

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Background of the Study

With no doubt, in delivering the ideas, certain messages or even the purpose of the communication, the expression is needed to be understood based on the meaning of the message is about. And it can be found generally in our language used and communication. Well in order to achieve a good communication, it is needed the tools of language which discourse markers (DMs) are some of them. There are a lot of definitions describes what DMs is, it refers to pieces of language that is larger than a sentence which has function together in delivering idea or information, it is a linguistic device which are applied to hang the pieces of language expression together (Sharndama & Yakubu, 2014). It's supported by Swan (2005) states that DMs are words and expressions which were used in order to portray our discourse structurally; they are functioned to serve the purpose of connecting or linking what we are saying, what we have said, and what will be said. Discourse markers (DMs) are the important elements of language in conversation, or in any kind of interactive face-to-face or non-face-to-face spoken exchange. And it is occurring conversation naturally, including classroom talk and phone conversation, they are characterized by discourse markers not only to provide coherence, but also to serve other essential functions such as regulating turns and signaling utterances with actions relevant to those in prior units.

In short, DMs refers to words or phrases in order to help readers or even listeners in comprehending a text of the speaker or writer (Bantawig, 2019). In

conclusion, they play a significant role in achieving the good communication. Hence, DMs serve as vehicles or tools in ascertaining relationships between speaker and listener phatic purposes stated by (Alami, 2015; Buyukkarci and Genc, 2009) and it has been agreed that Discourse Markers have a crucial role in the organization of interlocutors' speech. It helps the communicator to understand speech and information progression and to facilitate speakers' comprehension by creating a smooth and spontaneous interaction among them. Besides using Discourse Markers makes the spoken English sound more fluent and natural, and it may help to fill in some of the "pause" in speaking, as it's seen in this preliminary data below :

This preliminary data were taken at Harford Institute at Jl. Sekaming No. 17 Sekip Medan Petisah, from Intermediate Level Students when they conducted ODT (Oral Diagnostic Test).

M : What do you think about national examination ?

*SI : Well, in my opinion we need to, **eumm** have to be in government side, why they still implement the national examination, if they know that, that is not as working as it should be*

M : So you meant you agree with the implementation of national examination?

*SI : **no**, we should think first in detail why it is still used.*

M : okay

From the preliminary data above, it could be seen that there are 3 markers occurred in the conversation that uttered by students in nonformal education. They are **well**, **Eum**, **so**, **okay**.

well there as linking adverbial which is to show the connection among expression and the earlier talk and it occurred as the initial, **eum** in the second clause which is categorized Hesitator marker, in order to fill the hesitation pauses

in speech, it can be seen that the student was thinking pause the sentence in order to think about another ideas. **No** is categorized as Response forms, as a response to question as yes or no, in this category it's seen that student directly responded the question given by the teacher.

In day by day life, what individuals say during regular correspondence is semantic, paralinguistic, nonverbal components that signal connection between units of talk. It is utilized to show the intelligibility between units of talk, to guarantee that their messages are completely perceived and processed by the public Bantawig (2019). These are developing number of studies and exploration interest on phonetic things like *you know*, *OK* and *well* that individuals use in composed and spoken setting since Schrifin (1987)

Trihartanti (2017) analyzed the different use of discourse markers in spontaneous and non-spontaneous utterances, after being analyzed, it could be concluded that both spontaneous and non- spontaneous utterances, discourse marker 'hmm' as 'filler' is mostly used. The other discourse markers used by students are 'yes', 'oh', 'well', 'I see'. Discourse markers used in spontaneous utterance are more various, but at the same time the mistakes made in using them are also more.

The researcher found another phenomenon through this preliminary data which also were taken in Harford Institute during the pre-lesson in the class

T :okay, straight up to the questions please
S(NTH) : **Miss** do you know Jessica Iscandar? **Euh** the artist?
T : the kid is bule ? (foreigner)
S(NTH) : **hmm**, handsome right miss?
T : ha what about it?

There were 3 discourse markers applied by the student in the data above, they were **Miss**, **Euuh**, and **hmm**. Based on the theory proposed by Biber, et.al (1999:1083), **Miss** in the utterance belongs to Vocative Discourse Markers, which used by student as an addresses, it's clearly that the ideas or information next after the vocatives was intentionally given to the teacher, and it's realized in the initial position, and followed by another discourse markers **euuh** which belongs to hesitator marker, this marker showed up and applied by the students as a pause in a speech, it's seen after that the student continuing the sentence, next is **hmm** this is commonly used also as a part of hesitator, and it's also supported by the findings found in the previous research done by Trihartanti (2017) which claimed that "hmmm" mostly used as part of hesitator, but in this data it's found as a response forms as a yes.

Based on the phenomenon above, it has been found that this study were discussed about the discourse markers used by students in nonformal education in order to prove whether the result would be different or similar with the previous study if it was analyzed in students of nonformal education, and also it comes to conclusion that DMs are taking big role in how conversation is objectified, formed and transferred well. It assists the speaker dealing with the discussion and imprint when it changes. They are a set of clues which create cohesiveness, coherence, and meaning in discourse, Martinez (2004). Discourse markers do this by showing turns, combining thoughts, showing demeanor, and by and large controlling correspondence. A few group think discourse markers as an element of communicated in language only, in fact, they are fundamental for making a discussion seem normal and familiar

From the wonder has been expounded above demonstrated that DMs are an intriguing subject to examine, practicing the sorts, realizations and the reasons of discourse marker utilized in a speaking. Inside the previous fifteen years or more, there has been expanding interest in the hypothetical status of Discourse Markers, zeroing in on what they are, what they mean, and which capacities they are taking job in talking. It is likewise fortified by some different scientists who have examined in a similar field, one of them is Fung and Carter (2007) investigate about Discourse Markers in teacher talk which are still under-investigated, so far little consideration has been paid to the utilization and elements of Discourse Markers as one fundamental interactional factor in classroom teacher-student conversation. It is in accordance with another analysts named Ozer and Okan (2018) which targets deciding discourse markers utilized by Turkish instructors and local educators in EFL classrooms and looking at these things as far as assortments and frequencies, the outcomes demonstrated that Turkish educators utilized 29 diverse discourse markers and local teachers utilized 37 distinctive discourse markers in their classroom talk. It was likewise seen that Turkish teachers underused most discourse markers contrasted with local teachers in EFL classrooms.

Followed by another analysis done by Karlina, Suparno and Setyaningsih (2017) who discuss Discourse markers (DMs), the exploration utilized contextual analysis strategy. Also, the source of data were taken two English teachers teaching six EFL classroom in a secondary school in Surakarta, this examination portrays the event and literary elements of DMs utilized by the instructors. The information investigation uncovers that there are 19 types of DMs, either in

English, Indonesian, or Javanese language, utilized by the two teachers in their classroom talk

From those previous studies and the phenomenon found that have been analyzed above proved there are some similarities could be found in this research within the previous journals, but the types, the realization, reasons of discourse markers used by the students in nonformal education are the focus of this research.

The application of this research was very possible to be done, and the location will be nonformal education called Harford Institute. And the researcher also is one of the teachers there. So, in order to get the data can be obtained directly when teaching naturally.

In light of the assertion above, it is obviously expressed that this research was directed under the title Discourse Markers Used by Students In Nonformal Education.

1.2. The Problem of the Study

In light of the discussed background, the problems are detailed as the accompanying:

1. What types of discourse markers are used by students in nonformal education?
2. How are the discourse markers realized by students in nonformal education?
3. Why are the discourse markers realized in the ways they are

1.3. The Objectives of the Study

Corresponding to the problems of the study, the objectives of the study are;

1. To investigate the types of discourse markers used by students in nonformal education,
2. to evaluate the discourse markers realized by students in nonformal education, and
3. to elaborate the reasons of occurrence of discourse markers used by students in nonformal education.

1.4. The Scope of the Study

This research limited into discourse markers used in nonformal education. This study was focused on the students' utterances that uttered by the students, the types which were used and how they were used, why they were used as the way they are.

1.5. The Significances of the Study

The findings of the study are expected in theoretically and practically;

Theoretically, the findings of the research are expected to add up new horizons in pragmatic study. In addition, hopefully, the findings will explore the new ideas for other researchers in investigating the language used in social context along with its functions in society itself, and also be able to give much contributions and insights to apply linguistics particularly in the English which

can be used as a reference for the similar study with different focus or object in the future. Briefly, the findings can add up more horizons to linguistics.

Practically, the findings of the study can give contribution to other researchers as a guide line for them to conduct the further research related to pragmatic study. And it's also as knowledge to other learners in understanding the use of discourse markers. It is very useful to understand the language during interaction in nonformal education

