğitimi ve Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 4(3), 216-228.DOI: 10.31464/jlere.292927.

Ercan, Songun Gülsüm.2019. Ama (But)' as a disclaimer and its functions in Turkish Daily Discourse. In Viliyan Krystev, Recep Efe, Emin Atasoy (eds.) *Theory and Practice in Social Sciences*. 308-317. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.

Göksel, Aslı & Celia Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar.* London: Routledge.

Güçlü, Ruhan. 2020. Interactive metadiscourse markers in Turkish research article abstracts: a diachronic analysis. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-BELLETEN*, *70* (Aralık), 211-238.

Feng, H. (2015). Understanding cultural variations in advising Americans and Chinese. Communication Research, 42(8),1143–1167. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650213486668

Fuertes-Olivera Pedro, Marisol Velasco- Sacristan, Ascension Arribas-Bano & Eva Samaniego-Fernandez. 2001. PA. Persuasion and advertising in English: Metadiscourse in slogans and headlines. *Journal of Pragmatics.* Vol.33. 1291-1307. 1291-1307 DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(01)80026-6.

Hendley, William Clark.1977. Dear Abby, Miss Lonelyhearts, and the eighteenth century: The origins of the newspaper advice column. *Journal of Popular Culture*. 11(2):345-352.

Hinds, John (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In Ulla Connor & Robert B. Kaplan (Eds.), Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 Text (141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hyland, Ken .1998 Exploring corporate rhetoric: metadiscourse in the CEO's letter. *Journal of Business Communication*, 35(2), 224-45.

Hyland, Ken.2005a. Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192.

Hyland, Ken and Tse, Polly. 2004. Metadiscourse in academic writing: a reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156—77.

Hyland Ken.1999.Disciplinary discourses: writer stance in research articles. In Christopher Candlin & Ken Hyland (eds.), *Writing: Texts, Processes and Practices*. London: Longman: 99-121.

Hyland, Ken. 2000. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing.* London: Longman.

Hyland Ken & Fiona Hyland.2012. You could make this clearer: Teachers' advice on ESL academic writing. In Holger Limberg and Miriam A. Locher (eds.) [Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 221], *Advice in Discourse.* 53-71. Amsterdam& Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ho, Victor. 2016. Discourse of persuasion: A preliminary study of the use of metadiscourse in policy documents. *Text&Talk.* 36(1). 1-21. DOI 10. 1515/text-2016-0001

Ho, Victor. 2018. Using metadiscourse in making persuasive attempts through workplace request emails. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 134. 70-81.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.06.015

Ho, Victor & Cissy Li. 2018. The use of metadiscourse and persuasion: An analysis of first year university students' timed argumentative essays. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 33. 53-68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.02.001

Ho, Victor. 2020. Do hotels enhance and challenge rapport with customers with the same degree of commitment? *Journal of Pragmatics*.166. 70-83.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.06.002

Hudson, Thom 1990. The discourse of advice giving in English- I wouldn't feed until spring no matter what you do'. Language and Communication. 10(4): 285-297.

Kaplan, Robert. 1966. Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education. Language Learning. V. 16. N.1. p.1-20.

Kurtul, Kamil. 2011. Türkçe ve İngilizcedeki Bağlaçların Yazılı Metinlerde Kullanımı, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü dissertation

Norrick, Neal.2001. On the Conversational Performance of Narrative Jokes: Toward an Account of Timing. *Humor,* 14, 255-274. https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2001.003

Trosborg Anna.1995. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hatipoğlu, Çiler & Sedef Algı. 2017. Contextual and pragmatic functions of modal epistemic hedges in argumentative paragraphs in Turkish. In Çiler Hatipoğlu, Erdem Akbaş and Yasemin Bayyurt (Eds.). *Metadiscourse in written genres. Uncovering textual and Interactional aspects of texts.* (pp. 67-84). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Halliday Michael Alexander Kirkwood & Ruqaiya Hasan.1976. *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Hinkel, Eli. 1994. Appropriateness of advice as L2 Solidarity Strategy. 1-29.

Hinkel, Eli. 1997. Appropriateness of advice: DCT and Multiple Choice Data. Applied Linguistics. Vol. 18. No.1. OUP.1-26.

Hosni, H. R. (2020). Advice giving in Egyptian Arabic and American English: A cross-linguistic, cross-cultural study. Journal of Pragmatics, 155, 193-212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.11.001

Leech, Geoffrey. 2014. *The Pragmatics of Politeness.* Oxford: OUP.

Lewis, Geoffrey. 2000. *Turkish Grammar.* Oxford: OUP.

Locher, Miriam. 2006. *Advice Online.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Locher, Miriam.2013. Internet advice: Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kimoga, Joseph. 2010. Remorseless apology: Analysing a political letter. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 42(8) 2181-2188.

Mauranen, Anna.1993a. Contrastive ESP rhetoric: metatext in Finnish-English Economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes,* 12, 3-22.

Mauranen, Anna.1993b. *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang

Nida, Camalia Fatih (2020). Comparative study of speech act advice-giving in Indonesian culture and American culture found in Television series. CaLLs, 6(2), 238-253. http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/calls.v6i2.4731

Neff-van Aertselaer, J. & Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008). Argumentative patterns in different languages: An analysis of metadiscourse markers in English and Spanish texts. In M. Pütz, & J. Neff-van Aertselaer (Eds.), Developing contrastive pragmatics interlanguage and cross-cultural perspectives (pp. 87–102). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Overstreet, Maryann & George Yule.2001. Formulaic Disclaimers. *Journal of Pragmatics.* Vol. 33(1). 45-60. https:doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00125-3

Özdamar, Betül. 2020. Discourse structure and Discourse markers in the Argumentative Essays of English and Turkish Language Teaching Students. Ankara: Hacettepe University MA thesis

Philips, Angela. 2008. Advice Columnists. In Bob Franklin (eds.). *Analysing Print Journalism. Pulling newspapers apart: Analysing Print Journalism.* 97-105. London&New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203630709 (accessed 10.8.2022)

Richard, Erin & Michael McFadden 2016. Saving Face: Reactions to cultural norm violations in business request emails. *Journal of Business Psychology.* 31(2). 307-321.

Reza Abdi, Manoochehr Tavangar Rizi & Mansoor Tavakoli. 2010. The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A Framework for the use of metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 42. 1669-1679.

Sarıkaya, Zeliha Zeynep. 2020. Sosyal bilimler ve Fen bilimleri alanlarındaki makalelerde kullanılan bilim dilinin incelenmesi. *The Journal of Turkic Language and Literature Surveys (TULLIS).* 5(2). 233-241.

Schiffrin, Deborah.1987. *Discourse Markers. Contextual Coordinates of Talk*.[Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 5] Cambridge: CUP.

Şen, Ekin.2019. Bilimsel makale özetlerinde üstsöylem belirleyicilerinin incelenmesi. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University dissertation

Trosborg, Anna. 1995. *Interlanguage Pragmatics:* Requests, Complaints and Apologies. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tavakoli, M., & Tavakoli, A. (2010). A cross-cultural study of advice and social pressure. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5, 1533–1539. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.321

Uluçay, Çiğdem & Çiler Hatipoğlu. 2016. Causal markers in Turkish Cause Paragraphs. In Çiler Hatipoğlu, Erdem Akbaş, Yasemin Bayyurt (eds.) *Metadiscourse in written genres: Uncovering textual and interpersonal aspects of texts.* 172-190. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Yang, Na. 2021. Engaging readers across participants: A cross-interactant analysis of metadiscourse in letters of advice during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Pragmatics*.186. 181-193.

Yin, Zihan. 2015. The Use of Cohesive Devices in News Language: Overuse, Underuse or Misuse? *RELC Journal*, 46(3), 309–326. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688215597578

Vande Kopple, William.1985. Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36(1). 82-93.

Venuti, Lawrence. 2000. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London& New York: Routledge.

Yılmaz, Tuba. 2022. The Complexity of Pragmatic Competence: A Comparative Analysis of Native English Speakers: and Turkish ESL Students' Advice-giving Strategies. *Journal of Language Education.* 8 (2) 2022. 305-324.

Zeyrek, Deniz, Ümit Deniz Turan, Işın Demirşahin & Ruket Çakıcı. 2012. Differential properties of three discourse connectives in Turkish: A Corpus-based Analysis of Fakat, Yoksa, Ayrıca. In Anton Benz, Manfred Stede & Peter Kühnlein (eds.), Constraints in Discourse 3 [Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 223], 183-206. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.223.08zey.

LIST OF METADISCOURSE MARKERS IN TURKISH

Appendix 1: LIST OF METADISCOURSE MARKERS IN TURKISH

SEQUENCERS (SEQUENCING): Ardından (after) (1), başlangıçta (ın the beginning) (0), başka bir/ bir başka (another) (14) , biri (one of them) (0), birinci/si (first/firstly) (1), daha sonra (afterwards) (2), sonraları (afterwards) (0), -dan önce-/-dan sonra (before/after) (11), -(y) ıp (after) (21), ikinci/ikinci olarak (second/secondly) (3), ilk/ilk olarak (first) (12), nihai/son (last) (15), öncelikle (first of all) (2), son olarak (lastly) (2) , şu şekilde (as follows) **(0)**
LABELLING TEXT STAGES: Kısaca/sı, (briefly) (0), Son olarak/ Sonuçta (ın conclusion) (28) , Bu yazı (this text) (1), Bu yazışma (This correspondence) (1), Bu köşe (This column) (1), Sonunda (11)
ANNOUNCING GOALS: Amacıyla (for the purpose of) (3), Amaç (Aim), Araştırma (research), araştır (ıl) (to be discussed), ele al (ın) (to be discussed), konu ol (subject to), konu bul (find a topic), sonucunda (as a result of) (1), Bu araştırmada (In this research) (0), Hedefle (to target) (0), Çalış/ıl (to try) (0), Dene (to attempt) (0)
ILLOCUTIONARY MARKERS: Önermek(advise) (1), Ummak (hope) (16), Kutlamak (congratulate) (3), Tebrik etmek (congratulate) (1), Şükretmek (grateful for) (2)**,**Tesekkür etmek (thank) (1), Kusura bakma (apologise) (1) Tavsiye etmek (advise) (2), Dilemek (wish) (1)
CODE GLOSSES/REFORMULATION: Anlamına gel- (to mean) (1), Başka bir deyişle/ifadeyle (In other words) (0), bir anlamda (In a sense) (9), bu da gösteriyor ki (This shows that) (0), …Demektir, Denilebilir ki (It can be said that) (4), özetleyebiliriz (we can summarize as…) (1), The use of colons : (for explanations) (8), the use of hypen – (0),

The use of slash / (to indicate or) (0), the use of parenthesis (for presenting detailed information) (5), şöyle/ şöyle ki/ demek ki/ öyle ki (that's to say) (6), yani (that is to say) (7), şunu söylemeliyim ki (I must say this)(2), ya da/ veya/ yahut/ veyahut (or) (15), ki (that) (46)

EXEMPLIFICATION: Gibi (Such as) (35), Vs (etc.) (2), Vb.(etc.) (0), Örneğin/ Mesela/Misal/Misal olarak/ Söz gelimi (for example)(6), ve benzeri (and such) (0), -DAN olan (from ….) (1), ….olan (that…) (1), ….olarak (as…) (4), Bu tarz (these kinds of) (1), Bu tür (these kinds of) (28), Bunun gibi/Bu gibi (like this) (3), Buna benzer (like this) (0), Böylesi bir (like this) (0), Böyle şey (like this) (0)

TOPICALISERS: baktığınızda (when you examine) (0), açıdan (in terms of), açısından (in terms of) (0), -a dair (about) (0), -a dayanarak(based on) (0), -a gelince (as for) (2) , -a göre (according to) (0), bu açıdan (from this point) (0)

LOGICAL MARKERS ADDITION: aynı zamanda (In addition) (2), Aynı şekilde (In addition) (1), Ayrıca (0) , Bunun dışında (ın addition) (1), bunun yanısıra/-ın yanısıra (ın addition) (1), bunun yanında/-ın yanında, -cağı gibi, dığı/olduğu kadar, dığı/olduğu gibi (as well as) (6), ve (and) (206), yine (also) (3), zaten (besides) (20), üstelik (In addition) (8), Ayrıca (In addition) (0)

ADVERSATIVE: -mAsInA rağmen (despite) (0), mEklE beraber (together with) (0), Fakat (But) (0) , Tam Aksi (just the opposite) (0), Diğer taraftan (on the other hand) (0), ama (but) (170), ancak (however) (28), yine de (neverthless) (18), Yalnız (but) (0), Gene (de) (even if) (0), Bununla birlikte (0), Buna karşın/rağmen (in spite of that) (0), Buna karşılık (in spite of this) (5), Ne var ki /mamafih,

halbuki/oysa (ki) (however) (11), Gerçi (hoş) (0), Diğer taraftan(yandan)(on the other hand) (1), Öte yandan (on the other hand) (0), Lakin (however) (0), Aksi halde/ taktirde (on the contrary) (3), Tam tersine (7), Olsa da (4) yoksa (otherwise) 18,Olsa/Olmasa bile (even if/even if not) (1), bir yandan (on the one hand) (15)