#### **CHAPTER II**

#### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents several theories dealing with the issues being analyzed in this study. The theories are aimed to help the researcher solve the research problems. These theories include metadiscourse, category of metadiscourse, interactional metadiscourse markers.

#### 2.1 Metadiscourse

The term of metadiscourse comes by the linguists Zellig Harrisin 1959 (as cited in Hyland, 2005: 3), he states metadiscourseas a representing from the way of understanding language in use, and becomes an attempts of writer's or speaker's to guide the receiver's understand the text. The other definition also comes from William (1981), he takes the concepts that the subject and the addressed point make metadiscourse is important.

While in 1985, metadiscourse for VandeKopple is one of linguistic material that signals an author's presence without paying attention to propositional information. In the 1993, Crismore gives an advanced definition that the function of metadiscourse as linguistic material also as organizing, interpreting, and evaluating the given information in order to help the listeners or readers.

In another cases, some other researcher build a different comprehension about metadiscourse. The first, in 1975 is Meyer who builds a concept that signaling metadiscourse as a term which is similar with the prespective of functional linguistic. He proposed a semantic content that instructs the discourse. The second is Schifrin in 1980, he gives definition of metadiscourse as a meta-talk which related to continuing discourse, such words or phrases: "well", "I am telling you" that function to organize or evaluate the continuing discourse.

As the basis of these linguists' studies, Hyland (2000) putsmetadiscourse as comprehension that signaling social engagement is a part of communication. In 2005, Hyland saying a distinct definition:

Metadiscourseis 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.

By using metadiscourse as application theory, communication can be facilitated, viewpoints supported, readability improved, and relationship maintained (Yipei and Lingling, 2013: 91).

The researcher concludes that metadiscourse is a tools to organize, interpret, and evaluate the information from speaker/writer to listener/reader and to help the listener/reader to understand.

### 2.2 Category of Metadiscourse

As states before in scope and limitation of chapter one that metadiscourse has some different categories of version based on the linguist. First, it is delivered by VandeKoppe in 1985. VandeKopple (1985, 82) divided a classification system for metadiscourse. There are two categories of metadiscourse features based on VandeKopple namely textual metadiscourse and interpersonal metadiscourse. From the specific function point of view, textual metadiscourse is divided into four subcategories, and three subcategories in interpersonal metadiscourse. Metadiscourse model by VandeKopple's (1985) has gotbig attention in metadiscourse literature. It is proved that there are many metadiscourse research which are emerged.

As cited in Hyland (2005, 33), he states that metadoscourse model from VandeKopplehas its weaknesses in categorization and problems in functional overlap. First, we will get difficult to distinguish between *narrators* and *attributors* (under the category validity markers). For example, citation usually performs a variety of rhetorical functions, especially in the academic writing context. On the one hand, citation can function as a validity marker to enhance academic arguments with credible sources, and as a narrator to fairly inform readers what previous research or researchers have done/claimed.

Besides, citations might be applied for building an "intertextual framework to suggest a cumulative and linear progression of knowledge". The functions of citations has diverse and can be multi-functional at the same time. This is the second problem from VandeKopple'smetadiscoures model. Writers may aim to achieve a certain rhetorical function via citation; however, there is a great chance for readers to misdecode such a rhetorical act writers wish to perform.

Textual metadiscourse dimension include:

- Text connectives
- Code glosses
- Validity markers
- Evidential
- Narrators

Interpersonal metadiscourse dimension include:

- Illocution markers
- Attitude markers
- Commentaries

VandeKopple's (1985) has two problems that have been found in his metadiscourse model. It cannot be solved through close analysis of the context. Instead, they are an inherent weakness embedded in the classification of the metadiscourse itself. In the next years, there are two linguists, Crismore et al. (1993) and Hyland (1998, 1999) has recognized and refined metadiscourse model by VandeKopple's(1985). Crismore et al. (1993) proposed a revised metadiscourse

categorization which consists of only two major categories textual and interpersonal metadiscourse.

However, several metadiscoursal functions have been reorganized in two new subcategories of textual metadiscourse as *textual markers* and *interpretivemarkers*. The two new subcategories are used for explaining and concretizing the textual role metadiscourse performs. Textual markers are metadiscoursal features for organizing the discourse, while interpretive markers refer to features in relation to writer-reader relationship constructing and maintaining in academic writing. Namely, the interpretive markers function to "help readers interpret and better understand the writer's meaning and writing strategies" (Crismore et al., 1993, 47).

#### Textual metadiscourse

- 1. Textual markers
  - Logical connectives
- Sequencers
- Reminders
- Topicalizers
- 2. Interpretive markers
  - Code Gloses
  - Illocution markers
  - Announcement

#### Interpersonal Metadiscourse

- Hedges
- Certainly markers
- Attributes
- Attitude markers
- Commentary

In metadiscourse model by Crismore, several problems are still found. One problem is the functional arbitrary between the subcategories *reminders* and *announcement* placed in the textual metadiscourse as textual markers and interpretive markers. Referring to textual materials earlier in the text, *reminders* are classified in textual markers, while *announcement* in interpretive markers for reporting upcoming materials. With slight functional difference between *reminders* and *announcement*, the classification seems to eclipse the grouping basics of textual markers and interpretive markers.

It is also found the problems that come from the two subcategories in textual metadiscourse. On the one hand, organizational metadiscoursal features are essentially associated with the coherence of the discourse. Therefore, organizational metadiscoursal features, or collectively termed as textual markers according to the model (Crismore et al., 1993), are used to assist readers to interpret the discourse. In other words, the division principle between textual markers and interpretive markers seems to be unnecessary for both types of metadiscoursal markers contribute in the coherence, organization, and understanding of the discourse.

Hyland and Tse (2004) introduced another metadiscourse model modifying Thompson and Thetela's (1995) conception of metadiscourse. Hyland make a classification of metadiscouse into two categories: interactivemetadiscourse dimension and interactional metadiscourse dimension based on other linguist (as cited in Hyland, 2005: 49).

Hyland stated that this categorization is based on functional approach that becomes an attempt of the writer to interact with the reader through the text. The two categorization of Hyland is described below:

- a. Interactive metadiscourse dimension include:
  - Transitions
  - Frame markers
  - Endhoporic markers
  - Evidential
  - Code glosses

By this dimension the writer's purposes to shape and contrain a text as what the reader's want, in order to make relation between the writers and the readers through the text. It is directly state by Hyland (2005: 49) below:

This concerns the writer's awareness of a participating audience and the ways he or she seeks to accommodate its probable knowledge, interests, rhetorical expectations and processing abilities.

- b. Interactional metadiscourse dimension include:
  - Self mentions
  - Boosters
  - engagement markers
  - attitude markers
  - hedges

this categorization also tries to build relationship between the writer's and the reader's through a message or values from the text. Hyland (2005: 49) directly state below:

The writer's goal here is to make his or her views explicit and to involve readers by allowing them to respond to the unfolding text. This is the writer's expression of a textual 'voice', or community-recognized personality, and includes the ways he or she conveys judgements and overtly aligns him- or herself with readers. Metadiscourse here is essentially evaluative and engaging, expressing solidarity, anticipating objections and responding to an imagined dialogue with others. It reveals the extent to which the writer works to jointly construct the text with readers.

As the background of study state that this present study used only one dimension of metadiscourse named interactional dimension. As cited in the Dafouz (2008), recently Hyland (2005) and Hyland and Tse (2004) forward a strong view on interpersonal metadiscourse, in Continuum Discourse Series by Hyland (2005) directly stated:

Instead, I suggest that **all** metadiscourse is interpersonal in that it takes account of the reader's knowledge, textual experiences and processing needs and that it provides writers with an armoury of rhetorical appeals to achieve this (Hyland and Tse, 2004).

From those statements, this present study focuses on interactional metadiscourse dimension as represent interpersonal metadiscourseto following Hyland's suggestion. Using interactional metadiscoursedimention, the researcher analyze project proposals of Global Peace Foundation.

### 2.3 Interactional Metadiscourse Markers

This marker is offered a notion in defining characteristics of spoken or written communication through rhetorical features. Those rhetorical features are represented by five sub-categories of interactional metadiscoursemarkers below. This following description below is according to Hyland's (2005):

Table 2.3.1
Interactional Metadiscourse Markers

Interactional	Definition	Examples
Markers		
Hedges	Withhold commitment and	Might; perhaps;
	open dialogue	possible; about
Boosters	Emphasize certainty and	Infact; definitely; it is
	close dialogue	clear that
Attitude Marker	Expresses writer's attitude	Unfortunately; I agree;

	to proposition	surprisingly
Self Mentions	Explicit reference to	I; we; my; me; our;
	aouthor(s)	
Engagement	Explicitly build relationship	Consider; note; you can
markers	with reader	see that

# **2.3.1 Hedges**

This marker indicates an attempt of the writer to interact with the reader through alternative voices and viewpoints to make a proposition.

# Examples:

- possible
- might
- perhaps

### 2.3.2 Boosters

A booster is used by the writer to show his or her certainty in writing.

# Examples:

- clearly
- obviously
- demonstrate

#### 2.3.3 Attitude markers

Attitudes markers convey surprise, agreement, importance, obligation, frustration and others. The expression of attitude can be seen by the used of subordination, comparatives, progressive particles, punctuation, text location, and others. In the text it can be signaled by the examples below:

a. attitude verbs : - agree

- prefer

b. sentence adverbs : - unfortunately

- hopefully

c. adjectives : - appropriate

- logical

- reamarkable

# 2.3.4 Self mentions

Self mantions represent the writer's self-affirmation and control his or herself to improve the reability from audience. It is showing by the used of first person pronouns and possessive adjective such as:

- I
- Me
- Mine
- Exclusive we
- Our
- Ours, and so on

# 2.3.5 Engagement markers

This marker proposed to show impression of authority, integrity, and credibility through choises of hedges, boosters, self mention, and attitude that highlight in the text.

## Examples:

- Consider
- note
- you can see that

## 2.4 Previous study

The writer found two related studies that inspired this present study. The first is in International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature (IJALEL) written by two Indonesian university student named BayuPermanaSukma and Eva Tuckyta Sari Sujatna from Padjajaran University. Their tittle is "Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers Opinion Articles: A Study of Text Written by Indonesian Writers". This journal analyzed ten selected topic in newspaper by Kompas used Dafouz (2008) theory. The result shows that cultural preferences influence how the writer writes down their opinion.

The second previous studies come from International Journal of Language and Linguistics written by Nan Yipei and Liu Lingling, university students of China Three Gorges University. Their title is "Investigating the interpersonal and textual meaning of Steve Job's Stanford speech in terms of Hyland's metadiscourse theory. It

was a clear statement from the title that the object of the analysis is come from speech by Steve Job. The result of this analysis show that interpersonal meaning embodies all the use of language to express one's opinion, influence one's behavior, interact with and maintain relationship with others.

Both of the previous study above is chosen by the researcher to see the gaps to arrange this previous study. this present study intend to following Sukma and Sujatna to used interpersonal metadiscourse theory. While, Yipei and Linlingis inspired the researcher to used the interpersonal metadiscourse theory that belongs to Hyland in 2005.

#### 2.5 Global Peace Foundation

The Global Peace Foundation (GPF) is an international non-sectarian, non-partisan, nonprofit organization which promotes an innovative, values-based approach to peacebuilding, guided by the vision that all human beings are members of One Family under God.

Through partnerships with organisations around the world, GPF programmes facilitate intercultural and interfaith cooperation, strengthen families and communities, and foster a culture of service and peace. The Global Peace Foundation works in 15countries to date.

The Global Peace Foundation's unique approach topeacebuilding includes three essential aspects: interfaith leadership, empowering families & youth, building a culture of service (Global Peace Foundation team, 2015)