CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter II discusses the current literature related to metadiscourse (including types of metadiscourse in both category, interactive and interpersonal metadiscourse), speech, Barrack Obama's speech, metadiscourse in speech, and theoritical framework.

2.1. Metadiscourse

The term metadiscourse was firstly put forward by Zellig Harris in 1959 to provides an approach to comprehend language in use, showing how a writer or a speaker guide receivers to understand the text. Then, it has been developed by some writers such as Williams (1981), Vande Kopple (1985) and Crismore (1989). They propose their theory and the category of metadiscourse. However, their taxonomies of metadiscourse give a vagueness of categories and the fuctional overlaps (Hyland, 2005:32). In 2005, Ken Hyland developed the theory of metadiscourse which is become the latest version and more clearly to apply. He stated that, "metadiscourse is the cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers as members of a particular community" (2005:37). It shows that communication is not only exchange the information but also involves the personalities, attitudes and assumptions.

Metadiscourse can be the way people articulate and construct the interaction through the language to guide the audience's perspective of a text. A

speaker have to construct their speech in order to makes the communicative task easier and grab the audience's perspective. It is very important for the speaker to have "an ability to relate to an audience in ways that they will expect and understand means creating texts which see things as they do, so that the text is easier to comprehend, more interesting, and more likely to create the desired response" (Hyland, 2005: 5). At this point, it is crucial for the audience to get the information that the speaker is trying to convey because it certainly becomes the major aim in a speech.

Based on classifications given by other linguists, Hyland completes this concept of metadiscourse and divides it into two categorizes (Hyland, 2005:49) (see Figure 1). First, by organizing the text textually and adding cohesive devices on the writer's arguments, which later will be called interactive metadiscourse. Second, by positioning the writer's stance towards either his/her content or reader which mainly using interpersonal features, it is known as interactional metadiscourse. This categorization is employed here to analyze Obama's speech at University of Indonesia.

Table 1. A Model of Metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005:49)

Category	Function	Examples
Interactive	**Help to guide the reader through the text**	**Resources**
Transitions	Express relations between main clues	In addition; but; thus; and
Frame markers	Refer to discourse act, sequences of stages	Finally; to conclude; my purpose is;
Endophoric markers	Refer to information in other parts of the text	Noted above; see fig; in section 2

Evidentials	Refer to information from other text	According to X; z states
Code glosses	Elaborate propositional meanings	Namely; such as; in other words
Interactional	**Involve the reader in the text**	**Resources**
Hedges	Withhold commitment and open dialogue	Might; perhaps; possible; about
Boosters	Emphasize certainty or close dialogue	In fact; definitely; it is clear that
Attitude markers	Express writer's attitude to proposition	Unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly
Self mentions	Explicit reference to author(s)	I; we; my; me; our
Engagement markers	Explicitly build relationship with receiver	Consider; note; you can see that

2.1.1 Interactive Metadiscourse

Interactive metadiscourse is one of metadiscourse's categories that "concerns the writer's awareness of a participating audience and the ways he or she seeks to accommodate its probable knowledge, interests, rhetorical expectations and processing abilities (Hyland, 2005: 49). It aims to shape the needs of particular receivers and setting out arguments so that they will recover the speaker's preferred interpretations and goals. There are five type of interactive metadiscourse based on Hyland (2005):

Transitions: Transitions refer to "conjunction and adverbial clause which help readers interpret pragmatic connections between steps in an argument" (Hyland. 2004: 50). It consists of three kinds of signal; addition means adds elements to an argument, comparison means marks arguments as either similar or different, and consequence means tell readers that a conclusion or an argument is

being drawn or countered. However, "to count as metadiscourse they must perform a role internal to the discourse rather than the outside world, helping the reader interpret links between ideas" (Hyland, 2005: 50). The following table is the different roles for internal and external transitions.

Table 1. Different roles for internal and external transitions (Martin and Rose, 2003:127).

Relation	External	Internal
Addition, such as *and, furthermore, moreover, by the way*	Adding activities	Adding arguments
Comparison, such as: ~ similar; *similarly, likewise, equally, in the same way, correspondingly,* ~ different; *in contrast, however, but, on the contrary, on the other hand*	Comparing and contransting events, things, and qualities	Comparing and contransting arguments and evidence
Consequences, such as: ~ a conclusion is being drawn or justified: *thus,* *therefore, consequently, in conclusion* ~ an argument is being countered; *admittedly, nevertheless, anyway, in any case, of course*	Explaining why and how things happen	Drawing conclusion and countering arguments

For example:

It was pretty scary at that time, <u>but</u> looking back it was one of the best decisions I ever made. (Steve Job's speech) (Nan and Liu, 2013).

Frame Markers: Frame markers means the "text boundaries or elements of schematic text structures" (Hyland, 2004) that make the discourse clear to readers or listeners. There are 4 types of frame markers; sequencing parts of the text (*first, then, next, at the same time*), labeling text stages (*to summarize, in sum,*

by the way of introduction), announcing discourse goals (*I argue here, my purpose is, the paper purposes, there are several reasons why*), and indicating topic shifts (*well, right, OK, now, let us return to*). For example:

> Today I want to tell you <u>three</u> stories from my life. The <u>first</u> story is about connecting the dots. The <u>second</u> story is about love and loss. The <u>third</u> story is about death. (Steve Job's speech) (Nan and Liu, 2013).

Endophoric Markers: Endophoric markers refer to "information in other parts of the text and make the additional material available for the readers" (Davaei, 2013). It guides the readers to get the preferred interpretation or reading of the discourse. Here are a few examples of endophoric markers (for more examples see Hyland: 2005): *see figure 2, refer to the next section, as noted above,* etc. By using those markers, it will help the speech to become more interactive and more easily understand for the audiences (Burneikaite, 2009). For example:

> This is very much like the example we gave above <u>at the beginning of chapter 1</u>. (Applied Linguistics TB) (Hyland, 2005, p.104).

Evidential: Evidential is the information or things quoted that taken from other source "which guide the reader's interpretation and establish an authorial command of the subject" (Hyland, 2005:51). It is usually based on the literature and provides important support for arguments to persuade readers to believe in what the writer or speaker had been convey. Here are examples of evidential markers (Hyland, 2005, p.219): *according to X, Y states, (Z: 2010), (date)/(name),*

(to) cite X, (to) quote X, [ref. no.]/[name], according to X, cited, quoted. For example:

> We're the top-rated underwriter of emerging markets debt, according to *Euromoney*, and *International Financing Review* named Chase 'Emerging markets debt house of the year'. (Chase Manhattan, 1994) (Hyland, 2005, p. 78)

Code Glosses: Code glosses means "additional information, by rephrasing, explaining or elaborating what has been said, to ensure the reader is able to recover the writer's intended meaning" (Hyland, 2004: 52). It reflect the writer or speaker's predictions about the receiver's knowledge-base to give exemplifications as writers assess the processing needs, knowledge and rhetorical expectations of their receivers to present and then interpret ideas as they convey. Some examples of endhoporic markers are *in other words, that is, for example, this can be defined as,* etc. Those markers are essential in order to construct writers' argument in writing (Hyland, 2007). For example:

> The group is continuing to develop its three major housing estates, namely Laguna City, South Horizons, and Kingswood Villas, according to plan. (Cheung Hong Holdings, 1994) (Hyland, 2005, p. 76).

2.1.2 Interactional Metadiscourse

Interactional metadiscourse is metadiscourse that concern to the way speakers or writer conduct interaction by intruding and commenting on their

message. The speakers involve the receiver in the text, focus on the participants of the interaction and seek to display the speaker's personality in a speech as they pulling receivers along with their argument, focusing their attention, etc. Metadiscourse here is essentially evaluative and engaging, expressing solidarity, anticipating objections and responding to an imagined dialogue with others (Hyland, 2015, p.52). It reveals the extent to which the speakers work to jointly construct the text with receivers. There are five type of interactional metadiscourse based on Hyland (2004):

Hedges: Hedges are devices that "indicate the writer's decision to recognize alternative voice sand viewpoints and so withhold complete commitment to a proposition" (Hyland, 2005:52). Some examples of hedges are possible, might and perhaps. It allows the information to be presented as an opinion rather than a fact and therefore open that position to negotiation to emphasize the subjectivity of a position. For example :

Perhaps the best effect of learning English in classroom is to read difficult articles on the internet and to chat with English professors (Davaei, 2008).

Boosters: Boosters are words such as clearly, obviously and demonstrate, which allow writers to close down alternatives, head off conflicting views and express their certainty in what they say (Hyland, 2005:52), such as it is clear that, definitely,etc. By marking involvement with the topic and taking a joint position against other voices by closing down possible alternatives, boosters emphasize certainty and construct rapport. Boosters use strengthens an argument by

emphasizing the mutual experiences needed to draw the same conclusions as the speaker. For example:

> Obviously, we can promote learning English from both academic and institute programs. (Davaei, 2008)

Attitude Markers: Attitude markers refer to the writer's appraisal of propositional information. Attitude markers convey surprise, agreement, importance, obligation, frustration, and so on instead of commenting on the status of information which are probable relevance, reliability or truth. While attitude is expressed by the use of subordination, comparatives, progressive particles, punctuation, text location, and so on, it is most explicitly signalled metadiscoursally by attitude verbs (e.g. agree, prefer), sentence adverbs (unfortunately, hopefully) and adjectives (appropriate, logical, remarkable)" (Hyland, 2005:53). For Example:

> When I search the internet for the chemistry articles, unfortunately, I cannot understand the entire article. Because I don't know enough vocabulary and grammar (Davaei, 2008).

Self Mentions: Self mention refer to the degree of explicit author presence in the text measured by the frequency of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives (/, me, mine, exclusive we, our, ours) (Hyland, 2005:53). The convention of personal projection through firstperson pronouns is perhaps the most powerful means of self representation that the speakers use in his speech.

They cannot avoid projecting an impression of themselves and how they stand in relation to their arguments, their community and their readers. For example:

Learning English helps me to read articles related to my field of study (Davaei, 2008).

Engagement Markers: Engagement markers are devices that explicitly address readers, either to focus their attention or include them as discourse participants (Hyland, 2005:53). The speakers are can highlight or downplay the presence of their receivers in the speech to make a closer relationship with them. There are two main purposes focusing on reader participation; "acknowledges the need to adequately meet readers' expectations of inclusion and disciplinary solidarity" and "involves rhetorically positioning the audience, pulling readers into the discourse at critical points, predicting possible objections and guiding them to particular interpretations" (Hyland, 2005:54). In a speech, these functions are mainly performed by questioning the audiences/receivers. For example:

How can you be successful in the entrance examination of doctoral while you don't know English well? (a question marker) (Davaei, 2008).

2.2 Speech

Speech is a type of spoken language that arrange systematically to be delivered to the crowd. As the writer tells before, one example of the spoken language forms is a face to face conversation with the people around us like public speaking. Public speaking is the act or process of making a speech in public. Public speaking (sometimes termed oratory or oration) is the process or act

of performing a presentation (a speech) focused around an individual directly speaking to a live audience in a structured, deliberate manner in order to inform, influence, or entertain them (wikipedia.org, 2/4/2015). A good speaker should be able to change the emotions of their listeners, not just inform them. The speech must be powerful enough to motivating, influencing, persuading, informing, or simply ethos. A good speaker should be able to change the emotions of their listeners, not just inform them.

According to Ian McKenzie (2012), there are four basic types of speech; informative speech (to inform), demonstrative speech (to instruct), entertaining speech (to entertain), and persuasive speech (to persuade). Informative speech serves to provide interesting and useful information to the audience. Demonstrative speech has many similarities with an informative speech but it also teaches the audience something including a demonstration of how to do the thing. Entertaining speech provides pleasure and enjoyment that make the audience laugh or identify with anecdotal information. Persuasive speech works to convince people to change in some way: "they think, the way they do something, or to start doing something that they are not currently doing" (McKenzie: 2012).

In this case, the data source of this study could be classified as presidential speech because it delivered by President of United States, Barrack Obama. It is very important for the presidents to have skill in the effective use of speech, called rhetoric. As cited in his book, Hyland (2005) told that rhetoric is the art of persuasion; it concerns arguments on matters about which there can be no formal

proof. It aims to persuade or influence people. In other word, it can be said that presidential speech is a form of persuasive speech.

A speech must be well organize and easily understood. The content of the speech and speakers delivery also must fit with the audience. The speakers must to engage the audience's attention, convey their ideas in a logical manner and use reliable evidence to support their point. The purpose of the speech is to get the response the speakers want. Most speeches invite audiences to react in one of three ways: feeling, thinking, or acting. For example, eulogies encourage emotional response from the audience; college lectures stimulate listeners to think about a topic from a different perspective; protest speeches in the Pit recommend actions the audience can take.

2.3 Metadiscourse in Speech

The purpose of this part is to explain how metadiscourse works in a speech. Through the speech, the speakers try to convey their audiences about the information which is become the major aim of a speech. This aim could be realize by persuading the audiences with appropriate discourse or motivate particular audiences in specific situations, called rhetoric. Essentially, rhetoric is the art of persuasion that concerns arguments on matters about which there can be no formal proof. According to Mauranen (1993b: 20), the study of rhetoric has been rediscovered not only as a means of improving efficiency in verbal presentation, but as an analytical tool that can be used by different disciplines for uncovering certain aspects of discourse. A speech is an utterance meant to be heard and intended to exert an influence of some kind on those who hear it. Those kind of

influence could be described as persuasion. As persuasion needed to influence people in a speech, metadiscourse markers give the way that refers to how speakers project themselves in their texts to interact with their audiences.

There are three means of persuasion according to Aristotle's Rhetoric (1356a 2,3); *ethos* which means the personal appeal of one's character, *pathos* which means the appeal to emotions, and *logos* which means the appeal to reason. These three appeals tend to work in combination towards persuasive ends and equally important in different situations. Therefore, as cited from his book, Hyland conclude that "relating these means of persuasion to metadiscourse, we can see metadiscourse projecting the rational appeals of Logos when it explicitly links elements of the argument; it conveys an Ethos where it refers to the writer's authority and competence; and it relates to Pathos when it signals respect for the readers' viewpoint or that the message has direct relevance to the audience" (Hyland, 2005: 65). From these explanation, it is clear that metadicourse and speech are relate each other in having a big role in the way speaker's attempts to guide a receiver's perception of a speech by persuading them.

2.4 Barrack Obama's Speech

Barack Obama is the 44th President of the United States and the first African American to hold the office. He was born on August 4th, 1961, in Honolulu, Hawaii, to a mother from Kansas, Stanley Ann Dunham, and a father from Kenya, Barack Obama Sr. Obama's father left the family when Obama was two and, after further studies at Harvard University, returned to Kenya, where he died in an automobile accident nineteen years later (millercenter.org). After his

parents divorced, Obama's mother married another foreign student at the University of Hawaii, Lolo Soetoro from Indonesia. From age six through ten, Obama lived with his mother and stepfather in Indonesia, where he attended Catholic and Muslim schools. "I was raised as an Indonesian child and a Hawaiian child and as a black child and as a white child," Obama later recalled. "And so what I benefited from is a multiplicity of cultures that all fed me" (millercenter.org).

In this study, the text that will be analyzed is Barack Obama's speech transcript at University of Indonesia in 2010 . Obama's speech itself began with the story of little Obama and his childhood in Indonesia. It then was focused on three things; development, democracy, and religion because those three things are closely related, and 3 fundamental to human progress. The speech was closed with a hope that these two nations, Indonesia and America may work together, with faith and determination.

In this case, The writer choose to analyze Barack Obama's speech at University of Indonesia in terms of its metadiscourse markers in the speech because of some reasons. The first reason is dealing with the figure of Obama itself. Obama has been considered to be a master of oratory for his speeches. Secondly, his speech really got people's attention. Thousands of people attended the speech at UI and billions of people witnessed it by watching television or internet. Thirdly, it deals with the goal of the study; by analyzing the

metadiscourse markers in his speech, the writer wants to know further about Obama's way to interact with the audience.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

As mentioned above, metadiscourse closely associates with the purposes of speakers and writers. It allows them to project their interests, opinions and evaluations into a text and to process and refine ideas out of concern for receivers' possible reactions. Metadicourse have a big role for a speech in the way speakers' attempts to guide a receivers' perception of a speech by persuading them.

Based on classifications given by other linguists, Hyland categorizes metadiscourse into interactive metadiscourse resources and interactional metadiscourse resources (Hyland, 2005:49). This categorization reflects essential characteristics of metadiscourse. The interactive metadiscourse resources include transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, and code glosses. They concern with the writer's awareness of a participating audience and the ways he or she seeks to accommodate its probable knowledge, interest, rhetorical expectations and processing abilities. The purpose of this category are to shape and constrain a text to meet the needs of particular readers, setting out arguments so that they will recover the writer's preferred interpretations and goals (Hyland, 2005: 49).

Meanwhile, the interactional metadiscourse resources include hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self mentions and engagement markers. They concern with the ways writers conduct interaction by intruding and commenting on their

message. The purpose of this category are to make his or her views explicit and to involve readers by allowing them to respond to the unfolding text (Hyland, 2005: 49). This categorization is employed here to analyze Barrack Obama's speech at University of Indonesia.