

BAB II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents the review of the related literature which includes the concept of discourse and discourse analysis, discourse markers, the research background in thesis and the previous studies.

A. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis focuses on knowledge about language beyond the word, clause, phrase and sentence that is needed for successful communication.⁹ Discourse analysis concerns about the study of the relationship between language and the context in which it is used.¹⁰ It can be in the form of written text and spoken data whether formal or informal. Meanwhile, according to Brown and Yule, the analysis of discourse means the analysis of language in use.¹¹ Schiffrin said that discourse analysis consists of attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic unit, such as conversational exchanges or written texts.¹² Discourse analysis is also concerned with language in use in the social context, and in particular with interaction or dialog between speakers. Discourse analysis also considers the ways that the use of language presents different views of the world and different understandings. It examines how the use of language is influenced

⁹ Paltridge, Brian. *Discourse Analysis*. London : Great Britain. 2008.p.5.

¹⁰ McCarthy, M. *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 1991. P. 5

¹¹ Brown, G, & Yule, G. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983.p.1.

¹² Schiffrin, D. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 1987.p.1

by relationships between participants as well as the effects the use of language has upon social identities and relations. It also considers how views of the world, and identities, are constructed through the use of discourse. Discourse analysis examines both spoken and written texts.

All of those theories are really important because the analyses of discourse markers are parts of the analysis of discourse. So it really helps to understand what discourse analysis is and all of things that related with discourse markers before we know more about discourse markers.

B. Discourse Markers

1. Definition of Discourse Markers

Discourse markers are linguistic elements that signal relation between units of talk, relation at the exchange, action, ideational, and participation framework levels of the discourse (Schiffrin, 1987).¹³ This is the expression like well, but, oh, you know, because, and etc. Discourse markers have function in relation to enduring talk and text. In other word, discourse markers could be considered as a set of linguistic expressions comprised of members of word classes as varied as conjunction such as “and”, “but”, or interjections such as “oh”, adverb “now”, and “then”, and lexicalized phrases as like “ you know” and “I mean”.¹⁴ Schiffrin also provides the following

¹³ Kyrakis, Amy. Susan Ervin Tripp, (The Development of discourse markers in peer interaction), *Jurnal of Pragmatics*,31 (1999), 1321-1338.

¹⁴ Schiffrin,D. *Discovering the context of an utterance*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 1987b.11-12

definition: markers are sequentially dependent elements that bracket unit of talk.

Much of the literature relies heavily upon the characterization that Schiffrin made for discourse markers, as many scholarly works and articles cite her initial characterization. The initial characterization was made in her 1987 work, where Schiffrin operationally defined discourse markers as “sequentially dependent elements that brackets units of talk. Schiffrin analyzes the following items as discourse markers. English discourse markers.¹⁵ *Oh, well* (particles), *And, but, or, so, because* (conjunctions), *Now, then* (time deictics), *Y’know, I mean* (lexicalized clause).

According Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) seminal work on cohesion in English provided an important framework for analyzing text by addressing a basic question stemming from the very inception of discourse analysis : what makes a text different from a random collection of unrelated sentences? Although Halliday and Hasan did not speak directly of discourse markers, their analysis of cohesion (based on written texts) included words (e.g. *and, but, because, I mean, by the way, to sum up*) that have since been called markers and suggested functions for those words partially paralleling those of markers.

Like the work reviewed thus far, Fraser’s (1990, 1998) perspective on discourse markers is embedded within a larger framework that impact upon

¹⁵ Schiffrin, D. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 1987a.

the analysis of markers. In contrast to Halliday and Hasan whose main interest was cohesion of text, Fraser's theoretical framework concern the meaning of sentences, specifically how one type of pragmatic marker in a sentence may relate the message conveyed by that sentence to the message of a prior sentence. And in contrast with Schiffrin (1987a) whose starting point was to account for the use and distribution of markers in everyday discourse. Fraser's starting point is the classification of types of pragmatic meaning, and within that classification, the description of how some pragmatic commentary markers (discourse markers) dictate and interpretation of "the message conveyed by S2 [S= Segment] vis-a-vis the interpretation of S1" (Fraser 1998:302)

2. The Classification of Discourse markers

There are so many classification of discourse markers according some authors. In this explanation, the researcher explains the classification of discourse markers according to Fraser, Schiffrin, ,and Halliday and Hasan.

a. Fraser's Theory

According to Fraser, these are important in understanding function and use of discourse markers. Discourse markers relate some aspects of the message in S2 and S1. Fraser's category of discourse markers are *Contrastive Marker*, *Elaborative Markers*, *Inferential Markers*, and *Temporal Markers*

1) Contrastive Markers

The contrastive markers, signaling that the utterance following is either a denial or a contrast of some proposition associated with the preceding discourse (Cf. Fraser 1996b). These kinds of discourse markers show that interpretation of S2 contrast with and interpretation of S1. Consider the sentence below that contains DMs¹⁶ :

- John weighs 150 pounds. ***In comparison***, Jim weights 155.

In this sentence, *in comparison* indicates that S2 is in contrast with S1. According to its meaning, this subclass can be divided as : *but, alternatively, although, contrariwise, contrary to expectations, conversely, despite (this/that), even so, however, in spite of (this/that), in comparison (with this/that), in contrast (to this/that), instead (of this/that), nevertheless, nonetheless, (this/that point), notwithstanding, on the other hand, on the contrary, rather (than this/that), regardless (of this/that), still, though, whereas, yet*

2) Elaborative Markers

Elaborative markers is signal that the utterance following constitutes a refinement of some sort on the preceding discourse. Discourse Markers relate message in S2 to S1. In these cases, the DM signals a quasi-parallel relationship between S2 and S1:

¹⁶ Seyed Ali Rezvani Kalajahi,dkk. *Discourse Connector: An Overview of the History, Definition and Classification of the term*. World Applied Sciences Journal 19 (11): 1659-1673,2012

- You should be always polite. **Above all**, you shouldn't belch at the table.
- I think you should cool off a little. In other words, sit down and wait a little bit.
- They didn't want to upset the meeting by too much talking. **Similarly**, we didn't want to upset the meeting by too much drinking.

According to its meaning, this subclass can be divided as : *and, above 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, that is (to say).*

3) Inferential Markers

Inferential markers, expressions which signal that the force of the utterance is a conclusion which follows from the preceding discourse. these group of DMs shows that S2 is seen as conclusion for S1:

The examples:

- The bank has been closed all day. **Thus**, we couldn't make a withdrawal.
- It's raining. **Under those condition**, we should ride our bikes.

- Susan is married. **So**, I guess she is no longer available

It can also be said that S1 is viewed as a reason for S2. Thus, it indicates that content of S2 is the conclusion of S1.

According to its meaning, this subclass can be divided as : *so, after all, all things considered, as a conclusion, as a consequence (of this/that), as a result (of this/that), because (of this/that), 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.*

4) Temporal Markers

Temporal markers are time deictic to convey a relationship between the time at which a proposition is assumed to be true, and the time at which it is presented in an utterance.

The example:

- You should read **while** doing that
- A : I can't see the boy. B : **Then**, don't leave

According to its meaning, this subclass can be divided as: *then, after, as soon as, before, eventually, finally, first, immediately afterwards, meantime, meanwhile, originally, second, subsequently, when.* The temporal markers that are found in this research are *meanwhile, then,* and *while.*

As mentioned previously, the first main class of DMs relates to some aspect of S1 and S2 and they are called *Contrastive Markers*,

Elaborative Markers and *Inferential Markers*. the second main class of DMs in Fraser's category is Topic Change Markers.

For examples :

- The dinner looks delicious. ***Incidentally*** where do you shop?
- I'm glad that it is finished. ***To return to my point***, I'd like to discuss your paper.

In the first example, *incidentally* shows that S2 is a digression from the topic of S1, whereas in the other example, *to return to my point* indicates that the speaker intends to reintroduce the previous topic.

Back to my original point, I forget, by the way, incidentally, just to update you, on a different note, speaking of X, that reminds me, to change to topic, to return to my point, while I think of it, with regards to.

b. Schiffrin's Theory

Schiffrin said that, the important thing of the analysis on discourse markers is to know how speakers and hearers jointly integrate forms, meaning, and actions to make overall sense out of what is said.¹⁷ Schiffrin proposed that discourse markers could be considered as a set of linguistic expression comprised of members of word classes as varied s conjunctions (e.g *and, but, or*), interjections (*oh*), adverbs (*now, then*), and lexicalized phrases (*y'know, I mean*). Also proposed was a discourse model with

¹⁷ Schiffrin, D. *Approach to Discourse*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers. 1994.p.46

different planes: a participation framework, information state, ideational structure, action structure, exchange structure. Her specific analyses showed that markers could work at different levels of discourse to connect utterances on either a single plane or across different planes. In this explain below will be discuss about the function of discourse markers according Schiffrin :

1) Discourse Connective

The word “*and*” is use to coordinate ideas and to continue a speaker’s action in spoken language, it is considered as marker when it connects narrative sections, actions, or turns. However, “*and*” is not considered as marker when it connects noun (e.hg. John and Sue went to the beach) and verb phrase (e.g. John went to the beach and Swam in the ocean) since the conjoined unites in such cases were not discourse units but clause internal constituents.¹⁸

The word “*but*” is a coordinator like “*and*”, but it has different pragmatic effect. It marks an upcoming unit as contracting action. “*But*” does not coordinate functional units unless there is some contrastive relationship in an either their ideational or interaction content. Many use of “*but*” could be interpreted as speaker’s efforts to return to prior concern of making a point.¹⁹

The marker “*or*” (as coordinator like *and* and *but*) it is used as option marker. This would mean that “*or*” is exclusive since there

¹⁸ Schiffrin, D. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 1987.p.152.

¹⁹ Ibid.p. 153

is only one member of the disjunct can hold. Besides, “*or*” can also be inclusive since either one member or both members of the disjunct can hold. Schiffrin states that “*or*” is an inclusive option marker in discourse because it provides recipients with a choice between accepting only one member of a disjunct, and both members of a disjunct. It is said that “*or*” is fundamentally different from “and” and “*but*” since it is not marker of a speaker’s action toward this own talk, but of a speaker’s desire for a recipient to take action. Speaker’s desire for recipient to take action, in this case, means giving the recipient a choice of ideas and in daily conversation or could promote and interaction response.²⁰

2) Marker of Information Management

Schiffrin believed that “*oh*” is used as exclamation or interjection. When it is used alone, without the syntactic support of a sentence, it indicates strong emotional states, e.g. surprise, fear, or pain. Marker of “*oh*” is a marker of information management covers “*oh*” in repair and “*oh*” in the status of information. “*Oh*” in repair and “*oh*” in the status information. “*Oh*” in repair can be divided into two parts, which are repair initiation and repair completion. While in information status, “*oh*” mark to changes, which are the recognition of familiar information and the receiver of new information.²¹

This is example of “*oh*” as exclamation:

²⁰ Ibid.p. 155

²¹ Ibid.p.73-74

A : Is this what you are looking for?

B : “*Oh!*” *Ges, yes!*

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

A : “*Oh*”, *they will know later on.*

B : *Do not they go to the party? “Oh” maybe there are too old.*

3) Marker of Response

The usual dialogic functions identified for “*well*” as a discourse marker are used in the beginning of utterance which reject, cancel or disagree with the content or tenor of the foregoing discourse. “*Well*” often begins turn, serving as a left hand discourse bracket.

The example: *Well* some people before they go to the doctor, they talk to a friend, or a neighbor.

4) Markers of Cause and Result

“*So*” and “*because*” can mark idea units, information states, and action. They have semantic meanings, which are realized at both sentence and discourse levels. “*Because*” conveys a meaning of course or event, and “*so*” conveys a meaning result. Fact-based causal relations between *cause* and *result* hold between idea units, such as between the events, states, and so on. The following example will show a fact-based relation marked by “*so*” and “*because*”.²²

²² Ibid.p. 157

The Example: He was tired. *So*, he went home

5) Markers of Temporal Adverb

“*Now*” and “*then*” are time deictic because they convey a relationship between the time at which a proposition is assumed to be true, and the time at which it is presented in an utterance. Before we go further, let us discuss about the different between reference time and event time first. Reference time refers to the deictic relationship between proposition and it speaking time.²³

The example: Speaker: *ok. I can see that I’ve convinced you.*

*“Now’ go find the next random bad guy
who will advance plot.*

Speaker : *Reaching the shore, he dumps Bond Girl
in the arms of puzzled looking guy with a sailor
costume of sort, “**then**” goes back to follow the
Evil Mastermind.*

6) Information and Participation

Schiffrin believes that the basic meaning of “*I mean*” is to forewarn upcoming adjustments. Unlike “*um*” and “*uh*” which represent pauses, the term “*you know*” do not represent natural pauses in speech. Marker “*you know*” is cognitively process and used by

²³ Ibid.p. 160

speaker. Marker “*you know*” encourages addressees to think about the comprehensibility of what has just been said.²⁴

Holmes and Schiffrin have the same concept about the function of discourse markers. According to them discourse markers “*so*” function to summarize the information of speaker’s utterance.

c. Halliday and Hasan’s Theory

Halliday and Hasan have defined a text as “not just a string of sentences. It is not simply a long grammatical unit, something of the same kind as a sentence, but differing from it in size, a sort of super sentence, a semantic unit”. Discourse relations are believed to transcend grammatical structure. In *Cohesion in English* Halliday and Hasan identify five main cohesive devices in English discourse: *reference*, *substitution*, *ellipsis*, *lexical cohesion*, and *conjunction*. Halliday and Hasan’s classification of conjunction (connective elements) are summarized as follows:

- 1) Additive : and, or, also, in addition, furthermore, besides, similarly, likewise, by contrast, for instances;
- 2) Adversative : but, yet, however, instead, on the other hand, nevertheless at any rate, as a matter of fact;
- 3) Causal : so, consequently, it follows, for, because, under the circumstances, for this reason.
- 4) Continuative : now, of course, well, anyway, surely, after all;etc.

²⁴ Schiffrin, D. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 1987.p.167

All of those theories above are needed in this research to help me in determining discourse markers in the research background of these undergraduate student of STAIN Kediri which are included in discourse markers. But, in this research the researcher used Fraser's Theory to determine discourse markers because Fraser's Theory classifies discourse markers and explains the function more clearly and easily to understand.

3. The Concordance of Discourse Markers

Discourse Markers (DMs) according to Fraser's classification have procedural meaning and their linguistic and conceptual interpretation is 'negotiated' by the context. Fraser introduces two kinds of discourse markers. The first group relates to some aspects of S2 to S1 explicitness and the second group relates the topic of S2 to S1. For an expression to be a DM it must be acceptable in the sequence S1-DM+S2, where S1 and S2 are discourse segments, each representing an illocutionary force, although elision may have occurred. There are three necessary and sufficient conditions that a DM must meet.

- a. **Condition 1** : A DM is a lexical *expression*, for example, *but*, *so*, and *in addition*.
- b. **Condition 2** : In a sequence of discourse segments S1- S2, a DM must occur as a part of the second discourse segment, S2.
- c. **Condition 3** : A DM does not contribute to the semantic meaning of the segment but signals a specific semantic relationship which

holds between the interpretation of the two illocutionary Force segments, S1 and S2.

Whatever they are called discourse marker, discourse connective, discourse operators, or cue phrase, the expressions under discussion share on common property: they impose a relationship between some aspect of the discourse segment they are a part of, call it S2, and some aspect of a prior discourse segment, call it S1. In other words, they function like a two-place relation, one argument lying in the segment they introduce the other lying in the prior discourse. The canonical form as <S1. DM+S2>.

There are, however, several issues which mention here. First, consider the following example, which illustrate the segments related by a DM need not be adjacent.

*He drove the truck through the parking lot into the street. Then he almost cut me off. After that, he ran a red light. **However**, these weren't his worst offense.*

From the example above, the *however* relates the segment it introduces ('these weren't his worst offenses') with not just the immediately prior segment ('after that, he ran a red light'), but with several prior segments, including the immediately preceding one.

Second, a DM need not strictly 'introduce' S2, but may occur in medial or final position as well, as the example

- a. Harry is old enough to drink. **However**, he can't because he has hepatitis.

b. It is freezing outside. I will, *in spite of this*, not wear a coat.

A third issue involves the grammatical status of the discourse segments. There are four cases to consider. The first case is illustrated in the example below, where the DM relates independent sentences, S1 and S2 (the canonical case noted above).

a. We left late. *However*, we arrived home on time

b. The picnic is ruined, the mayonnaise has turned rancid. There are ants in the chicken. *Furthermore*, the beer is warm.

The second case is illustrated in the example next below, where two independent clauses are joined by a coordinate conjunction, in this case *and*. The form of these sequences joined by a DM may be the canonical one, <S1, DM+S2>, or <S1, DM+S2>.

a. Jack played tennis. *And* Mary read a book.

b. Jack played tennis, *and* may read a book.

Contrary to the DMs in the example before, whose occurrence is restricted to introducing an independent clause, the examples in the sentence above show that *and* (as well as *but*, *or* and *so*) can relate S2 to S1 in an alternative way. This raises the question of whether or not *and* (*but*, *or*) should be considered a DM in an elliptical sentence such as ‘Jack and Mary rode horses’. A DM introduces a separate message with its propositional content, whereas the *and*, in this and similar elliptical sentences, functions purely as a conjunction within a single message. See below for a clarification

on the grammatical status of DMs. A third case involves DMs such as those in the example below:

i.e. as a result (of that), because of this/that, besides, despite this/that, for this/that reason, in addition (to this/that), in comparison (to/with this/that), in spite of this/that. In this/that case, instead (of this/that), on this/that condition.

These can occur in the canonical form, <S1. DM+S2> and in two additional forms as well.

- a. There was considerable flooding. **As a result (of that)**, farmers went bankrupt.
- b. **As a result of** considerable flooding, farmers went bankrupt.

In the example (a) is the prepositional phrase (*as a result of that*) functioning as a DM? In the example (b), the expression *as a result of* is functioning simply as a preposition with a nominalization formed from S1 as its object, and, like the elliptical sentence above, it does not introduce a separate message. Thus, it is not functioning as a DM.

A fourth case involving expression such as *since, because, while, and unless* does not permit the canonical form, but only the pattern <S1, DM+S2> and <DM+S2, S1>, as shown in the example below.

- a. Mary is angry with you **because** you ran over her cat with your car.
- b. **While** she pregnant, Martha will not take a plane.

Because the DM is syntactically a subordinate conjunction, it cannot introduce a sentence which stand alone, but requires that the previous independent clause be present.²⁵ A whole of text sometimes need some of sentences to make their sentences concord with the meaning. So, it means that some of the sentences can we call Segment 3 (S₃), Segment 4 (S₄), or Segment 5 (S₅) needs to make their sentences more easy to understand and can convey the meaning of the sentences.

C. The Research Background of a Thesis

The Research background is certain thing that can support university students to do research. In the area of criminal it called motif but in education area it is usually called motivation that becomes a university student's do their research.²⁶ The research background is the explanation about phenomenon that becomes research and interesting for the researcher and not the reason from the researcher to choose the tittle. The research background if possible it can be support by supporting data and it can be find too from main source or second source.²⁷ Research background is an important thing in a Thesis. Research background refers to accessing the collection of previously published and unpublished information about a site, region, or particular topic of interest and it is the first step of all good archaeological investigations, as well as that of all writers of any kind of research paper.

In the research background, every researcher has special factor in writing research background. According Glattorn and Joyner (2005:165) some of special

²⁵ Bruce, Fraser. *What is Discourse Markers*. Journal of Pragmatic 31 (1999) 931-952

²⁶ Jauhari, Heri. *Pedoman Penulisan Karya Ilmiah*. Bandung : CV PUSTAKA SETIA. 2009.p24.

²⁷ Hariwijaya,M. Triton. *Skripsi & Thesis* . Jakarta: ORYZA. 2011.p.46

factor of background of the study are²⁸ *the social background of a study, Intellectual background of a study, professional research background, research background of a study.*

1. The social background of a study

The development and change in society that make problem of research becomes important thing.

2. The Intellectual background of a study

The moval of intellectual and main philosophical that happen when the time thesis are doing that give special contexts in the research

3. The professional research background

The development in certain area which made problem or issue needs to investigate.

4. The research background of a study

The new methods which need to use or a new theory that need to test, or because there is vacuity in the knowledge.

²⁸ Emilia, Emi. *Menulis Thesis dan Disertasi*. Bandung : Alfabeta. 2009.p.142

D. The Previous Studies

Some researcher from different universities have done the study of discourse markers. One of them was done by Hosnol Wafa in the year 2009, in this research examines the discourse markers used by James Bond as the main character of "Casino Royale". Here, Hosnol used qualitative methods to collect the data. And he used Schiffrin's theory to explain more his research. He found discourse markers which are used Jame's Bond's in dialogues Casino Royale Movie. First markers of "oh" is Markers of Information Management as exclamation or interection it indicates strong emotional states. Second markers of "well" is Marker of Response as preface utterances which is reject and disagree with the content the foregoing discourse. Tird marker of "and" is Discourse Connective Bond used it to coordinate ideas and to continue a speaker's action in spoken language. Forth Marker of "so" is Marker of Cause and Result Bond used it to convey a meaning of result. Fifth marker of "then" is Temporal Adverb Bond used it to make relationship between the time at which a proposition is assumed to be true. Sixth marker of "you know" is Markers of Information Bond uased it to encourage addresses to think about the comprehensibility of what has just been utter.