

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter deals with the related literature about Discourse, the Nature of Discourse Markers, The Types of Discourse Markers, The Function of Discourse Markers, Problems in Using Discourse Markers, Theses Discussion, and The DMS Pattern in Indonesian EFL Learners.

A. Discourse

Discourse is the study of language units and language that consists of more than one sentence, linked by several related topic systems. The ultimate goal of discourse is to send messages from the speaker to the listener or the writer to behave and react according to the message.¹ Based on the media's delivery, discourse is divided into two types, namely written discourse and oral discourse. A discourse conveyed oral or direct in the verbal language is the oral discourse, while the kind of discourse presented in writing is called written discourse.² In this research, the writer only focuses on written discourse. One of the written discourses that must be produced by all students is a thesis.

¹ Arburim Iseni, et. al., "The Role of Discourse Markers and Cohesive Devices in Writing: EFL Students A Case Study," *Anglisticum Journal* 2, no. 4 (2013): 36.

² Cut Irna Liyana, "Cohesion and Coherence in English Education Students' Thesis," *Englisia* 1, no. 2 (2014): 282.

Discourse as coherent sentences that are sequential, spoken, or written in most problems. It can be lecture speeches to students or politicians, novels, and interviews, or a series of other events where speeches are sequential and related to each other. General use discourse is a type of language such as political, religious, or whatever happens to analyze its object's discourse. As a linguistic term, it contains two things: connected languages and how they communicate coherent thinking or ideas. It relates to how language units come together to deliver a message.³

B. The Nature of Discourse Markers

There is terminology from different discourse markers according to the expert perspective. In literature, discourse markers have been mentioned by several terms such as cohesive elements (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), conjunctions (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004), discourse markers (Schiffrin, 1987)⁴, pragmatic marker (Fraser, 1999), discourse operator (Redeker, 1991), conjunctive adverbs (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999), linking words (Boardman & Frydenberg, 2002), and linking adverbials (Biber et.al. 1999).⁵

A discourse marker is a class of verbal expressions of categories of sign words, conjunctions, and preposition phrases.⁶ Thus, the primary source of discourse markers consists of coordinate and subordinate conjunctions (and, or, but, because), adjectives (consequently, subsequently), and

³ Sharndama, and Samaila, *An Analysis of Discourse Markers.*, 43.

⁴ Deborah Schiffrin, *Discourse Markers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), *Discourse.*, 64.

⁵ Iseni, et. al., *The Role of Discourse Markers.*, 35-36.

⁶ Fraser, "What are.", 931.

preposition phrases (above all, on the other hand). They are grammatical or functional words by connecting ideas in writing, and do not convey or change the meaning of sentences.⁷ Discourse markers have special meanings negotiated by context; they signify the relationship between the second sentence (S2) and the first sentence (S1).⁸

Discourse markers act as a tool to get communication in the text. They are essential elements that help students produce meaningful sentences, provide unity for text, and link ideas to articles. Using frequent and skilled discourse markers demonstrates a higher level of fluency and the ability to produce and understand language authentically.⁹ Meanwhile, inadequate knowledge and improper use of discourse markers can cause difficulties in creating coherence because the existence of discourse markers shows the author's awareness in organizing the text.¹⁰

Sentences contain correct discourse markers when they fulfill three needs and sufficient conditions. Condition 1: discourse markers are lexical expressions, for example, *so*, *but*, and *in addition*. Condition 2: In the sequence of discourse segments S1-S2, discourse markers occur in S2, part of the second discourse segment. Condition 3: discourse markers do not contribute to the semantic meaning segment but signify certain semantic

⁷ Syahdanis, *An Analysis*., 157.

⁸ Bruce Fraser, "An Approach to Discourse Markers," *Journal of Pragmatics* 14 (1990): 390.

⁹ Sharndama, and Samaila, *An Analysis of Discourse Markers*., 44.

¹⁰ Ulin Ni'mah, "EFL Learners' Ability in Using Discourse Markers to Build Coherence in The Writing," *Journal of English for Academic and Specific Purposes* 2, no. 1 (2019): 54.

relationships that apply between the interpretations of the two segments of the Illocutionary Act, S1 and S2.¹¹

Based on the explanation above, the researchers concluded that discourse markers are words or phrases that are freely syndicated. They have an empty meaning because it does not change the meaning of the sentence itself. They are used to signal or connect the relationship between information in the discourse.

C. Types of Discourse Markers

Bruce Fraser in 2009 divided discourse markers into three classes: contrastive markers (CDMs), elaborative markers (EDMs), and inferential markers (IDMs).¹²

a. Contrastive Discourse Markers (CDMs)¹³

This type indicates that the message conveyed by S2 introduced by them directly or indirectly contrasts with S1.

An example of using CDMs in the sentence “Many teachers confuse textbooks, *whereas* publishers explained that textbooks are in line with the curriculum.”

b. Elaborative discourse markers (EDMs)

EDM shows that the markers in this discourse segment are elaborated in the S2, represented by the information in the S1.¹⁴

¹¹ Fraser, “An account., 298-299.

¹² Ibid., 300-301

¹³ Bruce Fraser, "Pragmatic Markers," *Pragmatics* 6, no. 2 (1996): 187.

¹⁴ Fraser, “An account., 301

An example of using EDM is in the sentence, “The students need to explore their reading skills, and they have to use reading strategies to make it easier in the understanding text.”

c. Inferential discourse markers (IDMs)

Inferential discourse markers are those who S2 provide the basis for concluding S1. The next sentence is the conclusion for the last sentence.

For instance, “Not all students have the same result in English *because* they have different strategies in the learning process.”

Based on the types of discourse markers above, the researcher concludes to use Bruce Fraser’s theory in 2009. The classes of discourse markers are shown in table 2.1

Table 2.1
Types of Discourse Markers based on Bruce Fraser’s Theory in 2009¹⁵

Types	Example
Contrastive markers	<i>But, although, whereas, on the contrary, in contrast (with/to this), contrary to, conversely, in comparison (with/to this), rather (than), instead (of), on the other hand, however, despite (doing) this/that, in spite of (doing) this/that, nevertheless, nonetheless, alternatively, contrariwise, expectations, even so, in spite of (this/that), notwithstanding, yet, regardless (of this/that), though, whereas, still, while, as a matter of fact, instead..</i>
Elaborative markers	<i>Namely, and, above all, in addition, also, besides, for another thing, moreover, furthermore, parenthetically, more to the point, in particular, analogously, by the same token, otherwise, correspondingly, equally, likewise, similarly, for instance, for example, alternatively, besides, more accurately, on top of it all, more importantly, more precisely, or, otherwise, also, too, in other words, rather, after all....</i>
Inferential markers	<i>So, of course, consequently, as a consequence, as a logical conclusion, because of, for this/that reason, hence, as a result, therefore, in this case, thus, on this/that condition, because, since, in summary, then, as a conclusion, it follows that, , accordingly...</i>

¹⁵ Ibid., 300-301.

D. The Function of Discourse Markers

Discourse markers perform various functions in discourse. The central part of the discourse marker is explicitly signaling a relationship between text units. Those markers signify the relationship between the next segment of discourse and the previous discourse segment, possibly produced by another speaker.¹⁶ They occur to maintain unity from text ideas and lead an essential role in academic writing.¹⁷ They are needed to mark coherence relationships in texts, mark illocutionary strengths or propositional, and mark interpersonal relationships.¹⁸ The various functions usually associated with discourse markers include an indicator of discourse relations, structuring discourse, organizing conversations, organizing interpersonal relationships, and showing politeness.¹⁹

Discourse markers are semantically empty and grammatically optional. On the contrary, discourse markers present a variation function of pragmatic. They are grouped into two main categories. First, textual processes associated with speaker structure mean text creates a cohesive discourse using language in a relevant context. Second, the interpersonal function refers to the social exchange's nature: the speaker and the listener's role.²⁰

¹⁶ Ibid., 296.

¹⁷ Asmaa Al-khazraji, "Analysis of Discourse Markers in Essays Writing in ESL Classroom," *International Journal of Instruction* 12, no. 2 (2019): 561.

¹⁸ Gisle Andersen, *Pragmatic Markers of Sociolinguistic Variation: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Language of Adolescents* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001), 147.

¹⁹ Kerstin Fischer, and Furko Peter, "Approaches to Discourse Particles," *Argumentum* 4 (2008): 229.

²⁰ Brinton, *Pragmatic Markers*, 35-40.

E. Problems in Using Discourse Markers

Six categories of students' problems of discourse markers usage, including distraction, non-equivalent exchanges, overuse, semantic incompleteness, surface logicity, and wrong relation problems are presented in table 2.2.

Table 2.2.
Students' Problems of Discourse Markers Usage
Adopted From Kao and Chen's Theory in 2011²¹

Students' Problems of DMS	Definition
Distraction	Unnecessary use of discourse markers, or the context of a text can be coherent by itself without any discourse markers.
Non-equivalent exchange	The use of discourse markers that are not following the order of writing or place discourse markers are out of place.
Overuse	The abundant use of discourse markers. The high density of use of discourse markers in short text.
Semantic incompleteness	The sentences they produce lack elaboration, so that discourse markers are less functional.
Surface Logicity	A discourse marker fails to impose logic from a segment without any deep meaning or relationship in it.
Wrong Relation	The use of discourse markers does not match the relationship in the sentence or fails to bridge meanings between contexts. The appropriate discourse markers from other types replace inappropriate discourse markers.

F. Theses Discussion

Writing text has an important role and is required for students as a prerequisite for university graduation. The university students are required to submit their final project as a report of a study. In writing research reports, a writer starts with the research question, which then changes to a thesis statement. This thesis statement requires the writer to increase their writing to

²¹ Tung-yu Kao, and Li-mei Chen, "Diagnosing Discoursal Organization in Learner Writing via Conjunctive Adverbial," *ROCLING Papers*, 2011: 313-314.

several pages coherently. The writer must think explicitly about organizing and expressing her/his feelings, thoughts, and ideas in an easy way to fit the reader's image and expectations.²²

The thesis is a scientific paper that requires the application of language rules and aspects of language.²³ It also consists of several sections or paragraphs related to each other to be understood by readers. As a complete discourse, the thesis must contain discourse markers. They are needed for the readers to receive information conveyed by the writer through the idea. Besides, awareness of using discourse markers will help the students obtain critical thinking, which they must develop according to their research.²⁴

The discussion is one of the essential parts of the thesis and the critical role of presenting the research result to be reported. It is the part of the report where the researcher summarizes the study results and relates them to the research questions study was intended to answer. In writing the discussion, generally, the long discussion section consists of 6 to 7 paragraphs. The discussion section is divided into three parts: the introductory paragraph, the intermediate paragraph, and the closing paragraph.²⁵

²² Suwandi, "Coherence and Cohesion: An Analysis of the Final Project Abstracts of The Undergraduate Students of PGRI Semarang," *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 5, no. 2 (2016): 254.

²³ *Ibid.*, 282.

²⁴ Ramos, Jennifer Tan-de, "A Comparative Study of the Discourse Marker Types in the Body Section of the Research Papers of DLSU Students," *Tesol Journal* 2 (2010): 63.

²⁵ Oner Sanli, et. al., "How to Write a Discussion Section?" *Turkish Journal of Urology* 39, no. 1 (2013): 22-23.

The introductory paragraph contains the primary idea studies without repeating the introductory section. The introductory paragraph contains a summary of the problem, what solution can be taken to solve this problem, the latest issues and differences, and how studies will contribute to this problem. Intermediate paragraphs of discussion contain the researchers' findings and compare them with the findings from other researchers. Previous research can be an explanation or reinforcement of the findings of researchers. Meanwhile, the last paragraph of the discussion section contains essential research points that the researcher should mention. Researchers also point out limits of their research to reflect the author's objectivity and provide answers to research questions. In the last paragraph, the author also writes implications for the future.²⁶

Writing a research discussion can lead the reader to follow the research where the project results are conducted and provide evidence. The researcher must manage several criteria to achieve research discussion writing, such as repeat research questions and following each question with a brief description of the relevant results. The researcher needs to show the limitations of the researcher's studies and discuss possible alternative explanations for the study results. Comparing the study results with the results of other studies with the same topic also be stated in the discussion.

²⁶ Ibid.

Moreover, the researcher needs to conclude by explaining the importance of this research and providing advice for more research.²⁷

Apart from components, a good thesis discussion is also needed good writing organization. The writer must look at this writing organization to provide an adequate discussion with neatly arranged elements. In arranging components and ideas in the study's discussion, it must be written clearly, cohesively and coherently in paragraphs. The writer must connect a sentence to others coherently to create unity among the paragraphs and transitions between paragraphs in order sentences in paragraphs are well ordered. The researcher should write the text in the discussion section in simple language to easy for readers to understand.²⁸

G. The DMs Pattern in Indonesian EFL Learners

The use of discourse markers in written products helps to improve their structure in the text. Written discourse is like an oral discourse, discourse markers as a communicative activity help communicative activities be more efficacious.²⁹ The variants of discourse markers frequently used by Indonesian EFL learners are discussed according to their types. They are elaborative, contrastive, and inferential markers.

²⁷ Livingston, *How to Write.*, 14-15.

²⁸ Frensiska Muslim, *An Analysis on Thesis' Background of Study Written by English Department Students of UMM*, Thesis, Malang: University of Muhammadiyah Malang, (2012) : 3-4.

²⁹ Ulin Ni'mah, "EFL Learners' Ability in Using Discourse Markers to Build Coherence in The Writing," *Journal of English for Academic and Specific Purposes* 2, no. 1 (2019): 49.

The elaborative marker appears six common variants used by Indonesian students, namely *and, also, for example, or, in addition, moreover, besides, such as*. The discourse marker *and, also* mostly used in the middle position of the sentences to draw additional information, and give signals of the previous statement.³⁰ Five common variants of contrastive markers used by Indonesian students are, *however, but, in contrast, on the other hand, although, on the contrary*. Those variants are perceived to be mostly used in the writing context to show contradictory relations or contrast ideas.³¹ The marker *but* used in the middle position and the grammatical status of this marker to connect two independent clauses of the text. Meanwhile, the inferential variant's common variant is *so, because, because of, therefore, in conclusion, then*. In discourse markers, *because* it is often used to show a causal relationship even though it is considered less formal to establish a causal relationship in academic writing and mostly occur in oral discourse.³² Besides, these markers tended to establish the causal relationship among clauses and to draw a conclusion.³³

³⁰ Novi Yanti, et. al., "The Use of Discourse Markers by EFL Students in Essay Writing," *International Conference on the Roles of Parents in Shaping Children's Characters* 3, no. 4 (2018): 418.

³¹ Titik Rahayu, and Bambang Yudi Cahyono, "Discourse Markers in Expository Essays Written by Indonesian Students of EFL," *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* 2, no. 2 (2015): 26-27.

³² Titik Rahayu, and Bambang Yudi Cahyono, "Discourse Markers", 27.

³³ Truly Almendo Pasaribu, "Male and Female Students' Use of Textual Discourse Markers in Writing Academic Essays," *Journal of Language and Literature* 17, no. 1 (2017): 78-79.