# English Education Journal

# Comparison of the Use of Discourse Markers in English Speeches between Non-Native and Native Speakers of English

**Eva Yulita** ✉, **Dwi Rukmini, Widhiyanto Widhiyanto**

Universitas Negeri Semarang

| Article Info | Abstract |
|---|---|
| | This study revealed the comparison of the use of discourse markers in English speeches between non-native and native speakers of English. The study focused on the types of discourse markers, the similarities and the differences between non-native and native speakers in using discourse markers. This study employed a qualitative research design with the data from the spoken discourse. The findings of the study showed that there were ten sub-categories of discourse markers that are practiced by non-native speakers, namely: assessment marker, manner of a speaking marker, evidential markers, hearsay markers, contrastive discourse markers, elaborative discourse markers, inferential discourse markers, discourse management markers, topic orientation markers, and attention markers. On the contrary, there were nine sub-categories of discourse markers that existed in English speeches, especially delivered by the native speakers such as assessment marker, manner of a speaking marker, evidential markers, hearsay markers, contrastive discourse markers, elaborative discourse markers, inferential discourse markers, topic orientation markers, and attention markers. The total of discourse markers produced by the non-native speakers was 301 utterances while native speakers of English were 269 utterances. Therefore, it is concluded that discourse markers were useful in English speeches either by non-native speakers or native speakers. |

✉Correspondence Address:
Kampus Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Semarang, Jl Kelud Utara 3, Semarang, 50233
E-mail: eva.yulita10@gmail.com

**INTRODUCTION**

In communication, discourse markers are important things to convey the messages of the utterances. Dscourse markers dealt with the connective words in the utterances. According to Fraser (2009) discourse markers are groups of expressions that exist some signals. Besides, discourse markers refer to the element of language that use to bracket unit of talks (Schiffrin, 1987). Lewis (2006) stated that discourse markers concern with the ranges of form function mapping, rather than a set of forms. In the case of discourse markers, there are some words or phrases that included in discourse markers such as *and, but, so, also, I mean, you know, in summary, as a result, however, anyway,* etc. Those markers implied different functions of the utterances. They refer to the depending on the context of the utterances.

The functions of discourse markers also depend on how the speakers present the markers in their speeches or texts. Schiffrin (1987) as cited in Tannen et al. (2015) divided discourse markers into some types namely interjections, conjunctions, adverbs, and lexicalized phrases. Fraser (2009) classified discourse markers in some categories such as basic pragmatic markers, commentary pragmatic markers, discourse markers, and discourse structure markers. Besides, Redeker (1990) as cited in Ogi (2009, p.12) argued that discourse markers classified in several types like ideational markers (simple connectives, semantically rich connectives, and another temporal adverbial), and the pragmatic markers made up (conjunctions, interjections, and comment clauses). However, Naben et al. (2019) argued that discourse markers divided into two categories verbal and visual. The verbal discourse markers included basic markers, commentary markers, parallel markers, and discourse markers (Fraser, 1996, cited in Naben et al 2019), while the visual markers consisted of thinking face, pointing with gaze, hand movement, and smile following facial gestures (Bavelas & Chovil, 2013, cited in Naben et al, 2019).

Many researchers have conducted previous studies related to the discourse markers. Povolna (2012) focused on casual and contrastive discourse markers in novice academic writing. The study indicated paratactic markers such as *therefore* and *thus.* It also contained contrastive relations like the word *but* and *however.* Therefore, the novice non-native speakers of English use some markers incorrectly. The study also consisted of the differences between the individual markers.

Kalajahi et al. (2012) investigated discourse connectors that contained the history, definition, and classification of the discourse connectors. The study aimed to know the discourse connectors and the function of it. In the study, they stated that discourse connectors are words and expressions existed within the text. It concerned with the connection to connect between sentence to sentence, paragraph to paragraph, etc. They also said that the term of discourse connectors or discourse markers are appropriate with spoken discourse, even the definition and classification should connect with written discourse.

Tree (2014) analyzed discourse markers in writing. He adopted Aijmer theory (Aijmer, 1987). He explained that the discourse markers *"like, you know, um,* and *uh"* were more useful in spoken than written. The words *"like* and *you know"* were not really useful in writing. It was different from the words *"oh* and *well".* The use of those words was similar dominant either in writing or speaking.

A deeper study was conducted by Al-khawaldeh & Awal (2014) in sports news journalistic discourse. They took the data from the Arab news websites such as Aljazeera.net and Alarabia.net. They analyzed the data by adopting Fraser's theory (2005). The result of the study showed 73 times of discourse markers consisted of elaborative, contrastive, inferential, and temporal. The study also concerned with the

other markers in such signaling semantics and grammar forms (conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositions). In another study, Mohseni & Golestani (2015) examined contrastive discourse markers in ESP books of computer science developed by non-native (Iranian) and native (British) authors. They only focused on a type of discourse marker which is called contrastive by adopting Fraser's (2006) taxonomy. Based on the study, they stated that the use of contrastive discourse markers is not significantly different in non-native and native texts. The result of the study showed that the word *but* and *however* were more common use as the contrastive discourse markers in both non-native and native texts.

Discourse markers usually are used by native speakers, English foreign language learners, teachers, etc. It was because discourse markers could help the language's users in their communication. In a study, the teachers have positive perceptions in applying discourse markers to improve the pragmatic competence of language learners (Asik, 2015). It related to teachers' talk and classroom practices. On the contrary, the learners, especially Saudi learners had overuse discourse markers (Alsharif, 2017). It is showed by using the listing and resulting discourse markers. The learners also used four categories of discourse markers such as contrastive markers, elaborative markers, implicative markers, and temporal markers (Manan & Raslee, 2017). The other learners applied three types of discourse markers in their writing which consisted of contrastive, elaborative, and inferential (Susanto et al, 2019). They mentioned that learners only used certain familiar markers in their writing.

Yang (2011) focused on discourse markers on pedagogical setting. It was especially in teachers' talk. The signs *okay, so, and, right/all right,* and *now* are the most frequent used by the teachers (Rongrong & Lixun, 2015). Additionally, the words *ok, so,* and *and* included in the structural and interprsonal functions of disicourse markers (Vickov & Jakupcevic, 2017). Discourse

markers are also existed in the conversation between the teacher and the students (Zarei, 2013). The word *well* is the most frequent used in the conversation (Li & Xiao, 2012). In a study, the teachers used more than 60% of discourse markers (Nejadansari & Mohammadi, 2015). Discourse markers also existed in a speech that is conveyed by non-native or native speakers. A speech means a public speaking activity (Listiani, Rukmini, & Widhiyanto, 2019).

Referring to the previous studies, there is a gap to conduct the present study. Comparing between non-native and native speakers of English in using discourse markers in English speeches will be a topic of the study. This study will focus on both non-native and native speakers which will adopt Fraser's typology (Fraser, 2009). The typology relates to the types of discourse markers that includes verbal discourse markers. This study also will analyze the similarities and the differences between non-native and native speakers in using discourse markers.

**METHOD**

The purposes of this study are 1) to explain the use of discourse markers by non-native speakers in English speeches, 2) to explain the use of discourse markers by native speakers in English speeches, 3) to explain the similarities between non-native and native speakers in using discourse markers in English speeches, and 4) to explain the differences between non-native and native speakers in using discourse markers in English speeches.

This study indicates a spoken discourse study with a qualitative approach. The study focused on comparing between non-native and native speakers in using discourse markers in English speeches, especially in commencement events in graduating class. In this study, the data come from the videos of English speeches performed by non-native and native speakers.

The videos were taken from the YouTube channels.

In analyzing the data, started from some steps 1) transcribing the videos: in this step, transcribed all the videos related to the English speeches expressed by non-native and native speakers, 2) identifying the data: it referred to identify the verbal discourse markers based on the linguistics expression that exist in the utterances, 3) categorizing the data: this step concerned with dividing discourse markers into some categories based on Fraser's theory (Fraser, 2009), 4) calculating the data: it meant that counting the total of discourse markers existed in the English speeches, and 5) interpreting the data: it refers to the interpretation of the data based on the findings. The interpretation is also associated with Fraser's theory of discourse markers (Fraser, 2009). To avoid bias, the results of the study also are added by the expert judgment.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This part contained some results of the study. It related to the research problems that have decided in the sudy. It also existed the interpretation by adopting Fraser's theory of discourse markers (Fraser, 2009).

**Discourse Markers Used by Non-native Speakers in English speeches**

In this study, the are four types of discourse markers produced by non-native speakers. Those types will be shown in the following table 1.:

**Table 1.** Types of Discourse Markers Used by Non-native Speakers

| No | Types of Discourse Markers | | Freq. |
|----|----------------------------|--|-------|
| 1 | Basic Pragmatic Markers | | 0 |
| 2 | Commentary Pragmatic Markers | Assessment Markers | 1 |
| | | Manner of Speaking Markers | 1 |
| | | Evidential Markers | 3 |
| | | Hearsay Markers | 2 |
| | | Non-Deference Markers | 0 |
| 3 | Discourse Markers | Contrastive | 52 |
| | | Elaborative | 157 |
| | | Inferential | 56 |
| 4 | Discourse Structure Markers | Discourse Management Markers | 3 |
| | | Topic Orientation Markers | 8 |
| | | Attention Markers | 18 |
| Total | | | 301 |

Referring to table 1, there were 301 utterances of discourse markers done by non-native speakers in the English speeches. The highest utterance of discourse markers was elaborative with the total of 157 utterances. In addtion, the type of discourse markers is followed by inferential with 56 utterances. The third was contrastive with the total of 52 utterances. In this study, the attention markers were 18 utterances. Besides, the topic orientation markers are produced by non-native speakers with the total of eight utterances. Discourse management markers and evidential markers were three utterances each others. In a line, assessment marker and manner of speaking marker had an utterance. Meanwhile, there were no utterances of basic pragmatic markers and non-deference markers in this study.

**Commentary Pragmatic Markers**

In general, the commentary pragmatic marker refers to a marker that has a signal to comment on the utterances. There were some types included in commentary pragmatic markers such as assessment marker, manner of speaking marker, evidential markers, and hearsay markers. In English speeches, the non-native speakers used the assessment marker at one time. It meant that the assessment marker is not familiar with the non-native speakers. It also might be because the assessment marker was not suitable with the topic of discussion in the events. The assessment marker potentially conveyed what the speakers' feel by delivering the utterances. The non-native speaker applied the assessment marker occasionally. It

Evidential markers concerned with the truth of the basic message of the utterances. The markers helped the non-native speakers to create the power of their arguments by mean strongly or weakly. In this study, there were three times of evidential markers produced by non-native speakers in English speeches. Those frequencies presented that evidential markers were useful for the non-native speakers.

The last type of commentary pragmatic markers is a hearsay marker. The hearsay markers expressed the signs to support the speakers' opinions. In other words, it showed the other sources of the opinion, for instance, the signs "they say". By applying those signs, the non-native speakers can avoid bias when they delivered a part of the speeches.

**Discourse markers**

A discourse marker explains the procedural meaning of the utterances. It also shows the relationship between the previous utterances and the present utterances. Discourse markers have three types such as contrastive, elaborative, and inferential (Fraser, 2009). Contrastive reveals the contrasting meaning between some utterances. In this study, the total of contrastive was 52 times expended by non-native speakers. The words of contrastive were such as *still, but, anyway, however, instead of,* and *yet.* Those words initiated to express the contrast topic or

depended on what the speaker's want to share about.

Manner of speaking marker dealt with delivering the manner on the basic marker (Fraser, 2009). A word of the manner of speaking markers that existed in the English speeches is "seriously". It referred to the manner to let speakers in doing something. The marker also indicated to make a good organization of speaking. Similar to the previous marker, manner of speaking marker has a time in the English speeches. It showed that it was not really appropriate used in English speeches, especially in commencement events. It might be dominant in written or another event.

situation of discussion. By using those words, the non-native speakers also clarified to continue the speeches with a new topic.

On the contrary, the elaborative concerned with the markers that showed the relationship between the previous and the present utterances. In this study, the non-native speakers implemented 157 times of contrastive discourse markers which consisted of some words such as *also, or, too, equally, and, that is, for example,* and *better.* Elaborative markers were the dominant used by non-native speakers. Those markers helped the non-native speakers to constitute the utterances. It also indicated to add information to the hearers. The elaborative discourse markers were different from the inferential discourse markers. In this case, the inferential contained the conclusion of some utterances in the speech. The markers also aimed to clarify the messages of the previous utterances. Besides, by mentioning the markers meant that the non-native speakers invited the hearers to get new information. The markers were popularly used by non-native speakers. It is showed by the total of inferential with 56 times. Relating to the frequency, the non-native speakers also associated several words of inferential discourse markers in their English speeches such as *because, because of, so, then,* and *of course.*

**Discourse structure markers**

Referring to the types of discourse markers, discourse structure markers included in the last types of discourse markers. Discourse structure markers focused on organizing the messages of the markers in the utterances. In this part, there are various sub-types of discourse structure markers such as discourse management markers, topic orientation markers, and attention markers. The functions of those markers are almost similar. It depends on the utterances. It meant that the markers did not have specific function to convey the messages of the utterances. It was possible each marker has more than one function. In this study, the non-native speakers practiced those markers to make good organization, to provide new information, to digress from the current topic, to allow speaker's argumentation, and to introduce new knowledge. The keywords of those markers such as *then, but, by the way, now, well, look, so ok,* and *oh.*

**Discourse Markers Used by Native Speakers in English speeches**

This part concerned with the total of discourse markers used by native speakers in their English speeches. It is shown by the following table 2.:

**Table 2.** Types of Discourse Markers Used by Native Speakers

| No | Types of Discourse Markers | | Freq. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Basic Pragmatic Markers | | 0 |
| 2 | Commentary Pragmatic Markers | Assessment Markers | 2 |
| | | Manner of Speaking Markers | 4 |
| | | Evidential Markers | 3 |
| | | Hearsay Markers | 2 |
| | | Non-Deference Markers | 0 |
| 3 | Discourse Markers | Contrastive | 47 |
| | | Elaborative | 116 |
| | | Inferential | 45 |
| 4 | Discourse Structure Markers | Discourse Management Markers | 0 |
| | | Topic Orientation Markers | 7 |
| | | Attention Markers | 43 |
| Total | | | 269 |

Table 2 showed that the total of markers was 269 times produced by native speakers. The dominant markers were elaborative discourse markers with a total of 116 times. The second dominant was contrastive discourse markers, a total of 47 times. The total of inferential discourse markers was 45 times. Besides, the attention markers gained 43 times, and topic orientation markers were seven times. The total of manner of speaking markers was four times. The evidential markers were three times. The lowest makers were assessment markers and hearsay marker with a total of two times. Furthermore, there were no basic pragmatic markers, non-deference markers, and discourse management markers in this study.

We know that the native speakers mentioned some markers. Each marker has a different function in delivering the messages in the utterances, for example, commentary pragmatic markers. In this study, commentary pragmatic markers signal to convey the messages of the sentences or utterances. Commentary pragmatic markers divided into several types such as assessment markers, manner of speaking markers, evidential markers, and hearsay markers. Based on the data, there are two keywords of

assessment markers like *amazingly,* and *annoyingly.* The words presented two basic messages (Fraser, 2009), for instance *amazingly.* Using *amazingly* meant that the native speakers amazed in something that they heard or saw. It could express an appreciation of something.

The native speakers also produced manner of speaking markers with the words *generally, honestly,* and *seriously.* Focusing those words, the native speakers organized the manner of the utterances. The native speakers informed the hearers of how they gave the opinion. It is showed by producing the word *honestly.* It referred to the way of explaining something is honest. It supported the native speakers' argumentation to make the hearers trusting.

The native speakers adopted evidential markers by mentioning the words *perhaps* and *obviously* in three times. When saying those words emphasized that the speakers explained their argumentation clearly. In applying commentary pragmatic markers, the native speakers also put hearsay markers as the last type of commentary pragmatic markers. Hearsay markers supported the native speakers to prove some sources related to the information that they have given. One of the words or phrases of hearsay markers is *they say.* It showed that there was another source of information which meant it was not only native speakers' opinion. In summary, hearsay markers are important to support the power of information or knowledge.

On the contrary, the native speakers communicated discourse markers in their English speeches. They followed three types of discourse markers, namely: contrastive, elaborative, and inferential proposed by Fraser (2009). In this study, discourse markers gained the most popular markers, especially elaborative with a total of 116 times. The keywords of elaborative were *too, also, and, that's,* and *or.* Those words expressed the relationship between each utterance. The markers also established the parallel of the utterances.

Meanwhile, contrastive markers interpret the contrast messages in the utterances. For instance, the native speakers said the word *but.* It suggested more than one message with a different topic. In contrast, the inferential markers initiated the conclusion of the utterances. The native speakers used the markers to give information clearly. Conveying inferential markers meant that the speakers not only explained something but they also delivered the point of the topic. It made the speech more smooth.

The last is discourse structure markers. There are two types of discourse structure markers such as topic orientation markers, and attention markers. Topic orientation markers refer to a signal to build a new topic of discussion. In line with the function of topic orientation markers, the native speakers said the word *by the way.* Besides, the native speakers also implemented the word *but* as a sign of the contrasting situation. Therefore, topic orientation markers have many functions depending the words and the utterances that speakers' said. Hence, attention marker is a part of topic orientation markers. In this study, the native speakers practiced the attention markers to allow new information, and to add information.

**Similarities between Non-native and Native Speakers in Using Discourse Markers**

This study pointed out some similarities between non-native and native speakers in using discourse markers in their English speeches. It claimed by adopting the same theory of discourse markers proposed by Fraser (Fraser, 2009). The first similarity showed that the non-native and native speakers did not use basic pragmatic markers. It is shown by there were no keywords existed in the English speeches. The second, the non-native and native speakers adopted some subtypes of commentary pragmatic markers like assessment markers, manner of speaking markers, evidential markers, and hearsay markers. Besides, the non-native and native

speakers mentioned three types of discourse markers such as contrastive discourse markers, elaborative discourse markers, and inferential discourse markers. On the other hand, there were no non-deference markers used by non-native and native speakers in their English speeches.

Founding the similarities between non-native and native speakers in using discourse markers is possible because they discussed the same topic in their English speeches. They also spoke in the commencement events, in the graduating class. By mentioning the types of discourse markers meant that the non-native and native speakers expressed some signals in the utterances. It was such a connector within some utterances. It also could be a comment on something that happened. By using discourse markers also let the non-native and native speakers to explain some topics at the same time.

**Differences between Non-native and Native Speakers in Using Discourse Markers**

This study indicates some differences between non-native and native speakers in using discourse markers in the English speeches. In producing discourse markers, the non-native speakers produced the highest frequent of 301 times. It contrasted with the native speakers. They only created 269 times of discourse markers in English speeches.

In the English speeches, the non-native speakers employed ten sub-types of discourse markers such as assessment markers, manner of speaking markers, evidential markers, hearsay markers, contrastive discourse markers, elaborative discourse markers, inferential discourse marker, discourse management markers, topic orientation markers, and attention markers. On the other hand, the native speakers mention nine sub-types of discourse markers, namely: assessment markers, manner of speaking markers, evidential markers, hearsay markers, contrastive discourse markers, elaborative discourse markers, inferential

discourse markers, topic orientation markers, and attention markers.

Moreover, the non-native speaker did not use basic pragmatic markers and non-deference markers in their English speeches. While the native speakers did not apply the basic pragmatic markers, non-deference markers, and discourse management markers. Those cases showed that the non-native speakers were the most dominant in using discourse markers. In summary, the use of discourse markers was not only applied by native speakers but is also widely presented by non-native speakers. It was possible to happen because every people organized discourse markers depended on their necessary in the speeches.

**CONCLUSION**

The result of the study showed that the discourse markers were utilized in the speeches, especially in english speeches. In this study, the non-native speakers created more discourse markers than native speakers. The non-native and native speakers also used various types of discourse markers which have some functions. Additionally, the use of discourse markers could give benefit to the english teaching and learning process. It could be an example of how to use the discourse markers in the spoken text.

The discourse markers need to investigate deeply, not only in verbal but also in visual and audio. It is possible when further researchers conduct the researches analyzing discourse markers both visual and audio.

**REFERENCES**

Aijmer K (1987) Oh and ah in English conversation. In: Meijs W (ed.) *Corpus Linguistics and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 61–86.

Al-khawaldeh, A. A., Awal, N. M., & Zainudin, I., S. (2014). A corpus-based description of discourse markers in

Arabic sport journalistic texts. *4*(4), 200–215.

Alsharif, M. (2017). The frequently used discourse markers by Saudi EFL learners. *Arab World English Journal, 8*(2), 384-397.

Asik, A. (2015). Discourse markers in EFL settings: perceptions of Turkish EFL teachers. *Academic Journal, 10*(7), 941-950.

Bavelas, J., & Chovil, N. (2013). Some pragmatic functions of Conversational facial gestures.*Gestures, 17*(1), 1–47.

Fraser, B. (2009). An account of discourse markers. *International Review of Pragmatics*, *1*, 293–320.

Kalajahi, S. A. R., Abdullah, A. N., Mukundan, J., & Tannacito, D. J. (2012). Discourse connectors: an overview of the history, definition, and classification of the term. *World Applied Science Journal, 19*(11), 1659-1673.

Lewis, D. M. (2006). A discourse-constructional approach to the emergence of discourse markers in English. *Linguistics 49*(2), 415–443,

Li, M., & Xiao, Y. (2012). A comparative study on the use of discourse marker "Well" by Chinese learners of English and native English speaker. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 2*(5), 65-71.

Listiani, G., Rukmini, D., & Widhiyanto (2019). The inclusion of ideology in Jokowi's speech viewed from teh perspective of appraisal theory. *English Education Journal, 9*(4), 476-483.

Manan, N. A. A., & Raslee, N. N. (2017). Describing the use of discourse markers by ESL learners in writing. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences, 4*(3), 101-106.

Mohseni, A., & Golestani, M. (2015). Analysis of contrastive discourse markers implementation in ESP books of computer science developed by non-native (Iranian) and native (British)

authors. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2*(6), 128-144.

Naben, M. F., Mujiyanto, J., & Faridi, A. The existence of pragmatic markers in America's got talent judges' commentaries. *English Education Journal, 9*(3), 327-333.

Nejadansari, D., & Mohammadi, A., M. (2015). The frequencies and functions of discourse markers in the Iranian University EFL classroom discourse. *International Journal of Research Studies In Language Learning, 4*(2), 3-20.

Ogi, N. (2017). *Involvement and attitude in Japanese discourse: Interactive markers.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

Povolna, R. (2012). Casual and contrastive discourse markers in novice academic writing. *Brno Studies in English, 38*(2), 131-148.

Redeker, G. (1990). Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatic, 14,*367-381.

Rongrong, D., & Lixun, W. (2015). Discourse markers in local and native English teachers' talk in Hong Kong EFL classroom interaction: A corpus-based study. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 2*(5), 65-75.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Susanto, D. A., Mujiyanto, J., Bharati, D. A L., & Sutopo. D. (2019). The use and functions of English discourse markers (EDMs) in EFL students writing at university in Indonesia. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 343,* 67-70.

Tannen, D. Hamilton, H. E., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed.) India: Blackwell Publishers.

Tree, J. E. F. (2014). Discourse markers in writing. *Discourse Studies,* 1-19.

Vickov, Ga., & Jakupcevic, E. (2017). Discourse markers in non-native EFL teacher talk. *Studies in second language learning and teaching, 7*(4), 649-671.

Yang, S. (2011). Investigating discourse markers in pedagogical settings: A literature review. *ARECLS, 8,* 95-108.

Zarei, F. (2013). Discourse markers in English. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 4*(1), 107–117.