

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This last chapter describe the conclusion drawn from the findings of the study and the discussion. It also provides suggestions for various stakeholders based on the study's findings and limitations.

A. Conclusion

This study examines the use of discourse markers in Prabowo Subianto's interview on Al Jazeera by analyzing the discourse types and pragmatic functions in discourse. The findings showed various discourse markers, such as *oh*, *well*, *and*, *but*, *so*, *then*, and *you know*, frequently used in the interview. These discourse markers were not only used as expression or fillers, but served as important devices to help organized discourse, managed interaction, clarified ideas, and maintained coherence during communication.

On the other hand, this study also found that discourse markers helped in supporting Prabowo Subianto's communication strategies in political interview context. Topic change markers, *by the way*, were used to shifts the focus of conversation to another issue that he considered more advantageous. Elaborative markers, *and*, were used to expand explanation and provide additional information. In contrastive markers, *but*, were used to indicate rejection or disagreement. While inferential markers, *so*, helped to indicate conclusions or logical relationships between ideas. Furthermore, these markers also served pragmatic function in political interview, such as to soften statement, emphasize points, and maintaining engagement with the

audience. This implied that in political discourse, discourse markers served as strategic and rhetorical purpose, rather than functioning just as device in casual conversation.

In addition, the findings revealed that the use of discourse markers reflected how the speakers managed interaction and constructed meaning in political discourse. In political interview, they helped the speakers kept the conversation under control, responded to sensitive issues, and presented argument in more convincing and coherence way. Therefore, this study contributed to discourse analysis and pragmatics study by demonstrating how discourse markers considered as crucial element in shaping communication strategies, particularly in political interviews that conducted within the real moment of international media.

B. Suggestion

Studying discourse markers in discourse analysis and pragmatics field, particularly in political context, requires a careful understanding of what is to be analyzed and how it will be examined. Therefore, future researchers are recommended to investigate discourse markers across various topic, contexts, or subjects in order to gain broader insight into their use in diverse communicative situations. Future researchers may analyze discourse markers in presidential debates, diplomatic meeting, or other political discourse to provide different perspectives and more in depth-analysis.

Additionally, future researchers can implement a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to investigate aspects beyond linguistics features. This

enables the researchers to investigate ideology, media framing, power relations, or institutional influence in the construction political discourse. These examples can give deeper insight of how language is used strategically in the media and political communication.