



METADISCOURSE MARKERS ON STUDENT'S ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING IN THE 3RD SEMESTER, ENGLISH EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MATARAM

Diana Sukandi^{1*}, Arifuddin², Untung Waluyo³

¹²³English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
University of Mataram, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: dianasukandi042@gmail.com

Abstract: The results of previous research conducted by Fitriah (2016) show that when using metadiscourse markers, there are still many students who find it difficult to distinguish between facts and ideas. So many students who use metadiscourse markers categorized in different metadiscourse sub-categories function in the same way. Therefore, the researcher is interested in finding out about the use of metadiscourse markers in the argumentative writing results of 3rd semester students. The aims of this research are 1) to investigate the types of metadiscourse established by Hyland (2004) used in the argumentative writing of 3rd semester students of English Education, University of Mataram. 2) To explain the proper use of metadiscourse markers in writing to improve the argumentative writing skills of the students in the 3rd semester, English education program, University of Mataram. 3) To describe the most dominant of metadiscourse markers used in the argumentative writing of 3rd semester students of English Education, University of Mataram. The total population in the study was 30 3rd semester students of English Language Education at the University of Mataram who had completed their final argumentative writing assignment, and 10 of them were selected by convenience as the research sample. The results show that 1) students in presenting their arguments use all types of metadiscourse markers found in the interactive type, such as transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials and code glosses. Likewise with the interactional metadiscourse markers, such as hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mention, proposed by Hyland (2004). 2) the use of metadiscourse markers can be applied appropriately, but there are still some that are inappropriate for conveying an argument as found in datum 3.2, 7.1, 8.3 and 10.2, the writer is still wrong in using metadiscourse markers of the same type. 3) the most dominant type of metadiscourse marker used is transitional marker in interactive metadiscourse, with a total percentage of 39.9%, this shows that students present their arguments using appropriate semantic links at each point of the argument presented.

Keywords: Metadiscourse Markers, Argumentative Writing

INTRODUCTION

The term of "metadiscourse" is used frequently in discourse analysis and language instruction to describe an intriguing and relatively new way of conceiving the relationship between those who make texts and those who read the text. According to Hyland (2005), there are many different ways that metadiscourse can be interpreted and it is frequently used to refer to different aspects of language use.

Metadiscourse is a crucial component of writing that improves the coherence and consistency of the text. Students will take an argumentative writing course in semester 3 that teaches them how to write persuasively. In writing an argumentative essay, student must research the subject, collect, generate, and assess supporting data, and develop a clear opinion about it. In addition, argumentative writing can be understood as a style of writing paragraphs intended to persuade or convince the reader. Content for argumentative writing consists of explanations, proofs, reasons, or objective reviews followed by examples, analogies, and cause and effect. In writing an argument, the writer must be able to persuade and convince the reader about his / her writing. By using the appropriate metadiscourse markers in writing, the writer can more effectively convey the intended message from the contents of the writing to the reader, even in the context of the argument to be conveyed.

Metadiscourse besides functioning to clarify the author's intent and purpose in conveying the contents of his or her writing to readers, it also plays a very important role in the effectiveness of writing. Based on the results of Fitrah research (2016), there are still many students who find it difficult to distinguish between facts and ideas. Therefore, many students are functioning signifiers categorized in metadiscourse sub-categories in the same way. Based on a phenomenon discovered by Fitrah (2016) related to the use of metadiscourse markers in Argumentative Essays for English students in Maulana Malik Ibrahim University, Malang. The researcher is curious to find out more about the use of metadiscourse markers in the final project of the students in argumentative writing class of English Program in University of Mataram.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study was case study that used descriptive qualitative method. The source of the data in this study was the final project of 10 students in the 3rd semester who took the argumentative writing class. The sampling method used in this study was non-probability that was convenience sampling, with the consideration that students had taken the Argumentative Writing class and was willing to give permission to analyses their writing. In analyzing the data the researcher through some steps, such like recording, identifying, coding and conclusion.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Analysis of metadiscourse markers was carried out using written language products which were categorized as Argumentative writing. In this study, the results of writing from third semester students in Argumentative writing courses were used. The written product was the original works of the students in Argumentative Writing Class.

Types of Metadiscourse Markers used in Students' Argumentative Writing

Based on the findings, there was 127 metadiscourse marker items used in 10 Argumentative writing student papers, with 100 items classified as interactive metadiscourse and 27 things classified as interactional metadiscourse.

Table1. Interactive Metadiscourse Markers Found on Students' writing using theory by Hyland (2004)

No	Title of Student's Argumentative Writing		Interactive Metadiscourse					Total used
			Transition	Frame Marker	Endophoric Marker	Evidential	Code Glosses	
1	Why	Play Game?	8	1	-	-	3	12
2	Smoking	has Become Hobby for Many Cigarette Lovers.	5	3	1	1	2	12
3	Smoking	Should be Banned in the World	3	2	-	2	2	9
4	The Advantages	of Internet	2	-	-	1	1	4
5	Global Warming	in Indonesia	4	-	-	-	5	9
6	The Waste Problem	which is Still in the Public Spotlight	7	-	2	-	-	9
7	About	Cigarettes	10	1	-	3	2	16
8	Brunch	is not Good for Health	4	-	3	-	2	9
9	Is	Playing Games Dangerous?	6	1	-	-	3	10
10	Cigarette		6	1	-	-	3	10
Total Used			55	9	6	7	23	100

Table2. Interactional Metadiscourse Markers Found on Students' writing using theory by Hyland (2004)

No	Title of Student's Argumentative Writing		Interactional Metadiscourse					Total Used
			Hedges	Booster	Attitude Marker	Engagement Marker	Self-Mention	
1	Why	Play Game?	1	-	-	-	-	1

2	Smoking has Become Hobby for Many Cigarette Lovers.	-	1	2	-	-	3
3	Smoking Should be Banned in the World	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	The Advantages of Internet	1	1	-	-	-	2
5	Global Warming in Indonesia	-	-	-	1	1	2
6	The Waste Problem which is Still in the Public Spotlight	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	About Cigarettes	-	3	-	1	-	4
8	Brunch is not Good for Health	-	-	1	-	8	9
9	Is Playing Games Dangerous?	-	-	-	2	4	6
10	Cigarette	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Used		2	5	3	4	13	27

Based on the table above, the researcher examined the argumentative writing of third semester English education students using Hyland's (2004) theory of metadiscourse markers. The total amount of words used in the ten writings is 4,857 words. The types and total number of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers utilized by third semester students in argumentative writing are shown in Table 1 and 2.

Appropriate Used of Metadiscourse

Based on the data, it's found that students are able to use metadiscourse markers appropriately. However, there are some uses that are still inappropriate that need to be straightened out by the researcher. The use of *but*. *But* in this data is at the beginning of the sentence which also opens the paragraph. In opening a new paragraph that has a contrasting idea, the writer can use *However*. *However* is actually also a transitional markers in

Interactive Metadiscourse, but this is what's interesting about metadiscourse, not all types of the same metadiscourse have the same function.

Furthermore, the use of metadiscourse transitional markers (*Furthermore*). This marker is inappropriate use in sentences because the previous argument contrasts so sharply with the next argument. While *furthermore* is generally serves to add ideas to support arguments or previous ideas. So the correct phrase to use for the datum above is *On the other hand / however*. By using these phrases the reader can be more directed to understand the text.

In addition, the inappropriate use of metadiscourse markers in several student argumentative writings is found in this data, the writers use transitional markers in the form of *But on the other hand* and *However on the other hand*. It can be seen the inappropriate of its use, the writer places two types of transitional markers that have the same function in one sentence and their order. However, but and on the other hand are the same type of metadiscourse markers and have the same function is to combine two contrasting ideas or different ideas in a text. So, if the writer uses this type of interactive metadiscourse marker, the writer must choose one of the right phrases in the writing to be made.

The Most Dominant Used of Metadiscourse Markers

Table3.The Frequency and Percentage of Metadiscourse Markers

No.	Metadiscourse Markers	Frequency	Percentage
Interactive Metadiscourse			
1.	Transitions	55	39.9%
2.	Frame Markers	9	6.5%
3.	Endophoric Markers	6	4.3%
4.	Evidential	7	5.1%
5.	Code Glosses	23	16.7%
Interactional Metadiscourse			
6.	Hedges	2	1.4%
7.	Boosters	5	3.7%
8.	Attitude Markers	14	10.1%
9.	Engagement Markers	4	2.8%
10.	Self-Mentions	13	9.5%
Total		138	
Maximum		55	
Minimum		2	

From the table above it can be concluded that Transitions are the metadiscourse markers most often used by students to present their arguments. With a total percentage of 39.9%, this shows that students presented their arguments using the right semantic link at each point of the argument that was conveyed.

Meanwhile, the least metadiscourse marker found was Hedges with a percentage of 1.4% compared to other markers. These results indicate that students present their arguments to be presented as propositions that can open negotiations with the audience or readers. Hedges also imply that a statement is based on the writer's sound reasoning rather than specific knowledge, indicating the degree of credence that must be attributed to it.

Discussion

The findings above offer some reasonable theories about how metadiscourse is used, which will be quickly explained. But the primary topic that needs to be covered first is the research question. The findings demonstrate that the mentioned words, phrases, or sentence fragments satisfy the requirements as metadiscourse markers in identifying students' arguments in their written work. This can be demonstrated by identifying the highly significant impact that differences in the use of metadiscourse markers have on conversation. In other words, the author's argument will be more persuasive if the appropriate metadiscourse markers are used. For example, "can be" represents the authors' doubts about what they are saying. In other words, choosing the right use of metadiscourse markers plays an important role in giving weight to the author's argument. In addition, the use of metadiscourse markers finds the author's attitude in assessing and assessing arguments, either from the authority of others as supporting statements or the author's own ideas. The use of certain metadiscourse has several functions, such as strengthening, confirming, clarifying, and making the author's points of argument clearer.

As we know that this research concerns argumentation, the discussion needs to cover every important aspect of writing argumentative essays. One of them refers to other texts to reinforce the author's own ideas. This is how an argumentative writer provides evidence to justify and support statements or even claims in their own work. This can be seen from the use of "As reported by the scientist" which was successfully operated by the author. The data is used as a parameter for more academic results. So putting other people's ideas where relevant and functioning properly can provide points of credit for the arguments presented. Therefore, in an academic context, the degree of argumentation that uses a reference system is higher, than just writing that only puts forward its own ideas without any support.

Other results from these findings also show that the use of certain markers that fall into one metadiscourse sub-category plays the same role. In other words, some students operate on a type of metadiscourse that functions similarly in their writing. For example, the use of transitions markers which tend to be placed and functioned to express something that contrasts (However on the other hand). This can mean that students as writers are still often mistaken in using these two phrases usually because they follow the format of the text in Indonesian. But on the other hand in Indonesian is *tetapi di sisi lain*, which in that language is normal. But in the use of metadiscourse markers based on Hyland's theory (2004) that but

and on the other hand have the same function, to connect two contrasting sentences. So, the writer should use one of them.

The results of this study show some differences from some of the results of previous studies. In a study conducted by Anwardeen, et al. (2013) conducted research on Malaysian students who speak English as a second language about the use of metadiscourse in argumentative essays. The results of this study indicate that Malaysian students are not able to use interpersonal metadiscourse markers in writing argumentative essays effectively. It is important to use more interpersonal metadiscourse markers in writing argumentative essays because this discourse will help the writer to interact with the reader as they read. Argumentative essays that contain more interpersonal discourse are more convincing and will be more effective in convincing the reader to believe the points of the text being written. The main goal of argumentative writing is to convince the reader to believe the author's point of view. If the writer fails to interact with the reader with his writing, this main goal is difficult to achieve. Using interpersonal discourse effectively is a way to produce a well-written argumentative essay. Meanwhile, the results of the research conducted by the researchers showed that third semester students at the English language education department at the University of Mataram were able to convey their arguments using interpersonal metadiscourse markers, both interactive and interactional types. Furthermore, the results of another study, Rutipa's research (2014) on Metadiscourse in Indonesian EFL Learners' Persuasive Texts, showed that the use of textual metadiscourse markers was 16.34% higher than interpersonal metadiscourse markers.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher came to the following conclusions. First, students in presenting their arguments use all types of metadiscourse markers found in the interactive type, such as transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidential and code glosses. Likewise with the interactional metadiscourse markers, such as hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mention, proposed by Hyland (2004). Thus, this study is in line with the theory that metadiscourse markers play an important role in determining students' arguments in their texts. Second, the use of metadiscourse markers can be applied appropriately, but there are still some that are inappropriate for conveying an argument as found in some of data, the writer is still wrong in using metadiscourse markers of the same type. Third, the most dominant type of metadiscourse marker used is transitional marker in interactive metadiscourse, with a total percentage of 39.9%, this shows that students present their arguments using appropriate semantic links at each point of the argument presented.

REFERENCES

Anwardeen, Luyee, Gabriel, & Kalajahi, (2015). An Analysis: The Use of Metadiscourse in Argumentative Writing by Tertiary Level of Students. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, Vol. 6 No. 9; 2013. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n9p83>

- Deasy (2016) "The Interpersonal Metadiscourse in Finding and Discussion Sections of Students' Skripsi in English Department of Universitas Negeri Jakarta", *Jakarta: Published Thesis*.
- Fitrah (2016). Metadsicourse in Indonesian Student's Argumentative Essays, *Malang, Published Thesis*.
- Hyland (1998). Exploring corporate rhetoric: metadiscourse in the CEO's letter. *Journal of Business Communication. Vol 35 No 2*.
- Rustipa, (2014). Metadiscourse in Indonesian EFL learners' persuasive texts: A case study at English Department, UNISBANK. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 4(1),44*.