

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

A. An Overview of Discourse

1. Definition of Discourse

Before further explanations regarding discourse analysis, discourse marker and speech, it is a must to know about the concept of the discourse. James Paul Gee (1999, p.13) state that discourse is different ways in which humans integrate language with non-language “stuff” such as different ways of thinking, acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, believing, and using symbols, tools, and objects in the right places and at the right times so as to enact and recognize different identities and activities, give the material world certain meanings, distribute social goods in a certain way, make certain sorts of meaningful connections in our experience, and privilege certain symbol systems and ways of knowing over others (i.e. carry out all the building tasks above).

He added that discourses are always embedded in a medley of social institutions, and often involve various “props” like books and magazines of various sorts, laboratories, classrooms, buildings of various sorts, various technologies, and a myriad of other objects from sewing needles (for sewing circles) through birds (for bird watchers) to basketball courts and basketballs (for basketball players). Think of all the words, symbols,

deeds, objects, clothes, and tools you need to coordinate in the right way at the right time

Many people getting confused to distinguish between discourse and text, although it really different. Crystal (1992) and Nunan (1993) made an argument regarding both of them. They believe that discourse is a continuous stretch of (especially spoken) language larger than a sentence, often constituting a coherent unit, such as sermon, argument, joke or narrative. On the other hand, text is a piece of naturally occurring spoken, written, or signed discourse identified for purposes of analysis. It is often a language unit with a definable communicative function, such as a conversation, a poster. Haliday and Hasan (1976,p.1) also added that text refers to to any passage. spoken or written of' whatever length that does form unified whole, if that doesn't unified it called collection of unrelated sentence since text is a passage of the language which is more than on sentence in length.

Based on their argument, it could be concluded that “discourse” is a piece of language that always affect and involves situational context. Meanwhile , “text” referes to all recorded instances of language in use (spoken and written) which deals with structural properties of language.

2. Types of Discourse

a. Spoken and Written

Traditionally, Discourse can be divided into two major categories based on its form of language, namely spoken and written discourse. Brown and Yule (1983) propose several features of the spoken and written language along with the differences that distinguish them into the following identification:

1. The syntax of spoken language is typically much less structured than that of written language.
2. In written language an extensive set of metalingual markers exists to mark relationships between clauses, in spoken language the largely paratactically organised chunks are related by and, but, then and more rarely if.
3. Whereas written language sentences are generally structured in subject- predicate form, in spoken language it is quite common to find what Givon (1979) calls topic-comment structure.
4. In chat about the immediate environment, the speaker may rely on gaze direction to supply a referent.
5. The speaker frequently repeats the same syntactic form several times over

6. The speaker may produce a large number of prefabricated ‘fillers’: well, erm, I think, you know, etc.

It is believed that both forms of languages have their own features. Furthermore, the characteristics entailed to certain pole are not absolute; the spoken language can sometimes possess the characteristics of written language vice versa. On the other hand, this distinction will help in order to determine which form of language fits certain communicative function under specific context.

b. Monologue and Dialogue

Discourse also can be classified into two category based on the participant that involved. Mc Carthy and Carter (1994, p. 17) brought an arguments to distinguish them, the distinction they propose can be summarized as follows:

Texts that show no overt evidence of taking the receiver into account will be considered maximally monologic, and texts which depend crucially on overt receiver response or which explicitly include assumed receiver response, will be considered maximally dialogic. We are dealing with scale not absolute.

Mc Carthy and Carter (1994, p. 18) extend that dialogic text has the properties of both participants are considered as sharing a common right

to an input into its message, just as the one occurring in a real conversation. Dialogic elements include projected questions that the receiver might want answered (a common type of rhetorical questions), discourse markers that presuppose a contribution by another participant (such as the well) and actual inclusion of what a second party's contributions might have been (McCarthy and Carter, 1994, p. 18).

At the extreme end of monologue scale, we shall find the internal monologues of 'stream-of-consciousness' writing, personal diaries, reference texts (e.g. encyclopedia entries) and certain types of 'uninterruptable' speech forms (eg recitations, formal lectures, judges' summing-up speeches, church sermons). In between, there will be degree of monologue and dialogue, and mixtures of both (ibid, p. 19)

3. Cohesion and Coherence of a Discourse

a. Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan (1976:5) revealed that Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. They continue that 'when this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text'.

The concept of cohesion is set up to account for relations in discourse but in rather a different way. without the implication, there is some structural unit that is above the sentence. Cohesion refers to the range of possibilities that exist for linking something with what has gone before. Since this linking is achieved through relations in meaning (ibid:10) . Subsequently, it can be conclude that the way sentences link up with each other to form discourse is cohesion. Cohesion makes the items hang together.

Furthermore, Haliday and Hasan identify five general categories of cohesive devices that create coherence in the text : reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. These devices have possibility to be expressed partly through grammar and partly through vocabulary.

1. Reference

Reference is the specific nature of the information that is signalled for retrieval. In the case of reference the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning, the identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to and the cohesion lies in the continuity of reference, whereby the same thing enters into the discourse a second time (Haliday and Hasan , 1976, p.31).

From the explanation about, the term reference can be conclude that reference refers to specific items that cannot be interpreted semantically in their own but it has to make reference to something else or item within text or discourse. Furthermore, there are different types of reference : situational (exophora) or textual (endophora).

An exophoric item, however, is one which does not name anything; it signals that reference must be made to the context of situation (ibid, p.32). In other hand, exophoric always refers to something that is not part of a given text or discourse. Meanwhile an endophoric is the reverse of exophoric, that this reference points to other items within a given text or discourse.

Furthermore, endophoric reference points to the textual environment of a given element can be either anaphoric or cataphoric. Anaphoric reference which points out the reader or listener backwards to a previously mentioned entity or affairs and cataphoric reference which points out the reader or listener forward- it draws us further into the text in order to identify the elements which the reference items refer (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

2. Substitution and ellipsis

Substitution and ellipsis is the process in which one item within the text or a discourse is replaced by another (Halliday and Hasan, 1994). While reference was a relation on the semantic level (between meaning), substitution is a relation on the lexicogrammatical level (level of grammar and vocabulary). Meanwhile, Ellipsis is the form of substitution that replaced by nothing for example Andhika ate some black forrest cake and Aziz some pizza, so the word “ate” replaced by nothing or deleted. Both substitution and ellipsis can be classified in three types: nominal, verbal, and clausal. The type of substitution and ellipsis depends on the part of speech being substituted. Here are the examples of substitution:

- a) **Nominal substitution:** I think my axe is too blunt. I need a sharper one. Nominal ellipsis: My kids play an awful lot of sport. Both (0) are incredibly energetic.
- b) **Verbal substitution:** You think Joan knows? – I think everybody does. Verbal ellipsis: Have you been working? – Yes I have (0)
- c) **Clausal substitution:** Is it going to rain? – I think so. Clausal ellipsis: Why'd you only set three places?

Paul's staying for dinner, isn't he? – Is he? He didn't tell me (0).

3. Conjunction

Unlike the others type of cohesive devices, conjunctive elements are not cohesive in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings. conjunction does not point out anaphoric relation between parts of the text. But it is still considered cohesive device because it signals relationships that can only be fully understood through reference to other parts of the text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). There are four types of conjunction:

1. Adversative conjunction which bridges sentences in which the second/ later sentence moderates or qualifies the information in the first, e.g. however, on the other hand, although, etc.
2. Additive conjunction which signals the presentation of additional information, such as: and, in addition, furthermore, etc.
3. Temporal conjunction that exists when events in a text are related in terms of the timing of the occurrence, for instance: first, then, afterwards, etc.

4. Causal conjunction which relates sentences with the relationship of cause and consequence, e.g.: because, for, since, etc.

4. Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion refers to the way in which related words are chosen to link elements of a text or discourse. Lexical cohesion occurs when two words in a text are related in terms of their meaning (semantically related). According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), there are two major categories of lexical cohesion: reiteration (a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical item) and collocation. Reiteration includes repetition, synonym or near synonym, and superordinate. For example: “which dress are you going to wear?” – “I will wear my blue frock”. Uses the synonyms “dress” and “frock” for lexical cohesion.

b. Coherence

A discourse is acceptable to the extent that it exhibits coherence relations between its segments (Blakemore, 2000). Halliday and Hassan suggest that an important contribution of coherence comes from cohesion: the set of linguistic resources that every language has for linking one part of a text to another. We can infer that coherence is

the matter of logical relation between units of discourse. This relation can be implicit or sometimes it can be made explicit by the existence of the so-called cohesive devices

However, Widdowson (1978) in Nunan (1993) assert that cohesion is not sufficient for the establishment of coherence. He suggests that creating a context and then identifying the functions of each utterance in a discourse is necessary when one wants to decide a text as coherent or not.

c. Context

Amanda Coultas (2003,p.3) expressed her ideas regarding the definition of context , she stated that the word “context” literally means ‘with the text’ and there are different bits of information that can go with a text which help to create meanings for the reader. Depending on the nature of the text being studied, it can be consider following things as the context: the producer’s (of language) background, why the text was produced, whom the text was produced for, The political/social circumstances within which the text was produced , the history of the text and how it has been received and reviewed over time, how some of the language in the text may have changed its meanings, the method of text production, trends and fashions within text production , how the text relates to other texts.

All those things that mentioned, and many others also, make up the contexts of a text. Finding out about them from the producer/speaker may help to open up meanings for you as reader/receiver since discourse always contains the context.

Halliday and Hasan (1985) also stated that term 'context' has been defined as the words and the sentences before and after the particular sentence that one was looking at. Malinowski, however, needed a term that expressed the total environment, including the verbal environment, but also including the situation in which the text was uttered. So he coined the term 'context of situation' which he meant the environment of the text

Halliday and Hasan (1976) proposed that there are two types of context. The one concerns relations within the language, patterns of meaning realised by grammar and vocabulary; the other concerns the relations between the language and the relevant features of the speaker's and hearer's (or writer's and reader's) material, social and ideological environment. Context of situation in which a text is embedded refers to all those extra-linguistic factors which have some bearing on the text itself. The former is known as linguistic context and the latter is known as situational context.

There have been diverse arguments regarding what constitute context of situation. Halliday and Hasan (1985) mentioned that Firth's description of context of situation covers: 1) the participants in the situation; 2) the action of the participants; 3) other relevant features of the situation; and 4) the effects of the verbal action. Approximately in line with the notion, Dell Hymes (1967) in Halliday and Hassan (1985) described situational context as follows: 1) the form and the content of the message; 2) the setting; 3) the participants; 4) the intent and the effect of the communication; 5) the key; 6) the medium; 7) the genre; 8) the norms of interaction. Nunan (1993, p. 8) stated that situational context includes: 1) the type of communicative event; 2) the topic; 3) the purpose of the event; 4) the setting; 5) the participants and the relationships between them; and 6) the background knowledge and assumptions underlying the communicative event.

B. Discourse Analysis

1. Definition of Discourse Analysis

In the recent study of language, Discourse analysis become a trending topic among linguist, there are many studies and work that discussed about it, in this study also very necessary to know regarding the concept of discourse analysis since discourse marker is a part of discourse analysis itself. Some linguists determined many definitions

about discourse analysis. First, Cook defined (1989) Discourse analysis is study that examines how the stretches of language considered in their full textual, social, and psychological context become meaningful and unified for their user.

McCarthy (1991) argued that Discourse analysis concerns about the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used. It can be in the form of written text and spoken data whether formal or informal. Meanwhile, according to Brown and Yule (1989) the analysis of discourse means the analysis of language in use. Then, Schiffrin (1993) added 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 text.

From the explanation about, it could be conclude that discourse analysis is the study that concerned with language in use in social contexts, and in particular interaction or dialogue between speakers or spoken data from conversation to highly institutionalized forms of talk.

2. Scope of Discourse Analysis

McCarthy (2000,p.12) reveals that 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.

C. Discourse Marker

1. Overview and Definition of Discourse Markers

Discourse markers (DMs) are phenomena in linguistics which have been analyzed and discussed broadly by some linguists. There are numerous studies regarding DMs : (e.g., Schiffrin 1987; Brinton 1996 ; Jucker 1999 ; Jucker and Ziv 1998 ; Schourup 1999 Kaltenböck 2007; Brinton 2008: , 15; Dér 2010; Lewis 2011.) Since the DMs have become many subjects of studies, there are almost as many definitions as authors who have worked on them. Moreover, they gave various different names

on discourse markers such as discourse connective, Discourse particle, pragmatic markers and pragmatic particle.

In the beginning of discourse marker studies in linguistics, there is little consensus on whether they are a syntactic or a pragmatic category, on which types of expressions the category includes, on the relationship of discourse markers to other posited categories such as connectives, interjections, modal particles, speaker-oriented sentence adverbials, and on the term “discourse marker” as opposed to alternatives such as “discourse connective” or “pragmatic marker” or “pragmatic particle” (Lewis 2011: 419). Then, in the development of discourse marker, There is a general agreement that discourse markers contribute to the pragmatic meaning of utterances and thus play an important role in the pragmatic competence of the speaker (Muller 2005, p.1). Discourse marker also considered as syntax independent that does not change the truth condition meaning and as a set of linguistic expressions comprised of members of word classes as varied as conjunctions such as “and”, “but”, or interjections such as “oh”, adverbs “now”, and “then”, and lexicalized phrases as like “you know” and “I mean”.

Schiffrin (1987, p.31) defined in her book “Discourse Markers” that discourse markers are sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of talk. So that, it has function in relation to enduring talk and text. Schiffrin

also states that: discourse markers help speakers express interactional toward each other and perform conversational moves. In other hand ,Schiffrin argued that discourse markers contribute to the unity of any text.

Meanwhile, Choxtor & Michael McCarthy (2006, p.108) defined Discourse Marker as a word or phrase whose function is to organize discourse into segments, for example *well, I mean, hence, and you know*. The function is to link segments of the discourse to one another in ways which reflect choices of monitoring, organization and management exercised by the speaker. In conversation, discourse marker has function for showing a change in the way the conversation developing or showing the other speaker how you are reacting to what they are saying (MacMillan : 2002 :393)

Another definition brought by Brinton (1966) that said Discourse markers are words or phrases that function within the linguistic system to establish relationships between topics or grammatical units in discourse (as with the use of words like because, so, then). They also serve pragmatic functions and have been termed pragmatic markers. Discourse markers have significant interactive role in discourse as they show a relationship between the interlocutors, namely, the speaker and the hearer, between the addresser and the addressee.

2. Characteristics of Discourse Markers

Discourse markers have several characteristics that commonly found in the discourse, these features will be useful for decide whether certain linguistic element can be classified as discourse marker or not. Some linguist expressed their ideas regarding these features, one of that is from Brinton (1996) that reordered according to levels of linguistic description by Jucker and Ziv (1998, p.3)

Table 1 List of basic features of discourse markers

1.	Phonological and lexical features: a. They are short and phonologically reduced. b. They form a separate tone group. c. They are marginal forms and hence difficult to place within a traditional word class
2.	Syntactic features: d. They are restricted to sentence-initial position. e. They occur outside the syntactic structure or they are only loosely attached to it. f. They are optional
3.	Semantic feature: g. They have little or no propositional meaning
4.	Functional feature: h. They are multifunctional, operating on several linguistic levels simultaneously.
5.	Sociolinguistic and stylistic features: i. They are a feature of oral rather than written discourse j. They appear with high frequency. k. They are stylistically stigmatised. l. They are gender specific and more typical of women's speech.

Fatimah Seirei (2013:108) in International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences (IRJABS) collected some linguists argument that discourse marker have common features as follows : connectivity, multifunctionality, optionality, non-truth conditionality, weak clause association, literality and multi-categoriality. Also, Fung (2011) proposes that the following characteristics are usually possessed by DMs: connectivity, optionality, non-truth conditionality, initiality, and multi-grammaticality. To sum up, there are several characteristic that possessed by discourse marker :

- a. **Connectivity** : One of the characteristics of DMs is their use to relate utterances or other discourse units. This connectivity is, however, conceived in different ways. There is, for example, disagreement about whether DM connectivity must involve more than one textual unit. Schiffrin and Fraser's definitions, and most others, specify that DMs relate two textual units, thus contributing to inter-utterance coherence. Connectivity can be used to distinguish DMs from various other initial elements, such as illocutionary adverbials (frankly, confidentially), attitudinal adverbials (fortunately, sadly), and from primary interjections (yipes, oops) (Fatimah Seirei, p.108)

- b. **Optionality** : discourse marker are frequently claimed to be optional in two distinct senses. They are almost universally regarded as syntactically optional in the sense that removal of a DM does not alter the grammaticality of its host sentence. However, DMs are also widely claimed to be optional in the further sense that they do not enlarge the possibilities for semantic relationship between the elements they associate. Therefore if a DM is omitted, the relationship it signals is still available to the hearer, though no longer explicitly cued (Ibid, p.109)

- c. **Non-truth-conditionality** : DMs are generally thought to contribute nothing to the truth-conditions of the proposition expressed by an utterance (e.g. Blakemore, 1988). Some (e.g. Fraser, 1996, p. 167) take this to mean that DMs do not affect the truth-conditions of sentences, but support has grown for the view that truth-conditions pertain not to sentences but to mental representations (see Kempson, 1986, p.102; Blakemore, 1987, p. 16).

- d. **Initiality** : Regarding their positioning within the discourse, we find that DMs are often supposed to be at the beginning of a discourse unit (Muller, 2005). DMs predominantly occur at the initial position of the utterance (Schiffrin, 1987).

- e. **Multi-categoriality** : DMs come from different category of grammatical classes. Fung (2011) claimed that they can be adverbs (now, then, therefore), verbs (look, say, see, listen), conjunctions (and, but, also, nevertheless), sequencing conjuncts (first, next, finally), or non-finite clauses (to be frank, to be honest, I mean, you see, you know)
- f. **Multi-functionality** : discourse markers are very context-dependant, the functions can be analyzed by the context in which they occur. So that, discourse markers have multi-functional features. Many research has shown that generally the discourse markers under scrutiny fulfil more than one function or at least have sub-functions (Fischer, 2000).

3. Function of Discourse Marker

From the explanation above discourse markers have several characteristics related to their use and function. Furthermore, Schiffrin (1987) divided discourse marker into six category or function, that are:

a. Marker of Information Management

Schiffrin (1987, p.73) explained one of discourse marker is “oh” that 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. This marker also is not based on semantic meaning and grammatical status. This is example of “oh” as exclamation:

Speaker 1 : Is this what you are looking for?

Speaker 2 : “**Oh!**” Gesh, yes!

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

Speaker 1 : “**Oh**”, they will know later on.

Speaker 2 : Do not they go to the party? “**Oh**” maybe there are too old.

Regarding syntactic status or intentional contour, *oh* occurs as speakers shift orientation to information. During conversational context, oh mark a change in orientation of speaker (focus of speaker attention) which replace one information unit with another, as they recognize old information which has become conversationally relevant and as they receive new information to integrate into already present information knowledge. It can be concluded that oh has a role : pulls from flow of information in discourse a temporary focus of attention which is the of itself or other man agreement (Schiffrin :1987 p.74) in

addition, 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.

To sum up, 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. (Schiffrin : 1987 p.79)

b. 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.

The usual dialogic functions identified for *well* as a discourse marker are used in the beginning of utterances which reject, cancel or disagree with the content or tenor of the foregoing discourse.

Well often begins turns, serving as a left hand discourse bracket.

This is one example of “well”:

Speaker 1 : Where you would like to teach? If you have choose
your favorit spot, what is that?

Speaker 2 : Uh, “well” I like Japan.

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. (Schiffrin : 1987 p.127)

c. Marker of Connectives

Marker of Connective also can be called discourse connective is a kind of discourse marker that different with others, if the previous marker is not based grammatical status, discourse connective that consist of *and*, *but* and *or* have a role in grammatical system of English, their analysis of marker has to proceed somewhat differently.

The first item in discourse connective is *and*. The word “and” is use to coordinate ideas and to continue a speaker’s action in spoken language. *And* is the most frequently used mode of connection at a local of idea structure, for examples:

- a. See this is what every team do.
- b. **But** we lost
- c. **And** we were serious
- d. **And** we tried to win
- e. **And** we lost

A player of football explaining that his team tried to win the match (a,c, d) ; for example Real Madrid versus Barcelona, However, Madrid lost the match (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 shared by so. For example Andhika preface an outcome of reason with and. He is explaining why she remembers a particular childhood game; note, again preface of the reason with because.

- a. That’s one game I remember

b. **Because** we had a fun in chasing our friends

c. **And**, like we would catch a villain

d. **And** they would run around the yard?

e. **Y'know?**

f. **And I-** I remember it so distinctly

After explaining why he remembers the game (b-c), Andhika again mentions that memory (f). His paraphrase of the outcome is prefaced with *and* rather so. To summarize, *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 in discourse connective is “but”. it 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. Several use of “but” could be interpreted as speaker’s efforts to return to prior concern of making a point. For example :

Speaker : We're not livin' in a world where you have equality completely, you put that in this world, I'll go along with it, if it stays that way and where it doesn't make any difference. Yes, I'll go with that in second. I won't disagree with anything. **But** those people call us liar, it's true. We're nothing.

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 more 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. Look at the following example that described how *or* provides idea options in arguments.

Schiffrin suggested 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 a marker of a speaker's action toward his own talk, but of a speaker's desire for a recipient to take action. In other words, speaker giving the recipient a choice of ideas and gain a response some kind.

Example (1):

Speaker : Do you go down the shore? Like Atlantic City **or** Wildwood **or** cape may

Example (2) :

Speaker : It's how there's an economic situation then they use race. **“Or”** they use nationality, **“or”** anti-Semitism, **“or”** what have you.

d. Marker Cause and Effect

Items in this category is “So” and “because” , Schiffrin (1987 p.173) consider **these** item as discourse marker because they are complement both structurally and semantically. Like *and*, *but*, and *or*, *so* and *because* have grammatical properties which contribute to their discourse use. *So* and *because* can mark idea units, information states, and action. in other word, they have semantic meaning.

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 (ibid p.190) so that, they mark a relation between the main and subordinate clause in which “Because” conveys a meaning of course or event, and “so” conveys a meaning of result. (ibid p.174)

Because and *so* have semantic meaning which are realized at both sentence and discourse levels. Schiffrin also considered the structural role of *so* and *because* in sentence or discourse. She give an example in which there is fairy clear differentiation of main fro subordinate material. In the following example Ronnie uses both *so* and *because* to mark main and subordinate levels of explanatory structure. He is explaining why He and her wife are not goig to see their son that evening

Ronnie : a. **Well** we were going up to see our son to night,
 b. **but** we’re not
 c. seeing the younger one’s gonna come for dinner
 d. **“because”** 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, Ronnie uses *because* to progressively embedded reason in her explanation. And what marked by *so* ? is the thwarted plan : that refers to the initial plan described.

e. Markers of Temporal Adverb

The next category of discourse markers is markers of temporal adverb. The item in this category is *now* and *then* in which time deictic involves. 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). (ibid p.221)

Now occurs in discourse in which the speaker progresses through a cumulative series of subordinate unit by displaying attention to an upcoming idea unit, orientation and participation framework. Also it can be used as mark of temporal comparison. For example, Rudy is comparing the street in where his parents live to the street where he live in village :

Rudy : a. It's nice there b. **Now** our street isn't that nice

Here the mark *now* would not identify initial *now* as time adverb simply because the comparison in the discourse is between locations rather than time. For another function *now* also can occur with an opinion about a disputable topic. It is displaying the speaker's recognition of interpersonal differences about that topic

The next item is *then*, *Then* indicates temporal succession between prior and upcoming talk. For example Tina is answering Rika'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.

To sum up, *then* indicates temporal succession between prior and upcoming talk. Its main difference from the marker *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 (ibid : 230)

f. 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 are 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 within the information state of talk. Information states are formed as participants' knowledge and meta knowledge about the world redistributed through the talk. 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. *You know*

refers to the cognitive state in which one has the information about something.

For examples:

John : a. **And** when you're hateful, you tried to ins-
 b. In other words...you hate them because you are hateful
 c. In other words you are like unstable person
 d. Like this...**y'know** what unstable person is?

Nita : e. umhmmm

John : f. it's person that can not control her/him feeling.

In (d) John tries to illustrate his point by mentioning a unstable or labile person, but because he cannot be sure that Defy knows about unstable person, he checks her knowledge with ask her *y'know* what unstable person is? Since John knows about that person and the relationship to her is being hateful, John 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 (a), in which speaker/hearer shared knowledge is openly attested.

The second item in 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

John is explaining why he believes racial integration is increasing :

- a. **But** I think umm ten years from now
- b. It's going to be much liberal
- c. I could see it in my job
- d. **I mean**, when I started working in my office, there were no Foreigner **and** colored people
- e. **And** today eh.. uh... twenty five, thirty, forty percent of the people I work are foreigner and colored

John preface an expansion of (c) in (d-e) with *I mean* : He finds an increasing liberal attitude toward hiring of foreigner people in his office (c) and expands that idea by comparing his early days at work with the present

D. Speech

1. Definition of Speech

In general term, speech can be defined as communication or expression of thought in spoken words (Crystal 1980, p.327). However, in this study speech refers to a formal address that delivered to audience. Speech or

public speaking is as a kind of communication that differs from casual conversation in which the public speaker does most or all of the talking but public speaking is still interactive if we compared it with monologue discourse (Steven Bebee :2011). Commonly, speech has a certain purpose to be delivered wheter to inform or pursue the audience. A speaker is a source of information and ideas for an audience and the message in public speaking is the speech itself both what is said and how it is said.

2. Kind of Speech

According to Steven and Susan Bebee (2011) there are several kind of speech that deliver by the speaker, namely : informative speech, pursuative speech and Speech for special occasion.

- a. **Informative Speaking** : A speech to inform shares information with others to enhance their knowledge or understanding of concepts and ideas. When a speaker speak to inform, he/she typically at- tempt to achieve three goals: (1.) speak to enhance understanding. Understanding occurs when a listener accurately interprets the intended meaning of a message. (2.) Speak to maintain interest. If not focusing on the message, speakers won't achieve their informative-speaking goal. (3.) speak to be remembered, for example for a speech about people or an event.

- b. **Persuasive Speech:** Persuasion is the process of changing or reinforcing attitudes, beliefs, values, or behaviors. In a persuasive speech, the speaker explicitly asks the audience to make a choice, rather than just informing them of the options. To advocate a particular view or action successfully.
- c. **Speech for special occasion :** this kind of speech usually delivered in special event that commonly include ceremonial event such as in job environment event, school event , government event etc, it used to call public-relations speeches. The speeches are designed to inform the public and improve relations with them either in general or because a particular program or situation has raised some questions. There are many kind of public relation speech that generally delivered such as award presentation. Commencement, toast, acceptance, keynote address and etc.