CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This part introduces the present study. It describes background of the study, research problems, research objectives, significance of the study, scope and limitation of the study, and definition of key terms.

1.1 Background of the study

Zellig Harris firstly put forward in 1959 the term of metadiscourse that becomes an interesting field to be analyzed (as cited in Hyland, 2005: 3). Support by the searching from an online machine named google scholar at 1st May 2016 found 16.300 results for the words metadiscourse. It indicates that metadiscourse has been a special interest for researchers around the world.

Basically, metadiscourse comes from idea that communication is not only conveying information (Hyland, 2005:3). As the goal of communication, understand each other means there are certain expression like addresser emotion, attitude, value and the aim of the interaction. Thus, metadiscourse exist to seek out how writers or speakers communicate effectively.

Hyland's classification of metadiscourse (2004: 169) falls into two categories: interactive, help to guide reader through the text and interactional, involve the reader in the argument. Hyland (2005) and Hyland and Tse (2004) change the terminology by adopting Thompson's (2001) label of interactive (instead of textual) and interactional (instead of interpersonal) Metadiscourse (see Dafouz, 2008: 97). Some

1

of the research about metadiscourse has been done result that interpersonal metadiscourse strongly takes the role of communication in the text. One of a research done by Yipei and Lingling shows interpersonal meaning embodies all the use of language to express one's opinion, influence one's behavior, interact with and maintain relationship with others (Yipei and Lingling, 2013: 90). In line with the recent research done by Sukma and Sujatna (2014: 16), interpersonal metadiscourse is one of linguistic features that is closely related to persuasive writing. Thus, this recent studies choose to focus on interpersonal metadiscourse markers only to identify which interpersonal metadiscourse markers characterize the discourse of project proposals and which one of these markers found to function more persuasively, according to the highest frequency of interpersonal metadiscourse markers found in the data.

Following Dafouz's, the notion of metadiscourse will be adopted as an analytical framework since it has proved to be useful for textual analysis, agglutinating some of the explicit items that the writers use to guide or direct readers through a text so both the text and the writer's stance is understood (2008: 96). Trough that notion, so many researchers has been used metadiscourse in various fields of text or discourse (see Hyland, 2005: 5) and it proved by the recent finding on international journal that shows the use of metadiscourse in various genres: persuasive corpora (Heng and Tan, 2010), research articles (Abdi, 2011; Attarn, 2014; Khedri, Chan and Helen, 2015; Estaji and Vafaeimehr, 2015), newspaper opinion articles (Sukma and Sujatna, 2014), speech (Yipei and Lingling, 2013), email

essays and research proposal (Tabe, 2015). Therefore, this present study aims at filling in these gaps as an attempt to follow Hyland's (2005: 202) suggestion to discuss other field that left untouched by using project proposal as the data, specifically overview and program details written by a nonprofit organization named Global Peace Foundation.

As the title suggests, this study analyzes the project proposal of Global Peace Foundation, an international nonprofit organization. The project proposal of Global Peace Foundation is of special interest as it comes to a persuasive document. According to Congressional Research Service in form of report that downloaded at http://www.unco.edu/osp/proposal/docs/congress.pdf, the first step to arrange project proposal is to develop a clear, concise description of the proposed project that must in line with the values, vision, and mission of the grant-seeking organization. So, one of the key success of the project is how the arrangement of the project proposal conduct persuasively.

There are ten selected project proposals from the centre, the region, and chapter from Global Peace Foundation around the world that is analyzed. Both, background or overview and program details that write down on the project proposal are combination between the up to date news or issues about some conflicts that makes people suffer and the new paradigm of peace that offered. Therefore, it is not only about the organization of discourse, but also to separate the values of peace in life.

1.2 Research Problems

Based on the background of the study written above, the problems of the study are formulated as follow:

1. What are the types of interactional metadiscourse markers used by Global Peace Foundation in their project proposals?

2. How is the frequency of interactional metadiscourse markers in the project proposals of Global Peace Foundation?

3. What can the result of the research problem number two reflect to the Global Peace Foundation Indonesia project proposals?

1.3 Research Objectives

Based on the research problems above, the objectives of the study are:

1. To identify the types of interactional metadiscourse markers used by Global Peace Foundation Indonesia in their project proposals.

2. To investigate how the frequency of interactional metadiscourse markers in the project proposals.

3. To analyze what interactional metadiscourse markers can reflect to the project proposals written by Global Peace Foundation Indonesia. From this, the finding from my study could be reflecting the way of separating the values of peace through project proposals.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Most of the previous research about metadiscourse has done in the academic purposes. It is important to see the use of metadiscourse in the neglected area such as project proposal that also be Hyland's suggestion (Hyland: 2005). Hence, the result of this study is expected to give an insight into the persuasive ways in project proposal writings as a reflection from interpersonal metadiscourse markers.

1.5 Scope and Limitation of the Study

There are some different classifications about interpersonal metadiscourse from some researcher. This study will follow Hyland's classification (Hyland, 2005; 49), that covers five classifications: (1) hedges, (2) boosters, (3) attitude markers, (4) self mentions, (5) engagement markers.

In addition, the limitations of the study come from two elements from this research, the theory and the data. As Hyland mention this is largely because the origins of metadiscourse in pedagogic style guides (Williams, 1981) and intuitive reflection (Vande Kopple, 1985) provide an insufficiently solid theoretical foundation on which to analyse real texts or to understand how writers communicate effectively (as cited in Hyland, 2005: 6). It will also be contradiction to compare project proposals from some nonprofit organizations in order to get more insight from the result of this research because they have different ways to write in line with their core values.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

In order to avoid any misunderstanding term, the researcher give some definition of the key term that used in this study.

Metadiscourse is the cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers as members of a particular community (Hyland, 2005: 37).

Interactional metadiscourse is concerned with the direct interaction by intruding and commenting on the writer massage. The goal is to make the writer views explicit and to involve readers by allowing them to respond to the text given (Hyland, 2005).

Project proposal or grant proposal is one of persuasive document that is carefully prepared, thoughtfully planned, and concisely packaged by a grant seekers or foundations to get support or funding from company or institutions (http://www.unco.edu/osp/proposal/docs/congress.pdf).

The Global Peace Foundation (GPF) is an international non-sectarian, non-partisan, nonprofit organization, which promotes an innovative, values-based approach to peace building, guided by the vision of One Family under God. GPF engages and organizes a global network of public and private-sector partners who develop community, national, and regional peace building models as the foundation for ethical and cohesive societies (https://www.globalpeace.org/about-us).