

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The introductory chapter is to provide a general overview of this study. This chapter consists of some important aspects; research background, research questions, objectives of the study, significance of the study, and scope and limitation of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

This study examines the use of interactional metadiscourse by members of The U.S. House Republican primary debate. Metadiscourse is a general term for words, phrases, or sentences used by speakers to convey their ideas and to engage listeners through their speaking. As explained by Kitjaroenpaiboon & Getkham (2015, p. 125) that metadiscourse refers to the actions of speakers as they speak or think, or to the actions of understanding and listening by their listeners. Mostly, metadiscourse is used by speakers as a medium in order to communicate and interact with the listeners. Furthermore, metadiscourse can be a bridge for listeners to interpret the text that has been spoken by the speakers (Saputra & Putri, 2021, p. 42). This bridge is reflected in the form of markers as stated by Hyland (2005).

According to Hyland (2005, p. 49) metadiscourse is divided into two interaction dimensions, one of them is interactional metadiscourse markers. Interactional metadiscourse is the speaker's way of interacting by interrupting and commenting on messages from participants, this makes the focus on this dimension no longer on the content of the text but on the interaction participants. Sanford (2012, p. 9) argues that interactional metadiscourse markers are described as evaluative and engaging with the aim of expressing the solidarity of the constructed text with the listeners. Moreover, the aim of the speaker here is to make a clear point of view by involving the listeners and letting them take part through their responses to the ongoing text. From the definitions above, it can be understood that interactional metadiscourse is all about the interaction between the speakers and the listeners.

Within the scope of interaction, humans need language to communicate and build relationships with each other. Good communication depends on how we understand an instruction, how we make requests, ask questions and how we deliver information. In communication, it takes two or more people to interact with each other to channel their ideas. This is in line with the statement expressed by Tarigan (1984) in Affifatusholihah & Setyawan (2016, p. 110) where to achieve good communication requires interaction with other people so that communication goes well and avoids misunderstandings and misinterpretations between speakers and listeners. Many people express their thoughts using language that is poured both in spoken and written form. Both spoken and written language forms have their own structure, function, and benefits.

Written language is a language that is poured in the form of text, magazines, books, journals, newspapers, etc. (Sari, 2014, p. 1) while spoken language is a language that is directly pronounced by speakers to listeners. There are some differences between written language and spoken language. In written language the meaning is given directly by the text, in contrast to spoken language where the speaker's meaning is determined by the context. The difference between the two is also expressed by Zhang (2013, p. 835) that written language usually tends to be used to convey information while spoken language tends to be used to express personal emotions and feelings and to strengthen interpersonal relationships. In addition, written language is widely used for communication that crosses space and time such as Short Message Service (SMS), mail, news or advertisements and many more. While spoken language is mostly used between two or more people who are in the same place. The forms of spoken language that are often encountered are public speaking, oration, speech, and debate.

Debate is an activity to provide arguments carried out as a form of inquiry and advocacy process in order to reach a reasoned assessment of a statement (Freeley & Steinberg, 2013, p. 6). Debates can be held individually or in groups. Individuals use debate to express and reach decisions that are in their own minds, on the other hand, both individuals and groups usually use it with the aim of

bringing other people into their way of thinking. On several occasions, debate has been used as a medium for national and international competitions, but recently most people are more interested in the political debates carried out by members of the government in fighting for seats. Thus, based on this phenomenon, the writer in this study is interested in analyzing debate of the Republican candidates seeking Wyoming's lone seat in The United States House of Representatives on Wyoming PBS and Wyoming Public Media. In this case, the writer considers debate to be an interesting topic to discuss since debate always presents opinions and arguments for each preposition.

Several important aspects need to be considered when delivering an argument such as the theme, purpose, and also the content of the argument itself. Since debate demands critical thinking, debaters need to consider the choice of words used to strengthen the arguments presented (Freeley & Steinberg, 2013, p. 6). Therefore, this study is conducted to analyze the issues related to the choice of words used by the debaters. The writer focuses on issues related to the types and functions of interactional metadiscourse markers used by the debaters during their argumentation. In addition, since this study focuses on arguments of the debaters where the debaters try to involve the audience in every argument they express, the writer conclude that interactional metadiscourse can be applied in analyzing debates.

Several previous studies have shown that interactional metadiscourse in debate has been investigated. Istiani & Puspita (2020) analyzed the use of interactional metadiscourse in the Bloomberg international debate. Next, Dichoso et al., (2022) investigate the use of interactional metadiscourse markers in computer-mediated British parliamentary debates. After that, Albalat & Carrió (2019) analyzed Self-representation in political campaign talk: a functional metadiscourse approach to self-mentions in televised presidential debates. Then, Farghal & Kalakh (2020) conducted a study under the title Engagement in Translation: Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in American Presidential Debates. Next, Sukma (2017) analyzed interpersonal metadiscourse markers as persuasive strategies in Barack

Obama's 2012 campaign speeches. Then, Liu & Liu (2020) analyzed A Comparative Study of Interactional Metadiscourse in English Speeches of Chinese and American Stateswomen. The last is Tashi & Suksawas (2018) with the title entitled An Analysis of Interactional Metadiscourse in Public Speaking: A Case Study in English Speeches of the Prime Minister of Bhutan.

After reviewing the existing literature, it can be seen that no one has conducted research on the use of interactional metadiscourse markers on the same object as this research. Debate, as the object of this research, is interesting to analyze because it is conducted by the House of Representatives from the Republican Party, which is one of the two major political parties in The United States besides the Democratic Party. The Republican Party opposed slavery in the new territories, it was also associated with its low taxes and conservative social policies. In addition, this party has also often won general elections in recent years, for example in the 2016 United States general election, the republican party defeated the democrat party in all fields, both in parliamentary seats and in the presidential election. Donald Trump is the 45th President of the United States from the Republican Party. Since the debaters are part of a political party, therefore the debate that will be analyzed in this study is classified as a political debate. In the political context, it is necessary to make extra efforts to build a strong personality in the discourse to defeat candidates from other parties. This can be done by considering the audience, the candidates show their political personas through the arguments they have prepared with a vocabulary that they deliberately designed in such a way as to maintain the flow of thought and to urge voters to vote for them (Farghal & Kalakh, 2020, p. 109). If only by examining one candidate's argument, the writer can find several interactional metadiscourse markers in his argument. Therefore, this debate is interesting to be used as an object to be analyzed to find out types and functions of interactional metadiscourse markers used by the debaters in their arguments. That is why, the gap will be interesting to observe.

1.2 Research Questions

Based on the background of the study above, there are two research questions that are formulated to build the discussion as follows:

- 1) What are the types of interactional metadiscourse markers used by members of the U.S. house republican primary debate?
- 2) What are the functions of interactional metadiscourse markers used by members of the U.S. house republican primary debate?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Considering the formulation of the research questions above, the objectives of this research are as follows:

- 1) To identify the types of interactional metadiscourse markers used by members of the U.S. house republican primary debate.
- 2) To explain the function of interactional metadiscourse markers used by members of the U.S. house republican primary debate.

1.4 Significance of the Study

By conducting this study, the writer expects that the results of this study will provide theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, this study is expected to enrich knowledge about metadiscourse markers within academic context, especially in the interactional dimension. Practically, the writer expects that this study can help students in discourse analysis class, especially for those who are interested in metadiscourse so that it helps in analyzing the types and functions of interactional metadiscourse markers used by five candidates in the debate. Next, the writer expects that this study can serve as a reference for teachers when they are teaching about the role of interactional metadiscourse markers in debate. Next, the writer hopes that with this study the readers will understand the function of each interactional metadiscourse markers used in written and spoken language so that when listening to the debate they will understand the purpose of the arguments presented. Then, this study is expected to be used as a reference by

further researchers in conducting further research on interactional metadiscourse markers used in debate.

1.5 Scope and Limitation of the Study

The scope of this research is discourse analysis. This study only focuses on the use of interactional metadiscourse markers in the debate using the theory proposed by Hyland (2005). Not only that, the writer also focuses on the types and functions of interactional metadiscourse markers on the candidates' arguments. For the limitation, the writer limits to examine the words, phrases, and sentences in the arguments of the candidates. Therefore, this study will only analyze metadiscourse markers which are included in the interactional dimension.