

THE USE OF REFLEXIVE METADISOURSE BETWEEN ENGLISH AND INDONESIAN WRITERS IN ENGLISH JOURNAL ARTICLES

Candra Ayu Putri Darma

English Language Teaching Study Program
Postgraduate School, Universitas Islam Malang, Indonesia
Email: candraputri687@gmial.com

ABSTRACT

For second language writers to write English research articles (RAs), it seems really challenging for them to write academic articles by English. In order to make the good and understandable writing the use of metadiscourse is really important. Therefore, this study attempted to explore the comparison of using metadiscourse for two different authors, the English native and Indonesian authors in their RAs. This study focused on the introduction and discussion section only. It aimed to identify the differences between the authors and to investigate how they used metadiscourse in their texts. The subject of this study comprised in total, 10 introductions and 10 discussions from 10 journals which are 5 different articles for each English native journals and Indonesian journals. They are in the field of TESOL and applied linguistic. This study focused on Ädel (2006) reflexive metadiscourse model (i.e., personal and impersonal metadiscourse) as the analytical framework. This study found that the culture influenced the use between personal and impersonal metadiscourse. The English native authors used more personal metadiscourse. On the other side, the Indonesian authors seems comfortable to use impersonal one.

Keywords: “*impersonal metadiscourse*”, “*personal metadiscourse*”, “*reflexive approach of metadiscourse*”

INTRODUCTION

Metadiscourse is known as the reflective language used to build the interaction between readers and writers. It depends on how the authors apply it in the text. Especially in writing text, it can be used to express the important meanings correctly, to organize the text, and to interact with the readers for understanding the texts (Fagen, 2012). Similarly, Hyland (1998) states that with regard to view of writing as a social and communicative engagement between writes and readers, metadiscourse has been theorized in the term of helping writers to signal the communicative targets and supports the readers understanding of the text and their attitudes to the content and audience. Therefore, metadiscourse is a suitable features used in the writing text.

The change of metadiscourse types had been conducted time to time. Previously, Vande Kopple (1985) differs the metadiscourse into "textual" and "interpersonal". The function is based on the text in context and reader reaction of the text. Similar kind of metadiscourse has been delivered by Crismore et al., (1993) which only change the name from "interpersonal" becomes "interpretive". Next, Hyland (2005) divides metadiscourse become two different categories "interactive" and "interactional." However, these theories and types of metadiscourse have similar register instances such as *according to X, additionally, furthermore, it seems* which focuses the chunks in the texts.

Moreover, Ädel (2006) emphasizes this approach is termed 'interactive' of metadiscourse which is board and inclusive. It views metadiscourse as a form of textual interaction and emphasizes the textual and interpersonal function. Therefore, it comes with the 'reflexive' approach which emphasizes language reflexivity to restrict metadiscourse. It is focused on how the writers' commentary on the on- going text. Moreover, the reflexive metadiscourse divided into two kinds: "personal" and "impersonal" metadiscourse. The former type of reflexive metadiscourse is used to shows the relationship between readers and writer in the text. Also, it spells out the textual organization and language used. It is typical characteristic of spoken language. On the other side, another type refers to the current discourse which focusses on the chunks. It is typical characteristic of written language.

There are many metadiscourse analysis that compare a context to another in academic genre especially in research articles (RAs) (e.g., Cao & Hu, 2014; Del Saz-Rubio, 2011; Hyland, 2007; Lee & Subtirelu, 2015; Loi & Lim, 2013; McGrath & Kuteeva, 2012; Mu et al., 2015). In contrast, the reflexive approach is relatively limited in a few studies (Gil, 2018; Li & Xu, 2020; Pérez-llantada, 2010; Salas, 2015; Tjioe, 2014; Toumi, 2009) have explored the metadiscourse features in the same genre. However, reflexive metadiscourse analysis study seems rarely done for Indonesian context. Previously, Tjioe (2014) analyzes the reflexive metadiscourse that only focused on the English authors without comparing it with other contexts. Therefore, this current study focuses on the comparison between English and Indonesian authors in term of the use reflexive metadiscourse.

Since it is comparing the metadiscourse use between two different contexts, cultural influence may be one the focus of this study. Especially how English language teachers teach English metadiscourse and how the writers apply them in their articles. Moreover, Mu et al. (2015) and Vergaro (2004) state that the use of metadiscourse in the articles may be affected by the writers' cultures.

Based on this gap, this paper aims to compare the metadiscourse used between English native and Indonesian writers in their English RAs. This study focuses on how second language writers (Indonesian writers) apply reflexive metadiscourse and compare it to English native authors.

This study came with 2 different research questions. They are: (1) Are there any differences between English native and Indonesian writers use personal and impersonal of reflexive metadiscourse in their writing of introductions and discussions of RAs? (2) How do they differ in the use personal and impersonal of reflexive metadiscourse in their writing of introductions and discussions of RAs?

METHOD

This study applies a corpus-based study or corpora analysis. It is suitable to analyze linguistic features like metadiscourse features. Baker (2006) claims that corpora analysis implements more quantitative design for linguistic features. In addition, this kind of study depend on both quantitative and qualitative analysis. Therefore, the use of corpora analysis in this study also can be stated as descriptive statistics analysis. It is used to investigate the different and similar amount of reflexive metadiscourse in the journals. Moreover, the descriptive analysis is applied to describe the function of metadiscourse features based on the metadiscourse theories.

Research subject

This study applied 10 RAs from both Indonesians and English native authors. Each consists of 5 introductions and 5 discussions of RAs it can be stated that this study used 10 introductions and 10 discussions from the RAs. Also, the field of TESOL and applied linguistic had been chosen for this study. For English journals were taken from *Assessing Writing* and *Journal of Second Language Writing (JSLW)*. These journals had been chosen since they were published internationally and might be accessed by online. Moreover, for Indonesian journals were taken from *TEFLIN (Teaching English as Foreign Language in Indonesia)* journals and *IJAL (Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistic)*. These journals had been chosen since they were

indexed Scopus in Indonesia and might be accessed by online. Also, all the RAs from the two corpora were taken from the publication period of 2018-2021.

To analyze the data, the articles were read carefully and counted manually by categorizing metadiscourse markers to identify the metadiscourse category. Also, the different color coding used to differ the function of the categories. In order to answer the second aim, the markers were analyzed based on the function in sentence or texts and based on metadiscourse use theory.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. The different amount of personal and impersonal of reflexive metadiscourse used by English native and Indonesian writers in their introduction and discussion of RAs

Table 1: The total amount of Metadiscourse used by English Native and Indonesian authors in introduction section

Metadiscourse	English native corpus (EC)		Local corpus (LC)	
	Amount	Mean	Amount	Mean
Personal metadiscourse				
Meta-text	14	1.56	4	0.4
Writing reading interaction	4	1	3	0.75
Total	18	2.56	7	1.15
Total: 25				
Impersonal metadiscourse	Amount	Mean	Amount	Mean
Refer to code	4	4	5	5
Phoric Markers	30	6	37	7.4
Code glosses	11	11	8	8
Discourse labels	37	5.2	28	5.42
Total	82	26.2	78	25.82
Total: 160				
Overall total	100	28.76	85	26.97

Based on the table above, in introduction section, for overall total of metadiscourse that had been used between more in English native corpus than in Indonesian corpus ($100 > 85$) with the average ($28.76 > 26.97$). Between two different

types of metadiscourse, the use of impersonal one was used more than the personal one (160>25). For personal metadiscourse in the section, also, English native corpus had more amounts than Indonesian (18 vs. 7) with the average (2.56 vs. 1.15). Specifically, from two different kinds of personal metadiscourse that are used in the introductions, English native corpus had higher number for both meta-text ((14 vs. 4) with the average (1.56 vs. 0.4)) and writing reading interaction ((4 vs. 3) with the average (1 vs. 0.75)). It can be stated that the personal metadiscourse rarely used for both English native corpus and Indonesian corpus in their introduction of RAs. Next, for impersonal metadiscourse, English native corpus used more than Indonesian corpus (82 vs. 78) with the average (26.2 vs. 25.82). From the four kinds of impersonal metadiscourse, two of them, refer to code and photics were used more in Indonesian corpus than English native corpus (5 vs. 4) and (37 vs. 30). On the other side, for the others two which code glosses and discourse labels, English native corpus used more than Indonesian corpus (11 vs. 8) and (32 vs. 28). Therefore, it can be concluded that both two corpora used more impersonal than personal but had different amount for the kinds.

Table 2: The total amount of Metadiscourse used by English Native and Indonesian authors in discussion section

Metadiscourse	English native corpus (EC)		Indonesian corpus (IC)	
	Amount	Mean	Amount	Mean
Personal metadiscourse				
Meta-text	13	1.4	6	0.67
Writing reading interaction	4	1	1	0.25
Total	24	2.4	7	0.92
Total: 31				
Impersonal metadiscourse	Amount	Mean	Amount	Mean
Refer to code	11	11	3	3
Phoric Markers	25	5	20	4
Code glosses	6	6	4	4
Discourse labels	25	3.57	23	3.28
Total	67	25.57	50	14.28

Total: 117				
Overall total	91	27.97	57	15.2

As can be seen from the table, in discussion section, for overall amount of metadiscourse that had been used, English native corpus had more than Indonesian corpus (91 > 57) with the average (27.97 > 15.2). Similarly, the use of impersonal metadiscourse had more amount the another one (117 > 31). For personal metadiscourse in the discussions, English native corpus had higher number than Indonesian corpus (24 vs. 7) with the average (2.4 vs. 0.92). Especially, from the kinds of personal metadiscourse, also, English native corpus had higher number for both meta- text ((13 vs. 6) with the average (1.4 vs. 0.67)) and writing reading interaction ((4 vs. 1) with the average (1 vs. 0.25)). It can be stated that from the two tables above meta- text in personal metadiscourse was mostly used in introductions and discussions. Next, for impersonal metadiscourse, English native corpus showed higher number than the Indonesian (67 vs. 50) with the average (25.57 vs. 14.28). For all kinds of impersonal metadiscourse, English native had all higher number than Indonesian such as: refer to code (11 vs. 3), photics (25 vs 20), code glosses (6 vs. 4) and discourse label (25 vs. 23). Overall, it can be concluded that for both introduction and discussion section, English native corpus had higher number than Indonesian corpus. The difference might be seen from the different amount of features in the kinds of personal and impersonal metadiscourse.

2. The use of personal and impersonal of reflexive metadiscourse by English native and Indonesian writers in their introduction and discussion of Ras

2.1 PERSONAL METADISCOURSE

- a. Meta- text is used to contextualize the text. Moreover, it shows the textual organization and language use in the text. They used *saying, introduction to topic, focusing, arguing, adding, and concluding*. Especially, for *introducing topic* it was used to introduce the topic explicitly which is line with the introduction function of RAs, to introduce and tell the aim of study in the articles. Similarly, Li & Xu (2020) found that in its study, *the introducing topic* function of personal metadiscourse was mainly attributed. Moreover, Ädel (2006) claims that the explicit statement of introducing topic is going to facilitate the processing of the subsequent text for the readers. In another metadiscourse model by Hyland (2005), introducing topic is same as "Frame Marker". It is used to announce the aim and topic shift. Next, *focusing* function the next mostly used in the sections. Furthermore, it is used to narrow down purposes, arguments and information in order to take readers' attention on

the specific terms (Ädel, 2006). Moreover, *arguing* function seems the most important function to build readers' trust. Also, arguing is common in the discussion section of RAs (Pérez-llantada, 2010). By using this function, the readers might see how the authors persuade them to believe their statements. Also, the argumentative style of the authors may be seen. Belcher (2009) states that this section to determine of the whole article's rejection or acceptance. By arguing, the authors give negotiation room of meaning for the readers (Tjioe, 2014). Next, *reminding* is also found had more number in the discussion section. Tjioe (2014). states that the use of reminding in the discussion, implies a continuity that connects a previewed part of discourse with the next part. It is indicated that arguing and reminding were important functions of personal metadiscourse in the discussion section. For examples in introductions and discussions:

- ***we aim to bring some new analytic lenses*** (*Canadian, European, from applied linguistics and sociolinguistics*) to the fields of composition and second language writing in North America (taken from intro EC 4)
 - ***Our focus is on the dilemmas and challenges*** that WI course instructors face responding to linguistically-diverse classes made up large numbers of EAL students (taken from intro EC 4)
 - ***We conclude by considering implications*** for doctoral students and their supervisors (taken from intro EC 5)
 - ***We argue that***, as a result of increased social and linguistic diversity, such binaries are becoming ever-increasingly blurred and less relevant (taken from intro EC 4)
 - ***As we saw earlier***, study possibilities for self-hood take place within the epistemologies and conventions of particular disciplinary communities (taken from discussion EC 5)
- b. Writer-reader interaction is used to anticipate readers' reaction to build the relationship between them and the authors by engaging them in the dialogue. It is used to help the writers how to persuade the readers through the texts. Also, they should pay attention to predict the imagined readers' reaction. In introductions, English native authors used all functions except *clarifying* and in their discussions they used *aligning perspective* and *clarifying*. First, *aligning perspective* was known to have the reader to have same perspective as the authors. This function seems to be a strong rhetorical device in that the readers is assumed to agree with the authors to develop their argumentation that the audience would be more likely to follow (Tjioe, 2014). It can be stated that this function might be important for both introduction and discussion section. Next, *appealing the reader* seems to influence the readers' attitude so the writers' argument can be accepted (Ädel, 2006). For the argumentative skill in writing, besides *arguing* in personal metadiscourse, the use of *aligning*

perspective and *appealing to reader* seem really important to make the readers believe of writers' statement. For examples in introductions and discussions:

- **Only a couple of studies, to my knowledge, have attempted to map the criteria communal raters attend to in communal assessment sessions** (taken from intro EC 2)
- **Unfortunately, we did not find many published empirical studies that had also investigated the implementation of online flipped learning, albeit we had tried to check the articles that cited Marshall's work** (taken from intro LC 5)
- **Thus, the classification of coping strategies in the existing literature can only be interpreted approximately. We can assume that a student only applies one strategy when learning a language** (taken from intro LC 2)
- **And in the process, raters might become frustrated, but as Columbini & McBride argue, we must accept "conflict and consensus as dynamic intertwined processes"** (taken from intro EC 2)
- **Therefore, we doubt these strategies would provide a significant influence to reduce language anxiety** (taken from discussion LC 2)
- **we also attempted to elicit the supervisors' evaluation of any development in how the students expressed their voice. We did this by presenting the supervisors with two sets of comparable texts written by each student** (taken from discussion EC 5)

2.2 IMPERSONAL METADISOURSE

- a. Refer to the text/ code is used to the words/ expressions used in the text or the text itself at various level. It used to name the article when it was told in the statements, such as: *this article, this study, the study, etc.* This function is specifically to ask the readers to focus on the word that showed by the authors. In Hyland (2005) model of metadiscourse it is same as "Evidential" that was used to bring the information supporting the authors' statements. Loi & Lim (2013) state that the evidential form is used as the additional information or new references from the other sources than the information to be well- informed. In these sections, *refer to code* used to tell the position of the study, such as: *this article, this present study, etc.* Also, when the articles have tables or figures, *refer to code* used to tell the readers to see them. For examples in introductions and discussions:
 - *The first inference, **evaluation 1** refers to the link between an observation of performance and the observed score* (taken from intro EC 1)
 - *Examples of ideational metaphors can be seen in **Figure 1*** (taken from intro LC 4)
 - *In terms of the distinct decision-making **behaviors (Research Question 1)**, the raters displayed a wide array of behaviors* (taken from discussion EC 2)
 - *The challenges as identified in **Table 2** affirm similar findings of previous studies on novice and pre service teachers* taken from discussion LC 1)
- b. Phoric markers were used to mark the sign of the texts. Phoric markers have some functions. They are: *Previews, Reviews, Enumerators, Textual Deixis* and *Introducing &*

Closing. This study found that phoric markers had been used more than others category. *Preview* is used to tell or to announce what happened in the text. It asks the readers to take a look the next information of the text. On the other side, the next is *review*. *Review* is used to remind the reader about previous thing in the texts. It has the same function as *reminding* in personal metadiscourse but it only focus on chunks or features without any explicit way. Moreover, in Hyland (2005) metadiscourse model, these two functions are same as "Endophoric Marker". This marker used to tell the information that refer to other parts that which has been and will be discussed. In other comparative studies, also, this study found that English native authors used this function in their RAs (Li & Xu, 2020; Loi & Lim, 2013; Mu et al., 2015; Ozdemir & Longo, 2014). But, this study found that English native and Indonesian authors used them in equal number. The last function of phoric markers is enumerators. It is used to specify parts of information when related to each other. Mostly, the authors used it to tell the information when it has more than one number. Furthermore, in Hyland (2005) metadiscourse model, this function is same as "Frame Marker" that is used to number or to list the information. For examples in introductions and discussions:

- *Other types of grammatical metaphor are discussed **in the following section*** (taken from intro LC 4)
 - **Previously**, *During the 1990s, a group of scholars consistently challenged the language anxiety concept proposed by mainstream expert* (taken from intro LC 2)
 - **First**, *it aims at identifying specific moments when the students feel most anxious, including the effect that anxiety imposes on the students' performance. **Second**, it intends to investigate how the students apply the coping strategies and recognize...* (taken from intro LC 2)
 - **As the results showed**, *the correlations for almost all sets of related measures met the minimum threshold value of 0.70.* (taken from discussion EC 1)
 - **Finally**, *Resignation strategies are when students do not make any attempt to alleviate the tension* (taken from intro LC 2)
- c. Code glosses is used to give interpretation of elements or comments of responding in the articles. Moreover, in Hyland (2005) metadiscourse model, this category has the same function as "Code Glosses" which is used to be reformulation in the text. It can be stated the use of code glosses to make the statement is clearer so the readers may understand easily. In contrastive studies, code glosses are mostly used by English authors (Li & Xu, 2020; Loi & Lim, 2013; Ozdemir & Longo, 2014). It is indicated that code glosses also one of metadiscourse markers that is important and should be used in the articles. For examples in introductions and discussions:

- ***In fact***, in communal assessments, diversity rather than homogeneity are assumed to encourage sound assessments (taken from intro EC 2)
 - ***In other words***, any decisions in teaching practices must be research-based (taken from intro LC 5)
 - ***In other words***, it seems essential for the teacher to provide the syllabus prior to the commencement of the course (taken from discussion LC 5)
 - ***More specifically***, some students (e.g., John) reported having felt anxious at the beginning of the presentation. (taken from discussion LC 2)
- d. Discourse labels contains of verbs and nouns of expressions that may indicate the textual function of the part of the text. It is used in order to make the readers easy to interpret the various moves of the texts. They are: *saying/ defining, introducing topics, concluding, exemplifying, arguing* and *adding* First, the *exemplifying* function is to mark of giving example in the text. The authors used it to sigh when the statement has the examples to make it clearer. Moreover, in Hyland (2005) metadiscourse model, this category has the same function as "Code Glosses" which is used to be exemplification in the text. Second, the *arguing* function is used to emphasize the statement of the text. It has similar function of *arguing* in personal metadiscourse but this function only feature or chunks. In another metadiscourse model by Hyland (2005), *arguing* function has same function as "Boosters". It used to emphasize the authors' argument in order to make the readers have the conclusion as them. In others comparative and in this study, mostly, boosters were used by English authors (Gholami et al., 2014; Li & Xu, 2020; Mu et al., 2015; Ozdemir & Longo, 2014). Last, the *adding* function is used to add arguments or information that is needed. In another metadiscourse model by (Hyland, 2005), *adding* function has same function as "Transition Marker". It is used to define the key concept and to deliver clarifications in the text. Additive function which is the same as this function is one of the transition marker. This study found that the English native authors commonly used this additive function in their articles. It was proved (Gholami et al., 2014; Lee & Casal, 2014; Li & Xu, 2020; Mu et al., 2015; Ozdemir & Longo, 2014). In contrast, Mur-Dueñas (2007) which conduct metadiscourse comparative study between English and Spanish found that English text used lower additive marker than Spanish text. For examples in introductions and discussions:
- *Positive thinking can be defined as strategies to reduce thinking disturbance, such as providing a self- positive statement, or simply praying.* (taken from intro LC 2)
 - *Grammatical metaphor, which refers to the realization of a meaning in non-congruent grammar, does not deal with literal meanings* (taken from intro LC 4)

- *Thus, incorporating pre service teachers' reflections in portraying their initial professional development during **teaching practicum is a recommended measure to do, as conducted in this present study*** (taken from intro LC 1)
- ***To this end**, in all of these studies, the dialogic interactions were not so much a sharing of roles between the teachers and L2 writers* (taken from intro EC 3)
- ***Another example** is a study conducted by another study on the impact of task complexity on L2 writing processes.* (taken from intro LC 3)
- ***it does highlight the importance** of examining the scoring mechanisms, specifically them criteria used to judge students' writing performance, within a validity argument for classroom-based assessments* (taken from intro EC 1)
- ***It is clear from the discussion** thus far that for our five supervisors (perhaps with the exception of their personal preferences), there was a very close link between the overall quality of writing and perceived voice* (taken from discussion EC 5)
- ***Furthermore**, we could have expected much higher scores in students' post-test had we employed a progress test rather than a proficiency test as our post-test* (taken from discussion LC 5)

Metadiscourse has its own important function in the research articles (RAs). They are well-known as the complex articles since it should present the logical explanation and persuasive ideas for the readers (Swales & Feak, 2004). It is obviously stated that when the authors write this kind of article they should be aware in how to show the logic explanation and persuasive meanings. The using of metadiscourse is one of the correct way to show how to explain the ideas logically and how to persuade the readers. Hyland (2005) states that in fact, metadiscourse is functioned to persuade by showing appeals to rationality, credibility and character, and emotions. It can be stated that by using metadiscourse correctly may help the authors to write the good articles and publish them. Moreover, Ädel (2006) states that the using of metadiscourse is not only to serve the ideational function of the texts. Therefore, it seems that using metadiscourse features one of the appropriate way to make the readers understand. It is obvious since some researchers explored the use of metadiscourse through RAs. In addition, Loi & Lim (2013) and Hyland (1998) states that the pressure of scholars from their institutions to publish the journals it might be the reason that the use of metadiscourse correctly by adopting similar rhetorical of English used in order to engage the readers.

Moreover, when the authors used personal metadiscourse, it means they used pronoun pattern to show their existence explicitly. Commonly, the personal type refers to spoken language which use pronoun pattern (I and we). In this study, mostly, personal metadiscourse was used by English native authors. Other studies also found that mostly English authors mentioned themselves explicitly in their texts (Lee & Casal, 2014; Lee & Deakin, 2016; Loi & Lim, 2013; Mu et al., 2015; Mur-Dueñas, 2011;

Ozdemir & Longo, 2014). Actually, the use of pronoun link in academic article shows that the writers are responsible for the statements. Also, the effect may influence the reader about the claims (K. Hyland, 2001; Tang & John, 1999). Furthermore, Mur-Dueñas (2011) claims that English writers mentioned themselves in the text to indicate the scholars compete to publish the RAs internationally in English seems being the reason if the higher number.

On the other side, Ohta (1991) and Scollon (1994) state the use of first pronoun in the RAs is unacceptable largely in the Asia culture traditions since it is depended on the individual ideology rather that collective identity. Also, Mu et al. (2015) and Li & Xu (2020) states that although all RAs were single- authored, instead of using singular- pronoun to mention the existence of authors explicitly, Chinese authors did not mention themselves explicitly because they did not feel comfortable to put it in the articles. Sometimes, they used plural first pronoun or more often impersonal construction marker (i.e., the author, the writer, etc.) to play down the ownership and responsibility of the statements (Harwood, 2005). It seems that between the use of personal and impersonal metadiscourse was differed by the cultural factors, the confidence authors and publishing business.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the result of this research shows that there are findings in comparing the use of reflexive metadiscourse (i.e., personal and impersonal metadiscourse) between English native and Indonesian authors in their introduction and discussion section of RAs. As mentioned in previous chapter, this study conducts the descriptive statistics analysis to find and to answer the research questions. It can be stated the simple statistical analysis applied to show the different amount and mean of metadiscourse features. Moreover, the descriptive analysis applies to show how and why the features were used in the texts.

First, in simple statistic, this study finds the different amount and average of metadiscourse ued in form of numbers. It finds that between those two authors, English native authors have the higher number for using reflexive metadiscourse in general for both introduction and discussion section. The difference between two authors is found in the category of each reflexive metadiscourse type. For instance, in the introductions for personal metadiscourse, English native authors have higher number in both categories, meta- text and writer reader interaction. On the other side, Indonesian authors have higher number for two categories of impersonal metadiscourse such as: refer to code and phoric markers. Two others categories were had by English native authors (i.e., code glosses and discourse labels). Surprisingly, for

the discussion, English native authors have high number for both personal and impersonal metadiscourse features.

Next, in general, both English native and Indonesian authors have their own style in using each metadiscourse category. This study has discussed deeply the differences between the authors use personal and impersonal metadiscourse. Moreover, this study finds that English native authors use more personal metadiscourse to mention themselves explicitly in the texts (i.e., pronoun pattern: I and we). The authors believe when they use the link pronoun in academic articles, it shows writers' responsible in making the statements. Also, it is the reason of the acceptance to publish the RAs internationally is higher. On the other side, Indonesian authors mostly used impersonal metadiscourse in their texts. In fact, the use of first pronoun is unacceptable in Asia culture. Then, it can be stated that Asian authors rarely used pronoun pattern: I and we in their articles. Therefore, they mostly used impersonal metadiscourse which focuses on the chunks or features.

This study is expected to give benefits to whom interest in the comparative study of metadiscourse use. Therefore, there are some suggestions for the future researchers, the writers and English teachers. First, for the future researchers, other studies mostly have been explored in this field of study (i.e., TESOL and applied linguistic). The future researchers may point out other fields of study such as chemistry, business, health, etc. Also, they can focus in other different genre of texts, for example: news- paper, speeches, orations, etc. for Indonesian researchers, since this study focuses on the Indonesian journals which are published in Scopus, they can explore the metadiscourse marker for journals which are higher and published in Q1 journals such as: Modern Language Journal, Asia TEFL, TESEOL Quarterly, etc. This kind of study seems really important to inform to other researchers how the use of metadiscourse markers in their articles that can be accepted in the good journals.

Second, the writers are really important to understand the use of metadiscourse correctly. Especially, in writing RAs, they are known as the complex articles to show logical explanation and to persuade the readers. It is in line with the general function of metadiscourse which is used to show the ideas of writing logically and to build good relationship with the readers. It can be stated that by using metadiscourse correctly may help the authors to write the good articles and publish them. Also, by reading and understanding more about metadiscourse use, they may know how published journals use the metadiscourse markers and can replicate them in their writings. Next, for English teachers and lecturers, because the metadiscourse is used to make the coherence and to build interaction with the readers, it seems really important to teach them in the class. Especially for college students, since they should

write a research article as their final project in academic writing subject, the understanding of metadiscourse seems important to make them understand how to interact and to persuade the readers in the text. Therefore, this study may be one of the reference to help the students in order to understand the metadiscourse use to make the better writings.

REFERENCES

- Ädel, A. (2006). Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English / Annelie Ädel. *Studies in Corpus Linguistics*, 24, x, 243 p.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. Continuum.
- Belcher, W. L. (2009). *Writing Your Journal Article in Twelve Weeks: A Guide to Academic Publishing Success*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Cao, F., & Hu, G. (2014). Interactive metadiscourse in research articles: A comparative study of paradigmatic and disciplinary influences. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 66, 15–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.02.007>
- Crismore, A. (1984). The case for a rhetorical perspective on learning from texts: exploring metadiscourse. *Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*, 1–26.
- Crismore, A., Markannen, 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>
- Del Saz-Rubio, M. M. (2011). A pragmatic approach to the macro-structure and metadiscoursal features of research article introductions in the field of Agricultural Sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30, 258–271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.03.002>
- Fa-gen, L. (2012). Identification and Functions of Metadiscourse. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10(1), 864–854.
- Gholami, M., Tajalli, G., & Shokrpour, N. (2014). An investigation of metadiscourse markers in English medical texts and their Persian translation based on Hyland's model. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 2(2), 1–41.
- Gil, N. N. (2018). Reflexive metadiscourse in a corpus of Spanish bachelor dissertations in EFL. *Research n Corpus Linguistics*, 49(6), 29–49. <https://doi.org/10.32714/ricl.06.04>

- Harwood, N. (2005). "Nowhere has anyone attempted ... In this article I aim to do just that" A corpus-based study of self-promotional I and we in academic writing across four disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(8 SPEC. ISS.), 1207–1231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.01.012>
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse*. 30.
- Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(3), 207–226. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(00\)00012-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00012-0)
- Hyland, K. (2005a). *Metadiscourse*. NY:Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2005b). *Metadiscourse Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Continuum.
- Hyland, K. E. N. (2007). *Applying a Gloss: Exemplifying and Reformulating in Academic Discourse*. *Hyland 2005*, 266–285. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm011>
- Lee, J. J., & Casal, J. E. (2014). Metadiscourse in results and discussion chapters: Across-linguistic analysis of English and Spanish thesis writers in engineering. *System*, 46(1), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.009>
- Lee, J. J., & Deakin, L. (2016). Interactions in L1 and L2 undergraduate student writing: Interactional metadiscourse in successful and less-successful argumentative essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 33, 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.06.004>
- Lee, J. J., & Subtirelu, N. C. (2015). Metadiscourse in the classroom: A comparative analysis of EAP lessons and university lectures. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37(1), 52–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.005>
- Li, Z., & Xu, J. (2020). Reflexive metadiscourse in Chinese and English sociology research article introductions and discussions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 159, 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.02.003>
- Liu, Y., Li, Y., Zhang, H., & Huang, W. (2016). *Gender differences in information quality of virtual communities: A study from an expectation-perception perspective*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.08.011>
- Loi, C. K., & Lim, M.-H. J. (2013). metadiscourse in English and Chinese research article introductions. *Discourse Studies*, 15(2), 129–146.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445612471476>

- McGrath, L., & Kuteeva, M. (2012). Stance and engagement in pure mathematics research articles: Linking discourse features to disciplinary practices. *English for Specific Purposes, 31*(3), 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.11.002>
- Mu, C., Zhang, L. J., Ehrich, J., & Hong, H. (2015). The use of metadiscourse for knowledge construction in Chinese and English research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 20*, 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.09.003>
- Mur-Dueñas, P. (2007). same genre, same discipline: however, there are differences: a cross-cultural analysis of logical markers in academic writing. *ESP Across Cultures, 4*, 37–53.
- Mur-Dueñas, P. (2011). An intercultural analysis of metadiscourse features in research articles written in English and in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(12), 3068–3079. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.05.002>
- Ohta, A. S. (1991). evidentiality and politeness in Japanese. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 2*(2), 183–210. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/29x4q44m>
- Ozdemir, N. O., & Longo, B. (2014). Metadiscourse Use in Thesis Abstracts: A Cross-cultural Study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 141*, 59–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.011>
- Pérez-Ilantada, C. (2010). The Discourse Functions of Metadiscourse in Published Academic Writing : Issues of Culture and Language 1. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 9*, 41–68.
- Salas, M. D. (2015). Reflexive metadiscourse in research articles in Spanish: Variation across three disciplines (Linguistics, Economics and Medicine). *Journal of Pragmatics, 77*, 20–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.12.006>
- Scollon, R. O. N. (1994). As a matter of fact : The changing ideology of authorship and responsibility in discourse. *World Englishes, 13*(1), 33–46.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills (2nd ed.)*. The University of Michigan Press.
- Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The "I" in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*(SUPPL. 1). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(99\)00009-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00009-5)

- Tjiioe, L. N. (2014). Reflexive Personal Metadiscourse In Research Articles On Language Learning: A Discourse Analysis. *Lexicon*, 3(1), 45–64.
- Toumi, N. (2009). A Model for the Investigation of Reflexive Metadiscourse in Research Articles. *University of Reading Language Studies Working Papers*, 1, 64–73.
- Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). Some Exploratory Discourse on Metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36(1), 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.2307/357609>
- Vergaro, C. (2004). Discourse strategies of Italian and English sales promotion letters. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23(2), 181–207. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(03\)00003-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(03)00003-6)