

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Language is the capacity of humans to communicate with one another. The interaction can be done in two ways both spoken and written. As a main tool in communication, language is very important to be learned. Learning a language, especially English is necessary. The choice of words, structure, and style in delivering the message might represent a person's capacity for communication. Many people have learned and implemented English in their everyday lives or in their notes as the era has developed.

In academic settings, the text is one of the most commonly utilized tools in academic settings to connect individuals. The term text is used in linguistics to refer to any passages. Texts can be either spoken or written. It may take a form of a speech or writing to communicate our thoughts. (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) stated the text's linguistic usage in referring to some passage, whether written or spoken. This indicates that a text may be studied in a variety of ways, not only as a spoken text, such as conversation, speech, or film, but also as a written text, such as a newspaper, a magazine, a journal, an article, or an essay. Furthermore, text must have specific features, particularly a consistent texture, to produce a connected and well-structured statement that is easily comprehended.

One of the phenomena that sixth-semester English Department students at the Faculty of Foreign Languages experience, is when they are required to submit essays, articles, proposals, and theses. Students require creativity and abilities in this scenario to produce high-quality work. To portray the arguments, thoughts, or ideas that you wish to convey in writing, the appropriate concepts, ideas, and structures must be used. For undergraduate students who don't have sufficient writing abilities or who are still learning how to write well, this process may be rather challenging. In this study, argumentative texts are used to evaluate how well students can express their thoughts and arguments in written form. Argumentative texts can expand students' knowledge and develop their critical thinking skills. Students who write argumentative texts become more knowledgeable about recent issues, social standing, and differing points of view on various topics. So that, students develop their writing skills as well as their ability to communicate contrasts, statements, and ideas. Students in this study concentrated on producing argumentative texts on the subject of bird conservation.

In the writing process, discourse markers have an important role to connect phrase by phrase or sentence between sentences. Discourse markers are also important in their role in making sentences or a text coherent. According to Richards & Schmidt (2013), coherence is a term used to describe the connections between the meanings of words used in a discourse

or sentences used in a text. In writing, coherence refers to a text's ability to make sense to the reader. Halliday & Hasan (1976) declared that examples of cohesive devices include synonyms, personal pronouns, definite articles, demonstrative pronouns, and linking words. Since they serve to connect the sentences and paragraphs' constituent parts, linking words are regarded as the most important aspect of any text. A study conducted by Prommas (2011) proves that the use of DMs is necessary because transitional words, which are the most effective and obvious tools for demonstrating the connection of ideas, are used in essays.

1.2 Problems of the Study

Based on the background above, the problems were analyzed by the researcher are:

1. What types of discourse markers are found in argumentative text written by the Sixth Semester Student of Faculty of Foreign Languages in academic year 2021-2022?
2. How discourse markers are used by the Sixth Semester Student of Faculty of Foreign Languages in academic year 2021-2022?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Based on the problems mentioned above, two study objectives were created as the aims of this research, which are as follows:

1. To find out types of discourse markers in argumentative text by the Sixth Semester Student of Faculty of Foreign Languages in academic year 2021-2022.
2. To elaborate the use of discourse markers by the Sixth Semester Student of Faculty of Foreign Languages in academic year 2021-2022.

1.4 Limitation of the Study

Based on the study's background and problem, this study required problem limitation to be effectively defined. The study was carried out by categorizing types and used of discourse markers in Argumentative Text about Bird Conservation in Demulih village by the Sixth Semester Students of Faculty of Foreign Languages.

1.5 Significance of the Study

It is expected that scientific research will be used as feedback in English learning, especially in implementing the usage of discourse markers. This current study is likely to have both theoretical and practical implications.

1.5.1 Theoretical Significance

Theoretically, the study's findings should expand knowledge and bring new insights, particularly in the capacity to comprehend discourse markers.

1.5.2 Practical Significance

Practically, the findings of the study are likely to give information on discourse markers. This material can be used as a review to help readers improve their ability to use discourse markers. This study also provides advantage and may be evaluated, whether it be essays, articles, or others, in order to learn more about the use of discourse markers.



CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, CONCEPTS AND THEORIES

2.1 Review of Related Literature

This study investigated the types of DMs as well as the difficulties that students encountered while employing DMs in argumentative text. The researcher discovered the following related literature while doing this study.

The first thesis review was written by Sohaya (2018) entitled *English Discourse Markers Used in the Procedure Text Written by Senior High School Students*. In investigating the research problems, the writer used Bruce Fraser's theory (1999). Her study focused on the types of DMs and the reason of why the students used these types of discourse markers in their writing. The finding of this study that was there were 33 words of DMs in the procedure text written by students; there were 7 out of 8 types occurred in the procedure text written by students. The types of DMs were contrastive DMs (CDMs), elaborative DMs (EDMs), inferential DMs (IDMs), reason DMs (RDMs), conclusive DMs (CcDMs), exemplifier DMs (ExDMs), and sequential DMs (SDMs). This study also investigated the reasons why the students used that types of DMs to explain their writing. According to the findings of the study, sequential makers were the first dominating form of DMs employed in the procedure text, followed by elaborative markers, and lastly contrastive markers.

Another study about discourse marker was done by Kummala (2016) entitled *Discourse Markers in EFL Learners' Presentations*. The objective of this study is to gain a thorough understanding of the use of DMs in English student presentations, so it adopts a qualitative descriptive methodology. This study aims to describe (1) the types of DMs used by English language students when they present their thesis proposals using Brinton's (1996) classification of the functions of DMs. (2) English-speaking students present their thesis proposals using the method by which DMs emerge. Research information was gathered from English students at UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang who presented their theses. According to the study's findings, there are seven different DMs that can be identified in English student presentations: okay, well, yeah, okay yeah, yeah, then yeah, what is it, and then yeah. According to the research, some students frequently use the same DMs when giving presentations.

Another study was taken from an article entitled *Discourse Markers in Steve Jobs' Speech Introducing iPhone in Macworld 2007* written by (Jayantini et al., 2022). The purpose of this research is to identify the types and functions of discourse markers in Steve Jobs' Introducing iPhone in Macworld 2007 speech. The results show that Steve Job used a variety of DMs, totaling 123 data points. There were 78 markers of connective (63,5%), 20 markers of cause and result (16,2%), 13 markers of temporal adverb (10,6%), 10 markers of response (8,1%), and 2 markers of information and participation (1,6%).

Another article about discourse markers was done by Rahayu & Cahyono (2015) entitled *Discourse Markers in Expository Essays Written by Indonesian Students of EFL*. This study aims to show three instances of using DMs in expository essays of five development methods, including the most popular DM type, common DM variants, and whether using DMs is appropriate or inappropriate. In the academic year 2014–2015, 55 undergraduate students enrolled in the English Language Teaching (ELT) program at State University of Malang, Indonesia, wrote 275 essays for the study's Essay Writing Class. Five development techniques were used to create the essays: exemplification, comparison and contrast, classification, process analysis, and cause-and-effect analysis. Exemplification, comparison, and classification essays exhibit more elaborative markers, according to the findings. Then, essays that analyze processes and cause-and-effect relationships exhibit more inferential markers. The following common variants were present in each type of DM: contrastive markers, elaborative markers, and inferential markers. The most common misuse of DMs, according to the analysis of their suitability for use, is in the wrong relation. The issue should be solved by educating students about the proper and intentional use of DMs.

The last study was taken from an article entitled *The Used of English Discourse Markers in the Argumentative Writing of EFL Indonesian and Thai University Students: A Comparative Study*. In order to compare how the use of DMs by both Indonesian and Thai students contributed to the

coherence of the text, the author looked into the different types of DMs used by these students in their argumentative writing. The 46 argumentative writing were collected by the students were analyzed following (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) and (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) theories. The results of this study showed that addition DMs were the ones that Indonesian student used the most, followed by concession and contrast, cause and effect, and enumeration and order DMs. On the opposite side for Thai students, followed by questions on enumeration, order, cause and effect, and addition, in that order. This study also uncovered additional problems with the use of DMs, including the different kinds of DMs used, the absence of verbs in finite clauses, the use of DMs in complex sentences, run-on sentences, misuse of DMs, and repetitive DM use.

The difference between this study and the previous studies the data. This study collected data from the sixth semester Faculty of Foreign Languages students. The data used was argumentative text about bird conservation, and the DMs. It analyzed by using Fraser (1999) combined with Martínez (2004) theories for solving the first problem and Kao and Chen (2011) theory for answering the second problem of the study. This qualitative research that discussed about bird conservation is still limited because it is not only raises awareness of the importance of using DMs in writing but also makes students aware of their surroundings, beginning with learning about bird conservation. Then, this study discussed about the inappropriateness in using DMs in the argumentative texts. Previous studies

did not provide participants involved in data collection with a specific theme for their writing.

2.2 Concepts

There are two concepts as a main point in this study such as DMs and argumentative writing. Those concepts were to make the term in this study clearly and to make same perception with the readers.

2.2.1 Discourse Markers

DMs are group of linguistics item functioning within cognitive, expressive, social, and textual domains (Schiffrin et al., 2007). In theory, DMs are verbal and, at times, nonverbal mechanisms that contribute to the integrity of the discourse (Schiffrin, 1987). A DMs is a term or expression that helps in the control of discourse flow and structure. DMs are largely independent of grammar and do not generally modify the true conditional meaning of the sentence. In terms of writing, DMs assist in producing an effective and satisfying piece of writing

2.2.2 Argumentative Writing

The majority of the time, empirical research is required when writing an argumentative text, and the student can gather information by conducting interviews, surveys, observations, experiments, or literature reviews. The author should be aware of the various viewpoints on the subject so that they can choose a position and support it with research data (Rahimi, 2011). Argumentative writing is an important component of academic competence

development, and it is frequently used as an indicator of learners' language proficiency level in international exams such as the GRE, TOEFL, and IELTS. The ability to write an argumentative essay effectively is regarded as a distinguishing feature in universities that distinguishes proficient students from less proficient students (Mitchell, 2000).

Structure-based argumentation assists students in organizing their ideas, but this should include analyzing the relevance of all elements, as well as whether the claim is well supported by evidence, to ensure the overall quality of argumentative writing (Sampson & Clark, 2008; Stapleton & Wu, 2015). Most academic writing assignments call for the writer to present an argument supported by logic and evidence. The writer must consider his or her position, stance, or thesis statement while planning an essay or writing a response to the given question. One or two phrases in the introduction of the essay serve as the thesis statement, and a series of subject sentences—one in each paragraph—in the body of the essay serve to support it. Facts and illustrations gleaned from reading, studying, reflecting, observing, and analyzing are used to support each topic sentence (Bruffee, 1993).

2.3 Theories

In this study, a major theory was applied to answer the study's problem. Theoretical approaches were employed to determine the types and roles of DMs in argumentative writing. The theory is very closely tied to this study since the study's goal was to identify the sorts of DMs and to how the students used DMs while making argumentative text. This study

employs a combination of theories, namely Fraser (1999) with Martínez (2004). Fraser's theory employs four different types of DMs, which are combined with two different types of DMs from Martínez's theory. The two theories are quite representative of the types and are also useful when conducting research.

2.3.1 The Nature of Discourse Markers

DMs have become a growth market in linguistics (Modhish, 2012). DMs have been studied in a range of languages and investigated in a variety of genres and interactive scenarios since the late 1980s. DMs are sequentially dependent items that surround a unit of speech. It is said primarily to call attention to a particular kind of future utterance within the existing discourse context. DMs can convey specific speech acts, explicitly define the discourse's structure, and give the hearer additional context (Zhang, 2012).

Fraser state has a similarity. DMs are phrases that connect each segment (sentence) or introduce a separate message with its conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositional content. DMs must be distinct from other function words, which typically appear at the beginning of sentences in order to resume the discourse (Fraser, 1999). The basic conjunctions and then are frequently used in the natural statements listed above, not only to connect individual utterances within turns but also at the beginning of turns to connect one speaker's turn with another speaker, link back to an earlier turn of the current speaker, or otherwise mark a change in topic or subtopic.

As a result, the conjunctions are best understood of as DMs, as they organize and manage extended stretches of discourse (McCarthy, 1992).

The term which Halliday refers to as DMs, refers to the employment of formal markers to connect sentences, clauses, and paragraphs. He also stated that they are not primarily instruments for reaching out into the previous text, but rather communicate certain meanings that need the presence of other components in the discourse (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). One type of cohesive device is the DMs device. This demonstrates how the subsequence sentence to another phrase must be connected to another, based not only on the text meaning but also on the contextual subject.

DMs are distinct from other coherent connections such as reference, substitution, and ellipsis. Because they are not the major methods for achieving into the previous or following text, DMs do not have particular meaning like other cohesive relations, but they express specific meaning that demonstrates the presentation of other components in the discourse. Furthermore, DMs can be defined as cohesive by focusing on one single feature of them that is tied to other, structural ways, rather than on the semantic connections as such, as realized throughout the language's grammar (Ketabi & Jamalvand, 2012).

Conjunction is used to produce grammatical cohesion in texts that demonstrate the link between phrases. Conjunction refers to other portions of the text in order to make the relationship between sentences exceedingly

clear. Nevertheless, some researchers used various namely, although the majority of researchers agreed on identifying as DMs. Most researchers nowadays employ Halliday theories to help students comprehend discourse markers more easily. Thus, we can deduct from the above statements that DMs are a form of cohesive device that is employed to link separating messages on the text or to introduce segments to other segments.

2.3.2 Cohesion and Coherence

Cohesion is a concept used to define the relationship between meanings in a text. According to (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) that cohesion occurs once interpretation of a text part is dependent on another. The lexicogrammatical system helps to realize the textual quality of cohesion. Coherence, on the other hand, is the outcome of how the text has been interpreted. This implies that certain writings may be intelligible and understandable to some readers while being incomprehensible to others.

A set of well-connected phrases is considered to be cohesive and coherent. The two technical phrases used to express the connectivity of the sentence and concepts in the text are cohesion and coherence. The usage of specific objects that cannot be interpreted without the source to what came before them indicates cohesiveness.

2.3.3 Types of Discourse Markers

Fraser (1999) combined with Martínez (2004) define as a pragmatic class of lexical expressions derived primarily from conjunctions, adverbs, and

prepositional phrases in syntactic structure. There are four subcategories based on (Fraser, 1999) which are contrastive markers, inferential markers, elaborative markers, reason markers, and two subcategories according to (Martínez, 2004), conclusive markers and exemplifier markers. So, these are the types of discourse markers:

1. Contrastive Markers

(Fraser, 1999) states the contrastive markers can be either direct, an implied, a presupposed, or an entailed message. Contrastive markers are DMs that indicate the explicit interpretation of one segment in contrast to the interpretation of the previous segment. For more clearly according to Fraser's, these are a little example about contrastive markers:

- a. Harry is old enough to drink. *However*, he can't because he has hepatitis.
- b. It is freezing outside. I will, *in spite of* this, not wear a coat.
- c. We don't have to go. I will go, *nevertheless*.

(Fraser, 1999: 938)

2. Elaborative Markers

The frequent use of elaborative markers may be explained by the fact that descriptive writing in general necessitates the elaboration of concepts, which is dependent on the use of elaborative markers to indicate the links between segments. The examples of elaborative markers were taken from Fraser (1999):

- a. The U.S policy is crazy. *Furthermore*, I love you anyway.
- b. I will help you. *Similarly*, I will take care of Martha.

(Fraser, 1999: 941)

3. Inferential markers show that the current utterance conveys a message that is in some way, consequential to the previous utterance (Kao & Chen, 2011). For a clearer understanding of inferential markers, consider the following:

- a. Susan is married. *So*, she is no longer available I guess.
- b. Will he be able to leave *then*?

(Fraser, 1999: 944)

4. Reason Markers

Tavakoli & Karimnia (2017) argue a reason DMs indicates that the following sentence is a reason for the preceding sentence. To have a clearer understanding of reason markers, consider the following:

- a. I want to go to the movies. *After all*, it's my birthday.
- b. I'm not going to live with you anymore, *since* I can't stand your cooking.
- c. Take a bath right away, *because* we have to get going.

(Fraser, 1999: 948)

5. Conclusive Markers

Martinez's theory of DMs will complete subcategories theory of Fraser's, these markers is to show conclusion to what has been

mentioned before. (Martínez, 2004) provided the following instances of conclusive markers:

- a. In short
- b. In conclusion
- c. To sum up
- d. Finally

(Martínez, 2004: 69)

6. Exemplifier Markers

As an exemplifier, the discourse marker indicates a difference between the utterance in which it appears and the notion that utterance is meant to reflect (Jucker, 1997). Here's an example of an exemplifier marker, according to Martinez's:

- a. For example
- b. Such as
- c. For instance

(Martínez, 2004: 69)

2.3.4 Types of Inappropriateness

Kao and Chen (2011) conduct on discourse markers which is focused on the inappropriateness of discourse markers itself. Kao and Chen generalized six types of inappropriateness of discourse markers in the present study, which are non-equivalent exchange, overuse, surface logicity, wrong relation, semantic incompleteness, and distraction.

1. Non-equivalent Exchange

This type used to convey the same textual relation in an interchangeable manner when they are not. Here's the example of non-equivalent exchange.

- a. Those are the images of the UK that the Communists want to impose on the local Chinese. *On the contrary*, they describe the communists as patriotic Chinese who did not show the slightest fear.

(Kao and Chen, 2011: 313)

2. Overuse

Discourse markers use with high density in short texts, making texts fragmental and readers unable to expect where texts are going to lead. Kao and Chen (2011) provided following instance of overuse.

- a. The communicative approach proves not only practicable for juniors, but also for senior. *However*, only the junior forms were observed. *Nevertheless*, the study in juniors is essential for this is the stage when students establish the right ways of learning English.

(Kao and Chen, 2011: 314)

3. Surface Logicality

This type used to impose logicality to texts or bridge the gap among propositions when there exists no deep logicality in texts. To have clearer understanding of surface logicality, consider the following:

- a. This question means the same as 'Evaluate the degree to which Japanese imperialism was a result of militarism.' So this question

requires an independent argument about them. *So* the student must think critically if Japanese imperialism was a result of militarism.

(Kao and Chen, 2011: 314)

4. Wrong Relation

Wrong relation used to express certain textual relation that it does not express. The example of wrong relation was taken from Kao and Chen (2011).

- a. Many studies have showed that it would be better for the hearing disabled to have the cochlear implant at an early age. *Also*, if implanted the cochlear implant at the age one to two, their language learning could come out of great improvement.

(Kao and Chen, 2011: 314)

5. Semantic Incompletion

The context where discourse markers are used needs more elaboration to make the discourse markers functional. This is little example about semantic incompletion.

- a. After finishing the competitive entrance exam, you enter the college. *However*, nowadays, graduating from college not necessarily guarantees you future.

(Kao and Chen, 2011: 314)

6. Distraction

The context in using distraction would be coherent itself without the use of the discourse markers or that the use is redundant. For a clearer understanding of distraction, consider this following:

- a. Statistics that four countries had higher averages of education than Taiwan. *For example*, the percentage to get admitted to college of Finland and South Korea is 90 percent, New Zealand with 86 percent and Sweden with 84 percent.

(Kao and Chen, 2011: 314)

