CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter explains the literature review of the research. It contains pragmatics, discourse analysis, text, discourse markers, characteristic of discourse markers, types of discourse markers, and previous study.

A. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies aspects of the meaning and use of language that depend on the speaker, receiver, and other features in the context of speech. Pragmatic elements have a major role for the means by which speakers can build pragmatists and express their point of view through a language called pragmatic markers (Fraser, 1996). Strategically, pragmatic markers are used to create persuasive and appropriate interpersonal relationships with the interlocutor, which can assist the interlocutor in processing incoming messages (Fraser, 1996). Pragmatic markers come from all grammatical segments, verbs, nouns, adverbs, and idioms.

Pragmatics is the study of meaning as it relates to the context in which people write or speak (Paltridge, 2006: 53). This statement is in line with Yule who stated that pragmatics is the study of the relationship between linguistic forms and their use. By learning language through pragmatics, one can talk about the intended meaning of the interlocutor, opinions, thoughts, intentions or goals, and types of actions.

B. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is an analysis of spoken and written language. Discourse analysis is a language analysis strategy that examines language trends in the form of texts and the social and cultural context in which the texts take place (Paltridge, 2006). There are two forms of discourse, namely written discourse and oral discourse. Written discourse is like newspapers, books, journals, and so on. while oral discourse is like speech, and so on. Discourse analysis is not only concerned with utterances by one speaker, but also with conversations between two or more people. The purpose of discourse analysis is to explain how language users create and interpret meaning in discourse. According to (Brown & Yule, 1983), discourse analysis examines how recipients create or construct linguistic messages to interpret their meaning.

(Paltridge, 2006: 4) stated that discourse analysis examines the lingual unit in a paragraph structure, interaction patterns, and also the organization of the text, for example how the speaker opens a conversation, how the speaker closes a conversation, how the speaker takes turns in a conversation, and so on. According to (Paul Gee, 1999: 13), discourse is the way a person combines language with non-language things, such as differences in thoughts, beliefs, feelings, and actions between one speaker and another.

Discourse refers to a set of language standards, preferences, and expectations in the context used and modified by language users in producing and understanding language contexts. Discourse includes monologic and dialogical spoken and written language in contemporary science.

C. Text

The text is a verbal record of communicative activity. The meaning of the text is related to the words understood which are obtained through speaking (Brown and Yule, 1983). The text is not only spoken, but the text can also be in the form of writing. Halliday and Hasan stated that the text used in linguistics refers to every part, spoken or written, which forms a unified whole.

Text can be interpreted as a real use of language, regardless of the term which is an abstract unit of linguistic study (Widdowson, 2007). There are two types of text, namely spoken text and written text. Oral text is a speech made by someone such as speech, conversation, and so on. While the written text is a text produced by an author such as journals, books, newspapers, and so on. Written texts are usually more grammatical than spoken texts because in written texts discourse relations such as the instruments used are coherent in the text and the meaning of the text is more oriented.

D. Discourse Markers

According to (cf. Schiffrin, 1987; Blakemore, 1987,1992; Fraser, 1990, 1996a) in (Fraser, 1996: 339), a discourse marker is an expression that signifies the relation of the basic message with the previous discourse. Discourse markers are linguistic units that signify the coherence of relationships. This statement is in line with Fraser's statement which explains that discourse markers are markers that indicate the relationship between the discourse segments before and after them (Fraser, 2006). He emphasized that there are three aspects attached to the

notion of discourse markers, namely: discourse markers are only lexical expressions, not non-verbal gestures, S1 (segment 1) and S2 (segment 2) are interrelated and follow each other, S1 (segment 1) and S2 (segment 2) encode the message completely. Discourse markers can be placed in every part of the sentence, including the beginning. Discourse markers have a procedural, non-conceptual main meaning, and have a specific interpretation by context. So, it can be concluded that discourse markers are lexical expressions that function as markers to provide contextual interpretation of discourse.

According to Holker (1991), discourse markers relate to situations in conversation and also have an expressive rather than referential function. Discourse markers produce discourse boundaries in an interaction (Stenstrom, 1998). While, according to Halliday dan Hasan (1992), discourse markers are markers of cohesion in discourse and divide discourse into several parts, which include lexical cohesion, substitution, ellipsis, and reference. In this case, discourse markers are considered as connecting items. Connecting elements are not directly cohesive, conjunctions are not a means of connecting texts in a discourse, but connecting words have a role in explaining certain meanings by presupposing other components in a discourse.

Discourse markers give a signal to the reader or listener about the relationship in the text between the text before and after it. Without a good and sufficient discourse marker in a text, it will not look logical. In addition, the relationship between the sentences in the paragraph will not be clear. Discourse markers do not contribute to the meaning of sentences representatively, but only

procedural meanings, namely where discourse markers provide instructions on how a discourse marker in an utterance is attached to be interpreted.

E. Characteristic of Discourse Markers

Discourse markers have several characteristics, the character of discourse markers determines whether the language element in the discourse is a discourse marker or not. Discourse markers have several characteristics related to several fields of linguistics. Characteristics of discourse markers were compiled by Brinton (1996) and then re-explained by Ziv and Jucker (1996). The characteristics of discourse markers are that they lead to the types of pragmatic markers that found in writing. The characteristics of the first discourse marker are in terms of phonological and lexical features, discourse markers are phonologically short and reduced. The second characteristic of discourse markers is syntactical, discourse markers are often located in the initial position and are optional. The third characteristic of discourse markers is that semantically, discourse markers have little proportional meaning. The fourth characteristic of discourse markers is that functionally, discourse markers have multifunctional properties which can function at several linguistic levels simultaneously.

F. Types of Discourse Markers

According to (Fraser, 2009), discourse markers are categorized into four types, which include contrastive discourse markers, elaborative discourse markers, inferential discourse markers, and temporal discourse markers:

1. Contrasitive discourse markers

Contrastive markers are discourse markers that signal an explicit interpretation of S2 in contrast to the interpretation of S1. In addition, it indicates that the utterance in S2 shows the contrasting meaning of several prepositions related to the previous discourse.

For example:

a. A. We can go now, children. B. **But** we haven't finished our game yet.

b. Jane is here, **however**, she isn't going to stay.

In sentences (a) and (b), the word "But" and "however" shows contrasting meaning between S1 and S2. In general, the aspects of discourse segments S1 and S2 that are contrasted must be members of a set that can be contrasted, that is, a set of expressions that can be contrasted.

2. Elaborative discourse markers,

Elaborative Marker is a discourse marker that signals a quasi-parallel relationship between S2 and S1. This shows that the speech in the following segment is a refinement or to complete some of the previous segments.

For example:

a. Take your raincoat with you. But **above all**, take gloves.

b. I think you should cool off a little. **In other words**, sit down and

wait a little bit.

In sentences (a) and (b), the word "above all" and 'In other word" menunjukkan hubungan antara S1 dan S2. Because it can be seen in the two sentences above, S1 and S2 show a relationship.

3. Inferential discourse markers

Inferential discourse markers are expressions that show conclusions that follow the previous segment because of the strength of the previous segment. So it can be concluded that the inferential discourse marker shows the meaning of the conclusion from the previous segment.

For example:

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

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

In sentences (a) and (b), the words "After all" and "So" give a signal that the following segment shows the conclusion of the previous segment.

4. Temporal discourse markers

Temporal markers are discourse markers that convey the relationship between the time at which a proposition is considered true, and the time at which it is presented in an utterance. The meaning of temporal markers according to Fraser's theory are adverbs of time and also conjunctions.

For example :

a. You should read **while** doing that.

b. A: I can't see the boy. B: **Then**, don't leave

In sentences (a) and (b), the words "while" and "Then" show the relationship between the time at which a proposition is considered true.

Tabel 2.1
Types of discourse markers based on Fraser's theory

Types	Discourse Markers
Contrasitive Discourse Markers	but, alternatively, although, contrariwise, contrary to expectations, conversely, despite, even so, however, in spite of, in comparison, in contrast, instead, nevertheless, nonetheless, notwithstanding, on the other hand, on the contrary, rather, regardless, still, though, whereas, yet.
Elaborative Discourse Markers	and, above all, after all, also, alternatively, analogously, besides, by the same token, correspondingly, equally, for example, for instance, further (more), in addition, in other words, in particular, likewise, more accurately, more importantly, more precisely, more to the point, moreover, on that basis, on top of it all, or, otherwise, rather, similarly.
Inferential Discourse Markers	so, all things considered, as a conclusion, as a consequence, as a result, because, consequently, for this/that reason, hence, it follows that, accordingly, in this/that/any case, on this/that condition, on these/those grounds, then, therefore, thus.
Temporal Discourse Markers	Then, after, as soon as, before, eventually, finally, first, immediately, afterwards, meantime, meanwhile, originally, second, subsequently, when.

G. Previous Study

There are several studies related to analysis on discourse markers. The first research was conducted by Nurlaela Rahayati, Rina Herlina, Aa Surahmat in 2021 "Discourse markers in Abstracts of International Journal". This study examines the discourse markers used in Abstracts of International Journal and the most dominant types of discourse markers used in Abstracts of International

Journal using Fraser's theory which focuses on four types of discourse markers. They are contrastive, elaborative, inferential, and temporal markers. The design of this research is descriptive qualitative, with a sample of six international journals. The results showed that the most dominant discourse markers used in international journals were elaborative discourse markers. However, there are no specific differences regarding the discourse markers used in both qualitative and quantitative international journal abstracts. It is based on differences in style and culture.

The second research was conducted by Dio Adewibowo, Imranuddin, Azwandi in 2018 "A Study of Discourse Markers Used in the Theses Background Written By the Students of English Department of Bengkulu University (Academic Year December 2016)". This study examines the types of discourse markers used in the background of the students of the English Education Study Program graduates of December 2016 at Bengkulu University and the accuracy of the discourse markers used in the thesis background of the students of the English Education Study Program graduates of December 2016 at the University of Bengkulu. This research is a descriptive study using Fraser's theory. The subjects of this research are ten undergraduate thesis backgrounds for English Education Study Program students who graduated in December 2016. And the research findings show that there are four types of discourse markers used in the undergraduate thesis backgrounds of English Education Study Program students who graduated in December. 2016 based on Fraser's theory. For inferential markers there are 49 findings (42%), temporal markers

are 28 (24%), elaborative markers are 23 (19%), and contrastive markers are 18 (15%). So it can be concluded that the most dominant discourse markers used are inferential markers. This study also found that the most accurate discourse markers used were temporal markers at 78.57%.

The last research was conducted by Yulianto in 2021 "Discourse Markers in News Article of the Jakarta Post". This research is qualitative research. The purpose of this study is to determine the discourse markers contained in News Articles of the Jakarta Post by using interpretive data analysis and using the theory of Halliday and Hasan. There were four Jakarta Post news articles analyzed. The following are the titles of the Jakarta Post news articles analyzed including: Jakarta Extends Covid-19 state of emergency to April 19, Mdik Ban to begin Friday, roads to remain open, Health minister issues new protocols for public activities, and Indonesia records another record number of new COVID-19 cases. Based on Halliday and Hassan's theory, there are four types of discourse markers, which include additive markers, adversative markers, causal markers, and temporal or continuative markers. Based on the research findings, there are 21 discourse markers in four news articles of the Jakarta Post news articles and additive markers are discourse markers that are mostly found in four News articles of the Jakarta Post.

The research above has similarities and differences with the research that the author did. The similarity is that all three examine discourse markers using a qualitative descriptive design. While the difference is that the first study examines the discourse markers used in international journal abstracts and the

most dominant types of discourse markers used in international journal abstracts, the second study examines the types of discourse markers used in the thesis background of students graduating from the English Education Study Program. December 2016 at Bengkulu University and the accuracy of discourse markers, The third study examines discourse markers contained in four news articles of The Jakarta Post, Halliday and Hasan's theory. Meanwhile, the research conducted by the author is a study that examines the types of discourse markers that are found in the main character's utterances in the novel "The Lightning Thief Percy Jackson and the Olympians: The Titan's Curse" and the meanings of the types of discourse markers found in the main character's utterances in the novel "The Lightning Thief Percy Jackson and the Olympians: The Titan's Curse". In this research, the researcher used the theory of Bruce Fraser.