

Interpersonal Markers of Taylor Swift and Armaya Doremi in Their Graduation Speech

Gaizka Naufal Winalda¹, Rohmani Nur Indah²

¹⁻²Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia

E-mail: gaizkanaufal8301@gmail.com; indah@bsi.uin-malang.ac.id

Abstract

Public speaking, including presenting a graduation speech, becomes unintentionally complex because it has standardization. Delivering outstanding speeches becomes a challenge for English Foreign Language (EFL) learners, who delegate themselves as public speakers. This research compares graduation speeches by Taylor Swift, a native speaker, and Armaya Doremi, an EFL student. It is to identify the intricate skills that should be mastered in public speaking, namely using discourse markers. The descriptive qualitative method was used to find interpersonal markers used by Taylor Swift and Armaya Doremi. The theory used to analyze the data was the interpersonal marker theory by Ädel (2010). The findings demonstrated that the interpersonal markers used in both graduation speeches were linguistic comments, discourse organization, speech act labels, and references to the audience. Taylor Swift, a native speaker, used all main categories of interpersonal markers and longer interpersonal markers than Armaya Doremi, as an EFL learner. Future researchers are suggested to dig deeper into the topic, particularly concerning interpersonal markers of spontaneous speech in various contexts.

Keywords: graduation speech; interpersonal markers; public speaking

1. INTRODUCTION

Until recently, one of the greatest fears of humans is public speaking. The most recent Chapman University Survey on American Fears in 2019 found public speaking at No. 52, well behind sharks (41), death (48), and Obamacare (33) (Leith, 2019). When people present their ideas in front of others, fear frequently arises because they perceive speaking engagements as potentially threatening their reputation, image, and chance to connect with an audience; as such, the audience should receive understanding (Tsaousides, 2018; Damayanti & Listyani, 2020; Lesmana & Kharismadewi, 2022). All in all, the audience and public speaking are closely related.

The speaker should have an audience that accepts the speaker's words. Because of this consequence, for the message to be conveyed properly, the speaker must master the language. In this context, language comprehension is how the speaker tells meaning through the words (Daud et al., 2019). For example, the

speaker employs neatly arranged, systematic, and coherent speech. In addition to mastering the language, the speaker must have more knowledge to convey the message well. Another element that adds to your fear of public speaking is your expertise in a particular subject (Tsaousides, 2018).

The subsets of speaking can result in standardization. Many speakers are remembered as examples because their background is someone smart in this era. The listener will either be surprised or wish they could talk that way. They might talk intrinsically tied to the characteristics of speech, figurative language, sayings, and a neat language arrangement. Due to the significant influence on language learning, public speaking fear has played a crucial role in language learning (Terçan & Dikilitaş, 2018). In essence, not fully mastering the language is one of the reasons people are afraid to speak in front of an audience.

This fear will be multiplied for Indonesian students with EFL status. They become more careful in speaking. Because of people's expectations, they feel nervous. They become insecure when they believe the words, sentences, and information conveyed are incorrect. It will worsen if they stutter, tremble, or do not believe in themselves while doing it, plus their unsupportive environment. They are terrified of being humiliated or rejected (Black, 2019). Their lack of proficiency in the language, syntax, and speaking techniques contributes to their anxiety when speaking. They are concerned that the message conveyed to the audience will be misunderstood because it is not neatly organized, systematic, or coherent. In short, public speaking remains a terrifying specter for EFL students in Indonesia.

Public speaking, popular among students, is the commencement of a graduation speech. Being a speaker on graduation day is one of the student's most prestigious experiences (Amalia et al., 2021). According to Arthur and Fenyi (2022), the ability to express oneself through appropriate words is the key to a speech. As a result, many factors must be considered when delivering a speech. Azijah and Gulö (2020) state that a speaker must know several factors, such as word choice, language use, and speech organization. This understanding seeks to bargain with the listener to make the presentation more interactive and establish a relationship with the listener. The speaker typically builds a connection with the listener without even realizing it using discourse markers (Firdaus & Shartika, 2021)

Discourse markers may significantly impact how the speaker communicates with the audience. Discourse markers are linguistic resources used to achieve effective communication and persuasion, leading to successful interaction (Permana, 2017). Discourse markers in spoken or written sentences usually focus more on structure, whereas utterances concentrate more on their use in a specific context (Amalia et al., 2021; Azijah & Gulö, 2020). The context of the study is the state of discourse markers used in spoken language, mainly graduation speech. Ghafarpour (2022) believes that different types of spoken language, such as face-to-face conversations, monologues, and speeches, can contain varying amounts of discourse markers.

Listeners might only comprehend the speaker's saying when discourse

markers are used correctly. Discourse markers refer to the interaction between the transmitter and receiver, the speaker's and the hearer's roles (Kuswoyo & Siregar, 2019). In addition, discourse markers can represent the author's or speaker's efforts to lead the recipient's perception of a text or utterances (Zhang, 2019). According to Ghafarpour (2022), they can also help overcome obstacles to unprompted speech, such as the ability to be reviewed and revised; for example, 'oh' can be used to indicate that the future information belongs to the previous one in the discourse and "I mean" can be used to represent that the following information corrects a last error.

The sequences that discourse markers have can also be employed as contrastive markers. Regarding the sequential order of English discourse markers, Haselow (2019) focuses on combining a small number of discourse markers that include contrastive discourse markers, such as 'but,' 'yet,' and implicative so, as a result. Although no specific sequencing principles are identified, the argument implies that primary discourse markers logically precede secondary discourse markers, given that primary discourse markers are relatively non-specific in meaning. Secondary discourse markers determine the relationship between neighboring discourse units (Haselow, 2019).

Even as an option, the employment of discourse markers ultimately proves to be crucial. According to some scholars (Sukma, 2017; Yasinta et al., 2018), there are only two discourse markers: interactive and interactional. The interactive discourse marker features bring speakers and listeners together and organize material by paying attention to the requirements and expectations of listeners, both of which are reactions to interpersonal aspects (Rasooyar & Hosseini, 2019).

Interpersonal markers complement discourse markers since they can help organize the material provided. It places the speaker in the spotlight and encourages audience participation (Kashiha, 2022). Interpersonal markers, such as "I showed above" and "as you can see," can be used to make direct references from speakers and from what was said, as well as to establish a persona and take a stance (Matroudy & Ebrahimi, 2022; Rezaei et al., 2022).

As a result, this study goes into greater detail about the significance of understanding one subset of discourse markers, namely interpersonal markers, in an expression. Interpersonal markers facilitate communication between the speaker and the audience (Azijah & Gulö, 2020; Yasinta et al., 2018). Understanding the implied meaning of the speaker's utterance is required in all types of communication, including speech (Esmer, 2017).

This study used the pragmatics perspective to research discourse markers, especially in the interpersonal markers branch. According to Yule (in Hariati et al., 2020), pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies a meaning in the context of the speaker's speech. The pragmatic domain is the most suitable for this study because it can understand precise definitions and is most relevant to graduation speeches. They also state that pragmatics is used to study speakers' meaning based on the context of speech and when it occurs (Hariati et al., 2020). Discourse markers have been approved as one of the crucial elements of communication that can

measure effectiveness in speaking pragmatically (Yüksel & Kavanoz, 2018; Öztürk & Köse, 2021; Farahani & Ghane, 2022). It is critical for someone to master practical competencies to effectively communicate their thoughts and transfer/exchange knowledge and information as occurs during speech (Arthur & Fenyi, 2022).

Several researchers have investigated a similar topic regarding interpersonal markers, which motivates new researchers to dig deeper into Ädel (2010) theory. According to Amalia et al. (2021), discourse markers are also used in diplomatic settings as interpersonal markers. However, what is frequently mentioned by Amalia et al. (2021) is textual discourse markers. At the same time, Sukma (2017) discovered in a subsequent study that in the context of a diplomatic setting, Obama used all categories of interpersonal markers, namely fences, certainty markers, attributes, attitude markers, and comments, in his 2012 speech campaign. Of all the types, attitude and commentary markers were the most frequently used, indicating that the speaker attempted to build an emotional bond with his audience as a persuasive strategy in his campaign speech.

While more study outlines speech that emphasizes micro-categorization, Mirzaeian's (2020) findings show that, despite similarities in meta-discourse use between the two contemporary US presidents, each chooses to use a typical micro-category pattern. He concludes that the findings imply that writers speaking the same language and having the same cultural background would benefit from various micro-categories of interpersonal markers. It was done to fulfill any particular function of interpersonal markers, for example, establishing speaker-audience relationships or expressing attitudes toward interpersonal markers.

Even though several researchers are already interested in this field, this study differs from previous research in that it presents interpersonal markers in actual conditions during the graduation speech. Because in this situation, some people will share their personal experiences, motivations, and words of thanks. Then, discourse markers, particularly interpersonal markers, will appear more frequently. This study looks into this field because the researcher thinks learning more about interpersonal markers is essential. It must be well understood because it serves as a link between sentences. Furthermore, to express something effectively, it must be bridged between contexts. So, the expression is considered coherent. Understanding interpersonal markers in this pragmatic area will improve language mastery.

This study aims to examine all of Taylor Swift's utterances in her graduation speech for interpersonal markers. She is chosen because she is an influential and well-spoken individual. She does it when she gives speeches at talk shows and concerts. According to some social media comments on YouTube, Instagram, and Twitter, she is good at public speaking. She makes use of well-structured language. Meanwhile, this study also compared Armaya Doremi because she was one of the Indonesian EFL students allowed to speak on graduation day. She spent about ten months studying English and living in the United States. However, the topics that scholars have examined both share some similarities. They both had the opportunity to deliver commencement addresses. They build interpersonal markers during

ceremonial speeches by convincing the audience several times. This study aimed to demonstrate the differences in language structure used by the two, particularly in interpersonal markers. As a result, this study explored interpersonal markers in speech, providing new insights into social life regarding how native speakers and language learners used interpersonal markers.

2. METHOD

This research constructed the discourse marker, especially the interpersonal marker used in a graduation speech. Because the data in this study is in the form of words, it used the descriptive qualitative technique. However, there is universal agreement that qualitative researchers must show the credibility of their investigations (Creswell, 2009). The current study used a descriptive design that results in an in-depth examination of descriptive data. The descriptive-qualitative method aims to uncover the phenomena's essence via study (Hudon et al., 2013). Furthermore, this study employs real-world data, namely the usage of discourse markers in the interpersonal marker branch of university graduation speeches based on Adel's interpersonal markers theory (2010).

This research used primary and secondary data sources. The preliminary data of the research are Taylor Swift and Armaya Doremi's speech, entitled NYU's 2022 Commencement Speaker Taylor Swift, and Inspiring Commencement Speech from Indonesian Student Armaya Doremi in a video. YouTube links to each video of Taylor's <https://youtu.be/OBG50aoUwII> and Armaya's <https://youtu.be/4ONKazuDBpY>. Meanwhile, the secondary data are the downloaded transcripts of each video containing interpersonal markers in the form of words or phrases. Then, it is supported by several previous studies as a source of comparisons from earlier studies and ideas about interpersonal markers.

There are several stages of data collection. Firstly, the researchers watched the video of Taylor Swift entitled NYU's 2022 Commencement Speaker Taylor Swift and Inspiring Commencement Speech from Indonesian Student Armaya Doremi several times. Secondly, the researchers obtained the transcripts from their YouTube videos. Thirdly, the researchers also checked the content of the transcripts with the video.

The researchers analyzed the data in several phases. First, categorizing the interpersonal markers of Taylor Swift and Armaya Doremi into several categories, namely linguistic comments: repairing; reformulating; commenting on linguistics form/meaning; clarifying; managing terminology, discourse organization: introducing topic; delimiting topic; adding topic; concluding topic; marking asides; enumerating; endhoporic marking; previewing; reviewing; contextualizing, speech act labels; arguing; exemplifying; other speech act labeling, references to the audience: managing channel; managing audience discipline; anticipating audiences' response; managing the messages; imagining scenarios. Secondly, analyze the interpersonal markers of Taylor and Armaya using Adel's (2010) theory. Finally, the researchers concluded the findings of the research.

3. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

3.1. Result

Table 1 compares the interpersonal markers used by Taylor Swift and Armaya Doremi. The significance of the difference in the statistics of interpersonal markers raises potential concerns. Nevertheless, bear in mind that the lengths of each are different. However, it is undeniable that Taylor, a native speaker, employs more social cues. A clear differentiation between them is when they use references to the audience. Taylor provided 99, while Armaya provided 26 found in the data.

Table 1. Interpersonal markers used by native speakers and language learners

Interpersonal marker	Taylor Swift	Armaya Doremi
<i>Self-mention</i>		
I	108 (38%)	37 (39%)
Me	23 (8%)	17 (18%)
<i>Sum of self-mention</i>	<i>131</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Include audience</i>		
Me	20 (7%)	-
We	-	9 (10%)
Our	10 (3%)	4 (4%)
Us	12 (4%)	4 (4%)
You	91 (32%)	15 (16%)
Your	23 (8%)	8 (9%)
Yours	1 (0,3%)	-
<i>The sum includes an audience</i>	<i>157</i>	<i>40</i>
Total marker	288	94

3.1.1 Linguistic Comments

a. Repairing

08:45 *Not the type of doctor you would want around in case of an emergency* (datum 1.1)

When Taylor explained that she was already a doctor, datum 1.1 is a repair she formed. This interpersonal marker suggests the setting of what Taylor previously stated, "I would like to thank NYU for making me officially, at least on paper, a doctor." Nevertheless, she wants the listeners to get the right idea. Additionally, the pronoun "you" is used to imply references to the audience, which, of course, makes this an interpersonal marker. In the end, the audience's initial response of comprehension was quickly followed by laughter at Taylor's remarks. Therefore, it is evident that repairs were made to this data.

05:52 *In other words, don't be afraid*

05:56 *to take a risk because there may be*

05:58 *Something vulnerable and important*

06:02 *waiting for you, I did* (datum 2.1).

This information allows it to be concluded that Armaya successfully recreates her words. This sentence comes out due to the heroic message from Soekarno that she previously expressed. She stated that and then told the audience again in her own words. She uses reconstruction to help the audience understand the information she is trying to convey. The word “in other words” in the phrase discourse markers has taken on new meaning in this data. Using this word is not usually a sign of interpersonal markers. However, this information is included in the interpersonal marker because both “you” and “I” are pronouns in the dependent clause. Armaya addresses the audience as “you” to convey a special message. She uses “I” to reflect on this message to the audience.

b. Reformulating

08:51 *Unless your specific emergency*

08:53 *was that you desperately needed to hear a song*

08:56 *with a catchy hook*

08:58 *and an intensely cathartic bridge section* (datum 1.2).

Regarding the spoken “emergency,” Taylor clarifies it again by adding value to this word. Adding this value is reformulating the previously spoken sentence by reconstructing the sentence into an explanation. The emergency that Taylor referred to is aimed at people who need a song with a catchy hook and a great bridge, maybe a moment sad, anxious, precarious, or other conditions. Furthermore, Taylor instructs the audience to give the term emergency more meaning by pronouncing the pronoun “your” in that context. The following subordinate clause indicates that this formulation shift is quite lengthy.

03:14 *Well, I am thrilled even to imagine that*

03:16 *I could study in one of the Top*

03:18 *Universities in the U.S.*

Armaya appears to have changed his opinion by commenting on the earlier statement in light of these facts. She described the trip he took to get to America. She briefly described his journey before saying she enjoyed remembering those times. Then, an independent clause is added to this sentence to finish it. The audience was informed of the remarks with the phrase, “Well, I am thrilled to even imagine.” Interpersonal marker data is on the self-mentioned “I” by bringing a nice persona and commenting from his point of view. In the independent clause, “I” is used once more.

c. Commenting on linguistic form/meaning

12:04 *I guess I have been officially solicited in this situation* (datum 1.3)

Taylor assumed that she had been subtly requested to deliver the message after sharing stories from his life that were packaged as a message for the audience. Graduates will deliver messages about their personal experiences. In this data, interpersonal markers are also taken into account. This data incorporates interpersonal markers by using the pronoun “I” as a self-mention. Therefore, it is included as an interpersonal marker of linguistic comment.

04:35 *The program that assured me to American graduate school* (datum 2.3).

Managing terminology may be present in this material. Armaya explained how she could travel to the US and attend Boston University. She intended to clarify his point for the audience's benefit. Armaya wants the audience to comprehend what was previously conveyed. Furthermore, there is a "me" self-mention. Thus, this data will still be an interpersonal marker. The audience will know about her participation in the program to study in America. Complete evidence of interpersonal indicators and managing terms can be found in this data.

d. Clarifying

07:36 *I know that words are supposed to be my thing* (datum 1.4).

Context can be an essential factor when clarifying. Taylor believes that there are the most important people who venture with us, as in this data. These individuals are worth keeping in mind. Taylor thought that these words, even though directed at the public, should also be directed at herself. At that point in the sentence, she had clarified, "...that words are supposed to be my thing." What is more intriguing is when she updates her statement with the pronoun "I know" by adding a persona. Therefore, it is unnecessary to speculate about which information will be clarified.

00:16 *Before I begin, I want to thank God,*

00:20 *for the hold and blessing that he gives*

00:22 *us tonight* (datum 2.4).

Armaya organized her remarks differently than Taylor, using fascinating discourse organizations other than enumerating. She has used dialogue organizations to draw attention ever since the conversation started. Nevertheless, aside from that, it is also essential to organize the conversation. Everything has a beginning and an end, and she concluded by saying "last" after his speech. For this reason, the discourse is nonetheless logically organized, even without enumeration. The introduction topic in this data is displayed. The words "before I begin," according to Armaya, were sufficient to establish that it was an introduction. The pronoun "I" appears twice, as well as an attention-getting "us" as part of the given persona. There is no question as to the fact that this data exists and comprises sub-interpersonal markers that introduce the topic.

e. Managing terminology

13:16 *What I mean by that is knowing what things to keep and what things to release* (datum 1.5).

The definition of the earlier word is then given in a separate sentence in the final datum of the linguistics commentary by Taylor. Terminating management aims to describe something using a new formula rather than just its definition. Taylor wishes to provide his audience with more information about the situation. Because there is typically a specific phrase, managing terminology is simpler to write up. These unique words and expressions include "I mean." Then, there is no longer a need to dispute its reality. It is clear from the phrase that Taylor used "What I mean by that" as a persona to draw the audience's attention to the definition while beginning the statement. While

his previous statement's concrete meaning is "knowing what things to keep and what things to release," a few unique signs simplify marking and managing terminology.

06:30 *I will carry its spirit of creativity,*

06:33 *innovation,*

06:34 *and independent thinking through my*

06:36 *journey in a professional world*

06:39 *This university made it possible for me*

06:41 *to take on*

06:42 *New opportunities* (datum 2.5).

As usual, many speech acts were used, particularly commencement speeches. After her speech, Armaya hopes to inspire her audience to do good accomplishments. She also hopes the changes are from her and the audience to the outside world. She encourages us to take risks just like she did. "I will carry" is already a speaking act, according to this data. Using the formula "I" is the Subject and "will carry" is the Verb, it is possible to identify this statement as another speech act. However, since "I," "my," and "me" are mentioned, interpersonal markers are included in this data.

3.1.2 Discourse Organization

Enumerating

12:59 *The first of which is life can be heavy*

13:04 *Especially if you try to carry it all at once* (datum 1.6)

Taylor took note of the message's order before delivering it. She put it together by using the enumerating discourse organization technique. This sentence comes in the middle of the topic rather than at the start. Before she said that, she used to be more appreciative of the person who awarded her the doctor title, her parents, the audience members who were present, and the fans she still has. However, this sentence on data appeared whenever she needed to make a point. Taylor, who uses the phrase "The first of which is," fits under this category. She spoke in great detail. The pronoun "you" is used to support it when she speaks. In general, enumerating makes distinctions the simplest.

01:07 *I am incredibly honored to be your*

01:08 *commencement speaker* (datum 2.6).

In this case, the managing channel may indicate that Armaya is on the same page as the audience. Nevertheless, this information demonstrates that she wants to be consistent with other listeners. She was delighted to say that she would be speaking at Boston University's commencement address. The level of similarity in this data is trim, but it is accurate. This data has little information to suggest how it might fit into the sub. However, it is clear from the opening line, "I am incredibly honored to be your commencement speaker," that Armaya wants the audience to be aware that she has the same opportunity as other commencement speakers at the graduation. In addition, the

self-pronoun “I” becomes a distinct interpersonal marker as the speaker projects her persona. Consequently, this data’s managing channel is its actual presence.

3.1.3 Speech Act Labels

a. Arguing

15:34 It seems to me that there is a false stigma around eagerness (datum 1.7).

Here, Taylor’s data reasoning seems appealing. It is because the conversation uses actual words rather than references to the text. In the actual world, it is a fact that some individuals are hesitant to engage in a desired behavior. Perhaps as a result of worrying excessively about all the bad things that will happen if it fails. Taylor disputed this in response. These words in this data explicitly show the existing function of arguing speech act type. In the remark “it seems to me,” Taylor makes a cliched defense against actual occurrences. The sentence debate will then be continued. The pronoun “me” assumes the persona of the argument so that the audience will accept it, making the interpersonal marker obvious. In this statement, she has effectively communicated her point.

07:05 Last thing this is out of my script (datum 2.7)

This evidence proves that people frequently speak without considering the audience’s reactions. Before saying this, a thought of Armaya came to her. After giving the commencement speech, she broke into a spontaneous song to maintain the audience’s mood and thus improve her speech. As a result, when she mentioned the singing that was not part of the script, the audience agreed with her. She, therefore, considered the audience’s attitude before saying this. The existence of this data might have a unique component. Armaya sought applause from the audience and a spontaneous atmosphere, saying, “This is out of my script.” If not spoken, words like these are not all that bad. In contrast to verbal selfishness, this data only seeks to create a positive persona. The pronoun “my” also reflects her personality. She was able to amaze his listeners by using this information.

b. Exemplifying

14:56 For example, I had a phase where, for the entirety of 2012,

15:01 I dressed like a 1950’s housewife (datum 1.8).

The data that demonstrates this, in particular, appears unique. There are two function interpersonal markers in this datum. Of course, exemplifying comes first. The second that comes is imagining a scenario. Instead of speculating on possible outcomes, researchers will concentrate more on describing examples from the data. Taylor spoke this as an illustration of the context “cringe” she addressed. She even made herself cringe by saying that he had gone through it in 2012. The pronoun “I” and the phrase “for example” are both present in this datum as interpersonal markers. It cannot be disputed that this fact serves as an example.

06:46 *My fellow huskies this is the time, this is the time for us*
06:48 *to take on a challenge.* (datum 2.8)

In commencement addresses, managing messages is a typical occurrence. One of them involves the transmission of messages using this data. Armaya intends to leave the audience with a presumed message on what to do next. This recommendation should be implemented following graduation or even immediately following the commencement address. This line intends to excite the audience and make them aware of the accomplishments she and the audience have made. There may no longer be a need to question the existence of managing the messages on this data. Armaya added, “This is the time for us to take on a challenge,” demonstrating how she inspires the crowd with a unique message. As previously said, she wants both the audience and herself to seize any possibilities that may present themselves. Due to the audience’s special mention and the usage of the pronoun “us,” this information can also be used as an interpersonal marker.

c. Other Speech Act Labeling

26:12 *How do I give advice to this many people*
26:15 *about their life choices?* (datum 1.9)

Other speech acts labeling can be marked if they display the author’s persona by indicating the action to be delivered. This highly unusual data is used since it is a question. It is still a part of the function of the type, whether a statement or an inquiry. After her address, Taylor pointed out this by posing many questions to the crowd. Because she genuinely believed that she was powerless to provide the numerous people present with reasonable options for their lives. All this data makes it simple to characterize speech acts. Taylor asks a question using a speech act in which the letters S and V are combined to form the phrase “How do I give...” The subject is “I,” and the verb “give” is a verb form. From there, it can be seen that the sentence already has a self-mention, which is an interpersonal marker. It also contains much information in the form of speech acts and data.

05:31 *If you’re in public relations like*
05:33 *myself be someone*
05:36 *Who can make people understand what the*
05:38 *reality is* (datum 2.9).

There is a ton of information on this issue, but one that serves as an excellent illustration is the statistics on imagining scenarios. Based on these facts, Armaya compares herself to the audience. In other words, she wanted the audience to picture what it would be like to be like her. She, therefore, makes things easier by using an analogy. Usually, the natural world serves as an illustration for the analogy. She also demonstrates here how individuals and public relations cannot be separated. There are components that, when combined, may refer to the function of interpersonal markers.

Because there is an (if clause), Armaya makes this information explicit. Naturally, if this flag is present, the information is considered while picturing possible outcomes. Additionally, using the invitation pronoun “you” and the self-mention “myself” distinguishes this data as an interpersonal marker. Therefore, it is evident that they are imagining scenarios.

3.1.4 References to Audience

a. Managing channel

05:48 *And let me just say I am elated to be here with you today,*

05:54 *As we celebrate and graduate*

05:57 *New York University's Class of 2022* (datum 1.10).

The managing channels in Taylor's data are essential despite having few. She began her speech with this interpersonal function because it signals that she is in tune with the audience. Even though she is not a student in this instance, she expressed his happiness at New York University's 2022 graduation. This sentence gave the impression that she was also pleased with the audience. This data also demonstrates that interpersonal markers are occasionally not constrained by word count. As long as this statement serves as the managing channel, “I am elated to be here with you today as we celebrate and graduate New York University's Class of 2022.” Pronouns of solicitation and self-mentions are other interpersonal markers in this data. In other words, this information includes interpersonal marker lengths that take channel management into account.

b. Managing audience discipline

15:59 *So you have to listen to me when I say this* (datum 1.11).

The audience can learn to follow the speaker's instructions with the help of this sub-interpersonal marker. Before finally delivering the audience's attention-grabbing message, Taylor said this. She, therefore, took the initiative to order the audience so that they would pay closer attention to what she had to say. The imperative indication may be used to order the audience to behave. The phrase “You have to...” is necessary. The dependent clause, “listen to me when I say this,” directed at the audience, is then said. Of course, Taylor, who is speaking in front of a large audience, needs a sentence like this. Additionally, he adopted a persona that suggested the audience took his words seriously. In a discourse, reprimanding the audience is frequently used as a conclusion.

c. Anticipating Audience Response

18:24 *And I know it can be overwhelming*

18:27 *figuring out who to be and when,*

18:31 *Who you are now and how to act*

18:34 *in order to get where you wanna go* (datum 1.12).

Unknowingly, the discussion contained several questions that the audience might have. Sometimes, when we quarrel, we reflect more on what was said. However,

occasionally, this is also considered at first. Taylor made this comment while considering the signs. She deflated her ego rather than appearing arrogant when she thought that way. The crowd will then take what is spoken with more composure. Taylor would say, “I know...” when she did not want the crowd to object. In this way, she will feel that her audience supports hers. Sometimes, it is impossible to forecast the audience’s reaction to the symptoms of the term, but it is possible to do so by looking at the consensus. However, the data presented here employs unique expressions and corresponding viewpoints expressed by respectable personas while employing the pronouns “I” and “you.” As a result, there are only sometimes specific phrases to use when predicting audience responses.

d. Managing the Messages

11:11 But in this case, you and I both learned

11:14 that you don’t always get all the things in the bag

11:17 that you selected from the menu

11:20 in the delivery surface that is life (datum 1.13).

There are countless managing messages that Taylor can convey. Since it was considered that the other data appeared similar, the researcher selected the messages at random from among other data handling the messages. She wants to invite the audience to pay attention to her comments by mentioning one in this data. In light of this information, it is intended to explain the life path she has taken before and in the future. She continued, “Life will be as we have it now,” after expressing this. Taylor uses persona in his presentation and addresses the audience directly. The saying “you don’t always get all the things in the bag” conveys that some things in this life are beyond your control. Using the pronouns “you” and “I” made her engagement and that of the audience even more genuine. This sentence proves that she and the audience had the same experience.

e. Imagining Scenarios

22:31 Having the world treat my love life

22:33 like a spectator sport

22:35 in which I lose every single game

22:38 was not a great way to date in my teens and twenties,

22:42 but it taught me to protect my private life fiercely (datum 1.14).

Taylor attempted to describe the course of her relationship with love. However, the final sentences were like these due to the length, numerous confusing turns, and time constraints. Her initiative shows she wants to use as few words as possible to let the audience picture her romantic adventure. So, she makes an analogy to support that. This information is sufficient to imply that situations can be imagined because analogies are thought to exist. This sentence is an example for the audience to consider when Taylor says, “Having the world treat my love life like a spectator sport in which I lose every single game.” It implied that she frequently fails regarding matters of

the heart. When she says “self-mention,” the interpersonal marker element is present. To demonstrate possessive pronouns and a direct perspective of herself, she instantly uses “my” and “I.” In a nutshell, the data is successful.

3.2 Discussion

Based on the findings, interpersonal markers may be crucial in this study: graduation speech. First, both Taylor and Armaya have many data about self-mention. Both speakers use this technique to emphasize their contribution to the conversation and to represent themselves (Li & Xu, 2021).

For Taylor, 288 total pronouns serve as self-mentions, compared to 94 for Armaya. Graduation speeches frequently reference the audience, contrary to earlier studies on monologues in political discourse (Kashiha, 2021). For instance, imagining scenarios is absent from political addresses yet is frequently used in commencement speeches. Not to note, the delivery of managing messages is more frequent in graduation speeches than in political speeches. This fact happens because the graduation speech in this study, the monologue, concentrates on historical narratives and lessons for the future. Lastly, speech act labels are frequently employed. This data occurs due to the graduation speech advising on future behavior. In sum, graduation speeches frequently make use of interpersonal markers.

The linguistic comments used in graduation speeches have an exceptional result that requires discussion. Linguistic comments are the first to show up and heavily rely on context. In other words, this is a response to the previous claim. It is shown that all datums (1–5) depend on earlier knowledge. It is in line with Ädel’s theory (2010, 2012). There will be a response to the conversation that has been had. The reaction will reveal one subset of these five interpersonal markers: repairing, reformulating, commenting on linguistic form/meaning, clarifying, and managing terminology. Next, there is less data on linguistic comments than on references to the audience in monologues, particularly in commencement speeches. A prepared monologue is used during the graduation speech. The linguistic comments may have also been deliberate. The data will resemble repairing and clarifying in some ways. Nevertheless, reformulating and managing terminology is still a common practice. These facts are used because they grab attention and clarify the speaker’s point. In the end, the data’s singularity comes in the form of linguistic comments, which vary depending on context and are occasionally revealed in commencement speeches.

Discourse organizations are also emerging, but only occasionally should discourse organizations be used. The two data, Taylor and Armaya, generated only some of the Discourse Organization for the researchers to find. The Discourse Organization only partially emerged. They use it limitingly, just like they do with both subjects. Taylor chooses the topic of enumerating to give the discourse a clear structure. In contrast, Armaya uses previewing and reviewing to offer introductions and summaries of what has been delivered. Due to the researchers’ assumption that they were required, some additional Discourse Organizations were also discovered, like Marking Asides, Endophoric, and Adding Topics, found in the middle of the discourse

between the two topics. At least Taylor used marking asides to draw the audience's attention to the fact that the speaker might quickly turn off the topic or leave room for a significant deviation. Endophorics are only used to raise awareness and direct addresses to particular parts of speech in both subjects (Ädel, 2010; Kashiha, 2021). In the meantime, Armaya frequently employs Adding Topics to link various viewpoints and arguments.

In graduation speeches typically appear speech act labels. There are arguments because graduation speeches frequently discuss the real world, where people disagree about a belief that has developed or a culture that is accustomed to it. As in datum (1.7), where Taylor contests the assertion about real-world situations. Unlike speeches that are primarily political monologues and rarely present arguments. This data appears so they do not hurt themselves when giving a political speech. Giving examples helps the audience become more conscious, ensuring they understand. It improves speech coherence to a lesser level. The speech was logical, although the sum of the two themes mentioned was only three. In the section on managing terminology, both are more expressive. Finally, because many phrases inspire and express optimism for the future, Other Speech Act Labeling frequently appears in speech. Both subjects use this.

In this study, references to the audience are frequently made by both Taylor and Armaya. Since the primary goal of this is to direct the audience (Kashiha, 2021) explicitly, they use these terms. Except for managing channels and managing audience discipline, every component of this sub has a significant impact. Taylor stated that managing audience discipline and channels go hand in hand. Armaya only made one statement regarding managing channels and none regarding managing audience discipline. The data supports this because graduation is a conceptual monologue. Here, the managing channel is an unobtrusive validation rather than a statement that requires an audience reaction. For more information, go to datums 1.11 from Taylor's speech and 2.6 from Armaya's declaration.

On the other hand, as it might interfere with the speech's flow, there will not likely be an excessive amount of information on managing audience discipline on demand. Taylor stated in datum 1.11 that this aims to increase audience awareness that an important message would be delivered. Additional sections, such as managing the messages, imagining scenarios, and anticipating audience response, cover crucial topics for graduation speeches. To be humbler, graduation speeches anticipate the audience's reaction. Recall that imagining scenarios goes beyond all in both Taylor and Armaya's data. Taylor stated up to 47, whereas Armaya stated 18. Speaking at graduations is an excellent opportunity to share your history and accomplishments. The audience will be encouraged to imagine what the speakers say more frequently. As a result, graduation speeches tend to use references to the audience more regularly.

The contrast between native and Indonesian EFL can be recognized as having differences. First, there is no longer any discussion on the presumption that a native speaker will speak with ease. There is evidence to support the adoption of more interpersonal markers. Interpersonal markers are signs of comfortable language use since they are not constrained by the number of words in a phrase. Taylor frequently

utilizes lengthy interpersonal indicators. Second, Taylor emphasizes the persona in all discourses, similar to the numerous studies on self-mention. Taylor uses the numerals more frequently than Armaya. The possessive pronoun “yours” is one self-mentioned that Armaya never employs. Even though Taylor only named one, it was sufficient to distinguish between native and EFL speakers. Finally, this does not imply that an EFL cannot employ interpersonal markers in this study as effectively as a native. Because of the contrasts in duration, the data can be fundamental. If Armaya has a more extended discourse, it is worthy that the interpersonal markers utilized are similar.

4. CONCLUSION

There are essential points that can be concluded from this study. The first is Taylor’s use of interpersonal markers, including various types and self-mention. As a native speaker, her graduation speech dominantly used the interpersonal markers of references to audience type, followed by speech act labels and linguistic comments. The second is Armaya’s use of interpersonal markers also involved a variety of interpersonal markers, including self-mentions, just like Taylor. However, she only made fewer self-mentions. As a second language learner of English, her graduation speech dominantly used references to the audience, followed by linguistics comments, speech act labels, and discourse organizations.

As a result, it was found that both conveyed interpersonal markers in their graduation speeches. However, Taylor made a great flow with her interpersonal marker. However, Armaya’s delivery could be better, to be precise, stiff. Then, because they tell stories more, Taylor and Armaya found audience references to be frequently used. Numerous functions for imagining scenarios have been made. Also, another discovery in this study is that many types of speech act labels came out because both conveyed some motivations.

This study discovered a distinction between native and non-native speakers using various interpersonal markers to benefit everyone who wants to pursue public speaking, including lecturers, students, and those who wish to give graduation speeches. This study can strive to sound native and look adaptable in the use of language. In addition, there are recommendations for future researchers who intend to explore the same topic, especially on spontaneous speech in various contexts. They can study more about spontaneous speech through the phenomenological method. Besides, additional study, such as impromptu presentations and prepared speeches, is required in various circumstances. Because of that, there might be a follow-up study on various societal markers of interpersonal relationships. Additionally, gender is not linked in this study. Therefore, an additional study linking it to gender is required. The use of interpersonal markers may differ depending on a person’s gender.

REFERENCES

- Ädel, A. (2010). Just to give you kind of a map of where we are going, A taxonomy of metadiscourse in spoken and written in academic English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*. <https://ojs.ub.gu.se/index.php/njes/article/view/415/403>

- Ädel, A. (2012). "What I want you to remember is...." *English Text Construction*, 5(1), 101–127. <https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.5.1.06ade>
- Amalia, R. M., Citraresmana, E., & Saefullah, N. H. (2021). Discourse markers in diplomatic settings: Ministerial dialogue between Australia and Indonesia. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8(1), 346–359. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i1.18350>
- Arthur, R., & Fenyi, D. A. (2022). Metadiscourse Markers of Hedging In Classroom Interaction A Descriptive Analysis. *Technology and Science*, 2(3), 288–309. <https://globets.org/journal/index.php/IJETS/article/view/53>
- Azizah, D. P., & Gulö, I. (2020). Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers In Jacinda Ardern Speech At Christchurch Memorial. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 1(2). http://jim.teknokrat.ac.id/index.php/linguistics_and_literature/index
- Black. (2019). *Glossophobia (Fear of public speaking): Are you glossophobic?* Retrieved 23/01/21 from <http://www.psycom.net>. Remedy Health Media, LLC.
- Creswell. (2009). *Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry*.
- Cutting, J., & Fordyce, K. (2020). *Joan Cutting, Kenneth Fordyce - Pragmatics; A Resource Book for Students-Routledge*. Routledge English Language Introductions.
- Damayanti, M. E., & Listyani, L. (2020). An Analysis of Students' Speaking Anxiety In Academic Speaking Class. *ELTR Journal*, 4(2), 152–170. <https://doi.org/10.37147/eltr.v4i2.70>
- Daud, A., Ras, F., Novitri, N., & Audia, C. P. (2019). Factors Contributing to Speaking Anxiety: A Case Study of Pre-Service English Teachers. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(3), 412. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.3.3.p.412-422>
- Esmer, E. (2017). Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in Turkish Election Rally Speeches Delivered by Pro-Turkish and Pro-Kurdish Leaders. *Athens Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4), 367–384. <https://doi.org/10.30958/ajss.4-4-2>
- 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>
- Firdaus, A., & Shartika, M. (2021). *Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers and Appraisal Use Portrayed In BBC News Report*. <http://repository.uin-malang.ac.id/8442/>
- Ghafarpour, H. (2022). Teaching English Language Journal Interpersonal Discourse Markers in Online vs. Face-to-Face EFL Classes. *Teaching English Language*, 16(2), 63. <https://doi.org/10.22132/TEL.2022.155086>
- Hariati, P., Pulungan, A. H., & Husein, R. (2020). Illocutionary acts in Jack Ma's inspiring speech at his graduation from the University of Hongkong. *Britain international of linguistics arts and education (BioLAE) Journal*, 2(1), 384–394. <https://doi.org/10.33258/biolae.v2i1.209>

- Haselow, A. (2019). Discourse marker sequences: Insights into the serial order of communicative tasks in real-time turn production. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 146, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.04.003>
- Hudon, C., St-Cyr Tribble, D., Bravo, G., Hogg, W., Lambert, M., & Poitras, M. E. (2013). Family physician enabling attitudes: A qualitative study of patient perceptions. *BMC Family Practice*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2296-14-8>
- Kashiha, H. (2022). Academic lectures versus political speeches: Metadiscourse functions affected by the role of the audience. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 190, 60–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.01.003>
- Kuswoyo, H., & Siregar, R. A. (2019). Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers as Persuasive Strategies in Oral Business Presentation. *Lingua Cultura*, 13(4), 297. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i4.5882>
- Leith, S. (2019). *Afraid of public speaking? This is what the experts say*. Guardian News & Media Limited or Its Affiliated Companies. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/feb/04/public-speaking-sam-leith>
- Lesmana S., & Kharismadewi, Y. (2022). An Analysis of Cooperative Principles in A Group of Middle-Aged Women Conversation Found in Salayo Wedding Cooking Tradition: A Sociopragmatic Study. *IJOTL-TL*, 7(2), 123–134. <https://doi.org/10.30957/ijotl.v7i2.641>
- Li, Z., & Xu, J. (2020). Reflexive metadiscourse in Chinese and English sociology research article introductions and discussions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 159, 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.02.003>
- Matroudy, M., & Ebrahimi, S. F. (2022). Functional Analysis of Reflexive Metadiscourse in Dissertation Defense Sessions. *International Journal of Research in English Education*. <http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-601-fa.html>
- Mirzaeian, E. (2020). An Intra-cultural Analysis of Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers Used in Obama and Trump's Speeches on the Iran Nuclear Deal. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 4(2), 191–205. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-019-00076-7>
- Öztürk, Y., & Durmuşoğlu Köse, G. (2021). “Well (er) You Know ...”: Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native Spoken English. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 5(2), 223–242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-020-00095-9>
- Rasooyar, H., & Hosseini, E. (2019). Investigating interpersonal metadiscourse markers in English M.A. theses: The case of transition markers. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 9(4), 184–192. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjflt.v9i4.4089>
- Rezaei, O., Ebrahimi, S. F., & Yazdani, S. (2022). Reflexive Metadiscourse Markers in Academic Interviews: A Frequency and Functional Study. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 10(43), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.30495/jfl.2022.697340>
- Sukma, B. P. (2017). Interpersonal metadiscourse markers as persuasive strategies in Barack Obama's 2012 campaign speeches. *Aksara*, 29(2), 283–292.

- Tercan, G., & Dikilitaş, K. (n.d.). EFL students' speaking anxiety: a case from tertiary level students. *Journal International Association of Research in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics ELT Research Journal*, 2015(1), 16–27. <http://www.udead.org.tr/>
- Tsaousides, T. (2018). *Why Are We Scared of Public Speaking?* Psychology Today. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/smashing-the-brainblocks/201711/why-are-we-scared-of-public-speaking>
- Yasinta, N. L. P. A. K., Tika, I. K., & Sudana, I. G. P. Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in the “Monash Life” Magazine. *Humanis*, 626. <https://doi.org/10.24843/jh.2018.v22.i03.p09>
- Yüksel, H. G., & Kavanoz, S. (2018). Dimension of Experience: Metadiscourse in the Texts of Novice Non-Native, Novice Native, and Expert Native Speaker. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(3), 104. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.9n.3p.104>
- Zhang, M. (2019). Exploring Personal Metadiscourse Markers across Speech and Writing Using Cluster Analysis. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 26(4), 267–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09296174.2018.1480856>