CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter consists of findings and discussion. The first section addresses research question one, regarding the types of DM employed by Indonesian and Thai students. Next, the second section elaborates on research question two emphasizing on the similarities and differences regarding the DMs in the argumentative writing between Indonesian and Thai students. Finally, the third section addresses research question three, concerning whether Indonesian and Thai students employed DMs in their argumentative writing appropriately. Further, to be more details, this chapter presents all findings followed by discussion. In other words, this discussion section elaborates the findings more deeply by presenting some examples for each aspect.

Findings

1. Research Question One

What kinds of DMs did EFL Indonesian and Thai university students employ in their argumentative writing?

For general view of DMs used in Indonesian and Thai students' writings, the use of the words and DMs found was initially investigated. Then, the detail use of DMs by two groups was discussed. This section is concluded by presenting the most frequent DMs employed by both groups.

Table 5 Use of Discourse Markers and Total Words in the Texts

Groups	Average Words/ Composition	Average Number of DMs/ Composition	Percentage of DMs/ Total Words
ID	8,817	400	4.53%
TH	5,988	337	5.63%
Total	14,805	737	4.98%

Table 5 shows the use of the DMs by Indonesian and Thai students in their argumentative writings. This presents the information of the percentage of the use of DMs produced by both groups. Among the total number of DMs, it is identified that there are 4.53% of DMs produced by Indonesian students. Also, it is found that 5.63% DMs employed by Thai students. Therefore, out of 14,805 total words in the composition, 4.98% of them are identified as DMs found from Indonesian and Thai students in their argumentative writings.

Table 6 Use of Discourse Markers for Each Category

No	Groups	Total Number of DMs	CATEGORIES OF DMs			
			AD	CC	CR	EO
1	ID	400	125 (31.25%)	107 (26.75%)	86 (21.5%)	82 (20.5%)
2.	TH	337	94 (27.89%)	107 (31.75%)	73 (21.66%)	63 (18.69%)

Next, Table 6 reveals the percentage of the use of DMs by Indonesian and Thai students. Regarding each category of DMs, Here, the most-often occurring DM in Indonesian writings is *addition* category, followed by *concession and* **contrast**, *cause and result*, and *enumeration and order* category. Then, for Thai students, *concession and contrast* category becomes the most-often appearing DMs. Then, it is followed by *addition, cause and result* and *enumeration and order* category.

Table 7 Top Sixteen of Discourse Markers Produced by Indonesian Students

No	DMs	Total Number	Percentage (%)
1	because	43	10.75
2	if	37	9.25
3	and	30	7.5
4	when	29	7.25
5	also	23	5.75
6	such as	21	5.25
7	So	20	5
8	for example	16	4
9	but	16	4
10	first	14	3.5
11	besides	10	2.5
12	then	10	2.5
13	second	10	2.5
14	in conclusion	9	2.25
15	therefore	8	2
16	last	8	2
	Total	304	76

Table 7 shows the top sixteen individual DMs produced by Indonesian students. Out of 62 individual DMs, there are only 16 DMs presented in this table. A complete list of the DMs used by the group of Indonesian students is presented in Appendix C. The presented DMs are those appeared the most frequently in Indonesian students' writings. The raw data are arranged in a descending order. Moreover, this table shows the number and percentage of each DM. The most frequently used DM is *because*. It occurs 43 times out of the total of 400 occurrences. In other words, from the total 100%, its percentage is 10.75%. Following *because*, as the second most-often appearing DM is *if*. Its occurrence is not too different from *because*. It appears 37 times with the percentage of 9.25%. After that, *and* ranks the third. As to be quite similar with the previous rank, its number of occurrence is 30 times with the percentage of 7.5%. Finally, within 16 ranks, the two least often-appearing DMs are possessed by *therefore* and *last* which occur similarly 8 times with its percentage of 2%.

Similar to Table 7, Table 8 presents the top sixteen individual DMs produced by Thai students. Out of 51 of individual DMs, there are 16 of DMs presented as the most often-appearing DMs. A complete list of the DMs employed by the group of Thai students is presented in Appendix D. The first rank goes to *because*. It occurs 37 times out of 337 DMs. Hence, the percentage is 10.98% out of 100%. The second and third most often-occurring DMs are not too different in number. They are *and* and *when* which appear 30 and 29 times. This way, its percentages are 8.90% and 8.61%. They are *then* and *first* which occur 11 and 10 times. Thus, the percentages are 3.26% and 2.97%. Finally, regarding the two least frequently used DMs out of 16 DMs, there are *also* and *while* which appears 6 times with its percentage of 1.78%. Below is the detail.

Table 8 Top Sixteen of Discourse Markers Produced by Thai Students

No	DMs	Total Number	Percentage (%)
1	because	37	10.98
2	and	30	8.90
3	when	29	8.61
4	if	24	7.12
5	so	21	6.23
6	but	20	5.93
7	such as	15	4.45
8	for example	14	4.15
9	although	13	3.86
10	second	13	3.86
11	then	11	3.26
12	first	10	2.97
13	moreover	7	2.08
14	like	6	1.78
15	also	6	1.78
16	while	6	1.78
	Total	262	77.74

2. Research Question Two

What were the similarities and differences regarding the use of DMs in the argumentative writing produced by EFL Indonesian and Thai university students?

This section presents a comparison and contrast of the use of DMs by Indonesian and Thai students, especially related to the category and type of DMs in very details. First, as mentioned earlier, Table 6 revealed the similarity and difference of the use of DMs by Indonesian and Thai students. On regard to the category of DMs, the similarity was found in the use of category of *cause and result* and *enumeration and order*. The frequency of both categories of DMs employed by Indonesian and Thai students was closely similar. Moreover, those two categories of DMs became the third and fourth category of DMs produced by Indonesian and Thai students in their argumentative writing. Next, in terms of the difference, it was revealed that, for Indonesian students, they tended to use more *addition* category than *concession and contrast* category in their writing. On the contrary, Thai students tended to employ more *concession and contrast* category than *addition* category when they wrote an argumentative text. Thus, those were the similarities and differences of the use of each category of DMs by Indonesian and Thai students. Further, the following table shows more details for each category and type of DMs of the comparison and contrast.

Table 9 Discourse Markers Produced by Indonesian and Thai Students

Categories	ID			TH		
	DMs	Total	%	DMs	Total	%
	and	30	7.5	and	30	8.90
	also	23	5.75	such as	16	4.75
	such as	21	5.25	for example	14	4.15
Addition	for example	16	4	moreover	7	2.08
	besides	10	2.5	like	6	1.78
	specially	7	1.75	also	6	1.78
	in addition	5	1.25	specially	4	1.19
	like	4	1	beside	2	0.59

Table 9 (cont.)

Categories	ID			TH		
	DMs	Total	%	DMs	Total	%
	for instances	3	0.75	in addition	2	0.59
	moreover	2	0.5	furthermore	2	0.59
	furthermore	1	0.25	for instances	2	0.59
	in the same way	1	0.25	prime among	1	0.30
	not only that	1	0.25	these	1	0.30
	another example	1	0.25	at the same time	1	0.30
				in other words		
	Subtotal	125	31.25		94	27.89
	if	37	9.25	when	29	8.60
	when	29	7.25	if	24	7.12
	but	16	4	but	20	5.94
	on the other hands	5	1.25	although	13	3.86
	although	3	0.75	while	6	1.78
Concession	or	3	0.75	however	5	1.48
and	in fact	3	0.75	or	4	1.19
contrast	however	3	0.75	even	2	0.59
	eventhough	2	0.5	though	1	0.30
	even	2	0.5	nevertheless	1	0.30
	nevertheless	2	0.5	instead	1	0.30
	on the contrary	1	0.25			
	in the other side	1	0.25			
	Subtotal	107	26.75		107	31.75
	because	43	10.75	because	37	10.98
Cause and	so	20	5	so	21	6.23
result	therefore	8	2	therefore	5	1.48
	since	3	0.75	thus	3	0.89
	thus	2	0.5	due t	2	0.59

Table 9 (cont.)

Categories	ID			TH		
	DMs	Total	%	DMs	Total	%
	of course	2	0.5	since	2	0.59
	as	1	0.25	consequently	1	0.30
	for	1	0.25	accordingly	1	0.30
	from that	1	0.25	in this way	1	0.30
	statement	1	0.25			
	from that situation	1	0.25			
	from then on	1	025			
	by all means	1	0.25			
	otherwise	1	0.25			
	as a result					
	Subtotal	86	21.5		73	21.66
	first	14	3.5	second	13	3.86
	then	10	2.5	then	11	3.26
	second	10	2.5	first	10	2.97
	in conclusion	9	2.25	finally	6	1.78
	last	8	2	to sum up	5	1.48
	actually	6	1.5	actually	3	0.89
	finally	4	1	third	3	0.89
Enumeration	after that	3	0.75	in summary	2	0.59
and	third	3	0.75	after that	2	0.59
order	in this occasion	2	0.5	next	1	0.30
	in this case	2	0.5	in brief	1	0.30
	to summarize	2	0.5	in conclusion	1	0.30
	fourth	1	0.25	at this time	1	0.30
	sixth	1	0.25	last	1	0.30
	next	1	0.25	until	1	0.30
	in brief	1	025	meanwhile	1	0.30

Table 9 (cont.)

Categories	ID			TH		
	DMs	Total	%	DMs	Total	%
	on the whole	1	0.25	at these point	1	0.30
	in this position	1	0.25			
	in this time	1	0.25			
	in this way	1	0.25			
	one more time	1	0.25			
	Subtotal	82	20.5		63	18.69
	TOTAL	400	100		337	100

To sum up, based on the preceding table, some similarities of the use of DMs occurred in the Indonesian and Thai students' writings were found in terms of the frequency of the use of DMs and the types of DMs used. Related to the frequency of the use of DMs, DMs of *cause and result* and *enumeration and order* were as the third and fourth of the most frequent used DMs produced by Indonesian and Thai students. In addition, in terms of the types of the DMs used, among all types of DMs, *because* was the most often-employed DM found in both Indonesian and Thai students' writing. The examples of the similar use of DMs could be seen in the Excerpts (1) and (2) as Indonesian and Thai students employed the DM of *because* in a similar way.

(1)

[DM/ID/22] *"Facebook are the social media bringing people together.* *Because Facebook can be connecting one people to other people."*

(2)

[DM/TH/02] *"Furthermore, if we think about its advantages that is it helps people connect to each other easily, it is not right because it also has disadvantages too."*

Conversely, there were some elements of DMs used differently. The differences of the use of DMs were related to the total number of DMs occurred, frequency of the use of DMs, and types of DMs used. First, regarding the total number of DMs used, Indonesian students employed 4.53% of DMs while Thai students used 5.63%. Second, on regard to the frequency of the use of DMs, DMs of *addition* were the most frequent used DMs for Indonesian students while DMs of *concession and contrast* were the most occurred DMs found in Thai students' writing. Last, in terms of the types of DMs, for Indonesian writing, the top seven DMs were *because*, *if, and, when, also, such as*, and *so*; while for Thai writing, the seventh most-frequent occurring DMs were *because, and, when, if, so, but*, and *such as*. In Excerpts (3) and (4), a different use of DMs occurred in the Indonesian and Thai students' writing could be seen as follows. Here, regarding the total number of the use of DMs, Thai students employed DMs more comparing to Indonesian students.

(3)

[DM/TH/06] *"Finally, the social media make people that they **are not dare** to talk **when** they meet. Some people are **shy when** they meet someone and they are not dare to talk to **someone when** they meet. In the social media, they may be **dare to** talk with someone. For example, you want to talk **with the** person you like, but you are fear to talk to her **when you** meet her."*

(4)

[DM/ID/07] *"We can search our friends **when** we still junior **high** school, senior high school, or our old friends in **village."***

3. Research Question Three

To what extent did EFL Indonesian and Thai university students employ DMs in their argumentative writing appropriately?

Table 10 Appropriateness of Discourse Markers

Groups	Average Number of DMs/ Composition	Appropriateness/ Total DMs	
		Appropriate	Not Appropriate
ID	400	384 (96%)	16 (4%)
TH	337	325 (96.44%)	12 (3.56%)

Table 10 shows the appropriateness of the use of DMs. Among the DMs found in the Indonesian writing (n=400), 96% of them were appropriate while 4% of them were not appropriate. Similarly, in Thai DMs (n=337), most of the number of DMs were also appropriate with 96.44%, while 3.5% of them were not appropriate. This revealed that both groups had produced slightly different number of appropriate and inappropriate sentences containing DMs. Thus, comparing to the findings of both Indonesian and Thai students' writing, these revealed that they apparently employed the DMs appropriately. This way, the DMs in their texts constructed the unity of the text, as well as, better understanding for the readers (De Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). In contrast, there were also inappropriate uses of DMs. This might be triggered by several problems of the use of DMs (Prommas, 2011; Bennui, 2008; Budiharso, 2006; Fadlilatur, 2010; Andayani, 2013). Further, considering the use the DMs, this showed that both groups produced inappropriate uses of DMs which might be caused by some problems such as misuse, overuse, lack of use of DMs, and etc.

Discussion

Unlike the previous part of this chapter which only answers the three research questions of this study by giving a brief explanation on several tables, this part is the one that discusses deeply and clearly all objectives of this study followed by some examples and supporting references conducted by previous research studies for each section.

1. The Kinds of Discourse Markers Employed by EFL Indonesian and Thai University Students in their Argumentative Writing

The results gained from Table 5 revealed the occurrence of the use of DMs in Indonesian and Thai writings. Regarding the number of the appropriate DMs, it could be seen that the difference of the use of DMs by both groups was not quite different. The total number of DMs employed by Indonesian students (4.54%) was lower than that one used by Thai students (5.63%). Considering the total number of words in the composition, the Indonesian students produced higher number of words of composition than the Thai ones. Thus, it might become the reason the use of DMs by Indonesian students was lower than that by Thai students. Moreover, this distance of the total number of DMs employed by the two groups revealed that there was a different tendency of the use of DMs between both groups. This is consistent with the view that DMs are highly employed by Indonesian students (Kusumaningrum, 2013). Similarly, this was in line with the finding of Chanawangsa's study (1986). Chanawangsa found that there were a high number of DMs used by Thai students. The higher number of DMs in both groups' writing might be triggered by students' familiarity toward various cohesive devices and was used to employing them in their writing. Moreover, in L2 texts, the preference of the use of DMs often reflected the students' attempts to construct a unified idea flow (Hinkel, 2001).

In addition, Table 6 showed the detailed frequency of each category of DMs represented by the percentage. The percentages were scattered over each category of DMs produced by Indonesian and Thai students. Out of 100%, the Indonesian students employed *addition* (31.25%) as the most frequently used DMs. This indicates that there are a lot of arguments adding information to what comes before or showing information as parallel to preceding information produced by Indonesian students. To follow the *addition* category, the DMs of *concession and contrast* also achieved the second rank among the categories of DMs. This generally fits into the finding of Andayani's study (2013) revealed that among categories of DMs produced by Indonesian university students, *addition* and *concession and contrast* became the top two of the most frequently used DMs.

On the contrary, the Thai students yielded an opposite order of DMs' ranks in terms of those previous categories of DMs (*addition* and *concession and contrast*). Unlike the percentage of DMs used by Indonesian students, the DMs of *concession and contrast* (31.75%) were employed by Thai students in their argumentative writing. This is in line with the finding of Sitthirak's study (2010) which showed that Thai students highly employed the DMs of *concession and contrast*. Thus, it reflected the nature of how an argumentative genre which requires the writers to show their opinions through their pros or contrast arguments. Further, to respect the last two categories of DMs, *cause and result* and *enumeration and order*, both categories revealed less range of difference. This way, it indicates that both groups of students similarly employed such DMs functioning to show cause-effect relation and to order main points in the argumentative writing.

As clearly mentioned in the previous section, there were four categories of DMs adapted from Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) consisting of *addition, concession and contrast, cause and result*, and *enumeration and order*. This way, the students seemed to successfully employ the DMs based on those categories. For instance, when the students wanted to add some information as parallel to preceding information, they would make use of *and, also, furthermore, moreover, in addition, for example*, and etc. Next, the students also made use of employing *concession and contrast* in their writings. This use of *concession and contrast* was aimed to introduce information that is somewhat surprising or unexpected in light of previous information or to link information that is viewed as straight contrast. Next, the third category of DMs which was the *cause and result* functioned in showing the reason, result, and purpose of the preceding information. Last, the *enumeration and order* category were also mostly used by the Indonesian and Thai students in their writings. This category of DMs was aimed to signal the order of main points that speakers or writers want to make and indicate a sequence of steps in a process.

In summary, from the total number of 737 DMs in the Indonesian and Thai writings, 400 DMs and 337 DMs could be identified as DMs produced by Indonesian students and by Thai ones, respectfully. Therefore, both groups obviously employed a varied amount of DMs. Though there was a difference of the use of DMs by

Indonesian and Thai groups, ahigh number of DMs found obviously proved that those two groups of studentsproductively employed English DMs in their argumentative writings. Hence, this enabled to construct a more cohesive text, as well as the coherence of the text. As mentioned earlier in the previous study conducted by Modhish (2012) that the scarcity of DMs in students' essays in addition to other inadequacies makes their compositions less coherent. The more use of DMs might construct the more cohesive text, but it might not always be a coherent one. In other words, the overuse of DMs also could construct a less coherent text. This was in line with Zhang's (2000) study which states that the overuse of DMs could make ambiguity within the text so that the text was not understandable (incoherent). Moreover, De Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) also stated that a coherent text means an understandable one.

Furthermore, Table 7 and 8 revealed the individual DMs employed by Indonesian and Thai students. Here, the tables also provided the information of raw frequency counts of an individual DM and the ratio of frequency counts of an individual DM to the overall frequency of the DMs examined in the writing.Out of the total number of individual DMs, there were only listed 16 Indonesian individual DMs and 13 Thai individual DMs resulted from DMs counting for 2% or more of the total number of DMs produced in those groups' writings.

As can be seen from Table 7, the use of individual DMs was unevenly distributed over Indonesian writings. Some DMs were seemingly employed more often than others. The most frequent DMs in the Indonesian writing were *because, if,* and *and*. The DM with the highest frequency was *because*, which accounted for 10.78% of the overall occurrence of DMs in the Indonesian writing. From the eighth and ninth most frequently used DMs, *for example* and *but*, the percentage of the individual DMs dropped to 4.01%, which was less than half of the percentage of the most frequent DMs. This indicates that the DMs like *because, if, and, when, also, such as,* and *so* were mostly employed by Indonesian students, compared to other DMs such as *for example, but, first, besides, then, second,* and *in conclusion*. However, the seventh most-frequent used DM *so* only achieved 5.01%, which was a half of the highest frequency *because*. Besides using *so*, the Indonesian students alternatively used *therefore*, which scarcely appeared in the Thai writing, to mark off the result.

Next, the percentage of frequently used DMs from the fifteenth to sixteenth ranks (i.e. *therefore* and *last*) declined to 2%. This indicates that the Indonesian EFL students selected a quite varied cluster of DMs in their writing.

As shown in Table 8, the DMs with the highest frequencies in the Thai writing were *because, and,* and *when.* The first most frequently employed DM *because* alone accounted for 10.98% of the overall occurrences of DMs in the Thai writing. Unlike the Indonesian students who used *because* with 10.78%, Thai students employed *because* more intensively than Indonesian students (10.98%). This indicates that the Thai students produce a lot of sentences showing the cause and reason to the previous information, so many *cause and result* DMs employed there. From the seventh and eight frequently used DM *such as* and *for example,* the percentages of the most frequent used of DMs falls to 4.75% and 4.15%, which were less than half of the percentage of *because.* This suggests that unlike the DMs of Indonesian students, those of Thai students declined smoothly. However, starting from the ninth to thirteenth most frequently used DMs (*although, second, then, first,* and *moreover*), the percentage decreased to 2.08%. This way, it indicates that the Thai EFL students opted for only a small cluster of DMs in their writing.

In summary, as revealed in Table 5, 6, 7, and 8, Indonesian and Thai students apparently relied on a high variety of the types of DMs when producing their argumentative writings. There were about 62 and 51 individual DMs employed in the EFL Indonesia and Thai students respectfully. The most frequent DM found in the top rank in the two groups fell on *because* although they were different in the percentage of use. Additionally, there appeared some DMs infrequently shared by the two groups and much less found in the Thai writings, for instances, *in fact, on the other hands, on the contrary, as, for,* and etc. Seemingly, most of these were the DMs the usage of which the students had hardly been taught or exposed to in their writing classroom.

2. The Similarities and Differences on How Discourse Markers were Used by EFL Indonesian and Thai University Students in their Argumentative Writing

Although the quantitative examination of DMs has brought much informative data, the qualitative analysis of DMs is also another important task to reinforce research question one and to address research question two. On account of

this, this section discusses the similarities and differences in the use of DMs between the EFL Indonesian and Thai students. The discussion emphasizes the comparison of the use of DMs between EFL Indonesian and Thai students.

As mentioned earlier, in accordance with the taxonomy adapted from Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Halliday and Matthiesen (2004), the DMs identified can be classified into 4 semantic functional categories: *addition, concession and contrast, cause and result*, and *enumeration and order*. Based on the findings, within the fourth functional categories of DMs, the Indonesian students employed DMs of *addition* (31.33%), while Thai students tended to mostly used DMs of *concession and contrast* (31.75%) in their argumentative writing. Following *addition* category, the Indonesian students also used *concession and contrast* (26.82%), *cause and result* (21.55%), and *enumeration and order* (20.30%). Similarly, instead of employing a high number of DMs of *concession and contrast* (31.75%), the Thai students also used *cause and result* (21.66%), and *enumeration and order* (18.69%).

The occurrence of a high number of DMs of addition signalling *addition* in both Indonesian and Thai students' writing was actually not surprising. It seemed that both groups of students have produced a lot of arguments supporting the ideas or topic determined (which was proved from the high occurrence of *and*). This supports the nature of argumentative genre which requires the writers to express good opinions toward the topic of the text. In addition, in the argumentative essay, instead of adding some information to support the preceding statements, the writers also elaborate the information by adding some examples related to their opinions. Thus, the DMs of *addition* (i.e. *such as, for example*) were used to connect the writers' arguments with the example provided. In regard to the DMs of addition, some examples on this category are as follows.

(5)

[DM/ID/10] *"And if other people have same social media with us, we can communicate with them although in other country or island."*

(6)

[DM/TH/] *"And, when you missed the class because you have some reason, you can communicate with your friend or e-mail your teacher to ask the homework."*

Compared to the previous category, DMs of *concession and contrast* seemed to be used slightly differently by these two groups in terms of both quantity and quality. Thai students apparently used these DMs much more frequently than Indonesian students. However, both groups shared similar tendency to use *if, when,* and *but* in their argumentative writing. For instance, both groups used *but* similarly in terms of quality (See Excerpts (7) and (8)). This reflected the inherent nature of the argumentative genre, which requires writers to make an argument with some supporting and opposing ideas of an issue. In the argumentative essays, the writers have to take a stand as they are trying to persuade the reader to adopt or change certain beliefs or behaviour. The high number of *concession and contrast* devices therefore suggested that the texts produced involved the writers' frequently making opposing standpoints. Among the DMs of *concession and contrast, if, when,* and *but* were the most prominently used DM in both groups' writings. To respect to the occurrence of DMs in both groups, an example of each group's DM use is shown below.

(7)

[DM/ID/04]   *"Some people say that by using social media we **will more easy** to communicate with other people. **But,** this **argument** is not correct entirely."*

(8)

[DM/TH/18]   *"Social media also have a bad side too. **But,** if **you use it** right away, don't worry about it. Social media can **be useful** for you to keep in touch with friends, family, and **people all** around the world."*

Similarly, both Indonesian and Thai students also shared quite similar number of percentage related to the DMs of *cause and result*. It is already clear that this category of DMs function to introduce information that is a result, reason, or purpose of preceding information. Here, Indonesian and Thai students basically demonstrated a relatively consistent pattern of DMs use. Both of them highly employed the most frequently used DM like *because* to indicate some form of causal relation, in which the presupposing sentence expresses the cause and reason. Also, to presuppose sentence expresses a result, the DMs of *addition* such as *so* and *therefore*

were changeably used by both groups in their argumentative writing. Regarding the DMs of *cause and result*, the similar percentage gained from both groups reflected how those groups used these devices similarly to show causal and resultative relation in their argumentative writing, as respectfully shown in the examples (9) and (10) below taken from an Indonesian and a Thai writing.

(9)

[DM/ID/23] *"It may bring us near to some people but it may create the long distance which may be difficult to cover later on with some people. So, there is a need of balance if we will use Facebook."*

(10)

[DM/TH/16] *"Due to the globalization, communication is important. So, social media become a big part for communication of today society."*

Additionally, as far as the DMs of *enumeration and order* are concerned, the Indonesian and Thai students apparently showed a low degree of difference in its usage. Both groups of students showed a tendency to the number of DMs of *enumeration and order*. However, Indonesian students seemed to use a more varied types of individual DMs in this category (21 types for Indonesian group and 17 ones for Thai group). The two groups used this category of DMs intensively to order the main points they wanted to make in their argumentative writing, as shown in the following examples.

(11)

[DM/ID/02] *"Finally, for me and many people who used Facebook, Facebook is an interesting place to share our feeling and get information quickly and Facebook bringing people together."*

(12)

[DM/TH/04] *"To sum up, everything in this world just like social media always has two side although most people like to see only its advantages and never think about its disadvantages."*

On regard to the percentage of the DMs produced by Indonesian and Thai students, both groups employed a high number of various categories of DMs. The findings in this present study were similar to what previous research studies have found. Indonesian students employed a high numbers of DMs in their argumentative writing as reported in a large number of previous studies (e.g. Priyatmojo, 2011; Fadlilatur, 2010; Kusumaningrum, 2013; Andayani, 2013; Hinkel, 2001). Similarly, Thai students were used a high number of DMs (Prommas, 2011; Chanawangsa, 1986; Sitthirak, 2010; Tangkiengsirisin, 2010; Petchprasert, 2007).

Furthermore, regarding some similar problems found in the students' writing; they were the lack of the use of DMs, overuse of DMs, and repetition of the use of DMs.

2.1 Lack of the Use of DMs

In Excerpts (13)-(14) the students produced sentences with comma splices, making overly long or run-on sentences in their paragraphs, attributable to both Indonesian and Thai writing style. As this problem appeared in some students' writing, the tendency of constructing a very long sentence affected to the text coherence. Moreover, if the scarcity of DMs was also found in those long sentences, it would make the text less coherent as the sentences were not well-connected. This was in line with Modhish's (2012) study stated that the poor quality of the essays could also be ascribed to the students' tendency to produce rather long sentences with the less number of the use of DMs.

(13)

[DM/ID/10] *"In the other side, if we use social media it is free because the bill pay for the connection in previous time."*

(14)

[DM/TH/02] *"Furthermore, if we think about its advantages that is it helps people connect to each other easily, it is not right because it also has disadvantages too."*

2.2 Overuse of DMs

The Excerpts below illustrate some DMs were highly used by the students in their writings. For instances, the following Excerpts are the occurrence of *but*, *although,* and *because* in the students' writing.

To see an example of the overuse of DMs appear, Excerpt (15) illustrate the DM *and* is overly used with the DM *beside that* to create an additive relation between the prepositions. As stated by Fadlilatur (2010), the overuse of DMs produced by Indonesian students might be for the sake of emphasizing on the argument delivered.

(15)

[DM/ID/21] *"Most of people in the world use it. They think **that there** **are** several advantages of social media for them, **and,** beside that there are several people think that social media have disadvantages.*

In Excerpt (16), *but* is overly used by the students in concurrence with other connectors such as *although*.

(16)

[DM/TH/16] *"**Although** a lot of people says internet and social media has bad influence to people, **but** that does not **take out** the good advantages that social media can give **us, if we** using it in the right way."*

In Excerpt (16), the students produced a short paragraph employing a lot of DMs. The DM *when* is used in concurrence with *but* and *because*. As suggested by Bennui (2008), the wordiness or overuse style of Thai writing often appeared in Thai students' written English. In Thai paragraph or essay writing, the overuse of words, phrases, or sentences is used to motivate the readers to discover the topic of the writing. However, in English style, it confuses the readers. The language style level indicated cross-linguistic discourse influence.

2.3 Repetition of the Use of DMs

The following Excerpts show how several DMs are used by Indonesian and Thai in their writing. A study conducted by Yang and Sun (2011) revealed that the students utilized a small number of DMs and repeated certain DMs. In addition, it was also found that several DMs were repeatedly used by Indonesian students such as *and, or, because, so*, and *but* (Andayani, 2013), and Thai students such as *and, but, because*, and *for example* (Prommas, 2011). As shown in (17)-(18), other examples of repetition of the use of DMs are also presented, i.e. the use of DMs *when, if*, and *then*.

(17)

[DM/ID/17] *"They are very useful for people if people **use it as** careful as possible. They will also very bad for **people if** people use it misuse."*

(18)

[DM/TH/06] *"Finally, the social media make people that they **are not** dare to talk **when** they meet. Some people are **shy when** they meet someone and they are not dare to **talk to** someone **when** they meet. In the social media, **they may** be dare to talk with someone. For example, you **want to** talk with the person you like, but you are fear **to talk to** her **when** you meet her."*

To sum up, with regards to all errors discovered from the Indonesian and Thai students' writing, there were the lack of DMs, overuse of DMs, and repetition of the use DMs. This seems that both Indonesian and Thai students seem to have similar problems in encountering the DMs. In addition, the problems occurred may be as the effect of L1 transfer (interference) toward L2 performance (Budiharso, 2006; Bennui, 2008; Petchprasert, 2007).

Thus, it is suggested that these errors on DMs should be taken into account in the writing class. The similarity of the errors occurred in both students' writing indicates that the Indonesian and Thai students have similar problems in encountering English DMs. Regarding the pedagogical implications, these problems

should be tackled by the English teachers or writing instructors in order to improve students' lack of DM knowledge. In addition, this similarity can be a valuable source for the material developers in constructing the curriculum, materials, and instruction applied in English writing class both in Indonesia and Thailand.

3. The Appropriateness of the Use of Discourse Markers Produced by Indonesian and Thai Students

Regarding the use of DMs by Indonesian students, among 400 DMs, 384 of them were appropriate and the rest (n=16) was inappropriate. Additionally, for Thai case, out of 337 DMs appeared, 325 of them were appropriate and the rest (n=12) was inappropriate. Considering the use of DMs and text cohesion, this revealed that both groups of students enabled to employ the DMs appropriately. In addition, by using the DMs, the students could produce more cohesive text. Modhish (2012) in his study mentioned that the DMs were able to connect the components of the text so that their texts were more cohesive. The number of the use of DMs should be suitable with the need of DMs within the text. Both of the overuse of DMs and the scarcity ones could create a less cohesive text. Thus, the use of appropriate number of DMs and well-functioned ones could construct the text cohesion (Fadlilatur, 2010).

In order to produce a good text, the text should be cohesive and coherent (Harmer, 2001). Cohesion is a more about technical matters since it is about the various linguistic ways of connecting ideas across phrases and sentences. In doing so, cohesive devices are the tools to construct the cohesion of the text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Further, Halliday and Hasan (1976) categorized cohesive devices into reference, substitution/ ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. The present study revealed that the DMs were used appropriately in the argumentative writing composed by Indonesian and Thai students. The DMs could be able to construct a more cohesive text as they link the sentences in order to connect the ideas within the text. As a result, the more appropriate the DMs were used, the better text would be (Jalilifar, 2008). On the contrary, the less number of the use of DMs also could construct incoherent texts (Modhish, 2010).

With regard to the appropriateness of the use of DMs and lexical cohesion, there is evidence in this study that support the findings of previous studies that the appropriate use DMs was related to cohesion (Priyatmojo, 2011; Petchprasert, 2007;

Jalilifar, 2008). Priyatmojo (2011) investigated the the use of cohesive devices employed by Indonesian university students and the cohesion of the text. He found that one of cohesion categories, which were conjunctions, was related to cohesion as it could connect the writer's ideas across sentences. Similarly, this was also found in this present study that the use of DMs could facilitate the Indonesian and Thai students in developing their ideas towards the topic given. Thus, the DMs they used contribute to the text cohesion in the way the DMs link the components of the text. Additionally, Petchprasert (2007) reported evidence of the appropriate use of DMs and cohesion in the investigation of Thai students' essay writing. In addition, Jalilifar (2008) showed that the number of DMs used correctly contributed to the cohesion of the text positively, as well as to the writing quality of students' compositions. As shown earlier that the number of the DMs employed by the Indonesian and Thai students could be able to construct the cohesiveness within the sentences. The use of the DMs should be in appropriate number otherwise it would influence to the textual cohesion. In other words, either the overuse or restricted-use of DMs affected the textual cohesion (Jalilifar, 2008; Modhish, 2010).

Further, the finding of this study fits with the basic view of the function of DMs, in which connecting ideas across phrases and sentences. By employing the DMs in the sentences, this functioned to construct the cohesion of the text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Harmer, 2001; De Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). In doing so, the appropriate use of DMs was employed by the Indonesian and Thai students in their argumentative writing. The following examples may illustrate the fact that the DMs can contribute to cohesion.

(19)

[DM/ID/09] *"Facebook are the social media bringing people together. Today many social media are used by modern people **such as** Friendster, Twitter, Facebook, and soon. Facebook is the most popular social media. Many people use Facebook **because** it is easy and simple. Everyone can make one or more Facebook. **Besides,** many people using Facebook to find new or old friends. There are reasons Facebook can bringing people together."*

(20)

[DM/TH/02] *"Nowadays, lots of social media have been played important role in our daily life. We use it for communicating with people who live far away from us or even live in the same place. **Furthermore, if** we think about its advantage that is it helps people connect to each other easily, it is not right because it also has disadvantages too. For me, I think that the social media are setting people apart.*

The preceding paragraphs were taken from students' writing which was considered cohesive examined by the native speakers of English. It can be seen that the students employ the DMs appropriately. For the Excerpt (19), some DMs employed in the paragraph were *addition* (*such as, besides*) and *cause and result* (*because*). Then, for (20), the types of DMs used were *addition* (*furthermore*), *concession and contrast* (*if*), and *cause and result* (*because*). Here, regarding the appropriate use of DMs, it seems that the students were able to use DMs to bridge the previous sentences and the following ones to make their writing clearer and more logical (Braine and Liu, 2005). Hence, the cohesive paragraphs produced by the students indicate that the appropriate use of DMs appears to be a contributor to the text cohesion. In other words, the students who were able to use DMs appropriately were more successful in producing more cohesive compositions (Jalilifar, 2008). However, for Indonesian students, it seems easy to produce DMs appropriately as they have used to employing DMs appropriately in their L1. The students have been used to using DMs in Indonesian writing in order to produce a cohesive text (Priyatmojo, 2011). Thus, it indicates that students' L1 works positively in the other language writing (Odlin, 1989). Similarly, there were appropriate uses of DMs commonly found by the Thai students in the classroom context so that it also seems that the Thai students make appropriate use of DMs (Prommas, 2011).

Furthermore, the appropriateness of the use of DMs was also related to in the text coherence. Based on the findings of this study, the inappropriate use of DMs was because of some errors appeared in the use of DMs. Regarding the number of DMs used, it was found that the more the DMs were employed, the less coherence a

text would be. As mentioned earlier that the redundant use of DMs might cause the less cohesive paragraph so that the appropriate use of DMs would make a text cohesive and coherent (Fadlilatur, 2010; Bennui, 2008). Therefore, both of the number of DMs and the other problems could become causes of an inappropriate text.

Moreover, several overused-markers were found such as *and, also, so,* and *but*. These DMs might those which had kept on reoccurring on the teaching materials and in the classroom instruction carried out by the writing instructors. This way, the following findings were in line with this study which discovered the overuse of DMs which made the text seemed incoherent. As mentioned by Zhang (2000) and Alarcon and Morales (2011), the fact that the texts were inappropriate due to some cohesive features identified, such as the overuse and misuse of DMs.

Further, in terms of the possible causes of errors identified in this study, this might be influenced by students' L1 transfer (interference). In other words, their L1 contributes to their L2 writing. This case was not surprising as for EFL/ ESL students their English writing was commonly influenced by their L1 writing system. Similarly, the negative transfer or interference from the first language to the second language and other factors, concerning rule learning such as overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of rules, inadequate teaching and learning, seem to be the most likely source of errors (Pongsiriwet, 2001). With regard to the causes of grammatical errors found in this study, it seems that negative transfer or interference from both Thai students' writing was one possible source of these errors (Pongsiriwet, 2001; Bennui, 2008; Petchprasert, 2007; Kaplan, 1987 as cited in Grabe and Kaplan, 1996). Similarly, the errors also appeared in Indonesian students' writing. This may be partly due to the influence of writing practices in the non-native writers' first language and the writer's attempt to find an appropriate format in the absence of well-established research writing conventions in the first language (Mirahayuni, 2002).

Since Thai/Indonesian language and English differ in various aspects regarding linguistic properties, these differences might result in negative transfer, leading to errors in the second language. Apparently, the students' native language and intralingual factors of rule learning have contributed great influence on second language learning (Odlin, 1989). Consequently, both ESL/EFL teachers and students

should be aware of these factors and take them into account in the process of teaching and learning so that the mastery of the second language can be achieved. It is advisable that the EFL programs in Indonesia, Thailand and in the other similar contexts should treat writing as a separate skill and not to be looked as a secondary skill that is not given the attention it deserves. Then, EFL students should be encouraged by writing instructors to adventure with the language and not to be unnecessarily cautious of making errors as this might lead students to be rather inhibited. Furthermore, it should be emphasized once again that DMs should be tackled inductively and deductively by English language teachers in general and EFL writing instructors in particular. Providing students adequate exposure in L2 will certainly enable students to pay attention to these linguistic items and become aware of the facilitating role they play in making their texts more coherent and cohesive.

To sum up this chapter, this part has presented the numbers of DMs and its types employed by Indonesian and Thai students. Based on the findings, the total number of DMs employed by Indonesian students (4.54%) was lower than those used by Thai students (5.63%). Considering the total number of words in the composition, the Indonesian students produced higher number of words of composition than the Thai ones. Thus, it might become the reason the use of DMs by Indonesian students was lower than that by Thai students. Among all categories of DMs adapted from Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), for those occurred in the Indonesian students' writing, *addition* category was the first rank, followed by *concession and contrast, cause and result*, and *enumeration and order* category, and for those appeared in the Thai students' writing, the first ranks was *concession and contrast* category, followed by *addition, cause and result*, and *enumeration and order* category respectively.

Related to the types of DMs, Indonesian and Thai students shared similar tendency to employ *because* in more frequent occurrence. This indicates that they made causative relation more in expressing their points of view toward a case. Next, for Indonesian students, they also frequently used *if, and, when,* and *also* in their writing. For Thai students, this was slightly different as they mostly employed *and, when, if,* and *so.* In addition, there were also found several problems encountered by Indonesian and Thai students when they employed DMs such as the lack of the use of DMs, overuse of DMs

(e.g. *but*, *although*, and *because*), and repetition of the use of DMs (i.e. *because*, *if*, *for example*, *when*, and *then*). These problems may cause insufficient knowledge of complex-sentence formation, unawareness of grammatical restrictions DMs with its various types, L1 interference, written Thai style transfer, and oral culture influence (Prommas, 2011; Bennui, 2008; Petchprasert, 2007, Pongsiriwet, 2001; Mustaque, 2014).

        Finally, this study also revealed there was the appropriateness of the use of DMs. The DMs link the components of the text to make a text cohesive. For instances, the DMs of *cause and result* introduce information that is a reason, result, and purpose of preceding information. Similarly, the appropriate use of DMs also helped the writers to connect the ideas in its logical order. Thus, this logical order helps the readers understand the text better. Therefore, it was suggested that the knowledge of DMs should be taken into account in the writing class so that the students could produce a good paragraph.