

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents the review of the related literature which includes the concept of discourse analysis, discourse markers, interview, Al Jazeera, and previous study.

A. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis focuses on the study about language beyond the word, clause, phrase, and sentence that are required for successful communication (Paltridge, 2017). Moreover, discourse analysis refers on the investigation of the connection between language and the context in which it is used (McCarthy, 1991). This analysis can involve written texts and spoken data, both formal and informal. Similarly, Yule (2006) states that discourse analysis is the study of how language successfully interpret what other language users mean to communicate in texts or conversation. The object of discourse analysis is a linguistic unit larger than a sentence or utterance, which has unity and context. It can be speech text, live conversation, debate, or speech that is not made up and actually happens in everyday life.

In addition, Halliday (2003), as cited in Hamka (2019), states that language functions as a source for constructing meaning to situational and cultural context. Also, discourse analysis is used to describe human experiences through text or context, in which it can connected and organized as discourse. Fiveable (2024) declare that discourse organize the relationship between utterances in spoken or written text, which influence

how meaning is constructed and interpreted. By analyzing discourse, one can examine how context or intent shape meaning. All these theories are essential because the analyses of discourse markers are part of discourse analysis. Also, it gives explanation to the readers before they know about discourse markers.

B. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is an important aspect of language that goes beyond the simple exchange of information between speakers and listeners. Huang & Yan (2016) describe that pragmatics involves interpreting meaning in context and taking into consideration factors such as the speaker's intention. Another important aspect of pragmatic is the study of implicature, that refers to concluded meaning that is not explicitly stated by speaker (Grice, 1975). In addition, pragmatics also includes the study of discourse, that refers to a broader order of language that goes beyond the sentence level and involve interactions between speakers and listeners (Schiffrin, 1987).

Additionally, Yule (2006) explains that pragmatic requires an understanding of what speakers mean in a given context, not just what is literally stated in their utterances. In line, Leech (2016) states that pragmatics emphasizes how speakers use linguistic forms not only to convey literal meaning, but also to manage social relationship and achieve communicative goals. Pragmatics examines both the intended meaning behind language choices and the impact of that choice on the audience (Perkins, 2014). Pragmatics also involve in analyzing the construction of meaning in real-time interactions. The focus is in how speakers organize

information, switch topic, maintain coherence, and express attitudes (Birner, 2013).

C. Discourse Markers

The definition of discourse markers has been widely discussed theoretically. However, this study is characterized by a significant terminological variation, as different researchers use multiple names for the same linguistic study. According to Fraser (1999), as cited in Vinca (2018), discourse markers are also called discourse connector, pragmatic markers, discourse operator etc. However, discourse markers have been variously defined by different authors. Schiffrin (1987) defined discourse markers as sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of talk. She also showed her analysis that markers can function at several levels of discourse and can serve to connect utterances.

On the other hand, Fraser (1999) defines the discourse markers as expression which signals the relationship of the basic message to the foregoing discourse. And the function is to organize the discourse, manage interaction, and express the speakers. Discourse markers are effective in both speeches or writing. They help give a conversation or a text a proper shape in making it more fluent and logical (Müller, 2005). In addition, discourse markers do not contribute to the representative meaning of the sentence. They provide clues to the message recipient about how utterances associated. Blackmore (2013), as cited in Kirimo and Ireri (2018), state even though do not change the meaning of an utterance, they play a crucial role in helping readers or listeners to understand how information should be processed in a discourse.

In discourse analysis viewpoint, discourse markers are considered tools that help discourse organization and cohesion. Halliday and Hasan (1976), as cited in Woods (2015) point out that cohesion in text is achieved from contextual and logical relation, and discourse markers function as signal of this relationship. This indicates that clause, sentences, or turn of speech are related each other, to create a cohesive flow of ideas. In addition, discourse markers help to create proper discourse structure, especially in oral communication where real-time organization is crucial (Ebrahimi and Xodabande, 2023). Therefore, in discourse analysis, discourse markers contribute cohesion, communication structure, and text unity.

From pragmatics perspective, discourse markers are considered tools used by speakers to maintain interpersonal relationship, convey intent, and interpret beyond literal meaning. As stated by Grice (1975) communication involves more than just linguistic form. Speakers depend on pragmatics to imply meaning. In line, Brinton (2017), as cited in Pan (2025) explain that discourse markers contribute in the process of inference by signaling attitudes, politeness strategies, and persuasion. This indicates that discourse markers are crucial to interpret attitudes and formulating persuasive arguments, especially in political interview, where everything is considered strategically.

D. The Types of Discourse Markers

In this study, the types of discourse markers according to Schiffrin (1987). There are six types, namely Marker of Information Management,

Marker of Response, Discourse Connectives, Markers of Cause and Results, Markers of Temporal Adverb, and the last is Information and Participation.

Those types of discourse markers will be elaborate below:

1. Marker of Information Management

Schiffrin (1987) argues that *oh* traditionally is used as exclamation or interjection. When it is used alone, without the syntactic support of the sentence, *oh* is said to indicate strong emotional states, e.g. surprise, fear, or pain.

This is the illustration of *oh* as exclamation:

Speaker 1 : “Is this your precious picture?”

Speaker 2 : “*Oh!* Gosh, yes!”

It can also initiate utterance, either followed by a brief pause or without pause preceding the rest of the tone unit. For instance:

Example 1 : “*Oh*, they came when the study time is over.”

Example 2 : “Do not they go to the zoo? *Oh*, maybe there are too young.”

Marker *oh* is a marker of information management that indicate how information is managed among conversation participants. Basically, this shows a status change of information. For instance, from ignorance to knowing or from misunderstanding to understanding. In addition, marker *oh* appears in four contexts: first, *oh* in repair. This marker used when there is correction or clarification. The second is *oh* in question-answer/acknowledgement sequences. This used after receiving response or information from the opposite speaker. For example, in conversation “A:

Where were you, yesterday? B: At the zoo. A: *Oh*, I see”. The third is *oh* and the status information. This indicate whether the information is new, already known, or not as expected. The last is *oh* and shifts in subjective orientation. This marks a change in the speaker’s position toward the information. For instance, the speakers just realized or understood toward the information. Or to put it simply is cognitive or awareness shift.

2. Marker of Response

The word *well* is a discourse marker that typically appears in the beginning of the utterance, and is commonly used in response to prior utterance. *Well* serves as a marker of response that indicates the speaker orientation to the previous utterance, such as a question, request, or assumption. Rather than simply providing a direct answer, the use of *well* signals that the upcoming response not align with the expectations set by the previous turn.

Furthermore, *well* contributes to discourse coherence through local coherence, non-local coherence, and coherence options. Local coherence refers to the response to the prior utterance while also signalling a partial shift or disagreement. In non-local coherence refers to the relationship between the current utterance and a broader discourse topic that have been introduced before. While *well* and coherence options, it allowing the speaker to continue, clarify, or adjusting response.

The example of *well*:

Speaker 1 : “So, what do you want to fix?”

Speaker 2 : “*Well*, maybe we can start with the timeline first”.

3. Discourse Connectives

a. And

The word *and* is used to connect ideas and to continue a speaker turn. It is considered as markers, when it functions extends beyond coordination of clauses or connecting turn in conversation. Which means, *and* serves a discourse level by constructing continuity between utterance and helping to organize the conversation, rather than simply extending the propositional meaning. However, *and* is not considered as a marker, when it just connects element within a clause, such as nouns (e.g. John and Sue went to the beach) or verb phrases (e.g. John went to the beach and swam in the ocean) since the conjoined unites, in these cases, were not discourse units but elements within a single clause (Schiffrin, 1987).

The example of *and* as a marker:

Speaker 1 : “Tell me what happened after you got to the station”

Speaker 2 : “I was waiting for the bus, *and* this guy suddenly asked me if I needed help”.

b. But

The word *but* is a coordinator like *and*, but it has different function. *But* indicates contrasting in discourse. It conveys contrast between ideas or topics or it can be used to mark denial of the speakers' expectation of something.

The examples:

- He works in a luxury hotel, *but* his sister works in an ordinary cafe.
- He is a professional chef, *but* he cannot make a proper omelette.

As can be noticed, in the first example, the use of *but* here highlights the difference between two work situations. Both are workplaces, but their scale and environment are different. *But* marks the presence of two pieces of information that show contrasting characteristic. While the second example, *but* connects two prepositions that appear to be pragmatically different. As a professional chef, people would expect to be able to make a good omelette. The second clause negates this expectation, so the relationship marked by *but* is not simply one of contrast, but a denial of expectation.

c. Or

The word *or* (a coordinator like *and* and *but*) is used as an option marker in discourse. Schiffrin (1987) stated that *or* in discourse functions as a marker of inclusive choice, because it gives the listener the opportunity to accept either option alone or both at once. Unlike *and* or *but*, *or* does not indicate the speakers' own action. Instead, it indicates the speakers' desire for the listener to take action. In everyday conversation, the use of *or* often encourages interactive responses, because its presence invites the hearer to take a stance or respond to the options presented. The example of *or* marker:

Speaker : "It is how there's an economic situation then they use race.

Or they use nationality, *or* anti-Semitism, *or* what have you".

4. Markers of Cause and Result

The markers *so* and *because* can mark units of ideas, information, or action in discourse. Both markers operate not only at the sentence level,

but also at the discourse level. *Because* typically expresses a causal connection or triggering event, while *so* expresses the consequence or result that comes from prior condition. However, these relations are not always limited to fact-based causality, they also reflect inferential or interactional meanings within discourse. In addition to their logical function, in spoken conversation, these markers also help speakers organize the flow of their explanation and guide the listeners in comprehending the development of information.

5. Marker of Temporal Adverb

a. Now

Schiffrin states that *now* is used to mark the speakers' progression in discourse, especially in segments that are organized sequentially. It functions as a discourse marker that indicates a shift in the speakers' line of thought, frequently indicating a transition to a new topic or stage in the development of an idea. In addition, *now* helps the speaker to organize and manage the flow of discourse. Although *now* may still have a temporal meaning, its role in discourse is not indicate time, but rather to organize the speaker's ongoing utterances. For instance:

Speaker : "Ok. I understand your argument. *Now* let's look at the other side of the problem".

b. Then

Then is used in discourse to mark the relationship between the prior statement and the following statement by indicating sequence or consequence. This word can function to indicate temporal sequence,

logical result, or inferential connection between ideas. It can also be as a continuation of the flow. For instance:

Speaker : He opened the door. *Then*, he walked inside without saying
a word

6. Information and Participation

Schiffrin argue that the basic meaning of *I mean* is to signal that the speaker will make an adjustment, clarification, or correction to what has just been said. Rather than introducing new information, *I mean* typically functions to reformulate or make the prior utterance more precise for the listener.

On the other hand, unlike *um* and *uh*, which primarily function as pauses or fillers while the speaker plans what to say next, *you know* does not simply mark a break in discourse. Instead, *you know* is used by the speaker to refer to shared or assumed knowledge, as well as to engage the listener in interpreting the ongoing conversation. In other words, *you know* encourages the listener to view the information as something that can be shared or inferred.

E. The Functions of Discourse Markers

Here are the functions of discourse markers that have been mentioned in Fraser (1996) literature:

1. Topic Change Markers

This kind of markers is a signal that the following utterance, in the speakers' opinion, is diversion from the current topic. For instance:

Example 1 : “I don’t think we can go tomorrow. It’s Adam’s birthday.
Incidentally, when is your birthday?”

Example 2 : “*Speaking of* Marsha, where is she these days?”

Besides incidentally and speaking about, there are also other examples of topic change markers, include: before I forget, back to my original point, by the way, and just to update you.

2. Contrastive Markers

The next is contrastive markers. This marker’s function is signalling that the utterance following is either denial or a contrast of some preposition associated with the previous discourse (Fraser, 1999). For example:

Speaker 1 : “We can go now, honey.”

Speaker 2 : “*But* we haven’t finished our story yet.”

Additionally, there are other markers included in contrastive markers, for instance: anyway, all the same, regardless (of this/that), however, instead of (this/that), and even so.

3. Elaborative Markers

The further marker is elaborative markers. Elaborative marker’s function is to a sign that the following utterance becomes completion of a previous utterance in certain form. For instance, as follows:

Example : I think you should cool off a little. *In other words*, sit down and wait a little bit.

Additionally, there are other markers included in elaborative markers, beside in other words. For instance: above all, also, in addition, in fact, otherwise, and moreover.

4. Inferential Markers

The last kind of markers is inferential markers. The function of this marker is to sign that the point of the utterance is a conclusion which follows from the previous discourse. The examples:

Mary went home. *After all*, she was sick

Marsha is away for the weekend. *So*, she won't be available Saturday

Additionally, there are other markers included in inferential markers, for instance: accordingly, therefore, as a consequence, and then.

F. Interview

Interview is a structured form of verbal communication, designed for a specific purpose, and clearly defined roles for the interviewer and interviewee (Jong and Jung, 2015). Cohen (1976) points out that interview requires careful preparation, much patience, and considerable practice. Interview generally proceed through predictable phases; opening, information gathering, elaboration, and closing, each formed by different forms of questions and responses (Wijayanti, 2020). These highlighted that interview belongs to a recognizable genre of communication. Interviews are used in various professional, social, and institutional domains, including education, healthcare, journalism, and public communication. In this context, interview serve not only to gather information but also to negotiate and present point of view to broader audiences. This indicated that interviews are not just about questions and answers, but also a strategic interaction formed by audience's goals and expectations (Niu, 2024). Among the many forms of interviews, one of the prominent is political

interview, where the public figures present their political agenda and interact with public audience (Szczepańska-Włoch, 2022).

G. Political Interviews

Political interviews are specific form of journalistic interviews in which political figures are interviewed in public setting. Montgomery (2007) defines political interviews as broadcast meeting in which journalist ask politicians about issues of public concern. Unlike non-political interview, political interviews are influenced by managing ideological position and maintaining a positive public image. Ekstrom (2015) argues that political interviews act as a forum in which journalists criticizing their policies, decision, and public statement. Through this format, interviews as a bridge of communication between the government and citizens. In addition, political interviews are not simply events for exchanging information, but performative acts that contribute to the formation of political personas (Modell, 2025).

Additionally, Chilton (2004) highlights that political discourse is fundamentally strategic, as it is shaped by ideology and power relation. He also states that politicians not only communicate information, but also choosing language carefully to manage their image and control how their messages are interpreted in public. In line with this theory, Furkó and Abuczki (2014) explain that discourse markers can functions as rhetorical tools that help politicians organize their arguments and response defensively to critical questions. Thus, this framework helps to unveiling whether linguistic choices, specifically discourse markers, just used as markers or to

managing interaction, responding to challenges, and building credibility during interview.

H. Al Jazeera

Al Jazeera is a television station in Arabic and English based in Doha, Qatar. This media established in 1996 by Hamad bin Khalifa Al Thani and become the first independent news channel in middle east (Arab). Initially, Al Jazeera only broadcast programs in Arabic, but in 2006, the media launched that uses English. This indicates that as the years go by, Al Jazeera's reach in spreading information is becoming increasingly widespread. Additionally, this media has clear vision and mission. Its vision is "to be fearless in the pursuit of truth and to be the voice for the voiceless". While its mission is "to inform and empower people with accurate, in-depth and compelling content that upholds the value of truth and elevates the human spirit". Over the years, Al Jazeera has expanded into new channel, subsidiaries, and digital content. This is evidence of its unwavering determination to continue growing and providing its viewers with unparalleled professional journalism.

I. Talk to Al Jazeera

Several channels that are currently easily accessible are Al Jazeera English, Al Jazeera Sports, and Al Jazeera Live. Each of these channels has its own purpose. Al Jazeera English for instance, this channel features and broadcast people and events that affect their lives. It also raises topic that are often unreported, listens to all sides of the story, and gives voice to the voiceless. One of the shows aired on Al Jazeera English is Talk to Al Jazeera.

This program is a flagship interview in which are held face-to-face every week with global leaders, icons, influencers, and alternative voices that shapes our times. For example, some figures who have been invited to this program include; the president of Kazakhstan, foreign ministry of Suriah, and the president of Indonesia. Also, this program is exclusive and significantly different from conventional news interviews that tend to be brief. Danielson and Rolandsson (2020) noted that long term interviews allow for richer narrative construction and greater clarity of argument compared to conventional news interview. This makes Talk to Al Jazeera an ideal space for conducting interview in political communication.

J. Previous Studies

This study has relationship with another research that had been done by Cahyanti in 2021, which focus on types and functions of discourse markers in a vlog video by Bnay Youtube channel. The concern of this study is about the use of discourse markers in informal way, which can help to improve speaking fluency of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. By using qualitative as a method to get the data, the study found that there were ten types of discourse markers according to Biber et al. (1999) theory, namely Interjections, Greeting and Farewell Expressions, Linking Adverbials, Stance Adverbial, Vocatives, Response Elicitors, Response forms, Hesitators, and Expletives. Furthermore, the researcher using Castro (2009) theory to divide the functions. There were nine functions of discourse markers. One example is discourse markers serve as opening frame markers, such as *what's up*, *hello*, and *well*. The speaker uses *what's up* to greet the

audience through the camera. It is found in the beginning of the discourse to initiate the discourse.

The second study is conducted by Santoso et al. (2024). This study specifically focuses on the interpersonal discourse markers in presidential debate between Trump and Joe Biden. The aim of this study is to find the types and functions of interpersonal discourse markers. By using Fraser (1999) theory it is found that there were nine interpersonal markers with its functions that used by Donald Trump. Trump uses around nine interpersonal discourse markers, each with function. In other hand, it found that there were five interpersonal markers with its function that used by Joe Biden. Joe Biden uses around five markers which are also used by Donald Trump. Further, the use of interpersonal marker provides a new understanding of the use of markers, especially in political sector.

Another study is conducted by Jayantini et al. (2021) which focus on the types and functions of discourse markers in social situation. This study specifically investigated Steve Job's speech at Stanford Commencement Address. The finding shows the dominant discourse markers used were connective, cause and result, and temporal adverb. The connective markers take the dominant because it plays a significant role in linking the statement used to support the inspiring stories by Steve Jobs. On the other hand, marker of response is unfrequently used, because the speech is set on formal occasion. Followed by its functions, all the discourse markers are to gain coherent message in the speech. This is crucial for speaker to make sure that the relationship between speaker and audience is established.

The existing studies have similarities and differences with this study. The similarity among these studies is in the focus of the study. The focus of the study is to examine discourse markers in spoken discourse context. Also, the aim of the study is to identify the types and the functions of discourse markers. In addition, these studies conclude that discourse markers contribute in coherence, fluency, and interaction management in oral communication. While the differences of these studies are in communication context, the subject, and the genre of the study. For instance, the first study by Cahyanti (2021) is in informal interaction in a vlog. While the study by Santoso et al. (2024) is in political conflict discourse (presidential debate). And the last by Jayantini et al. (2021) is in formal ceremonial speech. After exploring some previous study, the studies rarely offer a deep analysis on the reason behind the produce of discourse markers choices by speakers, specifically in political interview. This study aims to close the gap by analyzing not only the types and functions of discourse markers used by Prabowo Subianto in his interview with Jessica Washington on Talk to Al Jazeera, but also the reason behind it.