### **CHAPTER II**

# REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter give a brief explaination 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

 $<sup>^{1\,1}</sup>$  Ken Hyland. *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing.* (London:Continiuum, 2005), 3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, 2004, 133.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Weixuan Shi & Jikun Han. "Research on Writing Samples from the Perspective of Metadiscourse". English Language Teaching, Vol. 7, No. 11, 2014, 152.

metadiscourse is recognized as an essential means of facilitating communication. For one thing, it helps the writer to produce the discourse. For another, it helps the reader understand the primary message and the author's attitude toward the content of the discourse. So, metadiscourse is like glue that holds sentences and paragraphs together.

Hyland and Tse explain that all metadiscourse is interpersonal because it takes account of the reader's knowledge, textual experiences, and processing needs and that it provides writers with an armory of rhetorical appeals to achieve this.<sup>4</sup> The notion of the writer-reader interactions has underpinnings on the following three key principles of metadiscourse that was suggested by Hyland &Tse:

- a. Metadiscourse is distinct from propositional aspects of discourse.
- b. Metadiscourse refers to aspects of the text that embody writer-reader interactions.
- c. Metadiscourse refers to relations only that are internal to the discourse.<sup>5</sup>

Hyland's model of metadiscourse comprised of two main categories of interactive and interactional metadiscourse. The interactive part of metadiscourse concerns the writer's awareness of his receiver, and his attempts to accommodate his interests and needs, and to make the argument

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Ken Hyland, Polly Tse, "Metadiscourse in Academic Writing", Applied Linguistic, 25(2), 2004 161

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Ken Hyland, Polly Tse, "Metadiscourse in Academic Writing", ......, 159.

satisfactory for him. In this part there are five sub-categories, those are, transition, frame markers, endhoporic markers, evidential and code glosse. The interactional part, on the other hand, concerns the writer's attempts to make his views explicit, and to engage the reader by anticipating his objections and responses to the text. The sub-categories for interactional part of metadiscourse are hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions, and engagement markers.<sup>6</sup>

# 2. Metadiscourse Categories

Metadiscorse category is the categories of metadiscourse. Hyland's model of metadiscourse is used in this study to define the metadiscourse categories. This study uses Hyland's model because his metadiscourse model is based on the research in academic discourse, which makes the model more concrete and more influential. It is also noted by Abdi, Hyland's model is highly preferred in modern metadiscourse studies for being recent, simple, clear and comprehensive.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Ken Hyland. Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing. (London:Continiuum, 2005), 49.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> R. Abdi. (2011). "Metadiscourse Strategies in Research Articles: A Study of the Differences across Subsections". In *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills* 3 (1), Spring 2011, Ser. 62/4, p. 5.

Table 2.1 Hyland's Metadiscourse Model

Category	Function	Examples
Interactive	Help to guide the reader through	Resources
Transitions Frame markers Endophoric markers Evidentials Code glosses	express relations between main clauses refer to discourse acts, sequences or stages refer to information in other parts of the text refer to information from other texts elaborate propositional meanings	in addition; but; thus; and finally; to conclude; my purpose is noted above; see Fig; in section 2 according to X; Z states namely; e.g.; such as; in other words
Interactional Hedges Boosters Attitude markers Self mentions Engagement markers	Involve the reader in the text withhold commitment and open dialogue emphasize certainty or close dialogue express writer's attitude to proposition explicit reference to author(s) explicitly build relationship with reader	Resources might; perhaps; possible; about in fact; definitely; it is clear that unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly I; we; my; me; our consider; note; you can see that

As seen in table 2.1, Hyland classified metadiscourse into two main categories, which are interactive and interactional metadiscourse. In each category consists of five sub-categories that will explain below.

# 1) Interactive Metadiscourse

Interactive resources allow the writer to help the reader to correctly interpret the text by managing information flow. They are concerned with ways of organising discourse to anticipate readers' knowledge and reflect the writer's assessment of what needs to be made explicit to constrain and guide what can be recovered from the text.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, 2004, p.138

### a) Transition

Transitions are logical connectors that express semantic relation between main clauses or sentences. They are realized mainly with conjunctions used to mark additive, contrastive, consequential, temporal. But, to count as metadiscourse they must perform a role internal to the discourse rather than the outside world, helping the reader interpret links between ideas. Examples: In addition, but, thus, and, moreover, furthermore, therefore, on the other hand.

Here are the examples of transition in metadiscourse:

- (1) **In contrast**, these findings were not found among the low collectivists. 11
- (2) 93 questionnaires were received with 84 valid responses.

  Therefore the response rate for the questionnaire is 37 percent. 12

### b) Frame Markers

Frame markers, is used primarily to organize texts for readers.

Frame markers are a cover term for a variety of linguistic devices and can be further classified into four subtypes according to their

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> 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, p.46

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Ken Hyland. *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing.* (London:Continiuum, 2005), p.50 <sup>11</sup> Ken Hyland, Polly Tse, "Metadiscourse in Academic Writing", *Applied Linguistic*, 25(2), 2004 165

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Ken Hyland, Polly Tse, "Metadiscourse in Academic Writing", *Applied Linguistic*, 25(2), 2004 p. 165

functions: sequencers, topicalizers, discourse-labels, and announcers. <sup>13</sup> Examples: Finally, my purpose, firstly, to sum up, in short, return to, in regard to, aim.

The following sentences are examples of frame markers:

- (1) The **next** question I want to examine is the relationship between the teacher's language proficiency and teaching effectiveness.<sup>14</sup>
- (2) **Thirdly**, the results and analysis are used to show the performance of the proposed compression. 15

# c) Endophoric Markers

This category refers to other parts of the text in order to make additional information available, provide supporting arguments, and thus steer the reader toward a preferred interpretation 16. Examples: Below, above, in chapter 1, in the following section, as noted above, see figure 2, in section 3.

To know how endophoric markers are used in metadiscourse, here are the examples of endophoric markers:

<sup>16</sup> Malcolm William, "Translating Metadiscourse: An Explanatory Analysis of Problems in Students'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Feng Cao, Guangwei Hu, "Interactive metadiscourse in research articles: A comparative study of paradigmatic and disciplinary influences", Journal of Pragmatics 66, 15—31, 2014. P.19

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", Journal of Second Language Writing 13, 2004, p.141

Work", Mutatis Mutandis. Vol. 3, No. 1.73-90. 2010, p.77

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

#### 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

<sup>17</sup> Feng Cao, Guangwei Hu, "Interactive metadiscourse in research articles: A comparative study of 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Feng Cao, Guangwei Hu, "Interactive metadiscourse in research articles: ......

<sup>.....</sup> P.19

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Feng Cao, Guangwei Hu, ...... P.25

the writer's intended meaning.<sup>21</sup> Examples: Called, defined as, e.g., in other words, specifically, for instance, namely, such as.

- (1) Other individual-level covariates include race/ethnicity (white, black, Hispanic, other), education (less than high school, high school graduate, college graduate) ......<sup>22</sup>
- (2) ..... it would be possible to see and understand how the cultural resources of the group—e.g., adherence to the class' norms of behavior, the particular language of the classroom, and the relationships built on respect and responsibility—would be ....23

### 2) Interactional Metadiscourse

Interactional resources focus on the participants of the interaction and seek to display the writer's persona and a tenor consistent with the norms of the disciplinary community. Metadiscourse here concerns the writer's efforts to control the level of personality in a text and establish a suitable relationship to his or her data, arguments, and audience, marking the degree of intimacy, the expression of attitude, the communication of commitments, and the extent of reader involvement.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Abdi, et al., "The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse.", Journal of Pragmatics 42, 1669-1679, 2010, p. 1674

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Ken Hyland. *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing.* (London:Continiuum, 2005), p.52

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Abdi, et al., "The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse.", Journal of Pragmatics 42, .....p. 1674

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", ..............., p.139

# a) Hedges

Hedges are resources that writers use to recognize alternative voices and viewpoints and so withhold commitment to the proposition. According to Hyland hedges allow the writer to present information as an opinion or a plausible reasoning rather than a fact.<sup>25</sup> Example: May, possible, perhaps, about, in my opinion, from my perspective.

These examples are sentences containing hedges:

- (1) It is possible that the measurement of more than one endpoint of the irritation response would be necessary to adequately assess
- (2) **This might also indicate** that the enthusiasm and goodwill factors were effects of this type of enrichment programs.<sup>27</sup>

### b) Boosters

This category allows the writer to anticipate and preclude alternative, conflicting arguments by expressing certainty instead of doubt.<sup>28</sup> Examples: In fact, definitely, it is clear that, clearly, it shows, indeed.

<sup>25</sup> Ken Hyland. *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. (London:Continiuum, 2005), p.52

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Abdi, *et al.*, "The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse.",......p. 1675

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", ......, p.145

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> Malcolm William, "Translating Metadiscourse: An Explanatory Analysis of Problems in Students' Work", *Mutatis Mutandis. Vol. 3, No. 1.73-90.* 2010, p.78

- (1) **It is obviously** a strong desire that vacation will take place at such a time of year that it provides ....<sup>29</sup>
- (2) **Undoubtedly**, there are limitations to the findings of the thesis.<sup>30</sup>

### c) Attitude Markers

This category expresses the writer's appraisal of propositional information, conveying surprise obligation, agreement, importance, and so on.<sup>31</sup> Examples: Unfortunately, surprisingly, I agree, hopefully,

(1) **Unfortunately**, specially designed experiments were not .....<sup>32</sup>

### d) Self-Mentions

Self-mention refers to the degree of explicit author presence in the text.<sup>33</sup> This can be realized by the use of first person pronouns and the possessive adjectives 'I, me, we, my, our, mine and us'. Other categories that can be used to 'self-mention' are 'the author, the writer, the author's and the writer's'.

(1) For **our** calculation purposes, **we** assume revenues from tanning to grow in line with inflation.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup>Ken Hyland, Polly Tse, "Metadiscourse in Academic Writing", Applied Linguistic, 25(2), 2004 163

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", ......, p.139

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> Ken Hyland. *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing.* (London:Continiuum, 2005), p.53

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> 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

# e) Engagement Markers

This markers explicitly address readers to draw them into the discourse.<sup>35</sup> In other words, it explicitly builds relationship with the reader. It means when writing, writers should really feel the presence of their readers, pull them along with their arguments, focus their attention, regard them as discourse participants and finally lead them to the right interpretations.<sup>36</sup> Examples: Consider, note, you can see that, inclusive we.

(1) **Note that** the variability over trials is reduced with ....<sup>37</sup>

# 3. Possible Causes of Frequencies in Metadiscourse Use

In writing a text, in this case, thesis abstract, each writer will have different frequencies of using metadiscourse. For instance, writer A uses more transitions in abstract while writer B dominantly uses self-mentions. This diversity occurs for some reasons.

Adel claims that there are several possible causes of variations in metadiscourse use. Those are, genre comparability, register awareness,

<sup>36</sup> Hamid Allami ¬, Haleh Serajfard., "Engagement Markers: a Technique for Improving Writing Skills", *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation (LCT), 1(1), 71–83*, 2012. p. 73.

<sup>35</sup> Malcolm William, "Translating Metadiscourse: An Explanatory Analysis of Problems in Students' Work", *Mutatis Mutandis. Vol. 3*, *No. 1.73-90.* 2010, p.78

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Abdi, et al., "The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse.", Journal of Pragmatics 42, 1669–1679, 2010, p. 1676

cultural conventions, and learner strategies.<sup>38</sup> That happens because difference usage of language in mother language and target language. Meanwhile, in this study, the researcher would like to explain the possible causes of frequent metadiscourse model employed in abstracts.

- a) *Transitions*, principally conjunctions, are central to academic writing as they represent writers' attempts to ensure readers are able to correctly recover their intentions. It is important, however, to distinguish conjunctions which are used metadiscoursally, that is, to mark transitions in the argument, from those which link experiences in the world beyond the text.<sup>39</sup> Besides, it could be that *transitions* are fundamental linguistic elements that have been taught to students in grammar and writing classes. Therefore, students are aware that the use of *transition* markers to link clauses and sentences would make their ideas more coherent to their readers.<sup>40</sup>
- b) *Frame markers*, the author tries to make sure that the scenario at issue is acted out as planned.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Annelie Adel. *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006), p.141

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", *Journal of Second Language Writing 13*, 2004, p. 140

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> Helen Tan and Wong Bee Ene, "Metadiscourse Use in the Persuasive Writing of Malaysian Undergraduate Students", *English Language Teaching; Vol. 7, No. 7*; 2014, p. 31

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> Abdi, *et al.*, "The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse.", *Journal of Pragmatics 42*, 1669–1679, 2010, p. 1674

- c) *Code glosses* offer valuable resources in order to clarify the presumably ambiguous terms and concepts briefly and extensively through defining, reformulating and exemplifying. Sometimes, an explanation is added to some familiar terms in order to delimit the commonly conceived general and, hence, ambiguous definitions.<sup>42</sup> *Transitions, frame markers* and *code glosses* mainly serve the function of making the texts clear and comprehensible to the audience. In fact, they are devices intended to minimize the processing efforts of readers.<sup>43</sup>
- d) *Endophoric markers* function as signposts within a text anticipating something that follows and summarizing something stated previously. Abdi, *et al* added that by using these markers, the writers say "we don't want to include the items here once more", while notifying that there is a need on the part of the reader to pay attention to them for the purpose of a clearer understanding of the immediate proposition.<sup>44</sup>
- e) *Evidentials*. Citation is central to the social context of persuasion in academic writing as it helps provide justification for arguments and demonstrates the novelty of the writer's position.<sup>45</sup> In line with this statements, in Hyland study, one of his interviewee stated about

<sup>42</sup> Abdi, *et al.*, "The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse.", *Journal of Pragmatics 42*, 1669–1679, 2010, p.. 1674

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> Abdi, *et al.*, "The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse.", *Journal of Pragmatics 42, 1669–1679, 2010*, p.. 1674

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup> Abdi, *et al.*, "The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse.", *Journal of Pragmatics 42*, 1669–1679, 2010, p. 1673

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", ......, p. 141

references that it is important not only for showing readers that he had read a lot, but also evaluating others' work and to justify his own perceptions.<sup>46</sup>

- f) *The hedged* claims were actually what the students wanted the readers to take as accurate information. By using hedges, writers wanted to highlight that their claims were based on plausible reasoning and readers were therefore expected to understand that the propositions were true as far as could be determined.<sup>47</sup> Hyland added that *hedges* reflects the critical importance of distinguishing fact from opinion in academic writing and the need for writers to evaluate their assertions in ways that are likelyto be acceptable and persuasive to their examiners and supervisors.<sup>48</sup>
- g) *Boosters*, according to Jun Zhan, *et al.* state that writers use *boosters* to highlight common knowledge in support of their findings, and stress findings which support their initial hypotheses. <sup>49</sup>
- h) *Self-mention* plays a crucial role in mediating the relationship between writers' arguments and the expectations of their readers, and the decision to adopt an impersonal rhetorical style or to represent oneself explicitly

<sup>47</sup> Puleng Makholu Letsoela, "Interacting with Readers: Metadiscourse Categories in National University of Lesotho Undergraduate Students' Academic Writing". International Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 5, No. 6, 2013, p.150

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> Ken Hyland, ...... P. 142

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> Ken Hyland, ...... P. 140

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> Congjun Mu, et al., "The use of metadiscourse for knowledge construction in Chinese and English research articles", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 20, 135-148, 2015, p. 138

- can influence the impression student writers make on their readers and have significant consequences for how their message is received.<sup>50</sup>
- i) *Engagement markers* are based on recognition of the audience as colleagues. They are mostly employed to caution, to direct and to draw in. When used in the first sense, it mostly precedes a statement to clarify the propositional argument. <sup>51</sup> *Engagement markers* also used to manipulate examiners/supervisors, in this case the readers, into agreeing with arguments made. <sup>52</sup>

#### 4. Abstract

When students write academic writing such as report, or reserch paper, they are obliged to write an abstract. Abstract is an overview of a research paper, before readers read the whole paper. As Hyland in Al-Shujairi, et.al. argued that the abstract is generally also the readers' first encounter with text, and it is often the point at which they decide whether to continue and give the accompanying article further attention or to ignore it.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", *Journal of Second Language Writing 13*, 2004, p. 143

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> Abdi, et al., "The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse.", Journal of Pragmatics 42, 1669–1679, 2010, p. 1675

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup>Puleng Makholu Letsoela, "Interacting with Readers: Metadiscourse Categories in National University of Lesotho Undergraduate Students' Academic Writing". ......, p.143

Yasir Bdaiwi Jasim Al-Shujairi, et.al., "Role of Moves, Tenses, and Metadiscourse in the Abstract of an Acceptable Research Article", *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 7 no. 2, March 2016, 379.

An abstract should indicate the author's motivation by presenting the background of the research project described in the paper and point out the problems to be solved. It should also state the author's contribution with respect to the problems, and finally, it should draw conclusions. In short, abstracts constitute the gateway that lead readers to take up an article, journals to select contributions, or organizers of conferences to accept or reject papers.

Abstract involves metadiscourse which associates the appropriate use of linguistic realization.<sup>54</sup> It represents what the writer attempts to guide the reader's perception of a text. Because abstract function as "advertising means" to bring the attention the the reader to read the whole research paper, metadiscourse is needed to help writers organize their texts, and engange readers. It is the set of linguistic resources that every language has as part of the textual metafunction for linking one part of a text to another.

The study by Crismore et al. cited by Garcia-Calvo<sup>55</sup> suggested that, because the abstract has been defined as a persuasive text, it would be beneficial to study the metadiscourse used by writers of abstracts. In this research, the data that will be analyzed is undergraduate thesis abstracts of

<sup>55</sup> Javier Garcia – Calvo, "Uses Of Metadiscourse In A Research Abstracts For Scientific Events" *Revista Letras, Curitiba*, n. 57, 2002, p. 197.

 $digilib.uins by. ac. id \ digilib.uins by.$ 

English Teacher Education Department who graduated in between 2014 and 2015. And it will be examined by metadiscourse framework from Hyland.

### **B.** Previous Studies

Before going further to this study, the researcher found some previous studies related to this research. The first is *Representation of Rhetorical Move of Thesis Abstracts in English Teacher Education Departement* by Lathifatul Fajriyah<sup>56</sup>. In this study, Fajriyah analyzed the move structure in 22 thesis abstracts of undergrduate students in English Teacher Education Department. She found out the rhetorical moves of thesis abstracts and differences moves among thesis abstracts of English Teacher Education Department. Even her study and this study analyze the similar data, however, this study tries to examine difference aspect of abstract, which is metadiscourse categories.

The second is study conducted by Mirshamsi and Allami entitled *Metadiscourse Markers in the Discussion/Conclusion Section of Persian and English Master's Theses*<sup>57</sup>. In Mirshami and Allami study, they used Hyland's model of metadiscourse to examine the Master theses. They observed about interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers used in discussion and conclusion sections of master's theses. They tried to find out the similarities and

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> Lathifatul Fajriyah, *Thesis: "Representation of Rhetorical Move of Thesis Abstracts in English Teacher Education Departement"*, (Surabaya:UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, 2015).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> A.Mirshamsi, H.Allami, "Metadiscourse Markers in the Discussion/Conclusion Section of Persian and English Master's Theses", *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)* 5 (3), Fall 2013.

differences in the use of metdiscourse markers in three categories, they are native English speakers, native Persian speakers, and non-native English speakers. And the result showed that native English writers used more interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers than native Persian and EFL learners.

Eventhough their study and this study observe the same scope of study, which is metadiscourse markers which adopted by Hyland's model, there are several differences between both studies. Mirshamsi and Allami used discussion and conclusion sections of master' theses as a data, while this study using undergraduate' thesis abstracts as a document. This data only focusing on one subject, that is non-native English speaker (English Teacher Education Department students), whereas they study analyzed three subjects, i.e., native English speakers, native Persian speakers, and non-native English speakers.

The third is study by Al-Shujari, Ya'u and Buba entitled *Role of Moves*, *Tenses, and Metadiscourse in the Abstract of an Acceptable Research Article*<sup>58</sup>. In their study, they investigated 60 research article abstracts that selected from two diciplines, which were applied linguistic and teaching English as a second language. All the seleted articles were taken from Pertanika journal of social science and humanities (official journal of University Putra Malaysia) which published between 2011 aand 2015. They analyzed the rhetorical moves,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</sup> Yasir Bdaiwi Jasim Al-Shujairi, et.al., "Role of Moves, Tenses, and Metadiscourse in the Abstract of an Acceptable Research Article", *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 7 no. 2, March 2016.

preferred tenses of each move, and metadiscoure 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 research 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 Rustipa<sup>59</sup>. 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, whic 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup> 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 comparation with other corpus.

And the last is *Metadiscourse in the introductions of PhD theses and research articles* by Tomoyuki Kawase<sup>60</sup>. 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' 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' thesis abstracts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> Tomoyuki Kawase, "Metadiscourse in the introductions of PhD theses and research articles". *Journal of English for Academic Purposes 20*, September 2015.