DAVID CAMERON’S DISCOURSE MARKERS IN THE ANDREW MARR SHOW

A Thesis
Submitted to Letters and Humanities Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Strata One

DEWI AFRIYANTI
1110026000023

ENGLISH LETTERS DEPARTMENT
LETTERS AND HUMANITIES FACULTY
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SYARIF HIDAYATULLAH
JAKARTA
2015
ABSTRACT


This study is concerned with particular types of discourse markers (DMs). The objective of this study is to find out the discourse markers utterances used by David Cameron in the Andrew Marr show on September 28, 2014 and to identify the meaning of the whole discourse markers based on the context that was used by David Cameron in the interview.

The methodology used in this research is qualitative method. The writer gets the data by analyze each sentence and look for markers which are considered as discourse markers like conjunction, adverbs, and prepositional phrase. Then, the writer identified all markers were found in the sentence. And the last, the writer analyzes types and function of discourse markers based on Fraser’s theory.

The result of this study is that the writer finds there are 73 times for marker *and*, 17 times for markers *but* and *well*, 13 times for marker *so*, 7 times for markers *or* and *because*, 6 times for marker *you know*, 5 times for marker *now*, 4 times for marker of course, 3 times for marker *I mean*, and once for markers *likewise* and *indeed*. In this analysis the writer also found compound marker such as 2 times for *but you know*, one time for compound marker *but then*, *but now* and *then you now*. Types of discourse markers that the writer found as follows: marker of response, contrastive marker, elaborative marker, temporal marker, inferential marker, and marker of information and participation.

keywords: *Discourse analysis, discourse markers, compound markers, context.*
APPROVAL SHEET

David Cameron’s Discourse Markers in The Andrew Marr Show

A Thesis
Submitted to Letters and Humanities Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Strata One

DEWI AFRIYANTI
NIM: 1110026000023

Approved by:

Advisor I
Pita Merdeka, M.A.
NIP: 19830117 201101 2 009

Advisor II
Rima Muryantina, S.Hum., M.Ling.

ENGLISH LETTERS DEPARTMENT
LETTERS AND HUMANITIES FACULTY
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SYARIF HIDAYATULLAH
JAKARTA
2015
DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this submission in my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which to a substantial extent has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma of the university or other institute of higher learning, except where due acknowledgement has been made in the text.

Jakarta, April 27th, 2015

Dewi Afriyanti
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praise is to Allah, the Lord of the world who has authority upon all creation in the whole world. The real writer’s guide whose blessings and mercies have brought the writer until this point. Peace and salutation be upon the greatest prophet Muhammad SAW., his family, companions and adherents.

The writer would like to express her deep aptitude to her beloved parents, Ibu Yanih and Bapak Asrop whose love is unquestionable and whose struggle to give the best for their children is too fierce to be put into words. If it is not for their love and their prayers, all of their children cannot arrive at this one phase of live achievement. And also the writer does not forget to mention thanks for her beloved sister, Teteh Yoyoh whose love, encouragement, advice, and prayer always mean a great deal for the writer.

The writer especially expresses her deep sense of gratitude to her advisors, Mrs. Pita Merdeka, M.A. and Mrs. Rima Muryantra, S.Hum., M.Ling., for the time and help every point of the writer’s research with wise and consideration. Without their advice, the writer would never have finished this thesis.

The gratitude is also dedicated to:

1. Prof. Dr. Syukron Kamil, M.A., the Dean of Letters and Humanities faculty;

2. Drs. Saefudin, M.pd., the Head of English Letters Departmment;

3. Elve Oktafiyani, M.Hum., the Secretary of English Letters Department;
4. And all lecturers of English Letters Department who have sincerely taught her during her study at UIN Jakarta.

Special thanks are dedicated to all friends at English Letters Department of the year 2010, especially class B and class Linguistic A and KKN Mestakung 2013. And also the writer says thanks to Inas, Cici, Nita, Ida, Cica, Iyos, Isye, Maya, and Fadilah for their help and support.

Special thanks are also dedicated to all her best friends whose always give her support in every time; who are Sandi, Tantri, Ike, Sari, Jenyta, and Devi.

Finally the writer would like to say thank you for everyone who might not be mentioned here. Everyone who has helped, supported, and motivated her in accomplishing this thesis writing.

Jakarta, March 2015

The Writer
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT............................................................................................................. i

APPROVAL SHEET................................................................................................. ii

LEGALIZATION...................................................................................................... iii

DECLARATION....................................................................................................... iv

ACKNOWLEDGMENT............................................................................................... v

TABLE OF CONTENTS.......................................................................................... vii

CHAPTER I............................................................................................................... 1

INTRODUCTION...................................................................................................... 1

A. Background of the Study............................................................... 1
B. Focus of the Study................................................................. 4
C. Research Questions.............................................................. 4
D. Objectives of the study.......................................................... 5
E. Significance of the Study....................................................... 5
F. Research Methodology........................................................... 6
   1. Research Method.............................................................. 6
   2. Technique of Data Analysis............................................ 7
   3. Unit of Analysis.............................................................. 7
   4. The Instrument of the Research.................................... 7

CHAPTER II........................................................................................................... 8
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK…………………………………… 8

A. Previous Studies……………………………………………… 8
B. Theoretical Framework………………………………………… 10
   1. Discourse Analysis………………………………………… 10
   2. Discourse Markers………………………………………… 11
   3. Group of Discourse Markers……………………………… 14
   4. Types of Discourse Markers……………………………… 16
   5. Language, text, and context……………………………… 21
   6. Talk show…………………………………………………… 23

CHAPTER III………………………………………………………… 25

RESEARCH FINDINGS……………………………………………… 25

A. Data Description……………………………………………… 25
B. Data Analysis…………………………………………………… 30

CHAPTER IV………………………………………………………… 51

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION……………………………… 51

A. Conclusion……………………………………………………… 51
B. Suggestion……………………………………………………… 52

BIBLIOGRAPHY…………………………………………………… 53

APPENDICES……………………………………………………… 55
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

This study is concerned with discourse markers (DMs). Basically, we often hear or use words like *first, second* as numbering and ordering points; *also*, *moreover* as adding something; *and, but, or* as conjunction; *so, because* as giving cause and result; and write or say *in summary* as finishing and concluding. And all of the words called as discourse markers.

Discourse markers are the fourth and final type of pragmatic markers\(^1\). In contrast to the other pragmatic markers, DMs do not contribute to the representative sentence meaning, but only to the procedural meaning: they provide instruction to the addressed on how the utterance to which the DMs is attached is to be interpreted.

For example:

(1)  
A: John has gone home.  
B:  
a) He was sick.  
b) *After all*, he was sick.  
c) *Thus*, he was sick.  
d) *Moreover*, he was sick.  
e) *However*, he was sick.

Speaker B’s response to A’s assumption that John has gone home may take many forms. B may simply utter (1a), and leaves the addressee with no explicit lexical clues as to what relationship the utterance bears to the former,

\(^1\) Bruce Fraser, “Pragmatic Markers” *pragmatics* 6(2) (Boston University, 1996), pp. 167-190
although there may be intonational and/or contextual clues. However by using DMs, the relationship is made explicit. *After all* in (1b) signal that the utterance counts as an explanation; *thus* in (1c) signal that it counts as a conclusion using the earlier utterance as the basis; *moreover* in (1d) signal that there is something more relevant about John, in addition to his going home; and *however* in (1e) signals that contrary to what the addressed might think about when John would go home, this time John was sick.

Based on the examples above, the writer concludes that DMs used as connecting the ideas, filling a void in the sentence, and making it easier for the listener to listen the speech who delivered by a speaker. Nearly, everyone uses DMs in speech and writing, and they can be found in all languages. Discourse markers help make discourse structuring more coherent and flow better. Discourse markers can make conversation livelier, personal, and involved. Without them, conversation can be stagnant and awkward.

However, when we talk to somebody else, we produce the meaning full word that becomes the ways in communication when we convey his or her idea, intention, feeling and so on. In this case, the writer shows the way of communication which occurs between speaker 1 and speaker 2 in the interview. When speaker delivers something, he uses the term called marker of information management such as *oh*, marker of responses as like *well*, discourse connective for example *and, but, or*, marker cause and result such as *so and because*, temporal adverb as *now and then*, information and participation like *you now and I*
mean. They have an important role in signaling connectivity in discourse is how we should account for the textual unity of discourse.²

In this study, the writer will examine the transcript of The Andrew Marr Show Interview with David Cameron on September 28, 2014. Britain Prime Minister, David Cameron, talks to the BBC’s Andrew Marr ahead of the party’s annual conference in Birmingham. As someone with a high power, David Cameron more concern about the use of discourse markers when he argues. For example, when he wants to answer the questions from the presenter, he uses marker well at the beginning of utterance. Well is marker of response. Schiffrin said that the function well is to show that the speaker is thinking about the question.

Further, in the utterances by David Cameron, the writer found other types of DMs such as, contrastive markers (CDMs), elaborate markers (EDMs), inferential markers (IDMs) and also temporal markers (TDMs). The writer analyzes the markers with look at the meaning of the word procedurally. That is the relationship between the discourse segment before DMs or afterwards.

Based on the example above, the writer uses Bruce Fraser’s theory about discourse Markers (DMs). Fraser’s theoretical framework concerns the meaning of sentences, specifically how one type of pragmatic marker in a sentence may relate the message conveyed by that sentence to the message of a prior sentence. S2 [S= segment] vis-à-vis the interpretation of S1.³ They impose a relationship

---

between some aspect of discourse segment they are a part of, call it S2, and some aspect of a prior discourse segment, call it S1. In other words, their function like a two-place relation, one argument lying in the segment they introduce, the other lying in the prior discourse. Fraser represents the canonical form of discourse markers as <S1. DM+S2>.5

For addition, The Andrew Marr Show is an hour-long British television program broadcast on BBC One on Sunday mornings from 9am. It presented by Andrew Marr. The Andrew Marr averages around 2 million viewers on episode, representing a 30% audience share.6

B. Focus of the Study

This research focuses on the David Cameron’s utterances The Andrew Marr Show. The writer wants to analyze kind of discourse markers by David Cameron used when he answered the question from the presenter, Andrew Marr.

C. Research Questions

To make more convenient and simply in the research, the writer formulates the questions of the research as follow:

1. What kinds of discourse markers used by David Cameron in the Andrew Marr show?

2. How do the discourse markers contribute toward all the David Cameron’s utterances in the Andrew Marr show?

---

4 Bruce Fraser, What are Discourse Markers, Journal of Pragmatics 31 (USA: N.H ELSEVIER, 1999), pp. 931-952
5 Ibid.
6 www.bbc.co.uk
D. Objectives of the Study

Based on the research questions above, the writer has several objectives to follow:

1. To find out what kinds of discourse markers are used by David Cameron in his utterances.
2. To analyze how do discourse markers contribute toward all the David Cameron’s utterances.

E. Significance of the Study

The significance of the study is unintended to develop acknowledge of the writer itself. The writer hopes that this research would help readers who are interested in analysis of discourse markers. The aim is to know and analyze what are words identified as discourse markers. The writer chooses transcript of *The Andrew Marr Show Interview with David Cameron on September 28, 2014* because in this corpus there are many discourse markers are used by David Cameron. The writer finds the position of DMs in the sentence there are in initial and medial.

In addition in this study the writer hopes to give a beneficial contribution and relevant reference for the next researcher who will analyze the discourse markers in the transcript of talk show interview.

F. Research Methodology

1. The Method of Research

In this research, the writer uses descriptive qualitative method. Qualitative research method is in a fact a thriving discipline and while it is
true that some issues have been subject to a lot of, and sometimes heated, discussion, there exists a core set of features that would universally characterize a properly conducted qualitative study.⁷

Further, this method is using a verbal data or nonnumeric. Most of data are transformed into various types of texts from recorded interviews, documents, journals or TV program such as talk show or interview. Unlike quantitative method, this method is more subjective because it is analyzing phenomenon in daily life depend on how the researcher’s viewpoint and the aim of qualitative descriptive method is to describe the data with words. It can represent multiplicity of viewpoints and can offer support to alternative interpretations.⁸

2. The Technique of Data Collection and Analysis

The analysis of DMs is presented in stages: first, the writer will analyzes each sentence and look for markers are considered as discourse markers like conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositional phrases. Second, the writer identified all markers that were found in the sentence. And the last, the writer analyzes types and functions of DMs according to the theory of DMs.

3. The Unit of Analysis

The unit analysis of this study is in transcript of The Andrew Marr Show Interview with David Cameron, MP Conservative Leader on

---

September 28, 2014. And the writer focuses on the David Cameron’s utterances.

4. The Instrument of Research

The instrument for data collection of this study is the data card in order to write, to identify which are needed from that text. The type of instrument that the writer uses is non test instrument that is observation. Observation is an instrument used to obtain verbal data that rely on the involvement of researchers, either directly or indirectly to the object being studied.\footnote{Muhammad Farkhan, Proposal Penelitian Bahasa & Sastra Edisi Revisi (Jakarta: Adabia Press, 2011), p.30}

The writer conducts the data with his original work and gets the transcript from the website www.bbc.co.uk and chooses The Andrew Marr Show as the corpus.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Previous Studies

This research is not the only one that analyzes about discourse markers (DMs). In this section, the writer will give some previous studies that will be compared with this research. There are some previous studies that the writer found in some international online journal, those are;

The first analysis entitled *Using English Discourse Markers (EDMs) by Saudi EFL Learners* by Sadeq Ali Saad al-Yaari. Employing a corpus based on descriptive analysis, the current study attempts at detecting EDMs in the talk of Saudi EFL learners, their frequency, use, usage, etc. Method in this research is two hundreds Saudi EFL learners were randomly selected from 20 public and private schools across the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA). Subjects were individually recorded while they were studying English in class. Recordings were then linguistically and statistically analyzed by the researchers. In conclusion, EDMs and, but and also are the most frequent EDMs in the talk of Saudi EFL learners. These devices are randomly used by Saudi EFL learners who mix their use (appropriateness) with usage (correctness) due to the influence of their Arabic. In compare to other EFL learners (native-non native), Saudi EFL learners use less
EDMs. These results confirmed the claims that EFL learners use EDMs less than native speakers.\textsuperscript{10}

The second analysis entitled \textit{A Discourse Pragmatic Functional Study of The Discourse Markers Japanese Ano and Nage} by Yan Wang. This study examines the usages of Japanese DM \textit{ano} and the Mandarin Chinese DM \textit{nage} in conversational discourse, both of which are derived from demonstrative adjectives, equivalent to “that” in English. The specific focus of this study is to analyze their discourse-pragmatic functions in conversational discourse. The database used in this study includes 10 conversations by native Japanese speakers and 12 conversations by native Mandarin Chinese speakers. The data was collected in semi-natural setting. Two participants were invited to pair together to have a free form conversation without particular conversation topics assigned. The participants were aware that their conversations would be used as linguistic data, but they were not informed of the particular topic and purposes of the current research. Finally, there are 302 cases of \textit{ano} and 252 cases of \textit{nage} in natural conversations, neither ano nor nage merely serves as a verbal “filler” in utterances. This study claims that the DMs ano and nage are politeness markers as well as modality markers, and such usages are derived from their original forms as demonstrative adjectives, which reflect a close relationship between physical and psychological distance.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{10} Sadeq Ali Saad al-Yaari, \textit{Using English Discourse Markers (EDMs) by Saudi EFL Learners}, International Journal of English Language Education Vol.1, No.2, Special Issue (King Saud University, 2013), p.2

The third analysis entitled *The Function of Discourse Markers in Arabic Newspaper Opinion Articles* by Fatima A. Al-Kohlani. The main goal of this study is to identify discourse markers that are used in Arabic newspaper opinion articles and describe their function at two levels of text structure, i.e. the sentence and paragraph. The data consist of 50 Arabic newspaper opinion articles drawn from the electronic editions. Discourse markers are found to serve three main functions: continuity, refocus, and change of topic.

The difference between this research and the previous studies above is that the writer uses Fraser’s theory to know and analysis what are words identified as discourse markers.

**B. Theoretical Framework**

1. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis concerns about the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used. It can be in the form of written text and spoken data whether formal or informal. According to Brown and Yule, the analysis of discourse means the analysis of language use. Then, Schiffrin (Quoting Stubbs statement) said that discourse analysis consist of attempt to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause. Discourse analysis is

---

also concerned with language in use in the social context, and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers. Next, discourse analysis can also be defined as understand and comprehension of language and its use within conversation.  

Those theories are important since the analysis of discourse markers are parts of the analysis of discourse, and those theories many give a rounded picture to the readers before they go further to recognize what discourse markers are.

2. Discourse Markers (DMs)

Discourse markers are the fourth and final type of pragmatic markers. In contrast to the other pragmatic markers, DMs do not contribute to the representative sentence meaning, but only to the procedural meaning: they provide instruction to the addressee on how the utterance to which the DMs is attached is to be interpreted.

There are three different theoretical frameworks within which DMs are discussed. The writer has listed below the major researcher briefly indicated what their contribution is. First, Blakemore has adopted and contributed to Sperber & Wilson’s Relevance Theory (RT). She never defines DMs and in fact, maintains that they are not a coherent class of linguistic entities. Her purpose is to make a case for a clear distinction

---

17 Bruce Fraser, “Pragmatic Markers” *pragmatics* 6(2) (Boston University, 1996), pp. 167-190
between procedural and content meaning. She does not form a coherent class.

Second, Fraser places DMs within a linguistic analysis of language but takes no position on the particular grammatical theory. He defines what DMs are, how they are characterized, the functional classes into which they fall, and indicates some of their variations in patterning.19 Third, Schiffrin treats DMs from a discourse point of view, working from sociolinguistics interview, she proposes that DMs may exist on up to 5 levels of discourse, with their purpose being to increase coherence. She never defines DM although she suggests some criteria including that there may be non-verbal ones.20

According to Schiffrin, that discourse markers as sequentially dependent elements that group units of talk. Discourse markers have function in relation to enduring talk and text. In other word, that discourse markers could be considered as a set of linguistic expressions comprised to members of word classes as varied as conjunction such as and, but, or interjections such as oh, adverbs now, and then, and lexicalized phrase as like you know and I mean.21 Schiffrin also sates that provides the following definition: markers are sequentially dependent elements that bracket units

---

of talk.\textsuperscript{22} In fact, Schiffrin states the point out that: discourse markers help speakers express interactional toward each other and perform conversational moves.\textsuperscript{23}

Fraser said that discourse markers are practical markers which provide remarks on the following utterance; that is they show the way off an utterance and indicate how the speaker intends basic message to relate to the previous discourse. Therefore, discourse markers are used as pointer of chronological discourse in social interaction.\textsuperscript{24} And the important thing of the analysis on discourse markers is to know how speakers and hearers jointly integrate forms, meaning and actions to make overall sense out of what is said.\textsuperscript{25}

By using the term \textit{signal} the writer means that the DM marks a relationship between S2 and S1 which the speaker of S2 intends the hearer to recognize.\textsuperscript{26} This semantic relationship is analogous to the additive relation, $+$, having a core meaning and, in this case, two arguments, S1 and S2. A DM does not \textit{create} a relationship between two successive segments, since the relationship must already exist for the S1-DM+S2 sequence to be acceptable. For example, the \textit{but} in (2a), repeated here,

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Water freezes at 32 degrees \textbf{but} boils at 212 degrees.
  \item The movie is over, \textit{so} we might as well go directly to the party.
\end{enumerate}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{22} Deborah Schiffrin, \textit{Discourse Markers} (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1987), p.31  \\
\textsuperscript{23} Deborah Schiffrin, \textit{Discourse Markers} (Cambridge: Blackwell Publisher, 1985), p.281  \\
\textsuperscript{24} Bruce Fraser, \textit{An Approach to Discourse Markers. Journal of Pragmatics 14:383-395}, 1990  \\
\textsuperscript{25} Deborah Schiffrin, \textit{Approach to Discourse} (Cambridge: Blackwell Publisher, 1994), p.46  \\
\textsuperscript{26} Bruce Fraser, Towards a Theory of Discourse Markers (2005), pp. 8-16
\end{flushright}
c. A: Fred is a real gentleman. B: **On the contrary**, he’s a boor.

Signals that a contrast exists between S2 and S1 and the hearer is to interpret the sequence while being aware of this, while the *so* in (2b) signals that the conclusion conveyed in S2 is justified by the message conveyed in S1, and the *on the contrary* in (2c) signals disagreement of the second speaker with the message of the first.

Another variable aspect of DMs is the manner in which the DM signals that there is a relationship between S2 and S1. In (3a), where the DMs are conjunctions, the syntactic properties of the DMs require that there be two discourse segments. On the other hand, in (3b), the anaphoric *that*, which is often elided, indicates that there is a previous segment which serves as the S1 for the relationship, while in (3c), the relationship between S2 and S1 is implied by the meaning of the DM.

(3) a. Syntactic requirement: *and, although, but, or, since, so, while, whereas.*

b. Anaphoric expression: *as a consequence (of that), as a result (of that), as a result (of that), because (of that), beside that, in comparison (with that), in spite of that, instead (of that).*

c. Implied by meaning of DM: *above all, accordingly, after all, as a conclusion, likewise, more accurately, otherwise, then, therefore, thus, yet.*

3. **Group of discourse markers (DMs)**

There are four groups of DMs, such as:

A. **Contrastive Markers (CDMs)**
Signaling that the utterance following is either a denial or a contrast of some proposition associated with the preceding discourse.²⁷ For example:

(4) a. A: We can go now, children. B: **But** we haven’t finished our game yet.

b. Nick won’t go to Europe. **Instead**, he will stay in London.

c. Quinn is here. **However**, she isn’t going to stay.

The class of contrastive markers includes:

*but,* **alternatively,** *although,* **contrariwise,** *contrary to expectations,* **conversely,**
*despite* *(this/that),* **even so,** *however,* **in spite of** *(this/that),* **in comparison** *(with this/that),* **in contrast** *(to this/that),* **instead** *(of this/that),* **nevertheless,**
*nonetheless,* *(this/that point),* **notwithstanding,** *on the other hand,* **on the contrary,**
*rather** *(than this/that),* **regardless** *(of this/that),* **still,** **though,** **whereas,** **yet.**

B. Elaborative Markers (EDMs)

Signal that the utterance following constitutes a refinement of some sort on the preceding discourse.²⁸ The examples:

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

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

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

Expressions of elaborate markers include:

*and,* **above all,** *also,* **alternatively,** **analogously,** *besides,* **by the same token,**
**correspondingly,** **equally,** *for example,* **for instance,** **further**(more), **in

---

²⁷ Bruce Fraser, *Pragmatic Markers* (Boston University, 1996), p.23  
addition, indeed, in other words, in particular, likewise, more accurately, more importantly, more precisely, more to the point, moreover, on that basis, on top of it all, or, otherwise, rather, similarly, that is (to say).

C. Inferential Markers (IDMs)

There is a class of inferential DMs known as inferential markers, expressions which signal that the force of the utterance is a conclusion which follows from the preceding discourse.\(^{29}\) For example:

(6) a. John went home. **After all**, he was sick.

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

And the expressions are included:

so, after all, all things considered, as a conclusion, as a consequence (of this/that), as a result (of this/that), as a logical conclusion, because (of this/that), consequently, for this/that reason, hence, it follows that, accordingly, in this/that/any case, on this/that condition, on these/those grounds, then, therefore, thus, of course.

D. Temporal Markers (TDMs)

The expressions of temporal markers included:

then, after, as soon as, before, eventually, finally, first, immediately afterwards, meantime, meanwhile, originally, second, subsequently, when.

4. **Types of Discourse Markers**

Schiffrin categorized the DMs are six categories, such as:

\(^{29}\) *Ibid.* p.25
A. Markers of Information Management

Schiffrin believes that *oh* is used as exclamation or interjection. When it is used alone, without the syntactic support of a sentence, it indicates strong emotional states, e.g. surprise, fear or pain.\(^{30}\)

This is the example of *oh* as exclamation:

(7) Speaker 1 : Is this what you are looking for?  
Speaker 2 : *Oh!* Gesh, yes!

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

(8) Speaker 1 : *Oh*, they will know later on.  
Speaker 2 : Do not they go to the party? *Oh* maybe there are too old.

Marker of *oh* is a marker of information management covers *oh* in repair and *oh* in the status of information. *Oh* in repair can be divided into two parts, which are repair initiation and repair completion. While in information status, *oh* mark to changes, which are recognition of familiar information and the receipt of new information.\(^{31}\)

B. Markers of response

The usual dialogic identified for *well* as a discourse marker are used in the beginning of utterances which reject, cancel, or disagree with the content or tenor of the foregoing discourse. *Well* often begins turns, serves as a left hand discourse bracket. *Well* anchors its user in a conversational exchange when the options

---

\(^{30}\) Deborah Schiffrin, Discourse Markers (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1987), p.73

\(^{31}\) Ibid, p.74
offered through a prior utterance for the coherence of an upcoming response are not precisely followed.\(^{32}\) For examples:

(9) Speaker 1 : Where you would like to teach? If you have choose your favorite spot what is that?
Speaker 2 : Uh, \textit{well} I like Japan.

C. Markers of Connective

The word \textit{and} is used to coordinate ideas and to continue a speaker’s action in spoken language, it is considered as marker when it connects narrative sections, action or turns. However, \textit{and} is not considered as a marker when it connects nouns (e.g. John and sue went to the beach) and verb phrases (e.g. John went to the beach and swam in the ocean) since the conjoined units in such cases were not discourse units but clause internal constituents.\(^{33}\) This example for \textit{and} markers:

(10) Speaker: I go on trips with ‘em, I bring ‘em here, we have supper, or dinner here, \textit{and} I don’t see any problem because I’m workin’ with college graduates.

The word \textit{but} is a coordinator like \textit{and}, but it has different pragmatic effect. It marks an upcoming unit as contracting actions. \textit{But} does not coordinate functional units unless there is some contrastive relationships in an either their ideational or interaction content. Many use of \textit{but} could be interpreted as speaker’s efforts to return to prior concern of making a point.\(^{34}\) For example:

(11) Speaker: We started everything, and we’re – we’re infidels? We’re pagans? Where does that come off? That does not add up! *But* in my father’s house, we were not taught hate.

The marker *or* (as a coordinator like *and* and *but*) is used as an option marker. This would mean that *or* is exclusive since there is only one member of the disjunct can hold. Besides, *or* can also be inclusive since either one member or both members of the disjunct can hold. Schiffrin states that *or* is an inclusive option marker in discourse because it provides recipients with a choice between accepting only one member of a disjunct, and both members of a disjunct. It is said that *or* is fundamentally different from *and* and *but* since it is not a marker of a speaker’s action toward this own talk, but of a speaker’s desire for a recipient to take action. Speaker’s desire for recipient to take action, in this case, means giving the recipient a choice of ideas and in daily conversation or could promote an interaction response. For example:

(12) Speaker: Its how there’s an economic situation then they use race. *Or* they use nationally, *or* anti Semitism, *or* what have you.

D. Markers of Cause and Results

*So* and *because* can mark idea units, information states and action. They have semantic meanings, which are realized at both sentence and discourse levels. *Because* conveys meaning of course or event, and *so* conveys a meaning of result. A fact-based casual relation between *cause* and *result* hold between idea units,

---

such as between the events, states and so on. The following example will show a fact-based relation marked by *so* and *because*.\(^{36}\) For example:

(13) Speaker: Well we were going up to see our son to night, but we’re not seeing the younger one’s gonna come for dinner *because* he’s working in the neighborhood. *So* that’s out.

E. **Markers of Temporal Adverb**

*Now* and *then* are time deictic because they convey a relationship between the time at which a proposition is assumed to be true, and the time at which it is presented in an utterance. Before we go further, let us discuss about the different between reference time and event time first. Referent time refers to the deictic relationship between proposition and it speaking time.\(^{37}\) For example:

(14) Speaker 1: Ok. I can see that I’ve convinced you. *Now* go find the next random bad guy who will advance the plot.\(^{38}\)

Speaker 2: Reaching the shore, he dumps Bond Girl in the arms of a puzzled looking guy with a sailor costume of some sort, *then* goes back to follow the Evil Mastermind. He tracks him back to a private jet that is about to take off.\(^{39}\)

F. **Markers of Information and Participation**

Schiffrin believes that the basic meaning of *I mean* is to forewarn upcoming adjustments. Unlike *um* and *uh* which represent pauses, the term *you know* does not represent natural pauses in speech. Marker *you know* is cognitively

---


\(^{38}\) Doval Diego, *the_quantum_of_solace_script_a.html*. 3006 2014

\(^{39}\) *Loc.cit.*
processed and used by speaker. Marker *you know* encourages addressed to think about the comprehensibility of what has just be said.\(^{40}\) This is example of *I mean* and *you know*:

(15) Speaker: How do you get on with this fellow hart? *I mean* he is a nice fellow normally, but he is a hell of a big head in some ways *you know* Reynard.

However, discourse markers serve important purpose in conversation since they are used to indicate whether one is ready to speak or want to keep speaking and to show how one responds to what someone has just said. Thus, if we succeed in learning to recognize discourse markers, we will be able to guess more accurately, what another person is trying to say.\(^{41}\)

5. **Language, text, and context**

The word *context* in English has meaning *con-text*; that is to say the word and sentence before and after the particular sentence that one is looking at. Malinowski needed a term that expressed the total environment, including the verbal environment, but also including the situation in which the text is uttered.\(^{42}\) The general notion of context of situation is as necessary for the understanding of English or any major language.

The activities that people are engaging in may differ from one place or one time to another; but the general principle that all language must be understood in

---


\(^{41}\) M. Hoey, *Spoken Discourse: Discourse Markers oh, well, and like* (2008), p.50

its context of situation is just as valid for every community in every stage of development. In London University, Malinowski has young colleague the linguist J.R. Firth, who subsequently became the first professor of general linguistics in a British University.

Firth’s description of context of situation:  

1. **The field of discourse** refers to what is happening, to the nature of the social action that is taking place: what is it that the participants are engaged in, in which the language figures as some essential component? 

2. **The tenor of discourse** refers to who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statuses and roles; what kinds of the relationship obtain among the participants including permanent and temporary relationship of one kind or another, both the types of speech role that they are taking on in the dialogue and the whole cluster of socially significant relationship in which they are involved? 

3. **The mode of discourse** refers to what part the language is playing, what it is that the participant are expecting the language to do for them in that situation: the symbolic organization of the text, the status that it has, and its function in the context, including the channel (spoken or written) and also the rhetorical mode, what is being achieved by the text in term of such categories as persuasion, expository, didactic, and the like.

These concepts serve to interpret the social context of a text, the environment in which meanings are being exchanged.

---

43 Ibid, p.6
44 M.A.K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, op.cit, p.10
6. **Talk show**

A talk show or chat show (as it is known in the UK) is a television programming or radio programming genre in which one person or group of people discusses various topics put forth by a talk show host.\(^{45}\)

There are several major formats of talk shows. Generally, each subgenre predominates during a specific programming block during the broadcast day.

- **Breakfast chat or early morning shows** that generally alternate between news summaries, political coverage, feature stories, celebrity interviews, and musical performances.
- **Late morning chat shows** that feature two or more hosts or a celebrity panel, and focus on entertainment and lifestyle features.
- **Daytime talk shows**, generally featuring a host, a guest or a panel of guests, and a live audience that interacts extensively with the host and guests.
- **“Lifestyle” or “self-help” programs**, which generally feature a host or hosts who are medical practitioners, therapist, or counselors, and guests who seek intervention, describe medical or psychological problems.
- **Late-night talk shows** that feature celebrity guest who talk about their work and personal lives as well as the their latest films, tv shows, or other projects they’d like to promote to the public. The hosts are often comedians who open the shows.

---

\(^{45}\) Brian Stelter (September 30, 2010), *Anderson Cooper to Host Daytime Talk Show* in [www.wikipedia.org](http://www.wikipedia.org)
- Sunday talk show or political discussion shows are a staple of network programming in North America. These shows feature elected political figures and candidates for office, journalist, and commentators.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH FINDINGS

A. Data Description

In the previous chapter, the writer has explicated the theory of discourse markers according to Fraser’s theory. Based on the explanation in the previous chapter, in this chapter the writer will analyze about what are discourse markers types and function in the corpus and to explain about how contribute the discourse markers in the utterances.

This chapter contains the data that will be analyzed from The Andrew Marr Show Interview with David Cameron, MP Conservative Leader on September 28, 2014. The writer uses method of qualitative descriptive research to collect the data and need the data card to categorizing the data before write it into the table. And here are the steps:

1. The writer watch and download the video of interview via https://www.youtube.com;
2. The writer download the interview transcription from www.bbc.co.uk;
3. The writer reads the whole transcription while watching the video;
4. The writer write down the transcript into data card, then categorizing the types and function that contain in the data. And the data card contains the number of data, the classification of types and function.

The writer finds there were 56 dialogues in the text. And only 25 data that will be analyzed by the writer because the others data there are no DMs. The
presenter in the corpus is Andrew Marr, and the speaker that the writer analyzes is David Cameron.

All of details of the data found are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dialogues</th>
<th>Markers</th>
<th>Number of frequency</th>
<th>Group of markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Dialogue 2</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dialogue 3</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Then</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Temporal marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likewise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Dialogue 6</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indeed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Of course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Marker of information and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Dialogue 8</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dialogue 9</td>
<td>Because</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Of course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of information and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Dialogue 10</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of information and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Then</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Temporal marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Of course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 11</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 13</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of information and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 14</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But you know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Compound marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 15</td>
<td>But you know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Compound marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mark of information and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 18</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 19</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But I mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Compound marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Temporal marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But then</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Compound marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 23</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contrastive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 25</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Temporal marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 30</td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Temporal marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 31</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of information and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 33</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marker of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 34</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 36</td>
<td>Because</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contrastive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferential marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue 40</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elaborative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Dialogue 42</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So</td>
<td>But now</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Dialogue 48</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Dialogue 49</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Dialogue 52</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Dialogue 55</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Of course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td>Then you know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Dialogue 56</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You know</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of the analyzed discourse markers in the corpus is that discourse markers contribute all the utterances, such as:

Marker *and* is used 73 times. In the text above, and is used to precede support units of talk through explanation and also it indicates a speaker’s continuation. To introduce further explanation, the speaker depends on using specific markers to achieve his aim. The using of marker *but* in the text indicates that what follows it contrast with what precedes it. It used 17 times.

Marker *well* is used 17 times. The speaker uses this marker exclusively at the beginning of the utterance. Starting a turn with marker *well* sets up expectation.
that the speaker is about to disagree with or correct information, either implicit or explicit, from the prior turn.

The writer also finds marker *then*. The speaker uses this marker as a sign of moving towards a new step or an event in future and they are also considered as announcement markers which refer forward to future sections in the text. The marker *then* is used 2 times.

To indicate cause and result of events, the markers *so* and *because* are used. Both markers contribute the coherence of discourse by signaling relations between discourse units. the marker *because* is used by the speaker to indicate a relation of cause and result while *so* is used to indicate a relation of premise and conclusion and also indicating a result and to establish a causal link among events. The marker *because* is used 7 times, while *so* is used 13 times.

The marker *now* is used 5 times. It refers to some events and relates them to each other. In this respect the use of marker *now* indicates temporal relationship between units of talk. Moreover the marker *now* is used to make a shift among different ordered events and refer to what will happen next.

The marker *you know* is used as marker of meta-knowledge about what speakers and hearers share and what is generally known. It is also used to indicate a situation in which the speaker knows that the hearer shares some knowledge about a particular piece of information. And marker *you know* is used 6 times.
The discourse marker *I mean* is used when the speaker re-state things to make them clearer. And it used 3 times. Marker *indeed* used when we need to make a stronger statement of something and to show that you agree with a previous statement. It used once.

Marker *of course* used by speaker for 4 times. And it is used indicate to refers to things that are obvious known. The writer also finds marker *likewise*. And it used once. The function is signal that the utterance following constitutes a refinement of some sort on the preceding discourse. The marker *or* it used 7 times. The function of *or* in the text is the speaker’s desire for recipient to take action, in this case means giving the recipient a choice of ideas.

**B. Data Analysis**

1. Data 1 (dialogue 2)

ANDREW MARR:
The big story of the morning really is still Iraq. General Richards, like many people in that very interesting House of Commons debate this week, have picked up on the fact that you can’t defeat ISIL (or whatever we call them) without pushing into Syria. It can’t just be done in Iraq alone. That’s true, isn’t it?

DAVID CAMERON:
That is true and we’re not trying to defeat ISIL from the air alone. We believe you do need troops on the ground, but they should be Iraqi troops, they should be Kurdish troops. We are part of a large international coalition to degrade and ultimately destroy this organisation, but it can’t be done unless the countries where this organisation has grown up play their part in destroying it.

In this data above, the writer finds markers *and* and *but*. The context in the utterance is Cameron said that troops on the ground were needed but insisted they must not be British one. Marker *and* in the
utterance indicate to precede support units of talk through explanation and also it indicates a speaker’s continuation.

Marker *but*, it is usually used as coordinator like *and*, and both of them have different pragmatic effect. It marks upcoming unit as contracting action. The DM *but* used by Cameron when he communicates with Marr about ISIL and how he can not defeat it. With marker *but*, Cameron said:

```
S1          DM          S2
We believe you do need troops on the ground, *but* they should be Iraqi troops, they should be Kurdish troops.
```

The writer concludes that the DM *but* has meaning of suggestion. Because by saying *…but they should be…* (see the text above), it indicates that Cameron has suggestion and reason about troops that we really needed.

Where, S1 consist of common sentence and S2 consist of specific sentence.

And the writer also finds *but* in other sentences when Cameron talks about how to destroy ISIL. With marker *but* Cameron wants to explain that reason why we can not defeat ISIL. And the sentence is follow:

```
S1
We are part of a large international coalition to degrade and ultimately destroy this organisation.
DM          S2
*but* it can’t be done unless the countries where this organisation has grown up play their part in destroying it.
```

In other words, the writer concludes that DM *but* is contrastive marker. Where, the function of DM is signal that the speaker intends the
explicit message conveyed by S2 to contrast with an explicit or indirect message conveyed by S1.

2. Data 2 (dialogue 3)

ANDREW MARR:
You told the House of Commons interestingly two things: you said that you wouldn’t go into Syria, we wouldn’t attack in Syria without another motion, without returning to the Commons; but you also said that you reserved the right to order attacks if there were some terrible humanitarian disaster that needed to be dealt with very quickly. Now if ISIL are pushed into Syria, we could very quickly see a humanitarian crisis there, so is it the case that you could order the RAF as part of the coalition into Syria without another vote?

DAVID CAMERON:
Well the point I was making didn’t just apply to Iraq or Syria. Frankly it applied to anywhere in the world. If as prime minister I feel there is a humanitarian disaster about to happen that Britain either alone or with partners could do something to avert, then it would be right to order that before going to the House of Commons because there wouldn’t be time. Likewise if there’s some unique British interest, some hostage situation, some unique British interest where you had to order action very quickly, I would always be prepared to do that first and explain to the House of Commons afterwards. I was trying to say to the House of Commons it’s important that this convention that’s grown up of a vote before premeditated action, I believe that’s right, but that doesn’t mean a government shouldn’t act if there’s something it needs to act urgently over.

The writer finds there are seven DMs in the utterance. The context in the utterance is that Cameron wants to give the argument perceive the Marr’s question. Actually he disagree with the Marr’s argument, so with marker well, he opens the statement. Cameron uses marker well to let himself think about the event and to anchor the listener on what is about to come, that is a change his plans and decisions to start a risky action.

The other markers that exist in the utterance contribute to support his utterance. For example, the writer finds markers then and because in
the utterance. Marker *then* is time deictic. Cameron uses this marker as a sign of moving towards a new step or an event in future and they are also considered as announcement markers which refer forward to future sections in the text. And marker *because* used to showing the causes between two segments in the sentence.

Marker *or* indicate the speaker’s desire for recipient to take action, in this case means giving the recipient a choice of ideas. Marker *likewise* indicates that signal the utterance following constitutes a refinement of some sort on the preceding discourse. The context is that Cameron wants to continue the argument in preceding discourse and both segments are still coherence. And for marker *and*, indicates that is as connector verb phrase. And marker *but* in the utterance indicates the contracting actions.

3. Data 3 (dialogue 6)

ANDREW MARR:
Okay now one of the other things that was talked about, again in the General Richards interview but again in the House of Commons as well by people like George Galloway, is that ISIL are not like an army. They don’t have barracks, they don’t have columns of tanks you can hit from the air. They sit inside the population; they hide themselves where civilians are quite deliberately. And that, therefore, an air campaign is bound to kill lots of civilians by accident without necessarily degrading ISIL as much as you hope.

DAVID CAMERON:
Well I don’t accept that *because* there are occasions, *indeed* there have been occasions when ISIL are out in the open threatening Christian communities, Yazidi communities, other Muslim communities, and they can be struck and stopped, and that’s exactly what’s happened you know close to where the Kurdish lines are and elsewhere. *But* if what you’re saying is we need, if you like, an uprising of the Sunni tribes rejecting these extremists and saying we want to be part of a democratic, pluralistic Iraq, yes of course we do need that. *And* that’s why you know our strategy here is not some simplistic you know drop a bomb from 40,000 feet and think you can solve the problem. It isn’t. This is one part of a comprehensive strategy to build an Iraq that has a democratic inclusive government for everyone and in time Syria needs exactly the same thing.
In this data, the speaker uses marker *well* again in the beginning of his utterance. And it indicates disagreement with the preceding discourse or the presenter’s argument. The context in the utterance is Cameron hit back at critics such as respect MP. George Galloway who have warned that the nature of the ISIL position mean many civilians will be killed.

With marker *indeed*, Cameron wants to make a stronger statement from the utterance before in data 3, *…there are occasions, indeed there have been occasions…*. And to encourage what he says, Cameron uses marker *you know* in the middle of his argument. When he uses marker *of course*, it indicates that the things that are obvious or already known.

4. Data 4 (dialogue 8)

**ANDREW MARR:**
There are three possible armies involved on the ground. There’s the Peshmerga who are defending their own territory in Kurdistan; there’s the Iraqi Army who have been frankly pretty useless so far and have run away most of the time; and there’s the Free Syrian Army which, as George Galloway said, barely exists. So who are these boots going to be?

**DAVID CAMERON:**
*Well* in both cases, in Iraq *and* in Syria, we need to build up the forces that are moderate, democratic *and* pluralistic. In Iraq what we need is an Iraqi government *and* Iraqi armed forces that represent the whole country – Sunni, Shia *and* Kurd. In Syria what we need is we do back the Free Syrian Army *and* the Syrian National Opposition *because* they are the legitimate forces in Syria, *but* it’s going to take time in Syria for them to be built up as a counterpoint to the regime. What’s required in Syria, sometimes … (Marr tries to interject) Ian Birrell was saying earlier that the government’s policy is somehow contradictory. It isn’t. The same thing in Syria is needed as in Iraq, which is a government that can represent all of the people. *So* you need a transition in Syria from the brutal dictator Assad whose action has helped to build up ISIL, *and* you need to replace that with a government that can represent all of its people.
In data 8, the writer finds there are four DMs. In the first utterance, Cameron uses marker *well*. *Well* in this utterance is different with *well* the utterances in dialogue 3 and 6. *Well* in this utterance indicate that Cameron unable to answer the question directly. He gives the statement and argument before answer the question.

When Cameron uses marker *and* in his utterance, the writer concludes that marker *and* is as connector. Like in the sentence, *in Iraq and in Syria; democratic and pluralistic; Shia and Kurd*, marker *and* contribute just as connect two prepositions, adjective and noun. But marker *and* in the sentence, *So you need a transition in Syria from the brutal dictator Assad whose action has helped to build up ISIL, and you need to replace that with a government that can represent all of its people*, contribute to continue his action and idea.

After Cameron gives the statement and argument to answer the question, then he makes the conclusion with marker *so*. Marker *so* used to indicate a relation of premise and conclusion and also indicating a result and to establish a causal link among events.

5. Data 5 (dialogue 9)

**ANDREW MARR:**
Absolutely, but you also need an army in Syria which can defeat ISIL, and the army in Syria that can defeat ISIL, the only organised army really left standing is Assad’s army. Are we now on the point of having to do a deal with the devil, as it were, to get rid of something worse?
DAVID CAMERON:  
No we’re not because Assad is part of the problem, not part of the solution. His brutality against his own people is one of the things that has been a massive recruiting sergeant for ISIL, so what we need in Syria is to build up the legitimate opposition, to go on with the diplomatic efforts alongside that, to have a transition in Syria from Assad to a new government that can represent the whole people. Of course that has to include Alawites, even prominent Alawites, so that Alawite and Sunni, Christian and other minorities in Syria can all feel they are part of the government. I thought when … You know Ban Ki-moon used this phrase of look “a missile can kill a terrorist, but it is good governance that will kill terrorism”. That is our policy.

In the utterance above, the writer finds discourse markers because and so. First, markers because and so in the utterance mark the idea units, information states, and actions. Marker because conveys a meaning of event and so conveys a meaning of result. With marker of course, it refers to thing that are obvious known between he and the presenter. And after that Cameron uses marker you know to give the conclusion and it contribute to encourage addressee to think about the comprehensibility of what he has just said.

6. Data 6 (dialogue 10)

ANDREW MARR:  
Quite right. Okay now again in the House of Commons you were asked about British boots on the ground and you said look if a helicopter lands and needs to be refuelled, there’ll be British people refuelling that helicopter. What about the Iraqi government and the Iraqi army? We’re giving them lots of new kit. Don’t we have to give them advisers and help in how to use that? Won’t there be logistic aspects of that as well? Aren’t there British boots on the ground even if inside the boots there aren’t actually combat troops?

DAVID CAMERON:  
Well they’re already … I mean we already have, whether it is in Baghdad or whether it is in the Kurdish regional authority, we have people there who are helping and advising and assisting - not in huge numbers - but if we’re trying to build up these forces, then yes of course we have to help
them. The expression I use very clearly is what we’re not having is some British invading army of combat troops on the ground. I think that’s very important …

Again, Cameron uses *well* in the first utterance. And after that he uses marker *I mean* to continue his utterance. In this context, Cameron uses marker *I mean* to re-state things to make them clearer. And it used to forewarn upcoming adjustment in the sentence. Marker *and* in the utterance indicates as connector the verb in the continuing his action.

The writer also finds there are markers *but* and *then* in the sentence

```
DM    S1    S2
but if we're trying to build up these forces, then yes of course we have to help them.
```

marker *but* indicates that there is contraction actions between segment (S) 1 and S2. And for marker *then* considered as announcement markers which refer forward to future sections in the text.

7. Data 7 (dialogue 11)

ANDREW MARR: (over) We could have, for instance, special forces trying to get hostages out of terrible situations?

**DAVID CAMERON:** Well we never talk about …

In this data, the writer finds marker *well* in the beginning of Cameron’s utterance. Cameron wants to give a clarification about the hostage.
ANDREW MARR:
You see a lot of your critics will say this is the problem. It starts with air power, it starts with advisers, and then – like Vietnam – it escalates. You get sucked in, and you’re sucked into something which may be the right war to be fighting, certainly the right enemy to be fighting, but nonetheless you don’t know where it’s going to end and you don’t know how deeply we’re going to be drawn in. However much you at the moment don’t want to be drawn in further, the logic of the war is that we will be.

DAVID CAMERON:
Well in a way that’s an argument for sort of never doing anything. And I think look when you face a situation with psychopathic terrorist killers in Syria and Iraq, who have already you know brutally beheaded one of our own citizens, who have already launched and tried to execute plots in our own country to kill and maim innocent people, you’ve got a choice. We can either stand back from all this, as Galloway and others would say, and say this is too difficult, it’s too complicated, let’s let someone else try and keep our country safe, or we take the correct decision to say let’s have a full, comprehensive strategy, but let’s be prepared to play our role to make sure these people cannot do us harm.

In this data, the writer finds markers well, and, you know, but. All markers here are to make the utterance more coherent exactly. And for marker or in this data, indicates that Cameron’s desire for recipient to take action, in this case means giving the recipient a choice of ideas.
DAVID CAMERON:
Well I have a lot of sympathy with that view, which is why I’ve said we support what the Americans and the five Arab nations have done in Syria. We have a Syria strategy, which is to build up the Free Syrian Army, the Syrian National Coalition to achieve a political transition in Syria. But you know I wanted to take to the House of Commons a proposal that I could achieve consensus for to make sure Britain was playing her role in this coordinated action across both countries.

The context in this data is Cameron uses marker well in the beginning of his utterance to add a comment to something or introduce a story we want to tell. And then in this data the writer finds compound markers in the utterance. By means of compound markers the speaker moves from one of these contextual realms to the another easily, segmenting and at the same time narrowing down and facilitating the possible inference and presuppositions.46

The writer concludes that, Cameron uses but to indicate that there is something contrast with the preceding discourse in the text. And with marker you know he wants to show the hearer something important and new expectation and also explain what are contrast.

10. Data 10 (dialogue 15)

ANDREW MARR:
Got it. Let’s turn to the Conservative Party conference. Did you have any idea that Mark Reckless was about to do what he’s just done?

DAVID CAMERON:
Not specifically, but you know he’s always been someone who … I mean he very rarely votes for the government and has made his views known. Look these things are frustrating and frankly they are counterproductive and rather senseless. If you want to have a European referendum, if you want to have immigration control, if you want to get the deficit down, if

---

46 Andrea Tyler, Yiyoun Kim, Mari Takada, Language in the Context of Use (New York: 2008), p. 58
you want to build a stronger Britain that we can be proud of, there is only one option and that is to a …

In this data the writer finds Cameron uses compound markers in the first utterance. With markers *but you know*, Cameron used it to open contrast statement, to continue and to make it clear the statement. Then Cameron uses marker *I mean*. It means that at the same time he wants to introduce a comment that he thinks is informative.

11. Data 11 (dialogue 18 &19)

ANDREW MARR:
(over) Before we do, Douglas Carswell, who was a great supporter of yours, why do you think you’re losing these kind of people?

DAVID CAMERON:
Well you’d have to ask them, but it is …

ANDREW MARR:
Well they say because you’re not a proper Conservative in the end.

DAVID CAMERON:
Well I disagree with that. *But I mean* in the end it is counterproductive. Douglas Carswell and Mark Reckless are both people who actually, unlike me, they want to leave the European Union no matter what. *Now* I don’t agree with that, I think we should have a real go at reform to get a better deal for Britain. *But then* there is this promise and it’s a complete and clear promise of an in/out referendum by the end of 2017. *So* even if you don’t agree with my renegotiation strategy, I am the only prime minister who is going to give you the chance to have a vote to stay in or get out of the European Union, and that’s why I say it’s so counterproductive and senseless.

With marker *well* in the beginning of the utterance, indicate that Cameron disagree with Marr’s argument. And with compound markers *but I mean*, Cameron wants to give contracting action and at the same time to introduce a comment that he thinks is informative. The writer also found compound markers *but then*. The function of marker *but* that is as
conjunction which have negative value, because it marker connect time deictic now and then. And to close his utterance, Cameron uses marker so to give the conclusion or the result what he says before.

12. Data 12 (dialogue 23)

ANDREW MARR:
Okay. So you can do things about benefits, but you can’t do anything about the free movement of peoples inside the EU and that won’t be part of your negotiating stance?

DAVID CAMERON:
Well that is one of the things that I think particularly worries people and concerns me – that, as I say, the right to go and work in France or Spain or Spanish people to come and do a job that has been advertised here, that is one thing; but it’s a completely different thing to be able to go to claim benefits, actually even to work in Britain, but to send your benefits home to your families that stay in your home countries. All of those things need to be addressed.

The context in the text is that Cameron uses marker well in the first utterance. The function of well is to let himself think about the event and to anchor the listener on what is about to come, that is a change his planes and decisions to start a risky action. As we know markers and and or are elaborative marker. Elaborative marker is signal that the utterance following constitutes a refinement of some sort on the preceding discourse.

13. Data 13 (dialogue 25)

ANDREW MARR:
Are you determined that we will stay inside the EU?

DAVID CAMERON:
Well I’m determined we’ll do the right thing for Britain. Now I’ve set out very clearly…

The context of this utterance is that Cameron wants to explain about his plans and with marker well he starts the utterance. Then,
Cameron uses marker *now* to indicate the time deictic. The marker *now* is used to make a shift among different ordered events and refer to what will happen next.

14. Data 14 (dialogue 30)

ANDREW MARR:
(over) But also they want to know what is your base position. You go there and you negotiate and if you don’t get everything you want, you say to the British people “Okay I haven’t got the deal. We should leave Europe” and, like many of your colleagues, you say there is a future for Britain outside Europe. It might be bumpy but in the end it’ll be fine. Or you’re determined to stay in Europe basically, in which case it’s much harder to get that negotiation successfully concluded.

DAVID CAMERON:
But here’s the point. When you’re going into a negotiation, I think you should set out what you want to achieve. And also I want the 27 other countries in Europe to see that there is a plan here that with reform can end with a reformed European Union and a reformed relationship with Britain and Britain staying in. I want them to see that that is the goal. Now, as I say, if I don’t achieve that, it will be for the British public to decide whether to stay in or to get out.

In data 30, the writer finds there are three DMs. First, Cameron uses *but* in the beginning of his utterance. It means that there is something contrast that he conveys. And the position of marker *but* is in the initial position of first segment. Second, Cameron wants to continue his ideas with marker *and*. The context is he explains what he wants about a negotiation. And the last, the writer finds marker *now*. The marker now that Cameron uses, it indicates that to make a shift among different ordered events and refer to what will happen next.
ANDREW MARR:
Are there any circumstances which you would go to the British people and say “I David Cameron – not Boris Johnson, not Nigel Farage – I, David Cameron, recommend that we leave the EU”?

DAVID CAMERON:
Well I’ve said this all my political life. I’ve said if I thought that it wasn’t in Britain’s interest to be in the European Union, I wouldn’t argue for us to be in it. I mean I believe … I’m a deeply patriotic politician and person. I do this job because I love my country, I care passionately about its future and I want it to be a strong, proud, self-governing, independent nation. Yes working with other European countries on trade and cooperation, maximising our influence in the world so we can do the best for our people in the world. That is what drives me.

The context in this data, Cameron wants to make clear about what the presenter asked to him. After he uses marker well in the first argument than he uses marker I mean to introduce a comment that he thinks is informative. And for marker because, it conveys meaning of cause and result.

ANDREW MARR:
If you don’t.

DAVID CAMERON:
Well I think the British public want someone who is absolutely determined to deliver for them a better future in Europe. But in the end, I don’t decide. They decide.

In data 16, the writer finds markers well and but. The context in the text is that Cameron uses of well in the first utterance. The function of well is to, first, let himself to think about the event and second, to anchor the listener on what is about to come, that is a change his plans. And marker but in this data indicate the contracting the action of the speaker.
ANDREW MARR:
Alright. Let’s move onto something else that you said recently, which was right at the end of the Scottish vote, you came onto the street of Downing Street and you said that English devolution should happen at the same pace as and in tandem with Scottish devolution. Do you still agree with that?

DAVID CAMERON:
Yes, absolutely. Let me be clear. We must keep our vows and we will keep our vows to the people of Scotland that they will have a stronger Scottish Parliament with stronger powers over taxation, over welfare, over spending. That will happen. And that agreement we set out was no … it was nothing … it wasn’t even a new departure for the Conservative Party because we have already signed up to plans for that, but what I’ve said is with a Conservative Government, with me in No. 10 Downing Street, you don’t just get Scottish devolution; you get properly English votes for English laws – the English question properly answered, so that MPs in Scotland … sorry MPs in Wales and Northern Ireland and in England get these rights in the way that the Scots now have.

In the text above, Cameron uses marker and to continue his idea and action. And further analysis, in the utterance the writer finds marker because. Marker of because indicate for explication and it shows a connection between the information contained in preceding discourse. And after use marker because, Cameron continue his action that contrast with marker but.

ANDREW MARR:
… and Ed Miliband will fall out and between you the Scottish thing won’t be delivered.

DAVID CAMERON:
No, no, we may well fall out over this issue of England because I don’t think Labour have got an answer to this question. We, the Conservatives, do have an answer. It was in our 2001 manifesto, it was in our 2005 manifesto, it was in the last manifesto as well. But be in no doubt, as
prime minister I will deliver both. **So** you’ll have a choice really. You can have Ed Miliband and have Scottish devolution …

The marker *because* indicate for explication and it shows a connection between the information contained in the sentence. And marker *because* also as marker of clarification issue. And then Cameron uses marker *but* in the middle of his utterance, it means that he wants to suggest about his reason. The last Cameron uses marker *so*, it indicates to make a result what he says before.

19. Data 19 (dialogue 40)

**ANDREW MARR:** Okay that’s very clear. Thank you very much indeed for that. And speaking of which, do you now favour an English Parliament as such and where would it sit?

**DAVID CAMERON:** No I don’t. I don’t think … Look I think the last thing frankly this country wants is another expensive parliament building with another expensive group of politicians with salaries and expenses and all the rest of it. That is not what we’ll be proposing. I think it is perfectly possible to make changes in the Westminster Parliament, *so* that when issues that are exclusively about England or England and Wales are addressed, we can find voting arrangements to reflect that. **And** we need to do that obviously not just in terms of what happens with English laws, **but** if the Scots are going to have – as we believe they should – the right to set income tax rates, you need arrangements in the UK Parliament, in the Westminster Parliament to make sure that there’s fairness there as well. **So** these plans are being worked out by William Hague. Either *there* will be an outbreak of good sense by my political opponents and cross-party consent. I doubt it. I suspect it will be the Conservative Party …

Cameron uses so many marker *and* here. And to conclude what he says in preceding discourse, Cameron uses marker *so*. And the other marker that he uses that is *but*. The marker *but* signals that Cameron intends the explicit message conveyed by S2 to contrast with an explicit or
indirect message conveyed by S1. And in the final of his utterance, Cameron back to uses marker so to give the result and conclusion from he says.

20. Data 20 (dialogue 42)

ANDREW MARR: Now your big announcement this morning is about using money from welfare cuts to boost the number of apprenticeships. Can I ask you, you’re cutting the welfare cap to £23,000. What evidence do you have that lots of families are going to be able to cope with £3,000 less?

DAVID CAMERON: Well what we’ve found with the welfare cap is it’s been a policy that has worked and worked very well. A lot of people said when we said we’re going to cap families at £26,000, people said this would cause chaos, families would have to move across the country, it won’t work. Actually what has happened is that a lot of those families have gone into work, have found a job, and actually it’s been a policy that has helped to help them with their lives. I think all the evidence is that the cap is too loose, particularly in some parts of the country, so bringing it down to £23,000 saves money, will mean more families getting into work. And what I want to see, the plan we have for Britain, is to spend less on welfare and more on helping people into work. So we’re going to use that money to pay for 3 million apprentices in the next parliament. This is after the last four years where we’ve seen 1.8 million more people get into work, our deficit come down, our economy turned round. As you were saying earlier, we’ve now got the fastest growth of any major country in the West. We’ve had a successful economic plan, but now is the time to turn that plan into a plan for every family in our country to give them the security and the peace of mind that they want. I want people to see that with a Conservative Government they’ll get the chance of a good job …

The context in the utterance is that Cameron uses marker well to start his argument. Then, Cameron uses marker and o continue his ideas and actions. And in the final he uses marker so to give the conclusion. In this data, the writer finds again compound markers but now. There are two markers turn up together when start the utterance. By means of compound markers the speaker moves from one of these contextual realms to another
easily, segmenting and at the same time narrowing down and facilitating the possible inference and presuppositions.

21. Data 21 (dialogue 48)

ANDREW MARR:
(over) Forty-eight per cent of these people … 48 per cent of these people have children, so my question to you is: are you not going to put – I mean for the best possible motives no doubt – but put a large section of the young population of the country into dire poverty quite quickly with this?

DAVID CAMERON:
We’re not talking about those people with children. This is about single people aged 18 to 21 who at the moment you can leave home, sign on, get housing benefit, get your own flat and start a life of dependency. Now that is no life at all and no future for your children when you do have them. So we’re saying save that money, make sure that after 6 months every one of those young people has to be in a job or in training, and use the savings to provide 3 million apprentices. And here’s the real point. We were talking earlier …

When Cameron uses marker now, it refers to some events and relates them to each other. In this respect the use of marker now indicates temporal relationship between units of talk. Moreover the marker now is used to make a shift among different ordered events and refer to what will happen next. And after that to make sure the conclusion of result, Cameron uses marker so.

22. Data 22 (dialogue 49)

ANDREW MARR:
(over) And their parents essentially have to support them.

DAVID CAMERON:
… we were talking earlier about immigration. If we want to solve the problem of immigration, the other side of the coin is education and welfare. We need an education system that educates young people so they
can take the jobs that are becoming available – and they are becoming available – and we need a welfare system that prioritises work. Now that is what you’ve seen over the last four years and you’ll see more of it over the next five.

ANDREW MARR:
For now prime minister, thank you very much.

In this data consist of elaborative marker and. Marker and in sentence, education and welfare indicate as connector between two nouns. Whereas marker and in the other sentences indicate as connect and continuing his action. To give the result of his utterance, Cameron uses marker so. The writer also find marker which indicate time deictic, that is now. It refers to some events and relates them to each other. In this respect the use of marker now indicates temporal relationship between units of talk. Moreover the marker now is used to make a shift among different ordered events and refer to what will happen next.

Data 23 (dialogue 52)

ANDREW MARR:
Are you ashamed about it?

DAVID CAMERON:
Well I’m very sorry about it. Yeah I’m very sorry.

In this data the writer finds marker well in the beginning of Cameron’s utterance. Cameron wants to give a clarification and made apologies about moment when he was overheard talking about the Queen “purring with pleasure”.
ANDREW MARR:
Alright. Now you said a little while ago that you were delighted to see Boris back, on his way back to the pitch. Once he gets onto the pitch, if the team wins, would you like him back in the cabinet as well?

DAVID CAMERON:
Well yes, of course, but he’s got to finish his term as Mayor of London. I know that’s what he wants to do and I believe you can be a Member of Parliament and Mayor of London and do a very effective job. But once he’s finished that, then you know he’s a star and, as I’ve always said, I want to have the stars in the team.

The context of this utterance is that Cameron wants to explain to something contrast. But in the first utterance he uses marker well, and it indicates that marker of response. After that, Cameron uses marker but and it signal the contrast message that conveyed. And also in the final of his utterance, there are compound markers then you know. As we know compound markers is that the speaker moves from one of these contextual realms to the another easily, segmenting and at the same time narrowing down and facilitating the possible inference and presuppositions.

ANDREW MARR:
Okay. You come to this conference with a couple of defections, a minor sex scandal and the problems inside the party. People are muttering final years of John Major. Does that make you quake or does it make you angry? How does it make you feel?

DAVID CAMERON:
Well I have to admit, it’s not been an ideal start. I think I’m prepared to say that. But look, the truth is these things – frustrating as they are – they don’t change the fundamental choice at the election, which is do you want to continue with a long-term economic plan that is working and that can deliver for Britain’s families and hardworking taxpayers, or do you want to lurch off with Ed Miliband with no plan, no leadership, no ideas about the economy – just more borrowing and taxes? That’s the choice.
And, look, you know you learn in this job, you often wake up and you find that all sorts of things have happened in your own party, but the question is does it change the fundamentals about what you’re trying to do and what the team is trying to do, and it doesn’t.

ANDREW MARR:
David Cameron, thank you very much indeed for joining us.

For the first utterance Cameron uses marker *well*. And the writer concludes that Cameron gives response the presenter’s question. And when Cameron wants to mark an upcoming unit as contrast then he uses marker *but*. With marker *but* Cameron intends to explain that there is something contrast. And to give the presenter an optional action, Cameron uses marker *or*. When he uses maker *you know* indicate that he wants to show the hearer something important and new expectation.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the analysis in the previous chapter, this analysis found discourse markers are used by David Cameron in *The Andrew Marr Show transcript interview on September 28, 2014*. There are 73 times for marker *and*, 17 times for markers *but* and *well*, 13 times for marker *so*, 7 times for markers *or* and *because*, 6 times for marker *you know*, 5 times for marker *now*, 4 times for marker of course, 3 times for marker I *mean*, and once for markers *likewise* and *indeed*. In this analysis the writer also found compound markers such as 2 times for *but you know*, one time for compound marker *but then*, *but now* and *then you now*. Types of discourse markers that the writer found as follows: marker of response, contrastive marker, elaborative marker, temporal marker, inferential marker, and marker of information and participation.

This analysis shows that discourse markers provide an important first clue to the conversational move about to be made by a speaker. They also provide important information about the current speaker's orientation to information provided in the prior turn, so they should be exploited by dialogue systems to coordinate shared beliefs.

B. Suggestion

The writer would like to suggest to the next researchers who are interested in investigating the same field can be more focus to analyze DMs and can find
many more types of DMs and also can connect the analysis of DMs with other linguistic disciplines that are not yet discussed in this research.

And keep in mind that in analyzing the words are included in the category of discourse markers, it can not just look at the meaning of these words, but must be seen from the context in the utterances.
REFERENCES


Fraser, Bruce “*Pragmatic Markers*” *pragmatics* 6(2), Boston University: 1996.


APPENDICES

THE ANDREW MARR SHOW INTERVIEW: DAVID CAMERON, MP

CONSERVATIVE LEADER SEPTEMBER 28, 2014.

1. **Data 1**
   ANDREW MARR:
   
   By my calculation, with just over 200 days till his own date with destiny at the next General Election, I’m joined now by the Prime Minister David Cameron. Thank you for joining us, Prime Minister.

   DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

   Good morning.

2. **Data 2**
   ANDREW MARR:
   
   The big story of the morning really is still Iraq. General Richards, like many people in that very interesting House of Commons debate this week, have picked up on the fact that you can’t defeat ISIL (or whatever we call them) without pushing into Syria. It can’t just be done in Iraq alone. That’s true, isn’t it?

   DAVID CAMERON:

   That is true and we’re not trying to defeat ISIL from the air alone. We believe you do need troops on the ground, but they should be Iraqi troops, they should be Kurdish troops. We are part of a large international coalition to degrade and ultimately destroy this organisation, but it can’t be done unless the countries where this organisation has grown up play their part in destroying it.

3. **Data3**
   ANDREW MARR:

   You told the House of Commons interestingly two things: you said that you wouldn’t go into Syria, we wouldn’t attack in Syria without another motion, without returning to the Commons; but you also said that you reserved the right to order attacks if there were some terrible humanitarian disaster that needed to be dealt with very quickly. Now if ISIL are pushed into Syria, we could very quickly see a humanitarian crisis there, so is it the case that you could order the RAF as part of the coalition into Syria without another vote?
DAVID CAMERON:

Well the point I was making didn’t just apply to Iraq or Syria. Frankly it applied to anywhere in the world. If as prime minister I feel there is a humanitarian disaster about to happen that Britain either alone or with partners could do something to avert, then it would be right to order that before going to the House of Commons because there wouldn’t be time. Likewise if there’s some unique British interest, some hostage situation, some unique British interest where you had to order action very quickly, I would always be prepared to do that first and explain to the House of Commons afterwards. I was trying to say to the House of Commons it’s important that this convention that’s grown up of a vote before premeditated action, I believe that’s right, but that doesn’t mean a government shouldn’t act if there’s something it needs to act urgently over.

4. Data 4
ANDREW MARR:
So we could go into Syria without another vote?

DAVID CAMERON: <the answer is not clear enough to identified by the writer>

I think I’ve answered. I’m not … But I think what people are worried about …

5. Data 5
ANDREW MARR:
(over) With respect you haven’t because you’ve said a big crisis might emerge, this could happen tomorrow or next week in Syria as part of … a result of what’s going on now in Iraq.

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

(over) To be clear … I’m not trying to dodge your question. To be clear, if something happened in Syria, anywhere in the world that there was a need for urgent action to prevent a humanitarian crisis or to protect a unique British interest, I would be prepared to take action and explain afterwards. I said that in the House of Commons. Happy to say that again here this morning.

6. Data 6
ANDREW MARR:
Okay now one of the other things that was talked about, again in the General Richards interview but again in the House of Commons as well by people like George Galloway, is that ISIL are not like an army. They don’t
have barracks, they don’t have columns of tanks you can hit from the air. They sit inside the population; they hide themselves where civilians are quite deliberately. And that, therefore, an air campaign is bound to kill lots of civilians by accident without necessarily degrading ISIL as much as you hope.

DAVID CAMERON:

Well I don’t accept that because there are occasions, indeed there have been occasions when ISIL are out in the open threatening Christian communities, Yazidi communities, other Muslim communities, and they can be struck and stopped, and that’s exactly what’s happened you know close to where the Kurdish lines are and elsewhere. But if what you’re saying is we need, if you like, an uprising of the Sunni tribes rejecting these extremists and saying we want to be part of a democratic, pluralistic Iraq, yes of course we do need that. And that’s why you know our strategy here is not some simplistic you know drop a bomb from 40,000 feet and think you can solve the problem. It isn’t. This is one part of a comprehensive strategy to build an Iraq that has a democratic inclusive government for everyone and in time Syria needs exactly the same thing.

ANDREW MARR:

Let’s return to the question of boots on the ground.

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

Yeah.

ANDREW MARR:

There are three possible armies involved on the ground. There’s the Peshmerga who are defending their own territory in Kurdistan; there’s the Iraqi Army who have been frankly pretty useless so far and have run away most of the time; and there’s the Free Syrian Army which, as George Galloway said, barely exists. So who are these boots going to be?

DAVID CAMERON:

Well in both cases, in Iraq and in Syria, we need to build up the forces that are moderate, democratic and pluralistic. In Iraq what we need is an Iraqi government and Iraqi armed forces that represent the whole country – Sunni, Shia and Kurd. In Syria what we need is we do back the Free Syrian Army and the Syrian National Opposition because they are the legitimate forces in Syria, but it’s going to take time in Syria for them to be built up as a counterpoint to the regime. What’s required in Syria, sometimes … (Marr tries to interject) Ian Birrell was saying earlier that
the government’s policy is somehow contradictory. It isn’t. The same thing in Syria is needed as in Iraq, which is a government that can represent all of the people. So you need a transition in Syria from the brutal dictator Assad whose action has helped to build up ISIL, and you need to replace that with a government that can represent all of its people.

9. **Data 9**

ANDREW MARR:

Absolutely, but you also need an army in Syria which can defeat ISIL, and the army in Syria that can defeat ISIL, the only organised army really left standing is Assad’s army. Are we now on the point of having to do a deal with the devil, as it were, to get rid of something worse?

DAVID CAMERON:

No we’re not because Assad is part of the problem, not part of the solution. His brutality against his own people is one of the things that has been a massive recruiting sergeant for ISIL, so what we need in Syria is to build up the legitimate opposition, to go on with the diplomatic efforts alongside that, to have a transition in Syria from Assad to a new government that can represent the whole people. Of course that has to include Alawites, even prominent Alawites, so that Alawite and Sunni, Christian and other minorities in Syria can all feel they are part of the government. I thought when … you know Ban Ki-moon used this phrase of look “a missile can kill a terrorist, but it is good governance that will kill terrorism”. That is our policy.

10. **Data 10**

ANDREW MARR:

Quite right. Okay now again in the House of Commons you were asked about British boots on the ground and you said look if a helicopter lands and needs to be refuelled, there’ll be British people refuelling that helicopter. What about the Iraqi government and the Iraqi army? We’re giving them lots of new kit. Don’t we have to give them advisers and help in how to use that? Won’t there be logistic aspects of that as well? Aren’t there British boots on the ground even if inside the boots there aren’t actually combat troops?

DAVID CAMERON:

Well they’re already … I mean we already have, whether it is in Baghdad or whether it is in the Kurdish regional authority, we have people there who are helping and advising and assisting - not in huge numbers - but if we’re trying to build up these forces, then yes of course we have to help them. The expression I use very clearly is what we’re not having is some
British invading army of combat troops on the ground. I think that’s very important …

11. **Data 11**

   ANDREW MARR:
   
   (over) We could have, for instance, special forces trying to get hostages out of terrible situations?

   DAVID CAMERON:
   
   Well we never talk about …

12. **Data 12**

   ANDREW MARR:
   
   I know you don’t.

   DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>
   
   … we never comment on special forces. The hostage situation is clearly an absolutely tragic one and we should do everything we can to help and I lead those efforts personally.

13. **Data 13**

   ANDREW MARR:
   
   You see a lot of your critics will say this is the problem. It starts with air power, it starts with advisers, and then – like Vietnam – it escalates. You get sucked in, and you’re sucked into something which may be the right war to be fighting, certainly the right enemy to be fighting, but nonetheless you don’t know where it’s going to end and you don’t know how deeply we’re going to be drawn in. However much you at the moment don’t want to be drawn in further, the logic of the war is that we will be.

   DAVID CAMERON:
   
   Well in a way that’s an argument for sort of never doing anything. And I think look when you face a situation with psychopathic terrorist killers in Syria and Iraq, who have already you know brutally beheaded one of our own citizens, who have already launched and tried to execute plots in our own country to kill and maim innocent people, you’ve got a choice. We can either stand back from all this, as Galloway and others would say, and say this is too difficult, it’s too complicated, let’s let someone else try and keep our country safe, or we take the correct decision to say let’s have a full, comprehensive strategy, but let’s be prepared to play our role to make sure these people cannot do us harm.
14. Data 14
ANDREW MARR:

I come back finally to the border question and not George Galloway but General Richards again – your favourite general at the moment, I’m sure. “You can’t possibly defeat ISIS by only attacking them in Iraq”, he says this morning. “How the hell can you win the war when most of your enemy can end up in a country you can’t get involved in?” That really is the question, isn’t it?

DAVID CAMERON:

Well I have a lot of sympathy with that view, which is why I’ve said we support what the Americans and the five Arab nations have done in Syria. We have a Syria strategy, which is to build up the Free Syrian Army, the Syrian National Coalition to achieve a political transition in Syria. But you know I wanted to take to the House of Commons a proposal that I could achieve consensus for to make sure Britain was playing her role in this coordinated action across both countries.

15. Data 15
ANDREW MARR:

Got it. Let’s turn to the Conservative Party conference. Did you have any idea that Mark Reckless was about to do what he’s just done?

DAVID CAMERON:

Not specifically, but you know he’s always been someone who … I mean he very rarely votes for the government and has made his views known. Look these things are frustrating and frankly they are counterproductive and rather senseless. If you want to have a European referendum, if you want to have immigration control, if you want to get the deficit down, if you want to build a stronger Britain that we can be proud of, there is only one option and that is to a …

16. Data 16
ANDREW MARR:

(over) Senseless not reckless.

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

… after the next election because the choice is really between that government – and we’ve got a track record now of getting the deficit down, getting people into jobs, taking a correct line on Europe – the choice is that or Ed Miliband in No. 10 Downing Street with no plan for the deficit, no leadership for our country, no way to get the economy growing,
the deficit going up, more borrowing, more spending, more taxes. That is
the choice. And so …

17. Data 17
ANDREW MARR:
(over) But whatever you think of …

DAVID CAMERON: <the question is not clear>

(over) … to act in a way that makes the Conservative government less
likely is senseless and counterproductive. But you know we have to now
get on with the job of this week in setting out our plans for the country.

18. Data 18
ANDREW MARR:
(over) Before we do, Douglas Carswell, who was a great supporter of
yours, why do you think you’re losing these kind of people?

DAVID CAMERON:
Well you’d have to ask them, but it is …

19. Data 19
ANDREW MARR:
Well they say because you’re not a proper Conservative in the end.

DAVID CAMERON:
Well I disagree with that. But I mean in the end it is counterproductive.
Douglas Carswell and Mark Reckless are both people who actually, unlike
me, they want to leave the European Union no matter what. Now I don’t
agree with that, I think we should have a real go at reform to get a better
deal for Britain. But then there is this promise and it’s a complete and
clear promise of an in/out referendum by the end of 2017. So even if you
don’t agree with my renegotiation strategy, I am the only prime minister
who is going to give you the chance to have a vote to stay in or get out of
the European Union, and that’s why I say it’s so counterproductive and
senseless.

20. Data 20
ANDREW MARR:
(over) Well let’s turn exactly to that strategy then if we could because
we’ve talked about this before, but it’s clear at the moment that the big
issue is the free movement of people into this country from the rest of
Europe. That is the thing that’s setting the UKIP people alight. A lot of
your own people are very, very concerned about it. Is that at the heart of your renegotiation policy – ending the open frontier?

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

Immigration will be absolutely the heart of my renegotiation strategy where I’ve been very clear. We need to get out of ever closer union. That shouldn’t apply to Britain.

21. Data 21

ANDREW MARR:

Sure.

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

We need proper safeguards for the single market. With others, with other countries we need to be able to block new regulations that we don’t approve of. A whole series of safeguards and changes at the heart …

22. Data 22

ANDREW MARR:

(over) Can you be … Okay.

DAVID CAMERON:

(over) Hold on. … at the heart of this, the idea that people – yes of course there is a right to go and work in other European countries, but it’s not an unqualified right. You should not be able to move for benefits, you should not be able to abuse the rules. When new countries join the European Union, you should be able to say to them look your people cannot come and work in our country until your economy is at a much more similar level to ours. So these are big changes.

23. Data 23

ANDREW MARR:

Okay. So you can do things about benefits, but you can’t do anything about the free movement of peoples inside the EU and that won’t be part of your negotiating stance?

DAVID CAMERON:

Well that is one of the things that I think particularly worries people and concerns me – that, as I say, the right to go and work in France or Spain or Spanish people to come and do a job that has been advertised here, that is one thing; but it’s a completely different thing to be able to go to claim benefits, actually even to work in Britain, but to send your benefits home
to your families that stay in your home countries. All of those things need to be addressed.

24. Data 24

ANDREW MARR:

I understand that.

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

It comes back to the bigger point, Andrew, which is there is only one way these things can get addressed. If Ed Miliband is in Downing Street none of these things will happen. If I am prime minister all of these things will happen and there will be an in/out referendum by the end of 2017.

25. Data 25

ANDREW MARR:

Are you determined that we will stay inside the EU?

DAVID CAMERON:

Well I’m determined we’ll do the right thing for Britain. Now I’ve set out very clearly…

26. Data 26

ANDREW MARR:

(over) Straight question.

DAVID CAMERON: <incomplete>

(over) No but this is important. I think people want to know what do I believe?

27. Data 27

ANDREW MARR:

They do.

DAVID CAMERON: <incomplete>

What I believe is right for Britain is to seek reform, get reform, and get Britain to vote to stay in a reformed European Union. That is my plan. Now …

28. Data 28

ANDREW MARR:

(over) There are two very, very different things, prime minister.
DAVID CAMERON: <incomplete>

(over) But the point is if people don’t like that plan …

29. **Data 29**

ANDREW MARR:

Sure.

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

… the only way they get to vote to get out of the European Union is if I am prime minister. I think people want to know what is your plan, not you know what if this, what if that. That isn’t …

30. **Data 30**

ANDREW MARR:

(over) But also they want to know what is your base position. You go there and you negotiate and if you don’t get everything you want, you say to the British people “Okay I haven’t got the deal. We should leave Europe” and, like many of your colleagues, you say there is a future for Britain outside Europe. It might be bumpy but in the end it’ll be fine. Or you’re determined to stay in Europe basically, in which case it’s much harder to get that negotiation successfully concluded.

DAVID CAMERON:

But here’s the point. When you’re going into a negotiation, I think you should set out what you want to achieve. And also I want the 27 other countries in Europe to see that there is a plan here that with reform can end with a reformed European Union and a reformed relationship with Britain and Britain staying in. I want them to see that that is the goal. Now, as I say, if I don’t achieve that, it will be for the British public to decide whether to stay in or to get out.

31. **Data 31**

ANDREW MARR:

Are there any circumstances which you would go to the British people and say “I, David Cameron – not Boris Johnson, not Nigel Farage – I, David Cameron, recommend that we leave the EU”?

DAVID CAMERON:

Well I’ve said this all my political life. I’ve said if I thought that it wasn’t in Britain’s interest to be in the European Union, I wouldn’t argue for us to be in it. I mean I believe … I’m a deeply patriotic politician and person. I do this job because I love my country, I care passionately about its future and I want it to be a strong, proud, self-governing, independent nation.
Yes working with other European countries on trade and cooperation, maximising our influence in the world so we can do the best for our people in the world. That is what drives me.

32. **Data 32**
ANDREW MARR:

So if you don’t get what you want, you say to the British people it’s time to go?

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

No, I’ve said I believe we will get what we want and I think the British …

33. **Data 33**
ANDREW MARR:

If you don’t.

DAVID CAMERON:

Well I think the British public want someone who is absolutely determined to deliver for them a better future in Europe. **But** in the end, I don’t decide. They decide.

34. **Data 34**
ANDREW MARR:

Alright. Let’s move onto something else that you said recently, which was right at the end of the Scottish vote, you came onto the street of Downing Street and you said that English devolution should happen at the same pace as and in tandem with Scottish devolution. Do you still agree with that?

DAVID CAMERON:

Yes, absolutely. Let me be clear. We must keep our vows and we will keep our vows to the people of Scotland that they will have a **stronger** Scottish Parliament with stronger powers over taxation, over welfare, over spending. That will happen. **And** that agreement we set out was no … it was nothing … it wasn’t even a new departure for the Conservative Party **because** we have already signed up to plans for that, **but** what I’ve said is with a Conservative Government, with me in No. 10 Downing Street, you don’t just get Scottish devolution; you get properly English votes for English laws — the English question properly answered, **so** that MPs in Scotland … sorry MPs in Wales and Northern Ireland and in England get these rights in the way that the Scots now have.
ANDREW MARR:

So the reason I’m asking is that the Labour Party don’t agree with quite a lot of that. Other parties have different views as well. It’s a very, very complicated thing to deliver in a few months and, therefore, a lot of people in Scotland are saying aha, this solemn promise on the front page of a newspaper won’t be delivered because you …

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

(over) No, no.

ANDREW MARR:

… and Ed Miliband will fall out and between you the Scottish thing won’t be delivered.

DAVID CAMERON:

No, no, we may well fall out over this issue of England because I don’t think Labour have got an answer to this question. We, the Conservatives, do have an answer. It was in our 2001 manifesto, it was in our 2005 manifesto, it was in the last manifesto as well. But be in no doubt, as prime minister I will deliver both. So you’ll have a choice really. You can have Ed Miliband and have Scottish devolution …

ANDREW MARR:

(over) But come what …

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

(over) … and nothing for the English, or you can have David Cameron and you get Scottish devolution and a proper answer to the English question. I don’t think I could be any clearer.

ANDREW MARR:

(over) Come … Well come what may, whatever the arguments going on in London about English parliaments and English … votes for English laws and all of that - however that’s going, the Scots will get the devolution promise …

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

Yes, yes.
ANDREW MARR:
… under all circumstances?

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

Yes, yes.

ANDREW MARR:
Okay that’s very clear. Thank you very much indeed for that. And speaking of which, do you now favour an English Parliament as such and where would it sit?

DAVID CAMERON:
No I don’t. I don’t think … Look I think the last thing frankly this country wants is another expensive parliament building with another expensive group of politicians with salaries and expenses and all the rest of it. That is not what we’ll be proposing. I think it is perfectly possible to make changes in the Westminster Parliament, so that when issues that are exclusively about England or England and Wales are addressed, we can find voting arrangements to reflect that. And we need to do that obviously not just in terms of what happens with English laws, but if the Scots are going to have – as we believe they should – the right to set income tax rates, you need arrangements in the UK Parliament, in the Westminster Parliament to make sure that there’s fairness there as well. So these plans are being worked out by William Hague. Either there will be an outbreak of good sense by my political opponents and cross-party consent. I doubt it. I suspect it will be the Conservative Party …

ANDREW MARR:
Alright.

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

… putting forward at the next election a balanced programme of devolution – both Scotland and the rest of the United Kingdom – and when we win our majority, we’ll put that into place in tandem and at the same time.

ANDREW MARR:

Now your big announcement this morning is about using money from welfare cuts to boost the number of apprenticeships. Can I ask you, you’re
cutting the welfare cap to £23,000. What evidence do you have that lots of families are going to be able to cope with £3,000 less?

DAVID CAMERON:

Well what we’ve found with the welfare cap is it’s been a policy that has worked and worked very well. A lot of people said when we said we’re going to cap families at £26,000, people said this would cause chaos, families would have to move across the country, it won’t work. Actually what has happened is that a lot of those families have gone into work, have found a job, and actually it’s been a policy that has helped to help them with their lives. I think all the evidence is that the cap is too loose, particularly in some parts of the country, so bringing it down to £23,000 saves money, will mean more families getting into work. And what I want to see, the plan we have for Britain, is to spend less on welfare and more on helping people into work. So we’re going to use that money to pay for 3 million apprentices in the next parliament. This is after the last four years where we’ve seen 1.8 million more people get into work, our deficit come down, our economy turned round. As you were saying earlier, we’ve now got the fastest growth of any major country in the West. We’ve had a successful economic plan, but now is the time to turn that plan into a plan for every family in our country to give them the security and the peace of mind that they want. I want people to see that with a Conservative Government they’ll get the chance of a good job …

Andrew Marr: Alright, can I …

David Cameron: <there are no DMs>

… that taxes will come down, that will get them a good school place for their children…

Andrew Marr: (over) One other question …

David Cameron: <there are no DMs>

… dignity in retirement. These are the things that we will be delivering.
(over) Okay one other question on this. Are we moving towards a situation where nobody under the age of 21 gets any kind of benefits at all because that’s what it looks like?

DAVID CAMERON: <incomplete answer>

It’s not quite as simple as that, but …

46. Data 46
ANDREW MARR:
(over) Pretty close.

DAVID CAMERON:

… at heart I want us effectively to abolish youth unemployment. I want us to end the idea that aged 18 you can leave school and go and leave home, claim unemployment benefit and claim housing benefit. We shouldn’t be offering that choice to young people. We should be saying you should be earning or learning. And so if you need to have benefits, there will be an allowance that you can have for 6 months …

47. Data 47
ANDREW MARR:

(over) I understand the logic behind it, but …

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

(over) … otherwise actually funny enough …

48. Data 48
ANDREW MARR:

(over) Forty-eight per cent of these people … 48 per cent of these people have children, so my question to you is: are you not going to put – I mean for the best possible motives no doubt – but put a large section of the young population of the country into dire poverty quite quickly with this?

DAVID CAMERON:

We’re not talking about those people with children. This is about single people aged 18 to 21 who at the moment you can leave home, sign on, get housing benefit, get your own flat and start a life of dependency. Now that is no life at all and no future for your children when you do have them. So we’re saying save that money, make sure that after 6 months every one of those young people has to be in a job or in training, and use the savings to provide 3 million apprentices. And here’s the real point. We were talking earlier …
49. **Data 49**

ANDREW MARR:

(over) And their parents essentially have to support them.

DAVID CAMERON:

... we were talking earlier about immigration. If we want to solve the problem of immigration, the other side of the coin is education and welfare. We need an education system that educates young people so they can take the jobs that are becoming available – and they are becoming available – and we need a welfare system that prioritises work. Now that is what you’ve seen over the last four years and you’ll see more of it over the next five.

ANDREW MARR:

For now prime minister, thank you very much.

**END OF MAIN INTERVIEW/THEN GOES TO EXTRA QUESTIONS AFTER THE NEWS**

50. **Data 50**

ANDREW MARR:

The prime minister is still with me. Prime minister, the other thing I must ask you about was that moment when you were overheard talking about the Queen “purring with pleasure.” Presumably she was furious because she’d been trying really hard to keep out of that debate all the way through. What were you thinking of?

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>

One of those moments when you look back and kick yourself very hard. It was not a conversation I should have had even though it was a private conversation and I’m extremely sorry and very embarrassed about it and I’ve …

51. **Data 51**

ANDREW MARR:

(over) Are you ashamed about it?

DAVID CAMERON: <there are no DMs>
… made my apologies and I think I’ll probably be making some more.

52. **Data 52**

ANDREW MARR:

Are you ashamed about it?

DAVID CAMERON:

Well I’m very sorry about it. Yeah I’m very sorry.

53. **Data 53**

ANDREW MARR:

And have you repaired things with the Palace?

DAVID CAMERON: (there are no DMs)

I’m not going to ever discuss my conversations …

54. **Data 54**

ANDREW MARR:

(over) Ever again.

DAVID CAMERON: (there are no DMs)

… with the Palace ever again. Even with you, Andrew.

55. **Data 55**

ANDREW MARR:

Alright. Now you said a little while ago that you were delighted to see Boris back, on his way back to the pitch. Once he gets onto the pitch, if the team wins, would you like him back in the cabinet as well?

DAVID CAMERON:

Well yes, of course, but he’s got to finish his term as Mayor of London. I know that’s what he wants to do and I believe you can be a Member of Parliament and Mayor of London and do a very effective job. But once he’s finished that, then you know he’s a star and, as I’ve always said, I want to have the stars in the team.

56. **Data 56**

ANDREW MARR:

Okay. You come to this conference with a couple of defections, a minor sex scandal and the problems inside the party. People are muttering final years of John Major. Does that make you quake or does it make you angry? How does it make you feel?
DAVID CAMERON:

Well I have to admit, it’s not been an ideal start. I think I’m prepared to say that. But look, the truth is these things – frustrating as they are – they don’t change the fundamental choice at the election, which is do you want to continue with a long-term economic plan that is working and that can deliver for Britain’s families and hardworking taxpayers, or do you want to lurch off with Ed Miliband with no plan, no leadership, no ideas about the economy – just more borrowing and taxes? That’s the choice. And, look, you know you learn in this job, you often wake up and you find that all sorts of things have happened in your own party, but the question is does it change the fundamentals about what you’re trying to do and what the team is trying to do, and it doesn’t.

ANDREW MARR:

David Cameron, thank you very much indeed for joining us.

INTERVIEW ENDS