



Discourse analysis takes a significant role in human communication since it is not only focuses on the language and the meaning but deeply to the some elements in communication, such as how, who, what, and when the language is used. It is in line with Brown and Yule (1983:1) who argued that Discourse analysis is committed to an investigation of what and how that language is used for. Discourse Analysis also considers the way that the use of language present different views of the world and different understanding.

The term of Discourse Analysis was first introduced by Zelling Haris in 1952, as a way of analysis connected speech and writing (Brian paltridge, 2006). Harris had two main interests: the examination of language beyond the level of the sentence and the relationship between linguistic and non – linguistic behavior. He examined a way for describing how language features are distributed within texts and the ways in which they are combined in particular kinds and style of text. In Harris, 1952:3 State that.

“Connected discourse occurs within a particular situation, whether of a person speaking or of a conversation, or of someone sitting down occasionally over the period of months the writer a particular kind of book in particular literary or scientific tradition”

He argues that it is not only share particular meaning, but it also has characteristic linguistic features associated with them, what these meaning are, and how they are realized in language is a central interest to the area of discourse analysis. (Fasold 2006:192) argued that all approaches to Discourse analysis address















degree of uniformity in structure and in content of the direction-giving in conversation.

The study was conducted on the Arizona State University campus. Four graduate students posed as typical student direction seekers. Two were nonnative speakers (one Chinese and one Japanese native speaker), who were essentially fluent in English, although they spoke with discernible foreign accents, and two were native speakers, a male and a female in each grouping, all the direction seekers gave a request for directions at a single location at similar times to a sample of 200 U.S. (native-speaking) university students, 100 males and 100 females.

Pearson and Lee also used *Scotton* and *Bernsten's* categorization on linguistic features to classify the direction-givers' responses. In order to test uniformity in structure and content, they counted how many subjects included the four parts and other subparts of the conversation; what combinations of directive types they used; and how similar they were on fluency measures: pause, filler, and hedges. In order to test for gender influence on directness, they counted the length of the conversation, indirect directive types, parenthetical remark, pause, filler, and hedges. To measure for gender influence on synthesis, they counted summary-like statement in opening section.

After analyzing, Pearson and Lee concluded that Female direction givers paused more than males and produced more comprehension

