

DISCOURSE MARKERS IN NATE BARGATZE'S EXTENDED INTERVIEW ON CBS SUNDAY MORNING

Anggi Cahyani Pramudita¹
Universitas Negeri Semarang

Christianti Tri Hapsari²
Universitas Negeri Semarang

[anggicahyanip@students.unnes.ac.id¹](mailto:anggicahyanip@students.unnes.ac.id)

Submit, 16-01-2026

Accepted, 13-04-2026

Publish, 18-04-2026

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the use of discourse markers (DMs) in a media interview titled Extended Interview: Comedian Nate Bargatze, published on the CBS Sunday Morning YouTube channel. The focus of this study is to identify discourse markers in the interview and classify them based on type and function. A qualitative descriptive method was employed, with data collected from the transcript of the interview video. The data were analyzed using Fraser's (2009) framework to identify discourse marker types and Crible and Degand's (2019) framework to examine their functions. The findings show that three types of discourse markers, which are elaborative, inferential, and contrastive marker, were found a total of 413 times. Elaborative markers appeared most frequently, with 224 occurrences, followed by inferential markers with 92 occurrences and contrastive markers with 56 occurrences. Furthermore, eight discourse marker functions were identified: addition, consequence, reduction, contrast, temporal, condition, alternative, and concession. In conclusion, discourse markers in interviews play an important role in maintaining coherence, organizing conversation, and sustaining the flow of interaction.

Keywords: Discourse Markers, Media Interview, Spoken Discourse

INTRODUCTION

Communication is an activity that people engage in every day. It can be conducted in both written and spoken forms, each with its own characteristics in terms of formality, structure, and immediacy (Liu, 2023). Written communication tends to be more structured, organized, and sometimes more formal, while spoken communication is usually more direct, less formal, and happens in real time (Farahani & Ghane, 2022).

One example of spoken communication is media interaction in the form of interviews, in which the presenter and interviewee or guest interact or converse in front of an audience. Although interviews are often scripted, as interviewees prepare their answers in advance to respond to questions prepared by the interviewer, both speakers still appear natural and relaxed, as if they are having a

casual conversation. Interviewers may also challenge the interviewee or go off script to make the conversation run more smoothly (Crible & Cuenca, 2017). Because of this combination of preparation and spontaneity, interviews become a rich source of spoken communication (O’Keeffe, 2006).

For communication to be successful, speakers need to share the same understanding. This means that the words and sentences should be organized in a way that makes ideas flow smoothly and logically. To achieve this, people often use certain words or expressions to connect ideas, show contrast, or express agreement or disagreement (García, 2021). These expressions are known as discourse markers.

Discourse markers (DMs) have been studied by many scholars from different perspectives. Schiffrin (1987) defines DMs as linguistic expressions such as ‘well’, ‘but’, ‘so’, and ‘because’ that help organize and structure sentences. She argued that DMs guide the flow of conversation and help listeners interpret meaning based on context. Blakemore (1996) expanded the discussion by using Relevance Theory. She explained that DMs should be understood in terms of procedural meaning rather than conceptual meaning. This means that DMs guide how hearers process information and infer intended meaning, instead of adding to the truth conditions of a statement. According to Fraser (1999), DMs are a type of pragmatic marker. He pointed out that their main function is to signal relationships such as elaboration, contrast, or cause-effect between discourse segments. Finally, Fraser (2009) further developed this view by categorizing DMs three types, which are contrastive, elaborative, and inferential marker.

The use of DMs in interviews is important for developing ideas and keeping conversations smooth. Communication becomes more complex when speakers change topics, add explanations, express conflicting ideas, or draw conclusions from previous statements (Choi, 2025). Without DMs, utterances can sound disjointed or difficult to follow, especially in interviews where turn-taking happens quickly. In public figure interviews, this complexity increases because conversations often involve storytelling, emotional expression, and reflection on personal experiences (Fu et al., 2024). The interview titled *Extended Interview: Comedian Nate Bargatze* is one example spoken interaction between two speakers. Therefore, understanding how DMs function in this kind of context is important for knowing how cohesion and interpersonal connections are built in spontaneous spoken interactions.

Although many studies have examined DMs, most research focuses on classroom contexts such as essays and presentations, or on learner corpora involving written and spoken data from students (Arya, 2022; Mahmud et al., 2023; Shimada et al., 2019; Wahid et al., 2020). Research on media interviews exists, but it remains limited, especially in interviews involving public figures. To

address this gap, this study focuses on an informal but structured interview that involves personal stories and spontaneous turn-taking. This study aims to analyze the DMs used in *Extended Interview: Comedian Nate Bargatze*. The focus is limited to types of DMs based on Fraser's (2009) theory, including contrastive markers, elaborative markers, and inferential markers and Crible & Degand's (2019) theory for analyzing the function of DMs. This study has two objectives: (1) to identify and analyze the types of DMs used in the interview, and (2) to identify the functions of DMs used in the interview. These findings are expected to contribute to a broader understanding of DMs in media communication and provide insight into their role in increasing audience cohesion and engagement.

LITERATUR REVIEW

Discourse markers (DMs) are small words that appear in various forms, including adverbs, conjunctions, and other linguistic elements commonly featured in spoken language (Verdonik, 2022). He added that these expressions help speakers organize information, guide listeners, and maintain coherence in interactions. Because spoken communication occurs spontaneously, DMs play an important role in helping speakers manage transitions, introduce new ideas, indicate relationships between clauses, and organize conversations. Therefore, DMs have been widely discussed in linguistic research and analyzed from various theoretical perspectives.

Several researchers have proposed definitions that show different aspects of DMs. Schiffrin (1987) describes DMs as expressions such as 'well', 'but', 'so', and 'because' that contribute to the overall discourse and help build coherence between units. Blakemore (1996), based on Relevance Theory, argues that DMs encode procedural meaning; that is, they guide the listener's interpretation rather than adding conceptual meaning. Fraser (1999) proposes that DMs are a subtype of pragmatic markers whose main purpose is to signal the relationship between two segments of discourse. Aijmer (2002) emphasizes the multifunctional nature of DMs in spoken English, showing that they help speakers manage turn-taking, express attitude, and organize spoken conversation. Fenk (1998) further suggests that DMs contribute to facilitating the flow of conversation, making spoken interactions easier to follow. Although their approaches differ, these studies agree that DMs are essential tools for maintaining coherence and ensuring smooth communication.

Developing on previous research, Fraser (2009) offers a clear classification of DMs into three main types: contrastive marker, elaborative marker, and inferential marker. Contrast markers such as 'but', 'still', and 'however' indicate an oppositional relationship between two segments. Elaborative marker such as 'and', 'also', and 'as well' indicate that the second segment adds related

information to the first segment. Inferential marker such as ‘so’ and ‘then’ indicate that the second segment is a logical consequence or inference from the first segment.

DMs also perform important pragmatic functions in communication. Crible & Degand (2019) introduced a multidimensional model consisting of fifteen functions, including addition, alternative, cause, concession, condition, consequence, contrast, hedging, monitoring, specification, temporal, agreeing, disagreeing, topic, and quoting. This framework provides a detailed perspective on how DMs support interactions to create cohesion. For example, markers can help manage attitudes (hedging), organize narratives (temporal), negotiate interpersonal alignment (agreeing/disagreeing), or guide listeners through transitions (topic). Because interviews involve spontaneous reactions, topic shifts, personal stories, and interpersonal negotiations, this functional model is relevant for analyzing DMs in media interviews.

Several studies have examined DMs in various contexts of media interviews. Afriyanti (2015) examined the types and functions of discourse markers used by British Prime Minister David Cameron in a televised political interview. This study used a descriptive qualitative method and focused on one episode of *The Andrew Marr Show* (September 28, 2014). The results showed that Cameron used several markers with the four highest frequencies: ‘and’ (73 occurrences), ‘but’ and ‘well’ (17 occurrences each), and ‘so’ (13 occurrences). In terms of functional grouping, this study reported response markers (e.g., ‘well’), contrast markers (e.g., ‘but’), elaborative markers (e.g., ‘and’), temporal markers (e.g., ‘now’ and ‘then’), inferential markers (e.g., ‘so’, ‘because’, and ‘of course’), and information/participation markers (e.g., ‘you know’, ‘I mean’). She argues that these DMs provide important clues about Cameron's conversational steps, his attitude toward the previous turn, and suggested that discourse marker analysis can provide insight into how dialogue can interpret the speaker's intentions.

A similar study by Fu et al. (2024) also investigated the use of the discourse markers ‘you know’ and ‘I mean’ in mediated English-language political interviews, with a particular focus on interviewers' speech in two well-known programs: *The Point with Liu Xin* from CGTN and *HARDtalk* from the BBC. Using a corpus-based comparative approach, they constructed a specialized interview corpus and analyzed the frequency, pragmatic functions (using a domain and function taxonomy), co-occurrence patterns, and positional distribution of both markers. The results of the study show that ‘you know’ appears significantly more often than ‘I mean’ in both corpora, which they interpreted as a reflection of the spontaneity, interactivity, and need for clarification that are characteristic of political interviews. Notably, Chinese interviewers used ‘you know’ more extensively, while British interviewers relied more on ‘I mean’ to clarify or

rephrase statements. Functionally, both markers played dual roles such as securing, agreeing, and monitoring in the interpersonal, sequential, and rhetorical domains.

In another study, there was an analysis of DMs in the setting of popular American talk shows, focusing on informal public conversations on *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, and using Fraser's (2009) framework for types of DMs (Luh et al., 2024). Using a descriptive qualitative approach, the researchers analyzed five episodes aired between February and April 2023, and identified four types of DMs and six functional categories in the spoken data. The results showed that elaborative markers were the most frequently used, especially for adding or expanding information, while inferential markers were rarely found. Another study investigated how non-native speakers use DMs in the talk show *Good Morning America*, focusing on the types and functions of DMs in a high-profile media context (Emmiyati, 2023). The researchers analyzed conversation data from non-native guests, identifying ten formal types: interjections, greetings and farewells, linking adverbials, stance adverbials, vocatives, response elicitors, response forms, hesitators, various polite speech-act formulas, and expletives. These forms were then interpreted functionally according to Schiffrin's categories, resulting in roles such as information management, response, connectives, cause and effect, temporal adverbials, and information/participation.

METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative method because it allows the researchers to explore language use in depth and interpret its meaning. Qualitative research is suitable for analyzing spoken language because it aims to understand phenomena rather than measure them (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In this study, discourse analysis was employed to identify and analyze the types of DMs based on Fraser's (2009) categorization as well as the functions of DMs based on Crible & Degand's (2019) framework.

The subject of this study is spoken interview data taken from media platforms that feature conversations with public figures in the entertainment industry. The selected sample is titled *Extended Interview: Comedian Nate Bargatze*, published on the CBS Sunday Morning YouTube channel. The interview involves Nate Bargatze, an American comedian, discussing his journey to become a comedian with interviewer Conor Knighton. The conversation mainly focuses on the career path, self-discovery, and life vision of Nate Bargatze. This interview was chosen because it represents natural spoken interaction that combines casual and semi-formal language. The interview video has a duration of 41 minutes and 42 seconds, and was accessed from the CBS Sunday Morning YouTube channel. The data consists of the transcript of the interview which was

transcribed by *Anthiago* website, then the researchers rechecked and edited the transcript to ensure its accuracy with the original video.

This study followed Fraser's (2009) categorization of DMs and used Crible and Degand's (2019) framework to identify their functions. Once the DMs were identified, they were classified into Fraser's subtypes, such as contrastive, elaborative, or inferential markers. After that, the markers were analyzed to determine their function based on the contextual relationship between S1 and S2 using Crible & Degand (2019) framework, such as addition, alternative, cause, concession, condition, consequence, contrast, hedging, monitoring, specification, temporal, agreeing, disagreeing, topic, or quoting. Finally, the findings were interpreted according to the research questions. To present the data systematically, each excerpt from the interview transcript is labeled with a code indicating the speaker and the order of the speech. The speaker codes are "N" for Nate Bargatze and "C" for Conor Knighton, followed by a number marking the data sequence (e.g., N1, N2, C1, C2). This coding system helps organize the analysis and maintain clear presentation of findings.

FINDING

1. Types of Discourse Markers in the Interview

Fraser (2009) classifies discourse markers into three types: contrastive, elaborative, and inferential. Contrastive markers indicate a direct or indirect contrast between S1 and S2, for example 'but', 'still', 'however'. The second type is elaborative markers, which signify elaboration of S2 on the information contained in S1, for example 'and', 'also', 'as well'. Lastly, inferential markers signal that S1 provides a basis for inferring S2, for example 'so', 'thus', 'then'. Based on this theory, the researcher investigated the types of discourse markers that appeared in the interview entitled *Extended Interview: Comedian Nate Bargatze*.

Table 1. Types of DMs

Types of DMs	Frequency	Percentage
Contrastive marker	56	14%
Elaborative marker	256	62%
Inferential marker	92	22%
Total	413	100%

Table 1 presents a total of 413 DMs appeared in the interview, with elaborative markers being the most frequently used at 62%, followed by inferential markers at 22%, and finally contrastive markers at 14%. Details on each type of DMs will be explained further below.

Contrastive Marker

Table 2. Contrastive markers

Contrastive Markers	Frequency
But	53
Yet	2
even though	1
Total	56

Based on the table above, the word ‘but’ was the most contrastive marker found in the interview, appearing 53 times during the conversation. Meanwhile, the marker ‘yet’ appeared twice, and ‘even though’ appeared once. Contrastive markers refer to direct or indirect comparisons between S1 and S2. In this study, ‘but’, ‘yet’ and ‘even though’ indicated a change of topic or a contradiction to another statement. The following are examples of excerpts from the interview.

N1: “I’ll probably make plenty of wrong moves. **But** the idea of it is not just about me being a movie star. It’s about what I want to build and I want to make movies for the next generation.”

N2: “**Even though** I was in front of this arena, in front of all these people that were there to see me, I knew I was going to a world with television, SNL, and the more mainstream ...”

C1: “Your book is called *Big Dumb Eyes*. And **yet**, when I hear you talk about comedy, it is smart almost to a surgical level, where it sounds like you're going word by word.”

In excerpt N1, the word ‘but’ connects two clauses with contrasting ideas. The first clause, “*I might make a lot of mistakes*” anticipates the possibility of failure, while the second clause, “*the idea behind it isn’t just about me becoming a movie star...*” shifts the conversation to Nate’s broader goals. In excerpt N2, the word ‘even though’ connects two clauses that describe contrasting situations. Nate compares being in front of a large live audience with entering the mainstream media world where many people do not yet know him. In excerpt C1, the word ‘yet’ marks the contrast between the title of Nate's book (*Big Dumb Eyes*) and Nate's actual character as a smart comedian.

Elaborative Marker

Table 3. Elaborative markers

Elaborative Markers	Frequency
And	149
Like	66
and then	41
Also	4
as well	2
Too	2
Or	1
Total	256

The table above shows the words that are used as elaborative markers in the interview. The word ‘and’ appeared 149 times as the most often used marker, followed by the word ‘like’ with 66 occurrences. Then ‘and then’ appeared 41 times. Next, the word ‘also’ appeared four times. The words ‘as well’ and ‘too’ each appeared twice. Lastly, the least frequently found word was ‘or’, which appeared only once. Elaborative markers indicate a linking or addition of information from S2 to S1. In this study, ‘and’, ‘like’, ‘and then’, ‘too’, ‘as well’, and ‘or’ became markers for adding information or explaining the previous clause. Below are examples from the interview.

N3: “I know what to do when not to veer. **And** I think that's what I've learned was because this took, you know, I've been doing comedy for 21 years.”

N4: “So, I can't go in with this energy of like I'm doing arenas, *man*. **Like**, I need to go win all these people over”

N5: “You're just a young kid that doesn't know where he wants to go do. **And then** I remember I would listen to Bob and Tom radio.”

N6: “The biggest part is you're around people that are nervous and trying for the first time **also**.”

N7: “Dollywood is like two hours away—two half hours away. Great theme park **as well**.”

N8: “And they can go be on their own for their first time. **Or** when they're 17 or 16, you go drop them off at a theme park.”

In the excerpt N3, the word ‘and’ is used as an elaborative marker that connects two related clauses. The second clause elaborates on the first by adding further details about Nate’s learning process, specifically by giving reasons based on his long experience in comedy. In excerpt N4, the word ‘like’ explains an example of the speaker’s mindset. This helps Nate explain his attitude towards performing in the arena in a more casual way. In excerpt N5, the word ‘and then’ connects Nate’s description of his initial uncertainty with later memories, thereby expanding the narrative sequence.

In excerpt N6 and N7, the words ‘also’, ‘too’, and ‘as well’ indicate addition. The word ‘also’ signifies that the people mentioned are not only present but are additionally nervous and experiencing something for the first time, while ‘as well’ expands the previous description by emphasizing that Dollywood is not only close but also a good amusement park. In excerpt N8, ‘or’ expands the previous clause by providing another situation that may be related to children visiting amusement park.

Inferential Marker

Table 4. Inferential markers

Inferential Markers	Frequency
So	76
If	11
that's why	4
Then	1
Total	92

Table 4 shows that in the interview, the words ‘so’, ‘if’, ‘that's why’, and ‘then’ were used as inferential markers. The word ‘so’ was used most frequently by the speakers, appearing 76 times. The marker ‘if’ appeared 11 times, while ‘that's why’ appeared four times. Lastly, ‘then’ appeared the least, which was once. These markers are used to indicate consequences or inferences. The following excerpts illustrate their use in the interview.

N9: “Their expectations are higher every time. **So**, I need to be better.”

C2: “**If** you want to be a doctor, you go to med school.”

N10: “It's all through experience. **That's why** I like doing all this stuff—hosting the Emmys or SNL Live or doing a movie or whatever it is.”

N11: “When you can really hear their laughter, **then** you can sit a little bit more and let them come to you.”

In excerpt N9, the marker ‘so’ signals consequence, implying that higher audience expectations mean Nate must try harder to perform better. In excerpt C2, ‘if’ introduces a conditional relationship, where someone wants to become a doctor, they must go to medical school. Excerpt N10 uses ‘that's why’, which explicitly states the conclusion drawn from Nate’s past experiences, guiding the diverse experiences of the present. Last, in excerpt N11, the marker ‘then’ signifies the inferred result, showing that hearing the audience's laughter clearly allows the comedian to adjust his tempo and delivery.

This study shows that speakers use DMs throughout the interview. They use DMs to help connect ideas and maintain interaction during the conversation. These findings are similar to the results reported by Fu et al. (2024) and Afriyanti, (2015), who found that DMs are often used in spoken media discourse to support fluency and coherence. In this study, speakers employ DMs when they need to elaborate on their thoughts, clarify meanings, or respond smoothly to their interlocutors.

In addition, this study shows that various types of DMs appear in the interview. These findings are relevant to the results of (Luh et al., 2024), who found that contrastive, elaborative, and inferential markers are used in a talk show, with elaborative markers appearing most frequently and inferential markers least frequently. Similarly, in this study, elaborative markers, particularly the marker ‘and’ were most frequently used by the speakers. This is because, in the

conversation, speakers often add to or develop ideas from the previous clause, and the marker ‘and’ is used for this purpose. However, the difference in this study is that contrastive markers appear least frequently. This indicates that speakers rarely place their ideas in opposition to previous statements.

2. Function of Discourse Markers in the Interview

The discourse markers (DMs) used by the speakers in the interview serve various functions. The researchers used the Crible & Degand (2019) framework to analyze the functions of DMs. They proposed fifteen discourse marker functions, including addition, alternative, cause, concession, condition, consequence, contrast, hedging, monitoring, specification, temporal, agreeing, disagreeing, topic, and quoting. The results of the analysis are illustrated in the table below.

Table 5. Functions of DMs

Functions of DMs	Frequency
Addition (ADD)	157
Consequence (CSQ)	81
Hedging (HDG)	66
Contrast (CTR)	55
Temporal (TEM)	41
Condition (CND)	11
Alternative (ALT)	1
Concession (CCS)	1
Total	413

Table 5 illustrates the functions of discourse markers found in the interview. A total of 413 DMs were identified across eight functions. Addition (ADD) was the most frequent, with 157 occurrences, followed by consequence (CSQ) with 81 occurrences. Hedging (HDG) appeared 66 times, while contrast (CTR) occurred 55 times. This was followed by temporal (TEM), which appeared 41 times. Less frequent functions included condition (CND), which appeared 11 times, whereas alternative (ALT) and concession (CCS) each appeared only once. Meanwhile, other functions, including cause, monitoring, specification, agreeing, disagreeing, topic, and quoting were not found in the interview.

Addition (ADD)

Addition (ADD) functions are used to add new information related to the previous segment. In interviews, addition functions help speakers expand on their ideas, explain in detail, and maintain the flow of conversation.

N12: “I’m not going to curse **and** I’m not going to be political.”

C3: “There’s plenty going on for you to think about other people **as well**.”

The examples above show discourse markers used to insert related information that expands on a previous statement. In excerpt N12, the word ‘and’ connects two parallel statements made by the speaker, while in excerpt C3, the phrase “as well” adds further information to the discussion.

Consequence (CSQ)

Consequence (CSQ) refers to a function in which the second clause presents the result that follows from the previous clause. This function allows speakers to show how certain feelings, actions, or situations cause specific outcomes during interactions.

N13: "I was so scared of that. **So**, I just didn't say anything."

N14: "I don't have to do it. **That's why** I thought my Saturday Night Lives did good."

In the excerpts above, discourse markers signify the relationship between cause and result. In excerpt N13, the marker 'so' connects Nate's fear (of other people's opinions) with his decision to remain silent. Meanwhile, in excerpt N14, 'that's why' suggests drawing conclusions from the speaker's previous experiences.

Hedging (HDG)

Hedging (HDG) is used when speakers soften their statements or express uncertainty. This function is commonly used in interviews, as speakers often soften their sentences when they talk.

N15: "I was not perfect at all. **Like**, I made bad decisions."

This text excerpt exemplifies how the discourse marker 'like' functions to soften a statement. Instead of presenting his evaluation rigidly, the speaker uses 'like' to introduce an example and soften his judgment of himself.

Contrast (CTR)

Contrast (CTR) occurs when the speaker expresses opposition or difference between two ideas. This function helps to point out inconsistencies in the conversation.

C4: "Right now you're the top touring comedian in the country, and **yet** you're considering wrapping up the touring."

N16: "They might be laughing the same way as an arena is, **but** I can't tell."

In the examples, contrastive markers show contradictory conditions. The marker 'yet' in C4 compares Nate's current success with his consideration of stopping the tour, while 'but' in N16 indicates the speaker's inconsistency in interpreting the audience's reaction.

Temporal (TEM)

Temporal (TEM) is used to indicate the sequence or progression of events. Through this function, the speaker organizes experiences in chronological order.

N17: "We both took some classes in Second City. **And then** I just kind of went into standup."

The marker 'and then' in quote N17 clearly indicates a shift in time, showing what happened after the initial experience. In the context above, that

helps Nate organize his statements by showing how one stage of his career followed another.

Condition (CND)

Condition (CND) describes hypothetical situations and possible outcomes. This function allows speakers to address a possibility and its consequences without stating certainty.

C5: “**If** you want to be a comedian, maybe you take a class, maybe you don't.”

In excerpt C5, the word ‘if’ identifies a conditional situation. The speaker states the outcome of taking comedy classes or not as a possibility if someone wants to be a comedian.

Alternative (ALT)

Alternative (ALT) presents different options or choices in a conversation. This function expands on the speaker's idea by offering more than one possible scenario.

N8: “And they can go be on their own for their first time. **Or** when they're 17 or 16, you go drop them off at a theme park.”

The marker ‘or’ indicates an alternative situation. This allows the speaker to describe different ways in which children might experience independence. Rather than replacing the first idea, this marker adds another possible option.

Concession (CCS)

Concession (CCS) means that an idea still stands despite other conditions that potentially contradict it. This function often represents a contrast combined with acknowledgment.

N2: “**Even though** I was in front of this arena, in front of all these people that were there to see me, I knew I was going to a world with television, SNL, and the more mainstream...”

The marker ‘even though’ in the example introduces a concessive relationship. Even though the speaker is performing in front of a large live audience, he acknowledges a shift toward a different professional environment. This shows that the second situation remains valid in spite of the first situation.

DISCUSSION

This study shows that DMs in the interview serves as tools that help speakers organize their ideas and communicate more clearly. There are eight functions found based on the categories proposed by Crible & Degand (2019). The dominant use is the addition (ADD) function, which indicates that speakers often add information gradually, especially when explaining experiences or opinions. This is because interviews are spontaneous, with ideas developing naturally as the conversation progresses, particularly in the responses given by

Nate Bargatze. On the other hand, alternative (ALT) and concession (CCS) functions appear very rarely, implying that the interview did not involve argumentative interactions or conflicting points. Instead, the speakers focused more on describing personal experiences and reflections than on expressing a contradiction. In conclusion, DMs help maintain clarity, coherence, and smooth flow throughout the interview.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the use of discourse markers in an interview titled *Extended Interview: Comedian Nate Bargatze*, which was uploaded to the CBS Sunday Morning YouTube channel. This study analyzed the types and functions of DMs. Based on Fraser's (2009) classification, three types of DMs were identified: contrastive, elaborative, and inferential. The results showed that a total of 413 DMs were found, with elaborative markers being used most frequently, occurring 256 times, followed by inferential markers with 92 occurrences and contrastive markers with 56 times occurrences. It was found that the elaborative markers used by the speakers are 'and', 'like', 'and then', 'also', 'as well', 'too', and 'or'. Speakers used inferential markers with the words 'so', 'if', 'that's why', and 'then'. Finally, contrastive markers were 'but', 'yet', and 'even though'.

Furthermore, this study analyzed the function of DMs using Crible and Degand's (2019) framework. Eight discourse marker functions were found in the data, with addition occurring 175 occurs, consequence 81 times, hedging 66 times, contrast 55 times, temporal 41 times, condition 11 times, while alternative and concession occurred once each. Meanwhile, several functions, such as cause, monitoring, specification, agreeing, disagreeing, topic, and quoting, were not found in the interview. Overall, these functions contribute significantly to cohesion and flow in spoken discourse in media interviews.

REFERENCES

- Afriyanti, D. (2015). *David Cameron's discourse markers in the Andrew Marr Show*, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Jakarta.
- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particles. Evidence from a Corpus*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Arya, T. (2022). Exploring discourse marker use in Thai university students' conversations. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network* (Vol. 13, Issue 1).
- Blakemore, D. (1996). Are apposition markers discourse markers? *Journal of Linguistics*, 32(2), 325–347. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4176371>
- Choi, I. (2025). Recent changes of now as a discourse marker in spoken English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 242, 175–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2025.04.012>

- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.).
- Crible, L., & Cuenca, M.-J. (2017). Discourse markers in speech: distinctive features and corpus annotation. *Dialogue & Discourse*, 8(2), 149–166. <https://doi.org/10.5087/dad.2017.207>
- Crible, L., & Degand, L. (2019). *Discourse domains and functions: a two-dimensional account of discourse markers*. <https://doi.org/10.4000/discours.9997>
- Emmiyati, N. (2023). Discourse markers used by non-native speakers in the Good Morning America talk show. *ELITE: English and Literature Journal*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.24252/elite>
- Farahani, M. V., & Ghane, Z. (2022). Unpacking the function(s) of discourse markers in academic spoken English: a corpus-based study. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 45(1), 49–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-022-00005-3>
- Fraser, B. (1999). *Fraser, B. (1999)*. What are discourse markers?. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 931-952.
- Fraser, B. (2010). An account of discourse markers. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 1(2), 293–320. <https://doi.org/10.1163/187730909x12538045489818>
- Fu, Y., Afzaal, M., & El-Dakhs, D. A. S. (2024). Investigating discourse markers “you know” and “I mean” in mediatized English political interviews: a corpus-based comparative study. *Frontiers in Communication*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1427062>
- García García, M. (2021). Turn-initial discourse markers in L2 Spanish conversations: insights from conversation analysis. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 5(1), 37–61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-019-00075-8>
- Liu, Y. (2023). Differences between spoken and written English. *Communications in Humanities Research*, 3(1), 757–761. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7064/3/20220615>
- Luh, N., Dewi, W. K., & Ayomi, P. N. (2024). Discourse markers in talk shows: the case study of The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. *Kulturistik: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Budaya*, 8(2), 108-116. <https://doi.org/10.22225/kulturistik.8.2.7974>
- Mahmud, M., Halim, A., & Nur, S. (2023). Discourse markers in the students’ individual presentation in Indonesian classroom. *PERFORMANCE: Journal of English Education and Literature* (Vol. 2, Issue 4). <https://doi.org/10.26858/performance.v2i4.54292>
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611841>
- Shimada, Kazunari, & Miura, A. (2019). Japanese EFL learners’ use of discourse markers in their speech and writing. *Language Education & Technology* (Vol. 56). https://doi.org/10.24539/let.56.0_187
- O’Keeffe, A. (2006). *Investigating media discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Verdonik, D. (2022). Discourse markers and dialogue act annotation for computational dialogue systems. In *discourse markers in interaction: From*

production to comprehension. Eds. M. Cuenca and L. Degand (De Gruyter Mouton), 191–214.

Wahid, A., Suyitno, I., Suyono, S., & -, M. (2020). Discourse marker in descriptive essays: a study on junior high school students. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists*, 8(3), 1099–1111. <https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.764191>