



<https://jurnal.unigal.ac.id/index.php/jeep>

P-ISSN: 2460-4046

English Education Program

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education

Galuh University

Received:	Accepted:	Published:
August 2021	September 2021	October 2021

DISCOURSE MARKERS IN ABSTRACTS OF INTERNATIONAL JOURNALS

Nurlaela Rahayati

nurlaelarahayati@gmail.com

English Education Program FKIP Galuh University

Rina Herlina

rherlina85@yahoo.co.id

English Education Program FKIP Galuh University

Aa Surahmat

andesva76@gmail.com

English Education Program FKIP Galuh University

Abstract

This study investigated discourse markers used in international journal' abstracts. This study was aimed at finding out: a) discourse markers used in abstracts of international journals, and b) the most dominant types of discourse markers used in international journal' abstracts. The study employed six abstracts of international journals chosen randomly as the sample of the study. The study utilizes qualitative descriptive design. In data analysis, this study used Fraser's theory (1999) that emphasized on four types, namely contrastive marker, elaborative marker, inferential marker, and temporal marker. In addition, the result shows that there are four types of discourse markers found in international journal's abstracts. Elaborative marker are the most dominant types; marker *and* is the overuse in the abstracts. It occurred 56 times of the total six abstracts of international journals followed by 2 times for marker *also, moreover, in addition, therefore, then, thus, so, or, then*, 1 time for marker *in addition, furthermore, for instance, beside, although, in contrast, in spite of, whereas, however, nonetheless, result indicate that, in conclusion, the result of, because, and finally*. Moreover, the study found contrastive markers consisted of *although, in contrast, in spite of, whereas, however, and nonetheless*. Elaborative markers consist of *and, or, in addition, furthermore, for instance, beside, and moreover*. Inferential markers consist of *so, therefore, thus, then, result indicate that, the result of, in conclusion, and because*. Temporal markers consist of *finally*. This study concludes that the most dominant types of discourse markers was elaborative markers due to the excessive use in the 6 abstracts.

Keywords: *abstract, discourse analysis, discourse markers, journal*

INTRODUCTION

Discourse analysis is an increasingly famous and essential language spot which discuss not only about language but also regarding the society, culture, and notion. It includes analyzing both language form and functions, and includes the study of both spoken interaction and written texts. Particularly, in spoken and written communication, Schiffrin (1987, p. 54) as cited in Razak, Purwadina, & Huda (2017), claims that “discourse markers are verbal and non-verbal tools that form the unity of the discourse”.

Discourse markers allows us to use an effective and satisfactory piece of writing, and takes part as far as writing is included in communication. Fraser (1999, p. 950) clarified that discourse marker is a pragmatic class, lexical expression drawn from the syntactic classes of conjunction, adverb, and prepositional phrases. This includes an examination of how discourse is developed by connection among participants and the effect discourse has upon social identities and relations (Paltridge, 2007, p.2).

Discourse analysis relates to the study of the connection between language and the contexts in which it is used. It can be both written text and spoken data formally or informally. Yule (1983, p. 1) states that, “the analysis of discourse means how to use language”. Discourse analysis is divided into spoken and written discourse. However, the data of this study focuses on written discourse.

One of branches of Discourse Analysis is Discourse Markers. Fraser (1999) emphasizes that discourse markers as a lexical expression adapted primarily from the syntactic classes of conjunction, adverbs, and prepositional phrases. Accordingly, Fraser (1999, p. 931) explains that there are four classes of discourse markers and its functions, such as: contrastive markers, elaborative markers, inferential markers, and temporal markers.

Contrastive markers is a denial or a contrast utterance of some proposition related to the preceding discourse (*all the same, but, contrariwise, con-versely, despite, however*). Elaborative markers sign that the present utterance bases an elaboration of a previous one (*above all, also, besides, better, for ex-ample, for instance, further (more), in addition*). Inferential markers, which mark that the current utterance delivers a message which is, in some certain extents, relevant to some previous aspects (*accordingly, as a consequence, as*

a result, consequently, hence, in this/that case, of course, so, then, therefore, thus). The expression of temporal markers consists of: *then, after, as soon as, before, eventually, finally, first, immediately afterwards, meantime, meanwhile, originally, second, subsequently, when*.

Discourse markers can be identified in the area of writing academic, one of them is journal. Generally, journal is as an indicator of proper scientific research consisting of title, abstract, introduction, theory, methods, results, discussion, summary and conclusion Socolofsky (2004).

There are three research related to the present topic (Razak, Purwadina, & Huda, 2017; Sharndama and Yakubu, 2013; Zarei, 2013). Unlike the previous studies aforementioned, the present study is intended to investigate the discourse markers used and the most dominant types of discourse markers used in international journal abstracts.

METHOD

This study used descriptive qualitative study in which it provides the description of events, people, place, and activities (Creswell, 2012, p. 274; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). This study was classified as a discourse analysis, as a part of qualitative study, at which the method provides the process of theorizing language (Willig, 2008, as quoted in Adjei, 2013).

To follow Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Razavieh, (2010, p. 457), This study utilizes document analysis that implemented “to written or visual materials to identify specific material characteristics”. The documents are gathered from qualitative and quantitative international journals about Teaching English Foreign Language at which their abstracts are used. Those journal abstracts used 3 qualitative and 3 quantitative paradigm. This study determined six international EFL journal because they have good qualification. Then, each of three journals generally has diverse style and culture in writing. So, it provides a lot of chances to investigate discourse markers used by the authors.

Meanwhile, content analysis is used to analyse the data which only focused on the international journal abstracts. The data analysis used three steps adopted from Miles and Huberman (1994). Regarding the first technique, data reduction, some words were marked in international journal abstracts containing discourse markers and created codes or categorization. The second technique is data display at which all Discourse Markers

variants were classified based on Fraser (2009). Each discourse marker occurred in each abstract was noted in a table displaying types of international journal abstracts, markers, number of frequencies, and group of discourse markers. The last steps is drawing conclusions and verifying them as a means of testing the validity of findings.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, 10 international journal abstracts were collected. However, just 6 abstracts were analyzed including three abstracts qualitative and three abstracts quantitative of international journal. Finally, the findings of what was being concerned with the study were displayed. The content analysis was used to answer two research questions. Those research question are “What discourse markers are used in abstracts of international journals?” and “What is the most dominant types of discourse markers used in abstracts of International journals?” The writer analyzed discourse markers based on Fraser (1999)

Discourse Markers Used in Abstracts of International Journal

In this study, the writer analyzed six international journal abstracts about teaching English for foreign language, following to the four types of discourse markers by Fraser (1999), contrastive marker, elaborative marker, inferential marker and temporal marker. As the matter of fact, the analysis in this study was purposed to answer the first research question. In this present study, the discourse markers were used in abstracts of international journals. All of details the data found are as follows:

Based on the data analysis, it was found that the discourse markers used in 6 abstracts of international journal are as follows: Abstract 1 consists of *and, although, in contrast, so, or*. Abstract 2 consists of *and, or, in spite of, therefore, in addition, then, furthermore, thus, finally*; then abstracts 3 consists of *and, also, for instance, whereas, besides, in addition, results indicate that*. But, in abstracts 4, there are only four markers: *and, moreover, in conclusion, the result of*, abstract 5 consists of *also, however, and, thus, nonetheless, therefore*. The last, abstracts 6 consists of *and, so, because, moreover, then*. From data analysis, journal abstract of 1, 2, and 3 are abstracts from qualitative international journal, and journal abstracts of 4, 5, and 6 are abstracts from quantitative international journal. However, there was no indication of a major difference in terms of

discourse markers variations between abstracts of qualitative and quantitative. That is based on differences the style and culture.

The Most Dominant Types of Discourse Markers Used in Abstracts of International Journal

The analysis result of the present study was purposed to answer the research questions number two. It revealed the most dominant types of discourse markers used in international journal abstracts. Based on the data analysis, it was concluded that the discourse markers used in 6 abstracts of international journal are as follows:

Abstracts 1 consists of *and* is used for 6 times, *although* is used 1 times, *in contrast to* is used 1 time, *so* is used 1 time, *or* is used 1 time. Abstracts 2 consists of *and* which is used 11 times, *or* is used 1 times, *in spite of* is used 1 times, *therefore* is used 1 time, *in addition* is used 1 time, *then* is used 1 time, *furthermore* is used 1 time, *thus* is used 1 time, *finally* is used 1 time. Then, abstracts 3 consists of *and* which is used 15 times, *also* is used 1 time, *for instance* is used 1 time, *whereas* is used 1 time, *beside* is used 1 time, *in addition* is used 1 time, *results indicate that* is used 1 time. But, in abstracts 4, there are only four markers: *and* is used 7 times, *moreover* is used 1 time, *in conclusion* is used 1 time, *the result of* is used 1 time. Abstracts 5 consists of *also* which is used 1 time, *however* is used 1 time, *and* is used 10 times, *thus* is used 1 time, *nonetheless* is used 1 time, *therefore* is used 1 time. The last, abstracts 6 consists of *and* which is used 7 times, *so* is used 1 time, *because* is used 1 time, *moreover* is used 1 time, *then* is used 1 time.

The data analysis shows that marker *and* is overuse. That marker is a kind of elaborative markers, in all abstracts marker *and* appeared 56 times, followed by marker *moreover*, *also*, *in addition*, *or* is used 2 times, and marker *therefore*, *then*, *thus*, *so* also emerged 2 times; those markers are kinds of inferential marker. Therefore, it was found that the most dominant type is elaborative marker because marker *and* is used more frequent than another marker. Its marker indicated one more extra item of the condition in the preceding sentence. According to Fraser (1999), "Discourse marker is a lexical expression taken mainly from the syntactic classes of conjunction, adverbs, and prepositional phrases". Based on the theory, it was found that there are conjunction and prepositional phrases.

CONCLUSIONS

This research investigated discourse markers and the most dominant types of discourse markers in International journal abstracts. The first findings showed that the discourse markers used in abstracts of international journals are 56 times for marker *and*, 2 times for marker *also, moreover, in addition, therefore, then, thus, or, so* 1 time for marker *in addition, furthermore, for instance, beside, although, in contrast, in spite of, whereas, however, nonetheless, result indicate that, in conclusion, the result of, because, finally*. Related to the most dominant types of discourse markers used in 6 international journal abstracts, the elaborative marker “*and*” was used more often than another marker. It indicates that it gives one more additional item of the condition in the previous sentence. However, there was no sign of a main difference related to various discourse markers between qualitative and quantitative abstracts. That is based on diverse style and culture the authors.

REFERENCES

- Adjei, S. B. (2013). Discourse analysis: Examining Language use in context. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(25), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2013.1502>
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to research in education (Vol. 8)*. Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th edition)*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E., & Hyun, H.H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York, USA: The McGraw-hill Companies Inc.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 931-952. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)00101-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00101-5)
- Miles M.B. and A. Michael H. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage Publication.

- Paltridge, B. (2007). *Discourse analysis: An introduction (Continuum Discourse)*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Inc.
- Razak, A., Purwadina, W., & Huda, M. I. (2017). The diversity of discourse markers on *College Sophomores' Writing*, 295-301.
- Sharndama, E.C., & Yakubu, S. (2013). An analysis of discourse markers in academic report writing: Pedagogical implications. *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection*, Vol. 1 No. 3, 2013, 15-25.
- Socolofsky, S. A. (2004). How to write a research journal article in engineering and science. Retrieved from https://ceprofs.civil.tamu.edu/ssocolofsky/downloads/paper_how-to.pdf
- Yule, B. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zarei, F. (2013). Discourse markers in English. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4(1), 107–117.