

CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses some theories that relates to the study. Literature review is very important because it gives what related studies have been done in past and what they have shown as Brown and Rodgers (2002) point out.

2.1 Theoretical Review

2.1.1 Metadiscourse

There are many definitions given by metadiscourse analysts. The first definiton comes from William in 1981 who considers that metadiscourse is as discourse, intended to direct readers than inform them. Vandekopple (1985, p.83) defines that metadiscourse is a discourse that people use to help readers connect, organize, interpret, evaluate and develop attitudes toward a referential material. Crismore (1983) defines the term of metadicourse as the author's intrusion into ongoing discourse to direct rather than inform the readers. The most important is about how to make the readers follow and go along with the the writer's piece of writing work.

Meanwhile, Hyland (2004) views metadiscourse as "self – reflective linguistic expression referring to the evolving text, to the writer, and to the imagined readers of that text" (p.33). In other words, states that metadiscourse is based on a view of writing as social engagement in which writers project themselves into their discourse to signal their attitudes. It is about how the writers represent themselves through their works showing their attitudes and their personality.

Since 1980, some researchers (e.g. Van de Kopple, 1985; Crismore, 1989; Mauranen, 1993; Hyland, 1998, 2005) have proposed some various definitions. Metadiscourse includes linguistic elements that refer to the organization the discourse and the relationship between the writer and the reader not to the external reality (as propositional or referential elements) (Crismore, 1989; VandeKopple, 2002). According to Hyland in 2002, knowledge about metadiscourse lead the writers to create harmonius connections with their readers, taking their views, beliefs, and expectations into account and strategically addressing them as intelligent equals in a shared disciplinary endeavour.

Hyland says “the term of metadiscourse was coined by Zellig Harris in 1959 to offer a way of understanding language in use, representing a writer’s or speaker’s attempts to guide receiver’s perception of a text”. Metadiscourse is based on a view of writing as social engagement in which writers project themselves int their discourse to signal their attitudes or communicative intentions. He also states that “Metadiscourse is the cover term for the self-reflective expression to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting a writer (or speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers as members of particular community” (p.37).

In addition, Mauranen and Crismore (1993) draw the same stance relating to term of metadiscourse. It is a linguistic material in the text that goes beyond propositional content without adding anything to the subject matter but able to guide the readers through organising, interpreting, and as well as evaluating the information that is mentioned before wtihin the text.

Although there are so many various definitions, most scholars agree that metadiscourse is equal in importance to the primary discourse and it is essential for the appropriate construction of any piece of writing. In academic writing, metadiscourse brings an essential social meaning to reveal the writer's personality and identity and to indicate how the writer's hope their readers to respond toward their ideas. It is also argued that its features help the writers to create a reader-friendly prose to avoid a dry boring text.

In short, metadiscourse is mostly considered as linguistic tools to communicate attitudes and to mark structural properties for a piece of discourse. It also plays a vital role creating solidarity between the readers and the writers because metadiscourse helps to construct a coherent text and reflects the writers' personality, credibility, considerateness of the reader, and relationship to the subject matter and to the readers.

2.1.2 The Early Models of Metadiscourse

Halliday's classification of language macro functions (ideational, interpersonal, and textual) is considered as the theoretical basis for the term of "metadiscourse". These are:

- *The Ideational function*: the use of language to represent experience and idea.
- *The Interpersonal function*: the use of language to encode interaction, allowing us to engage with others, to take on roles and to express and understand evaluation and feelings.

- *The Textual function*: the use of language to organize the text itself, coherently relating what is said to the world and to readers.

Crismore and Farnsworth (1990), Hyland (1998), Van de Kopple (1985) have drawn on Halliday's metafunctions to code their data by distinguishing the metadiscourse items from propositional matter and categorizing the former of metadiscourse whether as textual function by organizing coherent discourse or as interpersonal function by conveying the writer's attitude to the text. Since then, Hyland proposes two categories of metadiscourse, textual or interactive metadiscourse and interpersonal or interactional metadiscourse. Each of this category carries five subcategories. Transition Marker, Endophoric Marker, Frame Marker, Evidentials and Code glosses are the feature Textual or interactive metadiscourse meanwhile Interpersonal or interactional metadiscourse carries Hedges, Boosters, Self – Mention, Attitude Markers, and Engagement Markers.

According to Williams in 1981, three large common types of metadiscourse are hedges (*possibly*) and emphatics (certainly); sequencers (*in the next section*) and topicalizers (*with regard to*); narrators and attributors (*according to X* (2007)).

Based on Meyers (1975) and Crismore (1983) classified written metadiscourse into two general categories. First is informational such as goals (*the purpose of this study*), pre-plans (*this chapter is about*), post plans (*in the previous section*) and topicalizers (*with regard to*). The second one is attitudinal that includes saliency (*still more important*), emphatics, hedges and evaluatives

(*unfortunately*). These terms are similar to the textual and interpersonal function of metadiscourse.

Vande Kopple (1985) divided metadiscourse into seven types, the first four are textual and the remaining three are interpersonal. His textual types are connectives (*however*), code glosses (*this means that*), illocution markers (*to conclude*), and narrators. The interpersonal category includes: validity markers (hedges, emphatics, and attributors), attitude markers (*surprisingly*), and commentaries (*you might not agree with that*).

Investigating textual and interpersonal metadiscourse, some studies take a broad approach to metadiscourse such as Vande Kopple (1985), Crismore et al. (1993) and Hyland (1998). But other researchers such as Schiffrin (1980), Mauranen (1992; 1993a; 1993b), Bunton (1999), Dahl (2004), Valero-Garces (1996), Moreno (1997; 2004) and Peterlin (2005) only considered textual metadiscourse in their studies as narrow approach. The different features between broad and narrow approach lies on the inclusion among the former of stance – or what Vande Kopple calls ‘attitude’ – and validity markers.

2.1.3 Textual Metadiscourse and Interpersonal Metadiscourse

Many studies about discourse (e.g. Crismore et al., 1993; Dafouz, 2003; Hyland, 1998; Vande Kopple, 1985, among others) employ the Halliday’s distinction between textual and interpersonal functions of language in order to classify the linguistic units. Textual metadiscourse refers to metatext used in organising the text and directing the readers through the text. On the other hand,

interpersonal metadiscourse is used to develop a relationship between the readers and the writers in order to be more intimate and attached dialogue with the readers. According to Crismore (1984) the interpersonal function of language will be attained when interpersonal discourse markers are added to the text along with first and second pronoun.

Hyland (1999, pp. 7-8) believes that “textual metadiscourse is used to organize propositional information in ways that will be coherent for a particular audience and appropriate for a given context or purpose”. These category devices represent the audience’s presence within the text in terms of writer’s assessment of its processing difficulties, intertextual requirements and need for interpretative guidance. He also declares that interpersonal metadiscourse “allows writers to express perspective toward their propositional information and their readers. It indicates the writer’s assessment of information and their conviction in its reliability or truth. As a result, the writers project a strong, authoritative and credible authorial presence within the text.

According to Vande Kopple (1985), interpersonal metadiscourse is a crucial rhetorical strategy since it is the precise layer of the text in which the writers intrude into his/ her text to add affective values and demonstrate the degree of commitment toward the propositional content.

Previous research (e.g. Crismore et al., 1993; Mauranen 1993) has shown that writer’s language background affects the use of metadiscourse within the text. In addition, the quality and quantity of this feature is different in various genres

(Abdi 2002). As a result, the investigation of interpersonal metadiscourse markers can reveal the norm of various cultures and genres.

Hyland (2005) and Hyland and Tse (2004) have put a stronger interpersonal view on metadiscourse, claiming that all metadiscourse categories are essentially interpersonal since they need to take account the readers' knowledge, textual experience, and processing needs. Therefore, they change the terminology based on Thompson's (2001) label interactive (instead of textual) and interactional (instead of interpersonal) metadiscourse.

Moreover, Hyland's model (2005) all metadiscourse contributes to the interpersonal dimension of the text. Nevertheless, he distinguishes two kinds of metadiscourse categories: *interactive* resources help the writer or speaker organizing the information presented in ways that the audience may find coherent and convincing, and *interactional* resources helps involve the readers and alert them to the author's perspective on propositional information or on the readers themselves. The following are the type of metadiscourse proposed by Hyland (2005) :

- I. **Interactive (Textual) Resources:** these devices let the writer manage information flow to provide his/her preferred interpretation. On the other hand, they help to guide reader through the text to organize information presented in ways that the readers may find coherent and convincing . According to Hyland, here are some devices or the sub categories of interactive metadiscourse:

a. Transition Markers

Conjunctions and adverbial phrases are feature of transition markers that help readers to interpret pragmatic connection between steps in an argument signaling additive, causative, consequence, and contrastive relations in the writer's thoughts to express relationship stretches of discourse. To count as metadiscourse, they must perform internal role to the discourse to help readers interpret links between ideas. **Addition** adds elements to an argument that consist items such as *and, furthermore, moreover, by the way*, etc. **Comparison** marks arguments either similar (*similarly, likewise, equally, the same way, correspondingly* etc). **Consequence** relates either tell the readers that a conclusion is being drawn and justified (*thus, therefore, consequently, in conclusion*, etc) or that argument is being countered (*admittedly, nevertheless, anyway, in any case, of course*).

b. Frame Markers

This feature indicates text boundaries or schematic elements of text structure. There has to be care to identify feature that belong to argument rather than events in time. Frame markers can be used to sequence part of the text or to order an argument internally.

- Putting additive relations (*first, then, at the same time, next*)
- Labeling text stages (*to summarize, to sum up, by the way of ..*)

- Announcing discourse goals (*I argue here, my purpose is, the paper proposes, I hope to persuade, there are several reasons why*)
- Indicating topic shifts (*well, ok, right, now, let us return to*)

c. Endophoric Markers

They refer to the other part of the text (*See figure X, refer to the next section, as noted above*). These make additional material prominent and therefore the readers obtain to recovery of the writer's meaning by referring to earlier material or anticipating something yet to come. They help readers to steer them to a preferred interpretations of reading of the discourse.

d. Evidentials

The feature of this sub category is the representations of an idea from another source (Thomas and Hawes, 1994:124) which guides the readers to interpret and establish an authorial command of the subject. In academic writing, this feature refers to expert's thoughts or arguments as important support.

e. Code Glosses

By rephrasing, explaining or elaborating, the writer's thoughts, they indicate additional information to assure the readers is able to recover the writer's meaning. Code glosses are represented by some phrases such as *this is called, in other words, that is, this can be defined as, for example, etc.*

II. Interactional (Interpersonal) resources: they involve the reader within the text, focus on the participants of the interaction and seek to display the writer's personality in a text as he or she pulling readers along with their argument, focusing their attention. In other words, they help to involve the reader in the arguments within the text.

a. Hedges

Possible, might, perhaps are devices that represent this sub category that indicate writer's decision to recognize alternative viewpoints and so withhold complete commitment to a proposition. Hedges allow information to be presented as an opinion rather than a fact that open the position to be a negotiation since it emphasizes the subjectivity. The writers must have a precise measurement to be given in an assertion considering the degree of precision or reliability they want it to carry. It also implies that writer's plausible reasoning is a base on a statement instead of particular knowledge.

b. Boosters

Word such as *clearly, obviously*, let the witters close down the alternatives, cut off any conflicting views and show that writer's feel certain in what they say. Relating to academic writing, the researcher feel certain with that has been found related to the theoretical base. By closing down all possible alternatives with a single and confident voice, boosters emphasize certainty and build a rapport by marking

involvement with a topic and solidarity with an audience, taking a joint position against other voices (Hyland:1999).

c. Attitude Markers

This feature indicates writer's affective and attitude to propositions. Attitude markers convey surprise, agreement, importance, obligation, frustration and so on, instead of commenting on the status of information, its relevance, reliability or truth. They are most explicitly signaled by attitude verbs (e.g. *agree, prefer*), sentence adverb (*unfortunately, hopefully*) and adjectives (*appropriate, logical, remarkable*) while it is also expressed by the use of subordination, comparatives, progressive particles, punctuation, text location and so on. Besides, they show the writer's appraisal of propositional information such as *I agree, surprisingly, and so on*.

d. Self – Mentions

It relates to the degree of author presence within the text measured by the frequency of first – person pronoun and possessive adjectives (*I, me, we, our, ours*). The most powerful means of self – representation is the personal projection first person pronouns (Ivanic, 1998). It is unavoidable for the writers to project an impression of themselves and how they stand in relations to their arguments, their community and their readers. An explicit presence and absence of the author reference is option to take on particular stance and contextually situated authorial

identity (Hyland: 2001). The aim is to build relationship with the readers

e. Engagement Markers

These devices aim to make the readers focus their attention or include them as discourse participants. Writers are able to spotlight downstate the of their presence of their readers in the text by innovating impression of authority, integrity and credibility through choices of *hedges, boosters, self – mention, and attitude*. Moreover, attitude and engagement markers are often difficult to distinguish in practice since devices can also hale relational implications.

2.1.4 Skripsi

Skripsi contains a research which is conducted in a systematic way for the purpose of improving , modifying and developing the knowledge that can be delivered (communicated) and tested (verified) by other researchers (Fellin, Tripodi, and Meyer, 1996). It consists of five chapters namely introduction, literature review, methodology, finding and discussion, and conclusion and recommendation. Chapter I or introduction is the introductory part of the research that discusses about the background of the research, the research questions, the objective of the research, the scope of the research, and the significance of the research. Chapter II or literature review discusses some theories and previous studies related to the research. Next is Chapter III or methodology that discusses the research design used by the research. Meanwhile, Chapter IV talks about

Finding and Discussion section that is important to deliver what the researcher has found after analyzing the data. The last chapter is Chapter V or Conclusion and Recommendation in which the researcher conclude based on the result that has been described in detail in previous chapter as well as the recommendation towards the study – related matters and suggestion for the future research.

2.1.5 Previous Research

There are many studies done related to the Interpersonal metadiscourse. The previous study was conducted by Rezvan Davaei that focus on interpersonal metadiscourse used in composition written by male and female students who have been studying chemistry engineering. They wrote eighty words of composition based on topic given to them. Then the compositions were collected to be analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively to find out whether there is any differences in using of interpersonal metadiscourse markers between male and female students. It is found that all students employed all types of matadiscourse except endophoric markers and evidentials which are part of interactive metadiscourse. The hedges and boosters were the least frequently used while self-mentions were the most in both males and females. The differences in using metadiscourse with different degrees between these genders occur in the overall interpersonal metadiscourse.

Moreover, the research about interpersonal metadiscourse was also conducted by Mina Noorian which focus on a text written by American and Iranian columnist in two elite newspapers in the United States of America and Iran, *The New York Times* and *Tehran Times*. It aims to find out whether American and Iranian writers employes the same amounts of interpesonal metadiscourse proposed by Dafouz (2003). The findings revealed that there were significant differences between these two groups regarding the presence of interpersonal markers, especially in the case of commentaries.

Another research has been done by Elham Yazdanmehr that focus on research article abstract writer by Iranian applied linguists in English and Persian. The aim is to analyze Hyland's interpersonal metadiscourse used by 100 abstracts (50 Persian along with their 50 English counterparts) which have been selected randomly. The finding shows that the Persian abstracts are in all cases lengthier than their English versions, but in both the interactive features are more prevalent than the interactional ones.