

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter give a brief explanation about theories that support this study. There are two sub-section in this chapter, the review of related literature and the previous studies regarding with the analysis of metadiscourse in thesis abstracts.

A. Review of Related Literature

1. Definition of Metadiscourse

The term metadiscourse was coined by Zellig Harris in 1960 to offer a way of understanding language in use, representing a writer's or speaker's attempts to guide a receiver's perception of a text. The concept has been further developed by writers such as Williams, Vande Kopple, Crismore, and Hyland.¹

Metadiscourse is self-reflective linguistic expressions referring to the evolving text, to the writer, and to the imagined readers of that text.² Hyland and Shin and Han stated that metadiscourse connects discourse and context together.³ He highlights the interpersonal function of metadiscourse. In short,

¹¹ Ken Hyland. *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. (London:Continuum, 2005), 3

² Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, 2004, 133.

³ Weixuan Shi & Jikun Han. "Research on Writing Samples from the Perspective of Metadiscourse". *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 7, No. 11, 2014, 152.

- (1) **This article** has brought a micro-interactional perspective to bear on a perennial problem in school reform policy and research.¹⁷
- (2) Revenue from sale of bottles as computed **above**.¹⁸

d) Evidential

Evidentials refer to information from other. In academic discourse, evidential markers typically take the form of citations or academic attributions.¹⁹ Examples: According to Z, X states, cited, in Y's study.

- (1) **According to Slobin**, “children are guided by the set of grammaticalized distinctions in the language to attend to such categories of events while speaking”
- (2) In an insightful reflection on human identity, **Taylor (1989)** wrote, “Our identity is what allows us to define what is important to us and what is not”²⁰

e) Code Glosses

It supplies additional information, by rephrasing, explaining or elaborating what has been said, to ensure the reader is able to recover

¹⁷ Feng Cao, Guangwei Hu, "Interactive metadiscourse in research articles: A comparative study of paradigmatic and disciplinary influences", P.24

¹⁸ Hesham Suleiman Alyousef, "An Investigation of Metadiscourse Categories in International Postgraduate Business Students' Texts: The Use of Interactive and Interactional Markers in Tertiary Multimodal Finance Texts", *SAGE Open* October-December: 1–10. 2015, .p.7

¹⁹ Feng Cao, Guangwei Hu, "Interactive metadiscourse in research articles:
..... P.19

²⁰ Feng Cao, Guangwei Hu, P.25

preferred tenses of each move, and metadiscourse categories which used Hyland's model metadiscourse in 60 research abstracts.

What differ between their research and this research is the aspects they analyzed were move structure, preferred tenses and metadiscourse categories in abstracts, while this reseach only concerning on metadiscourse categories. And the subject fields' of Al-Shujari, et.al are applied linguistic and English as a second language, whereas this research' subject fields is English Education.

The fourth is *Metadiscourse in Indonesian EFL Learners' Persuasive Texts: A Case Study at English Department, UNISBANK*, study by Kathrina Rustipa⁵⁹. Her study explored about the use of metadiscourse markers in persuasive writing of 7 Indonesian EFL learners. She used Hyland's model of metadiscourse. She tried to figure out the metadiscourse markers applied by Indonesian EFL learners in persuasive writing. And her study compared the research findings with the metadiscourse used in standard proficient student writings (extract from British Academic Written Essays—BAWE corpus) revealed by Heng's and Tan's study (2010).

This previous study and this study analyze the same scope of study, which is metadiscourse markers. Rustipa study's, however, has significantly differences with this study, they are different in the type of corpus. This study uses undergraduate abstracts as document, while her study used persuasive writing

⁵⁹ Kathrina Rustipa. "Metadiscourse in Indonesian EFL Learners' Persuasive Texts: A Case Study at English Department, UNISBANK". *International Journal of English Linguistics*; Vol. 4, No. 1, 2014.

essays as document. Also, Rustipa compared the research findings with the metadiscourse used in BAWE corpus. And this study does not do any comparison with other corpus.

And the last is *Metadiscourse in the introductions of PhD theses and research articles* by Tomoyuki Kawase⁶⁰. Kawase's study examined how eight writers construct metadiscourse in the introductions of their PhD theses and research articles that they later produced based on the theses. By doing this, he believed that it examined the assumption that variations in the use of metadiscourse in those texts could be attributed to the nature of the genre. The research findings showed that the majority of writers made greater use of metadiscourse in their research article introductions. Both Kawase's study and this study examine metadiscourse markers which used Hyland's model of metadiscourse as the means to analysis. What makes it different is the corpus used. His study concerned on introduction sections of PhD theses and research articles, while this study focusing on undergraduate's thesis abstracts.

⁶⁰ Tomoyuki Kawase, "Metadiscourse in the introductions of PhD theses and research articles". *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 20, September 2015.