



## Investigating the Use of Elaborative Discourse Markers in Essay Writing among EFL Undergraduates

Piyapohn Pohnsuriya<sup>1</sup> , Wanwisa Changkwian<sup>2</sup> , Sattawat Chaiyasit<sup>3\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Language Institute, Burapha University

<sup>2</sup>International College, Burapha University

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Science and Arts, Burapha University, Chanthaburi Campus

### APA Citation:

Pohnsuriya, P., Changkwian, W., & Chaiyasit, S. (2026). Investigating the use of elaborative discourse markers in essay writing among EFL undergraduates. *Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 7(1), 40-53.  
<https://doi.org/10.62819/jel.2026.1268>

**Received:** February 6, 2026

**Revised:** March 27, 2026

**Accepted:** March 27, 2026

### Abstract

Given the importance of academic writing for undergraduates, understanding their use of discourse markers is crucial for effective writing instruction. This study examines the frequency of discourse markers used by non-native EFL undergraduate students and explores their misuse by employing both quantitative and qualitative methods. The results show that the most frequently used elaborative discourse markers are 'and' (73.05%), 'as well as' (9.26%), and 'in addition' (5.50%), respectively. Also, non-native EFL undergraduate students sometimes misplace EDMs by placing them in the middle of the clause, leading to confusion or grammatical errors. These findings suggest that explicit instruction of elaborative discourse markers should be incorporated to academic writing classrooms, and teachers or instructors could have students exposed to authentic academic texts so that they will be more familiar with the real texts and eventually more confident in their writing.

**Keywords:** academic writing, corpus linguistics, discourse markers, EFL writing, language teaching

### Introduction

*Problems with Elaborative Discourse Markers (EDMs)*

Writing can significantly impact a learner's performance, as they must be able to create an academic paper or essay to demonstrate their understanding (Riznanda, 2021). However, it is the

---

\*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [sattawat.ch@go.buu.ac.th](mailto:sattawat.ch@go.buu.ac.th)

skill that most learners pay less attention to because it is considered the most challenging to learn in a language (Sanjaya et al, 2020). In writing, words and phrases are used to combine ideas (Kaewlai, 2021), and discourse makers play a crucial role in achieving cohesion and coherence (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Arya (2020) also agreed that DMs are essential tools for meaningfully linking written sentences, especially EFL.

Fraser (2009) classified DMs into four types: contrast, elaborative, inferential, and temporal. However, DMs in the elaborative categories, including *'because'*, *'and'*, *'then'*, and *'therefore'*, are focused because they help tie sentences in an essay, allowing ideas to flow naturally and coherently (Fraser, 1999). Wahid et al. (2020) highlighted the importance of the EDMs since they were ranked the most frequency used discourse markers in descriptive text. However, the frequent repetition of this type of markers may also suggest that students lack sufficient knowledge of other types of discourse markers.

While a lack of discourse markers can hinder writing, their overuse can also lead to misinterpretation and diminish text quality (Al-khazraji, 2019; Jimola & Dada, 2023). It is believed that the errors could be influenced by the translation of their first language (Tikham, 2023). This leads to further study of non-native speakers' use of EDMs in essays, examining their patterns of frequencies, and application.

In the field, studies on the use of discourse markers shed light on various areas. Tikham (2023), Rabab'ah et al. (2020), and Martinez (2004) revealed that elaborate markers were employed the most frequently among non-native speakers to provide additional information, whereas other studies argued that other markers, such as sequential markers and distance markers, were used in the text more often (Sohaya, 2018; Wahid et al., 2020). In terms of writing quality, Muhyidin (2020) found that students' writing performance in exposition texts relied on their mastery of discourse markers. Karimah et al. (2020) also showed that the misuse of discourse markers and linguistic strategies is related. Furthermore, many EFL students struggle to select appropriate discourse markers for specific contexts (Ariyanti, 2021).

As the use of the DMs is influenced by learners' mother tongue (Tikham, 2023), the significant differences between Asian languages and English may affect how these markers are employed. Moreover, EDMs are not sufficiently emphasized in either textbooks or classroom instruction (Wahid et al., 2020), leading to a students' limited ability to use them effectively to make arguments or agreements should more convincing and natural. Therefore, teachers must clarify the significance of DMs and how to express them appropriately in different contexts (Riznanda, 2021). Before implementing such instructional strategies, the patterns of DMs used should be examined; this study focuses on EDMs, one of the essential markers used in expressing additional information in a logical order.

This study adopts Fraser's (1999, 2009) taxonomy of discourse markers as its main analytical framework because it provides a functional account of how markers signal

semantic-pragmatic relations between discourse segments. Within this framework, EDMs are particularly relevant to academic essay writing because they help writers add information, extend propositions, and create cohesion across clauses and sentences. Fraser's taxonomy is especially appropriate for the present study because it enables a more precise examination of whether lexical items function as discourse markers in context, thereby allowing a distinction between genuine elaborative discourse-marking uses and non-discourse grammatical uses.

Although prior studies have examined metadiscourse or transition markers in student writing, limited attention has been paid to the contextual appropriateness of EDMs in EFL undergraduate essays from the BAWE corpus.

## Research Questions

1. What are the frequencies of EDMs used by non-native speakers at the university level?
2. What are the characteristics and misuse of EDMs used by non-native speakers at the tertiary level?

## Methods

### 1. The Corpus

#### 1.1 Essay Selection Criteria

The essays in the BAWE were 2,761 essays from various types and disciplines. This study aims to investigate the EDMs used by EFL undergraduates in essays. The criteria to select the essays were as follows:

**Table 1**

#### *Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria of Essays*

Included	Excluded
1. Essays were written by undergraduate-level students.	1. Essays were written by other levels.
2. Their L1 was not English, and English was taught as a foreign language.	2. Essays were written by native English speakers.
3. The essays were expository in order to control the use of discourse markers.	3. Other types of essays were not included.

Out of 2,761 essays, 88 selected essays were used in this study. The essay topics are general topics from undergraduates across several disciplines, such as Economics. The essays' lengths were 350 – 450 words. Overall, the corpus size of 88 essays was at 242,307 tokens.

*1.2 EDMs Selection Criteria*

The criteria for including and excluding the EDMs samples were applied to ensure that the EMS followed Fraser's taxonomy.

**Table 2**  
*EDMs Based on Fraser's Taxonomy*

EDMs	Inclusion	Exclusion
and	Linking two clauses/discourse units Example: She studied hard, <b>and</b> she passed the exam.	Joining words/phrases inside a single NP/VP. Example: He bought apples <b>and</b> bananas.
also	Independent clause/sentence-level elaborator. Example: The policy is costly. <b>Also</b> , it reduces efficiency.	Inside <b>not only ... but also</b> , or modifying subject/verb. Example: She is not only smart <b>but also</b> diligent.
In addition	As a sentence-initial DM meaning “moreover” Example: <b>In addition</b> , the program improved retention	Prepositional phrase “ <b>in addition to</b> + NP” Example: <b>In addition to</b> her job, she studies law
besides	As “what’s more” (additive elaboration) Example: He is qualified. <b>Besides</b> , he has experience	As “apart from / except.” Example: <b>Besides</b> English, she speaks Japanese
or	When reformulative (“or, in other words”). Example: The findings were weak, <b>or</b> rather inconclusive	When marking alternatives/choices. Example: Would you like tea <b>or</b> coffee?

**Table 2 (Continued)**

<b>EDMs</b>	<b>Inclusion</b>	<b>Exclusion</b>
likewise / similarly	At the discourse level, showing parallel elaboration. Example: The first study succeeded. <b>Similarly</b> , the second showed gains.	As an adverb modifying a verb inside a clause. Example: She behaved <b>similarly</b> .
above all	When emphasizing the most important additional point. Example: He is talented; <b>above all</b> , he is honest.	When used as an emphatic adverb within a clause. Example: <b>Above all</b> things, honesty matters.
what is more	As an additive DM in discourse. Example: The system is simple. <b>What is more</b> , it is cost-effective	As conversational/colloquial filler without elaboration. Example: <b>What is more</b> fun than a holiday?
as well (as)	Rarely included: only if sentence-initial and functioning like “also.” Example: <b>As well</b> , the study highlights limitations.	Normal phrasal/prepositional use “X as well as Y.” Example: She speaks Thai <b>as well as</b> English.
plus	When used as DM means “in addition.” Example: The method is reliable. <b>Plus</b> , it saves time	When arithmetic or lexical. Example: Two <b>plus</b> two equals four.

---

## **Methodology**

### *1. Corpus Source and Data Collection*

To begin with, this study employed the British Academic Written English (BAWE) corpus as the primary data source. The corpus texts were accessed through the BAWE corpus search interface hosted by Coventry University and downloaded as plain text files (.txt) to ensure compatibility with corpus analysis software called Antconc 4.3.1. After the download process, 88 essays were selected according to the predetermined inclusion criteria. These criteria were designed to control text type and ensure comparability across samples, particularly in terms of genre and academic writing context.

### *2. Text Selection Criteria*

Subsequently, the essays were filtered and selected systematically according to the criteria specified earlier in the study. This controlled sampling approach was applied to reduce unwanted variation and ensure that the selected texts represented a consistent academic writing genre suitable for examining the use of EDMs. In particular, controlling genre was important because discourse marker frequency and function vary depending on communicative purpose and rhetorical structure.

### *3. Data Cleaning and Preparation*

After the essays were selected, the corpus texts were prepared for analysis using a data-cleaning procedure. Specifically, non-linguistic and metadata elements were removed, including essay prompts/topics, writers' names, and reference lists. This step was necessary to avoid inflating frequency counts with items not produced as part of the main essay body.

However, punctuation marks were intentionally retained. This decision was made because punctuation can signal clause boundaries and sentence organization, which are relevant to understanding how elaborative discourse markers function in authentic academic writing.

### *4. Corpus Analysis Procedures*

Afterward, the cleaned text files were imported into AntConc (version 4.3.1) for corpus-based analysis. Frequency analysis was conducted by searching for each EDM item included in the study framework. AntConc's concordance function was used to display the surrounding co-text of each marker, allowing the researcher to examine how each token operated within sentence structure and discourse flow.

In addition, the analysis included checking both lowercase and capitalized forms of markers (e.g., *'also'* vs. *'Also'*) to ensure comprehensive retrieval. For multi-word markers,

searches were conducted using complete strings (e.g. ‘*in addition*’, ‘*for example*’) to prevent partial or unrelated matches.

Importantly, concordance outputs were manually checked to ensure that only true elaborative discourse marker uses were counted. In other words, each retrieved token was evaluated in context to confirm that it performed an elaborative discourse function (e.g., adding, reinforcing, or extending information), rather than serving a purely grammatical or lexical role unrelated to discourse relations. Tokens that did not meet the functional definition of an elaborative discourse marker were excluded from the final dataset to maintain analytical accuracy.

Finally, validated EDM frequencies were recorded and summarized to reveal overall distribution patterns across the corpus. The frequency results were then interpreted to explain major tendencies in EDM use, such as overreliance on highly frequent markers and limited use of more formal academic elaborators. These findings were used as the basis for the subsequent discussion and pedagogical implications.

## Results

**Table 3**

*EDMs Used by EFL Undergraduates in Their Essays*

EDMs	Frequency	Percentage
and	1,168	73.05%
as well (as)	148	9.26%
In addition	88	5.50%
also	59	3.69%
besides	41	2.56%
or	32	2.00%
similarly	32	2.00%
likewise	19	1.19%
above all	8	0.50%
what is more	2	0.13%
plus	2	0.13%

The analysis of EDMs in the non-native undergraduate corpus (159,912 words) revealed a highly uneven distribution across marker types. A total of 1,599 tokens of elaborative markers were identified, but the overwhelming majority were concentrated on a single item.

The marker *'and'* accounted for 1,168 instances (73.05%), clearly dominating the category. This finding suggested that non-native EFL writers rely heavily on *'and'* as a default device to signal elaboration, often extending sentences or linking clauses with minimal variation. The reliance on *'and'* is aligned with earlier studies reporting learners' preference for basic coordinators in academic writing.

The second most frequent item was *'as well as'* with 148 tokens (9.26%), followed by *'in addition'* with 88 tokens (5.50%). These two markers, though less common than *'and'*, indicated some awareness of alternative academic elaborators. Similarly, *'also'* occurred 59 times (3.69%), suggesting its role as a supplementary additive device, albeit less frequently than in native writing reported in other studies.

Other elaborators occurred at relatively low levels: *'besides'* (41; 2.56%), *'or'* (32; 2.00%), *'similarly'* (32; 2.00%), and *'likewise'* (19; 1.19%). These markers appeared sporadically and suggested limited lexical variety in expressing elaboration. Rare items such as *'above all'* (8; 0.50%), *'what is more'* (2; 0.13%), and *'plus'* (2; 0.13%) were nearly absent, while *'namely'* did not occur at all.

Overall, the data showed that non-native EFL undergraduates overwhelmingly rely on *'and'*, with very limited use of more formal or academic elaborators such as *'moreover'*, *'furthermore'*, or *'namely'*. This pattern highlighted both a restricted repertoire and a tendency to overuse the most basic marker. Such findings pointed to potential areas for pedagogical intervention, particularly in raising learners' awareness of the range and rhetorical value of elaborative devices in academic writing.

### **Qualitative Findings: Misuse and Characteristics**

The concordance lines showed how non-native EFL undergraduates use EDMs.

The most noticeable feature was their heavy reliance on *'and'*, which accounted for more than seventy percent of all tokens. Students often used *'and'* as their default connector, linking many ideas in a single sentence. While grammatically correct, this habit produced long additive strings that lack clarity or rhetorical strength. For example, *"The policy was*

*implemented successfully, and the people trusted the government more, and they supported new reforms.*” In this case, a marker such as ‘consequently’ or ‘therefore’ would have made the logical relationship clearer.

Other elaborators appeared much less often and are sometimes misused. The marker ‘*also*’ was sometimes used well at the beginning of a sentence (“*Also, the survey supports the earlier findings*”), but was often misused in the middle of a clause, leading to awkward or ungrammatical sentences such as “*This result is also important that teachers give feedback.*” The marker *as well* (*as*) was most often used in conversational, sentence-final position (“*...students should read widely as well*”), which did not function as an EDM. Although ‘*as well*’ occasionally appeared at the beginning of a sentence and worked correctly as an additive marker, such cases are rare.

Other markers were less consistent and showed varied accuracy. ‘*Besides*’ was sometimes appropriately used as a discourse marker (“*He is qualified. Besides, he has experience in the field*”), but more often used in prepositional phrases such as “*Besides English, she speaks Japanese,*” which was not an EDM. The marker ‘*or*’ was never used to reformulate (‘*or rather,*’ or ‘*in other words*’). Instead, it only signaled alternatives, for example, “*Students can choose business or science.*” Rare emphatic markers, such as ‘*above all*’, ‘*what is more*’, and ‘*plus*’, occurred only a few times and sounded more conversational than academic. For instance, “*Above all, people must cooperate for success*” was strong rhetorically but less formal, while “*Plus, it saves time*” reflected spoken language rather than academic style.

Comparative markers such as ‘*similarly*’ and ‘*likewise*’ were used only occasionally. When they did appear, they were usually used correctly to signal parallels, as in “*Similarly, the second experiment confirmed the results.*” However, their rare use showed the limited range of elaborators in student writing.

In summary, the qualitative analysis supports the quantitative results: non-native undergraduates exhibited a narrow and unbalanced use of EDMs. Their writing relied too much on ‘*and*’, uses ‘*also*’ and ‘*as well*’ inconsistently, and rarely employed more advanced academic elaborators. These tendencies limited the variety of their vocabulary and reduced the coherence and sophistication expected in academic writing.

## **Discussion**

The findings answer the two research questions in complementary ways. Regarding research question 1, the quantitative results show that the essays relied heavily on a

limited range of EDMs, with and occurring far more frequently than other items. For research question 2, the qualitative analysis demonstrates that not all identified forms functioned appropriately as discourse markers in context, as some instances reflected misplacement, non-discourse grammatical use, or register inconsistency. In summary, these findings suggest that frequency of use does not necessarily indicate functional control in academic writing.

The results show that non-native writers frequently use EDMs differently, while *'and'*, *'as well as'*, and *'in addition'* were mostly used respectively by non-native writers in this study. It is inferred that non-native writers are more familiar with these three words than with others. Regarding the misuse of EDMs, non-native writers sometimes misplace them. For example, some markers are often placed in the middle of the clause, causing ungrammatical sentences. The results of this study show that writers who are familiar with some particular words or phrases are more likely to use those words more frequently, even though they usually make mistakes when using them. This aligns with the research studies by Muhyidin (2020), Ariyanti (2021), and Karimah et al. (2021), who stated that some students have difficulties using discourse markers, especially when it comes to EDMs, resulting from the proficiency of the students. In this way, having explicit instruction on discourse markers in the classroom is really essential for teaching students writing (Riznanda, A., 2021). There is a significant relationship between explicit teaching and the correct use of discourse markers in students' writing.

## **Pedagogical Implications**

The findings of this study suggest several pedagogical implications for EFL academic writing instruction. Non-native EFL undergraduates demonstrate an unbalanced reliance on a limited set of EDMs, particularly *'and'*, which accounted for **73.05%** of all EDM tokens. This restricted repertoire, along with observed misuse and misplacement of some markers, indicates that learners require more explicit guidance to use elaborative markers appropriately in academic contexts.

### *1. Explicit instruction and function awareness*

Writing instruction should include explicit teaching of EDMs, focusing on their rhetorical functions (e.g., adding information, reinforcing a point, highlighting importance) and their appropriateness in the academic register. Since learners tend to overuse *'and'* as a default connector and rarely employ formal elaborators such as *'moreover'* or *'furthermore'*, teachers should introduce a wider set of EDMs and demonstrate how each marker contributes to clarity and cohesion.

## 2. *Accurate Placement*

Because qualitative evidence shows that some markers (e.g., *also*) are misused in clause-medial positions, resulting in awkward or ungrammatical patterns, classroom practice should highlight correct positioning and punctuation. Teachers may use sentence-level correction tasks in which students revise incorrect placement into accurate academic structures (e.g., sentence-initial *Also*, or *In addition*, followed by a comma).

## 3. *Reduce “and-chains” through rewriting tasks*

The findings show that students often link many ideas using repetition and strings, which may reduce rhetorical strength and coherence. Therefore, teachers should assign rewriting tasks that require students to revise long additive sentences into more coherent structures by selecting more precise connectors (e.g. *furthermore*, *moreover*, *additionally*, *similarly*) and by combining ideas through clearer sentence boundaries.

## 4. *Use authentic input and corpus-based noticing*

Finally, EFL learners should be exposed to authentic academic texts such as journal articles, theses, and high-quality model essays to strengthen their awareness of how EDMs function in real academic writing. This can be supported through guided noticing activities, where students identify EDMs in authentic texts and practice applying them in their own paragraphs, leading to improved confidence and more sophisticated writing.

Overall, the results support the need for instructional approaches that develop both the range and accuracy of elaborative discourse marker use, thereby helping learners produce clearer, more academically appropriate writing.

## **Conclusion**

This study examined the use of EDMs in EFL undergraduate essays from the BAWE corpus through both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The results revealed a strong reliance on a narrow set of markers, especially *and*, suggesting that the students tended to depend on highly general additive resources rather than a wider range of more specific elaborative forms. The qualitative findings further showed that some items did not function effectively as discourse markers in context, particularly in cases involving misplacement, non-discourse grammatical use, and register inconsistency. These findings indicate that frequency alone does not reflect full discourse control in academic writing. Therefore, writing instruction should focus not only on increasing students' repertoire of EDMs, but

also on developing their awareness of how such markers function appropriately in formal academic discourse.

## **Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research**

Although this study provides useful insights into the frequency and characteristics of EDMs used in EFL undergraduate essays, several limitations should be acknowledged. To begin with, the study analyzed only expository essays in order to control discourse marker use and reduce variation across writing types. While this decision strengthens the internal consistency of the analysis, it also limits the generalizability of the findings to other academic genres, such as argumentative, reflective, or report writing. Therefore, future research should compare EDM use across a wider range of genres to determine whether the same reliance patterns occur when students are required to adopt different rhetorical purposes and organizational structures.

Moreover, the dataset consisted of 88 essays selected from the BAWE corpus, with each text containing approximately 350–450 words. Although this corpus size is adequate for identifying initial frequency tendencies, a larger dataset would likely generate more stable results and provide stronger statistical support. In addition, a broader sample could allow more detailed comparisons across disciplinary areas or proficiency levels, which may reveal meaningful variation in EDM use. For this reason, future studies may expand the sample size and examine whether disciplinary writing conventions influence how students elaborate ideas in academic writing.

In addition to sampling constraints, the study focused solely on EDMs, enabling a deeper examination of a single functional category. However, this approach does not fully explain how EFL learners create cohesion through other discourse marker categories, such as contrastive, inferential, or temporal markers. Since academic writing coherence is built through multiple discourse relations, future research should adopt a broader discourse marker framework to explore how different categories interact and jointly shape the clarity and logic of learner writing.

Finally, it should be noted that the present analysis is primarily corpus-based and frequency-driven. As a result, it does not directly demonstrate how EDM use affects the overall quality of writing, such as coherence, argument strength, or readability. Consequently, future research could triangulate corpus results with additional data sources, such as writing performance scores, rater evaluations, and learner interviews. Such an

approach would not only strengthen the validity of the findings but also help explain why learners choose certain EDMs, how effectively they apply them, and how EDM patterns contribute to the development of academic writing.

In summary, these limitations indicate that future studies should expand corpus scope, examine multiple genres, include other discourse marker categories, and incorporate qualitative triangulation methods to improve generalizability and explanatory power. Nevertheless, the current findings remain valuable, as they highlight common patterns of EDM overreliance and provide a useful foundation for improving instructional support in EFL academic writing contexts.

### Acknowledgement

The authors gratefully acknowledge the Department of Western Languages, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Burapha University, for providing the academic foundation where we pursued our studies and strengthened our English proficiency. We also appreciate the institutional support and research environment provided by the Faculty of Science and Arts, Burapha University, Chanthaburi Campus, as well as Burapha University International College (BUUIC) and the Burapha University Language Institute (BUULI). We are especially indebted to Dr. Montarat Rungruangthum for her expert supervision and invaluable suggestions, which strengthened the study at every stage. In addition, we would like to recognize Asst. Prof. Rinda Warawudhi for introducing Sattawat Chaiyasit to Corpus Linguistics and motivating his long-term engagement with scholarly research in this domain.

### References

- Al-khazraji, A. (2019). Analysis of discourse markers in essays writing in ESL classroom. *International Journal of Instruction* 12(2): 559-572.  
<https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12235a>
- Ariyanti. (2021). EFL students' use of transition signals in essay writing. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 6(1), 285-294. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v6i1.390>.
- Arya, T. (2020). Exploring discourse marker use in Thai university students' conversation. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal*, 13(1), 247-267. <https://so04.tcithaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/237854>.
- Fraser, B. (2009). An account of discourse markers. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 1(2), 293–320. <https://doi.org/10.1163/187730909x12538045489818>.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers?. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 931-952.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)00101-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00101-5)
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.

- Jimola, F. E., & Dada, E. M. (2023). Use of discourse markers in ESL undergraduates' expository essay writing among undergraduates in a Nigerian University. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 11(4), 25-42. <https://doi.org/10.37745/ijellr.13/vol11n42542>.
- Kaewlai, J. (2021). The use of scaffolding technique to develop and English composition writing skill of undergraduate students at Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon. *Rajapark Journal*, 15(43), 69-83. retrieved from <https://so05.tcithaijo.org/index.php/RJPJ/article/view/254120>.
- Karimah, N. A., Munir, A., & Anam, S. (2021). The use of discourse markers in the background of thesis proposals written by postgraduate students. *International Journal of Education and Social Science Research*, 4(1), 94-111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.37500/IJESSR.2021.4111>.
- Martínez, A. C. L. (2004). Discourse markers in the expository writing of spanish university students. *Ibérica*, 8, 63–80.
- Muhyidin, A. (2020). Does the writing exposition text ability correlate to reading habit and discourse markers mastery? *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists*, 8(2), 885–895. <https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.682065>.
- Rabab'ah, G., Ma'touq, A., & Alghazo, S. (2022). Discourse markers in narrative essays: A case study of Jordanian high school EFL learners. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures*, 14(1), 203-217. <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.14.1.11>.
- Riznanda, W. A. (2021). Discourse markers in tertiary level students' essay writing: Ability and problems. *Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, 5(1), 1-16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29240/ef.v5i1.1193>.
- Sanjaya, H. K., Apriani, E., & Edy, S. (2020). Using web blogs in teaching writing for EFL students. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, 4(4), 516-535. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.4.4.516-535>.
- Sohaya, E. M. (2018). *English discourse markers used in the procedure text written by senior high school students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara). CORE. <https://core.ac.uk/reader/225828888>
- Tikham, S. (2022). Analysis of discourse markers in Thai EFL students' essay writing: A case study of a university in northern Thailand. *Rajapark Journal*, 16(46), 50-66. Retrieved from <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/RJPJ/article/view/256844>.
- Wahid, A., Suyitno, I., Suyono S., & Martutik (2020). Discourse marker in cescrptive essays: A study on junior high school students. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists*, 8(3), 1099-1111. <https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.764191>.