ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS USED IN WRITING AT FIFTH SEMESTER STUDENTS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION SECTION IN IAIN BUKITTINGGI

Melisa Renosari
IAIN Bukittinggi – West Sumatera
Email: melisa.renosari97@gmail.com

Abstract

This research was due to several problems found in the field; some students did not use discourse markers in writing to connect ideas. They said that they understood the lecturer's explanation about discourse markers, but they were difficult to use in the text. They had difficulty finding the appropriate discourse marker to use in the text. This study aimed to find out the kind of discourse marker students used in writing and the problems students had in using discourse markers. This research used descriptive quantitative as the research method. This study's population was 121 students in the fifth semester of the English language study program at IAIN Bukittinggi and used random sampling as a research sampling technique. The sample in this research was 24 students. In addition, data analysis was done by analyzing data, percentages and making conclusions. The researcher found some discourse markers used by students, 75% students using an elaborative marker, 64% students using an adversative marker, and 62,5% students using the causal inferential marker. Then, there were fourth problems students faced when using discourse markers. The problem was overused, non-equivalent exchange, mistranslation, misinterpreted relation.

Keywords: *writing, discourse markers*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini disebabkan oleh beberapa masalah yang ditemukan di lapangan; beberapa siswa tidak menggunakan penanda wacana untuk menghubungkan ide-ide. Mereka mengatakan bahwa mereka memahami penjelasan dosen tentang penanda wacana tetapi mereka sulit untuk menggunakannya dalam teks. Mereka mengalami kesulitan untuk menemukan penanda wacana yang tepat untuk digunakan dalam teks. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui jenis penanda wacana yang digunakan siswa dalam menulis dan masalah yang dihadapi siswa dalam menggunakan penanda wacana. Penelitian ini menggunakan deskriptif kuantitatif sebagai metode penelitian. Populasi dalam penelitian ini 121 siswa pada semester lima Program Studi Bahasa Inggris di IAIN Bukittinggi dan teknik pengambilan sampel digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Penelitian ini mengambil sampel sebanyak 24 orang siswa. Selain itu, analisis data dilakukan dengan menganalisis data, membuat persentase dan membuat kesimpulan. Peneliti menemukan beberapa jenis penanda wacana yang digunakan siswa, 75% siswa

menggunakan penanda elaboratif, 64% menggunakan penanda adversatif, dan 62,5% siswa menggunakan penanda inferensial kausal.. Lalu, ada dua masalah yang dihadapi siswa saat menggunakan penanda wacana. Masalah tersebut adalah siswa terlalu sering menggunakan penanda wacana, penempatan yang salah, salah menerjemah,

Kata kunci: *Menulis, Penanda Wacana*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a complex process that combines the process and product of writing. Linse and Nunan said that writing aims to gather ideas and work with them until they are presented in a polished way and understood by the reader. It means producing writing starts from gathering ideas, developing ideas until producing a product in a written form by paying attention to the grammar. Writing is different from other language skills because students compose the idea with several complicated processes. Meanwhile, in listening and reading, the students receive a message that is formulated by another. Therefore, writing needs much concentration and different processes in different steps: composting, developing, and finalizing. In writing, students can develop the ideas they want. To connect these ideas, they can use connectors. One of them is the use of discourse markers. Li-Feng said that discourse markers, expressions like *well, but, oh* and *y'know,* are one set of linguistic items that function in discourses of various styles or registers. As far as writing is concerned, the appropriate use of discourse markers helps the writer produce a useful text.

Based on preliminary research did in January 2019, by asking the fifth semester of English Education Section students to write, researchers found that more than half of the students did not use discourse markers even though they had been taught how to use them. They said that they understand the lecturer's explanation about discourse markers, but they were difficult to use in the text. They have difficulty finding the appropriate discourse marker to use in the text.

Based on the explanation above, it is a scientific reason for the researcher to research to analyze discourse markers used in writing at fifth-semester students of English education section in IAIN Bukittinggi.

METHOD

The researcher only analyzed and makes descriptions about students who used discourse markers in writing. So, descriptive quantitative research was the type of research that is most related to this study's purpose. This was in line with Setyosari stated that descriptive research aims to clarify or describe some conditions, events, objects, or everything relevant with a variable that could be clarified either with number or word. Moreover, Gay, et al., as quoted Amri (2017) say that descriptive study is important since investigations occur in educational research and are used as an analytical method by many researchers to gather data to fix educational issues.

The population of the research was all of the fifth-semester students in IAIN Bukittinggi. Based on the data above, the 5th-semester students consist of 3 classes. Then, the researcher used cluster sampling as a technique in taking the sample. According to Arikunto, determining the type of cluster or group must be carefully considered what the characteristics are. The sample was taken equally between three classes of the population.

The instrument that was used in research should be designed optimally in order to get the actual data. There were several instruments that the researcher could use in quantitative research, for instance, test. The test is a sequence of questions or exercises or other apparatus to measure skill knowledge, intelligence, ability, or aptitude of an individual or group. In this research, the researcher used a writing test. Students were given a test to write a paragraph in which there were several topics to choose from. Three lecturers validated this instrument.

The steps of the researcher in collecting data; the researcher gave the writing test by providing a topic, analyzed the students' writing using a

taxonomy of discourse marker following the taxonomy of discourse markers, and make a conclusion and make percentage about the use of students' taxonomy of discourse markers in writing.

After the data were collected, the researcher would analyze the data. The steps of data analysis of the students' who used discourse marker in writing as follow; analyzed the students' writing based on discourse marker, tabulate students' who used discourse marker based on writing of the students' and makes their percentage, find out the percentage of items, the researcher use

following formula, and conclude the results.

$$P = \frac{f}{n} \times 100\%$$

P = the percentage of the result

f = the frequency of students use discourse marker

n = total amount of the sample

FINDING AND DISCUSSION
Analysis of kind Discourse Markers used students.

In this study, the researcher conducted a writing test to determine the kinds of discourse markers used by students in writing. It can be seen in the following table:

Table 1.Percentage of students used Discourse Markers.

No	Taxonomy of Discourse Markers	Researcher	Rater 1	Rater 2	Percentage
1.	Elaborative marker	20 students (83%)	22 students (92%)	12 students (50%)	75%
2.	Adversative marker	15 students (62,5%)	14 students (58%)	17 students (71%)	64%
3.	Causal Inferential Marker	15 students (62,5%)	18 students (75%)	12 students (50%)	62,5%

Based on the table above, there are three kinds of discourse markers used by students: namely, elaborative markers, adversative markers, and causal inferential markers.

First, the researcher found 83% of students used elaborative markers, 62,5% of students used adversative markers, and 62,5% used causal inferential markers. Among the three kinds, the more dominant

kind used by students was the elaborative marker. The kind of elaborative markers that often used "*and, for example.*" For example, for clothes it's not difficult to find, *and* it's very different from being fat, to dress is difficult because it doesn't fit, and there are many problems that will be found if I am fat.

Second, rater 1 found that there were 92% of students using elaborative markers, 58% of students using adversative markers, and 75% of students using causal inferential markers. The dominant kind used is the elaborative marker. The kind of elaborative marker that is often used was "**and.**" For example: **and** another different between facebook and twitter.

Third, rater 2 found that 50% of students were using elaborative markers, 71% of students were using adversative markers, and 50% of students were using causal inferential markers. The dominant kind used is the elaborative marker. The kind of elaborative marker that is often used was **"and."** For example, interface facebook is more complex and very

twitter is simpler **and** tends to be less attractive to some people.

In conclusion, in writing, students already used discourse markers. Then, from the data, students are dominant using the kind of elaborative marker. At the same time, the kind of discourse marker that was rarely used was a causal inferential marker.

The problem used discourse marker.

There are four problems students found in using discourse markers in student writing. There are several problems students had using discourse markers. The first problem in using discourse markers was overuse. Overuse is the abundant use of discourse markers; in writing, students can use one discourse marker, but students used two discourse markers in one sentence. The researchers and the rater found that some students overuse using discourse markers. There are as many as students overused in using discourse markers. **For example; so, in conclude** a manual dictionary has more effect like that. Students put two kinds of discourse markers in

one sentence. Next example: **and then** on Facebook has play games while does not.

The second problem was the non-equivalent exchange. Non-equivalent exchange is incorrect placement. In writing, students use discourse markers that do not match their placement. Students put discourse markers out of place. Based on the researcher and rater's findings, students used discourse markers, but students make it wrong. **For example; twitter in other hand has a limit like 140 characters so we can't have long status.** Another example is **that the vocabulary offered in the phone dictionary is less than the manual dictionary, so we need our knowledge to utilize both of these tools.**

The third problem was a mistranslation. Mistranslation is the use of discourse markers originating from Indonesian translations. Mistranslation often occurs when students translate from Indonesian into English. There are several examples of student writing that show the use of the discourse marker mistranslation. **For example; so, I am so like with my body at this time, not so fat, not so slim.**

The fourth problem was misinterpreted relation. Misinterpreted relation is the use of discourse markers that do not match the relationship in the sentence. Some students misinterpreted relations using discourse markers in writing. **For example, other than that, the phone dictionary's vocabulary is less than the manual dictionary, so we need our knowledge in utilizing both of these tools.**

In conclusion, based on the results, found that the problem of students in used discourse markers. The problems in using discourse markers are non-equivalent exchange, overuse, mistranslation, and misinterpreted relation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, there are three kinds of discourse markers used by students, namely: elaborative markers, adversative markers, and causal inferential markers. Among these three kinds, students' dominant kind of discourse marker was 75%

using the elaborative marker, and then 64% of students used an adversative marker, and 62,5 students used causal inferential marker. Then, students faced problems when using discourse markers that were overused, non-equivalent exchange, misinterpreted relation, and mistranslation.

REFERENCES

Alice Oshima and Ann Hogue (1990). Writing in Academic English.

Amri, S. (2017). An Inquiry on the Students' Writing Competence of Analytical Exposition Text. *EJI (English Journal of Indragiri): Studies in Education, Literature, and Linguistics*, *1*(2), 63-77. https://doi.org/10.32520/eji.v1i2.225

Barry B Powel, writing.(2012): theory and history of the technology of civilization. UK: Blackwell publishing.

Caroline T. Linse and Davis Nunan. (2005), Practical English Language Teaching, Young Learners.

Douglas Biber. (2006). University language a corpus-based study of spoken and written register.

Graham Ranger. (2018). Discourse Markers An Enunciate Approach. Library of Congress Control.

Halliday M.A.K. & Hasan, R(1976). Cohesion in English.

Hongwei Zhao. (2014). The textual function of discourse marker under the framework of relevance theory.

Jeremy Harmer. The practice of English language teaching, Ed-7.35

Li-Feng. (2010). Discourse Markers in English Writing. The Journal of International Social Research.

Jean E.Fox Tree. (2014). Discourse markers in writing. Reprints and permissions: sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav.

Jozsef Horvath. (2001). Advanced Writing in English as a foreign language. The University of Peck.

Laurel J Brinton. (1996). Pragmatic Markers in English Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions. New York. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Dat.

Lucile Chanquoy. (2001). Through The Models Of Writing. Springer science business media, b.v.

Li-Feng. (2010).Discourse Markers in English Writing.The Journal of International Social Research.Volume 3 / 11.1

Miriam Urgelles Coll. (2010). The Syntax and Semantics of Discourse Markers. New York. Miriam Urgelles Coll,

Meredith D Gall. (2003). al., Educational Research: an introduction, (Pearson education, inc.

Nur Mukminatien. (2016). Students' Ability in Using Discourse Marker to build coherence in writing. Teflin Journal. Volume 27, 20.

Norman Blake. (2003). Analyzing Quantitative Data. (London: SAGE Publication.).

Simone Muller. (2005). Discourse marker in native and nonnative English discourse. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Svetlana V. Kogut. (2015). Types of Discourse Markers: their Ethnocultural Diversity in Scientific Text. International Conference for International Education and Cross-cultural Communication.

Setyosari Punaji.(2010). Methode Penelitian Pendidikan dan Pembangan.

Sugiyono.(2011).Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan R&D. Alfabeta Bandung.Bandung.

Syahrul,widya Astuti.(2018) An Analysis of Students' Anxiety in Academic Writing at Sixth Semester Students Of English Education Department in Iain Bukittingi Academic Year 2017/2018, IAIN Bukittinggi, educative journal: Vol 1, (1).

Widya Safitri.(2016) The implementation of the genre-based approach in teaching writing at SMA 4 Solok, IAIN Bukittinggi, Journal Polingua: Vol 5 (2).