

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Previous Study

Similar studies have been done by some researchers in the past. In this study, the researcher took three previous relevant studies as the guideline to implement the research. The three relevant studies can be seen in the following table:

Table 2.1 Previous Study

Study	Title	Objective	Findings
Yipei and Lingling (2013)	Investigating the Interpersonal and Textual Meaning of Steve Jobs' Stanford Speech in terms of Hyland's Metadiscourse Theory	To investigate the Interpersonal and textual meaning of Steve Jobs' speech in the light of Hyland's	Metadiscourse used in the speech shows Steve Jobs elaborately projects his ideas, support his position and facilitates mutual communication.
Esmer (2017)	Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in Turkish Election Rally Speeches Delivered by Pro-Turkish and Pro-Kurdish Leaders	Analyze the use of interpersonal metadiscourse markers in Turkish election rally speeches delivered by two political	The result shows that the two leaders used the same interpersonal metadiscourse in their speeches but functioned differently
Tashi & Suksawas (2018)	An Analysis of Interactional Metadiscourse in Public Speaking: A Case Study in English Speeches of the Prime Minister of Bhutan	Analyze interactional metadiscourse used in the Prime Minister of Bhutan speeches of different topics	The finding shows that the uses of interactional metadiscourse in the speeches are connected with the audience.

Yipei and Lingling have done a research in 2013 entitle *Investigating the Interpersonal and Textual Meaning of Steve Jobs' Stanford Speech in terms of Hyland's Metadiscourse Theory*. The research is aim to investigate the

interpersonal and textual meaning of Steve Jobs' Stanford speech by analyzing the interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the speech. The object of the study is Steve Job's Stanford speech which last about fifteen minutes. The researcher analyzed metadiscourse markers used in the speech based on Hyland's (2005) interpersonal metadiscourse theory. The result shows that the researchers found 235 items which recognized as the interactive metadiscourse resources and 109 items are included as the interactional metadiscourse resources in Steve Job's Stanford speech. In addition, the researchers did not find any endophoric markers in Steve Job's speech. The result of the study shows that by the use of metadiscourse markers in the speech, Steve Jobs has successfully extended his thoughts, assembles relationship with the audiences, supports his position and encourages mutual communication.

Another study was done by Esmer in 2017. The research entitled *Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in Turkish Election Rally Speeches Delivered by Pro-Turkish and Pro-Kurdish Leaders*. The aim of the study is to analyze the use of interpersonal metadiscourse by two political leaders in their election rally speeches. The research also aims to discover the role of metadiscourse markers in the speech in the reflection of speakers' ideologies. The research is designed as a qualitative and quantitative research. The study uses metadiscourse theory from Crismore et al to analyze the data. As the result, the researcher found that the two political leaders have used the same interpersonal metadiscourse markers in their speeches; however the markers have different function due to the different ideology of each leader.

The last previous study was conducted in 2018 by Tashi and Suksawas. The study entitled *An Analysis of Interactional Metadiscourse in Public Speaking: A Case Study in English Speeches of the Prime Minister of Bhutan*. The aims of the study are to discover the interactional metadiscourse used in the Prime Minister of Bhutan speeches of various topics and to find the distinctions on metadiscourse markers used in every speech. The study is designed as a descriptive qualitative research. This study uses Hyland's metadiscourse theory as well; however, the researchers of the study limited the research to focus on the interactional metadiscourse markers only. The researchers find out that interactional metadiscourse used by the Prime Minister of Bhutan are connected with his audiences in an interactive, clear and elaborated direction. The result finds out that the speaker used 5 types of interactional metadiscourse in his speeches, such as: hedges, booster, attitude markers, self-mentions and engagement markers.

Those three previous studies discussed above have similarity with this current study that is concerned about the use of metadiscourse markers. However, the researcher found the space that makes this current research unique compared to the previous studies mentioned before. The object, the aims, and the theory in this study are different compared to those previous studies discussed earlier. The study conducted by Yipei and Lingling (2013) is aim find the interpersonal and textual meaning in Steve Job's Stanford speech, while the study conducted by Esmer (2017) analyzed interpersonal metadiscourse markers based on Crismore et al framework in which the framework has a lot of similarity with Hyland's

interactional metadiscourse. In addition, Tashi and Suksawas (2018) analyzed the interactional metadiscourse to find the differences on the use of metadiscourse in the speeches. Considering the gap between this research and other previous studies, the researcher is interested to analyze interpersonal metadiscourse markers used in Jacinda Ardern's speech at Christchurch memorial based on Hyland's interpersonal model of metadiscourse. This research presents the interpersonal metadiscourse markers, both the interactive and the interactional resources, and the function of each metadiscourse markers which are used in the speech.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 Metadiscourse

The term metadiscourse has been viewed as one of linguistic features that truly useful and helpful in the field of writing. Moreover, Kuswoyo & Siregar (2019) have added that metadiscourse is considered as one of the manifest tools that can be used in speaking skills. In addition, metadiscourse refers to "the forms we use to transfer what may otherwise be a lifeless text into discourse that meets the needs of participants" (Hyland, 2005:3). Meanwhile, in Ädel (2006:2) words, metadiscourse refers to "linguistics item which reveal the writer's and reader's (or speaker's and hearer's) presence in the text, either by referring to the organization of the text or by commenting on the text in other ways". In this sense, metadiscourse refers to linguistic devices which used both in writing and speaking to help readers and hearers decode the message of the text itself. Metadiscoursal resources can also be used be used to create a convincing reader-environment.

The use of metadiscourse will help speakers to organize and produce persuasive speaking based on the norms or standards and expectation of people involved. As stated by Hyland (2005) that metadiscourse is significant that it will help both native and non-native speakers of English to convey their ideas as well as engage with readers and hearers effectively. “Metadiscourse thus offers a framework for understanding communication as social engagement.” (Hyland, 2005:4) Therefore, metadiscourse becomes a universal aspect in our everyday language.

The concept of metadiscourse is based on Halliday’s classification of three metafunctions of language. Moreover, Kopple (1985) stated that ideational function is fulfilled by primary discourse, while interpersonal and textual functions are fulfilled by metadiscourse (Nasiri, 2013). Varieties of taxonomies of metadiscourse have been proposed by some scholars. The first taxonomy was proposed in 1985 by Vande Kopple (Duruk, 2017) with textual and interpersonal metadiscourse as the two major categories of metadiscourse markers. Textual metadiscourse include connectives, code glosses, illocutionary markers and narrators. On the other side, interpersonal metadiscourse include validity markers, attitude markers and commentaries.

Metadiscourse can be analyzed from different perspective because it is considered as an open-ended category (Vashegani, 2018). Therefore, other scholars have proposed different classification of metadiscourse. Hyland (2005) proposed another model of metadiscourse taxonomy. Unlike Kopple’s model, Hyland’s (2005) proposed that all metadiscourse markers are categorized

as interpersonal metadiscourse. All metadiscourse classifications are basically interpersonal, because they need to consider the knowledge of the readers, textual experiences and processing needs (Hyland, 2005). However, Hyland also proposed two major categories of interpersonal metadiscourse in which Hyland adopting Thompson's (2001) label of interactive and interactional. The model of interpersonal metadiscourse is shown in the following table.

Table 2.2.1 Interpersonal model of metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005:49)

Category	Function	Examples
Interactive Resources	<i>Help to guide reader through the text</i>	
Transitions	Express semantic relation between main clauses	in addition / but / thus / and
Frame markers	refer to discourse acts, sequences, or text 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
Evidential	refer to source of information from other	according to X / (Y, 1990) / Z states
Code glosses	help readers grasp meanings of ideational material	namely-/e.g./such as / in other words
Interactional Resources	<i>Involve the reader in the argument</i>	
Hedges	Withhold writer's full commitment to proposition	might / perhaps / possible /about
Boosters	Emphasize force or writer's certainty in proposition	in fact / definitely / it is clear that
Attitude markers	Express writer's attitude to proposition	Unfortunately /I agree / surprisingly
Engagement	explicitly refer to or build relationship with	consider / note that / you can see that
Self-mentions	explicit reference to	I / we / my / our

Interactive metadiscourse concerns with writer's awareness of his readers. Meanwhile, interactional metadiscourse concerns with the writers attempt to make his views explicit as well as to involve readers by predicting readers' objectives and responses to the text. In many recent studies, Hyland's (2005) model of

interpersonal metadiscourse is preferred amongst any other metadiscourse taxonomies. Thus, this study uses Hyland's taxonomy of metadiscourse. The following section discusses the two major categories and sub categories of each.

2.2.1.1 Interactive Metadiscourse

Interactive metadiscourse manages how the authors compose the text. How to write in the organization of the text can influence the readability of the reading and the reader can understand the text flowing. This category refers to the author's awareness of participating audiences and how he seeks to accommodate the possibility of knowledge, interests, rhetorical expectations, and processing abilities. According to Hyland (2005) the resources used in this category discuss ways of organizing discourse, not experience, and express the extent to which the text is built with the reader's needs in mind. Therefore, the author's purpose here is to shape and limit the text to meet the needs of certain readers, establish arguments so that they will restore interpretations and goals that the author likes. This metadiscourse also shows how the writer guides the reader in understanding the text with the aim that the reader is interested and responsive in the text. Interactive metadiscourse which concerns about the writer's awareness are divide into five subcategories:

- **Transitions** are devices, mainly conjunctions and adverbial phrases, used to mark additive, contrastive, and consequential between steps in the discourse, instead the external world (Hyland, 2005). Transitions are devices used to help audiences in indicating relationship between arguments. Transition used to signal additive (*and, in addition, furthermore, by the way, etc.*), comparison as either similar (*similarly, likewise, in the same way, etc.*) or

different (*but, on the other hand, by contrast, however, on the contrary, etc.*)

and to signal consequence (*in conclusion, therefore, thus, the result is, etc.*).

- **Frame markers** are references that signal text boundaries or elements of schematic text structure (Hyland, 2005) This includes items used to sequence, to label text stages, to announce discourse goals and to demonstrate topic shifts. Frame markers used by authors to signal text boundaries. It can be used to sequence text (*first, next, then, for instance, listing a,b,c,d, etc.*). Frame markers can also be used to label text stages (*in sum, in short, by of introduction, etc.*) or to announce discourse goals (*focus, I want to, I argue that, my purpose is, etc*) lastly, frame markers can function to indicate topic shift (*OK, well, move on, right, etc.*). This category also provides framing information about elements of the discourse.
- **Endophoric markers** are expressions that refer to other parts of the text to make additional material salient and available to the reader in recovering the writer's intentions (Hyland, 2005). Items included as endophoric markers are *as mentioned before, see chapter 1, in chapter three, as noted above, in this section, etc.* This metadiscourse markers are used to guide readers through the discussion to a preferred interpretation.
- **Evidential** indicate an idea from another source which originates outside the current text (Hyland, 2005). Evidential markers which mark the idea of another source outside the text such as *according to X, as stated by X, mentioned by X, etc.* This category is used to guide readers' interpretation.
- **Code glosses** signal the restatement of ideational information to give

additional information either by rephrasing or explaining what have been said (Hyland, 2005). Code glosses are the restatement which supplies additional information, by explaining, rephrasing or elaborating what have been stated in the text previously. According to Hyland (2005), code glosses are used to make sure that the audiences are able to recover the author's intended meaning. Markers included as code glosses are *for example, in other words, known as, namely, say, that is, etc.* in written text, code glosses can alternatively mark off by parentheses.

2.2.1.2 Interactional Metadiscourse

Interactional metadiscourse involves the author's intervention in providing explanations related to information provided in a text. It shows the way the writer interacts by intruding and commenting on their messages. These interactional resources involve readers or hearers and enabling them to contribute to the discourse. The author's purpose here is to make his views explicit and to engage readers by enabling them to respond to the text. It is stated that interactional metadiscourse, "reveals the extent to which the author works to jointly build the text with readers" (Hyland, 2005:50). This category of interpersonal metadiscourse involves audiences and open opportunities for them to contribute to the discourse. There are five subcategories of interactional resources include:

- **Hedges** express the writer's reluctance to present information in the text (Hyland, 2005). Hedges are devices such as *about, possible, might, almost, feel, perhaps, etc.* which indicate the author's reluctance and indicating the degree of confidence. It shows that the information presented is based on the

author's opinion rather than a fact or information from certain knowledge.

- **Boosters** mark the author's certainty in what the author's said (Hyland, 2005). Boosters are devices such as: *believe, in fact, certainly, obviously, actually, clearly, etc.* which express the author's certainty in presenting information. The use of boosters also strengthens an argument.
- **Attitude markers** express the writer's appraisal of propositional information that conveys surprise, obligation, agreement, importance, and so on (Hyland, 2005). It is signaled by devices such as: *hopefully, interesting, unexpectedly, agree, prefer, unfortunately, logical, etc.*
- **Engagement markers** explicitly address readers, either to focus their attention or to include them as participants in the text through second person pronouns, imperatives, question forms and asides (Hyland, 2005). Engagement markers are devices that address audiences. There are two functions of engagement markers. First, to focus audiences' attention which mainly performed by devices such as: *see, such as, not, have to, must, etc.* Second, to include them as discourse participants in the text with pronouns such: as *you, your, inclusive we, us, our, ours, let us*. By the use of engagement markers, an author is able to highlight or downplay a presence of readers in a text.
- **Self-mentions** mark the author presence in terms of first person pronouns and possessives (Hyland, 2005). The last subcategory of interactional metadiscourse is self-mentions which express the author's presence in the

text in terms of first person pronouns and possessive adjective such as: *I, my, me, mine, exclusive we, us, our, the author, the writer, the author's.*