SCRUTINIZING ENGLISH DISCOURSE MARKERS
IN EFL STUDENTS’ WRITING PRODUCTION

Listyaning Sumardiyan / Universitas PGRI Semarang
listyaningsmd@gmail.com
Dias Andris Susanto / Universitas PGRI Semarang
diasandris@upgris.ac.id
Corresponding Author: listyaningsmd@gmail.com

Abstract

Fraser (1988; 1996; 1999) which are classified EDMs functions as ‘contrastive, ‘elaborative, and ‘inferential. This study designated the use of English discourse markers by University EFL students in writing production. To answer the research question on how do they disclose EDMs in producing writing, the writers employed a qualitative research approach. The object was the documentation of students’ writing result mediated on the writing class. The participants were 38 students of semester III in the academic year 2018/2019. The findings are the contrastive markers are; but 63/instead of 2/whereas 2/however 16/although 2/in the other hand /side 6. The elaborative markers are; and 597/also 105/or 69/for example 27/besides 7/otherwise 3/in addition, 24/then 6/likewise 1. The inferential markers are; because 97/so 51/as a result 9/therefore 11/in conclusion 3/then 1. The most functions of discourse markers use by students are; the marker ‘but’ has a meaning ‘on the contrary. The marker ‘and’ has a meaning as ‘in addition’. Students used the marker ‘because’ to indicate ‘for the reason’. The implication of this study is that students need to understand in employing properly English discourse markers to make their writing being cohesive and coherent in texts.
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Introduction

The industry era 4.0 and the 21st century of education, students need to be able to make a good speaking and writing which becomes coherent and cohesive as well as meaningful prominently. Using the proper EDM in sentences and paragraphs make them semantically and lexically accepted in spoken and written global communication. The writers have investigated the use of causal markers function in the hortatory exposition text by the third-semester students of Universitas PGRI Semarang. The objectives of its study are to find out the causal function markers realized in hortatory exposition text and to find out the most dominant functions realized. According to Feng (2010), some causal markers function is summarized as follows; <so>, <consequently>, <it follows>, <for>, <because>, <under the circumstances>, <for this reason>, etc. The data were statistically analyzed and categorized using a qualitative approach. The subjects consisted of 37 respondents. Through collecting the hortatory exposition text written by each student, I have analyzed the causal marker functions which were used in its text. Then the writers collected the texts and read them intensively. Afterward, we analyzed each sentence which was observed attentively, finally I found out the English Discourse Markers (EDM) which was realized in its text.

The writers also have investigated the use of English discourse markers in students’ writing at Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia. Fraser (1997) identifies three functional classes of EDM; contrastive, elaborative, and inferential. The problems of this study are; what are the English discourse markers used in students writing, and what are the functions realized in students writing. This was a qualitative descriptive design. The sample of the
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study was the EFL students writing result which has 45 essays at the English education study program. The writers did analyze the data prior activities such as collecting and classifying. Previously, I also explained that students used contrastive EDM like; <but> 24, <however>, 8, <although> 5, elaborative EDM like; <and> 344, <also> 50, <in addition>, 3, inferential EDM like; <as a result> 4, <then> 10, <because> 13, <since> 39. It elaborates to us that most students used and familiar using elaborative functions (marked by intricate and often excessive detail; complicated; ornate) rather than contrastive (tending to contrast; contrasting) and inferential (characterized by or involving conclusions reached on the basis of evidence and reasoning). Furthermore, they have a very limitation in understanding and comprehending some words of EDM in their writing, it has only 10 markers in all functions. The more markers they use in their writing so that the more coherent and cohesive within their writing. The conclusion of this study reflects that students are still weak in using some EDM in their writing so that they only produce certain familiar markers. The pedagogical implication that I can say is that students of EFL need to get some kinds of EDM to compose their writing well organized and understood.

Based on the gaps above, the writers conclude that this study focuses on the use of EFL students at English education study program of Universitas PGRI Semarang in the way the produce the writing essay towards the functions of English discourse markers.

Problem of the Research
How do EFL Students reveal the use and functions of English Discourse Markers in writing production?

Review of Frameworks

Elaboration on the studies of discourse markers as conducted by (Ab Manan, 2017; Alsharif, 2017; Ghanbari, Nasim., Dehghani, Tahereh., & Shamsaddini, Mohammad Reza, 2016). Ab Manan (2017) he described the use of discourse markers by ESL learners in writing. 50 paragraphs written by the participants were scrutinized and the DMs used in each paragraph were recorded. The DMs used by the participants were classified into four categories; a) Contrastive Markers (CDMs); b) Elaborative Markers (EDMs); c) Implicative Markers (IDMs) and d) Temporal Markers (TDMs). It was found that the participants use Elaborative Markers (73%) the most followed by Temporal Markers (13%), Contrastive Markers (8%) and Implicative Markers (6%). Alsharif (2017) stated the frequently used discourse markers by Saudi EFL learners. The hypothesis is, and based on previous studies of discourse markers by English learners, Saudi English learners overuse them. English essays are collected as a corpus for analysis and a concordance program is used to shed light on how frequently key words in contexts are used by learners. Reza (2016) Mentioned that discourse markers in academic and non-academic writing of Iranian EFL Learners showed that there was a significant difference in the use of discourse markers in academic and non-academic writing. Furthermore, as the result revealed discourse markers were required more in academic than non-academic writing.

Studies on Discourse Markers in the classroom interaction have been declared by Schegloff (1982: 93, 2007: 13) mentioned that discourse as an interactional achievement: some uses of ‘uh huh’ and other things that come between sentences. analyzing discourse: text and talk. Schourup (1985: 227-265) declared that Common discourse particles in English: ‘like’, ‘well’, ‘y’know’. Granger, Hung Kasper, and Blum-Kulka (1993: 15) elaborated that Interlanguage pragmatics: an introduction. Fraser (1990, 1999: 931-952) explained what are discourse markers? Jucker (1993: 435-452) perceived the discourse marker well: a relevance-theoretical account. Lenk (1995: 245-257) explored discourse
markers and global coherence in conversation. Granger (1998c: 3-18) viewed prefabricated patterns in advanced EFL writing: collocations and formulae.

Evaluation on the use of discourse markers in writing production have been elaborated by Vickov, G., & Pulisić, E. G. (2003, January) analysed the role of children’s literature in early foreign Language Learning. Martínez, A. C. L. (2009: 9(2)) researched the empirical study of the effects of discourse markers on the reading comprehension of Spanish students of English as a foreign language. Coll, M. U. (2009) analysed the 'Anyway' formal approach to the syntax and semantics of discourse markers. Fox Tree, J. E. (2010: 269-281) studied the discourse markers across speakers and settings. Yang, S. (2011: 8) Investigated discourse markers in pedagogical settings: a literature review. Sharndama, E. C., & Yakubu, S. (2013: 15-24). Analyzed the discourse markers in academic report writing: pedagogical implications.

**Research Design and Analyzing Data**

It is assumed that students use English Discourse Markers in writing classroom interaction. This is a qualitative descriptive approach through the writers used a qualitative data result. Referring to Cresswell, John W (2009) then I define a research design as "a blueprint for conducting a study with maximum control over factors that may interfere with the validity of the findings".

In a qualitative study, the research design should be a reflexive process operating through every stage of a project". The activities of collecting and analyzing data, developing and modifying theory, elaborating or refocusing the research questions, and identifying and eliminating validity threats are usually all going on more or less simultaneously, each influencing all of the others. The Instrument of the documentation towards the EFL students’ writing result by semester III which these following steps; -Selecting the writing’s subject matter that was being taught, -Considering the lesson plan dealing with the meeting of lecturing, -Asking students to have an essay with the particular topic regarding with the syllabus on writing subject to get the writing production beyond the various topics, -Tabulating students’ works through the various classification like; Writing productions EDMs

**Research Findings and Discussion**

EFL Students reveal the use and functions of English Discourse Markers in writing production.

In identifying written EDMs in this study, the writers relied on the framework provided by English discourse markers as the theoretical basis towards Fraser (1988; 1996; 1999) which are classified as ‘contrastive, elaborative, and inferential

| NO. CODING | : WT |
| TOPIC : CAUSE EFFECT ESSAY |
| CLASS/ SMT : 3 |

**Writing Tabulation**

| Students’ Code | English Discourse Markers |
|---------------|---------------------------|
| 01            | Contrastive | Elaborative | Inferential |
|               | However (2)/But (2) | And (11)/Also 2/Or 2 | Because 2/Then 1 |

**The Use and Functions of EDMs in EFL Students’ Writing Productions on topic of cause and effect**
| Page | Discourse Marker 1 | Discourse Marker 2 | Additional Discourse Markers |
|------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 02   | But 2              | And 10/For example 1/In addition 2 | Or 3/Also 1                 |
| 03   | However (2)/But 2  | And 18/Also 1/Or 1           | Because 3                   |
| 04   | But 2              | And 22/Or 3              |                             |
| 05   | But 2              | And 13/For example 2/Also 1/Or 2 | Because 3/So 1/Thus 1     |
| 06   | But 1              | And 11/Also 2/Or 2/For example 1 | Because 2/So 2            |
| 07   | However (2) But 2  | And 25/For example 1/Also 5/Or 2 | Because 5                  |
|      | On the other side 1|                    |                             |
| 08   | But 3              | And 12/Also 3/In addition 1 | Because 3                   |
| 09   | However (2)/But 1  | And 20/Also 5/Or 4/In addition 1 | Because 4/So 1/As a result 1 |
| 10   | However (1)/But 1  | And 29/Also 4          | Because 2                   |
|      | On the other hand 1|                        |                             |
| 11   | However 1 But 2    | And 12/Also 11/Or 1/In addition 2 | Because 2/So 4            |
|      | For example 3/Beside 1|                      |                             |
| 12   | But 1              | And 16/Also 3/Or 1/In addition 1 | Because 3/So 6            |
|      | For example 1/Then 1|                      |                             |
| 13   | And 9/Also 1/Or 1  |                               | Because 1/So 1            |
| 14   | But 4              | And 18/Also 4/Or 2          | So 2                       |
|      | For example 1      |                               |                             |
| 15   | On the other hand 1| And 4/Also 2/Or 1/In addition 1 | Because 4/So 1            |
|      | For example 1      |                               |                             |
| 16   | But 4              | And 24/Also 4/Or 5/For example 1 | Because 2/So 6/Thus 1     |
|      | For example 1      |                               |                             |
| 17   | But 3              | And 8/Also 3/Or 2/For example 2 | Because 5/So 2/Therefore 1 |
|      | For example 2      |                               |                             |
| 18   | But 4              | And 24/Also 4/Or 4/For example 1 | Because 2/So 2/Therefore 1 |
|      | On the other hand 2| In addition 2               |                             |
| 19   | But 2              | And 10/Also 7/Or 1/For example 1/Besides 3 | Because 4/So 1            |
|      | For example 1      |                               |                             |
| 20   | And 15/Also 3/Or 1/For example 1/Then 1 | Because 2/So 1/Therefore 1 |
| 21   | However 4 On the other hand 1 | And 22/Also 3/Or 1/In addition 2 | Because 3/As a result 1/Therefore 1 |
|      | For example 3      |                               |                             |
| 22   | And 11/Also 3/In addition 1 | For example 1/Moreover 2/Then 3 | Because 4/So 2/Therefore 1 |
| 23   | But 1              | And 9/Or 1/In addition 1     | Because 2/So 3             |
| 24   | But 1              | And 7/Also 3/Or 1/Then 1     | Because 3/As a result 1/Therefore 1 |
| 25   | But 1              | And 17/Also 1/In addition 1  |                             |
| 26   | But 3              | And 17/For example 1          | Because 1/So 2             |
Here is the tabulation writing with the topic of the writing production is cause and effect essay. It is the findings of the EDMs used by students in exploring their skill to write an essay using those three functions of EDMs namely; contrastive function (But 63 instances, Instead of 2 instances, Whereas 2 instances, However 16 instances, Although 2 instances, In the other hand /side 6 instances), elaborative function (And 597 instances, Also 105 instances, Or 69 instances, For example 27 instances, Besides 7 instances, Moreover 3 instances, In addition 24 instances, Then 6 instances, Likewise 1 instance) and inferential function (Because 97 instances, So 51 instances, As a result 9 instances, Therefore 11 instances, In conclusion 3 instances, Then 1 instance).
This is the pie chart which gives the readers findings about the used of EDMs by students in the written productions. It is called as the contrastive function which is have some markers like; **But** 63 instances, **Instead of** 2 instances, **Whereas** 2 instances, **However** 16 instances, **Although** 2 instances, **In the other hand/side** 6 instances, the marker ‘but’ in <WT-1> has a meaning ‘on the contrary. The marker ‘instead of’ in <WT-2> has a meaning ‘rather than. The marker ‘whereas’ in <WT-3> has a meaning ‘although. The marker ‘however’ in <W01-4> has a meaning ‘granting. The marker ‘on the other hand’ in <WT-6> has a meaning ‘oppositely on the <WT-6>. The most frequently marker used is the marker ‘but’ 69%, which is the least marker is whereas and instead 2%.

**Witness:**

**Contrastive**

<WT-1>: this can adversely affect children, *but* in the midst of game development it turned out that there were still a few discussed by several game makers with the world of virtual education.

<WT-2>: *Instead of* learning with the internet facilities provided

<WT-3>: *Whereas* the fact that in the era before early 00s technology as mentioned before still very rare

<WT-4>: *However*, this can be overcome if the parent swiftly limits the use of gadgets to children

<WT-5>: *Although* the internet can open the horizons of children with access to various information

<WT-6>: *On the other hand* this causes children to be too depend on gadget

Here is the pie chart 2. tells us about the used of EDMs in students writing production on the topic of cause and effect. This pie chart shows that the marker used **And** 597 instances, **Also** 105 instances, **Or** 69 instances, **For example** 27 instances, **Besides** 7 instances, **Moreover** 3 instances, **In addition** 24 instances, **Then** 6 instances, **Likewise** 1 instances. The marker and in the writing <WT-7>: nowadays information **and** communication technology are developing very rapidly’ has a meaning as ‘in addition’. The marker ‘also’ in the writing <WT-8>: Computers can **also** be used to facilitate showing knowledge, has a meaning as ‘too. The marker ‘or’ in the writing <WT-9>: They can be playing game with their selves **or** in a group, has a meaning as ‘a choice. The marker ‘for example’ in the writing <WT-10>: **For example**, it can be done at any time in leisure time, has a meaning as ‘for instance. The marker ‘besides’ in the writing <WT-11>: The information can’t last long, **besides** exchanging information through conversation…has a meaning as ‘

**Witness:**

**Elaborative**

<WT-7>: nowadays information **and** communication technology is developing very rapidly.

<WT-8>: Computers can **also** be used to facilitate showing knowledge

<WT-9>: They can playing game with their selves **or** in a group
For example, it can be done at any time in leisure time.

The information can’t last long; besides exchanging information through conversation…

Moreover, now competition in various aspects of life is very hard.

In addition to having bad impact, the internet can also have an impact on both teenagers and children.

Then, he will not receive the focus of lessons delivered in school.

Likewise, teacher in schools must be more stringent to regulate students.

In this pie chart describes the used of EDMs towards the function on the students’ writing production. The EDMs markers that are used by students are; Because 97 instances, So 51 instances, As a result 9 instances, Therefore 11 instances, In conclusion 3 instances. Then 1 instance. The most frequently used the EDMs marker is the marker ‘because’ 57% in their writing production. The least EDMs used is the marker ‘then’. Students used the marker ‘because’ to indicate ‘for the reason in <WT-16>. The marker ‘so’ has a meaning as ‘consequently in <WT-17>. The marker ‘as a result’ has a meaning as ‘therefore in <WT-18>. The marker ‘therefore’ has a meaning ‘hence in <WT-19>. The marker ‘in conclusion’ has a meaning as ‘in summary in <WT-20>. The marker ‘then’ has a meaning as ‘at that time in <WT-21>.

Witness;
Inferential

because this will have a bad impact on children

so people today need information of technology in everyday life.

as a result of therapy development of technology

The impact of technology depends on the user. Therefore the key to balancing the positive.

In conclusion, kids in this era are very dependent on technology.

Just open youtube.com, then you will find various videos.

Conclusion

This is the conclusion of the EDMs used by EFL students in the written production that I can describe as; the function of EDMs used are; Contrastive 91 instances, Elaborative 839 instances, Inferential 102 instances. Here students prefer used elaborative function rather than contrastive and elaborative. Here, students prefer using elaborative markers as to expand their idea about their writing production onto paragraph they built. Then students less using contrastive since they rarely make any contras things on their paragraph. The function elaborative indicates that students used the elaborative markers to describe more about their
writing on the topic of cause and effect. Dealing with the topic then, writer thinks that student rarely used the markers contrastive because they feel that there is nothing to be opponent to show in their writing. The function inferential is less because students are still in the first semester then they felt difficult to have complex sentences.
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