Discourse Markers Functions in Social Interviews

BY

Sura Jasim Mohammed

PROF. Muhammed Badea' Ahmed (Ph.D.)

Discourse Markers Functions in Social Interviews

Sura Jasim Mohammed PROF. Muhammed Badea' Ahmed (Ph.D.)

Abstract

Face to face interviews are considered as a type of genre in spoken discourse and they include various linguistic strategies that worth investigating. Within these interviews, there is context sensitivity, since the interaction is active and direct between participants. Thus, there should be a use of certain expressions to perform a number of functions such as: topic shift, introducing a new topic, producing personal comment by participants, expressing politeness, etc. Those expressions are called discourse markers (henceforth DMs); they are of different categories and they convey textual functions (expressing coherence and cohesion) and pragmatic functions (expressing the speaker's attitude and other communicative purposes). DMs act as connectors (connect clauses, sentences, and paragraphs) , indicators (indicate relations in discourse), and instructors (direct participants to the accurate interpretation of an utterance). This study is a discourse study that concerns with the functions of different types of DMs in spoken interaction (social interviews).

This study aims at:(i) presenting a general theoretical survey of discourse markers and their relation to other types of markers in an attempt to get a unified framework to analyse the data of this study, (ii) investigating the effect and role of context, specifically social context in determining the meanings and functions of DMs, (iii) explaining the various functions that different types of DMs convey in spoken interaction particularly social interviews.

To achieve these aims , the study hypothesizes that: (i) It is hypothesized that context is the major factor that affects the choice of meanings and functions of DM , (ii)Certain types of DMs are used

frequently in active spoken interaction, and (iii) DMs convey particular types of functions in social interviews.

The model adopted in this study is: Fraser's classification of Pragmatic Markers 1996. It is applied to 2 selected TV interviews within one context , involving both genders, and from one program. The interviews are analyzed according to the adopted model.

The main conclusions of the current study are: (i) Context is represented as a main independent factor, that determines the choice of DMs types and the type of functions DMs convey, rather than working with other factors such as gender and social distance, (ii) Considering the variation of DMs, there are different types of DMs in the analyzed data, such as: SDMs and parallel markers, and (iii) DMs mainly convey textual and interpersonal functions in social interviews .

1-Introduction

Discourse markers (henceforth DMs) attract the attention of many linguists nowadays, therefore many attempts have appeared to study them. DMs are expressions that signal the connection of the basic message to the preceding discourse. They have textual and pragmatic functions depending on the type of DM on the one hand and on the context on the other hand; that is , the form, meaning and function of a DM depend on its context. In spoken interactions, mainly, there are several types of DMs which convey functions that can be interpreted differently by the hearer. DMs are considered as multifunctional expressions that are used by both genders. DMs are used in spoken interaction/ interviews in order to convey certain functions that can't be conveyed by other expressions. In fact, the use of an inappropriate DM which in turn conveys totally different function will cause break up in the interaction. Thus, the current study concerns with discovering the role and effect of context on DMs as an independent factor by itself or as dependent factor working with other factors such as gender and social distance in spoken interaction. Also this study attempts to find out the most frequent functions of different types of DMs in social interviews.

This study aims at : 1-presenting a general theoretical survey of discourse markers and their relation to other types of markers in an attempt to get a unified framework to analyse the data of this study, 2-investigating the effect and role of context, specifically social context in determining the meanings and functions of DMs.

3- explaining the various functions that different types of DMs convey in spoken interaction particularly interviews.

The hypotheses of this study are: 1- It is hypothesized that context is the major factor that affects the choice of meanings and functions of DMs 2- Certain types of DMs are used frequently in active spoken interaction. 3- DMs convey particular types of functions in social interviews.

The procedures followed in this study are: 1- Presenting a theoretical framework of different types of DMs, 2- Selecting the data which are interviews from one program taking into consideration the same context, variation of topics and gender of participants 3- Explaining different functions of DMs

4- Analyzing and discussing the data in two main steps of analysis: the detailed analysis which is concerned with analyzing the data in the form of tables for each interview and making a discussion for the two interviews which are from the same context 5- Drawing some conclusions.

The limits of this study are the following: 1- The study is limited to selected TV interviews in one context , social, from one TV channel and one program, with different guests , and of both genders.

2- The data analysis will be within the limits of the selected model: Fraser's classification of PMs 3- The study is limited to selected types of DMs in accordance with the model adopted with few modifications, they are: parallel markers and syntactic discourse markers (SDMs).

It is hoped that this study will be valuable to: 1- Those who are interested in studying the pragmatic functions of types of DMs in spoken discourse 3- Those who are concerned with investigating context differences in the use of different DMs in communication.

2- Discourse Markers and the Terminology

Expressions found in English spontaneous conversation such as *so, well, anyway, of course, on the other hand, in fact, I mean, and actually,* are generally described as discourse markers. Those expressions have attracted the attention of linguists in the spoken language. They are common in written language as well (M. Lewis,2006: 43). There are various approaches to the study of DMs. This variation is due to several different aspects such as: the language(s) under investigation, the elements taken into consideration, the functions focused on, the terminology employed, the problems considered and the methodologies used (Fischer,2006:1). DMs are expressions that are not part of the

propositional content. Thus, they can be in initial or final positions of an utterance. In fact, DMs have many different functions (Renkema,2004:169). Noticeably, there is a diversity in the terminology that is used in labeling DMs. Müller (2005:3) states that there is little "consensus" to whichever terms are used to describe markers and which linguistic items are considered as DMs among linguists.

In fact, there are diverse terms used by the researchers to refer to DMs. However, those various terms are convergent in meanings and functions and the difference lies in terminology only. Each researcher labels those expressions under a certain term depending on the aspect s/he intends to study in that term. Although there are few differences among the terms, yet they can be used interchangeably . Most of studies and sources agree on "DMs" as the most used term. However, such a variety in the terminology causes confusion to the readers. Therefore, within this study, it is preferable to select "DMs" as a cover term to cover and include all other types of markers; it is more comprehensive, inclusive and general. This study investigates different types of DMs. Such a choice will give the potential of including those types of discourse markers available in the data, thus giving the way to conduct a comprehensive study keeping the basic framework of the model adopted and adding the other varieties dealt with by other scholars.

Writers such as Schiffrin(1987), Jucker and Ziv (1998), as well as Schourup (1999), prefer to use the term DM. Schourup himself (1999:228) indicates that the term DM is the most familiar one among other terms used with "partial overlapping reference". Actually, the term *discourse marker* is considered to be a purely "functional term". Moreover, it is suggested to be the most "wide-spread" and regarded to be the most inclusive (Fischer,2006:5). There are various terms used to refer to DMs, such as *pragmatic particle* by (Östman,1981), *discourse marker* (Schiffrin,1987), *pragmatic expression* by (Erman,1987), *connective* by (Blakemore,1987,1988), *discourse particle* by(Schourup,1985;Abraham,1991;Kroon,1995), or *pragmatic marker* by (Fraser,1996,Briton,1996) (Beeching,2002:50).

2.1 Pragmatic Markers

The term *pragmatic marker* according to Andersen, describes "a class of short, recurrent" linguistic elements that have lexical meaning but still have important "pragmatic functions in conversation" (Andersen,2001:39).

Frequently, it is their "procedural meaning" which allows them to restrict the process of utterance interpretation (ibid:40). *Pragmatic markers* have essential (basic) meaning in speech and they are not only fillers. They have coherent meaning in which they link the preceding and following propositions. Their meaning contributes to the "pragmatic discourse structure": to the inferential, sequential, and rhetorical components (González,2004:1).

2.2Interjections

In English they include expressions such as *eh*, *aha*, *oh*, *yuk*, *wow*, *oops*, *ouch*, *ah*, *huh*, *shh*, *psst*, *brrr*, and *er*. Some treat expressions like *yes*, *no*, *hell*, *damn*, *bother*, etc., as interjections as well (Whatron, 2009:70). Furthermore, Trask (1993:144) views an interjection as a phrase or lexical word which expresses emotion and fails to enter any syntactic structures. Quirk et al., (1985:853) mentions that interjections are purely emotive items which do not enter into syntactic relations. Clearly, Aijmer (2002:97) states the frequency of interjections indicates that they can be placed anywhere to make the conversation more fluent and interesting. Still, there are rules for where they can be inserted.

2.3 Connectives

Scheibman (2002:34) suggests that this category includes coordinators and subordinators. They are considered as DMs. Actually they are labeled under this category (which is traditionally syntactic) depending on research by discourse analysts. Those analysts observe that in conversation, even syntactically categorized items (e.g. so, and) their basic function is to signal interactive phenomena rather than to link propositional material in an utterance.

3- Functions of DMs

Östman (1995:104) distinguishes the multifunctional nature of DMs by indicating three "parameters" with which communication occurs; they are "coherence, politeness and involvement"**.**

3.1 Textual Function

This function "relates to the structuring of discourse as text". There are different kinds of the textual function such as: beginning and ending discourse, attracting the attention of the hearer, maintaining discourse, marking boundaries, including episode (incident) boundaries and topic shifts, "reconstraining the relevance of adjoining clause" (Brinton, 2008:17-18). Many researchers agree that the use of DMs aids the hearer to

understand the speaker's utterances (Müller, 2005:8). Aijmer states that *discourse particles* function as guides or cues to the hearer's interpretation (Aijmer, 1996:210). Halliday's textual function is associated with "the textual resources the speaker has for creating coherence". Textual meaning is related to the context: the situational context, and to the preceding and succeeding text (Halliday, 1985:53).

3.2 The Interpersonal Function

It is also called *expressive function*. It relates to the organization of the social exchange and to "the expression of speaker attitude". There are various interpersonal functions, such as attitudes, responses, understanding, and expressing reactions, these are called subjective_functions. Other functions such as, expressing politeness (face-saving), shared knowledge, cooperation, respect and intimacy, are called *the_interactive functions* (Brinton, 2008:17-18). Also, Bazzanella calls the interpersonal function as "phatic function" and the discourse_particles as "phatic connectives". With this function, particles primarily serve a phatic function in the discourse, "underlying" the interactive structure of the conversation (Bazzanella, 1990:630). Phatic connectives can be considered in some of their uses as evidentials, i.e. as elements expressing attitudes or "modes of knowledge" (Aijmer, 2002:48). As an example, *actually* indicates that something goes beyond the expectation, *I think* marks (belief) the mode of knowledge (Chafe, 1986:270).

a- Phatic Discourse Particles and Politeness

Everyday conversation is characterized by indirectness, "face-saving" and politeness. After all, these are involved in the use of markers with interpersonal function (Bazzanella, 1990:636). "Sort of" and tags like *and that sort of thing*, which have "evidential meanings" such as approximation and imprecision, seem to indicate "the speaker's desire" to reduce social distance between herself and the addressee (Holmes, 1988:99). It seems that *you know* and *sort of* can be described as "negative politeness strategies". In interaction, they construct deferent verbal behaviour, lexical means "for the expression of non-imposing", and serve to communicate some degrees of politeness (James, 1983:198). *Sort of* and *you know* can be used as positive politeness strategies as well, drawing the addresser and the addressee closer to each other (Aijmer,2002:50)

b- Phatic Discourse Particles and Floor-holding

According to Aijmer, phatic particles are considered as part of "the planning process" particularly when they co-occur with other markers or

with pauses (ibid)**.** Moreover, the phatic or interpersonal function constitutes intimacy, solidarity and group-feeling (ibid: 50-51). Finally, the functions of DMs can be summarized as the following: to signal either background or foreground information, to help the speaker holding the floor in an interaction, to signal shift in discourse (topic shift), to mark the discourse cataphorically or anaphorically, to function as a filler (fill gaps) and as a delaying strategy, and to introduce a reaction or response as well as to affect interaction between speaker and hearer (Müller,2005:9).

4- Interviews : Pinpointed

The word *interview* usually refers to a "one-on-one" conversation with a person who takes the role of an interviewer and another person who takes the role of an interviewee. Usually the interviewer asks questions and the interviewee answers them. Interviews generally require a transfer of information from interviewee to interviewer which is the purpose of interview. Still, information transfer can happen simultaneously in both directions. Usually, interviews happen in person and face to face https://en.wikipedia.org/wike/Interfview .

Interviews in general have a stable structure which is the question-answer system. However, this system is not always followed by participants in all contexts and circumstances. In fact, the success of both participants (the interviewer and the interviewee) in an interview depends on how cooperative they are and the degree they obey the interview rules (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 96). Social or celebrity interviews almost have the same atmosphere of ordinary conversation which is characterized by :open options, relaxed atmosphere and friendly participants. The only thing that characterizes them as genre interviews is the question and answer structure.

5-Methodology

Since this study is concerned with finding out the functions of different types of discourse markers in social context interviews on one hand and the effect of context on those markers on the other hand, the collected data are two interviews from one program. The program is **The Ellen Show,** which is an American TV Comedy and social Talk Show, hosted by **Ellen DeGeneres** who is a comedian actress. It is of 13 seasons and still shows on. It aires weekly on NBC channel in Canada and the United States as well as ITV2 channel in the United Kingdom. The show "combines human interest stories", celebrity, comedy, and musical guests. She interviews celebrities and other characters from both genders in a relaxed and comic atmosphere. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Ellen_DeGeneres_Show

The Ellen Show has received 15 "Daytime Emmys", winning the "Best Talk show award" in the first three seasons. Also, Ellen was selected as "favorite TV Host" (Skerski,2007:376) .

The selection of data is intentional, the program is TV talk show which is specialized in interviewing people. Thus, the utterances are spontaneous and suitable for analysis. Within such atmosphere both participants tend to use variety of markers with different functions. The selected episodes are in the duration 2015 - 2016, with attractive topics for discussion and with variation of gender (man and woman).Within this study, the analysis will be based on Fraser's classification of Pragmatic Markers. The analysis will be presented in the form of tables, which is the first step. The table explains the types, sub-types and functions of different types of discourse markers . Then, a final discussion will be followed, which is the second step.

6- The Model Adopted: Fraser's Classification of Pragmatic Markers (PMs 1996)

Fraser mixes the pragmatic and textual functions of different types of markers in spoken interaction. This approach is mainly pragmatic; however, it views the markers from pragmatic and textual points of view. Fraser (1996: 171) focuses primarily on the pragmatic meaning of the sentence which indicates the direct, literal messages conveyed by the speaker and pays less attention to the content meaning. Fraser classifies PMs into four main types: *basic markers, commentary pragmatic markers, parallel markers, and discourse markers*. Only two types will be explained in details, those which are selected for this study.

6.1 Parallel Markers

They form a group of pragmatic markers. Those markers function to indicate "an entire message" in addition to "the basic message". There are four types of parallel markers:

1-Vocative Markers

This class of markers includes

a- Standard Titles: Mr. President, Mom, Tom, Father John …, etc.

b- General Nouns: young lady, man, ladies and gentlemen …, etc.

c- Occupation Name: judge, waiter, doctor …, etc.

Those expressions are clarified by these examples:

1) a- "*Mr. President*, what position are you taking today?

b- *Waiter*, please bring me another spoon. (Fraser, 1996:185)

By using one of these vocative expressions, for example *waiter* the speaker explicitly sends the message that the hearer is the waiter.

2-Speaker Displeasure Markers

This group indicates the speaker's displeasure, as in:

2) a- Get your *damned* shoes off the sofa!

b- Tom. Come here *right now*! (Fraser, 1996:185)

In (2) the markers indicate a message of the speaker "expressing annoyance", but it is not always clear whether the hearer or the situation is the cause of the anger. This set of markers includes: *the hell, right now, for the last time, damned*…, etc.

3-Solidarity Markers

This class of parallel markers indicates "solidarity". The speaker sends a message that expresses (un)solidarity with the hearer. Example:

(3) a- *As one girl to another*, we are in massive trouble.

b- *My friend*, we simply have to face this issue together.

4-Focusing Markers

This group indicates focusing or refocusing "on the topic at hand". This group includes: *Here, so, well, you see*, *now*, *listen*, and *alright*. Those markers are clarified in the following examples:

(4) a- She can't leave. *Y'see*, she isn't feeling well.

b- (on entering the house and seeing a fight) *Alright*, what is happening here? (ibid:186)

6.2 Discourse Markers

Fraser considers DMs are as the fourth type of PMs. They are expressions which signal the relationship of the basic message to the prior discourse. According to him, DMs are not like other types of PMs, they contribute only to the procedural meaning, and not to the representative meaning of the sentence. They provide instructions to the hearer that help and guide him in the interpretation of an utterance which includes a DM (Fraser, 1996:187). Suffice to say, some modifications have been done in the model adopted for the analysis (i.e., Fraser's model) in order to accord the current study needs; these are as follows: 1- Fraser calls one type of markers (which is mainly syntactic) as DMs in this model, however it will be referred to as syntactic discourse markers(SDMs). The reason behind naming this type with SDMs is to consider it as an independent type beside other types of markers under the cover term DMs.

2- DMs is considered as a cover term as explained in 2. There are four main classes of DMs:

1-Contrastive Discourse Markers

This group of SDMs indicates that the utterance following is either a contrast or a denial of certain proposition associated with the previous discourse. Example on this group of markers:

(2) A: We must go mow girls. B: *But* we haven't finished our lunch yet.

This group includes: *despite (this/that), inspite of (this, that), in contrast to (this, that), on the other hand, but, instead (of_doing this/ that*) …, etc. (ibid:187).

2-Elaborative Discourse Markers

This group signals that "the utterance following constitutes a refinement of some sort on the preceding discourse". Example of this class of SDMs:

(3) Take your umbrella with you. But *above all*, take the raincoat. Elaborative DMs include: *and, also, beside, above all, in addition, further(more), for instance/example, indeed, what is more* … , etc. (Fraser,1996:188).

3-Inferential Discourse Markers

This class signals that "the force of the utterance is a conclusion" which follows from the prior discourse. An example :

(4) Harry went home. *After all*, he was tired.

Inferential markers include expressions such as: *after all, as a_consequence, because of this\that, as a result, so, thus, then, therefore*_…, etc. (ibid:188).

4-Topic Change Markers

These markers signal that the utterance following constitutes in the speaker's view, "a departure from the current topic"

(5) *Speaking of Tom*, where is he these days?

This group of markers includes: *incidentally, speaking of x, parenthically, by the way, before I forget*…, etc. (ibid:187).

7-Data Analysis

Due to space limitation , only the needed extracts (from the data- the two interviews) are presented within the analysis ; in case the reader needs to watch the whole interview , the links are presented in page 27.

7.1First Interview: Hillary Clinton with Ellen

This interview is of Hillary Clinton as the guest with Ellen as the host. Although the interviewee is an American politician *Senator*, this interview is not pure political . It is almost social that has a friendly and

relaxed atmosphere and the topics vary from personal to social and political. Both participants are of the same gender *female*. In addition, both make jokes and laugh with each other.

Ellen: (..) Well, (..) I've said it before that you are held to completely different standard than everyone else that seems to be, (...) . And , you know what a supporter I am, (...)you're as president, and , you are.. [audience applause]. (..) there's so much going on with the gun violence , with terrorists, and everyone's scared. Everyone is so scared, and I think people need to be…(..) Um, I agree. I think ..and that's what I really try to do here with this show. (..)That's Kate McKinnon…Who also does me very well. So this time around, you're campaigning it was 2008 you were campaigning last time, right?. (..)I saw a selfie with you and , well , the selfie king and queen is Kanye and Kim. well[2nd] , I think its hers. I asked her the same thing(..), and that's ..she is really .. in real life, hideous(..). I love both of them.(..) , but when I saw that , I was like , "Where do get that ?" And I think it's hers(..).

(Table 7.1) Participant 1: The Interviewer Ellen

Markers	Main Type	Sub-Type	Syntactic Category	Line N.	Functions
Well (2times)	Parallel PM	Focusing marker	adverb	1, 8	IN, focuses and emphasizes on the topic at hand & attracts the H's attention
And (6 times)	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	2,3,5 , 7,9, 10	TE ,introduces something else in conversation , mainly the S's comment.
And (2 times)	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	4(2T)	TE ,provides elaboration on the topic. IN, explains the S's personal comment& runs the conversation smooth
Also	SDM	Elaborative	adverb	6	TE, gives extra information about the following part.
Right	Parallel PM	Focusing marker	adverb	7	IN, a response marker, here comes to request agreement.
Well[2nd]	Parallel PM	Focusing marker	adverb	8	IN, indicates that the S has heard something and introduces a comment on it, also shows cooperation
But	SDM	Contrastive	conj	9	TE, contrasts the following part with the preceding one.

T = Times, **IN** = Interpersonal, **TE** = Textual, **Conj** = Conjunction, **Intj** = Interjection, **S** = Speaker, **H** = Hearer, **DM** = Discourse Marker, **SDM** = Syntactic Discourse Marker, PM = Pragmatic Marker.

Clinton: Well, I think , if he is referring to what I believe he's referring to (...) and so much of the perception is rooted in, very ancient feelings that we have about the roles of men and women, and you know, I've had so many interesting and sometimes surprising experiences (..) "but I'm at least considering supporting you", and that's a big step forward. Because I don't know(..). Right Right. I know people are scared, and I understand that completely. (..) I mean, I've spent a lot of time around families that lost kids to gun violence, and[1st] there is just no words, and[2nd] I was so proud of the president(..). you don't expect to loose that child in a mass murder, and so, there's a lot to be afraid of. But at the same time we have to put it into the right context(..) and we have to get together and work together (..) and we can do that. We've got to understand we're all in this together, and at the end of the day (..), they just come and they say, "what can I do to help you?" And that's how we need to be. Right Right. I mean , when I see her doing me I go, "oh, no that's not me," and then (..) within inches of her and she's doing it and some of it is off, but some of it is a little too close to comfort!. And [1st] we had so much fun that day (..) and[2nd] it really is live TV. (..) and the first thing they wanted to do, they wanted to end the skit… as it eventually does, with me singing, and I said, "you really don't want to hear me sing". So , we go out to rehearse it and we get to the point where I sing, and I sing and the producers look at me (..). So , there's a little tiny bit of singing at the end, but that's all. (..) Right(..) Right. But here's what I learned…(..) so if anybody knows where you can get one. But, I mean, she whips it out(..) and she makes everybody look better than you have any reason to look , and she is very nice.

(Table 7.2) Participant 2 : The interviewee Clinton

Markers	Main Type	Sub-Type	Syntactic Category		Functions
Well	Parallel marker	Focusing marker	adverb	1	IN, expresses attitude ,the S's understanding of the topic.
And (9 times)	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	1,10, 12(2T), 14, 15, 16(3T)	TE, to provide extra information of the current topic.
And	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	3	IN, to introduce something else that the S wants to add to what she has just said
But (3 times)	SDM	Contrastive	Conj	3,13,19	TE, contrasts the following part with the previous one.
At least	SDM	Contrastive	phrase	4	IN, expresses politeness,

					indicates an advantage in spite of the disadvantage. means *anyway*
And (5 times)	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	4, 5, 6^{2nd}, 18(2T)	TE, elaborates the topic. IN, explains the S's attitude as personal comment. Also the S shows positive politeness (compassion)
because	SDM	Inferential	Conj	4	TE, gives result and details about the previous part.
Right (4times)	Parallel marker	Focusing marker	Intj	5(2T), 11(2T)	IN, shows understanding, employs back-channel.
And (2 times)	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	6^{1st} 13^{2nd}	TE, fills gaps and focus marker focuses on the topic.
And so	2 SDM	Elaborative (and) + inferential (so)	phrase	7	TE, elaborates and orders the text. IN, emphasizes the result , the topic at hand.
But	SDM	Contrastive	Conj	8	TE, adds something further in the discussion.
And (4 times)	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	8,9,11, 13^{1st}	IN, shows the S's attitude, to make a comment on what the S is saying.
And then	2 SDM	Elaborative	phrase	12	TE, gives more details about the topic at hand.
Eventuall-y	SDM	inferential	adverb	15	TE, to talk about the end .
So (3 times)	SDM	inferential	Conj	15,17, 18	TE, shows that the force is a conclusion of the prior part.
But	SDM (filler)		adverb	17	TE, filler in conversation, means *only*.
Right	Parallel marker	Focusing marker	Intj	17	IN, expresses agreement to the H.
But here's	SDM + Parallel marker	contrastive + Focusing marker	phrase	17	TE, focuses on topic. IN, expresses cooperation by explaining the things the S learns ,indicates a reply .

T = Times, **IN** = Interpersonal, **TE** = Textual, **Conj** = Conjunction, **Intj** = Interjection, **S** = Speaker, **H** = Hearer, **DM** = Discourse Marker, **SDM** = Syntactic Discourse Marker, PM = Pragmatic Marker.

7.2 Second Interview: Ed O'Neill with Ellen

This interview is of *Ed O'Neill* as the guest with *Ellen DeGeneres* as the host. The interviewee is a comedian actor. This interview has a friendly and relaxed atmosphere. The context is social and the topics vary between social and personal. The 2 participants are of different gender, the interviewer is female and the interviewee is a male. Furthermore, both participants are comfortable, they laugh and make jokes with each other.

Ellen: So you are so funny in this film. I cannot wait for people to see it, because it is so fun and we have a lot of scenes together. (..). So , you like … you got hired or did you audition? (..). Well , I don't know if they knew (..). And so I started this three years ago. (..)8.50 $. Well , I'm the star, so 9$ an hour. (Audience laugh). So[1st] that adds up over three years. Umm … So[2nd] … No, really, I got the call (..) and so three years ago we started, and[1st] I didn't even know who was going to be in it yet. And[2nd] when I heard the cast(..). It's really funny. And[3rd] you, now, do they make you breathe and scream as much as they make me? I know we have to go to break, but I have to get the Britney Spears story, because … [**Ed**: Oh, my God.] . (..) And so, you don't seem thrilled. [Audience laugh].

(Table 7.3) Participant 1 : The interviewer Ellen

Markers	Main Type	Sub-Type	Syntactic Category	Line N.	Functions
So (3 times)	SDM		intj	1,16, 4[1st,]	TE, marks the beginning of new part of the conversation . IN, shows cooperation.
Because (2 times)	SDM	Inferential	Conj	1, 8	TE, gives reason about the previous part.
And (2 times)	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	2, 5[1st]	TE, gives more elaboration about the topic. IN, explains the S's personal comment.
And so	SDM + parallel PM	Elaborative + focus marker	Phrase	3	TE, gives elaboration about the current or another topic.
Well	parallel PM	focus marker	adverb	3	IN, indicates that the S is amused by the other participant's words
So	SDM	Inferential	Conj	4	TE, gives a result or conclusion about the topic.

So	Hedge	Filler	Conj	4[2nd]	TE, fills gaps in the conversation.
Really	parallel PM	focus marker	adverb	5	TE, focuses on the topic at hand . IN, expresses the S's personal attitude.
And so	SDMs	Elaborative + inferential	Phrase	5	TE, gives more information about the current topic and shows result or conclusion.
And	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	6[2nd]	TE, gives more elaboration about the current topic.
And	SDM	Filler	Conj	6[3rd]	TE, fills gaps and spaces in conversation.
Now	parallel PM	focus marker	adverb	6	TE, focuses or refocus on the topic at hand.
But	SDM	Contrastive	Conj	7	TE, introduces something else the S intends to say
And so	DM + hedge	Elaborative DM + intj	phrase	7	IN, the S introduces a comment and question on what she has just mentioned

T = Times, **IN** = Interpersonal, **TE** = Textual, **Conj** = Conjunction, **Intj** = Interjection, **S** = Speaker, **H** = Hearer, **DM** = Discourse Marker, **SDM** = Syntactic Discourse Marker, PM = Pragmatic Marker.

Ed: (..) No, I got a call from my manager and he said, "Do you wanna do something on Finding Dory?" And[1st] I said, "What is that?". (..) And[2nd] they said, "well , you're going to play thin octopus." .They said "Well , it's Pixar, I said "Okay , I'll do it." [Audience laugh] . So , when I showed up (..) . So I did the one day, and then they called me back and then , you know, after like months and months (..). (..) I never knew. But, and I saw Tom Hanks talk about this once. So, you go in and they put headphones on and[1st] there's a podium and then you look and[2nd] you see them in a glass booth. (..). And they'll say, "Hello(..). So, all my stuff with Ellen, a lot of it was phonetic(..). And so you're going, "No, stop, no, go, run, dive, no, God, no, no," and then [sound] and I'm sitting in the booth going [laugh](..). Well , I was at LAX, I was flying alone to Hawaii and I was waiting for my flight(..). (..) and I picked up that little Modern Family hat, and I saw a woman approaching me, so I just flopped it on, you know , I was leaving. And she came up and said, "Oh Mr. O'Neill, I love Modern Family, and you're my favorite on the show". (..) " Could you please, and I know you're in a hurry" . And I said "sure (..) . So she sat there and we took it, and I said "have a nice trip" And I left. So , the next day, my manager text me and said what is this? So , I did call her manager, and I said you know,

you know my daughter Sophia, you are a moron. So I had to tell my little story, I'm sorry. So , I apologized. [audience laugh] .

(Table 7.4) Participant 2 : The interviewee Ed

Markers	Main Type	Sub-Type	Syntactic Category		Functions
And (15 times)	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	1, 2nd , 6st , 6nd, 7, 10(2T) ,11(2T), 13,14(3T), 15(2T)	TE, gives more elaboration and information about the current topic.
And	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	2st	TE, elaborates the topic . IN, as focus marker which focuses on the topic at hand.
Well	Parallel marker	Focusing marker	Adverb	3	TE, to emphasize the current topic.
So (6 times)	SDM	Inferential	Conj	3,4,6, 11,13,14	TE, gives result or conclusion about the current topic.
And then (2 times)	2 collocating SDMs	Elaborative	Phrase	4, 8	TE, shows more elaboration about the topic at hand.
Never	DM	Negative particle negates verbs in the past simple	Adverb	5	TE, negates the text and makes it more powerful.
But	SDM	Contrastive	Conj	5	TE, fills gaps in the conversation, filler.
And	SDM	Elaborative	Conj	5	IN, conveys the S's personal comment/ attitude.
And (2 times)	SDM	Filler	Conj	6, 9	TE, fills spaces in the conversation.
So (4 times)	SDM	Inferential	Adverb	7, 15, 16(2T),	IN, introduces the S's comment about something that

					has been said.
And so	2 SDMs	Elaborative + inferential	Phrase/ conj	8	TE, *and* gives more details and elaboration . IN, *so* comments on the situation

T = Times, **IN** = Interpersonal, **TE** = Textual, **Conj** = Conjunction, **Intj** = Interjection, **S** = Speaker, **H** = Hearer, **DM** = Discourse Marker, **SDM** = Syntactic Discourse Marker, PM = Pragmatic Marker.

8- Discussion

Within social interviews the atmosphere is relaxed, open, almost informal and there is no disagreement or direct confrontation in views. The only purpose is to show entertainment for both the gust and audience. Both participants feel comfortable regardless of gender. The choice of topic and all other things is flexible [not restricted] and does not attempt to cause direct attack or offense to the interviewee. Also participants use different types of DMs (SDMs and parallel markers) which show pragmatic functions spontaneously such as: telling jokes and laughing with each other ,showing agreement and understanding , stating an opinion or a comment ,and providing compliments without attempting to reduce the effect of certain face threats. These are also known as interpersonal functions. DMs also show textual functions which create cohesion and coherence, fill spaces , give elaboration, emphasize on something in the text, mark the beginning or end of something.

Participants just attempt to create a comfortable atmosphere, to make the interview smooth and to minimize the social distance. In addition, both participants (the S and H) show solidarity by: talking about personal topics, providing each other with personal comments and compliments. Furthermore, both the interviewer and interviewee use normal address system, sometimes they use pronouns such as *you* and *I* to refer to each other, or they call each other by their first names to show intimacy and familiarity. In social interviews both the interviewer and the interviewee are cooperative and they show features of cooperation regularly and clearly such as: enthusiasm, taking turns and back-channeling. Within the two social interviews the female interviewer is polite with both male and female interviewees. Therefore, the interviewees are polite to her.

Within the two interviews, the interviewer (Ellen) on the one hand, uses indirect questions as open utterances to avoid being direct and to

maintain conversation, she also uses direct questions to request information. She asks in a friendly style and adds her personal comment. Ellen is cooperative, she uses amplifiers , backchannels, and laughs to show interest .She interrupts at the beginning out of enthusiasm . In addition, she raises the topics and presents them sometimes with a comment and sometimes presents the topic directly. On the other hand, the interviewees (Ed and Clinton) do not ask , but answer the questions warmly . They are cooperative , use amplifiers, laugh and show enthusiasm. Moreover, they make fun of themselves many times during the interview which indicates intimacy. In fact, there is a high level of humour between participants through all the interviews, both are funny and laugh a lot with each other and with the audience. They also laugh on each other's personal experiences to create good mood and comfortable atmosphere. In both interviews there are some collocating markers that create cohesion and add power to the text. All participants talk about shared personal experiences and add personal comments. They use the personal pronoun *I* (especially the guest) to speak for themselves.

Within the first interview**,** the interviewee (Clinton) states her opinion with an assertive tone and finished sentences. Furthermore, the impact of being a politician is clear in the her talk. Clinton uses powerful vocabularies and inclusive *we* ,meaning the nation and all of "us"; she focuses mainly on political and social issues concerned with the society. Within this interview Clinton talks about: how difficult for a woman to run for president. She presents several pieces of advice to the society about how to live in a country where people love and accept each other. Then, she goes to personal topics; she talks about her personal experience in a comic TV show and describes her photo with two celebrities in a very funny way. In the second interview, the intimacy is clear because both participants are work partners, they act in the same movie; they are comic actors . During the interview, Ed talks about his character in the movie and narrates the whole story. Then he narrates an indirect personal situation , when he doesn’t recognize a celebrity while she requests to take a photo with him in a very comic way. Therefore, within this study and in the data analysed, it is shown that context works as a major independent factor by itself that affects the use of DMs, more than as dependent factor that works with other factors such as gender and social distance in spoken interaction. Context determines the interpretation of meanings and functions of DMs which differ in each

utterance. In addition, the most frequent functions of the types of DMs used in the current data are textual and interpersonal functions.

9-conclusions

This study reaches the following conclusions:

1- Context is represented as a main independent factor, that affects the choice of DMs types and the type of functions DMs convey, rather than working with other factors such as gender and social distance.

2- Considering the variation of DMs, there are different types of DMs in the analysed data, such as: SDMs and parallel markers.

3- DMs mainly convey textual and interpersonal functions in social interviews .

References

- Aijmer, K. (1996). Conversational Routines in English.Convention and Creativity. London: Longman.
- ----------. (2002). English Discourse Particles. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Andersen, G. (2001). Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistic Variation. Amsterdam : John Benjamins.
- Bazzanella, C. (1990) ."Phatic Connectives as Interactional Cues in Contemporary Spoken Italian". Journal of Pragmatics ,14, 639–47.
- Beeching, K. (2002). Gender, Politeness and Pragmatic Particles in French. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Brinton, L. (2008). The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Chafe, W. (1986). "Evidentiality in English Conversation and Academic Writing". In Chafe, W. and J. Nichols (Eds.). Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology. Norwood, N.J. : Ablex, 261–72.
- Clayman, C. and Heritage, J. (2002). The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, K. (2006). Approaches to Discourse Particles. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.

- Fraser, B. (1996). "Pragmatic Markers". Journal of Pragmatics, 6(2), 167-190 .
- González, M. (2004). Pragmatic Markers in Oral Narrative. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Halliday, M. (1985). Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.
- Holmes, J. (1988). "Sort of in New Zealand Women's and Men's Speech". Studia Linguistica, 42 (2), 85–121.
- James, A. R. (1983). "Compromisers in English". A cross-disciplinary approach to their interpersonal significance. Journal of Pragmatics, 7, 191–206.
- Lewis, D.M. (2006) ." Discourse Markers in English: a Discourse-Pragmatic View". In Fischer, K. (Ed.). Approaches to Discourse Particles. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd, 43-59.
- Müller, S. (2005). Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Östman, J.-O. (1995). "Pragmatic Particles Twenty Years After". In Wårvik, B., Tanskanen, S.-K. & R. Hiltunen (Eds.). Organization in Discourse. Proceedings from the Turku Conference. University of Turku : Finland, 95–108.
- Renkema, J. (2004). Introduction to Discourse Studies. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Scheibman, J (2002). Point of View and Grammar Structural patterns of subjectivity in American English conversation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Schourup , L. (1999). "Tutorial Overview: Discourse Markers". Lingua, 107, 227–265.
- Skerski, J. (2007). "From Prime-Time to Daytime: The Domestication of Ellen DeGeneres" . Routledge , 4, 363-381.
- Trask, R. (1993). A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics. London: Routledge.
- Wharton, T. (2009). Pragmatics and Non-Verbal Communication. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .

- **Enternet References**

https://en.wikipedia.org/wike/Interfview
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Ellen_DeGeneres_Show

The links of the interviews:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_02BeByzqPY
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nCs8k4JiZb0

الخلاصة

تعتبر المقابلات الحية كنوع أدبي في الخطاب المنطوق إذ تتضمن أساليب لغوية متعددة جديرة بالبحث وحيث يكون سياق الكلام في هذه المقابلات ذو حساسية ، ذلك لأن التفاعل بين المشاركين نشط ومباشر وبالتالي وجب إستخدام بعض التعابير لتنفيذ عددا من الوظائف منها: الإنتقال بالموضوع و تقديم موضوع جديد و إصدار تعليق شخصي بين المشتركين في أطراف المحادثة و للتعبير عن الكياسة والخ. تسمى هذه التعابير بروابط الخطاب حيث تكون هذه الروابط من فئات مختلفة و تحمل وظائف نصية (للتعبير عن الترابط المنطقي) وعملية أو قصدية (للتعبير عن موقف المتكلم و أغراض تواصلية أخرى). تعمل روابط الخطاب كأدوات ربط (تربط الجمل والفقرات) و كدلائل (تشير إلى العلاقات في الخطاب) و كذلك تعمل كمرشد (حيث تقود المشاركين إلى التفسير الدقيق للحديث) . هذه الدراسة هي دراسة تحليلية مختصة بوظائف أنواع مختلفة من روابط الخطاب في التفاعل المنطوق (المقابلات الاجتماعية).

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى: تقديم مادة نظرية عامة لأنواع مختلفة من روابط الخطاب و علاقتها ببعض في محاولة للوصول إلى إطار عمل موحد للتحليل في هذه الدراسة ، تهدف هذه الدراسة ايضا إلى معرفة تأثير و دور إختلاف سياق الكلام/المضمون على معاني ووظائف روابط الخطاب ، و أخيرا تهدف إلى عرض الوظائف المتعددة لأنواع مختلفة من روابط الخطاب في التفاعل المنطوق و خصوصا المقابلات الاجتماعية. لتحقيق هذه الأهداف افترضت الدراسة: إن السياق هو العامل الرئيسي الذي يحدد إختيار المعاني والوظائف ل روابط الخطاب، هناك انواع معينة من روابط الخطاب تستخدم بكثرة في التفاعل المباشر المنطوق ، و أخيرا تؤدي روابط الخطاب أنواع معينة من الوظائف في المقابلات الاجتماعية. فيما يخص إستنتاجات هذه الدراسة : تم تقديم السياق على إنه عامل أساسي مستقل إذ يحدد اختيار أنواع روابط الخطاب و أنواع الوظائف التي تؤديها تلك الروابط أكثر من العمل كعامل مشترك مع عوامل أخرى مثل جنس المتحدث و المسافة الاجتماعية، و فيما يخص تنوع روابط الخطاب هناك أنواع متعددة من روابط الخطاب في النماذج المحللة ، و أخيرا تؤدي روابط الخطاب وظائف نصية و قصدية في المقابلات الاجتماعية. نظرية التحليل المتبعة في هذه الدراسة هي النظرية البراغماطيقية التي استخدمها فريزر في تحليل روابط الخطاب 1996 إذ تم تطبيق النظرية على 2 مقابلات اجتماعية مختارة من سياق برنامج واحد، و إختلاف لجنس المتحدثين ، حيث تم تحليل المقابلات وفقا للنظرية المعتمدة .