



## **DISCOURSE MARKERS IN CLOSED-DOOR INTERVIEW OF 71<sup>ST</sup> MISS UNIVERSE**

Tupa Parulian Siburian<sup>1</sup>, Immanuel Prasetya Ginting<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>English Department, Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia

Correspondence E-mail: <sup>1</sup>tupasbr2101@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup>manuprojectpro@unimed.ac.id

### **ABSTRACT**

Discourse Markers (DMs) are indispensable elements in spoken communication, aiding in establishing coherence and organizing discourse in both textual and verbal interactions, as delineated by Brinton (2017). The objective of this research is to delineate the functions, and occurrences of Discourse markers employed by the finalists of the 71st Miss Universe 2022. This study employs a qualitative descriptive design to analyze the frequency and context of discourse

markers based on the recorded video interviews of the contestants, employing Brinton's (1996) theory as the analytical framework. Additionally, the analysis of the data reveals the types and functions used, and their effects on conversation. the researcher found sixty-tree data which contain 128 DMs that consist of nineteen types. All these findings are not having the same function.

**Keywords:** *Discourse Markers, Closed-door Interview Discourse, Brinton's Theory, Textual Function, Miss Universe*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Discourse Markers (DMs) are indispensable elements in spoken communication, aiding in establishing coherence and organizing discourse in both textual and verbal interactions, as delineated by Brinton (2017). They are often termed as discourse connectives or particles, functioning to connect and orchestrate segments of discourse. These linguistic constructs are essential for indicating the connections between ideas, demarcating the structure of conversations, and communicating the speaker's stance. Their utilization enhances the coherence and comprehensibility of spoken and written communication, making them a focal point of linguistic and pragmatic analysis.

Hence, looking into the roles (functions) of discourse markers in spoken and written text or thought which becomes an interesting research topic of discourse analysis (Ali, 2016; Nordquist, 2017; van Dijk, 1997; Roy, 200 in Lugovaya, 2011), is a relevant and productive academic attempt. In this paper, the researcher explores the forms and

functions of discourse markers as well as the categories of discourse cohesion employing the Discourse Theory of Brinton (1996) in a closed-door interview.

Discourse markers improve the quality of writing and increase the comprehension of text Al-khazraji A., (2019). Therefore, this paper aims to explore the function of discourse markers in the conversation closed-door Interview figure out the meaning potentials of discourse markers in a specific discourse as a gap. Based on the phenomena of Discourse Markers the researcher formulated two problems of this study. This study investigates the use of direct messages (DMs) by finalists Miss Universe in a closed-door interview setting at the Miss Universe pageant 2022.

1. What functions of DMs are used by Finalists in a Closed-door Interview?
2. How are the occurrences of DMs used by Finalists Miss Universe in their conversations?

This study aims to identify Functions of DMs: that refers to examine the functionalities of direct messaging platforms are utilized by finalists during the closed-door interview. The second problem is Occurrences of Patterns: this wants to examine how frequently and in what contexts do finalists engage in direct messaging conversations throughout the interview process.

1. To examine the functions of DMs used by Finalists Miss Universe in Closed-door Interview on YouTube.
2. To describe the circumstances of DMs used by Finalists Miss Universe in their Interview conversation.

## **METHOD**

The research being conducted employed a descriptive design with a qualitative approach to data analysis. The study is described explicitly in the language of finalist utterances in YouTube videos. The descriptive approach is a research method that describes the situation of event occurrences. As a result, that strategy is intended to collect primary data (Sukmadinata, 2017). Creswell, J. W. (2012) defines qualitative research as an inquirer engaging with data. Rather than figures and statistics, these are in the form of words or images.

## RESULTS

The researcher presented based on the classification of their types and function. On other side, the researcher gave a mark to the discourse Markers from the data source, so it made the researcher easier to analyze the data. The data obtained from the Asia's finalists who are going into top 16 (sixteen) in closed-door interview videos has been uploaded in the Official YouTube Channel of Miss Universe.

### 1. The Functions of DMs

In the findings, the researcher found sixty-tree data which contain DMs. All these findings are not having the same function. The types and functions found in this study were: *so, because, well, and, but, and then, like, yes, absolutely, oh, of course, yeah, you know, I would have to say, in my own capacity, I think, actually, uh, and um*. All of them serve different pragmatic purposes, none of them are pragmatically superfluous (Brinton p35). As a result, the function of DMS is connected in this situation. It implies that the way DMs functioned was affected by the conversation's context. Brinton (1996, p38) divides the function of pragmatic markers (the term of markers used in her studies) into two categories: textual and interpersonal. It can be considered as a dichotomy of the discourse marker's function, which includes two main functions. Here's a breakdown of key categories and function:

***Table 1a. The Textual Function of DMs in Closed-Door Interview***

Functional domain	Explanation	DMs
Opening frame markers	To initiate discourse, including claiming the attention of the hearer	So, because
Closing frame markers	To close discourse	So, well
Turn-takers	To aid the speaker in acquiring or relinquishing the floor.	Because, and
Filler	To serve as filler or delaying tactic used to sustain discourse or hold the floor.	Well, and, um
Topic switchers	To indicate a new topic or partial shift in topic.	But, because
Information indicators	To denote either new or old information.	And, so, because
Sequence/Relevance markers	To mark sequential dependence.	So, and then

Repair markers	To repair one's. own or other's discourse.	So, and then
----------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------

**Table 1b. The Interpersonal Function of DMs in Closed-door Interview**

Functional domain	Explanation	DMs
Response/reaction markers.	Subjectively, to express a response to the preceding discourse, including also back-channel signals of understanding and continued attention while another speaker is having his/her turn.	Yes, absolutely, oh, of course, Yeah.
Confirmation-seekers, face-savers, cooperation or sharing markers.	Interpersonally, to effect cooperation or sharing, including confirming shared assumptions, checking, or expressing understanding, requesting confirmation, expressing difference, or saving face.	You know, I would have to say, in my own capacity, yeah.
Attitudinal Marker	To express speakers' attitude	I think, actually
Cognitive Hesitation Markers	To express speakers' hesitation	Uh, um
Cognitive Processing Markers	To processing information	Uh, um, like

## 2. The Occurrences of DMs

In terms of occurrences, for the DMs functioning as turn-takers, opening frame marker they were occupied only in the beginning of the utterances. Then, topic switcher, repair marker, confirmation-seeker, face-saver cooperation or sharing marker, they were occupied not only in the middle of the utterance, but it could appear at the beginning and at the end of utterance. Nevertheless, in this case also found DMs only at the end utterance, which was that DMs function as Response/Reaction markers. A context influenced all these DMs.

The questions and answers that has been transcript becomes the data and data sources that are analyzed. The data is analyzed using Brinton's theory 1996. The utterances analyzed manually with word by word to get detail of DMs exist in

conversation. this process involving technique data verification according to the Brinton's theory 1996.

***Table 2. The Ourrences of Discourse Markers Based on Brinton's Inventory of Items***

No	Discourse Marker	Occurrences	%
1	So	18	14%
2	Because	6	5%
3	Well	1	1%
4	And	18	14%
5	But	4	3%
6	And then	1	1%
7	Like	17	13%
8	Yes	1	1%
9	Absolutely	1	1%
11	Oh	1	1%
12	Of course,	1	1%
13	Yeah	8	6%
14	You know	17	13%
15	I would have to say	2	2%
16	In my own capacity	1	1%
17	I think	4	3%
18	Actually	1	1%
19	Uh	6	5%
20	Um	20	16%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>128</b>	<b>100%</b>

As the result, this research found some kind of DMs. There were nineteen kinds of DMs from the video closed-door interview of 71st Miss Universe in their YouTube

channel. Firstly, the researcher found the highest result of “um,” in 20 or 16% of 128 DMs, secondly, the researcher found of “so,” and “and,” in 18 or 14% of 128 DMs. Thirdly, the researcher found of “like,” and “you know,” in 17 or 13% of 128 DMs. Fourthly, the researcher found of “yeah,” in 8 or 6% of 128 DMs. Fifthly, the researcher found of “because,” “and “uh” in 6 or 5% of 128 DMs. Sixthly, the researcher found of “but,” and “I think,” in 4 or 3% of 128 DMs. Seventhly, the researcher found of “I would have to say,” in 2 or 2% of 128 DMs. Lastly, the researcher found of “well,” “and then,” “Yes,” “absolutely,” “oh,” “of course,” “In my own capacity,” and “actually,” in 1 or 1% of 128 DMs.

## DISCUSSION

The analysis of the 71st Miss Universe competition's closed-door interview videos reveals several key findings regarding the use of discourse markers (DMs). The study, based on Brinton's (1996) theory, categorized the DMs into two main functions: textual and interpersonal. This study investigated the use of discourse markers in the closed-door interview of the 71st Miss Universe, employing Brinton's (1996) theory as the analytical framework.

This study was contributed to several previous studies that shared similarities between the objects and theories. Researchers categorized the similarity of their objects based on how often they were used in an interview or conversation. In earlier research, Luo Fei et al., (2023), a study on the TV talk show. Pujalinda et al., (2023), a study analyzed the use of DMs in research seminars. Renalyn (2019), A study of DMs in speeches delivered by the selected Asian presidents. The study's findings show that several DMs were identified during interview conversations. DMs, however, were more frequently used in spoken English interviews or conversation that involved discussion on a topic and interaction between two or more individuals.

According to the table 4, we can know that the use function of DMs in closed-door interview is quite obvious. The closed-door interview acquires a question-answer system and a reaction gap from the finalist. Therefore, the DMs employed by the finalist is conveyed into an answer system to structure, organize and manage their conversation when answer the question. These functions align with previous studies that analyzed the use of

DMs in interviews and conversations, highlighting the importance of DMs in facilitating effective communication and interaction.

The textual function and interpersonal function of DMs categorized by Brinton (1996) could be interpreted through the coherence theory proposed by Schiffrin (1986) and the rapport management framework claimed by Spencer Oatey (2008). Schiffrin thought the ultimate goal of discourse markers is to make coherence through a text, indeed, the common discourse markers like *and, so, then, but well, you know, I mean*, naturally connect the text from segment to segment. The spoken English of conversation is able to transfer the turn smoothly, and the written text could be managed logically through these discourse markers. However, discourse markers play a more important part in spoken English. People's epistemic stance and affective stance are encoded at many levels of linguistics forms (Ochs 1996: 412), and discourse markers are the handiest forms. The expression of epistemic and affective stance behind people's minds is challenged by face sensitivity, interactional goals and behavioral expectations, according to Spencer (2008). Therefore, solidarity becomes the ultimate goal of language expression to achieve rapport in communication. Based on the interpretation above, Brinton's textual function of DMs is thought to burden the ultimate goal of achieving coherence, and the interpersonal function of DMs has the ultimate goal of achieving solidarity.

Based on the function analyzed above discourse markers have meaning potentials because they have no fixed meanings in different circumstances. And the meaning potential here is just like the interpretation of Halliday. He thought learning a language is 'building up a meaning potential', and what is built up is a system of choices tot constitutes the 'reality' of culture and circumscribes what we can mean (1978: 30). The prominent characteristic of meaning potentials is that contexts determine the way in which the meaning potential is presented. When a language context is altered or reconstructed, its meaning potential goes with it and may be extended with richer meaning potentials deriving from the new context. Therefore, the meaning potentials of DMs interpreted in closed-door interview of 71st Miss Universe would serve to the accomplishment of the whole interview.

## CONCLUSIONS

This qualitative study employed a descriptive design to analyze discourse markers used in the closed-door interview videos of 71st Miss Universe contestants. By analyzing discourse markers, this study analysis two focuses. On the first, what functions of DMs are used by Finalists in a closed-door Interview? Secondly, how are the occurrences of DMs used by Finalist Miss Universe in their conversations? In the previous chapter. The researcher proposed the conclusions.

This thesis has examined the discourse markers used in the closed-door interview of the 71st Miss Universe pageant, focusing on Brinton's (1996) theory of discourse markers. The researcher found 128 DMs that consist of nineteen types which was so (18), because (6), well (1), and (18), but (4), and then (1), like (17), yes (1), absolutely (1), oh (1), of course (1), yeah (8), you know (17), I would have to say (2), in my own capacity (1), I think (4), actually (1), uh (6), and um (20). In this context was found textual function that classified into: Opening frame marker included "So." Closing frame marker included "So." Turn-takers included "Because." Fillers included "Well," "and," Topic switchers included "But," "because," Information indicators included "And," "so," and "because." Sequence/Relevance markers included "So," and "and then." And Repair markers included "Like," and "but," in conversation. And then, interpersonal function that classified into: Response/Reaction markers; back-channel signals included "Yes," "absolutely," "oh," "of course," and "yeah." Confirmation-seekers, face-savers cooperation or sharing markers included "You know," "I would have to say," "in my own capacity," and "yeah." Attitudinal makers included "I think," and "actually," Cognitive hesitation Markers included "Uh," and "um." And Cognitive processing Information markers included "Um," "uh," and "like" in conversation.

In terms of occurrences, for the DMs functioning as turn-takers, opening frame marker they were occupied only in the beginning of the utterances. Then, topic switcher, repair marker, confirmation-seeker, face-saver cooperation or sharing marker, they were occupied not only in the middle of the utterance, but it could appear at the beginning and at the end of utterance. Nevertheless, in this case also found DMs only at the end utterance, which was that DMs function as Response/Reaction markers. A context influenced all these DMs.



## REFERENCES

- Al-khazraji, A. (2019). *Analysis of Discourse Markers in Essays Writing in ESL Classroom*. British University Dubai.
- Banguis-Bantawig, R. (2019). *The role of Discourse Markers in the speeches of selected Asian Presidents*. Siquijor State College Philippines.
- Blakemore, D. (1987). *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brinton, L. J. (2017). *The Evolution of Pragmatic Markers in English: Pathways to Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brinton, L. J. (2023). *Pragmatics in the History of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Faharani, M. V., Ghane, Z. (2022). Unpacking the function(s) of Discourse Markers in academic spoken English: a corpus-based study. *AJLL* 45, 49-70. DOI: [10.1007/s44020-022-00005-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-022-00005-3)
- Fraser, B. (1999). What Are Discourse Markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*. 31, 931-952. DOI: [10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)00101-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00101-5)
- Fraser, B. (2006). *Towards a Theory of Discourse Markers in K. Fischer (Ed.), Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Elsevier.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Huang, L. (2019). A Corpus-Based Exploration of the Discourse Marker Well in Spoken Interlanguage. *Language and Speech*, 62(3), 570-593. DOI: [10.1177/0023830918798863](https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830918798863)
- Luke, K. (1990). *Utterance particles in Cantonese conversation*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Luo Fei & Zou. (2023). *The Function and Meaning Potentials of Discourse Markers in the TV Talk Show Discourse*. Shanghai Ocean University.
- Miss Universe. (2023). Miss Universe Organization About: <https://www.missuniverse.com/about>
- Nurlaela Rahayati., R. H. (2021). *Discourse Markers in Abstracts of International Journal*. English Education Program: Galuh University.
- Pujalinda, M. (2022). *Discourse Markers in Research Seminar*. Akademi Keperawatan YPPP Wonomulyo.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schourup, L. (1985). *Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation: Like, Well, Y'know*. New York: Garland.
- Verdonik, D. Ž. (2008). The Impact of Context on Discourse Markers use in two Conversational Genres. *Discourse Studies*. 10(6), 759-775.
- Yule. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.