

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

#### 5.1 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data analysis on the previous chapter, the study made it possible to arrive at the following conclusions.

(1) The conclusions presented here rest on the statistical analysis carried out on the basis of 811 markers between Trump and Clinton, which were in way sufficient to claim the results to be universal. Focusing on the types of discourse markers were used in presidential debate between Trump and Clinton, the research relates the findings of the types of the discourse markers in the Presidential Debate between Trump and Clinton the first was Interpersonal category about 158 markers (19.48%), the second was Referential category had number of markers 459 (56.60%), and the third was structural category had about 179 markers (22.07%) and the last was Cognitive category was about 15 (1.85).

(2) After analyzing the data had shown that the problem of discourse markers, their functions and distribution of discourse markers in the presidential debate between Trump and Clinton had been discussed from different angles in linguistic literature. Although they have been labelled and classified in many various ways, all their functions, properties and classification are still not well delimited by linguists. Consistent with the aims of the investigation, it had defined the functions of discourse markers

play in a coherent text (include of delevering debate) and proved that,although they fall into three domains namely subjective, interactional and textual, they were mutually exclusive. That is, they could appear simultaneously.

- (3) Discourse markers were essential in all the situation context. However, the choice of theselinguistic items and their functioning depend on the specificity of field, tenor and mode. itself. Each ofthe discussed situational context possesses a certain quantity of discourse markers. They were themost widespread in presidential debate between Trump and Clinton. The markers were in the presidential debate being the closest to spoken discourse was rich inrepetition of such discourse markers as *oh,I know, well, I mean, I guess*, etc. whereas the other lexical markers used more strict expressions.

## 5.2. SUGGESTIONS

In relation to the conclusions, suggestion are staged as the following:

- (1) It is suggested that other researcher should study about the discourse and pragmatics to analyze the utterances or language used by male and female
- (2) It is recommended that other researcher should elaborate the study about discourse markers in other field, such as in Indonesian presidential debate, Indonesian presidential speech or even in teaching and learning process or different kinds of discourse markers.

- (3) It is advised that discourse markers assume a pragmatic function. So, in order to attain certain goals relating to the complex pattern of social interactions; political figures (leaders) use specific discourse markers to influence the hearers mentally or emotionally, thus modifying their knowledge, convictions or feelings



THE  
*Character Building*  
UNIVERSITY