

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

Communication is very important in connecting people. By communicating, people can share each other's thoughts, ideas, information, and feelings. As a social individual, human will always need others' help, therefore a good comprehension in communication is important to avoid misinformation that causes misunderstanding. Language as the communication bridge plays a big role in transferring messages.

Language can be defined as utterances which have meanings or information to share with the others. It is understood by both the speaker and the hearer through the language used. According to Chomsky as cited in Barman (2014), language is a natural phenomenon, an element of the human mind that is physically reflected in the brain and a component of the species' biological makeup.

Noermanzah (2019) defined language as a message which is delivered in the form of expressions used as communication tools in certain situations and any activities either spoken or written. On the other hand, Wardhaugh (1973) stated that language is a set of arbitrary vocal symbols used for communicating with one another. The similar statement also came from Bloch and Trager (1984), language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols that determine how a social group collaborates. (cited in Pateda, 2011).

Because language is an arbitrary meaningful symbol, it must be learned consciously. Linguistics is commonly described as the study of language,

particularly human language. It includes various elements that are combined to create and form a particular language. Linguistics studies are specialized in to several parts. One of them is called discourse analysis. According to McCharty (1991), discourse analysis is a broad term that studies how people use the language, both written and spoken.

Therefore, the scope of discourse analysis is very large and varied. Discourse analysis is the analysis of the content of communication and how the analysis of the message of the discourse is organized, manipulated and understood in order to understand the intention conveyed in the discourse. In addition, in the process of analyzing a discourse, there are some tools that help to promote the understanding of ideas in text, such as cohesion and coherence. (Irawati, 2021)

Achieving effective communication and communicating complex ideas can be a daunting task especially if it is for public consumption. To overcome these challenges, various linguistic devices can be used to guide the and improve coherence throughout the text. Among these devices, discourse markers are crucial for making connections between ideas, showing relationships between concepts, and facilitating the smooth flow of information.

According to Schiffrin (1987), discourse markers are components of language that shows particular index connections and cohesiveness among linguistic units. Discourse markers, also called discourse connectors or transitional elements, are linguistic elements that establish logical, temporal, causal, or symmetrical relationships between different parts of a text. Schiffrin (1987) explain the use of discourse markers when a speaker making a conversation or written text.

Discourse markers are also explained as information management markers which can include as linking discourse as *but, or, and*, response markers *too*, tags of causes and effect, such as *so* and *because*, information and participation for example *I mean, you know*, temporal adverb like *now* and *then*. They act as signposts, that guide the reader or listener into the author's or speaker's thought process and helping them understand the information presented. Discourse markers range from simple words such as *but, thus* and *furthermore* to more complex phrases such as *on the other hand, consequently* and *in contrast*.

The analysis of discourse markers in academic writing offers valuable insights into the rhetorical strategies employed by writers to construct coherent and persuasive arguments. By examining the distribution, frequency, and contextual use of these markers, researchers can uncover the underlying patterns and functions that contribute to the overall organization and structure of scholarly texts. Fraser (1990) also argued discourse markers do not affect sentence grammatically. Moreover, discourse marker analysis provides a lens through which researchers can investigate the interplay between language and argumentation, shedding light on how writers present evidence, make claims, and establish logical connections within their discourse.

Discourse markers are not limited to written academic texts; they also play an important role in spoken language, especially in intimate situations. In everyday conversations, people use a variety of speech markers to facilitate interaction, convey meaning, and manage the flow of speech. Trillo (2002) argued that discourse marker are items without obvious meaning and grammatical credit, it is

difficult to classify, but play an important part in the pragmatic framework of interaction. In this case, an interaction occurring in communication considered will be better according the use of discourse markers (cited in Sadeghi, 2014). These linguistic devices serve a variety of functions, such as indicating agreement or disagreement, expressing uncertainty, signaling a change of subject, or organizing information.

In contrast to the more structured and planned nature of academic written language, spoken language in informal settings is characterized by spontaneity, rapid rotation, and immediacy of context. Discourse markers in spoken language serve as verbal cues to help interlocutors navigate conversational exchanges, maintain coherence, and manage contributions to ongoing discourse. These markers can include single words, phrases, and even non-lexical elements such as delays, padding, and intonation patterns. Fraser (1999) classified two main kinds of discourse markers. The first categories are discourse markers that related to messages, such as: inferential markers as *so*, *accordingly*, etc; elaborative markers (*and*, *also*, *above all*, etc); contrastive markers like *though*, *but*, etc. The second category is discourse markers which relate topics such as *by the way*, *returning to my original point*, etc (cited in Ramadhani & Syarif, 2023).

The analysis of discourse markers in spoken language reveals the subtle mechanisms employed by speakers to negotiate meaning, establish rapport, and manage interpersonal dynamics. Researchers investigate how discourse markers play a role to the construction of social identities, politeness strategies, negotiation of power, and the establishment of common ground between participants.

Additionally, discourse marker analysis sheds light on how speakers use these markers to signal their involvement and engagement in the conversation, including their reactions, emotions, and cognitive processes. Methods such as transcription and speech analysis can be used to identify and analyze various discourse markers used in speech. These approaches provide an understanding of how speakers strategically use these markers in real-time to guide turnover, resolve communication trouble, and convey social meaning. Research of the discourse markers used in spoken language provides insight into the dynamics of informal communication and the strategies individuals use to engage in effective conversation. Through the study of discourse markers in spoken language and informal situations, the readers can gain valuable insights into the complexities of everyday conversation and the social dimensions of language use.

One of the popular forms of communication as well as entertainment which is popular today is Talk show. Talk programs frequently bring up a guest panelist (including specialists and regular audience), a studio participant, and occasionally a part of "callers" through the guidance of a host. Talk shows display a hybrid broadcast discourse in which social and communicative behavior patterns may be connected to several discourse types by blending into other mediatized discussion forms as debates, game shows, sitcoms, quizzes, also interviews. (Ilie, 2006).

*The Tonight Show starring by Jimmy Fallon* known as one of the famous late nights talk show. This program is hosted by Jimmy Fallon in which known as an actor and comedian. They have various famous guest stars from actors, actress, musician, artist, producers, etc. that entertain the audience from any ages. This talk

show often promoting a new movie, album, single, and any kind of guest star's achievements. Therefore, the topic of the conversation mostly non-formal and casual talk combining with some games. Besides aired on NBC in late-night, it is also uploaded in Online Platform Channel and social media for free such as YouTube so the audience can easily rewatch any episodes of the talk shows.

This research discuss what types and functions of discourse markers occurs in informal conversation especially in talk show entitled *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. Moreover, by exploring the functions, variations, and contextual influences of these markers, both the researcher and the readers can enhance their understanding of how individuals engage in interaction, negotiate meaning, and establish social relationships in informal settings. Ultimately, this research can contribute to improving communication skills, promoting intercultural understanding, and enhancing effective interpersonal interactions in diverse social contexts.

## 1.2 Problems of the Study

Related to the background of the study described above, the problem of the study are stated as follow:

1. What types of discourse markers are used in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Falon*?
2. What are the functions of the discourse markers employed in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Falon*?

### 1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are mentioned below:

1. To identify the types of discourse markers used in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*.
2. To describe the functions of the discourse markers used in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*.

### 1.4 Limitation of the Study

To limit the scope of this research as narrow as possible, the author focuses on five episodes of *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* which was uploaded in February to April 2023. The data in this research are analyzed using the theory proposed by Fraser (2009), Halliday and Hasan (1985), and Schiffrin (1987).

### 1.5 Significances of the Study

Theoretical significance and practical significance are separated into two categories in the study.

#### 1.5.1 Theoretical Significance

Based on the purpose of the study above, the author gives some contribution to understanding the type and function of discourse markers in spoken language. Researchers hope that readers can understand the type and function of discourse markers in informal conversation.

#### 1.5.2 Practical Significance

Practically, this analysis is expected to provide insight and understanding of type and function of discourse marker through discourse analysis. This study can

also help English language learners to improve their fluency in spoken English. Moreover, this study can be a resource for other academics who want to do research on English, especially in Discourse Analysis.



## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, CONCEPTS, AND THEORIES**

In this chapter, several discourse analyses related topics are presented and explained. It is divided into several sub-chapters such as a review of related literature, concepts, and theories. Five undergraduate papers were chosen as a survey of related literature. The next subchapters discuss discourse analysis, discourse marker, and talk show. And the last part is theories which are used to analyze the data. This study used the theory of discourse marker.

#### **2.1 Review of Related Literature**

There are many studies that discuss discourse analysis, especially about the analysis of discourse marker. The first article topic was entitled “Discourse Markers Used by Presenters in Their Thesis Seminars: A Case at English Education of Graduate Program of Universitas Negeri Padang” by Ramadhani & Syarif (2023). The study focuses on discourse marker in spoken language especially the discourse markers that presenters often use in their thesis presentations and oral answers during discussion sessions, the reasons behind their difficulty using them, and the types of discourse markers that presenters find challenging to utilize in Universitas Negeri Padang Thesis Seminars. Descriptive qualitative analysis is used in this research. The subject of the study are twenty students as speakers who completed their own thesis proposal seminar or their thesis outcome seminar during the academic year 2014–2015. This analysis uses Fraser (1999) theory and then identifies the discourse markers found in the transcriptions which are six kinds of

discourse markers. There are topic change markers, contrastive markers, causative markers, elaborative markers, inferential markers and interactional markers. The students' difficulties as presenters in using discourse markers were controlling themselves not to keep on repeating the same words, phrases, or sentences, from each type of discourse marker. The causes of the challenges which found were the influence of mother language, lack of practice, and the lack of student awareness about the use of discourse markers.

Second is Ussolichah et. al. (2021)., article entitled "Discourse Markers Analysis in *Avengers: End Game* Movie" in 2021. The data taken from dialogue in *Avenger: End Game* Movie directed by Anthony Russo and Joe Russo. This study focused on analyzing the discourse markers used in dialogue of *Avenger: End Game* Movie. This study is designed as descriptive research using Leech Theory. Based on the result, discourse markers found in the data were *oh, so, okay, you know, right, now, well, good, I mean, anyway*. The most frequent marker that used in the movie was *oh* which appear 55 times. Meanwhile, the most infrequent marker used was *anyway* which only used once.

Third, in Yulianto (2021) article entitled "Discourse Markers in News Articles of *The Jakarta Post*". This analysis focuses on discourse markers used in newspapers and its function. This study uses a descriptive qualitative method using Halliday and Hasan (1976) theory. Based on the result, there were 21 discourse markers found in four news articles. All the markers included four kinds of discourse markers which were additive, adversative, causal, and temporal or continuative discourse markers that used in the news articles of *The Jakarta Post*.

The function of the discourse markers used in the news article was helped the readers to understand the articles better.

Next, is a thesis entitled “An Analysis of Discourse Markers Found in English Textbook “*Pathway to English*” for 11<sup>th</sup> Grade Published by Erlangga” by Irawati (2021). The study focuses on analyzing the types and functions of discourse markers found within written texts provided in English textbook for 11th Grade entitled “*Pathway to English*” published by Erlangga using Fraser (2009) theory. According to the findings the type of discourse markers used were contrastive, elaborative, inferential, and temporal markers. Meanwhile, the functions were to signal any contradictions, to denote additive information, to limit or introduce examples of particular ideas, to show cause and effect relationship, to conclude information, and the last one is to indicate sequence of event, time, order, or logical division.

Lastly, the thesis by Alifatul (2020) entitled “The Use of Discourse Markers in “*The Kid Who Would Be King*” Movie”. This research focuses on describing the kinds of discourse markers and investigates the function of discourse markers using Schiffirin (1987) theory. Descriptive qualitative method used in this research. Based on the findings, the researcher found ten types and six functions of discourse marker used in “*The Kid Who Would be King*” movie. The types found in the data such as interjection marker, expletive marker, linking adverbial, stance adverbial, hesitator, response form, various polite speech-act formulate, stance adverbial, greeting and farewell, and vocative marker. Moreover, six functions found in the data are markers of information management, markers of response, markers of connectives,

markers cause and effect, markers of a temporal adverb, and markers of information and participants.

According to related articles and theses mentioned before, the similarities of the previous research with this study were discussing the same topic which is the analysis of discourse markers. The differences from the previous studies were the theory used, the data sources, and the data collection methods. This study uses spoken language as the database and takes data from informal conversation on talk shows. The data analyzed with the theory stated by Fraser (2009) as the main theory and supported by Halliday & Hasan (1985) also Schiffrin (1987) theory by observing documents in the form of videos and the transcript.

## **2.2 Concepts**

This subchapter aimed to explain the key terms used to give the reader clear understanding of the study. Concept can be defined as the main idea of the research or study. There are two concepts used in this study they are discourse marker, and talk show.

### **2.2.1 Discourse Marker**

Discourse marker are expressions in the form of words or phrases that use to manage the text or conversation and mark when it changes without affecting the grammar. Discourse marker can be used both in written and spoken form either formal and informal field. It also has several various definitions and approaches by experts. As Schiffrin (1987) states, discourse marker is a linguistic element that connects units of conversation and relationships at the framework level of conversational exchanges, ideas, actions, and expectations. Besides, Fraser (1999)

give another definition of discourse marker by saying it is a pragmatic class which are lexical expressions drawn from the syntactic class of conjunction, adverbials, and prepositional phrases. Fraser added that discourse marker used to signal the relationship between the segment they introduce and the prior segment. The core meaning of discourse marker are procedural, not conceptual and more specific interpretation of them is depend on the context, both linguistic and conceptual.

### **2.2.2 Talk Shows**

The talk show is a casual content that served information, news update, and entertainment related to some topics which lead by a host to interview the guest star. Several popular broadcasts with social discourse techniques have been generated as much controversy and subjected to academic and cultural criticism in recent years than talk shows, especially television talk shows. The idea of a talk show prompts inquiries regarding the distinctions between dialogue (typically involving multiple participants) and monologue (typically involving a single speaker), as well as the divisions between public and private matters, collective and individual experiences, expertise and personal encounters, interpersonal and mass communication, information and amusement, and distinct and shared identities (referring to oneself, others, and the general population as *me, you, us, them*).

### **2.3 Theories**

Discourse analysis seems to provide a complete description of language because it is not enough to analyze language features only in terms of structure and meaning. Discourse analysis analyzes conversations (casual conversations, phone calls, gossip, etc.), speeches (election campaigns, official speeches of politicians,

etc.), and written discourse (novels, news, speeches, etc.). Discourse analysis investigates discussions between two or more persons in addition to complex statements made by speakers.

Discourse analysis's main objective is to clarify how language users create and understand meaning in conversation. Brown (1983) found that discourse analysis examines how addressees construct linguistic messages for addressees to interpret. Paltridge (2000) argued that discourse analysis examines at linguistic units in text organization, the structure of paragraph, and the patterns of conversational interaction, like how a speaker introduces themselves, ends a discussion, and shares their opinions.

In other hand, Gee (1999) explains that discourse provides humans with an alternative means of combining language with various aspects of cognition, emotion, behavior, faith, and more. Additionally, he claims that discourse remains a part of a disorganized of social institutions and frequently involves a variety of "props" such as different books and magazines, classrooms, labs, different types of buildings, different technologies, and a wide range of other objects. Consider all the phrases, symbols, items, attire, and equipment we need to synchronize properly at the appropriate moment.

In order to analyze the marker occurs in discourse, some theories are needed to be implemented. The researcher uses three theories in this study. The first theory is type of discourse marker by Fraser (2009) to classify the discourse marker found in the data. Second is the theory of context of situation by Halliday and Hasan (1985) in purpose to analyze the context of the situation happen when the marker

occurs in the data. And the last is function of discourse marker theory by Schiffrin (1987) to identify the function of the marker based on the context of situation.

### 2.3.1 Types of Discourse Marker

Regarding to Fraser (2009) types of discourse marker are divided into four which are contrastive marker, elaborative marker, inferential marker, and temporal marker. Contrastive marker indicating that the following utterance is either a denial or a contrast of some idea related to the previous speech. Elaborative marker applied to indicate that the following utterance is an improvement of some kind on the previous speech. Inferential markers are expressions that indicate that the power of the utterance is a conclusion created from the previous discourse. Meanwhile, temporal marker is implemented to indicating timing signals.

**Table 2. 1 Type of Discourse Marker by Fraser (2009)**

TYPE	EXAMPLE
Contrastive Marker	<i>But, however, still, yet, although/though, while, on the other hand, in contrast, etc.</i>
Elaborative Marker	<i>And, also, like, such as, for example, namely, specifically, that means, in particular, you know, etc.</i>
Inferential Marker	<i>Since, because, so, in conclusion, in short, therefore, hence, consequently, due to, etc.</i>
Temporal Marker	<i>Now, right now, then, after, before, soon, later, today, tonight, tomorrow, yesterday, in a while, next day/week/month/year, in a moment, etc.</i>

#### 2.3.1.1 Contrastive Marker

These markings indicate that there is direct or indirect contrast information or alternatives between the first utterance and the next utterance. Fraser (1996) explained that words and phrases categorized in this type are; *still, nevertheless,*

*anyway, in comparison (with this/ that), but, regardless (of this/that), conversely, in spite of (this/that), despite (this/that), however, in any case, in contrast (to this/that), instead (of doing this/that), nonetheless, even so, on the contrary, on the other hand, rather (than do this/that), that said, though, all the same, yet.*

Hence, when these expressions are found within a discourse, it may be able to distinguish that the function of these markers are used to mark or signal contradiction, comparison, and contrast information. The example in sentence (1) below taken from an article by Fraser (1996) entitled “Pragmatic Marker”;

- (1) a) A: *We can go now, children.* B: *But we haven't finished our game yet.*  
 b) *John won't go to Poughkeepsie. Instead, he will stay in New York.*  
 c) *Jane is here. However, she isn't going to stay*

In sentence (1a) marker *but* shows contradiction occurs in utterance A and B. In utterance A the speaker said that they need to go now while the response in utterance B showing an indirect reject. Moreover, sentence (1b) uses the word *instead* to mark contrast information in the first clause that he would not go to the mentioned place and the second clause that says he will stay in the other place. Lastly in sentence (1c) the word *however* give signal to a contrast information that Jane is there but not going to stay.

### **2.3.1.2 Elaborative Marker**

Elaborative marker can be described as particle that shows addition such as data, information, and example to the sentence or utterance. Moreover, Fraser (1996) argued that these markings served to indicate details or additions in the

second utterance to the information claimed in previous utterance. He classified the expressions include as elaborative markers into; *and, also, above all, for example, besides, correspondingly, better, by the same token, equally, further(more), in addition, in any case/event, likewise, in other words, in fact, indeed, more accurately, in particular, more importantly, on that basis, more precisely, alternatively, more specifically, more to the point, moreover, on top of it all, or, otherwise, similarly, that is, too, what is more, to cap it all off, etc.* For the example, below are sentences from Fraser (1996);

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

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

c) *He did it. What is more, he enjoyed doing it*

The word *above all* in sentence (2a) marking additional information in previous clause. Then, marker *in other word* in sentence (2b) shows additional detail about the subject's instruction. Also, in marker *what is more* in sentence (2c) used to mark added information of particular topic mentioned in previous clause. In this case, the speaker talked about the object's achievement and add more information about the object's feeling in the second clause.

### 2.3.1.3 Inferential Marker

The other sort of discourse markers defined by Fraser (2009) namely as inferential marker which speaks to certain signals to what the utterance is gathering based on data given in the previous utterance. The expressions that categorized as

inferential markers are; *after all, accordingly, all thing considered, as a logical conclusion, as a consequence, it can be concluded that, as a result, because of, consequently, therefore, hence, in this/that case, it stands to reason that, of course, on this/that condition, then, for this/that reason, thus, so*. In order to improve understanding of inferential marker and its functions, the examples below are taken from Fraser (1996);

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

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

In sentence (3a) the word *after all* marked the cause-effect relationship in the problem mentioned on the first clause, then in the second clause mention about the cause of the problem appeared in the first clause. Moreover, in sentence (3b) marker *so* used to conclude the information given in utterance A.

#### 2.3.1.4 Temporal Marker

In truth, this kind of discourse sign was framed by Fraser in 2006 as quoted in Irawati (2021) where these markers are used to signal the sequence between first sentence and the second sentence, while also indicating timing signals. The signals classified into temporal markers are; “*then, after, as soon as, before, eventually, finally, first, immediately, afterwards, meantime, originally, second, subsequently, when...*”). For example;

(4) *First, we went to the restaurant and we ate Mansaf, then we went to the Red Sea.* (Rabab'ah et al., 2022)

Marker uses in sentence (4) are *first* and *then*. Both shows the sequence of time started in the first clause and the information continued in the second clause.

### **2.3.2 Function of Discourse Markers**

The main function of discourse markers is to build coherent texts. According to Schiffrin (1987), the discourse marker influences his coherence signal locally. Furthermore, discourse marker also influences the global coherence that connects segments by incorporating external information between parts of discourse, improving the coherence of the discourse as a whole. Schiffrin stated six functions of discourse markers. There are: to signal any contradictions, contrasts, comparison; to denote additive information or idea; to limit or introduce examples of particular ideas; to show cause-effect relationship; to conclude information or idea; to indicate sequence of event, time order, or logical division. Furthermore, the interpretation of the function of Discourse Markers will be based on the context of situation of the communication.

Context refers to both the text's internal elements and everything that surrounds it externally. According to Halliday and Hasan (1985) the situation under discussion is limited to three basic components: field, tenor, and mode. Field relates to what is happening in the text and the nature of social processes: what the participant is doing by utilizing language as a medium, or as 'the social action'. Tenor or engagement is referred to as 'the role structure' and relates to who is participating in the social event, the character of the participants, social position, and role. The mode or method is 'the symbolic organization,' relating to the role that language performs (as cited in Samsudin, 2020). Examining the context of

situation is important in order to classify the function of the discourse marker used in the data.

