

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides the background of the study, research questions, purpose of the study, scope of the study, and significance of the study.

1.1 Background of study

Booster as interactional metadiscourse has an important role in engaging the audiences to the perspective about the content, both in spoken and written. Boosters allow writers to show a credible image of authority, decisiveness, and conviction in their views (Hyland,1998). On the other hand, the study on Boosters shows their important role in creating conversational solidarity (Holmes, 1984,1990). As metadiscourse, Boosters are not alone, Hedges which are also under interactional umbrella come out as the most significant communicative resources in academic writing. They are both two sides of the same point in the sense that they both contribute to the emphasize and persuasive import of academic communication (Vazquez & Giner, 2009). Hedges (i.e. withhold commitment and open dialogue, such as *might* and *perhaps*) and boosters (i.e. emphasize certainly and close dialogue, such as *absolutely* and *certainly*), in particular, are two types of linguistic resources which have been proved rhetorically powerful in persuading the reads and influencing their perceptions towards the subject matter in their research (Hyland, 2011).

The importance of metadiscourse is highlighted in a way that academic writers draw their findings according to set of rhetorical strategies in their own field of study and social environment to make arguments, provide evidence and check claims so that readers are persuaded (Hu & Cao, 2011; Hyland, 2005). In academic writing, Boosters can allow writers to project a credible image of authority, decisiveness, and conviction in their views (Hyland, 1998). Engaging readers is highly necessary as it indicates the success of many academic genres, especially in writing genre as published article, textbooks, and L2 student's essays (Hyland, 2002).

The expression of Hedges (might) and Boosters (absolutely) are central to the rhetorical and interactive character of academic writing. According to Hyland (1994), effective academic writing actually depends on interactional elements which supplement propositional information in the text and alert readers to the writer's opinion. Academic writing in a foreign language becomes a central aspect of the writer-reader dialogue involving careful interpersonal negotiations in which writers seek to balance claims for the significance, originality, and truth of their work against the convictions of the readers (Hyland, 2001). English has become the lingua franca of academic discourse, and novices as well as established researchers must be able to express themselves in that language if they want to be fully accepted members of the international academic community. According to Swales (2004) the "English zation"

(?) of the academic world and increasing number of non-native speakers of English require special attention to academic style.

Numerous studies have been conducted in metadiscourse field. The previous study by Hyland (2000) revealed Hedges, Boosters and Lexical Invisibility: noticing modifiers in academic texts. This study examined the view of the items that the writers used to modify their claims, commonly referred to as hedges and boosters. The data were gathered from a small retrospective think aloud study which explored how 14 Cantonese L1 undergraduates responded to Hedges and Boosters in an academic text. The results of this study suggested that while the subjects generally attended to the Boosters, Hedges did seem to be more invisible. In English Department, there are only two studies which investigate Boosters, and the study which was conducted by Kenny (2015) and Astry (2016) specifically explored the use of Booster devices used English Department Students' Skripsi of UNJ. Those studies' finding show that English Department of State University of Jakarta students are definitely helped if boosters are used.

In other words, to fill the gap on the previous studies, this study was analyze Boosters used in The Jakarta Post's rubric opinion, this study was seek to what extent and how varied booster by The Jakarta post's rubric opinion.

1.2. Research question

1. What are the types of boosters used in The Jakarta Post's rubric opinion?
2. What types of booster are dominantly used in The Jakarta Post's rubric opinion?
3. What are the functions of boosters used in the Jakarta Post's rubric opinion?

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore Boosters used in The Jakarta Post's rubric opinion according to Hyland's (2001) framework by identifying and analyzing the use of Boosters as metadiscourse devices that an intended to answer the research questions, those are:

1. To find out the types of boosters devices used in The Jakarta Post's rubric opinion
2. To find out the most dominant boosters device used in The Jakarta Post's rubric opinion
3. To find out each function of booster used in the Jakarta Post's rubric opinion

1.4. Significant of the Study

This study intends to:

1. Build on the knowledge on Boosters as the part of metadiscourse, so the students can be more exposed to the convention of teaching persuasively in their writings.
2. Be an up to date model on the usage of these particular devices and enhance their vocabulary list of Boosters
3. Also, it will give understanding of Booster as one of interactional linguistic devices in delivering writing.

1.5. Scope of Study

This study was conducted to analyze the Boosting devices based on Hyland's taxonomy (2005) used in the Jakarta post specifically in rubric opinion section of three of authors. There were five types of boosters analyzed: modal verbs, lexical verbs, adjective, adverbials, and solidarity features.