



## AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT FUNCTION IN DISCOURSE MARKER *WELL* IN DEBATE NIGHT AMERICA PROGRAM: A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

**Veronika Listi Ferdini Damopolii<sup>1</sup>**

Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris, Universitas Negeri Manado, e-mail: [veronikadamopolii@unima.ac.id](mailto:veronikadamopolii@unima.ac.id),

*Article history:*

Received  
2 Maret 2021

Received in revised form  
20 Mei 2021

Accepted  
30 Mei 2021

Available online  
Mei 2021

**Keywords:**  
Discourse Marker; Well;  
Pragmatics; Interview.

**DOI**  
10.22216/kata.v5i1.55

**Abstract**

The research entitled “Discourse Marker *Well* in Debate Night in America Interview Program.” The objectives of this research are to analyze and describe two types and two functions of discourse marker *well* which occur in Debate Night in America Program. This marker that frequently occurs in the program demonstrates a special sort of discourse marker *well* in particular news interviews. This study uses description method to analyze the research. Pragmatic is used to approach the analysis, which is mainly developed by Schiffrin (1987). He called discourse markers as linguistics expressions, which can be a word or phrase. The results of this study show ten discourse markers *well* that frequently occur in Debate Night in America Program. In term of functions, the frequently marker proposes various functions. The marker serves its own function in guiding the hearer and the audience to interpret the intended meaning of the speaker. In addition, the functions of discourse marker *well* provide particular purpose by the speaker in order to influence and attract the voters. The function analyzed in the use of discourse marker *well* is to show agreement and disagreement.

### INTRODUCTION

In English conversation, the words *well*, *oh*, *so*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* are familiar to hear. Linguistically, those words are known as discourse markers. Discourse markers are linguistic expression without semantic meaning but serves pragmatic meaning. The researcher intends to analyze discourse markers to find out the intended meaning by seeing the context.

In determining discourse markers, recognition of the meaning is truly necessary. For example:

- (1) All I wanted to say is that, she plays her part really *well*
- (2) *Well* the state who has to buy it

Both of the uses of *well* are different. In (1) *well* is as adverbial use and in (2) *well* as a leading in answering question. *Well* example above has proved that in (1) *well* has semantic meaning. When we omit *well* at the utterance, it will affect the whole meaning. However, in (2) *well* has pragmatic meaning, the presence or absence of *well* does not change the meaning at the utterance. Thus, it can be concluded that example (1) is non discourse marker and (2) is discourse marker.

Besides *well*, other markers which Schiffrin (1987) proposed are *you know*, *like*, *I mean*, and *so*.

- (3) x: Finally, John and Sarah got married
- y: *you know* they have been in love for five years (Schiffrin, 268: 1987)

Here, *you know* maintains discourse markers' function. Y tries to inform x that John and Sarah got married is not surprising news since they are in relationship for five years.

Corresponding author.  
 E-mail address: [veronikadamopolii@unima.ac.id](mailto:veronikadamopolii@unima.ac.id),

Schiffirin proposed it as meta-knowledge. It conveys meaning that speaker and hearer share about particular piece of information.

Those examples reflect if discourse markers serve pragmatic meaning. The meaning is provided by context. The context itself is surrounded by pauses, intonation breaks and non-verbal gesture. Furthermore, discourse markers relate to the prior discourse and intend its basic message from speaker to hearer. The message then constructs the purpose of the communication. Hearer's response is guided speaker in face to face communication to show if they either accept new information of the talk or need more clarification. In accepting the information through the utterance addressee interprets each new utterance in the context by turn taking system. The shared knowledge, the social relationship among the addressee, hearer's feedback, and relevant information derive from the using of discourse marker.

Since discourse markers serve fabric talk in progress, they can occur as lexical expression or complements of gesture or intentional cues that subtly guide and modulate the addressee's understanding. The lexical at discourse markers are the word like *well, you know, so, I mean, like* and *oh* which link the information that contained. The majority of studies simply assume that discourse markers only occur at casual conversation. The presence of them is, hence, related to speaking situation.

Although discourse markers are more common in casual conversation (Erman and Kotsinas, 1993: 91; Holmes, 1986: 12, 1990: 192; Lalljee and Cook, 1975: 305), the findings of discourse markers in news interviews become questionable. When the discourse markers are used at the formal situation, as in news interviews, the appearance of discourse marker becomes contradictions. Since the proposal of discourse markers indicate to speaking situation, most of discourse markers, in fact, are found with guest rather than in dinner table with family, and frequently used with friend rather than with strangers. Hence, here are some contradictions too about using discourse markers in some situations. Besides, the situation that influences the using of discourse markers, the relationship between the participants affects the frequency of discourse markers. In conclusion, the closer the relationship, the more discourse markers will be used.

The conversation situation, relative distance, intimacy are the point of research in finding discourse markers in news interviews. News interviews as a genre of public discourse markers are peculiarly suited to study the tension about discourse markers because they have interaction situation which discourse markers can easily be found. Much has already been written about discourse markers; discourse markers in oral narratives, discourse markers in courtroom and other specific meaning about discourse markers. Thus, news interviews provide an excellent opportunity to give some contribution in discourse markers.

## THEORITICAL BACKGROUND

To examine the discourse marker *well*, the writer uses pragmatics. Pragmatics concerns about the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by listener (Yule, 1998: 3). The analysis of pragmatics is about what people mean by their utterance and how the utterance might be mean by them. In other words, pragmatic is the study of speaker's meaning. The meaning itself is created by context. It explores the utterance in order to fully understand the intended meaning. Without context, the meaning of utterance is as far as it goes. For example:

(1) *John met Mary yesterday.*

*Amazingly, he already loves her.* (Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams, 2003: 208)

In order to understand *he* and *her*, we need to see the context from the utterance. When *John* and *Mary* are preceded, the interpretation would be clearer. In addition to comprehend *amazingly*, it has been very clear by general knowledge, if it is unordinary to

love someone only in a short time and the completion of falling in love is indicated by *already*.

The meaning is said or unsaid then can be answered by relative distance. Through relative distance, the hearer can assume how much intended meaning can be interpreted. It can normally be found polite and say appropriate things within familiar people. In a new social setting, people often feel unsure about what to say and worry that they might say something wrong (Yule, 1998: 5). Thus, people are followed general patterns of behavior expected within the group.

Pragmatic is also the study of linguistic form. Sometimes, linguistic form not only can learn through pragmatic but also from a regular pattern by social group. Basic experience and similar sharing a lot of non – linguistic knowledge derive the type of linguistic form. As Yule (1998) proposed an example:

(2) *I found an old bicycle lying on the ground. The chain was rusted and the tires were flat.*

People will not ask why a chain and some tires were mentioned. It can be assumed that people infer if the chain and tire are parts of the bicycle. Therefore, what was communicated is more than what was being said.

## 1. Context

Often what people say is not literally what is meant. The meaning of utterance is influenced particularly by context. It requires of how speaker organize their utterance in accordance with who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances (Yule, 1998: 3). In addition, context is important part in inferring a meaning or in determining the appropriate utterance. For example, when a husband says *well I'm tired*, if it says at night, it may count as excusing myself and getting off to bed before his wife or it can be interpreted by hearer as a hint that her husband wants her to come to bed too. However, if it is said when the alarm clock goes off, it probably means that he does not want to get out of bed and perhaps it can be interpreted as a hint that her wife should get up and make the coffee. In conclusion, we cannot determine the meaning without knowing the contexts.

Understanding the meaning is sometimes important to make up extended talk and the sequential properties in the talk-in-interaction. Discourse markers do not have any semantic meaning or conceptual meaning, their meaning is built by the context. Discourse markers' function according to Schiffrin (1987) is determined by its markers. Schiffrin (1987: 318) suggested that markers select a meaning relation from whatever potential meanings are provided through content of talk, and then display that relation. She further stated that discourse markers typically provide contextual coordinates: (i) locating the utterance on one or more planes of talk of her discourse model (ii) indexing the utterance to the speaker, the hearer, or both (iii) indexing the utterances to prior and/or subsequent discourse. The context of discourse markers contributes to discourse coherence, which then distinct discourse markers into five planes.

### Speaker's Meaning

Speaker has important role in meaning cycle. Speaker utters the utterance and then hearer interprets the meaning through the context. The interpretation of meaning is the study of what speaker's meaning. The goal of speaker's meaning is to lead or to adopt the attitude from the hearer. Regarding the meaning is the consequence of inference. It implies sometimes the utterance is unclear.

Determining speaker's meaning involves four parts; participant, time, situation, and under what circumstances. When someone says *I've just finished a book*, it can be

inferred as he has just finished reading a book. However, if it is uttered by a university lecture, it usually means that they have just finished writing one. Therefore, knowing who is talking will help to determine the meaning. Or another example proposed by

(3) *Should I read your book*

*Your book* becomes ambiguous between the book you own or the book which you are the author.

Speaker sometimes uses utterance to mean one thing at an explicit level or implicit level. It complements of expression meaning in two ways: (a) it provides a linguistic expression to be used meaningfully and connect meaning what people say by means of using language. (b) It helps hearer to understand the actual meaning through expressions uttered.

In conclusion, although people often think that what is said has been clear, determining utterance is indeterminate. Speaker's meaning then is partly trying to account for the ability to determine what speaker's intention even there is some unsaid utterance.

## 2. Discourse Marker

The term discourse markers are usually used to refer the word. Those words often use in expressing word such *oh, well, so, like, y'know*. The word is often not related with the main idea of the sentence and it relates more to social context: claiming next turn, drawing attention to what one is about to say, or hesitating or continuing some thought. Discourse markers are sequentially dependent elements that group of unit talk (Schiffrin, 31: 1987). She also stated "an operational definition", Schiffrin (1987: 41) defines discourse markers at a more theoretical level as members of a functional class of verbal and nonverbal devices which provide contextual coordinates for ongoing talk. Discourse marker (Anderson, 2001 : 39) serves pragmatic function because it constrains the relevance of discourse units.

*"Discourse markers are a class of short, recurrent linguistic items that generally have little lexical import but serve significant pragmatic function in conversation."*

Schiffrin (1987) identified how certain terms and/or phrases indicate understanding or coherence in conversation. She further concluded each single marker in communal lexicon has various functions, depending upon the situation of the speaker. Redekker (1992) and Brinton (1996) analyzed discourse markers into two levels, first is textual level or ideational level and interpersonal level. Both levels are monitoring discourse in text and the activity communicating. Textual level or discourse – marking relate to the structuring of discourse as text. It is initiating and ending discourse marking boundaries in the discourse, signaling topic, shifting and repairing discourse. Interpersonal level relates to the expression or speaker attitudes and it expresses response, attitudes and face – saving.

It is clear that sentence can still has its meaning although we omit discourse markers. As Fraser (1988: 22) stated that the absence of the discourse markers does not render a sentence ungrammatical and or intelligible. So discourse markers are not tied to the sentence structure but remains outside the syntactic structure.

Besides, the position discourse markers at grammatical structure, discourse markers also indexically point to features of the context. The markers index utterance can be referred to as discourse planes; ideational structure, action structure, exchange structure, information state, participant framework, social identity and social act. Since

discourse markers lack of semantic meaning, the meaning of it is provided through context. Lack here is not fully lack a complete absence meaning but markers here having no meaning or a vague meaning (Schiffrin, 1987: 328). In addition, discourse markers do not add the informational or propositional content of the utterance which contain the marker.

### 3. Types of Discourse Markers

The term discourse markers set of wide of words and phrases ranging from coordinate conjunction; *and*, *or* and *but* to interjection; *oh*, *well*, verbs; *look*, *see* and literally phrase; *you know*, *I mean*, and *overall*. Hence, the available set of discourse marker can be sliced into different grammar categories. Many researchers have different argument about what type of discourse markers are. Knott, 1995; Rey, 1997; Millis, 1995 do not refer *oh*, *well*, *you know* as discourse markers, they consider it as interjection or comment clause. Similarly, Frasser (1990) includes them as interjection. Halliday and Hasan (1973) propose different terms; they call it as cohesive conjunction. They differentiate it in two categories, *grammatical cohesion* and *lexical cohesion*. However, Schiffrin (1987) gives detailed study about types of discourse markers. She proposes twelve discourse markers types in English: *and*, *but*, *so*, *or*, *well*, *like*, *now*, *because*, *well*, *oh*, *you know*, and *I mean*.

Schiffrin (1987) maintains types of discourse markers based on their position in discourse

Thus, discourse markers do not form syntactic class but are rather linguistic expression drawn from different classes. In other words, they can be considered as discourse markers when the words can be omitted without affecting the meaning of the whole sentence. Schiffrin (1987) also argues that coherence of discourse views through relating different component of talk in the sense the interpretation of any component depends on the interpretation in other.

#### Discourse Marker *Well*

Since the word *well* seems to be the most popular discourse markers in English. It is expressed as a disagreement toward information stated in discourse. Discourse marker *well* can be seen as interpretation process the concomitant background selection. *Well* is usually used as a response marker when anchor its user in interaction when upcoming contribution is not fully constant with prior coherence options. Below *well* shows the way it is used as a discourse marker

- (1) A : but who has to buy it  
B : *well* the – the state has to buy the

The presence or absence of *well* in B's utterance does not change the truth condition of the propositional content. If B omit *well*, it doesn't add any information. It probably indicates that the answer should have been clear to A and thus it relates to the speech situation rather than to the situation talked about. Moreover, it does not have any referential function in this utterance, but it reflects the speaker's attitude towards the question. *Well* used at the beginning of a speaking turn and can be used as a marker of insufficiency, as a face – threat mitigator, as a delay device and indicating a request for elaboration and clarification. Lakoff (1973) deals with discourse marker *well* in the context question and answer. It is used in cases in which respondent know that they are not giving directly the information which questioner has requested, Lakoff (1973: 458) or they sense some of insufficiency (1973 : 463). The replies can be insufficient can lack of some details or the speaker some additional information. For example:

- (2) A : *did kill your wife?*  
 B (1) : *yes*  
 B (2) : *well yes* (Lakoff 1973 : 459)

There is no difference in the truth – conditional between B (1) and B (2) utterance by replying by *well* or not. B (1) is a direct answer. On the other hand B (2) is not a direct answer. It suggests answer *yes* but it is not complete answer because it believes there are extenuating circumstances. Schiffrin (1987) notes that *well* is often used when an answer is not optimally coherent with preceding question because the respondent cannot supply the requested information. In addition *well* signals a lack of coherence, need renegotiating the relevance background information.

*Well* also begins the answer with *well* if someone asks a question which assumes something that it is not true. According to Owen (1981, 1983) *well* signals and mitigates some sort of confrontation: for instance an assessment which is followed by disagreement rather than agreement; a request which is refused rather than granted or an offer which is rejected rather than accepted. These situations therefore are called face – threats.

- (3) A : *they must worry about you though Eddie, don't they, your mum and dad, when you're doing all these jumps*  
 B : *well they always come to all the shows*  
 (4) A : *can I just see them*  
 B : *well I'm not allowed to do that* (Owen 1981 : 109)

In (3) the example above as assessment followed by a disagreement rather than agreement. There is modal ‘must’ and the tag question *don't they* presents these assumptions as though everybody should agree. The interviewer just wants to elicit an agreement from Eddie. However, Eddie’s parents apparently do not worry unduly otherwise they would not come to all the shows. In (4) a request is followed by compliance. The A’s utterance implies that the position is in a position to grant it. However, this is again a background assumption which turns out to be assumption which turns out to be ill – founded.

*Well* typically prefaces a host utterance or it leads as ‘leading up’ to the formulation of the ensuing utterance. *Well* suggests continuation, the speaker considers what is going to say next and the hearer expects the complete sentence. As Quirk et al classify *well* then as initiator, it represents semantic proposition that “something else has to be said.”

## RESEARCH METHOD

Description analysis is the method that is used in analyzing the research. The data were collected and the procedure of the collecting was then using approaching technique through the theory as analysis tool and revealing the facts of the data.

In analyzing, the writer downloads the video of The Debate Night in America program and searching the discourse marker *well* that the speakers used. Furthermore, the writer uses the theory that already mentioned in theoretical objection to classify and analyze the type and also the function of discourse markers *well*.

The data were taken from news interview at *Debate Night in America in CNN News*. The program was special program in discussing the election of presidential in America. The main focus of the research finds the type of discourse markers, which frequently occurred in news interview, and also the function of discourse marker in news interview. In collecting the data, the data were gathered through tapping. The writer taps the language used in the

conversation. The analysis is finding the word that was classified as discourse markers. After the data were collected, the writer used note-taking system. In note taking, the writer classified the data. It was marked according to his or her aims. The marking in this study is based on the word that contains word that contains discourse markers. Further classification is the data sorted out and reserved for the next conduct of this study. The data are taken from nine speakers on *Debate Night in America in CNN News*. Those speakers are Gloria Borger, David Gergen, Alex Castellanos, Anderson Cooper, Van Jones, Candy Crowley, Jen Psaki, Dana Bash, and Rob Portman. They are presenters, a support team and a team of opposition candidates for US presidential candidates.

The principle of data analysis in this study employs the content and distribution analysis. Content analysis develops replicable and legitimate inferences by considering the context at the data. Distribution analysis allows writer to rely open determinant components on the language itself (Djajasudarma, 1993: 62).

By content analysis, the writer attempts to analyze the discourse markers at the conversation. The analysis is finding the marker that occurs during the conversation.

With distribution analysis, the study attempted to determine the function of discourse markers. The analysis was conducted in two main levels; textual or ideational level and interpersonal level. Both level were monitoring where marker function in textual level and social domain where all the function was as social monitor.

The main theory that was used to classify the types of discourse markers are Schiffrin's theory (1987) which specifically mention about one of the twelve discourse markers.

## ANALYSIS

### Discourse Marker *Well*

There are 6 data of *well* marker revealed agreement and disagreement. Those are classified based on their types. The type of *well* is identified by discourse marker features; when the word is omitted. It affects neither grammatically structure nor semantically meaning of the utterance.

Furthermore, the function is based on the context of the utterance. The context is created by the previous utterance, whether produces by current speaker or current hearer. So, the illustration of type and function of *well* is treated by topic or content of talk which classify the function as *textual level*. Furthermore, *well* which are identified from the response of the interaction between speaker and hearer signal *interpersonal level*. There are two classification of *well* as an agreement and *well* as face-threat mitigator or disagreement

### *Well* As An Agreement

There are four data of marker *well* as an agreement. The type and the function are classified based on the reaction of the speaker toward hearer's utterance. *Well* as an agreement is frequently prefaced by hearer. *Well* as an agreement is signaled when hearer rises the information and speaker shows the acceptance of the information using *well*. The falling tone also contributes to determine both type of *well* and its function.

The illocutionary provides clearly evidence in showing agreement. Although, questions are frequently showed in initiating moves, the form of agreement – showing with *well* – also account as reactive moves. By function of moves, the agreement is connected to specific type of directive move in interactional level.

### Data 1

Gloria Borger : “*She won by not losing, to a certain degree, because expectations were so low.*”

David Gergen : “*Well, she was still standing when it was over, yes.*”

In data 1, there is crosstalk about Sarah Palin, McCain’s vice president nominee. They compare Paul Ryan’s case with Sarah Palin’s in which the low expectation predisposes the polls. Trying to contribute his opinion, David uses *well* to account his move.

The function of *well* in this data, “*Well, she was still standing when it was over, yes*” shows the agreement in interpersonal level. The reaction moves from the speaker toward the question clearly signs the function. Moreover, David provides this agreement with long raising tone and pause. Here, after *well* Gergen presents his agreement with adding the information ‘*she was still standing when it was over*’ and put the final word ‘*yes*’. Therefore, it can be concluded, if *well* can portray the hearer the agreement form without giving explicit sentence form.

David agrees with Gloria’s opinion by using discourse marker *well* in his first word as the form of spontaneous expression to say something correct or same opinion. The discourse marker *well* also can be used to express agreement or ‘*yes*’ reply fast before explain the answer or reason completely furthermore.

### **Data 2**

Alex Castellanos : “*But you don't want to go into a debate with a card in front of you that says you're thinking about what not to do. You're in the arena.*”

Gloria Borger : “*Well, then you'd be thinking about –*”

Alex Castellanos : “*You want -- you want to be -- you want to be –*”

Gloria Borger : “*-- what his father won't do.*”

Alex Castellanos : “*You're fighting for your life. And not only your life, you're fighting for your country's life.*”

In data 2, the CNN correspondents are still discussing about Romney’s card named ‘*dad*’ and it considers as the things that is not supposed to do since you are in the arena. Although, there is not explicit idea in turn – taking system, Gloria directly knows that it is her turn. Realizing that it is her turn, Gloria proposes her utterance with *well*.

The function of *well* in the expression “*Well, then you'd be thinking about –*” shows the agreement in interpersonal level since it reflects the agreement toward prior utterance in which Alex’s utterance. The falling intonation and the raised shoulder greatly reflect agreement the function. Long pause after *well* and followed by *then* conveys meaning the agreement and the illocution act. Gloria seems to pursue Alex’s utterance with saying *you’d thinking about*. This represents the effect of previous utterance about the hearer’s information. In the term of delivering of what she is thought, however, Alex interrupts and continues the unfinished utterance from Gloria.

At the next utterance, Gloria finally can finish her information that writing the card in the middle of debate is not prevalent. Thus, *well* in this data have function as an agreement form in responding the prior utterance. It is because the hearer has already known the situation mentioned by the speaker, Alex, before and in the same thought about what situation happened at that time.

### **Data 3**

Gloria Borger : “*But with Mitt Romney, I think what's interesting is that it's so much fulfilling his father dream. It's trying to be like his father. Because he really does idolize his father. And in many ways, and he wants–.*”



- David Gergen : “*But his father never got to the presidency.*”  
 Gloria Borger : “*His father never got to the presidency.*”  
 David Gergen : “*And he's living out that dream.*”  
 Gloria Borger : “*And in many ways he is like his father, with the energy, but in many ways he's not like his father.*”  
 Anderson Cooper : “**Well** – “  
 Gloria Borger : “*He's not as natural. And he's not a backslapping guy. His father was a very different kind of politician.*”

In data 3, there is a discussion between CNN anchor and CNN senior political analyst. They are discussing about Mitt Romney's habit in writing his dad's name on a card at every debate. Gloria, who interviews Ann Romney, argues that Romney too idolize his father and living with his father's dream. Then David interrupts that Romney's father never got to the presidency and then repeated by Gloria as the emphasizing. Furthermore, Gloria continues giving the information that in many ways he is not like his father. Trying to give his contributing opinion, Anderson uses *well* marker to account the move.

The function of *well* in data above clearly serves agreement function. Moreover, the falling intonation and the raised shoulder conveys meaning if he could not agree more with Gloria's statement. The interpretation of *well* with preceding move fits in very well as an agreement. Gloria, on the other hand, winds down her previous argument about Mitt Romney.

Anderson uses discourse marker *well* as the representation of his agreement with previous speaker, Gloria. It represents his same thought event though he doesn't continue his reason. It because probably he thinks about safe or appropriate answer or doesn't want to offend others since it's it political talks. The agreement meaning in discourse marker *well* used by Anderson is also supported by his body language that is nodded.

#### Data 4

- Anderson Cooper : “**Well**, he backtracked on that, didn't he? He said it's case by case.”  
 Van Jones : “*Yes. Look. Case by case, but he was asked pretty directly about humanitarian case.*”  
 Alex Castellanos : “*Using force was humanitarian enough.*”  
 Van Jones : “**And** – “  
 Alex Castellanos : “*And he said, he said that it has to be in the strategic interest of the United States.*”  
 Van Jones : “**Well** – of course.”  
 Alex Castellanos : “*He didn't say humanitarian was not enough.*”

In data 4, the discussion about the humanitarian case as the issue which Paul Ryan is concerning about. In the previous discussion, Van is telling about the case that Paul is delivered at the debate. Cooper then agrees with the case that is served. He uses *well* to present his agreement.

The function of *well* is as agreement. In the expression “**Well** – of course” spoken by Van Jones, *well* provides the hearer to the information if Paul Ryan backtracked the case. It can be seen after Alex gives opinion “*And he said, he said that it has to be in the strategic interest of the United States.*” The raising intonation slightly provides this agreement.” Therefore the second *well* also provide agreement function since after initiating *well*, the speaker puts the word *of course*, which clearly interprets this as agreement function.

The discourse marker *well* used by Van Jones shows same opinion with the previous speaker, Alex. Both seem to understand the intentions and circumstances at that time. There is no resistance to Van Jones words. It is also as the form of approval emphasis.

**Well as face – threat mitigator in showing disagreement**

There are two data of face – threat mitigator that show disagreement. The assessment of disagreement rather than agreement is the main feature of this type of *well*. The raising tone and pause also represents the disagreement form of the previous utterance. Moreover, *well* in this case frequently occurs in initially position. Mostly, it initiates the utterance in question and answer. Furthermore, the function presents the speaker’s disagreement toward the served information by the hearer. This also can be a signpost for the hearer to readjust the background information.

**Data 5**

- Candy Crowley : “*But we know at the same that Mitt Romney is going to want to and in fact the debate moderator will want to have them mix it up and are you like, nope, look at the camera, have him talk straight to the people at home.*”
- Jen Psaki : “**Well**, *look, we don't think and the president doesn't think that attack lines and all of the...*”
- Candy Crowley : “*No, but discussion back and forth.*”

In data 5, Candy is interviewing Jen Psaki. Candy gives a comment on the previous answer by Jen that Romney also wants to share to American people about his vision. Furthermore, Candy discusses on how debate moderator tries to have balancing them in delivering proportion. However, Candy assumes that Jen Psaki, the Obama campaign travelling secretary, pushes the president to always talk directly toward the camera without giving his opponent a chance to talk. Jen, initiates his answer with *well* to show ‘it is wrong’.

Jen tries to confront Candy’s assumption. *Well* in the expression “**Well**, *look, we don't think and the president doesn't think that attack lines and all of the...*” apparently can be a frame for hearer that the given information is disagreement. After *well*, Jen adds *look* to ask the hearer’s attention that the information is prominent. Moreover, the following utterance clearly reflects the negation utterance that is preceded by *well*. Thus, *well* in this case has a function as face threat – mitigator.

The discourse marker *well* in data 5 has a function as mitigation tool used by Jen as her initial disagreement before continuing her explanation and defense to the interviewer as previous speaker. Actually, in this case, the writer also finds an emotional expression of the use of discourse markers because it is spoken with high intonation because she disagrees with the previous speaker.

**Data 6**

- Dana Bash : “*Did he actually practice a nod or did you just –*”
- Rob Portman : “**Well**, *no he didn't take it seriously –*”

In data 6, Dana Bash is interviewing Rob Portman, the Republican team in mock debate. They are discussing about several candidates that have once played by Portman. Portman is famous of playing character in GOP shows. He successfully plays the role from the gesture till the voice. Once, he played Al Gore and doing nod reaction. Bash is probably

curious about this thing and asks Portman whether Gore truly did it or it was just his improvisation. Portman provides his answer with *well* marker to lead his mitigation.

This *well*, in the expression “*Well, no he didn't take it seriously –*” conveys the disagreement rather than the agreement toward the prior utterance. Portman then continues his explanation with *no* word, which explicitly shows the disagreement. Hence, this data is classified as face threat – mitigator.

The use of discourse marker *well* is also as mitigation tool to show his disagreement with statement assumed by the previous speaker. It is because this discourse marker *well* after that followed by the correction expression “*no he didn't take it seriously –*.” This is as an expression of rebuttal that was carried out.

## CONCLUSION

The type of discourse marker *well* in news interview on *Debate Night in America Program in CNN News* is classified based on the discourse markers feature as linguistic element; which are difficult to place within a traditional word class, which are syntactically optional, which may occur at the beginning, middle, or end of utterance, which lack of semantic meaning, which occur in oral rather than written. If they are found in both, they often assume in oral medium. In addition, the function of discourse markers is taken as the identification of the type also.

Most of discourse markers' function facilitates the hearer to interpret speaker's utterances. As description of contribution of discourse markers function; provide contextual coordinates for utterance. This contextual conveys function for markers since markers select their meaning through content of talk. In *Debate Night in America Program*, discourse marker *well* that shows agreement and disagreement has various functions as follows:

- *Well* as an agreement *in employing the acceptance to the prior utterance*
- *Well* as an agreement *in showing same opinion*
- *Well* as an agreement *in saying yes*
- *Well* as an agreement *in emphasizing approval*
- *Well* as face – threat mitigator *in showing defense to the prior utterance*
- *Well* as face – threat mitigator *in showing disagreement*
- *Well* as face – threat mitigator *in showing rebuttal*

Although, discourse marker *well* considers as the beginning of the utterance, the function of *well* in different genre of talk is different. In *Debate Night in America Program*, *well* as discourse marker provides leading the utterance in responding question and answer. It shows more frequently function rather than other functions. This is assumed that the interviewees need a space for themselves to start what information they are going to be delivered.

The less frequent function is *well* as face – threat mitigator in showing disagreement. This is assumed as the interviewees avoid pursuing an act against the prior utterance in order to transgress the limit of goal oriented during election.

## REFERENCES

- Andersen, Gisle. 2001. *Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistics Variation: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Language of Adolescents*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Ariel, Mira. 1994. *Pragmatic Operators*. In R.E Asher (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press
- Blakemore, D. 2002. *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brinton, L.1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English Grammaticalization and Discourse*

- Functions*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Clayman, Steven, Heritage, John. 2002. *The News Interview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Djajasudarma, T. Fatimah. 1993a. *Metode Linguistik: Ancangan Metode Penelitian dan Kajian*. Bandung: PT. Eresco.
- Fraser, B. 1990. *An approach to discourse markers*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 383 – 395. (accessed January 7, 2019)
- Fraser, B. 1999. “What Are Discourse Markers?” *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 931-952.
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing pragmatics*. London: Hodder Arnold Publication.
- Hussein, Miri. 2002. *Two Accounts of Discourse Markers in English*. UK: Percy Building
- Lenk, Uta. 1998. *Discourse Markers and Global Coherence in Global Conversation*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30, 245 – 257. (accessed January 7, 2019)
- Norrick, Neal R. 2001. *Discourse Marker in Oral Narrative*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33 849 – 878
- Macmillan. 2002. *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*. Oxford: Macmillan/Bloomsbury
- Miller, Jim and Weinert, Regina. 1995. “The Function of LIKE in Dialogue”. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23, 365-393.
- Muhammad, M. Hum. 2011. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Owen, Marion. 1981. *Conversational units and the use of ‘well’*. in: P. Werth, ed., *Conversation and discourse*, 99-116. London: Croom Helm.
- Redekker, Gisela. 1990. “Ideational and Pragmatic Markers of Discourse Structure”. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 367-381.
- Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP
- Schourup, Lawrence. 1985. *Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation*. New York: Garland.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.