

Exploring Translation Techniques of Discourse Markers from *Laskar Pelangi* into *The Rainbow Troops* Novel

Ayunda Shinta Dwi Satya Putri^{1✉}, A. Dzo'ul Milal²

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:
Received September 2024
Accepted October 2024
Published November 2024

Keywords:
discourse markers,
translation techniques,
Laskar Pelangi, *The
Rainbow Troops*,
comparative analysis

Abstract

This study aims to explore the types and functions of discourse markers (DMs) in *The Rainbow Troops* and analyze the translation techniques used in transferring these markers from the original Indonesian novel *Laskar Pelangi* into its English version. Using a descriptive qualitative method, the researcher thoroughly examined the Indonesian novel *Laskar Pelangi* and its English translation by downloading their full texts. Data collection involved an in-depth reading and repeated verification of highlighted discourse markers, while the analysis comprised classification and examination of translation techniques based on identified markers. The findings reveal a total of 682 occurrences of DMs in *The Rainbow Troops* novel. Connective markers were the most frequent, occurring 180 times, indicating their importance in maintaining narrative flow and logical coherence. In terms of translation techniques, literal translation was predominantly used, especially for markers with direct equivalents in both languages, ensuring that the original meaning and narrative structure were preserved. More complex techniques, such as transposition and modulation, were applied when a more nuanced translation was necessary to maintain naturalness and pragmatic function. In conclusion, the findings emphasize the importance of discourse markers in shaping narrative structure and highlight the translator's careful choices in adapting these markers across languages to retain their function and effect.

INTRODUCTION

In linguistics, discourse markers play an important role in shaping conversation's flow and the coherence of written texts. Discourse markers, as defined by Schiffrin (1987), are linguistic elements that organize and manage discourse, signaling relationships between clauses, sentences, or turns in conversation. These markers, which include words like *and*, *but*, *so*, and *well*, help to create coherence and guide the listener or reader through the speaker's or writer's intended meaning. Schiffrin (1987) emphasizes that discourse markers are not merely grammatical elements but are crucial in shaping discourse by indicating transitions, providing emphasis, and structuring interactions. Their role in communication is pivotal, as they help construct meaning and maintain the flow of conversation or text. In narrative texts, discourse markers not only help in structuring dialogue but also provide insights into the relationships between characters and the nuances of communication (Schiffrin 1987). This means that in literary works such as novels, discourse markers play a significant role in shaping the flow of the narrative, structuring dialogue, and reflecting character interactions. Therefore, these markers are essential not only for narrative cohesion but also for enriching the authenticity of character voices and interactions within the story (Aijmer, 2013).

The novel *Laskar Pelangi* is an Indonesian literary masterpiece that has gained international recognition for its touching portrayal of childhood in a marginalized community. Its English translation, *The Rainbow Troops*, has reached a broader audience and introduced the novel's cultural and emotional depth to global readers. However, the process of translating discourse markers between languages can be challenging due to the differences in how markers are used and interpreted across linguistic contexts. Research on the translation of discourse markers, particularly between languages as distinct as Indonesian and English, highlights the complexities of maintaining both form and function in translated texts (House, 2015).

As it pertains to this study, researchers used two novels, the original novel and its English translation as a subject to this study. The first novel is entitled "Laskar Pelangi" as the Source Text (ST) and the second novel is entitled "The Rainbow Troops" as the Target Text (TT). This study aims to identify the types and functions of discourse markers used in the English translation of "Laskar Pelangi" novel and also to investigate the translation techniques employed to transfer these markers between the two languages.

Researchers have recently conducted several studies using the novel “The Rainbow Troops” as an object in many fields. Saputri (2018) conducted a deixis analysis in the first chapter. In line with this, several aspects of translation also have been analyzed by several researchers, such as a study of translation procedures of Indonesian cultural terms (Yesi et al., 2021), a study of translation shifts (Ramadhani & Yusrah, 2023), a study of translation quality (Yulianti et al., 2024), and a study of techniques used in translating moral and values (Mariam & Suryanti, 2021). In all the studies above, no researchers have analyzed discourse markers using *The Rainbow Troops* novel as the object.

Other researchers have also examined discourse markers across various languages, highlighting their importance in maintaining coherence and ensuring smooth transitions in discourse. Aijmer (2013) focused on the role of discourse markers in Swedish-English translations, demonstrating how these markers can be interpreted differently depending on the cultural and contextual factors of the target language. In line with this, Furkó (2015) explored the translation of discourse markers from English into Hungarian. Meanwhile, in Ussolichah et al. (2021), an analysis of discourse markers was carried out using the *Endgame* movie as the research object. Similarly, Akbar et al. (2023) analyzed discourse markers using *The Ron Clark Story* movie as the object. Besides, research on discourse markers to be used as a thesis has also been carried out, such as in Nurjannah (2021), who conducted research on discourse markers with the object of an English textbook. However, there is limited research focusing on Indonesian-English translation, particularly regarding discourse markers in literary texts. This study aims to fill that gap by providing a detailed analysis of discourse markers in the context of an Indonesian novel and its English translation.

In this study, researchers identified the types and functions of discourse markers in *The Rainbow Troops* novel translated by Angie Kilbane. Although research using the object of the rainbow troops has been done by many other researchers, research focusing on examining the discourse markers is still rare. In addition, research conducted by other researchers by examining discourse markers also did not use *The Rainbow Troops* novel as the object of their research. Hence, this could be a gap for researchers to analyze the types and functions of discourse markers with these objects. In addition, researchers also analyzed what techniques are used when translating discourse markers, thereby contributing to a better understanding of translation strategies in literary contexts.

This study has significant contributions to the fields of translation studies and discourse analysis by providing an analysis of discourse markers in *The Rainbow Troops* novel. By examining the types and functions of discourse markers in *The Rainbow Troops*, this research enhances our understanding of how language coherence and meaning are maintained or altered during the translation process. Additionally, by identifying the translation techniques used to convey these markers from Indonesian to English, the study offers valuable insights for translators and linguists on the intricacies of preserving discourse-level features in literary works, contributing to improved translation practices and cross-cultural communication.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Discourse Markers

Schiffrin (1987) described discourse markers (DMs) in her book “Discourse Markers” as sequentially dependent items that bracket units of speaking. As a result, it serves a purpose in terms of long-term communication and text. Schiffrin further claims that discourse markers enable speakers to express interaction with one another and conduct conversational actions. On the other hand, Schiffrin contended that discourse markers contribute to the unity of any work. According to Schiffrin (1987), discourse markers serve various functions, such as indicating transitions, creating coherence, highlighting emphasis, and shaping the speaker’s stance. The original corpus-based analysis of 11 English DMs (okay, well, and, but, or, so, because, now, then, I mean, and you know) formed the basis of Schiffrin's (1987) model, which is a corpus-based method. So, in her view, DMs are “sequentially dependent elements which bracket the units of talk” and serve as “discourse glue” that gives the text its structure and coherence (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 31).

Schiffrin's model (1987) categorizes discourse markers into several functional groups based on their roles in discourse, such as markers of information management (oh, well), connectives markers (and, but, or, so), markers of temporal relations (then, now), markers of contrast and concession (but, however, although), markers of response (yes, no, oh), markers of interactional stance (you know, I mean). Schiffrin (1987) argues that discourse markers serve both cohesive and coherent functions in communication. Cohesion refers to the explicit links between sentences or clauses (i.e., grammatical and lexical connections), while coherence refers to the broader logical connections between ideas and how they make sense to a listener or reader. Moreover, discourse markers are multifunctional,

meaning they can serve more than one role depending on the context in which they are used. For example, “well” can act as a transition marker, a way to soften disagreement, or a pause filler to give the speaker time to think. In this study, Schiffrin’s framework is applied to identify and classify the types and functions of discourse markers found in *The Rainbow Troops*. By analyzing the frequency and contextual use of these markers, the study provides insights into how discourse markers contribute to the coherence and meaning of the texts.

Translation Techniques

Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) dismiss individual words as translation units, emphasizing that translators deal with concepts and sentiments in multiple semantic areas, not individual lexemes. They define the translation unit as “the smallest segment of the utterance whose signs are linked in such a way that they should not be translated individually”. Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) taxonomy of translation procedures used to deal with SL and TL structural incompatibilities separates two basic translation methodologies. Borrowing, calque, and literal translation are all examples of direct translation, which is characterized by word-for-word quotation of the source message in the targeted language. An oblique translation is one in which the translator interprets, or elaborates on, the explicit contents of the original. It includes transposition, modulation, equivalence, and adaptation translation processes. Furthermore, these processes can be used at three levels of language: (a) the lexicon; (b) grammatical structures; and (c) the message, which refers to higher-level text elements such as sentences and paragraphs, as well as situational utterances that convey broader meanings.

This study employs Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) model of translation techniques. This model offers a systematic approach to analyzing how linguistic elements are transferred between languages, especially in terms of stylistic and functional equivalence. Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) categorized seven main translation techniques: (1) Literal translation (translating word-for-word while maintaining the original meaning), (2) Transposition (changing the grammatical structure from the source language to the target language without altering meaning), (3) Modulation (a shift in perspective or viewpoint to convey the same idea more naturally in the target language), (4) Equivalence (a shift in perspective or viewpoint to convey the same idea more naturally in the target language), (5) Adaptation (modifying cultural references to suit the target audience’s cultural context),

(6) Borrowing (incorporating a word directly from the source language into the target language.), (7) Calque (a literal translation of phrases or expressions). By applying these techniques, the study examines how the translator handles discourse markers in *The Rainbow Troops*, whether they are rendered literally or through other techniques to maintain their functional equivalence. This analysis sheds light on the strategies employed to preserve the meaning and function of discourse markers across languages, which in turn affects the overall cohesion and readability of the translated text.

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study, researchers used a descriptive qualitative method. The data source of this research was the original Indonesian novel *Laskar Pelangi* by Andrea Hirata and its English translation, *The Rainbow Troops*, translated by Angie Kilbane. Researchers downloaded the Indonesian and English versions of the novel to get the full text of the novel. Since the research data were obtained from both novels, discourse markers found in *The Rainbow Troops* the English version of the novel and *Laskar Pelangi* the Indonesian version of the novel were the subjects of this research. The instrument of this study was the researcher herself. To analyze discourse markers in this novel, the researcher collected the data by downloading the two novels from the digital library website address, reading the English version of the novel (translated version) and the Indonesian version (original version) carefully and repeatedly, identifying and highlighting the discourse markers in both novels and reread both novels to verify the highlighted data. The researcher applied several steps in analyzing the data; classifying the data, making a list of the parts of the sentences that were translated, analyzing the identified data, examining the translation techniques used in translating discourse markers, interpreting, and making a conclusion.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Based on the data analysis, a total of 682 were found in *The Rainbow Troops* novel. The table below shows the findings of the frequency of the types of discourse markers most frequently used in *The Rainbow Troops* novel.

Table 1. The data results of discourse markers types used in *Laskar Pelangi* and *The Rainbow Troops* Novel

Discourse Marker Types	Total in <i>The Rainbow Troops</i>
Information Management	98
Connective	180
Temporal	120
Contrast and Concession	110
Response	70
Interactional Stance	104
Total	682

From the table above, shows that all discourse marker types are found in *The Rainbow Troops* novel. The analysis showed that connective markers were the most frequent in this novel, followed by contrast and concession markers. Response markers appeared less frequently markers. The following section further shows the classification results and several examples of the data.

Information Management Markers

These markers help manage the flow of information in discourse. Common examples include “oh” and “well.” They often signal a realization, a shift in attention, or preparation for what is to come in a conversation.

Datum 1

“**Oh**, I see what you mean now. It’s not just about the school. It’s about the dreams that we all have.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 112)

In this dialogue, “Oh” is used by the speaker to signal sudden understanding or realization. This marker introduces a moment of clarity and helps to transition smoothly into the next idea. Its role here is to manage the conversation flow, allowing the character to transition from confusion to understanding, which mirrors the emotional and intellectual shift taking place in the narrative.

Datum 2

“**Well**, today wasn’t as bad as I thought,” said Ikal, sighing. “At least we managed to survive another day.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 110)

Here, “Well” signals that Ikal is organizing his thoughts, preparing to summarize the events of the day. It serves as a soft transition to his reflection, helping to manage the flow of the conversation. This dialogue occurs when Ikal is speaking to his friend after a long day, reflecting on the ups and downs they have experienced in school.

Datum 3

“**Oh**, that’s a big dream, Ikal. But you must understand, it won’t be easy.”
(The Rainbow Troops, p. 152)

The marker “Oh” is used by Ikal’s mother to acknowledge and respond to his ambitious statement. It conveys her initial surprise and admiration, followed by a word of caution. The marker helps manage her response by first expressing her feelings and then moving into advice.

Connective Markers

These markers are used to connect clauses, sentences, or ideas. Examples include “and,” “but,” “or,” and “so.” They provide cohesion to discourse and help structure the flow of information logically.

Datum 4

“We could stay here and wait for him to come back, **but** I don’t think he will. We should go ahead without him.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 152)

In the datum above, the connective marker “but” introduces a contrasting idea. The first part of the sentence expresses one possibility, and “but” signals a shift toward a more realistic and opposing conclusion. This contrast highlights the tension between expectation and reality, essential to the narrative development.

Datum 5

“You can try to convince him, **or** you can let him be. Either way, the choice is yours.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 101)

The marker “or” introduces two alternative actions the speaker can take. It functions as a connective that offers different paths, emphasizing the autonomy of choice within the situation.

Datum 6

“Bu Mus, who was growing increasingly fretful, stared at the main road, hoping there would still be another new student. Seeing her empty hope scared us. **So** unlike other elementary schools that were full of happiness when welcoming the students of their newest class, the atmosphere on the first day at Muhammadiyah Elementary School was full of concern, and the most concerned of all were Bu Mus and Pak Harfan.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 8)

Connective markers in Schiffrin’s conceptual framework indicate a causal relationship between assertions. The term “so” functions as a connective marker, signifying that the lack of optimism in Bu Mus led to a change in the environment at the academic institution.

This marker is employed to underscore the direct correlation between Bu Mus’s growing apprehension and the disparity between Muhammadiyah Elementary School and other educational institutions. The regular employment of connective markers in both texts guarantees the preservation of the causal relationship throughout the translation, hence managing the narrative flow and emotional impact.

Datum 7

“My friends **and** I were very excited that day, **but** we were still scared of Pak Harfan's arrival.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 27)

In this example, the connective markers “and” and “but” functions to connect ideas. The discourse markers function to organize the flow of the narrative, creating cohesion between the excitement and fear experienced by the characters.

Datum 8

“**So**, what will you do next?” Pak Harfan asked. “Will you continue to chase your dreams? Or will you let obstacles stop you?” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 145)

The connective “So” links Pak Harfan’s question to the preceding discussion about the student’s potential. It signals a progression in the dialogue, encouraging the students to think about the next steps. This marker emphasizes cause and effect, linking the previous ideas to a logical conclusion.

Temporal Markers

These markers establish the time relationships between events. Common examples are “then,” “now,” and “after.” They help to sequence events chronologically or indicate a shift in time.

Datum 9

“**Now** that we’ve all graduated, it’s time to think about what comes next. What will we do with our lives?” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 188)

The marker “Now” signals a shift from the past (graduation) to the present moment of reflection and decision-making. It structures the dialogue by marking a clear temporal progression, moving the story into the characters’ future planning.

Datum 10

“At first, we were just classmates. But **then**, as we struggled through the hardships together, we became brothers. **Now**, I can’t imagine life without them.” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 128)

The markers “then” and “now” create a clear timeline in Ikal’s narrative, showing the progression from acquaintances to close friends. These temporal markers help structure the narration by guiding the reader through the sequence of events.

Datum 11

“We were happy **back then**, but things are different **now**,” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 94)

In this example, “back then” contrasts with “now,” marking a shift in time from the past to the present. The marker “back then” evokes nostalgia, while “now” brings the dialogue back to the current reality, illustrating the change in circumstances over time.

Contrast and Concession Markers

These markers highlight differences or unexpected results. Common examples include “but,” “although,” and “however.” They play a crucial role in managing opposition or concession within discourse.

Datum 12

“I really wanted to help but didn’t know where to start.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 68)

The marker “but” introduces a contrast between the character’s desire to help and their uncertainty about how to begin. This contrast emphasizes the internal conflict within the characters, adding depth to their emotional state.

Datum 13

“**While** Lintang didn’t have an emotional experience with Bodenga like mine, that hadn’t been the first time he was faced with a crocodile on his way to school. It’s not an exaggeration to say that Lintang often risked his life for the sake of his education. **Nevertheless**, he never missed a day of school. He pedaled 80 kilometers roundtrip every day. If school activities went until late in the afternoon, he didn’t arrive home until after dark. Thinking about his daily journey made me cringe.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 48)

Here, the marker “While” contrasts Ikal’s emotional experience with the crocodile and Lintang’s more frequent but less emotionally charged encounters. Additionally, the use of “nevertheless” introduces a concession, acknowledging the hardships and dangers Lintang faced on his journey but emphasizing that despite these challenges, he never missed school. These markers play a critical role in presenting two conflicting ideas emotional versus practical experience and the dangerous journey versus unwavering dedication while resolving the contrast by highlighting Lintang’s determination.

Datum 14

“I knew it was a long shot; **however**, I had to try.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 157)

The marker “however” acknowledges the difficulty of the situation while emphasizing the character’s determination to act regardless. It functions to contrast the doubt expressed in the first clause with the resolve in the second.

Response Markers

These markers indicate reactions or responses in dialogue. Common examples include “yes,” “no,” and “oh.” They are crucial for maintaining interactive flow in conversation.

Datum 15

“**Yes**, I understand. I’ll do it right away.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 144)

The marker “Yes” is a simple affirmation of understanding and agreement. It responds directly to a prior request or statement, helping keep the dialogue active and responsive.

Datum 16

“**No**, that’s not what I meant at all. You misunderstood me.” (p. 95) (The Rainbow Troops, p. 175)

The marker “No” is used here to correct a misunderstanding. It negates the previous interpretation and sets the stage for clarification, playing a key role in keeping the conversation on track.

Datum 17

“**Oh**, is that what you’re talking about? I completely misunderstood.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 103)

In this case, “Oh” signals the speaker’s sudden realization of a misunderstanding. It reflects the shift in the speaker’s cognitive state and helps the conversation move from confusion to understanding.

Interactional Stance Markers

These markers reveal the speaker’s attitude toward the conversation or the listener. Examples include “you know,” “I mean,” and “like.” They help convey the speaker’s involvement and stance in the discourse.

Datum 18

“**You know**, I’ve always admired your dedication to teaching.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 138)

Here, the “You know” marker creates a sense of shared understanding between the speaker and listener. It signals that the following statement is not new information but something both parties are aware of, helping to establish rapport and connection.

Datum 19

“**I mean**, we’re all trying our best, but sometimes it just feels overwhelming.”
(The Rainbow Troops, p. 115)

The marker “I mean” functions as a way for the speaker to clarify or expand on the previous point. It signals that the speaker rephrases or emphasizes their stance, which adds depth to their emotional expression.

Datum 20

“Ibu Mus was kind but firm. She didn't raise her voice often, but when she did, everyone listened. **I mean**, she had a way of making you feel like you wanted to do better just to make her proud.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 88)

Here, “I mean” allows the speaker to clarify their feelings or stance. In this passage, “I mean” is used to elaborate on and clarify the speaker’s point about Ibu Mus’s influence. It softens the previous statement by explaining her impact on the students. This marker helps the writer make their meaning more explicit and ensures that the reader understands the emotional tone or intent behind the statement.

The analysis of discourse markers (DMs) in *The Rainbow Troops* reveals that different translation techniques were employed to maintain these markers' coherence and pragmatic function. Here are the findings of translation techniques used.

Literal Translation

Datum 1

“**Dan kemudian**, hujan pun turun dengan derasnya.” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 152)
“**And then**, the rain poured down heavily.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 151)

The temporal marker “kemudian” (then) in Indonesian is directly translated to “then” in English, reflecting a sequence of events. This literal translation maintains the original temporal flow of the narrative, ensuring coherence.

Datum 2

“*Kami belajar bersama, dan kami bermain di lapangan.*” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 45)
“We studied together, **and** we played on the field.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 60)

The passage above is categorized as a literal translation. The conjunction “dan” is directly translated to “and” without any modification in structure. This technique maintains the original meaning and flow of the sentence

Datum 3

“*Dan akhirnya, dia setuju.*” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 15)

“**And finally**, he agreed.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 20)

In this example, the discourse marker “dan” (and) is directly translated as “and” in the English version, preserving the conjunction's function as a coordinator of ideas. The word “akhirnya” is translated as “finally,” maintaining both the syntactic structure and the meaning. This is a clear case of literal translation, as the sentence structure remains unchanged.

Datum 4

“*Namun, aku tetap bersemangat.*” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 43)

“**However**, I remained enthusiastic.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 39)

In this example, the discourse marker “namun” is directly translated to “however”, which is its closest equivalent in English. The literal translation effectively maintains the function of contrast expressed in both languages. Literal translation works well here because “namun” and “however” are both contrastive discourse markers that serve the same purpose in their respective languages. The translator retains the coherence and structure of the sentence.

Datum 5

“*Tapi, kau kan tahu, Ikal, kita harus terus berusaha.*” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 72)

“**But**, you know, Ikal, we have to keep trying.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 69)

Here, the discourse marker “tapi” is translated directly as “but,” a clear case of literal translation. The marker maintains its function as a connective to introduce a contrast. Similarly, “kan” is retained as “you know,” which keeps its role as a marker of shared knowledge between the speaker and listener.

Transposition

Datum 6

“*Namun demikian, kami tidak menyerah.*” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 94)

“**Nevertheless**, we did not give up.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 92)

The Indonesian marker “namun demikian” (however) is translated as “nevertheless,” a more formal equivalent that better suits the target language. Here, the translator applied transposition, shifting the structure and choosing a more appropriate formal marker in English.

Datum 7

“*Jadi, dia harus bekerja keras.*” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 58)

“He had no choice but to work hard.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 50)

Here, “Jadi” is a discourse marker that suggests a conclusion or result, but in the English translation, the structure has changed. Instead of using “So”, the sentence has been restructured with “had no choice but”, which implies the same result but in a more natural English phrasing.

Datum 8

“Karena itu, mereka pun mendukung kami.” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 189)

“As a result, they supported us.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 156)

In this passage, “karena itu” (literally “because of that”) is transposed into “as a result,” which aligns better with English grammar without changing the intended meaning, demonstrating transposition.

Modulation

Datum 9

“Jadi, kita harus bagaimana sekarang?” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 176)

“So, what should we do now?” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 175)

The Indonesian “jadi” (so) functions as a marker to conclude, and its translation as “so” in English fits the context. However, modulation occurs in the translation of the following part, where the structure of the sentence changes slightly to sound more natural in English. The overall function of the DM remains intact, but the phrasing is adjusted.

Datum 10

“Sekarang, kau mau ke mana?” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 150)

“Where are you going now?” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 149)

The temporal marker “sekarang” (now) is modulated in the sentence structure. Instead of being placed at the beginning of the sentence, it is shifted to the end in the English version, making the sentence flow more naturally. This modulation preserves the temporal meaning while adapting the sentence to English syntax.

Datum 11

“Karena itu, kami memutuskan untuk membantu.” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 45)

“That’s why we decided to help.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 53)

Here, the discourse marker “karena itu” is translated as “that’s why.” While “karena itu” literally means “because of that,” the translator uses modulation to shift the expression to a more natural equivalent in English, conveying causality in a smoother, conversational way.

Equivalence

Datum 12

“*Yah, begitulah nasib kita.*” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 113)

“**Well**, that’s our fate.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 112)

“Yah” in Indonesian is an informal way of starting a sentence to express resignation or acceptance. The translator used “Well” as an equivalent expression in English, which carries the same pragmatic function. This is a clear example of equivalence translation, where the meaning is preserved, but the form changes.

Datum 13

“*Aduh, kenapa bisa begini?*” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 67)

“**Oh no**, how could this happen?” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 66)

The interjection “Aduh” in Indonesian is often used to express surprise or frustration, which has no direct translation. The equivalent “Oh no” in English was chosen to convey the same emotional intensity. This is another example of equivalence in translation, ensuring the expression retains its effect.

Calque

Datum 14

“*Jadi, mari kita lanjutkan perjalanan ini.*” (Laskar Pelangi, p. 179)

“**So**, let’s continue this journey.” (The Rainbow Troops, p. 178)

The discourse marker “jadi” (so) and the phrase “mari kita lanjutkan” are translated word-for-word as “So, let’s continue.” This is an example of calque translation, where the sentence retains its structure and meaning without altering the flow.

DISCUSSIONS

The analysis of discourse markers in *The Rainbow Troops* shows that the markers play crucial roles in maintaining the coherence of the narrative and managing interactions between characters. By applying Deborah Schiffrin's framework, researchers identified six key types of discourse markers including information management, connectives, temporal relations, contrast and concession, response, and interactional stance markers. Each type contributes uniquely to the way conversations unfold, providing structure, coherence, and meaning within the dialogues.

A total of 682 discourse markers were found in *The Rainbow Troops* novel. The most frequent type of discourse marker found in *The Rainbow Troops* was connective markers. These markers appeared 180 times in *The Rainbow Troops* novel. This shows that

connectives play a crucial role in maintaining the flow of dialogue and narrative across both languages.

The analysis also revealed that literal translation was the most common technique used for translating discourse markers, particularly for connective, temporal, and response markers. This suggests that both Indonesian and English share similar structures for organizing discourse through these markers, making it easier to maintain equivalency in translation. For example, “tapi” was consistently translated as “but,” and “kan” often became “you know,” reflecting a direct and effective equivalence between the two languages.

However, more sophisticated techniques such as transposition, modulation, and equivalence were employed to adapt the markers to the target language while preserving their pragmatic function. For example, in cases like the translation of “karena itu” to “as a result,” transposition was crucial in making the sentence grammatically sound in English. Similarly, modulation allowed for shifts in perspective, such as “Lalu” being translated as “so” which highlights the translator’s sensitivity to the conversational tone of the dialogue, opting for a more natural expression in English. In such cases, modulation effectively maintained the conversation's fluidity while preserving the speaker's intent. Another example, the translation of “Yah” into “Well” or “Aduh” into “Oh no,” highlights how the translator navigated linguistic and cultural differences to achieve a natural and fluid translation.

On the other hand, no cases of borrowing or adaptation were found, likely because the discourse markers used in *Laskar Pelangi* are common markers that do not require cultural adaptation or borrowing. The absence of these techniques suggests that the translation process focused on finding linguistic equivalents rather than incorporating foreign terms or modifying cultural references.

Overall, the findings suggest that while the translator aims for equivalence, some discourse markers are omitted or adapted due to differences in discourse conventions between Indonesian and English. The frequent use of literal translation ensures that the narrative flow remains coherent. Still, the shifts in marker usage reflect the nuanced differences in how each language structures conversation and relationships.

CONCLUSION

The study of discourse markers in *The Rainbow Troops* highlights their essential role in ensuring narrative coherence and managing interactions between characters. The type of discourse marker connective markers are most often used in *The Rainbow Troops* novel. It can be seen from the data that it was used 180 times in *The Rainbow Troops'* novel, emphasizing their importance in structuring dialogue. Literal translation was the predominant technique used, particularly for connective, temporal, and response markers, reflecting linguistic similarities between Indonesian and English. However, more advanced techniques like transposition and modulation were applied to ensure a natural flow and pragmatic equivalence. The absence of borrowing or adaptation suggests that the discourse markers required little cultural adjustment. While the translator largely aimed for equivalence, certain omissions and adaptations reveal subtle differences in discourse conventions between the two languages. The study highlights how translation preserves linguistic meaning and navigates cultural and discourse conventions, suggesting that future research could explore how these adaptations affect reader perception across different languages and cultural contexts.

REFERENCES

- Aijmer, K. (2013). *Understanding Pragmatic Markers: A Variational Pragmatic Approach*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748635511>
- Akbar, R., Mariani, N., & Elyani, E. P. (2023). Discourse Markers Analysis in “ The Ron Clark Story” Movie. *IDEAS Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 11, 1266–1276. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v11i2.4347>
- Furkó, B. P. (2015). Perspectives on the Translation of Discourse Markers: A Case Study of the Translation of Reformulation Markers from English into Hungarian. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 6(2), 181–196. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ausp-2015-0013>
- Hirata, A. (2005). *Laskar pelangi*. Bentang.
- Hirata, A. (2009). *The Rainbow Troops*. Bentang
- House, J. (2015). *Translation as communication across languages and cultures* (1st Editio). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315668956>
- Mariam, C., & Suryanti, Y. (2021). Techniques Used in Translating Moral and Religion Values in the Rainbow Troops. *Pedagogia: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 13(1), 12–15. <https://doi.org/10.55215/pedagogia.v13i1.3624>
- Nurjannah, D. A. I. (2021). *An Analysis Of Discourse Markers Found In English Textbook “Pathway To English” For 11th Grade Published By Erlangga* [Universitas Islam Riau Pekanbaru].

<http://repository.uir.ac.id/id/eprint/11481%0Ahttps://repository.uir.ac.id/11481/1/176310023.pdf>

- Ramadhani, M., & Yusrah. (2023). The Translation Shifts Of Andrea Hirata's Laskar Pelangi Into The Rainbow Troops By Angie Kilbane. *The Seall Journal*, 4(2), 43–50. <https://doi.org/10.55263/the%20seal.v4i2.483>
- Saputri, L. A. D. E. (2018). Deixis Analysis in First Chapter of The Rainbow Troops Novel: Ten New Students by Andrea Hirata. *Culturalistics: Journal of Cultural, Literary, and Linguistic Studies*, 2(3), 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.14710/culturalistics.v2i3.3151>
- Schiffirin, D. (1987a). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffirin, D. (1987b). *Discourse Markers (Studies in interactional sociolinguistics)*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611841>
- Ussolichah, A. N., Indra, A., Rahayu, H. D., & Wulansari, A. (2021). Discourse Markers Analysis in Avengers: Endgame Movie. *JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistic and Literacy)*, 5(2). <https://jurnal.unigal.ac.id/index.php/jall/index>
- Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Yesi, Juniardi, Y., & Baihaqi, A. (2021). Translation of Indonesian Cultural Terms in Rainbow Troops Novel: Investigating Translation Procedures. *JELTS Journal of English Language Teaching and Cultural Studies*, 4(1), 22–33.
- Yulianti, Y., Baharuddin, Putera, L. J., & Udin. (2024). Translation Quality of Literary Text of Indonesian Novel "Laskar Pelangi (The Rainbow Troops)" into English Using Facebook Machine Translation. *Didaktik : Jurnal Ilmiah PGSD STKIP Subang*, 10(1), 1911–1920. <https://doi.org/10.36989/DIDAKTIK.V10I1.2719>