

Interactivity and Interpersonality Elements Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse

Atik Rokhayani¹, Dina Novita Wijayanti², Pauline Joy Gelacio Tardaguila³,
Muh Shofiyuddin⁴

¹ English Education Department, Universitas Muria Kudus, Indonesia

² UPT Bahasa, Universitas Muria Kudus, Indonesia

³ Master of Art in English, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines

⁴ English Education Department, Universitas Islam Nahdlatul Ulama Jepara, Indonesia

Contact:	Atik Rokhayani		atik.rokhayani@umk.ac.id
----------	----------------	---	--------------------------

How to cite:

Rokhayani, A., Wijayanti, D. N., Tardaguila, P. J. G., & Shofiyuddin, M. (2024). Interactivity and interpersonality elements produced by college students in spoken discourse. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*, 7(1), 73–84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v7i1.26149>

ABSTRACT

Speaking tends to be a difficult skill for Indonesian students. To overcome the problem, one can use discourse markers (interactivity and interpersonality elements) for a conversation. The purposes of the study are to explain the kinds of interactivity and interpersonality elements and the implementation of interactivity and interpersonality elements of spoken discourse produced by college students. The study belongs to qualitative research. The data are the elements of interactivity and interpersonality, while the data source is transcripts of job interviews. The instrument of this study is documentation. Based on the findings, all interactivity and interpersonality elements are found in the data source. Based on the findings of the study, all kinds of interactivity and interpersonality elements are found in the data source. The students dominantly use discourse markers as first rank to fill the gap between previous and next utterances and maintain the stability of the conversation. In contrast, their application in the spoken discourse of college students is still low because only one element out of four is used dominantly (more than 50%). In order to address the issue, students must enhance their self-confidence in speaking English. Also, consistent practice leads to improvement.

KEYWORDS:

Interactivity;
Interpersonality;
Spoken discourse;
Conversation.

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received:
05 April 2024
Accepted:
06 August, 2024

Introduction

Speaking is an essential means of communication, as well as interacting with other people in the world. According to Novi and Pambudi (2017), communication can be useful for sharing information about traditions, local wisdom, trade, language, business, technology, etc. Moreover, it can be added by applying gestures and mimics in order for the message of the

speaking to be understood by the interlocutors. Wijaya (2018) states that speaking is a useful activity for exchanging messages about the topic being discussed in order for the interlocutor to catch the point of the discussion. Being able to communicate effectively in English is essential for achieving this aim since it allows someone to interact with people throughout the globe, so the teacher needs to apply communicative strategies in the class (Mariam et al., 2022). Rahmawati (2017) also gave her own opinion about language skills, and she stated that speaking is the activity of processing information from certain people to the interlocutors in an appropriate context to get the point of the discussion. Since speaking skills involve the accurate use of vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, listening, and pronunciation in an organized way that communicates significant concepts to other people, the fluency of speaking of a person indicates his or her entire competency in a particular language (Harmer, 2001; Nunan, 1993).

In particular EFL/ESL pedagogical contexts, many researchers have analyzed the use of discourse markers by English native speakers and non-native (Aşık & Cephe, 2013). As we know the people who can speak English smoothly are the ones who can apply it in daily life as a tool of communication. Based on the reasons above, speaking English is difficult to master. Gudu (2015) states that speaking is a language skill that is not easy to be applied in daily life, especially for people who use it as English foreign learners or as English as a second language. The students must show characteristics of spoken language, including spontaneity, to use the proper spoken language (Wijayanti & Rokhayani, 2022). In addition, students must be given relevant material supplemented by specific speaking-related techniques to be effective while communicating. There are some reasons, such as they are worried when their speaking will be checked the grammar by others and laziness in studying the language. The students have problems speaking English related to turn-taking and limited vocabulary. Ideally, if they practice speaking English every day with other people, they can produce A-B-A-B (ideal turn-taking) in their English speaking. Moreover, they may use fillers (discourse markers) as the elements of interactivity and interpersonality in spoken discourse, such as *hmmm*, *emmm*, *errr* while waiting to produce the next statement. Fillers are words or chunks that can be placed everywhere in an utterance, which is useful to help the speaker to think of the suitable next utterance to maintain speaking stability (Fatimah, 2017). Discourse markers frequently arise in spoken interactions (Bolden, 2015).

There are some previous studies. Ekaningsih (2019) revealed that both undergraduate and graduate students use elements of spoken language, such as spontaneity, interactivity, interpersonality, and coherence. The undergraduate students frequently used spontaneity elements, and the graduate students frequently used interactivity elements. In terms of interpersonality and coherence, elements are balanced and used by undergraduate and graduate students. The similarities between the previous and present studies are that they use undergraduate students and analyze two elements of interactivity and interpersonality. The difference between the previous and present studies is that the previous study analyzed all elements of spoken language. The present study only examines two elements of spoken language (interactivity and interpersonality elements) and the application of spoken discourse to college students.

Based on the explanation above, the researchers conducted a study entitled "Interactivity and Interpersonality Elements produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse". The purposes of the study are to explain the kinds of interactivity and interpersonality elements of spoken discourse produced by college students and the implementation of interactivity and interpersonality elements of spoken discourse of college students. Interactivity is a turn-taking

process, while interpersonality shows how to behave with others. Discourse is the use of language in a certain context, whether spoken or written. Moreover, it is a means of social interaction, especially in conversation used in daily life (Khan, 2016). Sometimes, discourse produced in different moments will cause different interpretations by other people because of background, knowledge, and power. In this case, the researchers will focus on the elements of spoken discourse (spoken language): interactivity and interpersonality (Thornburry, 2012). Thornburry (2012) stated that interactivity comes from the word "interact". This means that some elements need synergy, such as producing turn-taking by delivering questions and answers, overlapping, interruption, and interruption during the conversation. It is also supported by Ekaningsih (2019), who stated that interactivity is the activity done by the people in daily life that can produce the activity of taking and giving turns of speaking in conversation. Interactivity elements consist of questions, backchannel, overlapping and interruption, and discourse markers. Question is done by delivering the questions to the interlocutor, the interlocutor; backchannel is done by repeating the previous utterance into the highlight of the next utterance because it is an important one. Overlapping is done when the speaker is speaking over and dominating the turn. Interruption is done by cutting the other speaker's utterance because the person wants to share something in a hurry while a discourse marker is a chunk of words to help fill up the empty space when speaking by saying *well, okay, hmmm, rrr*, etc.

Related to the interpersonal elements of spoken language, the elements show how to behave with other people via the use of language in order to create a united feeling among the people in the conversation. Moreover, by applying interpersonality elements in conversation, it can establish and defend group solidarity Novi and Pambudi (2017). They consist of laughter, hedging, discourse markers, and evaluative language. Sometimes, when people speak, they also produce laughter to express something fun. It also helps to maintain speaking. Hedging is one of the elements of interpersonality that is useful to disguise the different opinions of the speaker in a discussion in order to maintain the other participant's feeling, while discourse marker is useful to help the conversation run smoothly by giving chunks such as *hmmm, errr, emmmm* in order to avoid empty space in speaking. The usage of discourse markers also helps to maintain the speaking existence. Evaluative language is useful in making the interlocutor understand what the speaker has said to reduce misinterpretation among the participants. In this case, the interactivity and interpersonality elements are applied in conversations in terms of job interviews with university students. A conversation is a discussion between or among people to share an idea or concept. In this case, a university student did role play as an interviewer to get the best candidate in a job interview and acted as an interviewee to get a desired job.

Method

The study belongs to qualitative research. Qualitative research is a study to interpret the meaning of data based on the topic of the study itself (Sari, Putu Pande Novita, Adnyani, Ni Luh Putu, Sri, Paramarta, 2021). The data of the study are the words or phrases of interactivity and interpersonality elements in spoken discourse, and the data source is the transcripts of 10 job interviews produced by 20 university students of the Psychology study program of an Indonesian private university for 10 minutes. So, the instrument of the study is the documentation of 10 job interview transcripts. In those transcripts, the students did job interviews as the interviewer delivered snared questions, and the interviewee answered them diplomatically.

The procedure for collecting the data is selecting the students of the Psychology Department at Indonesian private university. The next recording is the activity of randomly taking 10 job interviews. The researchers applied snowball sampling to take the data source. This is done because, from the small number of data sources, it is estimated that they have not been able to provide complete data (Nurdiani, 2014). Next, the procedure of analyzing the data is to identify the words that belong to the interactivity and interpersonality elements. Then, classify based on the types, calculate them in the form of numbers and percentages, compare them with the ideal ones, and interpret the results.

Results

The Kinds of Interactivity and Interpersonality Elements of Spoken Discourse Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse

The researchers analyzed the data sources of the kinds of interactivity and interpersonality elements of spoken discourse produced by college students; the findings are as follows.

Table 1 *The Kinds of Interactivity Elements of Spoken Discourse Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse*

No	Conversation	Interactivity Elements				Total
		A1	A2	A3	A4	
1.	Conversation 1	6 (6.8%)	1 (7.1%)	2 (14.3%)	12 (10.5%)	21
2.	Conversation 2	11 (12.5%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)	13 (11.4%)	26
3.	Conversation 3	11 (12.5%)	2 (14.3%)	2 (14.3%)	6 (5.27%)	21
4.	Conversation 4	5 (5.65%)	3 (21.7%)	3 (21.69%)	7 (6.14%)	18
5.	Conversation 5	14 (15.9%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)	23 (20.2%)	39
6.	Conversation 6	9 (10.3%)	2 (14.3%)	2 (14.3%)	12 (10.5%)	25
7.	Conversation 7	10 (11.3%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)	12 (10.5%)	24
8.	Conversation 8	7 (7.95%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)	13 (11.4%)	22
9.	Conversation 9	9 (10.3%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)	10 (8.82%)	21
10.	Conversation 10	6 (6.8%)	1 (7.1%)	0 (0%)	6 (5.27%)	13
		88 (100%)	14 (100%)	14 (100%)	114 (100%)	230

Based on the table above, A1 in interactivity elements means to question, A2 means backchannel, A3 means overlapping and interruption, and A4 means discourse marker. The occurrence of questions in conversation 1 is 6 (6.8%), in conversation 2 is 11 (12.5%), in conversation 3 is 11 (12.5%), in conversation 4 is 5 (5.65%), in conversation 5 is 14 (15.9%), in conversation 6 is 9 (10.3%), in conversation 7 is 10 (11.3%), in conversation 8 is 7 (7.95%), in

conversation 9 is 9 (10.3%), in conversation 10 is 6 (6.8%). So, the total occurrence of questions is 88. The occurrence of backchannel in conversation 1 is 1 (7.1%), in conversation 2 is 1 (7.1%), in conversation 3 is 2 (14.3%), in conversation 4 is 3 (21.7%), in conversation 5 (7.1%), in conversation 6 is 2 (14.3%), in conversation 7 is 1 (7.1%), in conversation 8 is 1 (7.1%), in conversation 9 is 1 (7.1%), in conversation 10 is (7.1%). So, the total occurrence of the backchannel is 14. The occurrence of overlapping and interruption in conversation 1 is 2 (14.3%), in conversation 2 is 1 (7.1%), and in conversation 3 is 2 (14.3%). In conversation 4 is 3 (21.69%), in conversation 5 is 1 (7.1%), in conversation 6 is 2 (14.3%), in conversation 7 is 1 (7.1%), in conversation 8 is 1(7.1%), in conversation 9 is 1 (7.1%), in conversation 10 is 0 (0%). So, the total occurrence of overlapping and interruption is 14. The occurrence of discourse marker in conversation 1 is 12 (10.5%), in conversation 2 is 13 (11.4%), in conversation 3 is 6 (5.27%), in conversation 4 is 7 (6.14%), in conversation 5 is 23 (20.2%), in conversation 6 is 12 (10.5%), in conversation 7 is 12 (10.5%), in conversation 8 is 13 (11.4%), in conversation 9 is 10 (8.82%), in conversation 10 is 6 (5.27%). So, the total occurrence is 114.

Table 2 *The Kinds Interpersonality Elements of Spoken Discourse Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse*

No	Conversation	Interpersonality Elements				Total
		B1	B2	B3	B4	
1.	Conversation 1	2 (6.9%)	1 (11.1%)	12 (10%)	0 (0%)	15
2.	Conversation 2	1 (3.4%)	1 (11.1%)	13 (12%)	0 (0%)	15
3.	Conversation 3	1 (3.4%)	1 (11.1%)	6 (5%)	0 (0%)	8
4.	Conversation 4	2 (6.9%)	1 (11.1%)	7 (6.%)	0 (0%)	10
5.	Conversation 5	4 (13.8%)	0 (0%)	23 (21%)	3 (50%)	30
6.	Conversation 6	3 (10.4%)	1 (11.1%)	12 (10%)	0 (0%)	16
7.	Conversation 7	4 (13.8%)	0 (0%)	12 (10%)	2 (33%)	18
8.	Conversation 8	4 (13.8%)	2 (22.3%)	13 (12%)	0 (0%)	19
9.	Conversation 9	4 (13.8%)	1 (11.1%)	10 (9%)	0 (0%)	15
10.	Conversation 10	4 (13.8%)	1 (11.1%)	6 (5%)	1 (17%)	12
		29 (100%)	9 (100%)	108 (100%)	6 (100%)	158

Based on the table above, B1 means laughter, B2 means hedging, B3 means discourse marker, and B4 means evaluative language. The occurrence of laughter in conversation 1 is 2 (6.9%), in conversation 2 is 1 (3.4%), in conversation 3 is 1 (3.4%), in conversation 4 is 2 (6.9%), in conversation 5 is 4 (13.8%), in conversation 6 is 3 (10.4%), in conversation 7 is 4 (13.8%), in conversation 8 is 4 (13.8%), in conversation 9 is 4 (13.8%), in conversation 10 is 4 (13.8%). So, the total frequency of laughter in all conversations that were analyzed was 29. The

occurrence of hedging in conversation 1 is 1 (11.1%), in conversation 2 is 1 (11.1%), in conversation 3 is 1 (11.1%), in conversation 4 is 1 (11.1%), in conversation 5 is (0%), in conversation 6 is 1 (11.1%), in conversation 7 is 0 (0%), in conversation 8 is 2 (22.3%), in conversation 9 is 1 (11.1%), in conversation 10 is 1 (11.1%). So, the total occurrence of hedging found is 9. The occurrence of discourse marker in conversation 1 is 12 (10%), in conversation 2 is 13 (12%), in conversation 3 is 6 (5%), in conversation 4 is 7 (6%), in conversation 5 is 23 (21%), in conversation 6 is 12 (10%), in conversation 7 is 12 (10%), in conversation 8 is 13 (12%), in conversation 9 is 10 (9%). In conversation 10 is 6 (5%). So, the total occurrence of discourse markers found in conversation 1 is 12 (10%), conversation 2 is 13 (12%), in conversation 3 is 6 (5%), in conversation 4 is 7 (6%), in conversation 5 is 23 (21%), in conversation 6 is 12 (10%), in conversation 7 is 12 (10%), in conversation 8 is 13 (12%), in conversation 9 is 10 (9%), in conversation 10 is 6 (5%). So, the total occurrence of discourse markers is 108. The occurrence of evaluative language in conversation 1 is 0 (0%), in conversation 2 is 0 (0%), in conversation 3 is 0 (0%), in conversation 4 is 0 (0%), in conversation 5 is 3 (50%), in conversation 6 is 0 (0%), in conversation 7 is 2 (33%), in conversation 8 is 0 (0%), in conversation 9 is 0 (0%), in conversation 10 is 1 (17%). So, the total occurrence of evaluative language is 6.

The examples of the kinds of interactivity elements of spoken discourse produced by college students are as follows.

Table 3 *The Example of Question Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse*

Turn	The Students	The Utterance
3	A	Well, My name is Apriana Evita and I will be the one interview with you today. <i>How are you?</i>
4	B	I'm great and you , <i>how are you?</i>
5	A	Well, I'm fine.

From the examples above, the element of interactivity (question) produced by college students is "How are you?" in the first example in turn 3, and "How are you?" in the first example in turn 4. In this case, speaker A asked to speaker B about her condition, and then speaker B answered by saying "I'm great" and then asked speaker A's condition by saying "How are you?".

Table 4 *The Second Example of Backchannel Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse*

Turn	The Students	The Utterance
1	O	Hey good morning, I am Dentamara Apriliani and hmm aaaa I am the head of human asset division in this company. So to get started please tell me about yourself.
2	P	<i>Tell about myself?</i> Hmm nice to meet you to start this, let me introduce myself, hmm my name is Ria Rismawati.

From the examples, backchannel found in the first example is when speaker O asked speaker P by saying "Hey good morning, I am Dentamara Apriliani and hmm aaaa I am the head of human asset division in this company. So, to get started, please, tell me about yourself" (turn 1). Then, speaker P answered "Talk about myself? Hmm, nice to meet you to start this, let me introduce myself, hmm my name is Ria Rismawati. I am a graduate of SMK

majoring hmm in multimedia. I have an experience hmm designing packaging for home producers and hmm sellers for three months. Laugh" (turn 2).

Table 5 *The First Example of Interruption Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse*

Turn	The Students	The Utterance
20	I	Yes, yes of course I can can speak English, <i>Jaaaaaaa.....</i>
21	J	<i>Japanese. Wow, that's great.</i>

From the examples above, the interruptions produced by college students are "Yes, yes of course I can speak English, *Jaaaaaaa....*" (Turn 20). Then, the speaker answered by saying "Japanese, wow, that's great" (Turn 21).

Table 6 *The Example of Discourse Marker Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse*

Turn	The Students	The Utterance
28	I	How much time this company need to inform to me the result of this interview?
29	J	<i>Hmmm</i> as soon as possible. May be at the end of this week. We will send you an email about the result.
30	I	<i>Hmmm</i> ok Ma'am thank you. Laugh

Based on the examples above, discourse markers produced by college students in Table 6 are "We will send you an email about the result" (turn 29). And "*hmmm*, ok Ma'am thank you. Laugh. (Turn 30). The words in bold are examples of discourse markers in conversations produced by college students.

Examples of the interpersonal elements of spoken discourse produced by college students are as follows.

Table 7 *The Example of Laughter Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse*

Turn	The Students	The Utterance
19	C	<i>Hmmm</i> , we will contact you soon for the result
20	D	Thank you very much. Nice to meet you. I hope I will got good news from here. <i>Laugh</i>

Based on the examples above, laughter produced by college students in Table 7 is "Thank you very much. Nice to meet you. I hope I will get good news from here. *Laugh*".

Table 8 *The Example of Hedges Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse*

Turn	The Students	The Utterance
17	E	<i>Hmmm</i> , I'm great at using computer. <i>So, I can work here directly right?</i>
18	F	<i>Hmmm</i> Alright I will inform to the boss.

From the tables above, the hedges found in the first example is when speaker E said "So, *I can work here directly right?*" (Turn 17) and then speaker F answered, "*Hmmm* Alright I will inform to the boss".

Table 9 *The Example of Discourse Marker Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse*

Turn	The Students	The Utterance
6	D	Yes, of course I am interested in that position.
7	C	<i>Hmmm</i> , do you have any work experience?

The discourse markers found in the examples above are *Hmmm*, do you have any work experience (Turn 7)?

Table 10 *The Example of Evaluative Language Produced by College Students in Spoken Discourse*

Turn	The Students	The Utterance
24	N	Well, it was <i>a great chance</i> to meet you. I think you are <i>the best</i> .

Based on the table above, the evaluative language found "it *a great chance* to meet you." (turn 24), and "think you are *the best*.." (Turn 24).

The Implementation of Interactivity and Interpersonality Elements of Spoken Discourse of College Students

Spoken discourse is the use of language in spoken text. The researchers focus on the elements of interactivity and interpersonality elements to explain the application of interactivity and interpersonality elements of spoken discourse of college students in the Psychology department at a private university.

Table 11 *Interactivity and Interpersonality Elements Found in Spoken Discourse of College Students*

No	Dialogue	Interactivity Elements					Interpersonality Elements				
		A1	A2	A3	A4	Total	B1	B2	B3	B4	Total
1	1 st -10 th	88	14	14	114	230	29	9	108	6	158
2.	Dialogue	38%	6%	6%	50%	100%	19%	7%	70%	4%	100%

Based on the table above, A1 in interactivity elements means to question, A2 means backchannel, A3 means overlapping and interruption, and A4 means discourse marker. The percentage of questions is 38%, the backchannel is 6%, and the interruption is 6% of the total percentage. The percentage of discourse markers is 50% of the total percentage. So, the percentage of interactivity elements, which consist of four elements, showed that the element, which is 50% is only a discourse marker while the other elements of interactivity, such as the question, backchannel, and interruption, are less than 50%. So, it can be inferred that the application of interactivity elements found in the spoken discourse of college students is still low.

Based on the table above, B1 means laughter, B2 means hedging, B3 means discourse marker, and B4 means evaluative language. The percentage of laughter is 19% of the total percentage. The percentage of hedging is 7%, and the discourse markers is 70% of the total percentage. The percentage of evaluative language is 4% of the total percentage. So, it can be concluded that only one element of interpersonality is more than 50% (discourse marker), while the other elements are less than 50%, which are laughter, hedging, and evaluative language. This means that the application of interpersonal elements by students is still low.

Discussion

This study explored the use of language in spoken text. The researchers focus on the elements of interactivity and interpersonality elements to explain the application of interactivity and interpersonality elements of spoken discourse of college students in the Psychology department at a private university.

From the result of the study, the students used the interactivity element (question) is to inform the listeners about important things by delivering questions and answering it based on the real conditions to maintain speaking consistency because turn-taking happened. It is also supported by Thornburry (2012), who stated that it is important to ask something then the interlocutor answers it, so the stability of speaking still exists. If there is no question-and-answer session in speaking, it will be boring.

This study found that the students used backchannel in their conversations. Backchannel is done by repeating the previous utterance into the highlight of the next utterance because it is important. It is also supported by Thornburry (2012), who stated that backchannel is useful to make sure that the interlocutor is still paying attention to whether the topic is still discussed or not because sometimes, when the speaker is still speaking, the interlocutor did not follow the speaker's slot. Moreover, using a backchannel is useful to check whether the interlocutor still follows the speaker's plot (Ekaningsih (2019). Furthermore, the students also applied interruptions, which functioned to cut the other speaker's utterance because the person wanted to share something in a hurry. This is in line with the statement by Thornburry (2012) that the function of interruption is to interrupt when someone is going on to speak because the person shares something urgently. Furthermore, there are three ways to create a positive interruption. The first is when the speaker is still breathing or thinking about the next utterance, and the second is when the speaker finished speaking something. The third one is when the interlocutor has a positive contribution that she or he wants to share (Ekaningsih, 2019).

In the conversation, the students used discourse markers. The function of discourse markers is to fill up the discrepancy in an utterance so the conversation can run smoothly. Moreover, by using it the speaker can use it to think of a suitable next utterance so they can maintain speaking stability. It is suitable with the statement by Thornburry (2012), who stated that discourse markers are useful for managing the gap when speaking is still going on and connecting the previous and the suitable following utterance by applying a device. The other expert also supports it, saying it is functional to bind the unit of talks (Chen, 2019). As the connective, the speaker can think of the appropriate utterance or fill the pause the speaking by using fillers (Pamolango, 2016). The discourse marker "hmmm" is functional in bridging the discrepancy between the previous and following utterances to maintain speaking consistency. It is also supported by (Thornburry, 2012), who states that discourse marker is useful to help the conversation run smoothly by giving chunks such as *hmmm*, *errr*, *emmmm* in order for it to be no empty space in speaking. The usage of discourse markers also helps to maintain speaking consistency. It is useful to help the speaker think of a suitable next utterance to maintain speaking stability (Fatimah, 2017).

The next element discussed in this study is interpersonality element. Interpersonality elements show how to behave with other people via the use of language to create a united feeling among the people in the conversation. Moreover, applying interpersonality elements in conversation can establish and defend group solidarity (Novi & Pambudi, 2017). The function of laughter is that sometimes, when people speak, they also produce laughter to express something fun or unique. It also helps to maintain speaking. Thornburry (2012) stated that showing the uniqueness of casual conversation is beneficial because sometimes, when a

unique thing is talked about, the participants show laughter. Moreover, it is a solution that can reduce stress (Olver & Elliott, 2014).

During the conversation, the students also used hedges. The hedges shown above are very important to help the speaker determine what his or her statement can keep the other interlocutors feeling. A hedge is one of the elements of interpersonality that is useful to disguise the different opinions of the speaker in a discussion in order to maintain the other participant's feelings (Thornburry, 2012). Moreover, it also helps to blur the utterance when the agreement is not achieved (Shi & Li, 2019).

Based on the data, the students also used evaluative language to show an exaggeration of something to blunt misinterpretation among the participants speaking. Moreover, it guides the participants to have the same line. Thornburry (2012) stated that evaluative language is important to make the interlocutor understand the speaker's words to reduce misinterpretation among the participants. Moreover, it can also use exaggeration to keep the other participants' feelings. Moreover, the other researcher said that language can persuade others to create a social system (Fadly, 2020).

As an international language, most students are afraid to speak it in daily life because of the judgment from society. Moreover, Indonesian college students learn English as a foreign language. This means that the language is only actively used in the classroom rather than outside (Wijayanti & Fatmawati, 2019). The impact of the application of interactivity and interpersonality elements in a spoken discourse of college students is still low. To overcome the problem, the students must increase their confidence in speaking English because of the importance of the language as a lingua franca. They will make more progress by practicing the language with their friends or family. Moreover, to complete the conversation or spoken discourse in order for it to run smoothly based on their expectation, they may apply spoken language elements such as interactivity and interpersonality elements. Applying these principles can solve the gap between previous and subsequent utterances. In other words, if the speaker is still thinking about the suitable utterance, he or she can apply those elements so that turn-taking runs smoothly (maintaining speaking stability).

Conclusion

Based on the analysis, the kinds of interactivity elements produced by college students in spoken discourse are the frequency of question is 88 (38%), the frequency of backchannel is 14 (6%), the frequency of interruption is 14 (6%), the frequency of discourse marker is 114 (50%). So, the discourse marker is the first rank of interactivity elements produced by college students. They use it to bridge the discrepancy when the participants are still speaking by applying discourse markers by saying *hmmm*, *well*, *okay*. The second rank of interactivity elements is in question. They do it to maintain turn-taking (question and answer session). If the students just keep silent, the impact of the turn-taking can run as smoothly as possible. The third rank of interactivity elements is backchannel and interruption, which is 14 (6%). They use a backchannel to highlight the previous utterance into the next utterance because it is an important part, while interruption is used when the other speaker cuts someone's speech who is still going on to speak because there is a thing to be discussed or guessed soon. The next kinds of interpersonality elements produced by college students in spoken discourse are laughter, discourse marker, hedging, and evaluative language. The first rank of interpersonality element is the discourse marker. The frequency is 108 (70%). The students use discourse markers to fill the empty space between the previous and following utterances by using linguistic devices such as, *well*, *hmmm*, *yeah*, and *okay*. The second rank is laughter, which is

29 occurrences (19%). They usually laugh to express something fun. It is useful to maintain solidarity among the participants by showing laughter, chuckles, etc. The third rank is hedging. The frequency of it is 9 (7%). The function of hedging is to blur the expression of disagreement about something being discussed. Moreover, it can be functional in keeping others' feelings. The fourth rank is evaluative language. The frequency is 6 (4%). The function is to make the interlocutor understand what the speaker has said to reduce misinterpretation among the participants. Moreover, it uses exaggeration to maintain or respect the other participants' feelings.

The application of interactivity and interpersonality elements in the spoken discourse of college students is still low. There is only an element in interactivity elements that is 50% and the same in interpersonality elements. Hopefully, the study can give some significance in the education field such as it can give a useful overview for the next researchers who will do the same topic in the different data sources, support the theory of spoken language in terms of theoretical significance, and give the authentic proofs in order the academicians and the other people may apply those elements of spoken language to establish and maintain the speaking stability learners generally and EFL especially in order the English speaking runs smoothly. In other words, using those elements in spoken discourse can manage the cut and thrust when speaking is still going on among the participants (practical implication).

References

- Aşık, A., & Cephe, P. T. (2013). Discourse markers and spoken English: Nonnative use in the Turkish EFL setting. *English Language Teaching*, 6(12), 144–155.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n12p144>
- Bolden, G. B. (2015). Discourse markers. In K. Tracy (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of language and social interaction* (pp. 1–8). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Chen, J. (2019). *What are discourse markers?* 268(November), 1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/sohe-19.2019.1>
- Ekaningsih, N. (2019). Analysis of casual conversation in spontaneity, interactivity, interpersonally and coherence features. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 131–140.
<https://doi.org/10.25134/iefj.v5i2.1809>
- Fadly, A. (2020). Evaluative language in the discourse of cebong vs kampret ('tadpole vs microbats') on Twitter. *BAHTERA : Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 19(1), 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.21009/bahtera.191.01>
- Fatimah, G. S. (2017). An analysis of fillers used by lecturer and students in EFL classroom interaction. *JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy)*, 1(2), 43–51.
<https://doi.org/10.25157/jall.v1i2.1735>
- Gudu, B. O. (2015). Teaching speaking skills in English language using classroom activities in secondary school level in Eldoret municipality, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(35), 55–63.
<https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3122464>
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Longman.
<https://www.researchgate.net/file.PostFileLoader.html?id=53c8bdf6d4c1185f198b45b9&assetKey=AS%3A273601113067522%401442242996719>
- Khan, D. M. S. (2016). An Analytical Study of Discourse Markers In Interactions-2 Reading Textbook. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention*, 3(5), 2113–2121. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsshi/v3i5.07>

- Mariam, S., Kepirianto, C., Raharjo, R., & Ma'mun, N. (2022). Integrating short conversation and English conversation applications to improve students' speaking skills. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*, 5(2), 107. <https://doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v5i2.17128>
- Novi, A., & Pambudi, B. D. (2017). *Spoken-language feature in casual conversation a case of EFL learners' casual conversation*. 1937(October), 73–76.
- Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. Penguin Group.
- Nurdiani, N. (2014). Teknik sampling snowball dalam penelitian lapangan. *ComTech: Computer, Mathematics and Engineering Applications*, 5(2), 1110–1118. <https://doi.org/10.21512/comtech.v5i2.2427>
- Olver, I. N., & Elliott, J. A. (2014). The use of humor and laughter in research about end-of-life discussions. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 4(10), 80–87. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jnep.v4n10p80>
- Pamolango, V. A. (2016). An analysis of the fillers used by Asian students in Busan, South Korea: A comparative study. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 2(3), 96–99. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijlll.2016.2.3.74>
- Rahmawati. (2017). Improving English speaking ability using the Team -Games-Tournament technique. *English Education Journal*, 8(1), 1–13.
- Sari, Putu Pande Novita, Adnyani, Ni Luh Putu, Sri, Paramarta, I. M. S. (2021). *Conversational analysis : Turn taking on Indonesia lawyer club talk*. 28(1), 47–57. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.23887/ls.v28i1.30924>
- Shi, W., & Li, W. (2019). Analysis of hedges in English commercial advertisement under the cooperative principle graduate student in school of foreign languages , North China Electric Power University , No 689. *Research Journal of English Language and Lite*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33329/rjelal.7119.88>
- Thornbury, S. (2012). Beyond the sentence: Introducing discourse analysis. In *Macmillan* (Vol. 60, Issue 4). <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl033>
- Wijaya, T. W. (2018). The effectiveness of songs for teaching speaking. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 75–85. <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.3231>
- Wijayanti, D. N., & Fatmawati. (2019). The appropriacy of discourse markers used in psychology department students' conversations. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Missio*, 11(2), 279–292. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36928/jpkm.v11i2.160>
- Wijayanti, D. N., & Rokhayani, A. (2022). Spontaneity elements found in spoken discourse of university students. *Prominent*, 5(2), 101–113. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.24176/pro.v5i2.7587>