

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses the reviewed literature related to the focus of this study; engagement markers and finding and discussion sections of skripsi.

2.1 Metadiscourse

Metadiscourse was composed by Zellig Harris (1959) to offer a way of understanding language in use, representing a writer's or speaker's attempts to guide a receiver's perception of a text, and then Kopple (2002) defined Metadiscourse as 'the linguistic material which does not add propositional formation but which signals the presence of an author. Ken Hyland (2004) also defined metadiscourse as linguistic devices used by writer to organize their text and signal their attitudes toward the content and their audiences. They conclude metadiscourse as linguistic devices used by the writer to signal the presence of an author with their attitudes. Metadiscourse also an approach in language and interaction between with the reader, according to *Metadiscourse* (2005), Hyland argued this linguistic devices is also an approach to conceptualizing interactions between text producers and their texts and between text producers and users. In line with Hyland, Crismore (1983) explained metadiscourse as a linguistic material in texts, written or spoken, which does not add anything to the propositional content but that is intended to help the listener or reader organize, interpret and evaluate the information given. In sum,

metadiscourse is a linguistic material in written texts or spoken texts to conceptualizing interaction with the reader which help listener or reader organize, interpret and evaluate the information given.

Ken Hyland (2004) proposed metadiscourse as an umbrella term to include heterogeneous array of cohesive and interpersonal features. Cohesive features assist the readers to “connect, organize, and interpret” the text, while interpersonal features are the ways preferred by the writer in presenting their content. Accordingly, researchers then divided metadiscourse into two major categories, which are *textual* and *interpersonal* (Vande Kopple, 1985; Cismore et al, 1993 in Hyland 2005)

According to M.A.K Halliday (1999), *Textual metadiscourse* 'shows how we link and relate individual propositions so that they form a cohesive and coherent text and how individual elements of those propositions make sense in conjunction with other elements of the text'. Whereas *Interpersonal metadiscourse*, is the use of language to encode interaction, allowing us to engage with others, to take on roles and to express and understand evaluations and feelings, on the other hand, 'can help us express our personalities and our reactions to the propositional content of our texts and characterize the interaction we would like to have with our readers about that content'.

Different with Halliday, Kopple (2012) offered six categories of metadiscourse that included text connectives which show the readers how the parts of the texts are connected and organized (e.g. *first, at the same time*), code glosses which help readers understand the meaning in the text (e.g. *so – called, sort of*),

illocution markers which explicitly tells the readers what speech or discourse act are performing at certain points in texts (e.g. *to sum up, we claim that*), epistemology markers, how we committed to the truth of ideational material, sometimes we are cautious and signal the caution (e.g. *perhaps, most certainly*), attitude markers, is to help us reveal what attitude we have toward ideational material to express such attitudes, (e.g. *fortunately, I regret*), and commentary which address readers directly into an implicit dialogue. (e.g. *some of you will be amazed that*).

The vagueness of the categories and the functional overlaps, however, mean they have proved difficult to apply in practice. Hyland (2005a, 2005b) re-organizes ideas presented in Vande Kopple's classification, primarily adopting a clear functional approach. To improve Kopple's metadiscourse, Ken Hyland (2004) offered two kind of metadiscourse which later have been used by other researchers; interactive and interactional, Interactive metadiscourse, refers to linguistics features which concern with ways writer organizing their text. Under interactive umbrella are *frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, and code glosses*. On the other hand, the interactional metadiscourse involve the readers in the argument by alerting them to the authors' perspective toward both proportional information and the reader themselves. It consists of hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mention, and engagement markers strategies.

2.2 Interactional Metadiscourse

Interactional metadiscourse is those linguistic features which make the texts more audience – centered interactional. According to Hyland (2005), interactional

metadiscourse draw the reader into the discourse and give them an opportunity to build their interaction and engagement as the contribution to the writer's perspective on propositional information, orientation and intention. There are 5 models of interactional metadiscourse proposed by Hyland which are *Hedges*, *Boosters*, *Attitude Markers*, *Engagement Markers*, and *Self mentions*.

Hedges is device that indicates the writers' decision to recognize other voices, viewpoints or possibilities, in examples (*apparently, assume, feel, guess, from my perspective*). *Booster* is device which allow writers to close down alternatives, head off conflicting views and express their certainty in what they say. (*beyond doubt, clearly, definitely, in fact*). *Attitude Markers* is used to express the writer's attitudes to the propositional material he or she presents (*unfortunately, interestingly, I wish that, how awful that*). *Engagement Markers* is device that explicitly address readers to draw them into the discourse (*by the way, assume, find, follow, go*). *Self-mentions* is used to explicit author presence in the text (*I, we, the author*).

In Previous study conducted by Mohsen Khedri (2013) Interactional metadiscourse features is the way for writers to interact with readers, get access to them, and signal their truth-value about current propositional information. To fulfill these objectives, writers must intrude more into the text with the help of interactionally metadiscursive strategies. As Hyland (2005) said, interactional metadiscourse elements play a crucial role in contributing new knowledge and making academic claims. However these metadiscoursal devices display significant conventional channels of encoding meaning that guide and provide a clearer

interpretive situation, representing how authors and audiences interact with each other and involving a culture of communication in their own genre through texts

2.3 Engagement Markers

Engagement markers is one of interactional metadiscourse proposed by Hyland (2005). Engagement markers refer to the various ways writers bring readers into the discourse to relate to them and anticipate their possible objections. It includes *personal asides*, *directives*, *reader pronoun*, *appeal to share knowledge*, and *questions*. With this linguistic device the writer or speaker deploys engagement markers in their text in order to connect to readers, recognizing the presence of their readers, pulling them along with their argument, build relationship with reader, focusing their attention, acknowledging their uncertainties, including them as discourse participants, and guiding them to interpretations.

Hyland (2005) stated that engagement markers have two functions: 1) Acknowledge the audiences through *inclusion* and *disciplinary solidarity*. Here the readers addressed as participants in an argument with reader pronouns and interjections. 2) Position the audience. The writer pulls readers into the discourse at critical points, predicting possible objections and guiding them to particular interpretations with questions, directives and references to shared knowledge. While Hamid Allami (2012) noted that in his research paper, a research writers typically address their readers as experts and use engagement markers to draw on shared understandings and emphasize solidarity.

2.3.1 The Classification of Engagement Markers

According to Hyland (2001) based on its function engagement is categorized into two; soliciting reader solidarity and crafting reader agreement. Soliciting reader solidarity can be done through *reader pronouns* (*audience pronouns*) and *personal asides*, while, crafting reader agreement can be done by *directives*, *appealed to shared knowledge*, and *questions*.

Reader pronoun are most explicitly brought into the text as discourse participants by the use of personal pronouns (Hyland 2001). Second person pronoun *you* and *your* are explicit ways in acknowledging audience's presence (Hyland, 2001 & 2005). As a more binding engagement, Hyland (2001) noted that inclusive pronoun *we*, *our*, *us*, *ourselves* which meaning includes *you* and *I* are used to showing concern in the same discipline. Hyland (2001) also found the use of indefinite pronoun which he believed is interactive and encompassing, in most writing. For example :

Now that we have a plausible theory of depiction, we should be able to answer the question of what static images depict. But this turns out to be not at all a straightforward matter. We seem, in fact, to be faced with a dilemma. Suppose we say that static images can depict movement. This brings us into conflict with Currie's account, ...

Although we lack knowledge about a definitive biological function for the transcripts from the 93D locus, their sequences provide us with an ideal system to identify a specific transcriptionally active site in embryonic nuclei.

Personal asides are linguistic features to bringing readers into the text in the main discourse by address them directly through asides and interruptions to the ongoing discussion, “briefly breaking off the argument to offer a meta-comment on an aspect of what has been said.” (Hyland,2001). Although asides express something of the writer’s personality and willingness to intervene explicitly to offer a view, they can also be seen as an essentially reader-oriented strategy. By turning to the reader in mid-argumentative flow, the writer once again acknowledges and responds to an active audience, often to initiate a brief dialogue that is largely interpersonal. In an attempt to acknowledge audience presence, the writer makes a dialogue in which present the involvement both participants (writer and audiences) in the same discipline community. For example :

He above all provoked the mistrust of academics, both because of his trenchant opinions (often, it is true, insufficiently thought out) and his political opinions.

What sort of rigidity a designator is endowed with seems to be determined by convention (this, by the way, is exactly the target of Wittgensteinian critiques of Kripke's essentialism).

In the example above the writer show that both writer and readers are engaged in the same game and are in a position to draw on shared understandings.

Directives are utterances that instruct the reader to perform an action or to see things in a way determined by the writer (Hyland, 2005). Hyland (2005) divided *directives* into three, *textual acts*, *cognitive acts*, and *physical acts*. *Textual acts* direct the audiences into another part or point of

another text, *cognitive acts* lead the audience to understand and be convinced in the propositions in a way the writer determined, and *physical acts* suggest audiences to perform certain actions that is being delivered in the discussion. (Hyland, 2002) noted that directive is typically realized in three main ways: by (1) the presence of an imperative (like *consider*, *note*, and *imagine*), (2) a modal of obligation addressed to the reader (e.g. *must*, *should*, *ought*), and (3) a predicative adjective expressing the writer's judgment of necessity/importance controlling a complement *to* clause (*it is important to understand . . .*).

Appeal to share knowledge clarifies reader or audience's agreement by creating implicit contract concerning what is relatively incontrovertible (Hyland, 2001). Hyland (2001) also noticed that successful text, somehow, linked 'what is common' between writers and readers. It is also important to note that audiences are the same disciplinary members who may have different point of view regarding to certain proposition being delivered, thus, the writer (or speaker) attempts to involve the audiences by anticipating either their objections or agreements. For example:

Of course, we know that the indigenous communities of today have been reorganized by the catholic church in colonial times and after,.....
(Soc)

Chesterton was of course wrong to suppose that Islam denied 'even souls to women'. (Phil)

The final strategy of positioning readers proposed by Hyland (2005) is *Questions*. This engagement marker sometimes used to establish a niche; steering audience attention to the topic or proposition will be discussed. As

Webber (1994) stated in Hyland, (2001), in her study of questions in academic medical journals, pointed out,

“Questions create anticipation, arouse interest, challenge the reader into thinking about the topic of the text, and have a direct appeal in bringing the second person into a kind of dialogue with the writer, which other rhetorical devices do not have to the same extent. (p. 266)”

Writers sometimes open with a question to “establish a niche” and draw the reader in from the beginning, creating interest and clearly setting out the topic the article will respond to. Hyland noticed that writer or speaker often make rhetorical question about 80%, presenting an opinion as an interrogative, so the reader appears to be the judge, but actually expecting no respons (Hyland, 2001). For example:

Is it, in fact, necessary to choose between nurture and nature? My contention is that it is not.

What do these two have in common, one might ask? The answer is that they share the same politics.

2.4 Academic Writing

Academic writing is a writing style that researcher use to define the intellectual of their disciplines and areas of expertise (Hartley, 2008). Academic writing is also used for publications that are read by teacher and researchers or presented at conferences. Murphy (2010) believes academic writing styles vary according to the rules and conventions of the different disciplines. The social sciences, the natural sciences, the humanities, business studies, technologies and engineering all have their own sub-sets of discourse conventions.

2.4.1 Skripsi

Thesis is a writing which carried out by a student based on the assignment of academic from the college as the requirements of graduation as an undergraduate (Leo, 2013). According to *Panduan Kegiatan Pedoman Penulisan Tugas Akhir, Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Negeri Jakarta (2013)*, *Skripsi* is one of the requirements for students to graduate in a university. It contains several sections: abstract, introduction, literature review, methodology, data collection, data analysis, discussion, and conclusion. In this case, the writer will focus on the discussion section only as the object of this study.

2.4.2 Finding and Discussion Sections of Skripsi

Findings and discussion sections is a part of research paper which purpose of is to convey the meaning of the result (Hess, 2004) and also to present a summary of data analysis (James H. McMillan, 2010). According to Kretchmer (2003) on *Fourteen Steps to Writing an Effective Discussion Section*, Discussion is a part to state interpretations and opinions, explain the implications of findings, and make suggestions for future research. The main function is to answer the questions posed in the Introduction, explain how the results support the answers and, how the answers fit in with existing knowledge on the topic. To support the answer with the result, Kretchmer (2003) argued to address all the results relating to the questions, describe the patterns, principles, and relationships shown by each major

finding/result and put them in perspective. The sequencing of providing this information is important; first state the answer, then the relevant results, then cite the work of others. If necessary, point the reader to a figure or table to enhance the “story”. Murphy (2010) added discussion helps the reader from narrow and specific results to more general conclusions. According to (<https://www.heacademy.ac.uk>), finding and discussion sections should not be simply a summary of the results you have found and at this stage you will have to demonstrate original thinking. It should highlight and discuss how your research has reinforced what is already known about the area. When discussing what is already known, the writer explicitly build relationship with reader as same as the function of *engagement markers* (Hyland, 2005). Rob J. Hyndman (2009) also added, when discussing the finding on what is already known, *reader pronoun* is used to referring to the reader and author together. It showed that they reader and writer are in the same community.

Writer presents the research findings by discussing the elaboration of stages in proving his/her hypothesis, how he/she states the limitation of the study in order to answer the research problem, and then how he/she links the research problem solving steps to a number of related previous research that have reviewed in the chapter two / literature review (Faculty of Language and Arts, 2013). In presenting the finding and discussion the writer used engagement markers to make participants or reader and writer feeling visible via the writer’s choice to promote rapport (Salek, 2014).

2.5 Previous Study

Markovic (2013) stated in his journal, examined engagement markers in grammar textbook of contemporary English, *A Student Grammar of the English Language* written by Huddleston and Pullum (2005). From the data, all the five engagement markers have been found in the corpus, some of them being very prominent. Namely, the extremely frequent use of reader pronouns, directives and appeals to shared knowledge was accompanied by sporadic uses of personal asides and questions. The overall extensive use of engagement markers, however, is justified in the textbook used as the corpus, since it acquires the primarily informal tone of accidentally but rather constantly engaging the reader into the discourse.

A research on engagement in writing also conducted by Ruspita (2014), she conducted a research on 7 Indonesian EFL learners' Persuasive writings. The research results reveal that the occurrences of textual marker types in EFL learners' Persuasive texts are overall closely similar to those at considered as standard proficient writing (extract from BAWE corpus), while those of interpersonal marker types are different from the standard proficient writing. She found The occurrences of interpersonal markers in EFL learners' Persuasive texts are as follows: self mention markers are the most numerous interpersonal markers (29 or 45%), followed by attitude markers (22 or 34%), hedges (6 or 9%), boosters (4 or 6%), and finally engagement markers (3 or 5%). This indicates the EFL learner writer are less skillful in engaging the readers.

A reseach conduct by Abdi (2011) in his research about metadiscourse on 54 research articles from social science and natural sciences. He found that

engagement markers is used in research article. In introduction section there are 39 engagement markers and 47 engagement markers in method section, while in result and discussion section are 134 engagement markers. His study proved that engagement markers were among the most frequently used metadiscourse markers in result and discussion section.

The study by Alfi Ayuni (2015) on students speech performance found that students have used four from categories of engagement markers in their speech, including *reader pronoun (audience pronoun)*, *questions*, *directives*, and *appeal to shared knowledge*. It also indicates that students were aware of their audience's presence and involved them into their speech. The research also found that the most dominant engagement markers used is *reader pronoun (audience pronoun)* which contributed 62,66% from all total of engagement markers, which means that the students were well-aware of their audience by addressing them directly and positioning them into the discussion of the speech. Next, *questions* were constituted 18,28% and *directives* with 14,38%. *Appeal to shared knowledge* then, has the least frequency with 4,48%

2.6 Theoretical Framework

This study is designed to analyze the use of engagement markers in English Department students' discussion section of skripsi. Based on the explanation above, the researcher uses Hyland (2005) concept to investigate the most common types of engagement markers and the function to support information flow in

discussion section of skripsi. The concept categorizes engagement markers into 5 types:

1. *Personal asides* are set of linguistic features which address the audiences through asides and interruptions.
2. *Directives* are divided into three *directives*, included *textual, cognitive, and physical acts*.
3. *Reader pronoun*, mostly comprises second person pronoun, inclusive pronoun, and other addressee pronoun.
4. *Appeal to share knowledge* clarify reader agreement by creating 'implicit contract concerning what is relatively incontrovertible'. Hyland (2001:566) believed this strategy involves the readers within 'boundaries of disciplinary understanding' through appeals of shared knowledge of what is controversial for rhetorical.
5. *Questions*, which Hyland noticed that writer or speaker often make rhetorical question in their text.