

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the research

Teaching English consists of teaching English skills and components. One of the productive skills that learners should master is speaking. Speaking can be called a technique of oral communication because speaking is one of the most significant abilities to improve learners' competence. Palmer writes in his book (2011) that "the vast majority of human communication is oral." Therefore, learners are required to speak with a variety of people face-to-face.

Teaching English consists of teaching English skills and components. One of the productive skills that learners should master is speaking. Speaking can be called a technique of oral communication because speaking is one of the most significant abilities to improve learners' competence. Palmer writes in his book (2011) that "the vast majority of human communication is oral." Therefore, learners are required to speak with a variety of people face-to-face.

Harmer (2011) states that speakers have a wide range of expressive options under their control. They can modify their tone and stress in addition to the words they use, which enables them to show which element of what they are saying is most significant. They can also effectively convey their attitude toward what they say by adjusting the pitch and intonation of their voice. According to American educators as stated in Walqui and Heritage

(2018), teachers develop discussions to encourage the right thoughts and information for learners. Following that, the teachers in the class attempt to systematize their thoughts and ensure that their language follows a consistent pattern.

In addition, Walqui and Heritage (2018) also explain that the characteristics of productive talk have many aspects, such as (1) having depth: the specific idea being discussed is central to the theme of the lesson, is presented in interconnected ways, and engages learners' analytical thinking. (2) sustaining: one student's statement is followed by another student's response, which extends, refutes, or questions what is first said. (3) controlling: learners control what they say, not the teacher. But teachers set up parameters for the interactions, sometimes framing questions that start the conversation. These questions are intended to communicate new related ideas and propose counter ideas or examples.

In reality, connectors in spoken English, such as "well," "alright," "now," "yeah," "I see," and so on, can be used naturally to combine and expand more complex words into sounds. Karlina and Setyaningsih (2015) state that the learners' speech should be organized appropriately to maintain the conversation's coherence and continuity. Therefore, learners need to employ Discourse Markers (DMs, henceforth) in their speaking in order to meet these characteristics and have relevant classroom interactions.

Classroom discourse is a type of discourse that takes place in a classroom setting. Classroom discourse analysis is a type of classroom

process study that allows teachers to keep track of both the quantity and intensity of their students' work. Classroom discourse analysis is simply defined as looking into the language used in the classroom to see how different patterns influence one another. (Lubis,2020).

Furthermore, Martn-Laguna and Alcon-Soler (2018) discover that DMs are one of the pragmatic elements that aim to make the conversation in the classroom more communicative. By adding certain terms of DMs, the interlocutor might easily get the point of what the speaker is talking about. After that, learners tend to use DMs as verbal aids for task handling and as aids to support the reasoning process during task performance, according to Gánem- Gutiérrez and Roehr (2011).

DMs are also important for learners to communicate effectively at the pragmatic level of interaction. As Lam (2009) points out, DMs help non-native English speakers achieve native proficiency in a second language. This sense of familiarity will assist learners in feeling at ease when learning a foreign language. They are pragmatic markers, according to Fraser (1996), which are viewed as meaningless terms that can only be understood by looking for clues in the context and situation. In contrast with him, Schriffrin (1987) called them DMs, which by definition is a linguistics element signaling the relationship between units of talk, exchange, and ideational level of discourse.

Thus, learners are to possess the pragmatic competence to communicate in English. They are knowledgeable about not only language usage but also language use. Pragmatic competence, according to Tauchi

(2009), is the capacity to use language effectively in a social situation. Furthermore, pragmatic competence can be used to reduce misunderstandings of the speech acts used in the classroom.

The information that the speaker-hearer utilizes to engage in communication, including how speech actions are successfully done, is referred to as pragmatic competence. Then, when foreign learners interact with their peers in English, this is referred to as an interlanguage pragmatic (ILP, henceforth). In other words, it is a study of the pragmatic competence of language speakers who have learned a second language which is not their mother tongue.

Related to this topic, there are previous studies related to the use of DMs in the classroom. The first study is conducted by Karlina, Suparno, and Endang (2015). The purpose of this study is to discuss DMs as a specific aspect of classroom interaction and language use. The qualitative study case approach is shown in this investigation. Then, the information is collected from two English teachers who instructed six EFL classes in a high school in Surakarta. The prevalence and textual functionalities of DMs used by teachers are described in this study. The data analysis reveals that there are 19 different varieties of DMs, all of which are in English, Indonesia, or Javanese. The fact that DMs are excellent resources for facilitating the structuring of classroom discourse shows that English teachers should be more aware of DMs' use in teacher talk.

Another study is conducted by Lubis (2020). The purpose of this study is to look at how teachers employ discourse markers in English

classroom interactions. In other words, this study aimed to determine the types of discourse markers that are most commonly utilized by teachers, as well as the reasons for their existence. The topic of this study is an SMP English teacher at Medan Swasta Pahlawan Nasional. This study uses a descriptive qualitative design. The information is obtained by observing and recording the words of the teacher as well as conducting an interview with the subject. Moreover, the data is analyzed using Fung's method and Carter's theory (2007). The research revealed that there are four types of discourse markers used by teachers in English classroom interactions, e.g., interpersonal, referential, structural, and cognitive. The English teacher used interpersonal the most, with 38.94 percent; referential 25.26 percent; structural 30.52 percent; and cognitive 5.26 percent. The presence category (teacher's belief) and the context category (the class in which the teaching process took place) both influenced why the instructor utilized interpersonal markers as the dominating one.

One more study is conducted by Khurtina (2015). The objective of this study is to determine which types of discourse markers the selected teacher uses to engage students in active learning in the classroom. Two teachers from Padwa Widyanata's Easy English Course are descriptively analyzed in six classroom observations. As a result of this observation, seven of the ten categories adopted by Awan (2005) and Carter et al. (2011) are employed by teachers who claim to have successfully used active communication in the classroom. Starting a conversation, responding, ending a conversation, changing a topic, showing surprise,

and conveying something in different ways are all examples of discourse markers. After that, the other three types managed to explain their meanings by using markers like sharing knowledge, sounding less direct, and using *um* and *erm*.

The research conducted for this paper is different from the studies previously mentioned. It is different from the data in several ways. First, the previous studies mostly based on the teacher talk and initiation-respond- feedback (IRF) meanwhile this study examines the different discourse markers that appeared between students' conversations in the classroom. Second, the theory also reveals the other distinctions. The theory presented by (Douglas Biber Biber, 1999; Hasniar, 2017; Nurul & Amrin, 2021) is employed in this study. In contrast, the previous research employed the theories presented by Fung and Carter (2007), Swan (2005), and Carter et al. (2011). Third, while the first study discussed function, this study focuses more on types and how the speaker and listener interpret the dialogue. Therefore, this study aims to fill the gap by examining the discourse markers used by learners in conversation classes and how they can help them make their speech more understandable in speaking classes.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

This general study entitled “Investigating the Use of Discourse Markers by Learners in their Speaking Performance” aims to examine two primary questions, which comprises of:

1. What types of DMs are used by the learners in classroom interaction?
2. Do the DMs employed by the speakers assist them to make their talk

understandable?

1.3 Research Objective

The study's objective is to investigate the types of discourse markers employed by the learners in the classroom interaction and how the speakers assist them in making their discussion understandable, which is in line with the problem description above.

1.4 Scope and Limitation

In an attempt to concentrate the study's limitation, this study focuses primarily on investigating the different discourse markers used by the learners in their classroom interactions and how the speakers help them to make their discussions understandable. The study's scope area includes EFL students who employed discourse markers during speaking interactions. This study uses a descriptive case study methodology as to represents the three group of discussion from STBA LIA Jakarta to obtain more information by observing an online classroom using Google Classroom (GCR). The study will quickly discover the primary focus of this investigation by determining the scope and limitations.

1.5 Research Methodology

1.5.1 Method

A case study methodology is used in this study's descriptive qualitative research. The author employs this qualitative research and uses observation to acquire a comprehensive understanding of the types of discourse markers and how speakers facilitate their understanding.

1.5.2 Data Source

In conducting this research, the second semester speaking class of

STBA LIA Jakarta is presented as the data source for this study's data source. The author selects three groups from a total of ten groups, whose topics are about "How to deal with bullying," "Love is blind," and "Celebrating the New Year." This observation is obtained from a video conversation that they submitted to Google Classroom.

1.5.3 Data Collection

The data collection is taken either from group discussion. In this study, the writer chooses data recording as an instrument to collect the data. These are some steps as follows:

1. Collecting the video conversation one by one
2. Selecting the relevant data relating to the study
3. Listening to the group conversation from start to finish
4. Transcribing the group conversation into notes
5. Highlighting the DM's word or phrases that will be analyzed

1.5.4 Data Analysis Techniques

The steps of data analysis are to:

1. Classifying the various types of DMs that appeared in the conversation
2. Categorizing the DMs markers used by the speakers using (Douglas Biber Biber, 1999; Hasniar, 2017 ;Nurul & Amrin, 2021) theory
3. Analyzing the DMs whether they assist the speakers to make their talk understandable

1.6 The Organization of Writing

This research is divided into four chapters. In the first chapter, the introduction, the researcher explains the background of the study; statement of problems; scope and limitation; research methodology; and organization of writing. Second chapter, describes the theory used in this research. Third chapter, the researcher demonstrates how the data is analyzed. The fourth chapter, describes the overall finding and conclusion of the research.