

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter draws explanation about the background of the study, the research questions, purpose of the study, the scope, and the significance of the study.

1.1. Background of the Study

In recent decades, interactive metadiscourse has been examined under metadiscourse research project. It is one of sub-categorizes of metadiscourse markers which attempt the writers in constructing and organizing the information effectively in order to make coherent and convincing written text (Hyland, 2005). According to Hyland and Tse (2004), interactive metadiscourse is the features which set out an argument to explicitly establish the writer's preferred interpretation. They are concerned with ways of organizing discourse rather than experience to anticipate readers' knowledge. Thus, interactive metadiscourse is used to specify the ways how the writers organize their text in order to guide the readers through the texts effectively.

Theoretically, Hyland (2005) developed the model of metadiscourse and categorized it into two divisions. First, interactional metadiscourse is the device to let the writer set their ideas in a way that their readers are likely to accept, to contribute in the text and also at the same time display the writer's perspective of the information in the text. Second, interactive metadiscourse is the device, used

to construct and organize the information in a way that the reader is likely to find it coherent and convincing. It can be said that interactional metadiscourse will be responsible to the way the information be presented communicatively and engaged socially, while interactive metadiscourse is responsible to the way the information of a text be presented effectively (Tanjung, 2015).

Having very significant role in organising text to reflect the writer's ideas of what needs to be made explicit from the text, interactive metadiscourse consists of the types which are able to manage the information flow explicitly to establish writer's preferred interpretations. These types are: (1) **Transitional Markers**, which are mainly conjunctions and adverbial phrases, used to signal additive, constructive and consequential in a text such as *furthermore, equally, however, but*; (2) **Frame Markers**, which are signals to text boundaries or elements of schematic structure used to sequence parts of the text, to label text stages, and to indicate topic shift such as *first, next, in sum, to summarize, well, now*; (3) **Endophoric Markers**, which refer to information in other parts of the text, for example *as noted above, see figure 2*; (4) **Evidentials**, which indicate the sources of textual information, for instance *according to, X, Y states*; and (5) **Code-glosses**, which supply the additional information or restatement of the writer, for example *in other words, that is, this can be defined as, for example* (Hyland, 2005, p. 51-52).

The purposes of finding and discussion section based on the moves proposed by Brett, 1994; Posteguillo, 1999; Thompson, 1999; Young & Allison 2003; in Paltridge & Starfield, 2007 are first, to explain the early information by

relating and providing background information, referring to previous information, also showing the location of tables, figures or charts. Second, present the result of study by showing what the data are and highlighting the data for readers' attention and providing evidences. Third, comment the result by interpreting, making a claim and looking for meaning. However, based on the previous explanation, interactive metadiscourse has five classifications according to Hyland's theory (2005) they are transitions, endophoric markers, evidential, and code glosses. Each classification offers different purpose in a text, especially in finding and discussion section. In referring to previous information and showing the location of tables, figures or charts, the writer could effectively use endophoric markers since its function is referring to other parts of the text to make the readers appropriately follow the discussion. Endophoric marker could also be used to present the result by showing and highlighting what the data are. In addition, finding and discussion section also presents how the writers link the research problem solving steps to a number of related previous research that have reviewed in the literature review (Hess, 2004). In this case, evidentials could effectively used since the function of evidentials is referring to the other sources.

Numerous researchers have been examined the interactive metadiscourse in different data. The study which was conducted by Abdi (2011) about the distribution of metadiscourse markers in different parts of research articles across sciences (Social Science, and Natural Science), its discussion found that Finding and Discussion Section use more frequent interactive metadiscourse than other sections (Introduction & Methodology). This view can be proven by the total of

the interactive sub-categorize words which were taken from the data. The most dominant sub-categorize of interactive metadiscourse that were found in the discussion sections are transitions and frame markers. According to Abdi (2011) this is because discussion section needs more signposting, as claimed by Hyland (2005) to ensure that the reader is on the right track and appropriately follows the discussion. In the discussion section as well was found more frame marking than the other sections of research article because more frame marking is used to display what they are doing in the discussion. Definitely, it is accordance with the characteristic of the interactive metadiscourse which is used to construct and organize the information in a text that the reader is likely to find it coherent and convincing. This indicates that the study of interactive metadiscourse in finding and discussion section is necessary to remember that academic writing needs better strategy to present, draw, and elaborate the result and hypothesis of the study which can be achieved by means of interactive metadiscourse.

In the past ten years, a number of studies have established the use of interactive metadiscourse. The first previous related study which was conducted by Khedri (2013); he focused on identifying the interactive metadiscourse markers in the result and discussion sections of academic research articles across four disciplines (English Language Teaching, Civil Engineering, Biology, and Economics). They analysed 16 research article result and discussion sections. The study found that code-glosses and transitions had the highest occurrence in the corpus.

The next study was conducted by Alshahrani (2015), he investigated the presence of interactive and interpersonal metadiscourse in the discussion section of academic writing, written by Arab postgraduate ESL students. His study reveals that the corpora contain more interactive metadiscourse (57%) than interpersonal metadiscourse (42%). This study implies that interactive metadiscourse markers are mostly and easily found in the academic writing especially in the discussion section. Another recent study related to interactive metadiscourse is conducted by Mardhatillah (2015), she analysed the interactive metadiscourse used by English department students in their finding and discussion Section of *Skripsi*. She used content analysis design with qualitative method in her research and used Hyland's theory (2004) as the framework of the study. She examined 10 discussion sections of *Skripsi* as the data, chosen from educational and literature program. Her study discovers that transitions marker is the most dominant marker used in both program.

Accordance to previous research of interactive metadiscourse analysis projects, the present study intended to bridge the gap in examining the types of interactive metadiscourse and find out how far the interactive metadiscourse used in finding and discussion section of English department students' theses since the essential part of writing a thesis especially in finding and discussion section is coherent in presenting arguments and cohesive in structuring ideas (Murphy, 2010). In order to get cohesive and coherent writing, the writers could alternatively use the interactive metadiscourse. Besides, Murphy (2010) supported that finding and discussion section presents a unity and coherence of the material

both for the writer and the reader. Thus, interactive metadiscourse could take an important role in helping the writer to make the reader effectively understand the discussion.

1.2. Research Questions

The researcher composes two research questions:

1. What types of interactive metadiscourse are found in the finding and discussion section of English Department students' theses?
2. How are interactive metadiscourse used in finding and discussion section of English department students' theses?

1.3. Purpose of the study

This study will be conducted in order to find out:

1. The types of interactive metadiscourse used by the English department students in their finding and discussion section of theses.
2. How interactive metadiscourse was used in finding and discussion section of English department students' theses.

1.4. Scope of the study

This study will be limited on identifying interactive metadiscourse which is proposed by Hyland (2005) in the discussion section of English department students' theses. The study is on the interactive metadiscourse types: transition markers, evidential markers, endophoric markers, frame markers, and code glosses.

1.5. Significance of the study

The researcher hopes this study will lead to the deeper understanding in interactive metadiscourse as a part of linguistics competence especially for language learners so that they will be able to use it in academic discourse and also to enrich their linguistics awareness in academic writing. The result of this study is expected to contribute information about interactive metadiscourse that is commonly found in the academic writing genre such as thesis or dissertation. For others who want to conduct a study related to interactive metadiscourse, hopefully this study would provide reference. Moreover, the list of interactive metadiscourse items which have been found can also be useful for writing in academic English class where English department students can try to write using the list in their writing.