

A COMPARATIVE RESEARCH ON META-DISOURSE MARKERS USED IN INTRODUCTION SECTION ON LOCAL, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ARTICLES OF ENGLISH EDUCATION

¹ Hairiyanto, ² Alamsyah Harahap and ³ Dedi Sofyan

¹STIES-NU Bengkulu 2019, ^{2,3} Universitas Bengkulu

Corresponding email: hairiyanto@stiesnu-bengkulu.ac.id

Received on Oct, 15th, Revised on Nov, 17th, Published on Dec 30th 2020

ABSTRACT

This research aims to identify the meta-discourse feature mostly used and the difference between interactive and interactional categorize among Local, National and International Journals. This research was a corpora analysis employed journal articles as the object of the research. Data were collected purposive random sampling with a total of sampling were 30 articles taken three journals. The data is a cropped introduction section to be made a Microsoft file and processed by using the AntConce Application. Data were analyzed using a qualitative method by focusing on the use of the meta-discourse feature and different interactive and interactional categorized by Hyland's (2005). The results show that: 1) The meta-discourse feature that is mostly used in each journal is interactive. The interactive has the same tendency used among Local, National and International journals. 2) The transition categorizes the most frequent in the Local, National and International Journal. 3) The meta-discourse feature that is least used was found in the Asian EFL Journal, the frame markers that are least used were found in Joall journals, and the endophoric that is the least used was found in Joall journals. 4) There are significant differences in the use of interactive and interactional in each journal. So it can be concluded that each writer has known and used meta-discourse in writing articles, the use of meta-discourse is not influenced by the level of journals, both Local, National and International Journal, but is influenced by the writer competence in expressing his thoughts, and the culture of the author's environment. Besides, the articles published in each journal are influenced by the editor of the journal itself.

Key words: Meta-discourse feature, Interactive and interactional Category, Local, National, and International Journal

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi fitur meta-wacana yang paling banyak digunakan dan perbedaan antara kategori interaktif dan interaksional antara Jurnal Lokal, Nasional dan Jurnal Internasional. Penelitian ini merupakan analisis korpora dengan artikel jurnal sebagai objek penelitian. Pengumpulan data dilakukan secara purposive random sampling dengan jumlah pengambilan sampel sebanyak 30 artikel yang diambil tiga jurnal. Data tersebut merupakan bagian pengenalan yang dipotong untuk dijadikan file Microsoft dan diolah dengan menggunakan Aplikasi AntConce. Data dianalisis menggunakan metode kualitatif dengan berfokus pada penggunaan fitur meta-wacana dan berbagai interaktif dan interaksional yang dikategorikan oleh Hyland (2005). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa: 1) Fitur meta-wacana yang banyak digunakan di setiap jurnal bersifat interaktif. Interaktif memiliki kecenderungan yang sama digunakan antara jurnal Lokal, Nasional dan Internasional. 2) Kategorisasi transisi paling sering terjadi di Jurnal Lokal, Nasional dan Internasional. 3) Fitur meta-wacana yang paling sedikit digunakan ditemukan di Jurnal EFL Asia, penanda bingkai yang paling sedikit digunakan ditemukan di jurnal Joall, dan endoforik yang paling sedikit digunakan ditemukan di jurnal Joall. 4) Terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan dalam penggunaan interaktif dan interaksional di setiap jurnal. Sehingga dapat disimpulkan bahwa setiap penulis telah mengetahui dan menggunakan meta-wacana dalam menulis artikel, penggunaan meta-wacana tidak dipengaruhi oleh level jurnal, baik Jurnal Lokal, Nasional maupun Jurnal Internasional, tetapi dipengaruhi oleh kompetensi penulis dalam menulis artikel, mengekspresikan pemikirannya, dan budaya lingkungan penulis. Selain itu, artikel yang dimuat di setiap jurnal dipengaruhi oleh editor jurnal itu sendiri.

Kata Kunci: Fitur meta-wacana, Kategori Interaktif dan interaksional, Jurnal Lokal, Nasional, dan Internasional

INTRODUCTION

Meta-discourse is a widely used term in current discourse analysis and is a relatively new approach that refers to the ways of writers or speakers' projecting themselves in their texts to interact with their receivers. It is a concept that is based on a view of writing or speaking as a social engagement (Hyland, 2005; Dafouz-Milne, 2008). It is, using meta-discourse is believed to play an important role in organizing the discourse, engaging the audience and signaling the writer's or speaker's attitude (Fuertes-Olivera et al., 2001).

In communication between humans, that is carried out through writing, the use of meta-discourse is very important to convey information through different linguistic expressions and construct it cohesively and logically so that deafness looks more effective. (Khadije Ghahremani Mina: 2017). Cohesive is a harmonious relationship between one element and another in the discourse, so that neat understanding is created. Cohesion refers to the linkage of form, while cohesion refers to the linkage of meaning. Good discourse generally has cohesion and coherence in it.

Metadiscourse studies have been conducted by some researcher for long time ago such as Hyland, 2005a, Mur-Duena, 2011 and others. Some of them have been studied meta-discourse into some science,

such as natural science, social science, linguistics, an exact science, and others. So that meta-discourse marker becomes to a tool helper for writers to convey ideas to readers or listeners more effectively. Academic writing should be effectively understandable to support idea and aim of the text more interactive between the readers and writers or speakers and listeners.

Therefore, the use of meta-discourse is important as the support in understanding the text. Fa-gen, 2012 state that Meta-discourse is known as the reflective language used to interact between readers and writers or speakers and listeners. It depends on how the users display the meta-discourse itself. Especially in writing text, it can be used in expressing the important meanings correctly, in organizing the text, and interaction between them for understanding the text.

Hyland (2005) have been improving meta-discourse to some group. This grouping is also based on the function of each category and includes sub-classifications. It aims to facilitate the authors in using the meta-discourse itself. The first category is transition markers, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidential, and code glosses. This sub-classification is categorized as interaction. Furthermore, the second category is hedges, boosters, engagement markers, attitude markers, and self-mentions. This sub-classification is included in the

interactional category. So that it can be understood that, the use of meta-discourse can help writers in creating writing that is more suitable between one sentence and another.

The introduction section is a very important part of the research. Because in this section the researcher must load the background of the problem to be examined so that the readers were easier to understand what the researcher did. According to Bowker (2007: 37), the Introduction section generally starts with a general statement that reflects the topic or context of the thesis. Here the researcher made a stronger argument so that the reason why the topic is important is to be examined. This is where the role of meta-discourse is played. Where the writer use transition category and, but also, and in addition to connecting one sentence with another sentence. In academic writing, the writers usual tend to use and to add an argument and but to show the opposite argument. The writers also tend to pay attention to the compilation of texts, how writers use linguistic aspects or features so that the text is structured and its communicative goals are achieved. Therefore, the researcher uses many interactive and interactional to help or guide the reader to understand a text and to involve the reader in a text with hope can give a feedback or response from the reader.

Although the researchers in writing an article, Often find problems in making a coherence sentence which is caused by several things, including a lack of understanding of the function of metadiscourse itself. Even though a good sentence is when there is compatibility, balance, integration between one sentence and another, between one main idea and the next idea. Then the idea that the author will convey is very easy for the reader to understand. Therefore, an understanding of meta-discourse is very important for writers to produce their articles, so that the articles produced can be published in various journals, both Local, National and International journals.

In producing text and persuading writing, Meta-discourse markers can also be used as one of the important rhetorical area. In part of solving problem to increasing writing and reading skill on the research, or to grow up some issue that essential in listening and speaking parts, the metadiscourse markers to be one of tool can be used by the researchers (Hyland (1998).

Previews research about this case had been tried relations among of metadiscourse function with some differences and similarities in science. One of them is Li Fa-gen (2012). He tries to focuses on the analysis of the relations between the meta-discourse functions and Hallidayan three

meta-functions and on the analysis of similarities and differences, and points out the fact that meta-discourse mainly has four semantic functions: experiential function, textual (interactive) function, interactional (interactive) function, and rhetorical function. In comparative of meta-discourse, María Luisa (32nd International Conference) explained the results of his research that she analyses and a corpus of one hundred emails written by two groups of non-native speakers of English working in an export company and using English to communicate in a business environment.

She found that in the corpus analyses, variation in the use of the following boosters between speakers of different mother tongues, its means that speakers with different linguistic backgrounds use boosters differently. So the different of this research which previews research focus on the using of Meta-discourse feature, Interactive and interactional Category in introduction on Local, National, and International Journal.

The basic reason for the writer in choosing a local, national and international journal is that each of the journals is indicated to be a representative of the authors themselves. In local journals, article writers generally come from among students/writers locally, although not as a whole. While the national-scale journals, in

general, the authors of the articles in the journals come from the national scale, i.e. the writers there from various campuses in Indonesia. While the national-scale journals, the authors who sent articles to the journal were from various countries in the world.

Therefore, the author wants to see whether from various backgrounds the author wants to see the difference in the use of meta-discourse in each of those journals. Based on the explanation above, the researcher is interested in the use of meta-discourse in article Journals published in Local, National and International Journals. It is to find out what features of meta-discourse markers are mostly used and is there any difference between interactive and interactional categories in the introduction section use in Local, National and International Journals?

METHODOLOGY

This research is a corpora analysis using journal articles as the objective of the research. The collecting data using random purposive sampling which total of sampling 30 articles, each journal is taken 10 articles randomly. Then the data is cropped in the introduction section to be made into a Microsoft file, then processed using the AntConc application. The analyzing data was using a qualitative method by focusing on the use of meta-discourse features,

interactive and interactional categorize by Hyland's (2005) taxonomy. Next, the person Chi-square test was run to see whether there are significant differences in the use of interactive and interactional categorize in each journal. The researcher uses the documents as instrument in this reasearch.

The data was selected by the different articles of the Journal. The articles collected based on each journal. The articles cropped on the introduction section and pasted into Microsoft Word file. Then the data were analyzed by using the AntCounc application to make easy in selecting meta-discourse makers used in the introduction section of journal articles and to identify the type of interactive and interactional meta-discourse markers that were mostly used in Local, National and International Journals. The output of the AntCounc data sent to the table frequency form to ensure the percentage of occurrences of each type of meta-discourse. Meta-discourse types that seen interactive and interactional meta-discourse.

Then the analysis of the aforementioned categories, the whole corpus was examined word by word, rather than selecting several interactive and interactional typical. Each meta-discourse markers were checked again to make sure it is correctly classified. Finally, after collecting data, the

SPSS version 22 software was applied to achieve quantitative analysis

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The meta-discourse features frequently used in the introduction section in Local, National and International Journals are interactive.

Based on the findings of this research, the interactive is a meta-discourse feature that is often used in Local, National and International Journals. The appearance of interactive in each journal article indicates each writer knows that the meta-discourse is one of the important parts of the writing article. Because the main purpose of writing is to inform everything, be it facts, data or events including opinions and views of facts, data, and events so that readers gain new knowledge and understanding of various things that can or what happens. Thus the writer can change the reader's beliefs; instilling an understanding of something with the reader; Stimulate readers' thought processes; please or entertain readers; tell the reader, and motivate the reader.

Besides, every writer realizes that in constructing inter-sentence instructions must be able to invite the audience to participate by accommodating the possibility of knowledge, interests, rhetorical expectations and processing abilities. So that the purpose of writing the article can form and limit a text to meet the needs of certain readers, establish arguments to restore the interpretation and

goals that the author likes. Therefore, the use of resources in this category discusses ways of organizing discourse, rather than experience, and expressing the extent to which the text is constructed with the reader's needs in mind. That is the reason, why

interactive tends to be used by every writer, both Local, National and International writers.

The detail of meta-discourse feature used in each Journal was presented in table 1 below:

Table 1. Frequency of Meta-discourse Feature used

Meta-discourse features	Joall		Teflin		Asian EFL		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Interactive	1106	81	1194	79	767	79	3067	80
Interactional	265	19	318	21	201	21	784	20
	1371	100	1512	100	968	100	3851	100

Table 1 shows that interactive is the meta-discourse feature most frequently used in the 3 Journals. Whereas interactional features are not often used in the 3 journals. The most interactive found in Teflin journals. The least interactive found in Asian EFL journals. The interactive on the Teflin was appearance 1194 times, and then in Joall appeared 1106 times while in the Asian EFL appeared 767 times. So it can be concluded that interactive is most often used found in the Teflin Journal while interactive least used is found in the Asian EFL Journal. This probably happens to be caused by the tendency of Local and National writers to use long sentences in building their arguments, thus allowing more interaction between the writer and the reader. Whereas writers in international journals, they don't need long sentences to build their arguments.

They are immediately focused on the subject, simple and compact. That is why the introduction sections of the Local, National and International journals are different.

Meanwhile, the interactive and interactional have quite a big difference, the total number of interactive occurrences in the 3 journals is 3067 times or 80%, while the total interactional number of the 3 journals is 784 times or 20%. But between interactive and interactional meta-discourse features are interrelated with each other, though. The following is an example of using meta-discourse features that have interactive dimensions in a sentence.

We use language to talk not only about the world and ourselves but also to talk about talk. We sometimes refer explicitly to ourselves not only as experiencers in the world but also as communicators. We may

also comment on the situation of communicating in addition to the topic of the situation (Ädel, 2006). (Source: Paragraph 3 on Gholami. Mehrnaz (2014).

The paragraph above is one example of a sentence that uses the meta-discourse feature that interactive, where the writer use transition category and, but also, and in addition to connecting one sentence with another sentence. The writer wants to convey that using language not only talk about the world and ourselves but also talk about talk. The point is that language can be used in many ways, not limited to a particular space and an object, but also more widely, such as studying what other people are talking about and what is the difference between one group and another group in the talk.

There was a bit different use of interactive and interactional categories in Local, National and International Journal.

Based on the result of this research there were differences in using interactive and interactional categories in Local, National and International Journal. These differences can be seen in the appearance of each category in each journal. In Joall for example, the interactive category often used by writers is the transition, the second is endophoric and the third is frame markers. Meanwhile, the interactive category often used by writers in Teflin is also the

transition, the second is frame markers and the third is evidential. Then, the interactive categories that are often used in the Asian EFL Journal are a transition, then frame markers and evidential. This can be seen the difference in the order of the categories used by each journal. Teflin and Asian EFL tend to have the same sequence of categories, namely transitions, frame markers, and evidence. Being in Joall has a sequence of categories namely Transition, Endophoric and Frame Marker. This happens because the article writers on Joall often use the words in this, above, See, seems instead of purpose, objective and so on. While Teflin and the Asian EFL often use according to and XY states rather than using the words above see, seem and so on. This shows that writing scientific papers from these two journals is better than the writers in Joall Journal which is caused by experience in scientific writing.

For more information can look at the table 2 below. Table 2 shows that the transition is at the level mostly used in each journal. The transition occurs 1350 times or 44 %. Frame Marker occurrence 782 times, Endophoric 532 times, Evidentials 315 time and Code Glosses 88 times. This shows that the importance of the transition is to help the reader interpret the argument or sentence one after the other. The transition has functioned as a link between sentences so that the sentences in the paragraph sound coherence.

Table 2. The Interactive and Interactional Categories used in Local, National and International Journal

No	Meta-discourse feature	Categories	Joall		Teflin		Asian EFL		Total	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Interactive	Transition	522	47	512	43	316	41	135	44
		Frame Marker	108	10	369	31	305	40	782	25
		Endophoric	360	33	129	11	43	6	532	17
		Evidential	72	7	155	13	88	11	315	10
		Code Glosses	44	4	29	2	15	2	88	3
		Total		1106	100	1194	100	767	100	3067
2	Interactional	Categories	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
		Hedges	21	8	120	38	21	10	162	21
		Booster	75	28	15	5	8	4	98	13
		Attitude Marker	57	22	90	28	17	8	164	21
		Self Mentions	9	3	24	8	9	4	42	5
		Engagement Marker	103	39	69	22	146	73	318	41
Total		265	100	318	100	201	100	784	100	

In academic writing, the writers usual tend to use *and* to add an argument and *but* to show the opposite argument. The writers also tend to pay attention to the compilation of texts, how writers use linguistic aspects or features so that the text is structured and its communicative goals are achieved. This happens because the longer the introduction in the article, the more transitions are used and shorter the introduction in the article, the shorter the transition is used. That is why the transition category is least found in the Asian EFL.

Whereas in interactional categories there are differences in each Journal. The Joall

mostly used the engagement of the interactional in their articles from another category, then booster and attitude markers categories. While in Teflin mostly used is hedges, then attitude markers and engagement categories. Then in the Asian EFL journal mostly used were engagement, then attitude markers and hedges categories.

If viewed from these 3 journals, there are no journals that have the same order as each other in using interactional in writing their articles. This is probably caused by the diversity of the author's skills in each journal. This tendency shows every writer has a certain character in starting writing to include

the readers and show their presence is more in presenting the arguments without being so assertive. The difference in the number of occurrences categories in each journal can be analysed using the chi-square method. The results show that there are differences between interactive and interactional categories used in each journal. These differences affect the quality of the writings published in each journal. The better one's writing, the more chance it has to publish in international journals. For more information look at the result of interactive data analysis using Chi-square.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	456.988 ^a	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	477.912	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.551	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	3067		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.01.

The table data of Chi-square above shows that the chi-square number is 456,988 with an Asymp.sig value *Asymp.sig* (p)=0,000. Because of the value of $p < 0.05$, it can be said that there are significant differences in interactive categories based on each journal.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	263.196 ^a	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	257.521	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.001	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	784		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.77.

The table data of Chi-square above shows that the chi-square number is 263.196 with an Asymp.sig value *Asymp.sig* (p)=0,000. Because of the value of $p < 0.05$, it can be said that there are significant differences in interactional categories based on each journal.

DISCUSSION

The finding of this research shows that the meta-discourse feature mostly used in Local, National and International Journals are interactive. The interactive has the same tendency used among the 3 Journals. The interactive feature is a feature that is very familiar to be used by the writer, and the tendency of the writer to use this feature is also influenced by other people's writing models so that the writer tends to imitate the authorship style of that person. Susanti (2017) said that the writers tend to include the readers and show their presence is more in presenting the arguments without being so assertive. In using those feature, the more skilful writer use more variation on the use of words and phrases functioned as an interactive meta-discourse feature. She also stated that skilled writers have an awareness of the needs of their readers and control the strategies for making their texts more considerate and accessible to the readers. This result also supported by Simin and Tavangar (2009) in Susanti (2017) who found that the more proficient learners are in the second

language, the more they use meta-discourse markers.

The writers in writing articles are an actualizing of the writer's mind which is manifested in a piece of writing. According to Hyland (2013), quoted from Mardiana (2018), said that writers tend to pay attention to the compilation of texts, how writers use linguistic aspects or features so that the text is structured and its communicative goals are achieved. This result is line to Loi and Lim, (2013) state that in writing articles, the writers should consider the relationship of the main topic, supporting topics and complement the sentences, so that the reader can understand that what the writer writes. In academic writing, the use of meta-discourse markers was not affected by the Local, National or International Journal because the way writers use a language was not determined by Local, National or International Journals but constructed through social practices (Tse & Hyland, 2008, p. 1246). The interactive meta-discourse markers can help to signal the relationship of the ideas and order materials that the audiences probably found convincing and appropriate (Hyland, 2005, p. 90). Furthermore, the predominance of interactive markers aims to emphasize the importance of guiding the reading process and clarifying the meanings (Hyland, 2005, p. 92). In the Journal articles, the writers need to ensure that their arguments have a plausible relationship

with reality in their discipline. Here the roles of meta-discourse markers, especially the interactive feature were used. The interactive feature can help writers to signal the relationship of the ideas and order materials that the audiences were probably found convincing and appropriate (Hyland, 2005, p. 90).

The introduction was an important part of the research. Because in this section the researcher must load the background of the problem to be examined so that the readers were easier to understand what the researcher did. According to Bowker (2007: 37), the introduction section generally starts with a general statement that reflects the topic or context of the thesis. Here the researcher made a stronger argument so that the reason why the topic was important to be examined. Therefore, the researcher uses many words transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidential, code glosses, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions or engagement markers to help or guide the reader to understand a text and to involve the reader in a text with hope can give a feedback or response from the reader.

Hyland (2005, p. 92) states that the predominance of interactive markers aims to emphasize the importance of guiding the reading process and clarifying the meanings. It means that the introduction section built by the writer using interactive methods can help

the reader in understanding a text so that the readers more easily understand what was written by the writer. This argues strengthened by Tomoyuki Kawill bee (2015) states that the majority of writers made greater use of meta-discourse in their research article introduction sections. This becomes the reason for the research article, among Joall, Teflin and Asian EFL Article employed more interactive than interactional meta-discourse markers.

Based on this finding research, the transition categorizes were found in the 3 Journals. Transition is the arrangement of words that move between one sentence with another sentence. Transition is an element in a paragraph. So the transition has functioned as a conjunction between sentences in the paragraph so that between the sentences sounds coherence. Transition is divided into two kinds, namely in sentence transition and inter-sentence transition. Intra sentence transition is a transition that is in one sentence. Its function is to connect the parent sentence and the child clause. For example the word "and" in the sentence "By revealing the interactional **and** interactive preferences of writers in different communities.". The words of **and** in the sentence above connect the main sentence with supporting sentences in one paragraph. So the writer wants -vggiiigigto show that there is still a link between the main idea and supporting ideas.

The inter-sentence transition is a

transition that connects between two sentences. For example the use of the word in **addition** in the sentence "Mauren (1993) and others into intercultural discourse variation, exploring the expectation for particular method formation course and interpersonal practices of different first language groups in the target contexts. *In addition*, Hyland (2005, p. 250) also states that research into the methods of study is typically used by different discourse communities can help seeing more clearly about how texts are the result of interactions, and how discourse practices which involve engagement in a web of professional and social associations". (Source: Susanti 2017 on introduction section)

The frame maker categories on Teflin and Asian EFL Journals are 2nd place after the transition, while in Joall Journal is endophoric marker after the transition. For the 3rd position in Joall Journal is frame markers while in Teflin and Asian EFL journal is an evidential marker. This different probably caused by the ability and experience of writers in writing articles in national and international journals, and the average writer in journals of national and international reputation has passed through a very strict review stage, and written by experienced writers, while the article was written by a local writer, they should learn more about writing good articles. These findings were supported by Mina and Biria (2017) who argue that frame markers

were used more in social science and humanity. The frequent use of frame markers in humanity has aimed to shift the topic and keep the smooth flow in humanity Journal articles.

Endophoric categories were exclusively used in the Joall. Whereas, endophoric categories less used in Teflin and Asian EFL Journal. In basically endophoric categories used to refer to the graphs and tables in research articles. The graph was a collection of data from several tables that were presented or also displayed in the form of images, such as squares, circles, cubes, triangles, beams, cones and others. The graph can also be interpreted as a framework or also a picture that was used to create visualization objects from the data in the table to provide information about data from the material presented to the recipient of the material. Hence of the use of endophoric more the used at textbooks than the articles. It was caused by the function of endophoric itself to navigate the discourse in the long pedagogic text. This becomes the reason why Journal articles, which were not as long as textbooks, do not employ many endophoric markers. In Pasaribu's (2017) findings, it was found that the EFL writers do not use many endophoric markers. According to Hyland (2005), endophoric categories have a function to refer the reader to related material in the text. In the soft fields, this device was aimed to reinforce

the argument by ensuring that the reader has access to relevant arguments in the text.

Evidential categories were mostly used in Teflin Journals, but a little more was used in Joall and Asian EFL. This result was in line with Hyland (2005) he said that soft disciplines employed more evidential, especially citations. The reason was because of the citations in soft disciplines was not only extending the knowledge from the previously established base but constructing the writer self by positioning the writers (Hyland, 2005, p. 161). Inhumanity Journals, often find that there were so many citations to confirm the writing with the previous theories or findings. On the other hand, the findings from Ghafoori and Oghbatalab (2012) were in contrast with this research finding. His findings showed that evidential was employed more in hard science to keep the exactness of data.

The last category of interactive types was Code glosses. The Code glosses were not mostly used in Joall, Teflin, and Asian EFL articles. The results show that this number of categories is the least used by the writer, among of in the Joall, Teflin and Asian EFL Journals. Code glosses can be seen from some phrases such as that is, this is called, for example, this can be defined, etc. Code glosses can also be marked off by theses. Besides, these categories clarify the unfamiliar term or usage.

Categories of interactional categories

were Hedges, Boosters, Attitude Markers, Self-Mentions, and Engagement Markers. The following part discusses each of the interactional types used in Joall, Teflin, and Asian EFL articles.

Based on the result finding of this research, the interactional types were not mostly used in Local, National and International Journal compared by using interactive types. However, it can look difference of interactional categories. In here can be seen that the interactional categories were mostly used at Teflin Journal, but not commonly used at the Joall and Asian EFL Journal. It shows that the Teflin Journal more interactional than Joall and Asian EFL Journal.

Khajavi, and Vahidnia (2012) as quoted in Mina (2017) in the international Journal mentioned that interactional in written texts were considered the same way as in spoken texts. Hence one of the most important actions in communication among people was to express the information by different linguistic expressions named meta-discourse markers which were used to convey a cohesive and logical construction of information and show the writer makes his/her opinions based on the content. Susanti (2017) found that the more proficient writer used more in number and variations of interactional meta-discourse markers than those of the less proficient writer did. For the most frequent interactional

meta-discourse markers, the more proficient writer used engagement marker, while the less one used self-mention as the most frequent marker in introducing the research and reviewing related research. It means that the more proficient a writer, the number and variations of interactional meta-discourse to be used. Then the writers tend to include the readers and show their presence more in presenting the arguments without being so assertive.

Interactional categories also used to express ideas written by giving a form of thoughts and feelings with a series of sentences that were logically arranged in unity. Besides that interactional used to facilitate the organization of ideas for those who write and provide ease of understanding for the readers. The frequency of interactional categories appear in among articles has a different tendency. In Joall, The Interactional categories mostly used were Engagement markers, Booster, and Attitude marker. In Teflin mostly used of Hedges, Attitude Marker, and Engagement markers. While in Asian EFL mostly used of Engagement markers, Hedges and Attitude Marker. Here seen of difference tendency among writers' articles. Engagement simply means two-way communication, which according to communication expert Wilbur Schramm in mirza (2012) states that the interactional communication. The key to

interactional communication is feedback or responses to certain messages or content. Jason Falls (2012) he mentioned the results of good communication is if the audience gives attention in the form of response.

The hedges were devices that aimed to imply that a statement based on the writer's reasoning rather than certain knowledge. The devices indicate the degree of confidence. A hedge also emphasizes the subjectivity in a text to open for negotiation (Hyland, 2005, p. 52). The resulting finding of this research has relevance to Hyland's (2005) findings in the analysis of meta-discourse markers in research articles.

Ghoreyshi (2015) found that boosters were commonly found in soft disciplines. Hyland (2005) also supported the findings of this research. His analysis revealed that boosters were more common in humanity and social science papers.

Self-mention categories were not frequently used in Journal, Teflin and Asian EFL Journal. The findings were supported by Hyland (2005) whose findings showed that self-mentions categories were frequently used in human and social sciences. It is also supported by Mina and Biria (2017) who stated that social articles were using more attitude and self-mention than scientific articles. These categories were used by the writer to adopt a certain stance and the writer's identity (Hyland, 2005, p. 53). It

becomes one of the reasons why self-mentions were employed more in the humanity field. Since these devices were aimed to state the writer's presence in the text, the field that frequently used these markers was humanity. In science, we often found the writers used self-mentions too

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The meta-discourse features frequently used in the introduction section in Local, National and International Journals are interactive.

The interactive is a meta-discourse feature that is often used in Local, National and International Journals. The appearance of interactive in each journal article indicates each writer knows that the meta-discourse is one of the important parts in the writing article. It shows that the interactive was more widely used by each writer than the interactional; the interactive method allows the writer to help the reader to correctly interpret the text by managing information flow. Then these features were used to organize the propositional ideas of the text. The readers can find the conveyance and the coherence of the text. Here, the writer's purpose was to shape and constrain a text, find the needs of the readers so that they can set up their arguments to interpret what they read. I expect that this research will give more contribution to language teaching in the school or English course. Not only increasing

our knowledge about the meta-discourse, but also suggesting the teacher or lectures to educate the students how to compose a quality scientific writing by using metadata course.

There was a bit different use of interactive and interactional categories in Local, National and International Journal.

This difference can be seen in the appearance of each category in each Journal. In Joall for example, the interactive category often used by writers is the transition, the second is endophoric and the third is frame markers. Meanwhile, the interactive category often used by writers in Teflin is also the transition, the second is frame markers and the third is evidential. Then, the interactive categories that are often used in the Asian EFL Journal are a transition, then frame markers and evidential. It happened to influence someone writing is the style of writer, culture, and competences of the writer in academic writing. For Indonesian writer tendencies to longer and passive writer while for the foreign writer tendencies to the point, no longer and be an active writer. This is the reason why there are differences in the appearance of interactive and interactional categories in each Journal.

The Interactional categories in JOALL mostly used were Engagement markers, Booster, and Attitude marker. In TEFLIN mostly used of Hedges, Attitude Marker, and

Engagement markers. While in ASIAN EFL mostly used of Engagement markers, Hedges and Attitude Marker. Here seen of difference tendency among writers' articles. This different influenced by way of thinking, direction of discussion, understanding point of view, and content of writing. Each of writers has a style and direction of thinking that is different, this caused by differences in references used. Therefore understanding of meta-discourse, as well as the breadth of experience of each writer is very important, because the ability to write is not born by itself, but due to frequent writing exercises and the number of reading references.

SUGGESTIONS

In terms of writing this thesis, the researcher is well aware that there are still many shortcomings and weaknesses that occur, caused by the limitations of the ability of the writer, the suitability of the arrangement and sequence of words to cause many deficiencies. Therefore the researcher highly expect suggestions for improvements to the writing of the next thesis and the researcher also hope to the researchers, to be able to develop this research so that it will increase our knowledge about the metadata course.

REFERENCES

Bowker, N. (2007) *Academic Writing: A Guide to Tertiary Level Writing*. Massey

- University, Palmerston North, 1-112.
- Biber and Susan Conrad. (2001). *Quantitative Corpus-Based Research: Much More Than Bean Counting*. DOI: 10.2307/3587653
- Khadije Ghahremani Mina: 2017. *Exploring Interactive and Interactional Meta-discourse Markers in Discussion Sections of Social and Medical Science Articles*. <http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-71-en.pdf>. DOI: 10.29252/ijree.2.4.11
- Camiciottoli, B. C. (2003). Meta-discourse and ESP reading comprehension: *An exploratory researcher. Reading in a Foreign Language*, 15(1), 28-44.
- Crismore, A. (1984). The rhetoric of textbooks: *Meta-discourse*. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 16(3), 279-296. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0022027840160306>
- Crismore, A. (1989). *Talking with readers: Meta-discourse as rhetorical act*. New York: Peter Lang Publishers.
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R., & Steffensen, M. S. (1993). *Meta-discourse in persuasive writing: A researcher of texts written by American and Finnish university students*. *Written Communication*, 10(1), 39-71. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741088393010001002>
- Dafouz-Milne, E. (2003). Meta-discourse revisited: *A contrastive researcher of persuasive writing in professional discourse*. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, 11(1), 29-57.
- Dahl, T. (2004). Textual meta-discourse in research articles: *a marker of national culture or of academic discipline?* *Journal of pragmatics*, 36(10), 1807-1825. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.05.004>
- Fa-gen, L. (2012). *Identification and functions of Meta-discourse*. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10(1), 846-854.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P. A., Velasco-Sacrista'n, M., Arribas-Bañ'o, A., & Samaniego-Fernández, E. (2001). Persuasion and English: *Meta-discourse in slogans and headlines*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(8), 1291-1307. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)80026-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)80026-6)
- Gholami. Mehrnaz (2014). *An Investigation of Meta-discourse Markers In English Medical texts and their Persian Translation Based On Hyland's Model*. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies* Vol.2, No.2, pp.1-41, June 2014
- Ghafoori, N. and Oghbatalab, R. (2012). A Comparative Study of Meta-discourse in Academic Writing: *Male vs. Female Authors of Research Articles in Applied Linguistics*. *The Journal of Applied*

- Linguistics*. Vol.5, Issue 1, spring 2012.
- Hyland, K. (1994). Hedging in academic writing and EAP textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(3), 239-256.
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic meta-discourse*. *Journal of pragmatics*, 30(4), 437-455.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)00009-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00009-5)
- Hyland, K., (1999). *Talking to students: Meta-discourse in introductory course books*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(1), 3-26.
- Hyland, K. (2000). Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing. London: Longman. Hyland, K., (2001a). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(3), 207-226.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(00\)00012-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00012-0)
- Hyland, K. (2002). Directives: *Argument and engagement in academic writing*. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 215-239.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.2.215>
- Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: *Meta-discourse in L2 postgraduate writing*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(2), 133-151.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.02.001>
- Hyland, K. (2005). Meta-discourse: Exploring interaction in writing (1st ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2007). *Applying a gloss: Exemplifying and reformulating in academic discourse*. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 266-285.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm011>
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Meta-discourse in academic writing: *A reappraisal*. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156>
- Isnawati (2015). *Aspek-Aspek Dan Faktor-Faktor Yang Dapat Meningkatkan minat Peserta Didik Dalam Menulis*. Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris. Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan. Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar
- Le, E. (2004). Active participation within written argumentation: *Meta-discourse and editorialist's authority*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(4), 687-714.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(03\)00032-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00032-8)
- Mauranen, A. (1993a). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: *Metatext in Finnish-English economics texts*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12(1), 3-22.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(93\)90024-I](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(93)90024-I)
- Mauranen, A. (1993b). *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric: A Text Linguistic Researcher*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Publisher.
- Mardiana.wiwik (2018). Analisis Meta-

- discourse Dalam Teks Deskriptif Mahasiswa Teknik Industri. Seminar Nasional Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat -2018. LP4MP Universitas Islam Majapahit
- Mur Dueñ as, M.P. (2007). "I/we focus on...": *A cross-cultural analysis of self-mentions in business management research articles. Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6(2), 143-162.
- Tomyuki. 2015. *Meta-discourse in the introduction sections of Ph.D. theses and research articles*. Journal of English for Academic Purposes
- Schiffrin, D. (1980). Meta-talk: *Organizational and evaluative brackets in discourse. Sociological Inquiry*, 50(3/4), 199-236.
- Susanti (2017). *Interactional Meta-discourse Markers in the Introduction of Dissertations: Differences across English Proficiency Level*.
<https://doi.org/10.24167/celt.v17i2>;
ISSN: 1412-3320 (print); ISSN: 2502-4914
- Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). *Some explanatory discourse on meta-discourse*. *College Composition and Communication*, 36(1), 82-93.
- Vande Kopple, W. J. (2002). Meta-discourse, discourse, and issues in composition and rhetoric. In E. Barton & G. Stygall (Eds.), *Discourse studies in composition* (pp. 91-114). Gresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Williams, J. M. (1981). *Style: Ten lessons in clarity and grace*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Zarei, G. R. & Mansoori, S. (2011). *A contrastive researcher on meta-discourse elements used in humanities vs. non humanities across Persian and English*. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 42-50.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n1p42>

/e