II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 AN OVERVIEW OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

2.1.1 The Definition of Discourse Analysis

In the study of language, some of the most interesting questions arise in connection with the way language is ‘used’, rather than what its components are. We were, in effect, asking how is that language-users interpret what other language-users intend to convey. When we carry this investigation further and ask how is that we, as language-users, make sense of what we read in texts, understand what as opposed to jumbled or incoherent discourse, and successfully take part in that complex activity called conversation, we are undertaking what is known as discourse analysis.

The analysis of discourse is necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independently to the purposes or functions which those forms are designed to serve in human affairs. While some linguists may concentrate on determining the formal properties of a language is used for. While the formal approach has a long tradition, manifested in innumerable volumes of grammar, the functional approach is less well documented. Attempts to provide even a general set of labels for principal functions of language have resulted in vague, and often confusing, terminology.

The term discourse analysis is very ambiguous. It can refer to the linguistic analysis of naturally occurring connected spoken or written discourse.
Roughly speaking, it refers to the attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistics units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts. It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with language in use in social contexts, and in particular interaction or dialogue between speakers.

Discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the context in which it is used. It grew out of work in different disciplines in the 1960s and early 1970s, including linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology and sociology. Discourse analysts study language in used; written texts of all kinds and spoken data from conversation to highly institutionalized forms of talk.

2.1.2 The Scope of Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is not only concerned with the description and analysis of spoken interaction. In addition to all our verbal encounters we daily consume hundreds of written and printed words: newspaper articles, letters, stories, recipes, instructions, notices, comics, billboards leaflets pushed through the door, and so on. We usually expect them to be coherent, meaningful communications in which the words and/or sentences are linked to one another in a fashion that corresponds to conventional formulae, just as we do with speech; therefore discourse analysts are equally interested in the organization of written interaction.
2.1.3 The Types of Discourse

Discourse can be classified into two kinds, namely:

1) Oral Discourse or Spoken Discourse

It is a discourse which used the spoken text, such as conversation. By oral discourse, we mean discourse which text is constructed in the real time. It means oral discourse is concerning some actual facts in the present time.

2) Written Discourse

It was formed by the written text (written language). By written discourse, we mean discourse which text is not constructed in the real time.

Briefly, these two types of discourse above can be distinguished according to the type of situation. Oral discourse is concerning face-to-face situation while a recorded transmission situation involves in the written discourse.

There are still other types of discourse which is important to be distinguished namely interactive and non-interactive discourse. A definition of interaction, if it is to be used for the term of discourse, should be based on an analysis on the type of role play by participants in the communication. It is called interactive discourse if each participant constructs only part of text, expressing a number of fragments in alternation with the other participants. It is called non-interactive discourse if a single participant is responsible for the whole of the discourse.
Can both the oral and written discourse be both interactive and non-interactive? It is undutiful that the majority of oral discourse is interactive, since this type of discourse is usually realized in face-to-face communicative situation which generally need the interactive participation of all present. In certain situation, however, the oral discourse can be in non-interactive form, for example the political speech or lecturer, who is clarifying the subject of the lesson, produces the whole discourse orally by him without any participation of the collegian.

On the other hand, a written discourse can also be interactive and continuity. For example: in the first letter, Bob writes to his uncle asking for help. In the second letter, Bob’s uncle replies the help will be given at the exact time he needs. In the third letter, Bob thanks his uncle for the favor that was offered, and mentions the time when he needs the help. These three kinds of letters are regarded as three ‘speaking turns’ which form the whole. This discourse is, therefore, interactively coherent.

2.1.4. Properties of Discourse

There are 3 properties of discourse, they are discourse forms structures, conveys meaning, and accomplishes action. The first two properties are largely concerned with discourse as extended sequences of smaller units, e.g. sentence, propositions and utterances. The third property is more concerned with language as it is used within social interaction; included is speakers’ use not only of extended sequences, but their use of single unit within social interaction.
1. **Structure**

More recent approaches have based discourse grammars on transformational generative sentence grammar claims that texts can be treated as extensions of sentences and that a text grammar can be written in the same form as a generative sentence grammar. Within such a text grammar, the acceptability of a discourse would be determined by a set of rules acting as formal criteria for the interpretability of sentences within the text. Several studies take a more liberal approach to non-textual factors in their suggestion that discourse structure reflects the informational content and structure what is being talked about. They all view discourse as a structured composition of linguistic constituents (morphemes, clauses, sentences) within a monologue.

2. **Meaning**

Particular items such as pronouns, adverbs and conjunctions help create discourse not because of their rule-governed distribution, but because they indicate an interpretive link between two parts within the text. And although we can recognize a cohesive element by its surface appearance in a clause, what such an element actually display is a connection between the underlying propositional content of two clauses - the clause in which the element appears and a prior clause. In short, the cohesive link is established because interpretation of an element in one clause presupposes information from a prior clause.

Studies of cohesion indicate that the meaning conveyed by a text is meaning which is interpreted by speakers and hearers based on their inferences about the propositional connection underlying what are said. Cohesive devices do
not themselves create meaning; they are clues used by speakers and hearers to find the meanings which underlie surface utterances.

3. Actions

Structure and meaning are properties of discourse when discourse is considered as a linear sequence of smaller units, e.g. sentences, turns, propositions. Although action or more accurately the accomplishment of action is also a property of discourse, it is a property which emerges not so much from arrangements of underlying units, as from the organization of speaker goals and intentions which are taken up and acted upon by hearers, and from the ways in which language is used in service of such goals.

2.2 DISCOURSE MARKERS

2.2.1 Why Analyze Discourse Markers

The analysis of discourse markers is a part of more general analysis of discourse coherence-how speaker and hearer jointly integrate forms, meanings and actions to make overall sense out of what is said.

For example, the discourse (1) is a rhetorical argument through which a speaker (Tina) is defending a position-her belief in destiny-by presenting personal experience to serve as evidence, or support, for that position.

(1) a. I suppose we can’t deny that we all have our own time in this world.
   b. I believe that … y’know its destiny.
   c. it really is.
   d. because my grandfather died of heart-attack.
   e. and one day before that he instead to have a great party.
f. *and* I really believe.

g. I don’t think that you can deny destiny.

f. *and* I think a lot of people do.

g. I don’t think that you can deny destiny.

h. *and* I think a lot of people do.

i. *but* I feel that we are brought to this world for many, years or whatever the case is

j. *and* that’s how it was and it will be.

k. *because* like when I was studying in Malaysia

l. I supposed to study there for two years.

m. I got a letter saying that my immigration files got lost.

n. and I had to go back to Indonesia.

o. And when I got back I got admitted in USU, Indonesia.

p. while I was enjoying my stay in Malaysia.

q. and I just felt, this was better for me.

r. because if it isn’t, I would have not got into USU.

s. *so* eh *y’know* it seems it just seems that it’s meant to happen like that.

Consider, first, that (1) forms an argument because it contains two informational differentiated parts. The main part of an argument as a position: a general statement toward whose truth a speaker is committed. Subordinate to the position is support: any information, e.g. personal experience, other’s testimony, logical reasoning, which justifies either the truth of the statement of the speaker’s commitment towards the truth. Ira’s position in (1) is that she believes in destiny;
she states this in various ways in several locations; lines (a)-(c), (f)-(j) and (s), support for this position is given through brief description of two experiences in which coincident events had no rational explanation, and are thus interpreted as meant to be. This evidence is presented (in line d-e, k-r) between paraphrases of the position.

Several markers in (1) play a role in its formation as an argument. First, we find because preceding support in (d) and (k). Because often precedes not just evidence, but other casually related discourse material, e.g. background information in narratives.

We find and in (f); and precedes a self-interrupted restatement of the position. We will see that and often precedes material which continues an earlier part of discourse-especially material which is not subordinate to the overall structure of the discourse. In both (h) and (j), and links ideas which seems closely related to just prior ideas. In (h), the speaker is contrasting a feeling of her own (about denying destiny) with the actions of others. Thus, within the position, and seems to have a role in linking related ideas when the union of those ideas play a role in larger ideational structure of the argument.

In (i) but is an adversative conjunction suggests that what follows but is an idea which contrasts with what has preceded. Like and, then, it seems that but could have a cohesive function within the position.

Finally we find so in (s), preceding the final paraphrase of the position. We will see often so brings information understood as resultative (the outcome of connection between reported events) or conclusive (the outcome of inferential connections). Markers also occur within the position and the support.
There is one other marker in (1) that is *y’know*. It is directed toward gaining hearer involvement in an interaction. In (b) and (s), *y’know* seems to be marking some kind of appeal from speaker to hearer for consensus, e.g. for understanding as to the meaning of destiny, or even for understanding as to the meaning of destiny, or even for agreement on the position being taken about destiny.

We will see that *y’know* is widely used throughout talk at locations in which discourse tasks hinge on special cooperative effort between speaker and hearer.

The observation about what markers add to discourse have based largely on their locations within discourse where markers occur, and with what markers co-occur. There are other issue: markers as coherence options, shows options for each other-as alternative ways of saying the same thing also rises the problem of whether elements as diverse as *and*, *y’know* can form one class of items in a discourse paradigms. In traditional linguistic analysis, items which occur in the same environment but do not produce a different meaning are in contrast, whereas items which occur in the same environment but do not produce a different in meaning are in free variation.

### 2.2.2 Kinds of Discourse Markers

As explained above, there are many kinds of discourse markers. Understanding of discourse markers requires separating the contribution made by the marker itself, from the contribution made by the discourse slot in which the markers occur.
1) Marker of Information Management

The first type of discourse markers is *oh*. The explanation of discourse markers *oh* is not clearly based on semantic meaning or grammatical status.

*Oh* is traditionally viewed as an exclamation of interjection. When it use alone, without the syntactic support of a sentence, *oh* is said to indicate strong emotional states, e.g. surprise, fear or pain. For examples:

1) Andi : Was that interesting games?
   Budi : *oh*! yes! It was

2) Andi : Like I’d say, ‘What d’y’mean you don’t like rock music concert?
   *Oh*! I don’t like it. It’s too crowded

*Oh* can also initiate utterances, either followed by a brief pause;

3) Fay : *oh*, well I was here when I was a child
   Or with no pause preceding the rest of tone unit:

4) Adi : does he like classical music? *Oh* maybe he’s too young.

Regardless of its syntactic status on intentional contour, that *oh* occurs as speaker shift their orientation to information. *Oh* pulls the flow of information in discourse to the temporary focus of attention which is the target of self and or other management. *Oh* occurs in several different situations such as: oh in repair initiation, for example, Cathy is answering a question about whether she believes in extrasensory perception by describing her husband Jack’s abilities to predict future political events.

5) I mean …he can almost foresee:…eh::for instance with

   Nixon…he said …now he’s not in a medical field my husband.
   He said coagulation his blood…uh thinning his-Nixon’s blood…will
not be good for him, if he should be operated on. *Oh* maybe it’s just knowledge.

I don’t know if that’s E.S.P or not in that C-in this case.

Cathy recategorizes a particular description from an instance of E.S.P. to an instance of knowledge: this self-repair is initiated with *oh*.

*Oh* prefaces both self and other completion. For example, Lita self-initiates and self completes her replacement of *yeh* with *no* and Senior High School Plus and then further self-completes with *oh that’s right*.

From all the examples above, *oh* has a role in information status because *oh* marks a focus of speaker’s attention which then also becomes a candidate for hearer’s attention. *Oh* has or is suggested to have a pragmatic effect-the creation of a joint focus. *Oh* can be focused on or situated in social interaction. First, *oh* makes evident a very general and pervasive property of participant framework. Because *oh* displays one’s own on going management of information, its user is temporarily displayed as an individual active in the role of utterance reception.

So *oh* is a marker of information management: it marks shifts in speaker’s orientation (objective and subjective) to information which occurs as speakers and hearers manage the flow of information produced and received during discourse. Orientation shifts affect the overall information of state of a conversation: the distribution of knowledge about entities, events, and situations. Although *oh* is a number of cognitive tasks, its use may have pragmatic effects in interaction.
2) Marker of Response

Like *oh*, the use of *well* is not based on semantic meaning or grammatical status. Although *well* sometimes is a noun, an adverb or degree word, its use in utterance initial position is difficult to characterize in terms based on any of these classes. We can see some placements of *well*.

It can occur in request-compliance pairs, for example: in (1) Irene issues a request for action to Henry and Zelda, who have been talking about topics other than those on conversational agenda.

(1) Irene : Let’s get back because she’ll never get home.

Debby : *Well*, actually we don’t have that much more.

*Well* can occur in request for confirmation although it is a bit harder to identity. Such requests are often identifiable because of the information status assumed to hold at the time of speaking, that is, speaker or hearer knowledge and meta-knowledge. This is, if a speaker makes a statement about an event about which a hearer is expected to have knowledge as request for confirmation, then, are statements about the hearer’s past life, abilities, likes and dislikes, knowledge, and so on. For examples:

(2) Erwin : And my father has been working for the government company.

Roni : So your father must like them as an employer then.

Erwin : *Well* my father likes his job, now.

*Well* is a response marker: *well* anchors its user in a conversational exchange when the options offered through a prior utterance for the coherence of an upcoming response it is not precisely followed. More generally, *well* is possible whenever the coherence options offered by one components of talk differ
from another: *well* locates a speaker as a respondent to one level of discourse and allows a temporary release from attention to others.

3) **Markers of Connectives**

Another different set of markers are *and, but, and or*. They are called discourse connective. The first item of this kind of marker is *and*. *And* is the most frequently used mode of connection at a local of idea structure, for examples:

(3) a. See this is what every student does.
   b. **But** we were serious
   c. And we tried to answer
   d. And we tried to pass
   e. **And** we fail

Mathematic teacher is explaining that every student tried to do the sum in the exam (a,c,d); some students, however, failed the exam (b, e). The contrast between the efforts to pass and the unintended fail is marked, first with *but* (in b), and then with *and* (in e). *And* thus occurs in environment by *but*.

*And* also occurs in an environment shard by *so*. In (4) Nely prefaces and outcome of reason with *and*. She is explaining why she remembers a particular childhood game; note, again preface of the reason with *because*.

(4) a. That’s one game I remember
   b. Because we had a driveway
   c. And, like we would hide
   d. And they would walk around the driveway?
   e. Y’know?
   f. **And** I- I remember it so distinctly
After explaining why she remembers the game (b-c), Nely again mentions that memory (f). Her paraphrase of the outcome is prefaced with *and* rather *so*.

*And* is a structural coordinator of ideas as which has pragmatic effect as a marker of speaker continuation. But discovering which ideas are coordinated by *and*, which action are continued, required looking into the content and structure which tell us what idea units, are being marked by *and*.

The second item of connective marker is *but*. Although *but* is a discourse coordinator (like *and*), it has a very pragmatic effect: *but* marks an upcoming unit as a contrasting action, because this effect is based on its contrastive meaning, the range of ideational uses of *but* is considerably narrower that that of *and*, for examples:

(5) a. *But*, in my house, we were not taught liar.

b. And he didn’t have a place to sleep.

c. Never did I ever say this girl is like this, that girl is like that.

d. It was prove for a fact that her uncle always did take care of his children.

e. She put her in her own house.

f. So we were not liar.

This shows the contrast that becomes a new position, and evidence is presented to support his position. In (6), John shows or faced contrast with the tolerance provided the family.

(6) g. *But*, I went to my village.

h. And I-I felt the hostility in some people
This contrast explains the use of *but* in (g). The mentioning of hostility is also broader structural role in the argument: it provides an instance of support, and thus provides evidence for the main position of the argument. *But* marks both position and support in John’s argument. But it does so only when the content of those units contrast with prior ideas: *but* in (a) contrast the tolerance faced by one group with the tolerance provided by that group; but in (g) marks both of these contrasts. *But* marks idea units which are functionally related—support, position, their functional relationship is less important than their contrastive contents in explaining the use of *but*.

The third item of connective marker is *or*. *Or* is used as an option marker in discourse. It differs from *and* and *but* not only in meaning, because it is move hearer-directed: whereas *and* marks a speaker’s continuation, and *but* a speaker’s return to a point, or marks a speaker’s provision of options to hearer. *Or* offers accepting only one member of disjunct or both members of a disjunct. *Or* provides idea options in argument—a mode of discourse whose organization has also revealed the use of *and* and *but*. *Or* is used in arguments primarily to mark different pieces of support as multiple evidence for a position. In (7), for example, Jack is arguing Hongkong movies never present a realistic view of life. He presents two examples to support his generalization about the lack of realism.

(7) Jack : i. I’m-I’m speaking how kind everybody is on the movie.
        j. *Or* uh …how’s poor working girl is out looking for a job.

There are two potential ways to interpret *or* in (7). First, we could say Jack is directing his hearers to choose one example, either example, but only one. This would mean that *or* is exclusive: only one member of the disjunct can hold.
This would mean that *or* is inclusive; either one member *or* both members of the disjunct can hold.

*Or* is also used to offer inclusive options, as a response to questions, for examples:


Wina : b. Who wouldn’t

Ita : c. I was up there with my husband last two weeks. There are many beautiful places there.

Wina : d. There are really beautiful.

Ita : e. *Or* I have a sister that lives up in eh: Bandung. Do you know it?


Ita : f. So, they have nice places, really beautiful places

*Or* can also occur in a clarification. For examples:

Edy : a. If I had a girl friend

    b. I’d never let her go out to somewhere alone.

Evi : c. Y’think it’s too uh…

Edy : d. I would never let her t-

    e. No no no. Its very good idea

    f. But I *or* I would never let my sister to go out to somewhere alone either

    g. I think its too-it’s too dangerous for them.

    h. I think that they should be with their friends.
Or is also used in offering inclusive options to hearer in disagreement. For example:

Diana : a. Yeh, but wait; it doesn’t mean because they’re got the same religion, they’re-they’re bad.

b. Or if they are of your religion that things are gonna work out well.

c. It’s the person… too.

d. So it takes both.

Or is used as an option for a marker in discourse: it provides with a choice between accepting only one member of disjunct or both members of disjunct. Thus, or is fundamentally different from and and but because it is not a marker of a speaker’s action toward his own talk, but of a speaker’s desire for a hearer to take action.

More specifically, or represents a speaker’s effort to elicit from a hearer a stance toward an ideas unit, or to gain a response of some kind, or thus prompts the exchange the status quo, and but returns it to a prior state.

4) Markers of Cause and Result

Another different set of markers are so and because. They are called markers of cause and result. Like and, but, and or, so and because have grammatical properties which contribute to their discourse use. So and because are grammatical signals of main or subordinate clauses respectively, and this grammatical difference is reflected in their discourse use: because is a marker of subordinate idea units, and so is a complementary marker of main idea units. It is important to define ‘subordinate’ and ‘main’ in discourse. Such designations
depend on both the functional and referential organization of talk. From a functional perspective, subordinate material is that which has a secondary role in relation to a more encompassing focus of joint attention and activity. From a referential perspective, subordinate material is that which is not as relevant in and of it, as it is to a more global topic of talk. For example, *so* and *because* may show a fairly clear differentiation of main by from subordinate material. In the following examples, Defy is explaining why she and Fajar are not going to see their daughter that evening.

**Defy :**

a. Well, we were going up t’see uh… my- our daughter tonight.

b. But we’re not

c. *Cause* the younger one’s gonna come for dinner.

d. *Cause* he’s working in the neighborhood.

e. So that’s out.

The event being explained is in (b): we’re not. The first reason is in (c) and a reason for that reason is in (d). Thus, Defy uses cause to progressively embedded reason in her explanation.

*Because* and *so* have semantic meaning which are realized at both sentence and discourse levels: *because* conveys a meaning of ‘cause’ and *so* conveys meaning a ‘result’. These meanings appear on three of planes of discourse: ideational structure, information state and actions.

*Because* and *so* can mark fact-based cause and result relations at both local and global levels of discourse. (1) Illustrates *so* at both levels.

(1) a. *So*, her mother wouldn’t let her go to there anymore.

   b. And she tried to get another jobs and she couldn’t
The event in (a) resulted from the prior story events; thus, *so* functions globally over a wide range of talk.

Both *because* and *so* are use used to mark convergent portions of an explanation and an answer. For examples:

Ira : a. Susi goes with me a lot  
    b. *Cause* she has more patience…with my son I do  
    c. *So*, sometimes we go shopping together with my son.

It is important to note down that *so* is used at potential transition locations in talk-when speakers offer hearer a turn at talk, a chance to complete an incomplete proposition by answering a question, an opportunity to change topic.

*Because* and *so* convey meanings of cause and result which may be realized as fact-based, knowledge-based and/or action based relations between units of talk. Like the other markers considered so far, *so* and *because* work at both local and global levels of talk. At local level, *so* and *because* allow two ordering options which are thematically constrained by surrounding discourse. Like *and*, *but*, and *or*, *so* and *because* are used in discourse in ways which reflect their linguistic properties.

5) **Markers of Temporal: Now and Then**

Deictic elements relate an utterance to its person, space and time coordinates. *Now* and *then* are time deictics because they convey a relationship between time at which a proposition is assumed to be true and the time at which it is presented in an utterance. In other words, *now* and *then* are deictic because their meaning depends on a parameter of the speech situation (time of speaking).
Now occurs in discourse in which the speaker progresses through a cumulative series of subordinate units. The discourse in which now occurs need not be explicitly structured or identified as having two subordinate units. Now occurs not only when the comparison is explicitly identified as having two clearly introduced subtopics, but also when the subtopics under comparison are only implicit. For example:

Tony:  

a. They aren’t brought up the same way.

b. Now Italian people are very outgoing.

c. They’re very generous.

d. When they put a meal on the table it’s a meal.

e. Now, these boys were Irish.

f. They lived different.

Tony is comparing the childbearing practices of Italians and Irish. This comparison is explicitly introduced in (a). Following the introduction of the comparison, Tony uses now to introduce both subtopics: Italians (b) and Irish (e).

Now also occurs with an opinion about a disputable topic. It is displaying the speaker’s recognition of interpersonal differences about that topic. For example: Sally has asked Zelda how she feels about intermarriage.

a. Well … it is all depend on um..

b. Now my husband believes in eh marrying in his own religion.

c. And he tried to stress it with the boys.

After introducing a comparison (a), Zelda prefaces her husband Henry’s position with now. She then continues with her own opinion.
Now shows a speaker’s progression through the discourse time of a comparison a discourse which is comprised of a cumulative series of subtopic. In all the comparisons, however, now has the same function. It displays that what is coming next in the discourse is but a subpart of a larger cumulative structure, and thus has to be interpreted as a subordinate unit in relation to a progression of such units. In short, now marks the speaker’s orderly progression in discourse time through a sequence of subparts.

Then indicates temporal succession between prior and upcoming talk. For example: Sari is answering Tina’s question about where she has lived:

a. And…I lived there until I got married.
b. And then, for about two years after then
c. So: uh, and then we moved here.
d. We’ve been living here for about twelve years.

In (b), then indicates both coterminous and successive event time: initial then marks the two years time period following Sari’s marriage (a) and final then marks the time period co-occurring with the time of the marriage.

Then marks successive subtopics in list. For example: Irene is answering Lely’s questions about her bowling team.

Lely : How many people are in the team?
Irene : Four
Lely : So, it’s just the two of you and …
Irene : The two couples, yeh…

And then the kids have their own team.
The overall topic of Irene’s answer is the membership of the bowling teams. Her two subtopics are the members of each team: first, the two couples and second, the kids. Her answer lists the two teams.

*Then* indicates temporal succession between prior and upcoming talk. Its main difference from *now* is the direction of the discourse which it marks: *now* points forward in discourse time and *then* points backward. Another difference is that *now* focuses on how the speaker’s own discourse follows the speaker’s own prior talk; *then*, on the other hand, focuses on how the speaker’s discourse follows either party’s prior talk.

6) **Markers of Information and Participation**

The last markers whose literal meanings directly influence their discourse use are *y’know* and *I mean*. *Y’know* marks transition in information state relevant for participant framework, and *I mean* marks speakers orientation toward own talk i.e. modification of idea and intention. Both markers also have the uses which are less directly related to their literal meanings: *y’know* gains attention from the hearer to open an interactive focus on speaker-provided information and *I mean* maintains attention on the speaker. These both markers are called information and participant.

*Y’know* functions as the first information and participant marker. The literal meaning of expression *you know* suggests the function of *y’know* in information status. *You* is a second pronoun and it is also used as an indefinite general pronoun similar to one. *Know* refers to the cognitive state in which one has the information about something.
For examples:

Mark : a. And when you’re resentful, you’re ang-

    b. In other words…you are angry because you are resentful

    c. In other words you are like stupid person

    d. Like this…y’know what stupid person is?

Defy : e. umhmmm

Mark : f. Stupid person is person can not do anything.

In (d) Mark tries to illustrate his point by mentioning a stupid person, but because he can not be sure that Defy knows about stupid person, he checks her knowledge with y’know what stupid person is? Since Defy knows about stupid person and that the relationship to her is being resentful, Mark tries to continue his description in (f). Thus, this illustrates the transition from situation (b), in which the speaker does not know that the hearer has knowledge to situation (a0, in which speaker/hearer shared knowledge is openly situated.

Y’know also occurs when a hearer is invited to share in the information transfer being accomplished through narrative discourse. The interaction effect of y’know in narratives differs however, because y’know enlists the hearer not just as an information recipient, but as a particular kind of participant to the story telling (an audience).

This function is suggested by the fact that y’know has two primary locations in narratives: with the events which are internally evaluative of the story’s point, and with external evaluation of the narrative point.
For examples:

Henry : a. And I was working very hard

b. And I told him, I said I must save money t’send my children t’college.

c. *Y’know* what he told me for an answer?

d. He says, “Henry, children find their own ways t’go t’college if they want to

e. He says, “They make better children!

By the example, Henry illustrates *y’know* with an internal evaluation. It is the end of retelling Henry’s conversation with a wealthy man. Henry has previously made the point that by giving the children too much money it is a kind of giving them poison, and the story reiterates that point. *Y’know* in (c) prefaces the reported speech in (d) and (e) which conveys the story’s point: children should not be spoiled.

*Y’know* helps creating a particular kind of exchange structure. *Y’know* displays the speaker as one whose role as the information provider is contingent upon the hearer reception.

The second information and participant marker is *I mean*. *I mean* functions within the participant framework of talk. *I mean* marks the speaker attention to two aspects of the meaning of talk: ideas and intentions. For examples:

Maya : a. But I think umm 12 years from now.

b. It’s going to be much more democratic.

c. I could see it in my country.
d. *I mean*, when I was born in Indonesia, there were about 30 percent who demanded a more democratic country.

e. And today eh..uh..sixth percent, of the people are demanding a more democratic country.

Another sense of ‘mean’ is the speaker intention. *Meaning* and *I mean* both preface explanation of intention, particularly when the intended force of an action is deemed to have been missed by a recipient, e.g. because it is too indirect for appropriate uptake. For examples:

Tina  : a. But, the last time they were around she wasn’t there.

b. And they were kidding him.

c. They said, “Where’s your wife?”

d. *Meaning*, is she running round now.

e. Y’know sorta teasing him.

Tina uses *meaning* in (d) to preface an explanation of the quoted speaker’s indirectly conveyed intentions in (a). Compare with another example below that Tina is describing how Henry proposed marriage to her.

Tina  : a. He says, “Oh, I wish you could come with me!”

b. And I said-I was very pro-proper and prim!

c. And I said, “Oh, I couldn’t go away with you.’”

d. And he says, “*I mean* let’s get married!”

e. And I said, Oh okay!

Here, it is Tina’s *I mean* in (d) which prefaces an explanation of Henry’s indirect proposal in (a). Thus, again we see that the predicate ‘*mean*’ has parallel
uses in two different expressions: both *meaning* and *I mean* preface explanation of the speaker intention.

The two examples above focus on only one aspect of speaker intention: intended action. Another aspect of speaker intention is the tone which a speaker intends an utterance to be interpreted.

There are some reasons for having considered *y’know* and *I mean* together. First, the semantic meaning of *y’know* and *I mean* influence the discourse functions of both markers: *y’know* marks interactive transitions in shared knowledge, and *I mean* marks the speaker’s orientation toward the meaning of own talk.

Second, the functions of *I mean* and *y’know* are complementary; whereas *I mean* focuses on the speaker’s own adjustments in the production of his or her own talk, *y’know* proposes that a hearer adjusts his/her orientation toward the reception of another’s talk.

Third, whereas *y’know* works basically within the formation of state of talk, with secondary effects on the participant framework, the functioning of *I mean* may be the reserve.

Fourth, the reason to have being considered *y’know* and *I mean* together is that both are markers which are socially evaluated and negatively sanctioned.

So the analysis suggests a reason for such consideration. First, we have seen that *y’know* is used whenever the continuation of conversation hinges upon a hearer giving to the speaker something which is the exchange for the speaker’s talk.
*Y’know* can be interpreted as revealing a speaker’s dependence on other for his/her own talk, simultaneously forcing the hearer into a relationship of exchange and reciprocity. Second, we have seen that *I mean* focuses attention on the speaker’s own orientation to his/her own talk. *I mean* can be interpreted as displaying the speaker’s own involvement with his/her own talk.

In short, the use of both *y’know* and *I mean* could run counter to standard beliefs about the appropriate division of labor in conversation: use of *y’know* can be interpreted as overdependence on the hearer, and use of *I mean* can be interpreted as over involvement with itself.

### 2.3 RELEVANCE STUDY

In completing the writing this thesis, the writer has consulted some thesis and previous research findings. Those thesis and research findings help the writer to complete this thesis.

Chaume Frederic studies in University of Jaume, Castello, Spain has analyzed discourse markers. The title of the study is *Discourse Markers in Audvisual Translating*. The object of the study is movie *Pulp Fiction*. The result of the study is in the domain of audiovisual translating from English into Spanish, the particles *now, oh, you know, I mean, you see, look* are often omitted for the sake of brevity or for the meaningful and stroking presence of the parallel image. Their omission in the translation affects the balance between interpersonal meaning and semantic meaning.
Norrick Neal also has tried to analyze discourse markers which entitle *Discourse Markers in Oral Narrative*. The aim of this study is to demonstrate that well and but function as a special sort of discourse markers in oral narrative and that their function within the oral narrative context follow neither from their usual meanings nor from their usual discourse markers functions in other context. The analysis of well and but in oral narrative shows that discourse markers enjoy specialized functions in this particular type of discourse due to its highly coded sequentially and storytelling conventions.

Besides Chaume and Norrick, another research is Taboada Maite who studies in Simon Fraser University, Department of Linguistics. Taboada also has analyzed discourse markers. Its title is *Discourse Markers as Signals (or not) of Rhetorical Relations*. This study uses two different corpus studies: a study of conversations and a study of newspaper articles. The conclusion in both studies is that a high number of relations (between 60 and 70% of the total, on average) are not signaled. A comparison between the two corpora suggests that genre-specific factors may affect which relations are signaled and which are not.

Atmaja (2005) in his thesis *A Study on Discourse Markers Found in Friend Season 1 Episode 1: A TV Show* analyzes the data by using quantitative method. The result of this thesis is marker of information management (oh) is the most dominant kinds of discourse markers found in Friends Season 1 Episode 1: A TV Show.

The writer will use some references which are concerned with this topic to support this analysis. Since the analysis of this thesis talks about discourse markers, the reference is related to the topic.
The first book as reference is *Discourse Markers* by Deborah Schriffin (1987). Schriffin tries to discuss about several properties of discourse: discourse form structure, convey meaning, and accomplishes actions. It will become obvious that these properties concern slightly different aspects of discourse. The first two properties are largely concerned with discourse as extended sequences of smaller units, e.g. sentence, propositions, utterance. The third property is more concerned with language. It is used within a social interaction, included in speaker not only of extended sequences, but their use of a single unit (e.g. an utterance within the social interaction).

The second book as reference is *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language* by Michael Stubb (1983). In his book states that discourse analysis consists of attempts to study the organization of language above sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units such as conversation exchanges or written text. It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with language in use in social context and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers.