EXPLORING METADISCOURSE IN STUDENTS' NARRATIVE WRITING: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE GUNTUR MODEL

Utami Rosalina[1*], Tria Aditia Nugraha[2], Mochamad Guntur[3] , Fauziah Al Fiana[4], Lukman Hakim Nur Hidayatullah[5]
[1]utami.rosaline@gmail.com, [2]aditianugrahatria@gmail.com, [3]gunturmath@gmail.com, [4]fauziahal1702@gmail.com, [5]lukman12g@gmail.com

INSTITUT PRIMA BANGSA

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the use of metadiscourse in students' narrative writing and to discuss its implications for designing the GUNTUR model as a potential writing strategy for high school students. The research method used was qualitative descriptive by analyzing the narrative text of grade XI students at SMAN 7 and SMAN 5 Cirebon. A total of 75 narrative texts were collected from 65 students and examined using metadiscourse analysis to identify the use of discourse features within students' writing. The results showed that textual markers dominated students' writing, especially logical connectives (81% in SMAN 7 and 82% in SMAN 5) and frame markers (15% in SMAN 7 and 17% in SMAN 5), which helped maintain cohesion and storyline. Meanwhile, the use of interpersonal markers is much more limited, with person markers (64% in SMAN 7 and 54% in SMAN 5) and attitude markers (22% in SMAN 7 and 30% in SMAN 5) as the main categories, while hedges, boosters, and relational markers appear relatively rarely. These findings confirm that students tend to master textual aspects more than interpersonally. The results suggest the need for instructional support, such as the GUNTUR model, to help balance these two dimensions and enhance students' metalinguistic awareness. Further research is recommended to test the application of this model to different types of texts and broader educational contexts.

Keywords: GUNTUR Model, Metadiscourse, Narrative Writing, Senior High School Students, Writing Skills Development

A. INTRODUCTION

Writing skills in English are one of the essential competencies that high school students in Indonesia need to master. Writing plays a vital role in the development and expression of language (Fareed et al., 2016). These skills not only serve as a means to express ideas and ideas, but also as an important indicator in assessing students' academic abilities. In national examinations, classroom assessments, and even international tests, writing is often used as a benchmark to evaluate students' mastery of the language. Moreover, in a globalized era where communication across cultures is indispensable, the ability to write effectively in

English enables students to participate in academic, professional, and social contexts beyond the classroom (Qin & Uccelli, 2019).

The very rapid development of a collection of texts and to analyze them has greatly changed the way of understanding writing (Kaszubski, 2003; Pearson & Abdollahzadeh, 2023). Writing is no longer viewed merely as a static product but also as a dynamic process that reflects thinking, decision-making, and interaction between the writer and the reader. Digital platforms such as blogs, collaborative documents, and learning management systems have blurred the boundary between academic and non-academic writing, making writing a more interactive and socially constructed practice (Godwin-jones, 2021). These developments highlight the dynamic nature of writing as both a cognitive activity, where students plan, organize, and evaluate their ideas, and a social practice, where writing functions to engage with readers and negotiate meaning. Thus, writing requires mastery of grammar, vocabulary, text structure, and the ability to organize ideas cohesively and coherently. Beyond these technical aspects, good writing also demands rhetorical awareness, or the ability of writers to engage readers and convey messages effectively. This includes the use of metadiscourse markers to signal relationships between ideas, guide readers through the text, and express stance (Hyland, 2005a). Clear, cohesive, simple, and accurate delivery of ideas are therefore key criteria for evaluating the quality of writing (Khieder, 2012). In academic contexts, successful writing not only demonstrates linguistic accuracy but also rhetorical competence, since readers must be able to follow the argument, recognize the purpose, and engage with the writer's perspective (Lee & Deakin, 2016).

In the context of EFL (English as a Foreign Language), this challenge becomes even greater because students have to write in a language that is not their native language. This often requires additional effort in managing linguistic, structural, and rhetorical demands simultaneously. Many EFL learners struggle with limited vocabulary, lack of grammatical control, and difficulties in developing well-structured and coherent texts (Fareed et al., 2016). Furthermore, rhetorical differences between the students' first language and English may lead to problems in organizing arguments or in using appropriate discourse markers (Hyland & Hyland, 2019). These challenges not only hinder students' ability to produce high-quality writing but also affect their confidence and motivation in writing tasks. For this reason, targeted pedagogical interventions, such as models that integrate linguistic, rhetorical, and metadiscourse elements, are crucial to support EFL learners in overcoming these barriers. Various studies reveal that high school students in Indonesia still face serious difficulties in writing academic texts. Students often feel less confident in writing, especially when they have to implement strategies that maintain coherence and connectivity between parts of the text (Cer, 2019; Crossley & McNamara, 2016). Additionally, most students tend to write only to meet the demands of the assignment, without understanding how their text can build interaction with the reader. One of the reasons is the lack of attention to the use of metadiscourse in learning to write.

In fact, metadiscourse functions an important function in directing readers, affirming the author's position, and increasing the cohesion and coherence of the text (Hyland & Hyland, 2019; Zou & Hyland, 2020). Metadiscourse is a theory in the field of linguistics, while the understanding of metalinguistics related to linguistic thought processes and decision-making in writing is mostly rooted in the realm of cognitive psychology (Myhill et al., 2023). Metadiscourse today has developed into one of the well-established approaches in the study of discourse analysis, especially in academic texts (Consonni et al., 2020; Hyland & Kevin,

2018). Although both aspects of metadiscourse are equally important for showing the interpersonal side of a text, the use of elements that serve to organize the flow or structure of the discourse, as opposed to those that express the author's attitude, still receive less attention (Hyland & Jiang, 2020). Thus, the main attention is directed to how the author seeks to achieve goals, both by strengthening and maintaining, conveying attitudes, and displaying personal involvement (Abdi, 2002; Stuart & Vafaeimehr, 2015; Gillaerts & Velde, 2010).

Recent studies show that explicit teaching of metadiscourse is able to improve the quality of writing of foreign language learners. Research in Indonesia shows that although students are aware of the importance of reader engagement, the implementation of metadiscourse strategies is still minimal due to a lack of conceptual understanding (Elyana, 2025). These findings show that there is a gap in writing teaching, especially at the high school level, where students are not used to using metadiscourse as a writing strategy. The absence of a directed strategy in learning to write often makes students experience obstacles in composing ideas and developing paragraphs that are coherent (Ghasemi, 2013; Richards & Renandya, 2022). In addition, learning activities are still dominated by traditional approaches that emphasize more on the final outcome, without giving adequate evaluative attention to the learning process itself.

As a solution to this problem, this study analyzed the GUNTUR (Guide, Understand, Nurture, Think, Utilize, Reflect) Model. This model is designed to provide a writing learning experience that focuses not only on linguistic aspects, but also on rhetorical awareness through metadiscourse. With the *Guide* stage, students get initial direction as a lighter; *Understand* encourages conceptual understanding; *Nurture* fosters motivation and confidence; *Think* trains critical thinking skills; *Utilize* gives students the opportunity to practice metadiscourse-based writing strategies; and *Reflect* facilitates students' self-evaluation of the student's writing process. The urgency of this research lies in the need to analysis a writing learning strategy that is in accordance with the needs of high school students in Indonesia. So far, metadiscourse research has been carried out more at the university level or in the context of formal academic writing. There is still limited research that specifically examines the application of metadiscourse at the high school level, even more so through a qualitative approach that explores the experiences of students and teachers in depth. In addition, most of the research in Indonesia is still general descriptive and has not systematically examined the existence of frame markers, transitions, and sequence markers as important structural elements in early academic texts (Akoto, 2020). The lack of focus on the explicit forms of these markers causes the structure of student papers to become less clear, which has an impact on the low persuasiveness and credibility of the writing (Elyana, 2025). This research seeks to fill this gap by emphasizing the process and meaning of the writing learning experience that arises from GUNTUR Model.

The novelty of this research lies in the analyzing of a metadiscourse-based writing learning model that is explicitly implemented in high school. Unlike previous research that focused more on quantitative outcomes in the form of writing scores, this study prioritizes a qualitative approach to understand how students build rhetorical awareness, internalize metadiscourse strategies, and reflect on their experiences in the writing process. The contribution of this research is theoretical and practical. Theoretically, this study expands the study of metadiscourse-based writing learning in the context of secondary education. Practically, this study provides an alternative for English teachers in high school to

implement writing learning strategies that are more innovative, reflective, and in accordance with the needs of students. The GUNTUR model is expected to help teachers guide students in producing writing that is not only grammatically correct, but also communicatively effective. Thus, the purpose of this study is to analyze a metadiscourse-based GUNTUR Model as a writing learning strategy for high school students in Cirebon, and identify the implications of this model on improving students' writing skills.

B. METHOD

This study employed a descriptive qualitative design to analyze the use of metadiscourse in students' narrative writing. The findings from this analysis are expected to inform the future of the GUNTUR model as a writing learning strategy for high school students. Participants in this study are grade XI students from two high schools in Cirebon, namely SMA Negeri 5 and SMA Negeri 7 Cirebon. The selection of participants was carried out by purposive sampling technique, which is to select research subjects based on certain considerations that are relevant to the research objectives. Grade XI students were chosen because at this level students already have experience writing texts in English, especially narrative texts, but still often have difficulties in organizing ideas, using the right language, and developing arguments sequentially. The participation were selected to explore students' current writing skills and patterns of metadiscourse use. The insights gained from their writing serve as a basis for informing the design of the GUNTUR Model, as this study remains at the needs analysis and exploratory stage.

Tabel 1. Demographic of Participants

School	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
SMA Negeri 7 Cirebon	16	16	36
SMA Negeri 5 Cirebon	9	20	29

Data collection is carried out through several complementary techniques. First, class observation to see how students interact in the writing learning process using the GUNTUR Model. Second, document analysis was employed by collecting students' written work to evaluate the development of students' writing skills in terms of text structure, coherence, and the use of metadiscourse elements. In addition, students were assigned to write narrative texts based on given instructions, and these texts were used as the main corpus of the research. Importantly, data collection focused on capturing students' authentic writing practices, ensuring that the findings reflect their natural use of metadiscourse within narrative writing. Then, the data were analyzed using descriptive qualitative analysis. The analysis stage begins with copying the results of observations, and documents, then categorizing the data according to the focus of the research. Next, identify the main themes that emerge, such as improving the structure of the text, metalinguistic awareness, and strategies for using metadiscourse. The analytical framework used is the metadiscourse framework of Hyland (1998), which is a modified version of the scheme (Crismore et al., 1993). This framework was chosen because it is able to provide a more comprehensive analysis mechanism by clearly distinguishing between textual and interpersonal dimensions. Each text is systematically analyzed by marking all the elements of metadiscourse that appear, then grouping them into categories as proposed by Hyland. The metadiscourse classification system proposed by Hyland represents the main principles in its definition. A summary of these categories is shown in Table 3 based on the framework of Hyland (2005).

Table 2. Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse according to Hyland (2005)

Category	Function
Textual Metadiscourse	
Logical Connectives	Shows the relationships between main clauses.
Frame Markers	Refers to discourse actions, phases, and sequences.
Endophoric	Shows information referenced in another part of the text.
Evidentials	Shows information sourced from other references.
Code Gloss	Provides detailed explanations of words or phrases.
Interpersonal Metadiscourse	
Hedges	Expresses uncertainty and allows for open discussion.
Boosters	Expresses certainty and reinforces a direct dialogue.
Attitude Markers	Conveys the writer's stance or attitude toward a proposition.
Relational	Directly refers to the author.
Person	Directly establishes a connection with the reader.

Through this stage, researchers can map the pattern of the use of metadiscourse in students' writing and relate it to the application of the GUNTUR Model. The results of this analysis are expected to provide an in-depth understanding of the contribution of the GUNTUR Model in improving students' academic writing skills, both in terms of text organization and interpersonal strategies in writing.

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study showed that students from SMA Negeri 7 and SMA Negeri 5 Cirebon utilized various forms of metadiscourse in writing students' narrative texts, both textual and interpersonal. Based on Table 3, it can be seen that textual metadiscourse dominates usage in both schools compared to interpersonal metadiscourse.

Table 3. Metadiscourse in Narrative Text

Category	School			
	SMAN 7		SMAN 5	
Textual Metadiscourse				
1. Logical Connectives	598	81%	534	82%
2. Frame Markers	114	15%	110	17%
3. Endophoric	2	0%	0	0%
4. Evidentials	28	4%	9	1%
5. Code Gloss	1	0%	3	0%
Totals	743	100%	656	100%
Interpersonal Metadiscourse				
1. Hedges	6	6%	1	8%
2. Boosters	1	1%	0	0%
3. Attitude Markers	24	22%	4	30%
4. Relational	8	7%	1	8%
5. Person	68	64%	7	54%
Totals	107	100%	13	100%

As shown in Table 3, textual metadiscourse is more widely used than interpersonal markers in SMAN 7 and SMAN 5. Logical connectives were the most frequently used, followed by frame markers, suggesting that students focus primarily on organizing and linking ideas to maintain coherence in their narrative texts. In contrast, endophoric markers and code glosses were scarcely employed, indicating limited effort to refer readers to other parts of the text or clarify meanings explicitly. This finding aligns with Hyland & Hyland (2019) argument that student writers, especially EFL learners, tend to prioritize cohesion over clarification devices. Regarding interpersonal metadiscourse, the data reveal that students rarely engaged in stance-taking or building interaction with readers. While personal pronouns dominated, other categories such as hedges, boosters, and relational markers appeared minimally. This supports Dafouz-Milne (2008a) view that novice writers often underuse interactional resources, focusing instead on delivering content. Overall, the findings highlight that students' narrative writing skills are more developed in terms of textual coherence than in interpersonal engagement, reflecting a tendency to prioritize clarity of events over rhetorical interaction. Similar trends were also reported by (Alotaibi, 2018), who found that EFL students' writing frequently demonstrates stronger use of textual features than interpersonal ones. Further the data analysis focused on the type, number, and examples of the use of metadiscourse markers in students' narrative texts in two schools, namely SMAN 7 and SMAN 5 Cirebon. This identification aims to describe the dominant patterns that appear in students' writing, both in the textual and interpersonal dimensions. The following Table 4 and Table 5 present the distribution of the metadiscourse markers found, along with real-life examples of student texts.

Table 4. Number, Type & Examples of Metadiscourse Markers Found in Narrative Text at SMAN 7 Cirebon

Metadiscourse Marker	Number	Sample of Metadiscourse Marker
Textual Metadiscourse		
1. Logical Connectives	598	And, but, while, meanwhile, instead of, unlike, also, for, so, however, because, therefore, then, as a result,
2. Frame Markers	114	Long ago, at last, first, one day, finally, now, next, then, before, after that, from that, long time ago, second, third, fourth, once more, in the end, once upon a time, immediately, eventually, immediately
3. Endophoric	2	She was shown into, as before
4. Evidentials	28	Naveen asked, she said, the poor girl said, said the prince, the elder said, the mouse was so scared and said, the mouse said, he said, farmers to claim, the genie of the lamp said, father said, stepmother said, jolly said, the genie said, Aladdin said,
5. Code Gloss	1	That is
Interpersonal Metadiscourse		
1. Hedges	6	Just like, like, look like, must be like, might,
2. Boosters	1	Know
3. Attitude Markers	24	Unfortunately, innocently, fortunately
4. Relational	8	As you know, remember
5. Person	68	I, my, me

Table 5. Number, Type & Examples of Metadiscourse Markers Found in Narrative Text at SMAN 5 Cirebon

Metadiscourse Marker	Number	Sample of Metadiscourse Marker
Textual Metadiscourse		
1. Logical Connectives	534	And, so, for, instead of, then, but, however, because, also, meanwhile, eventhough, although
2. Frame Markers	110	A long time ago, after that, finally, immediately, eventually, once upon a time, one day, after that, later, suddenly, in the end, from that, now, at last, once again, next, first
3. Endophoric	0	-
4. Evidentials	9	The oldest troll said, she said, he asked, the golden bird said
5. Code Gloss	3	Such as
Interpersonal Metadiscourse		
1. Hedges	1	might
2. Boosters	0	-
3. Attitude Markers	4	Actually, amazingly, unfortunately, previously,
4. Relational	1	remember
5. Person	7	I, my

In the textual metadiscourse category, *logical connectives* were the most frequent form, namely 598 times (81%) in SMAN 7 and 534 times (82%) in SMAN 5. This shows that students rely heavily on logical conjunctions such as *and, but, so, because* to connect clauses and maintain the continuity of the story. Such dominance of connectives aligns with Hyland & Hyland (2019) claim that EFL student writers often depend on basic cohesive devices to ensure narrative flow. The next category is *frame markers* used to mark stages of the storyline, such as *once upon a time, finally, after that*. SMAN 7 recorded 114 times of use (15%), while SMAN 5 recorded 110 times (17%), indicating that students are aware of conventional sequencing devices in narrative writing (Alotaibi, 2018). Meanwhile, *the endophoric* category is rarely found, only 2 times in SMAN 7 and does not appear at all in SMAN 5, reflecting limited awareness of textual referencing strategies (Dafouz-Milne, 2008a). The *evidentials* are relatively more used by SMAN 7 (28 times) than SMAN 5 (9 times), while *code gloss* is very minimal, namely 1 time in SMAN 7 and 3 times in SMAN 5, consistent with findings by Gholami et al. (2014), who noted that code glosses are rarely used in EFL learners' writing.

In the interpersonal metadiscourse category, SMAN 7 students used more *person* markers (68 times/64%) such as *I, my, me* compared to SMAN 5 which was only 7 times (54%). This indicates that SMAN 7 students showed a stronger personal presence in their texts, consistent with Hyland & Jiang (2024) observation that novice writers rely on self-mentions to assert authorship. Meanwhile, *attitude markers* such as *unfortunately, fortunately, actually* appeared 24 times in SMAN 7 (22%) and 4 times in SMAN 5 (30%). The use of *hedges* and *boosters* is still limited, for example *might* or *know*, and *relational markers* such as *remember* or *as you know* are only found a few. This supports findings by (Crismore &

Abdollehzadeh, 2010), who argue that EFL learners often struggle to balance between expressing stance and maintaining reader interaction.

Overall, the findings indicate that students from both schools prioritize textual coherence over interpersonal engagement in their narrative writing, which is consistent with broader trends observed in EFL contexts (Alotaibi, 2018; Hyland & Hyland, 2019).

1. Textual features of Metadiscourse

The previous analysis showed the dominance of textual features over interpersonal features in students' narrative texts. In particular, the logical *connectives category* is the most often used to maintain the connection of ideas, with a percentage of 81% in SMAN 7 and 82% in SMAN 5. This is reflected in the use of coordination connectors such as *and, but* also causal connectors such as *because, since, therefore.*

Logical Connectives

Narrative texts utilize a wider variety of logical connectors to realize various functions of textual meaning. Dafouz-Milne (2008) states that logical markers serve to show the semantic relationship between parts of discourse. The results of the analysis showed that students made more use of logical connectives in the construction of the following sentences. This indicates that students rely on cohesive devices not only to connect events chronologically but also to signal cause-and-effect relationships, contrast, and elaboration. The frequent appearance of markers such as *then, therefore, however,* and *because* suggests that learners attempt to build coherence and guide readers through the unfolding of the story. Moreover, the consistent use of these markers reflects their awareness of the importance of textual organization in narrative writing. In this way, logical connectors function as essential tools that support both clarity and readability in students' narratives.

> (a) *"She planted the seed, **and** soon a beautiful flower bloomed."*
> (b) *"**However,** the star was guarded by an evil witch who wanted to use its light to conquer the kingdom."*

Frame Markers

The second category is frame markers, which are markers that function to show logical boundaries in discourse (Lin, 2005). These elements include words that hint at order, mark transitions between sections, state the purpose of the text, and indicate a change in topic. In narrative writing, frame markers play a crucial role in helping readers follow the flow of events and understand how the story is organized. Expressions such as *first, finally, first, next, once upon a time, in the end, or one day* help readers recognize when a new event begins, when an explanation is provided, or when the narrative reaches its resolution (Hyland, 2019). In this study, frame markers appeared 114 times in SMAN 7 (15%) and 110 times in SMAN 5 (17%). Although their proportion is lower compared to logical connectives, the relatively balanced use in both schools shows that students are aware of the need to structure narratives in a chronological and logical order. This finding suggests that frame markers play a supportive role in ensuring that stories are easy to follow, thereby enhancing both textual cohesion and overall narrative coherence.

> (c) *"**Once upon a time**, there was an old woman."*
> (d) *"**In the end**, Beauty and the prince were married."*

Endophoric

The third category is endophoric markers, which are elements that direct the reader to other parts of the text. These markers serve as textual signals that guide readers to look forward or backward in the discourse, thereby reinforcing cohesion and coherence (Sanford, 2012). Typical examples include references such as *as mentioned above, see the following, in the next section, as before* or *as stated earlier.* In narrative writing, endophoric markers can help writers maintain continuity by linking different stages of the story or by recalling previously introduced events and characters. In this study, endophoric markers were almost absent only two instances in SMAN 7 and none in SMAN 5. Their rarity suggests that students do not typically use explicit intratextual references when constructing narratives. This is unsurprising in the context of narrative writing, which relies more on chronological progression and plot development rather than on textual cross-referencing. The minimal presence of endophoric markers therefore implies that students prioritize linear storytelling over textual self-referencing, which reflects both the nature of narrative discourse and the developmental stage of their academic writing skills.

> (e) *".... with everything occurring **as before**, except that on the third night."*

Evidentials

The results of the analysis showed that the use of evidentials in students' narrative texts reached 4% in SMAN 7 and 1% in SMAN 5. Evidentials are discourse devices that signal the source of information, either by referring to prior knowledge, external authorities, or textual references (Lin, 2005; Sanford, 2012). In narrative writing, students can enhance authenticity by grounding the story in familiar contexts, cultural references, or shared knowledge, thereby creating a sense of credibility for the reader. However, the relatively low frequency of evidentials in both schools suggests that students rarely draw upon external references or contextual grounding when constructing their narratives. Instead, students tend to rely on imagination, chronological sequencing, and personal voice to build their stories. This limited use indicates that students may not yet view evidentials as a necessary resource in narrative genres, which contrasts with their more prominent role in expository or argumentative writing (Alotaibi, 2018). Thus, while evidentials have the potential to enrich narrative writing by making events feel more realistic and reliable, the students' minimal use of them reflects both the conventions of the narrative genre and their developmental stage as EFL writers In this category, students utilize various forms of evidentials as shown below.

> (f) *"**The golden bird said** "You have proven that your heart is pure, keep this feather, and the kingdom will never lack happiness"*

Code Gloss

In contrast to logical connectors that function not only as a syntactic coordination tool but also as a link between ideas, explanatory codes play a role in clarifying or interpreting propositional meanings (Lin, 2005) Code gloss is used to reflect the expectations of the speaker or writer; its function is to reinforce logical appeal and persuasive effect by providing additional information to the reader (Abusalim et al., 2022). Typically, code glosses appear in the form of exemplifications, reformulations, or restatements that help readers grasp the intended meaning more easily. For instance, markers such as *that is, in other words, namely,* or *for example* are employed to expand or clarify the preceding statement. Students use it in the following sentences:

> (g) *"She found in the ocean, **such as** forks, cups, and mirror."*
> (h) *"He heard a strange voice and found **that is** from the puppet."*

2. Interpersonal features of Metadiscourse
Hedges
Hedges reflect a lower level of certainty or commitment than the author explicitly wants to assert, and the students are able to make appropriate use of it (Sanford, 2012). These markers allow writers to express caution, soften their claims, or acknowledge alternative perspectives (Lin, 2005), thereby creating space for interpretation. Common examples of hedges include expressions such as *perhaps, might, it seems,* or *possibly,* which help writers avoid making absolute statements. In students' narrative texts, hedges are often employed to describe events or characters with a degree of uncertainty, for instance, when retelling a legend or folktale whose details cannot be fully verified. The use of hedges therefore demonstrates students' awareness of rhetorical strategies that not only enhance textual nuance but also align with the conventions of narrative storytelling.

> (i) *"...that his dreams **might** never come true."*

Boosters
Boosters, as opposed to hedges, need to be taught explicitly and purposefully because there is potential for overlap with other markers, especially attitude markers. Boosters serve to express a stronger level of certainty or commitment from the author (Lin, 2005). These markers indicate confidence in the proposition and are often employed to persuade the reader or emphasize the truthfulness of a statement (Sanford, 2012). Typical examples of boosters include *clearly, definitely, of course,* and *indeed,* which leave little room for doubt or alternative interpretations. In narrative writing, students tend to use boosters when highlighting the certainty of an event or underscoring the qualities of a character. In the student text, the form of boosters is used as follows.

> (j) *"In the guild, natsu became **know** for his courage, wild spirit, and big heart."*

Attitude Markers
Attitude markers usually reflect the author's views or character by emphasizing certain aspects that the reader needs to pay attention to and showing how the writer expects the reader to respond to the information. Mai (2016) states that attitude markers function to express the author's feelings, such as surprise, frustration, interest, and obligation. In narrative texts, these markers are frequently realized through evaluative words or phrases like *unfortunately, surprisingly, fortunately,* which signal the writer's stance toward events or characters.

> (k) *"**Unfortunately**, she was locked up in a tower with no doors."*
> (l) *"**Fortunately**, Elara learned that the lantern's true power was not only the magic inside it."*

Relational
Relational markers place more emphasis on reader engagement by using second-person pronouns, command sentences, question forms, and inserts that cut through the ongoing flow of discourse (Hyland, 2000). These markers aim to establish a closer relationship between writer and reader by directly addressing the audience or inviting to participate in the discourse. In narrative texts, relational markers can be used to make the story more

interactive and engaging, drawing readers into the events rather than keeping them as passive observers.

> (m) "**As you know**, the fox is an intelligent yet cunning animal."
> (n) "Ellara **remember** that her grandmother had once given her a small lantern."

Person

A personal marker refers to the author's level of presence explicitly indicated in the text, which is identified through the use of first-person pronouns and proprietary adjectives (Lin, 2005; Sanford, 2012). These markers highlight the writer's involvement in the discourse and make their presence visible to the reader. Furthermore, personal markers demonstrate students' awareness of how to project voice and identity within student's writing, which is a crucial aspect of developing a distinctive narrative style.

> (o) "If **I** take this, **I** will be powerful."
> (p) "I just want to know how great **my** king."
> (q) "Oh **my** Lord, forgive **me**, for **my** curiosity entering your cave."

The results showed the dominance of textual metadiscourse, especially in the logical *connectives category*, both in SMAN 7 (598) and SMAN 5 (534). This reflects the ability of students to maintain cohesion between clauses and sentences. The presence *of frame markers* which are also quite significant (114 in SMAN 7 and 110 in SMAN 5) further emphasizes students' skills in following conventional narrative flows. However, the categories of *endophoric markers* and *code glosses* are still very rarely used and are not found at all in the texts of SMAN 5 students. This condition shows that students still have difficulty connecting different parts of the text or providing explicit explanations of terms, even though both aspects are important to enrich the elaboration of the writing. These findings are consistent with studies (Ädel, 2010) that stated that EFL novice writers tend to ignore elaborative strategies in narrative writing.

In contrast to the textual dimension, the use of interpersonal metadiscourse looks much more limited, especially in SMAN 5. In SMAN 7, students tend to be more expressive with 68 *person markers*, 24 *attitude markers*, 6 *hedges*, 8 *relational markers*, and 1 *booster*. This shows that there is awareness to build interaction with readers through personal expressions and attitudes. In contrast, SMAN 5 students only used 7 *person markers*, 4 *attitude markers*, 1 *hedge*, and 1 *relational marker*, without a single *booster*. The lack of interpersonal expression indicates that students' writing is still informative and structural, but less communicative. In other words, the interpersonal dimension is still a weakness in the writing skills of SMAN 5 students.

When compared to previous research, these findings show a difference in the context of metadiscourse. The study of Rabab'ah et al. (2024) shows that in the virtual context of EFL, *interactional markers* (interpersonal) are more predominantly used to maintain online student engagement. However, in the context of high school students' academic writing, the pattern is reversed, where students focus more on structural cohesion through *textual markers*. This difference indicates that the practice of teaching writing in the classroom has not adequately integrated interpersonal awareness. In addition, these findings are in line with recent research on *hands-on* context-directed learning (DDL) which proves that direct exploration of metadiscourse markers can increase awareness and use them more effectively

(Esfandiari & Allaf-Akbary, 2024). This is relevant for the development of the GUNTUR Model, which can incorporate explicit strategies and reflective experiences to strengthen the interpersonal dimension.

Thus, the results of this study strengthen the urgency of developing the metadiscourse-based GUNTUR Model. This model not only focuses on textual aspects, such as narrative organization and intersentence cohesion, but also encourages students to increase metalinguistic awareness in building relationships with readers. Crismore & Farnsworth (2016) found that metadiscourse markers play a role in building ethos, which is one of the important factors in increasing the effectiveness and persuasiveness of a writing. Through the application of this model, students are directed to optimize the use of *textual markers* to strengthen the cohesion and coherence of texts, develop the use of *interpersonal markers* to make writing more communicative and expressive, and reflect on the choice of language strategies used in the writing process. In other words, the GUNTUR Model can bridge the technical (textual) and communicative (interpersonal) aspects according to the framework of Hyland (2005) which emphasizes the importance of balancing the two dimensions of metadiscourse.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the development of metadiscourse studies by emphasizing that EFL students are generally stronger in the textual dimension than interpersonal, while showing variations between schools. Pedagogically, the GUNTUR Model offers a practical framework for EFL teachers to teach metadiscourse explicitly, both through traditional strategies and *data-driven learning*. Thus, this research not only enriches the literature on metadiscourse-based teaching of writing, but also provides a new direction for the improvement of high school students' writing skills through innovative learning models that balance textual and interpersonal dimensions.

D. CONCLUSION

The aim of this research was to analyze the use of metadiscourse in students' narrative texts and to explore its pedagogical implications. Based on the results of the research, it can be concluded that these findings highlight the need for explicit instruction in metadiscourse to help students produce more structured, cohesive, and communicative texts. The analysis also reveals that enhancing students' rhetorical awareness can support them not only in organizing ideas but also in establishing clearer relationships with readers. These insights provide an initial foundation for designing the GUNTUR Model as a potential writing strategy for high school students. Rather than presenting a finalized product, this study serves as an exploratory step that informs the conceptual development of the model. This model is able to facilitate students in understanding the role of metadiscourse, both textual and interpersonal, so that students' writing skills become more structured, cohesive, and communicative. These findings confirm that metadiscourse awareness not only assists students in organizing the text, but also in building more explicit relationships with the reader. The contribution of this research lies in strengthening the pedagogical perspective that metadiscourse can be systematically integrated in writing learning at the high school level. Further research is suggested to test the GUNTUR Model to other types of texts or at different levels of education to expand the understanding and effectiveness of its use.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

E. REFERENCES

Abdi, R. (2002). Interpersonal metadiscourse: An indicator of interaction and identity. *Sage Publications*, *4*(2), 139–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456020040020101

Abusalim, N., Zidouni, S., Alghazo, S., Rababah, G., & Rayyan, M. (2022). Textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in political discourse: A case study. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *9*(1), 2124683. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2022.2124683

Ädel, A. (2010). Using corpora to teach academic writing: Challenges for the direct approach. *Corpus-Based Approaches to ELT*, 39–55.

Akoto, O. Y. (2020). Metadiscourse within a discipline: A study of introduction and literature review chapters of sociology masters' theses. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 471–480.

Alotaibi, H. S. (2018). Metadiscourse in dissertation acknowledgments: Exploration of gender differences in EFL texts. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, *18*(4), 899–916. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.4.0247

Cer, E. (2019). The instruction of writing strategies: The effect of the metacognitive strategy on the writing skills of pupils in secondary education. *SAGE Open*, *9*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019842681

Consonni, S., D'Angelo, L., & Anesa, P. (2020). *Digital communication and metadiscourse: Changing perspectives in academic genres*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.6092/978-88-97413-25-7

Crismore, A., & Abdollehzadeh, E. (2010). A Review of Recent Metadiscourse Studies: The Iranian Context. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *9*(2), 195. https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.223

Crismore, A., & Farnsworth, R. (2016). Mr. Darwin and his readers : Exploring interpersonal metadiscourse as a dimension of ethos. *Routledge*. https://doi.org/10.1080/07350198909388880

Crismore, A., Markkanen, R., & Steffensen, M. S. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. In *Written Communication* (Vol. 10, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088393010001002

Crossley, S. A., & McNamara, D. S. (2016). Say more and be more cohere nt: How text e elaboration and cohe esion can increase writing q quality. *Journal of Writing Research*, *7*(3), 351–370. https://www.jowr.org/jowr/article/view/657/619

Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008a). The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: A cross-linguistic study of newspaper discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *40*(1), 95–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.10.003

Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008b). The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: A cross-linguistic study of newspaper discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *40*(1), 95–113.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.10.003

Elyana, K. (2025). Analisis penggunaan frame markers, transitions, dan sequence markers dalam penulisan ilmiah mahasiswa. *Adjektiva: Educational Languages and Literature Studies*, *8*(1), 30–38. https://doi.org/10.30872/adjektiva.v8i1.5181

Esfandiari, R., & Allaf-Akbary, O. (2024). Assessing interactional metadiscourse in EFL writing through intelligent data-driven learning: The Microsoft Copilot in the spotlight. *Language Testing in Asia*, *14*(51), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-024-00326-9

Estaji, M., & Vafaeimehr, R. (2015). A comparative analysis of interactional metadiscourse markers in the Introduction and Conclusion sections of mechanical and electrical engineering research papers. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *3*(1), 37–56. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1127334.pdf

Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: Problems, factors and suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, *4*(2), 81–92. https://doi.org/10.20547/jess0421604201

Ghasemi, M. (2013). An investigation into the use of cohesive devices in second language writings. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *3*(9), 1615–1623. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.9.1615-1623

Gholami, J., Nejad, S. R., & Pour, J. L. (2014). Metadiscourse markers misuses; A study of EFL learners' argumentative essays. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 580–589. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.454

Gillaerts, P., & Velde, F. Van de. (2010). Interactional metadiscourse in research article abstracts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9*(2), 128–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.004

Godwin-jones, R. (2021). Evolving technologies for language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, *25*(3), 6–26. https://godwinjones.com/vietnam/articles/evolving_tech.pdf

Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *30*(4), 437–455. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(98)00009-5

Hyland, K. (2000). Disciplinary discourses: social interactions in academic writing. *Harlow: Longman.*

Hyland, K. (2005a). Representing readers in writing: Student and expert practices. *Linguistics and Education*, *16*(4), 363–377. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2006.05.002

Hyland, K. (2005b). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(2), 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*, 1–22. https://www.academia.edu/40425290/Contexts_and_issues_in_feedback_on_L2_writing

Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (2020). Text-organizing metadiscourse: Tracking changes in rhetorical persuasion. *Journal of Hisrorical Pragmatics*, *21*(1), 137–164. https://ueaeprints.uea.ac.uk/id/eprint/69402/1/Accepted_manuscript.pdf

Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. K. (2024). Metadiscourse: The evolution of an approach to texts. *Text and Talk*, *44*(3), 411–433. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2021-0156

Hyland, K., & Kevin, F. (2018). "In this paper we suggest": Changing patterns of disciplinary metadiscourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, *51*, 18–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.02.001

Kaszubski, P. (2003). Corpora in applied linguistics. *ELT Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.4.416

Khieder, M. (2012). The student awareness of writing skill: The case study third year students at Biskra University. *Biskara University*, 1–114. http://archives.univ-biskra.dz/bitstream/123456789/4604/1/The student awareness of writing skill.pdf

Lee, J. J., & Deakin, L. (2016). Interactions in L1 and L2 Undergraduate Student Writing: Interactional Metadiscourse in Successful and Less-successful Argumentative Essays Abstract. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, *85*(1), 6.

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

Mai, H. (2016). An intercultural analysis of meta-discourse markers as persuasive power in Chinese and American political speeches. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *4*(6), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20160406.13

Myhill, D., Ahmed, A., & Abdollazadeh, E. (2023). Going meta : Bringing together an understanding of metadiscourse with students ' metalinguistic understanding. *Language Teaching*, *56*, 146–148. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444822000416

Pearson, W. S., & Abdollahzadeh, E. (2023). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A systematic review. *Lingua*, *293*, 103561. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2023.103561

Qin, W., & Uccelli, P. (2019). Metadiscourse: Variation across communicative contexts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *139*, 22–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.10.004

Rabab'ah, G., Yagi, S., & Alghazo, S. (2024). Using metadiscourse to create effective and engaging EFL virtual classrooms during the covid-19 pandemic. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *12*(1), 107–129. https://doi.org/10.30466/IJLTR.2024.121421

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2022). Methodology in language teaching an anthology of current practice. *Research Gate*, *May*. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.36344.72962

Sanford, S. G. (2012). *A comparison of metadiscourse markers and writing quality in adolescent written narratives*. https://scholarworks.umt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2385&context=etd

Zou, H. (Joanna), & Hyland, K. (2020). "Think about how fascinating this is": Engagement in academic blogs across disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *43*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100809