Interactive and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in research articles of Indonesian expert writers

Dian Kustyasari, Yazid Basthomi*, Mirjam Anugerahwati

English Department, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Negeri Malang

Academic writing articles as the medium of communication to share knowledge are made in such a way that the idea they deliver is both understandable and acceptable by employing metadiscourse markers. Viewed as an essential element of credible written texts, these markers were investigated in this study. Employing descriptive qualitative approach, data of interpersonal metadiscourse markers were collected using extreme-case sampling from the articles published by the selected Indonesian expert writers. Following that, interviews were conducted to gain deeper understanding on their functions in academic writing. Thematic analysis of qualitative research was performed to the discussion section of the articles and the results show that the metadiscourse markers in the articles are found to be similar to the commonly used markers among academic community, including interactive and interactional markers. Moreover, the employment of markers in the articles reveal the functions of them to indicate relation between sentences, involvement of readers, existence of example, limitation of commitment to propositions, emphasis on general practice and certainty, and reference to the writer.

Keywords: Metadiscourse, interpersonal marker, interactive marker, research article, expert writer

INTRODUCTION

Academic writing articles serve as the medium of communication among scholars to share knowledge and new inquiries). Generally, writers compose an academic article to report on a piece of research which has previously been carried out or to synthesize studies done by other scholars on a particular topic (Barley, 2011). In order to communicate effectively, writers or scholars anticipate their readers' expectations, requirements and background knowledge, and try to engage them in their texts and affect their understandings of them. Therefore, writing is seen as a social and communicative process between scholars and readers (Hyland, 2005) which implement communicative principles, applying the strategy of interacting and conveying ideas. Based on Firoozian, Khajavy, and Vahidnia (2012), interaction in written work is similar to that in spoken speech; both foundation is the principle of communication. Hence, to summarize, one essential action in communication in academic writing is expressing the information commonly delivered by implementing different linguistic expressions so called metadiscourse markers. It is a concept which is based on a thought of writing as a social engagement (Hyland, 2005) well-known as interpersonal metadiscourse comprising interactive and interactional markers with five sub-categories (Hyland, 2010) as prescribed in Table 1.

TABLE 1 | Interpersonal Metadiscourse

Interactive	Functions	Interactional	Functions
Transitions	Expressing relations between main clauses	Hedges	Withholding commitment and proposed ideas
Frame Markers	Referring to discourse acts, stages, or sequences	Boosters	Emphasizing force or writers' confidence with the proposed ideas
Endophoric Markers	Referring to idea presented in other parts of the text	Attitude Markers	Expressing writers' attitude to the prsented ideas
Evidential Markers	Referring to information from other texts	Engagement Markers	Referring to or building relationship with readers explicitly
Code Glosses	Elaborating proposed ideas with synonyms or examples	Self-Mention Markers	Referring to the writers explicitly

Metadiscourse is considered an essential element of good written work composed by students of ESL and native speakers, by which the intelligibility of communication in research articles can be achieved through appropriate discipline values, norms, and assumptions to track the writers' route to academic promotions (Zarei and Mansoori, 2011). Related to the practice of metadiscource use in academic writing, Hyland (2010) carried out research to explore how advanced second language writers deploy metadiscourse markers in their manuscripts. The use of metadiscourse is seen as a method of revealing the rhetorical and social distinctiveness of disciplinary communities (Hyland, 2010). Additionally, Kruse (2012) states that culture of academic writing takes the forms as established rules, practices, and attitudes in regard to the function of writing for teaching and learning. It is, therefore, essential that students receive appropriate instruction in metadiscourse using models of argument to practice writing within the norms and socio-cultural limitations of their readers (Hyland, 2005).

In different circumstances, lamentably, Lestari (2008) reported that teaching writing is still following such a stereotype pattern in which the teacher provides one particular topic on which the students must write in one or several paragraphs. Moreover, the teacher commonly tends to check the grammatical structures, minimizing mistakes related to the forms of language and have not focused on the rhetorical parts of speech and texts (Amiryousefi and Rasehk, 2010). As a result, the teachers nowadays often do not find the message supposed to be conveyed in the essay. This phenomenon apparently occurs due to the unnaturally writing process done by the students which is most likely to reduce grammatical inaccuracies. Additionally, Amiryousefi and Rasehk (2010) also revealed that the writing lesson is delivered by focusing on elements of grammatical points, but metadiscourse is not notably taught. He pointed out that it is very common that students are hardly able to envisage their readers and to interact appropriately with them. They often ineffectively overuse boosters and engagement markers, thereby turning a formal academic writing to an informal and direct argument (Amiryousefi & Rasehk, 2010). Besides, several studies have acknowledged that student-writers in the tertiary levels are not aware of the profound functions of

the use of metadiscourse markers (Gholami, Nejad, and Pour, 2014) and simply overuse them as a trend in the academic articles (Letsoela, 2013). Some prefer to employ them in the scholarly work merely due to the astigmatism of being uncertain with their utterances (Wijaya, 2010). In the Indonesian context, studies on the implementation of metadiscourse in academic writing have been done by several researchers. Suhono & Haikal (2018) explored metadiscourse categories (interactive and interactional) of students' writing results. The results revealed that all interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers were found in the writing with transitions as the highest occurrence. In addition, a study conducted by Wijaya (2010) investigated flouting and hedging of maxims in the Indonesian graduate students' classroom discussion context and the reason behind them. He found that flouting and hedging occured in the students' utterance. The reasons underlying the violation of maxims are due to the assumption of the understanding of hearers on the topic and presentation, avoiding answering questions beyond their comprehension, and preventing further discussion due to awareness of the vagueness of the utterance.

The previous studies focused their investigation on the use of metadiscourse in academic writing among students of tertiary level of education and non-native English expert writers. However, despite the need to reveal the appropriate use of metadiscourse as indicating the social interaction in the written work, the studies of metadiscourse in Indonesia merely spotlighted the problems of inadequate use of such markers among the learners and are lacking in revealing functional need underlying the employment of such markers among the expert writers. Therefore, this study aims at bridging this gap by providing the investigation of the utilization of interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the published academic articles written by Indonesian expert writers to bring to light the factors of such adoption, so as it can provide the answer of the appropriate implementation of metadiscoursal-features in the academic research articles. Two elaborating questions served as the basis of discussion.

METHODS

This study aimed at revealing the implementation of interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the research articles of Indonesian expert writers and unearthing the functions as related to the standard of academic writing. Thus, it was conducted using a descriptive qualitative approach. The main object of this research was the discussion sections of the academic articles written by selected Indonesian expert writers serving as the subjects of the study. In selecting the subjects, extreme-case sampling of the qualitative sampling method was employed. According to Johnson & Christensen (2014), in this sampling method the extremes of some characteristics are examined. Based on Akbari & Yazdanmehr (2014), experts are those with such a length of occupational background. Therefore, being expert writers in English means that they were aware of the use of the interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the articles and their function to implicate intercultural-related issues towards the readers.

As for the sources, the selected articles needed to follow such criteria as: being conducted employing open-ended questions in the research, being written by the selected Indonesian expert writers of Universitas Negeri Malang as a sole writer, and being published in the national and international indexed journals from the period of 2014-2019. Following these criteria, six articles were gathered and served as the primary data source.

Instruments
To accommodate in the data collection, a metadiscourse classification table which helped in classifying data according to themes was employed as the main instrument. This instrument was directly adapted from Hyland (2005) interpersonal metadiscourse which consists of interactive and interpersonal markers. The table was chosen since it was used in many studies investigating metadiscourse in academic written work. Moreover, Hyland (2010) also refers his analysis to this table. Thus, no changes were made. Moreover, a semi-structured interview guide was employed to assist in the 30-minute interviews with every research subject. Based on Ary et al., (2010), semi-structured interview is not only formulated by particular questions to ask, but also provides a chance for the researcher in modifying and adding the applicable questions during the interview process.

Data Collection
The data collection of metadiscourse and the interview process were conducted simultaneously. In an attempt to collect the data of the interpersonal metadiscourse markers, the researcher first selected the subjects who were fitted with the criteria. Following that, the researcher asked for a permission from the subject (writer) by either a spoken direct request or text messages. Once the permission was granted, the articles were downloaded from Google Scholar site. The articles had to be published within a contemporary

period of 2014-2019 to allow actuality of the data, academic norms, and topics of the articles. Following that, the discussion part of each article was looked through to discover the interpersonal metadiscourse markers used. These data were then tabulated into tables. To allow the credibility of the data, the tabulated data were sent to an expert validator who is an academic staff of Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang in the department unit of AIPT national and international division.

Simultaneously, a semi-structured interview guide was arranged according to the result of the collected data. Then, interview appointments were made between the researcher and the expert writers. Once the date was set, the interviews were arranged with each of the expert writers. The semi-structured interview guide which consisted of questions related to the implementation of interpersonal metadiscourse markers and cultural-related issues bound in the articles accommodated the interview process. Responses to the questions in the interview were recorded. Finally, after all of the interviews had been administered, the recording was transcribed into words as the other data to generate the answers of the norm values implied in the articles.

Data Analysis
There were two data analyses performed in this study, metadiscourse analysis and interview analysis. The tabulated data of metadiscourse were analyzed qualitatively. To analyze the data, the researcher employed an interpretive analysis method. According to Johnson & Christensen (2014), this analysis deals with data, such as managing data by segmenting it into manageable units, giving codes on the data, synthesizing them into category systems and drawing patterns into conclusive findings.

Simultaneously, the interview results were analyzed qualitatively following Johnson & Christensen (2014). Several statements in the interview transcription which indicated the factors of the use of each type of the interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the articles by the writers were highlighted. The previously prepared highlighted segments were grouped under similar categories and codes attained in the primary data collection, so that the factors of the use of interpersonal metadiscourse were matched to themes of the types of the metadiscourse markers. Consequently, the underlying factors affecting the use of the interpersonal metadiscourse markers are revealed. Furthermore, the underlying facts of the results acquired through the analyses of the interviews are presented by illustrating the acquired codes and themes in tables in the Finding section.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The interpretive analysis of the discourse in the six articles reveals the utilization of metadiscourse markers in the academic research composed by the four Indonesian expert writers. According to the result, the Indonesian expert writers employed the interpersonal metadiscourse suitable with the table classification of metadiscourse based on Hyland (2005),

including the types and functions. However, each writer did not employ the same numbers of each category. While some writers applied more interactive markers compared to the interactional ones, one writer applied all types of interpersonal metadiscourse markers in each category.

Interestingly, the interactive markers were employed more often than the interactional ones among the Indonesian expert writers. The findings are presented in Table 2 and further details in the following sub-sections based on the results of metadiscourse implemented by each writer.

TABLE 2 | Presence of Metadiscourse Markers in the Articles

Interactive Marker	Expert Writer 1 (EW1)	Expert Writer 2 (EW2)	Expert Writer 3 (EW3)	Expert Writer 4 (EW4)
Transitions (Tr)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Frame markers (FrM)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Endophoric markers (EdM)	-	✓	✓	✓
Evidential markers (EvM)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Code glosses (CdG)	✓	✓	✓	-
Interactional Markers				
Hedges (Hg)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Boosters (Bs)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Attitude markers (AtM)	-	✓	-	✓
Engagement markers EgM)	-	✓	✓	-
Self-mention markers (SfMt)	-	✓	-	-

In the use of transitions, the EW1 employed them in the form of adverbs such as: Thus, Accordingly, Therefore, Moreover and In addition to communicate the semantic relation between the previous sentence and the next sentence. The occurrences of transitions functioning as an adverb can serve the purpose of consequence, based on Hyland (2005), of the previous sentence from which the impact is found in the next sentence. These markers help to build the coherence. Below is the excerpt extracted from the discussion part of the article that contains the instance of metadiscourse.

Excerpt 1.1
The video-making process was beneficial in helping the students to write in a foreign language ... Thus, the difficulty in developing ideas in writing ... can be overcome ...

Interview Excerpt EW1 1.1
This is kind of continuation. By using the marker, the consequence is somewhat cause and effect.

Meanwhile, the existence of transitions in an adverb form can also function as giving an addition, based on Hyland (2005), to the previous idea with the next sentence. This helps to provide extra information. This is clearly shown in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 1.2
In addition, writing helps students develop their ability in using the language with precise vocabulary and grammatical use.

Interview Excerpt EW1 1.2
The politeness is not the way I look at the transition because basically it is the way of making some points coherent in writing.

In addition, EW2 employed frame markers to show sequential order within the discussion. They are presented in the form of adverbs and noun phrases as illustrated in the following excerpts.

Excerpt 1.3

... to both the first and second offers made by C1 and C3, respectively,...

Excerpt 1.4
The second perspective sees indirectness ...

Interview Excerpt EW2 1.1
Yeah..yeah (I want to show the order). I think so.Yes. That is quite common in academic writing I believe ....

The occurrences of the frame markers of the interactive metadiscourse in the form of an adverb in Excerpt 1.3 and a noun in Excerpt 1.4 serve as a sequence to set consecutive orders of two ideas, in which one comes after the other, and to link the idea in the previous sentence to that in the next sentence, respectively. These interactive markers help to build the coherence of the ideas. This is also found in the interview result that the writer claimed it was used to show the order or sequences.

To add, EW3 also used metadiscourse in the category of endophoric markers. The marker is found in an adverbial phrase form. The example of the marker is depicted in Excerpt 1.5.

Excerpt 1.5
A combination of ... was a common practice ..., as demonstrated in Table 3.

In the above excerpt, the writer employed endophoric marker to refer to the idea which has been presented previously in the article. This functions as the guidance for

the readers to focus on the mentioned information.

To show references to others' previous work, EW3 used evidentials in the discussion section. In the use of evidentials, the EW3 employed them in the form of active reduced adjective, a transitive verb, a noun and a sentence to communicate the supporting ideas found in other articles, as seen in the following excerpts.

Excerpt 1.6
This finding echoes Breen's [13] and Lacorte's study, ...

In Excerpt 1.6, EW3 employed evidential in the form of an transitive verb whose object indicate the reference to a source of information from other studies. This phrase indicates the evidence of the relation of the presented idea in the discussion with the related findings in the similar field. This was explained further by the writer n the interview as shown in the following excerpt.

Interview Excerpt EW3 1.1
This is the procedures. When you want to discuss your findings, do the findings relate to the other previous studies. It is an international norm.

The interview with EW3 reveals the academic norm behind such practice. She believed that the use of evidence in the text is to relate with the previous studies and it is a part of rules in scientific writing. She added that relating her research finding to that other scholar is an international norm of academic writing.

The interpersonal metadiscourse markers found in the articles written by Indonesian expert writers are appropriate example of the implementation of metadiscourse in the academic writing. They have followed the classification and functions of each category of metadiscourse proposed by Hyland (2005) in the academic writing. It is revealed that among the analyzed articles written by the Indonesian expert writers, the existence of the interactive metadiscourse markers is found more than that of the interactional markers. This finding echoes Lin (2005) who reveals that non-native writers used less degree of interpersonal metadiscourse. Additionally, the finding is also similar to that of Livingstone (2019) and Shafouqie et.al (2019) on the higher frequency of interactive markers compared to interactional markers among non-native speakers.

The interactive metadiscourse employed by Indonesian expert writers include transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, and code glosses. This supports the metadiscourse classification of Hyland (2005) in which the occurrences of transitions can serve the purpose of consequence of the previous sentence from which the impact is found in the next sentence and an additional idea to the previous one with that in the next sentence or giving comparison of ideas presented in the text. By applying the marker, the writers aim at showing continuation of ideas which help to build the coherence. Oshima & Hogue (2007) state that transition functions to connect the idea in one sentence to

that in the other. It is used to show relationship between the sentences.

Besides, to help the readers understand the order of the ideas presented, Indonesian expert writers also use frame markers. They are employed to indicate a sequential order and label of stages in the text. This reflects Hyland (2005). The writers employ frame markers in order to clarify the proposed ideas for the readers (Khedri, Ibrahimi & Chang, 2013).

Moreover, the evidential markers are used to indicate the reference to a source of information from other studies (Hyland, 2005). This phrase indicates the evidence of the relation of the presented idea in the discussion with the related findings in the similar field. This indicates that importance previous studies to support the proposed ideas. This finding is similar to that of Mazic (2013) who mentioned that in scientific research, the reference plays as the essential information to help the readers identify and find the used sources of supporting information.

The interactional metadiscourse employed by Indonesian expert writers include hedges, boosters, engagement markers, attitude markers, and self-mention markers. This supports the metadiscourse classification of Hyland (2005). This is in line with Hyland (2005) that hedges are seen as the mark of writer's reluctance in proposing the ideas. While the hedges can make people sure about the result, there is no element of forcing. The implementation of hedge reflects the highly valued role of interpretation to build up a relationship with readers to persuade them on the proposition (Hyland, 2005). Besides, boosters are also employed in the articles of Indonesian expert writers and they function to emphasize the certainty in the writer' argument and to put an emphasis on the general practice of the idea delivered. This is to indicate that the writer is certain with the proposed argument. This is in line with Hyland (2005) of the booster function in the text.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, the study on the use of interpersonal metadiscourse in the discussion academic articles written by Indonesian expert writers reveals the utilization of interactive and interactional markers following the classification and functions of each category of metadiscourse proposed by Hyland (2005). The finding reveals the appropriate utilization of interpersonal metadiscourse in research articles which indicates the international norm of academic writing. Thus, employing such markers the Indonesian expert writers have fulfill the intelligibility of communication in international research articles.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Akil, M. (2011). The quality of indonesian-english translation by English department students of higher learning institutions in Makassar (Doctoral dissertation, Udayana University).

Akbari, R. and Yazdanmehr, E. (2014). A critical analysis of the selection criteria of expert teachers in ELT. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. *4*(8), 1653-1658.

Amiryousefi, M. and Rasekh, A. E. (2010). Metadiscourse: definitions, issues and its implications for English teachers. *English Language Teaching*. 3(4), 159-167.

Ary, D., Jacob, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education.* (8th Ed). Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.

Barley, S. (2011). Academic Writing: A Handbook for international students (Third edition). New York: Routledge.

Firoozian, A., Khajavy, H., and Vahidnia, F. (2012). A contrastive study of metadiscourse elements in research articles written by Iranian applied linguistics and engineering writers in English. *English Linguistics Research*. *1*(1), 88-96.

Gholami, J., Nejad, S. R., and Pour, J. L. (2014). Metadiscourse marker misuses: a study of EFL learners' argumentative essays. Procedia-Social and Behavioural Science. *98*, 580-589.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2010). Metadiscourse: Mapping interactions in academic writing. *Nordic journal of English Studies* 9(2): 125-143.

Johnson, B. and Chistensen, L. (2014). *Educational research: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Fifth edition. United State: Pearson Education, Inc.

Khedri, M., Ibrahimi, S. F. and Chang, S. H. (2013). An exploration of interactive metadiscourse markers in academic research article abstracts in two disciplines. *Discourse Studies*. *15*(3), 319-331.

Kruse, O. (2012). Writing cultures and student mobility. learning to write effectively: *Current trends in European research*, 293-296.

Lestari, L. A. (2008). The interactional approach to the teaching of writing and its implications for Second language acquisition. *TEFLIN Journal*. *19*(1), 42-56.

Letsoela, P. M. (2013). Inappropriate use of transitions by national university of lesotho students. *International Journal of English Language Education*. *2*(1), 100-112.

Lin, C. (2005). Metadiscourse in academic writing: An investigation of graduate students' MA theses in Taiwan. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*. *2*(1), 1-66.

Livingstone, K. A. (2019). Examining the use of metadiscourse markers in academic writing. *International Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics*. *5*(3), 244-254.

Mazic, I. (2013). The importance of proper citation of references in biomedical articles. *Acta Informatica Medica*. 21(3), 148-55.

Oshima, A and Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to academic writing* (Second Ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc

Shafique, H., Shahbaz, M., and Hafeez, M. R. (2019). Metadiscourse in research writing: A study of native english and pakistani research articles. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. *9*(4), 376-385

Suhono, H. & Haikal, H. 2018. Interactive metadiscourse and interactional metadiscourse categories of student's international program school based on gender. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, *5*(1): 81-91.

Wijaya, M. H. (2010). Flouting and hedging in the graduate student's classroom discussion context at State University of Malang. Unpulished Master Thesis. Malang: Library of State University of Malang

Zarei, G.R., & Mansoori, S. (2011). A contrastive study on metadiscourse elements used in humanities vs. non-humanities across Persian and English. *Journal of English Language Teaching*. *4*(1), 42 -50.