

**METADISOURSE MARKERS IN ENGLISH ESSAYS WRITTEN BY  
INDONESIAN STUDENTS IN EFL SETTING****Rosyida Ekawati<sup>1\*</sup>, Afifah Al Rosyidah<sup>2</sup>**<sup>1</sup>rosyida.ekawati@trunojoyo.ac.id, <sup>2</sup>afifah.rosyidah@trunojoyo.ac.id

UNIVERSITAS TRUNOJOYO MADURA

**ABSTRACT**

English essays commonly use metadiscourse markers to assist and direct readers in understanding the essays. This study aims at identifying and explaining interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers used by male and female students and their roles in the essays. There are 10 essays written by English Department students of second semester at the University of Trunojoyo Madura. The essays were written by male and female students with one of the assigned topics about diet for female and music for male students. This research was conducted as descriptive qualitative research methods, while to show the frequency of metadiscourse markers used by male and female students in the essays, simple quantification was done manually. Results show that both male and female use interactive metadiscourse markers in the essays that consist of transitions, frame markers, and code glosses, while interactional metadiscourse markers consist of hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mention, and engagement markers. Male students tend to use metadiscourse markers lower than female students but they use similar pattern of the markers. Only for self-mention items that is used higher by male students. The uses of metadiscourse markers have a significant role in organizing and producing of written essays to achieve certain communicative purposes.

*Keywords:* Metadiscourse, Interactive, Interactional essays

**A. INTRODUCTION**

Students' essay writing is a kind of academic writing where it is not only oriented toward the content but also comprises numerous rhetorical strategies that assist the project of the writers on the text so that the content and also the writers' attitudes could be easily understood (Musa et al, 2019). In writing an essay, they deal with their social relations with the readers. The orientation to the reader is an important matter in assuring their rhetorical goals in writing because writers should also anticipate and respond to the possible repudiation of their reasons and arguments. The use of metadiscourse could be one of the ways to ease the writers to organize the propositional content of the texts (Asadi, 2018), ease readers understand the text, and convince readers to agree with and accept their arguments.

An essay addresses a certain problem from the author's personal perspectives. In writing an essay, the writers put their point of view in order the ideas that are being conveyed are

easily understood by the readers. In putting ideas into words, the organizations of the ideas which are manifested into texts are intended to be able to offer the knowledge with proper skills of thinking, interpreting, and presenting ideas (Irvin, 2010).

Metadiscourse is considered to be an attempt to guide receivers'/readers' perception of a text using a kind of devices which explicitly organize texts, engage readers, and signal the writer's attitudes to both their material and their audience (Hyland, 2005). In writing an essay, the writers are not simply presenting information by merely elaborating on the idea, but taking it from the perspective of the readers. Therefore, the use of metadiscourse could be an integral part of a writer's rhetorical devices. The functions expose the writer's understanding towards the readers's need, either for explanation, clarification, or guidance (Nasiri, 2013).

There are two main categories for the popular taxonomy of metadiscourse. They are interactive and interactional metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005). The interactive metadiscourse markers comprise transitions markers, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials markers, and code glosses. Meanwhile, the interactional metadiscourse comprises markers for hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions, and engagement markers. Any elements in the interactive metadiscourse category are utilized to make organized and coherent text, while the interactional metadiscourse category is utilized to build interaction between the writers and readers. Metadiscourse is about the developing text or the author's explicit commentary on the author's ongoing discourse. It is used to convey information and show the author's opinion based on the content (Adel, 2006).

Furthermore, there are five sub-categories for interactive metadiscourse markers. They are transition markers, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, and code glosses. Transition markers are mostly in the form of conjunctions and adverbial phrases which utilize readers to interpret the pragmatic relations between stages in an argument. They indicate additive, causative and contrastive connections in the writer's thinking, expressing relationships between stretches of discourse. Frame markers are employed to sequence sections of the text or to arrange an argument internally, often acting as more explicit additive connections. Endophoric markers are expressions that refer to other sections of the text. Evidentials are metalinguistic representations of an idea from another source. Code glosses supply additional information, by rearranging, explaining, or elaborating what has been said, to ensure the reader can rediscover the intended meaning.

In interactional metadiscourse, there are also five sub-categories. The first is hedges such as *possible*, *might* and *perhaps*, that indicate the writer's decision to identify other possible voices and viewpoints and thereby withhold complete commitment to a proposition. Secondly, boosters comprise words such as *clearly*, *obviously* and *demonstrate*, that facilitate the writers to avoid alternatives, avoid conflicting views and express their certainty in what they say. Another marker is attitude markers that show the writer's affective, rather than epistemic, or attitude to propositions. Instead of commenting on the status of information, attitude markers express surprise, agreement, importance, obligation, frustration, and so on. Self-mention refers to the author's explicit presence in the text as measured by the frequent use of pronouns, either first person pronouns or possessive adjectives. The last is engagement markers that explicitly guide the readers to focus their attention and to include them as participants in the discourse.

Studies on metadiscourse on texts were done by Fuertes-Olivera et.al (2001) who studied on slogans and headlines. Meanwhile, Davoodi (2016), Mohamed & Rashid (2017), Alotaibi (2018) conducted studies on the use of metadiscourse in different kind of academic texts. In particular, some studies of metadiscourse in academic writings in Indonesian settings was done by Rustipa (2014) with their different data and focus. Rustipa studied metadiscourse on seven persuasive writings of EFL learners. These previous studies above are different from the proposed current study in which this study is intended to investigate more on the use of interpersonal metadiscourse, both interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers used in the essays written by male and female freshmen of university students at English Department, University of Trunojoyo Madura. This study is intended to identify metadiscourse markers, both interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers of students' essays at English Study Program, University of Trunojoyo Madura, explain the differences of metadiscourse markers in relation to gender, and explain the roles of metadiscourse markers used in the essays.

## **B. METHOD**

To deal with the complexity of meaning in the context of social language, this research was conducted as descriptive qualitative research methods. Qualitative research methods are naturalistic, uncontrolled, and focus more on the problem of validation than on reliability and generalization (Patton, 2002). To support the qualitative analysis, it is also provided the frequency of metadiscourse used by male and female students in the essays by using simple quantification that was done using frequency formula. Source of data for this research are essays written by English Department students of second semester, Academic Year 2018/2019 at the University of Trunojoyo Madura. There are 10 essays from male and female students with one of the assigned topics for male and female. Female students discuss about diet and male students discuss about music. By consideration that they have equal level of proficiency in which they passed Writing Subject in Semester I and took Writing subject in semester II, the essays are purposively chosen. The data of this study are words or phrases that have functions as the markers of interactive and interactional metadiscourse.

This study uses content analysis. The writers are the ones who collected, analyzed and interpreted the data. During the study, the writers carefully read the students' essays word by word from beginning to the end with particular attention to the functions and meaning of the words. In identifying and categorizing the metadiscourse, this study uses the most recent category of metadiscourse markers proposed by Hyland (2005). The interpretation depends on the human judgement to specify the functions of the expressions in the contexts of use. To assess the quality of the result, it also used various viewpoints and approaches derived from the theory and literature to describe the phenomena and context in using the language.

The data were categorized using a coding scheme based on Hyland's (2005) potential metadiscourse markers list. This model is utilized because this category is clear and comprehensive category. To have a record of the specified interpersonal metadiscourse in the essays, then the manual frequency count is employed. After determining the type of interactive and interactional metadiscourse used in the essays, the collected data are categorized based on gender and counted their frequency then analyze using frequency formula. The data is coded by using F/M (female/male), D (Data), and P (Paragraph). For example, if it is coded by (F, D2, P2), it means that the data is female student, D2 = data no

2, and P2 = paragraph 2. Then, the word or phrase that has function as interactive and interactional metadiscourse is elaborated qualitatively to explain the variations and functions of the words or phrases of each category.

**C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

Metadiscourse markers that are found in students’ essays in interactive category are transitions, frame markers, and code glosses, while in interactional category are hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mention, and engagement markers. Both endoporic markers and evidentials are absent as metadiscourse markers in the students’ essays. It can be seen in table 1.

**Table 1. Metadiscourse Markers in Students’ Essays**

Category	Male	%	Female	%	Total
<b>Interactive</b>					
Transitions	16	34%	31	66%	47
Frame Markers	6	20%	24	80%	30
Code Glosses	3	25%	9	75%	12
<b>Interactional</b>					
Hedges	1	11%	8	89%	9
Boosters	2	15%	11	85%	13
Attitude Markers	3	33%	6	67%	9
Self-mention	23	72%	9	28%	32
Engagement Markers	18	28%	47	72%	65
Total	72	33%	145	67%	217

Table 1 below details each category of discourse markers in the essays comprises the number of each category and also percentage of each based on gender category, male and female students. There are 219 metadiscourse markers, 72 (33%) markers used by male students and 145 (67%) discourse markers used by female students.

**Transitions in Students’ Essays**

Transitions that are used in the essays primarily conjunctions which help readers to define the logical relationships between propositions. Transition has a function to express relation between clauses or sentences. Transition markers in students’ essays can be seen in Table 2. There are 47 transitions used in the essays which consist of 16 transitions used by male students and 31 transitions used by female students.

**Table 2. Transition Markers in Students’ Essays**

Transition Markers	Male	Female	Total
after that	0	1	1

and	1	1	2
because	8	7	15
beside	0	1	1
besides	0	1	1
but	4	5	9
even though	1	1	2
however	0	1	1
in addition	0	2	2
moreover	0	1	1
nevertheless	0	1	1
so	2	8	10
therefore	0	1	1
Total	16	31	47

Based on table 2, for both male and female categories, the most prominent and frequently transition used is *because* which appeared 15 times in the essays. Transition marker *so* appears 10 times, *but* appears 9 times, the rest are only once or twice in the essays. Three prominent transition markers are elaborated in the following.

Transition *because* shows the logical relationship between clause to introduce cause or reason.

- (1) Don't forget to avoid sugary drinks and instant fruit juice *because* it contains too much sugar. (F, D3, P2)
- (2) *Because* from tone of music, your brain can easily remember. (M, D6, P3)
- (3) Drinking mineral water helps you lose weight *because* it flushes down ....(F, D10, P2)

From examples no (1) – (3) above, as one of the interactive metadiscourse markers, transition *because* connects one clause to another clause in a sentence which function to show the cause. In example (1), the writer wanted to remind readers who are in diet to avoid instant fruit juice because it contains too much sugar which is not good for diet. In example (2), concerning with the music which is claimed as one of the ways to memorize vocabulary, the writer provide evidence how the music works for it. In example (3), in relation with diet program, it is shown how mineral water is good to lose weight.

The second transition marker frequently used is *so*. This transition introduces an effect or result.

- (4) You can choose what you like the most *so* you enjoy and make it effectively. (F,D3,F5)
- (5) The calories expended aren't comparable to those that enter, *so* the calories accumulate and turn into fat. (F, D4, P1)
- (6) *So* this article is made to give information about some of music that have a function for mind therapy. (M, D9, P1)

The examples (4) – (5) above provide clearer understanding of *so* as transition marker to connect clause in a sentence, while example no (6) shows connection between sentence. Both have function as connector showing result.

Transition marker *but* is used to contrast. The following examples are transition marker *but* used in the essays.

- (7) *But* dieting also have positive effects. (F, D, P1)
- (8) All food is still needed for the body, *but* you have to arrange the portion well. (F, D4, P2)
- (9) *But* something that make this music different is people must love this music first. (M, D9, P4)

Transition markers *but* in examples (7) – (9) above are used to contrast between clauses in a sentence or between sentences. The other transition markers used in the essays are *after that, and, beside, besides, even though, however, in addition, moreover, nevertheless, therefore*. They also connect clauses in a sentence or between sentences. All of the transitions used are intended to make logical connection between propositions in the essays.

### Frame Markers in Students' Essays

Frame markers are commonly used to sequence parts of the text. They can also show the order arguments in the text. They have four specific purposes i.e. to sequence, to label stage, to announce goal, to shift topic. In the essays, there are 30 frame markers used by male and female students which comprise only one type of frame marker i.e. to sequence that use *first, second, third, fourth, fifth, the last, and then*.

**Table 3. Frame Markers in Students' Essays**

Frame Markers	Male	Female	Total
Fifth	0	1	1
First	1	6	7
Fourth	0	1	1
Last	1	1	2
Second	2	6	8
the first	1	0	1
the last	1	4	5
Then	0	2	2
Third	0	3	3
Total	6	24	30

The following examples are frame markers in the essays. The choice of frame marker is intended to show the sequence between sentences.

- (10) *First*, choose the right food intake... (F, D4, P2)
- (11) *Second* benefit is music can help learning process. (M,D6,P3)
- (12) *The last* is folk music. (M,D9,P4)

### Code Glosses in Students' Essays

Code glosses give additional information, by explaining or elaborating what has been mentioned, to make sure the readers are able to understand the writer's intended meaning. There are 12 code glosses used both by male and female students in their essays.

**Table 4. Code Glosses in Students' Essays**

Code Glosses	Male	Female	Total
especially	2	2	4
for example	0	4	4
some examples	0	1	1
such as	0	2	2
the examples	1	0	1
Total	3	9	12

Code glosses in the essays are in the following examples (13) and (14). They provide additional information on what have been explained in order to give clearer understanding of the proposition.

(13) Some negative of diet are ... *for example* typhus (F, D1, P2)

(14) *The examples* of classic music like Beethoven (Love story piano), Mozart (Sonata ABC), etc. (M,D9,P2)

### Hedges in Students' Essays

Hedges are used by the writer to express the decision about his/her opinion and commitment to a proposition. They can reveal commitment and open dialogue. There are 9 hedge markers in students' essays. Male students use only once, while female students use 8 times. They are *generally*, *maybe*, and *usually*. The details frequency of the use of hedges can be seen in Table 5.

**Table 5. Hedges in Students' Essays**

Hedges	Male	Female	Total
generally	0	1	1
maybe	0	1	1
usually	1	6	7
Total	1	8	9

The examples of hedges used in the essays are as follow.

(15) *Generally*, fast food contains of higher calories and fat. (F,D2,P3)

(16) *Usually*, the indigestion experienced by a person on a diet is diarrhea, nausea and constipation (F,D5,P2)

In example (15), *generally* shows the writer's point of view about fast food. In example (16), *usually* also provides the writer's point of view related to diet. Both hedges express open dialogue because both are not the fixed propositions and there can be some possibilities. They show the writer's decision to recognize other viewpoints or possibilities and be open to negotiate with the readers.

### Boosters in Students' Essays

Boosters allow the writer to close any alternatives, avoid any different views, and express his/her certainty in what he/she said. They are used to show certainty or close dialogue. In the essays, there are 13 boosters used. Two boosters used by male and 11 boosters used by

female students. *Must* is the highest frequency of use showing certainty. Others are *actually*, *basically*, *of course*, and *really* that are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6. Boosters in Students' Essays**

Boosters	Male	Female	Total
actually	0	1	1
basically	0	1	1
must	1	7	8
of course	1	1	2
really	0	1	1
Total	2	11	13

The following is the examples of using boosters in the essays.

(17) So, your food and your activity *must be* balanced. (F,D2,P1)

(18) They already know that if they are stress, they will ... and *of course* the cost is pretty expensive. (M,D9,P1)

In example (17), the writer provides a certain statement showing close dialogue. It expresses the obligation of balancing food intake and activity regarding to diet. The example (18) also gives idea of certainty of the writer's proposition. Both statements using boosters show no alternatives and express certainty instead of doubt.

#### Attitude Markers in Students' Essays

Attitude markers are used to express opinion or evaluation of a proposition. They can be indicated by the presence of attitude verbs, sentence adverbs, and adjectives. Attitude markers are used 9 times both by male and female students in the essays as shown in Table 7. Each has three items of attitude markers.

**Table 7. Attitude Markers in Students' Essays**

Attitude Markers	Male	Female	Total
have to	0	3	3
I think	1	0	1
it is important	0	1	1
Should	1	2	3
Unfortunately	1	0	1
Total	3	6	9

The followings (19) and (20) are the examples of the use of attitude markers in the essays.

(19) So I suggest you who want to try diet, you *should* try some ways of diet but still as you need. (F,D3,P7)

(20) And *I think* Islamic music has several benefits for our life. (M,D7,P1)

Both propositions in (19) and (20) show the writer's affective, rather than epistemic, attitude to propositions. Those statements using *should* and *I think* are based on the writer's assessment.

#### Self-Mention in Students' Essays

Self-mention indicates the explicit authorial presence in the text and gives information about the writer. There are 32 self-mention markers in the essays dominated by male students which consist of 23 items of self-mention markers, while female students use 8 times in their essays. The details are in Table 8 below.

**Table 8. Self-Mention in Students' Essays**

Self-Mention	Male	Female	Total
I	0	2	2
my	1	0	1
our	14	6	20
ourselves	1	0	1
us	2	0	2
we	5	1	6
Total	23	9	32

The information about the writer is shown by the use of personal pronouns projecting the author into the text in a powerful way. The examples are the following.

- (21) Moreover, the extreme diet is not a great way to get ideal body, because it will harm *our* body.(F,D5,P1)  
 (22) Music has several benefits for *our* mind, especially for teenager. (M,D6,P5)

The use of possessive adjective *our* in both examples (21) and (22) indicate the existence of the writer in the texts.

### Engagement Markers in Students' Essays

Engagement markers are tools that address readers, either to focus their attention or include them as discourse participants. They explicitly build relationship with reader. In the essays, there are 65 engagement markers both used by male and female students. They are only the address for second person *you*, *your*, and *yourself* as shown in Table 9.

**Table 9. Engagement Markers in Students' Essays**

Engagement Markers	Male	Female	Total
You	13	32	45
Your	5	14	19
Yourself	0	1	1
Total	18	47	65

The examples of the use of engagement markers in the essays are shown below in examples (23) – (25).

- (23) A good choice of menu holds an important thing for the success of *your* diet.(F,D2,P2)  
 (24) Nowadays, *you* can choose which one is the best way for dieting.(F,D3,P1)  
 (25) While *you* listen to *your* favorite song, *you* will be easier to remove *your* stress. (M,D6,P2)

From the examples above, they can be understood that engagement markers *you* or *your* are the devices to address readers and used to meet the readers as discourse participants.

The English essays written by Indonesian students in EFL setting are used metadiscourse markers to achieve certain communicative purposes. From discussion of the data examples (1) – (25) above, the interactive metadiscourse markers consist of transitions, frame markers, code glosses, while interactional metadiscourse markers are hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mention, and engagement markers.

Interaction metadiscourse occurs 89 times or 41% of the overall metadiscourse markers. The writer used those markers to interact with their texts. They are the markers used by writers to assist and guide readers to understand the messages of the text. For both male and female students, they use transitions as the numerous markers among interaction metadiscourse. These occurrences are similar to those at standard proficient writing exposed in Heng and Tan's study (2010) that transitions dominate the occurrences. With the absent of the use of evidentials and endophoric markers, frame markers are used only to direct the sequence in the texts, and code glosses to elaborate or to give additional information. They are to ease readers to follow the flow of the writers' propositions. From the total interactive metadiscourse markers, male students use lower metadiscourse markers (25 times) than female students (64 times). They have the same patterns of metadiscourse used, which is in accordance with Pasaribu's findings (2017), essays that are written by both male and female students have similar patterns.

For interactional metadiscourse markers, between male and female students also use the same pattern. Total occurrences are 128 times (59 %) which are used by male students (47 times) and female students (81 times). Female students have a tendency to utilize more interactional metadiscourse than male students.

In general, interactive metadiscourse markers used are lower than interactional metadiscourse markers in the essays. It is different from several other metadiscourse studies, such as studies conducted by Intraprawat & Steffensen (1995), Jalilifar & Alipour (2007), Firoozian et al., (2012) and Rustipa (2014). All those studies found that the use of interactive metadiscourse is higher than interactional metadiscourse. But, these findings are in accordance with the study conducted by Heng & Tan (2010) that found the interactional metadiscourse is higher than interactive metadiscourse.

Interactional metadiscourse strategies can have a significant role in academic writing because of the dialogic characteristics of the academic genre. It is in accordance with Hyland's (2005) remarks that interactional metadiscourse elements play a crucial role in contributing new knowledge and making academic claims. They were found to carry out an essential rhetorical role in attaining effective interactions with readers in which it also has similar finding from the study conducted by Khedri et al (2013) in which they stated that interactional metadiscourse features pave the way for writers to interact with readers and get access to them. In the essays, the writers built persuasion, knowledge, and successful academic arguments so that the use of interactional metadiscourse is more dominant than the use of interactive metadiscourse. Meanwhile, interactive metadiscourse tends to indicate the ways the writers project themselves into their arguments to declare their attitudes and commitments to the readers.

#### **D. CONCLUSION**

Metadiscourse markers have a prominent role in the way to organize and produce written essays. Interactive metadiscourse is utilized throughout the text that guides the readers to the level of comprehension with the existence of transition markers, frame markers, and code glosses. Interactional metadiscourse markers are utilized to pursue interaction by intruding and commenting on their message and to include he himself/she herself in the text. In total, male students use lower metadiscourse markers than females. There is only one kind of metadiscourse markers that is used higher than females, i.e. self-mention to announce their presences in the essays which can be used to promote themselves and their personal contributions. Both male and female students use similar variation for both interaction and interactional metadiscourse markers. Interpersonal metadiscourse, both interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers, as the linguistic tools are used to make the texts clearer. It is considered as a concept of interaction among the writer with their texts from one side and between them and the readers from the other.

## REFERENCES

- Adel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English (Vol. 24)*. John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Alotaibi, H. S. (2018). Metadiscourse in dissertation acknowledgments: Exploration of gender differences in EFL texts. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 18(4).
- Asadi, Ali. (2018). Enhancing Writing Skills of English Learners through Metadiscourse Resources. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 42, 3 (1).
- Davoodi, Kobra. (2016). On the Use of Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in Conclusion Section of Language Testing Articles. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*.3 (4), 211-216.
- Firoozian, A., Khajavy, H., & 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. <https://doi.org/10.5430/elr.v1n1p88>
- Fuertes-Olivera, P. A., Velasco-Sacristán, M., Arribas-Baño, A., & Samaniego-Fernández, E. (2001). Persuasion and advertising English: Metadiscourse in slogans and headlines. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33(8), 1291-1307.
- Heng, C. S., & Tan, H. (2010). Extracting and comparing the intricacies of metadidcourse of two written persuasive corpora. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Tecnology (IJEDICT)*, 6(3), 124-146. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.24>
- Mohamed, A. F., & Rashid, R. A. (2017). The metadiscourse markers in good undergraduate writers' essays corpus. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(6), 213-220.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Intraprawat, P., & Steffensen, M. S. (1995). The use of metadiscourse in good and poor ESL essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 253-272. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743\(95\)90012-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(95)90012-8)
- Irvin, L. Lennie. (2010). What Is “Academic” Writing? in *Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing, Volume 1*. South California: Parlor Press.
- Jalilifar, A., & Alipour, M. (2007). How explicit instruction makes a difference: Metadiscourse markers and EFL learners' reading comprehension skill. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 38(1), 35-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2007.10850203>

- Khedri, M., Ebrahimi, S.J., Heng, C.S. (2013). Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in Academic Research Article Result and Discussion Sections. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies – Vol 19 (1): 65 – 74*
- Musa, Almudgaffari, Hussin, Supyan., Ho, I. Abdullah. (2019). Interaction in Academic L2 writing: An analysis of Interactional Metadiscourse Strategies in Applied Linguistics Research Articles. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 25(3): 16 – 32 .<http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2019-2503-02>
- Nasiri, S. (2013). Exploring the significant role of meta-discourse in academic writing for a discourse community by academic members. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 2(1), 67-74.
- Pasaribu, T. A. (2017). Male and female students' use of textual discourse markers in writing academic essays. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 17(1).
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. SAGE Publications, inc.
- Rustipa, K. (2014). Metadiscourse in Indonesian EFL learners' persuasive texts: A case study at English Department, UNISBANK. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 4(1), 44.