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**Abstract**

In delivering an argument, there are several things that must be known, such as the theme, the purpose, and content of the argument in debate. Also, since debate demands critical thinking, debaters need to consider their words’ choice in delivering their argument. In that case, this research aims to analyze the uses of interactional metadiscourse markers that is applied in the Bloomberg International Debate. In doing the analysis, the writer used descriptive method and proposed Hyland’s theory (2005). As the result of the research, it shows that the most speaker who is producing interactional metadiscourse markers is Ella Cox, followed by John Allan and then Ndidie Okezie and finally Auday and Rus Ma. Apparently, although there are three speakers in each team (both proposition and opposition), it seems that the third person on each team only as support and the one who then summarize the result of the debate for each team. Further, related to the uses of interactional metadiscourse, the most used of the interactional dimension markers is self-mention, followed by booster, hedges and booster.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Debate is an activity of having argument as process of inquiry and advocacy either individually or in groups that provides reasoned argument to support for and against a proposition (Freeley and Steinberg, 2013). Commonly, in the field of law courts and legislative bodies, debate is used as media to reach decisions (Freeley and Steinberg, 2013). However, recently the writer noticed that debate is not only used for formal purposes but also used a medium for competition, both national and international. Thus, regarding to the phenomenon, the writer in this research is interested in examining a debate show in Bloomberg International Debate. Here, the writer finds debate as an interesting topic since the debaters always provide and give opinions or arguments for every proposition.

In delivering an argument, there are several things that must be aware, such as the theme, the purpose, and content of the argument in debate. Also, since debate demands critical thinking, debaters needs to considers their words’ choice in delivering their argument. In that case, this research aims to analyze the issue by dealing with the aspect of debaters' language during giving arguments. The writer addresses issues such as the type and function of every word that was uttered by debaters during argumentation. Therefore, in order to analyze that kind of issue, a study of interactional metadiscourse markers can be applied.

Metadiscourse mostly focuses on written language but there are kinds of phenomena in spoken language that can be found and analyzed in metadiscourse, such as: language gender, political debates and many others (Hyland, 2005: 24). Thus, regarding to the explanation, it can be said that commonly, metadiscourse is a study that focuses on written language. However, it does not mean that metadiscourse do not analyze spoken language. As the matter of fact, metadiscourse also can be used as tool to analyzed language gender, political debates and many more.

Furthermore, Hyland (2005: 50) also divides metadiscourse into two broad categories, they are: interactive metadiscourse and interactional metadiscourse. The interactive metadiscourse centers on the content of the text, while interactional focus on the participants of the interaction (Zareifard and Alinezhad, 2014). Thus, since this research focuses on the argument of debaters, which every argument shows the interaction among the debaters, the writer noticed that interactional metadiscourse can be applied to analyzed the debate. Therefore, in this analysis, the writer is interested in analyzing interactional metadiscourse in debate to explore the metadiscourse markers employed by the debaters in the Bloomberg International Debate with the topic “*Is Education the Most Important Factor in Achieving a Diverse Business Environment?*”.

Interestingly, the study of metadiscourse have been discussed by many scholars such as Mina and Biria (2017) who identify interactive and interactional metadiscourse in a targeted sample of 100 English research articles written by Iranian writers utilizing Hyland’s taxonomy.As the result, the Iranian writers used hedges, boosters and self-mention more frequently in medical science articles compared to those in social sciences. Salichah et al (2015) investigated the use of hedges and boosters which are important in academic writing discourse as a mean of communicative strategies for increasing or reducing the force of statement. The finding indicates that students used hedges more than boosters in their research articles as a way of reducing the risk of opposition, as a mean of being polite and as a way to obscure their authorial identity while advancing their opinion. Sari (2014) examined and explained the function of interpersonal metadiscourse markers used in Michele Obama’s speech. The result of the research shows that both interactive and interactional metadiscourse are applied in the Michele Obama’s speech.

Accordingly, metadiscourseis considered as a new concept in fields of discourse analysis and language education (Mirshamsi and Allami, 2013). Further, this research aimed to describe the types of interactional metadiscourse markers and its function used by the debaters in Bloomberg International Debate. Also, this research is expected to give readers new knowledge about overview of metadiscourse, especially how to applied the interactional one in debate as form of verbal text.

**Research Method**

In order to do the analysis, the researcher employed Hyland’s theory (2005) of metadiscourse.Metadiscourse is recognized as an important means of facilitating communication, supporting a writers' position and building a relationship with an audience (Hyland and Tse, 2004).Metadiscourse also defined as discoursing about spoken or written discourse which provides readers or listeners with direction rather than information (Crismore et al, 1994; Ädel, 2006). However, Hyland (2015) defined metadiscourse as the interpersonal resources used to organize discourse or the writer’s stance toward either its content or the reader. In that case, the study of metadiscourse reminds us that statements do not just have an orientation to the world outside of the text, but simultaneously orientate to the readers’ understanding of that world through the text itself.

Metadiscourse allows readers to understand discourse texture and intertextuality, to share pragmatic presuppositions, to infer intended meanings, and to interpret the institutional and ideological ties underlying the text (Pérez-Llantada, 2003) and it facilitate the reconstruction of the writer’s writing plan by readers and helps readers create and affirm expectations about the text (Crismore in Hashemi and Golparvar, 2012).

Here, the study of metadiscourse can be analyzed both in written and spoken form. Thus, Hyland (2005) distinguish the model of metadiscourse into two categories, they are interactive and interactional metadiscourse.The interactive metadiscourse centers on the content of the text, while interactional focus on the participants of the interaction (Zareifard and Alinezhad, 2014).Both of interactive and interactional resources being as two inter-related modes of interaction (Thompson, 2001). However, since this research focused in analyzing interactional metadiscourse, the writer only described the markers of interactional metadiscourse based on Hyland (2005) which the model of the metadiscourse can be noticed as follow:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Interactional Resource Involve The Reader in The Text** | | |
| **Category** | **Function** | **Keywords** |
| **Hedges** | Withhold writer’s full commitment to proposition | Might/perhaps/possible/about |
| **Boosters** | Emphasize force or the writer’s certainty in proposition | In fact/definitely/it is clear that |
| **Attitude markers** | Express the writer’s attitude to proposition | Unfortunately/I agree/surprisingly |
| **Engagement markers** | Explicitly refer to or build relationship with the reader | Consider/note that/you can see that |
| **Self-mention** | Explicit reference to author(s) | I/we/my/our |

Table 1. Hyland’s Model of Interactional Metadiscourse (2005: 49)

Hyland (2005: 49) explained that the interactional metadiscourse concerns the ways writers conduct interaction by intruding and commenting on their message. As it seen from the table 1., those features are metadiscourse markers that are mentioned by Hyland in order to involve readers and open opportunities for them to contribute to the discourse by alerting them to the author’s perspective towards both propositional information and readers themselves.

**A. Hedges**

Hedges are devices such as *possible*, *might* and *perhaps*, which indicate the writer's decision to recognize alternative voices and viewpoints and so withhold complete commitment to a proposition(Hyland, 2005). Hyland (2005: 52) also stated that “the use of hedges enables the writers to express a perspective on their statements, to present unproven claims with caution and to enter to a dialogue with their audience.” Example: *And for me, this is personal because my story* ***would not*** *be* ***possible*** *without this city.*(Sari, 2014)

**B. Boosters**

Boosters as a tool which serves to strengthen the claim to show the writer’s commitment and can be used as a means orcommitment to the truth value of proposition (Hyland, 1988a). The function of boosters is to increase the force of assertions, medium to create interpersonal solidarity with readers (Hyland, 2005).Example: *It is* ***certainly*** *a pleasure to be here with all of you today.* (Sari, 2014)

**C. Attitude Markers**

Attitude markers express writer’s attitude to propositional content, conveying surprise, obligation, agreement, and importance(Hyland, 2005). Hyland (2005: 53) also explained that “this markers are realized in deontic verbs (should, have to), attitudinal adverbs, adjectival constructions, and cognitive/mental verbs which instead of commenting on the status of information, its probable relevance, reliability or truth, attitude markers convey surprise, agreement, importance, obligation, frustration, and so on.” Example: ***Unfortunately****, the level of health is very low among agers in Iran*. (Zareifard and Alinezhad, 2014).

**D. Self-Mentions**

Self-mentions refers to the degree of explicit author presence in the text measured by the frequency of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives (such as: I, me, mine, exclusive we, our, ours)(Hyland, 2005: 53). Self-mentions suggest the extent of author presence in terms of first-person pronouns and possessives and it also reflects the degree of author presence in terms of the incidence of first person pronouns and possessives (Hyland, 2005: 53). Example: ***We*** *are so very proud of you.*(Sari, 2014)

**E. Engagement Markers**

Engagement Markers are devices that explicitly address readers, either to focus their attention or include them as discourse participants. It explicitly addresses readers, either by selectively focusing their attention or by including them as participants in the text through second-person pronouns, imperatives, question forms and asides (Hyland, 2005).Example: *And as business leaders,* ***you*** *all know that this city’s young people are* ***your*** *future workers,* ***your*** *future customers.*(Sari, 2014)

**Findings and Discussions**

The research analyzed the interactional metadiscourse markers in Bloomberg International Debate with topic “*Is Education the Most Important Factor in Achieving a Diverse Business Environment?*” which was held on Bloomberg. In the analysis, the writer focuses on the speakers or the debaters, since all of them show different argumentation that lead into another idea. These kinds of argument are also used by the debaters in order to answer the question that is given by other debaters. Hence, in producing their arguments, they will producing different kinds of interactional metadiscourse that also have different function.

**Hedges**

**4.1 Might**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 1st Opposition Speaker | This shows that we have severe problems in the education system that we ***might***not be able to fix. In the next few years, it ***might*** take us decades to actually fix these problems… |

Table 4.1 The Finding on marker “Might”

Table 4.1 shows that the metadiscourse marker that is used by the speaker is the word “might”. Here, the speaker comes from the opposition and according to the speaker, the hedges “might” is used in order to show two issues. The first is the issue of education system that is probably cannot be fixed and secondly, even though the problem of educational system can be fixed, it might take a very long time (indicated by the word “decades” by the speaker). Here, the use of word “might” as the interactional metadiscourse of hedges on the sentences above is showing an uncertainty. In other word, the hedges “might” in this case shows the function as information to give an opinion rather than fact. Here, the speaker tries to give the audience and other speakers their own judgement from their own point of view by seeing this kind of constrain of beneficial growth.

**Booster**

**4.2 Truth**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 1st Proposition Speaker | In today’s debate we face an incontrovertible***truth*** that education is the passport to prosperity. |

Table 4.2 The finding on marker “Truth”

As it seen from the table 4.2, the metadiscourse marker used by the speaker is “truth” which in this case, the speaker comes from the proposition. Here, the speaker used booster from the word “truth” to explain to the audience and also other debater participants about the reality that happened recently based on his perspective that education is the passport to prosperity. The speaker uses the maker “truth” to boost or strengthen his opinion about his argument that education is the most important thing in order to reach prosperity. In other word, the booster from the word “truth” has function to strengthen an argument by leading the audience to draw the similar conclusion as the speaker.

**4.3 In Fact**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 2nd Proposition Speaker | ***In fact***, with all the us-and-them rhetoric that is so prevalent across our society today, … is ***in fact*** the only way we will ever truly deliver on that vision. |

Table 4.3 The finding on marker “In Fact”

The table 4.3 above shows that the speaker is using different booster that is “in fact” twice in order to support the previous speaker (from proposition) which is they believed that the truth that education is the ground or the basic thing that laying on the very groundwork business world is a fact. In that case, the function of booster in the word “in fact” from the utterance has function to strengthen the speaker’s argument by leading the audience to draw the same idea as the speaker.

**4.4 Of Course**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 1st Opposition Speaker | That’s not something we’re going to disagree with, ***of course*** there are discrepancies in recruitment. |

Table 4.4 The finding on marker “Of Course”

The next booster that is used by speakers is the word “of course” which in this case, this booster is mentioned by two speakers, the first from the opposition and secondly from the proposition. However, regarding to the metadiscourse markers, both of them are having similar function, that is strengthening the speaker’s argument so that the speaker is able to lead the audience to get into speaker’s perspective.The only difference is the topic that they are delivered for both debaters and audience. In this case, the speaker is talking about discrepancies or differentiation in recruitment for some factors when people go to the same recruitment process.

**4.5 Very Clear**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 1st Proposition Speaker | Our definition today is ***very clear*** we think that in the school system where the primary, … |
| …and so, our case actually today is ***very clear***; how do we make it so... |

Table 4.5 The finding on marker “Very Clear”

Based on the table 4.5, there the speaker is using booster “very clear” twice. First, it is used in order to gives his argument about the importance education which in this case, it described as the school system on the primary, secondary or tertiary that is developing both important skills and technical skills. Further,on the second argument, the speaker is giving his supporting idea of how important the education for business world since in this case, he brings the matter of Asia and Africa which is alluded from the opposition’s speaker. Here, the metadiscourse marker has function to strengthen the arguments so that he can lead the audience so they can have the similar thought or idea with the speaker which the ideas are from the combination from two arguments that is about the importance of educational system.

**Attitude Markers**

**4.6 Agree**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 1st Opposition Speaker | On side opposition today, we also ***agree*** that education is extremely important, but what side proposition are missing out on is that alone education cannot achieve diversity. |

Table 4.6 The finding on marker “Agree”

On the table 4.6 above, it shows that the metadiscoursemarkers that is used by the speaker is in the word “agree”. Here, through the attitude markers, the speaker is telling about her argument that both her team and herself personally agree that education is extremely important which in this case, the speaker basically agree with the argument from the proposition team that education is important for society and business world. In this case, the markers which is used by the speaker has function to demonstrate an agreement.

**4.7 Totally**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 2nd Opposition Speaker | Everyone on our side of the argument ***totally*** accepts that point… |

Table 4.7 The finding on marker “totally”

Based on the table 4.7 above, the markers still from the attitude markers, only this time, it comes from the word “totally”.Here, the agreement based on his utterance is that the speaker and his team agree with the argument or idea from the proposition team where they admit that education is important and vital. Further, the researcher found that the function of this marker also similarly to the previous data that is to show an agreement of an argument or opinion.

**Self-Mention**

**4.8 I**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 1st Proposition Speaker | On that basis, ***I*** beg to propose, thank you. |

Table 4.8 The finding on marker “I”

In the interactional metadiscourse markers of self-mention, the researcher found almost from each of the speaker. In that case, the researcher only put one example datum that is related to each marker since the function are similar. Here, the most used marker by the speaker that the researcher found is from the word “I”. As it seen from the table 4.8, the example of the datum is taken from the proposition speaker which in this case, the speaker uses it after he finished delivering the argument. As the function of this marker, it is used to explicit reference to author, means that the marker of “I” shows reference to the speaker herself which refers to the speaker from proposition.

**4.9 We**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 1st Proposition Speaker | In today’s debate ***we*** face an incontrovertibletruth that education is the passport to prosperity. |
| Our definition today is very clear ***we***think that in the school system where the primary… |

Table 4.9 The finding on marker “We”

Table 4.9 above shows another marker from the self-mention metadiscourse which is “we”. Here, the researcher found similar case just like the previous datum that the uses of self-mention “we” is used by most of the speakers, but the only difference is the topic that they bring when they are using this marker. However, the function of this marker is similar for each speaker that is to draw the audience’s attention into the argument from the speaker and to shows that the speaker is representing the similarity of idea or arguments of his team. As it seen from the example of the datum above, the speaker from the proposition used the marker of “we” twice in the debate. In this case, the speaker use this self-mention for two purposes, firstly, the speaker used it to involve the audience to see the fact that education is the key to achieve property and second, to shows the involvement of the speaker and his team of proposition.

**4.10 My**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 1st Proposition Speaker | Today ***my*** partner Ndidi is gonna tell you about the dangers that come with not emphasizing the importance of Education. ***My***partner Rus Ma is gonna summarize but ***my*** case is about the technical base… |

Table 4.10 The finding on marker “My”

The next metadiscourse markers from self-mention that is used by speakers is from the word “my”. Here, the researcher noticed that this marker also used by more than one speaker so that in this case, the researcher only shows one example of many data since the function of this marker is similar that is to indicate the speaker’s possessives which in this case, the possessives are in the form of “partner” and “case”. However, the only difference from one datum to another is the topic that they bring in using the marker. As it seen from the table 4.10, the example shows that the marker of “my” is used to shows the possession of speaker’s partner.

**4.11 Our**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 1st Proposition Speaker | ***Our*** definition today is very clear wethink that in the school system where the primary… |

Table 4.11 The finding on marker “Our”

On the table 4.11 above, it shows another metadiscourse marker that is used by speakers which still in the field of self-mention that is “our”. Similarly to the previous data, this marker also used by more than one speakers so that the researcher only put one datum example that represents all of them since the function of this marker also similar.In this case, the word “our” also acts as the possessive adjective which in this case, the writer noticed that the speaker is using the self-mention to shows the audience about the topic that his team is going to present about. Further, the function of self-mention in this utterance acts as the possessive adjective that refers not only to himself but also refers to his team as well.

**4.12 Us**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speaker** | **Utterance** |
| 2nd Proposition Speaker | I implore you therefore, do not let the opposition take ***us*** backwards with this motion. |

Table 4.12 The finding on marker “Us”

Based on the table 4.12, the metadiscourse marker used by the speakers in the field of self-mention is “us”. In this marker, the researcher found that it is only uttered by two speakers which comes from both opposition and proposition. However, as it similarly shows the similar function, the researcher in this case only shows one datum example in order to represents the uses of the marker. Here, the datum shows that the speaker used the word “us” in her utterance in order to asks the support from the audience that hopefully, they will understand and in line with the objective from the argument of proposition team since the word “us” refers to herself and her team. Thus, the self-mention in this case has function as involving the listener into the speaker’s argument.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the findings, the researcher draws conclusion that regarding to the types of interactional metadiscourse markers, the types of markers that are used by speakers consists of Hedges, Boosters, Attitude Markers, Self-Mention and Engagement Markers. However, in the process of analyzing the metadiscourse markers of interactional dimension, the researcherdid not find the metadiscourse that is related to engagement markers.

In that case, related to the result of the finding, the researcher concludes that the most speaker who is producing interactional metadiscourse markers is the first speaker from the opposition team, followed by the second speaker from the opposition team and then the second speaker from the proposition team and finally the first and third speaker from the proposition team. Apparently, although there are three speakers in each team (both proposition and opposition), it seems that the third person on each team act as support and also the one who summarize the result of the debate for each team. Further, related to the uses of interactional metadiscourse, the most used of the interactional dimension markers is self-mention, followed by booster, hedges and booster. Here, the writer does not need to describe all of the exact data finding since most of them (such self-mention) are showing the similar words so that the function is technically similar.
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