

**METADISCURSIVE INTERACTION IN RESEARCH ARTICLES:
A CASE OF INDONESIAN SCHOLARS WRITING IN BAHASA
INDONESIA AND ENGLISH**

Antonius Suratno

A thesis
submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

School of Education, Communication and Language Science



July 2012

DECLARATION

I acknowledge that this thesis is original and is my own work

Antonius Suratno

July 2012

Abstract

This study presents an analysis of research articles (RAs) written in English (Eng) and Bahasa Indonesia (BI) by 6 Indonesian scholar writers, each contributing 5 RAs in Eng and 5 RAs in BI. The rhetorical features of these 60 pre-published RAs which represent 6 different disciplines (Ecology, Cultural Studies, Applied Linguistics, Economics, Medicine, and Literature) were examined to reveal metadiscursive interaction using the interpersonal metadiscourse (IMD) taxonomy of Crismore et al. (1993) and self-mentions adapting Hyland's (2002c) and Harwood's (2005) models to find out: if writers differ in their deployment of interpersonal metadiscourse and self-mentions across BI and Eng; if differences of education, disciplines and publication experiences influence authors' deployment of these elements in the writing of RAs in BI and Eng; and if their understanding of discourse community and interaction effect their strategies in the writing of RAs in BI and Eng. Using mixed techniques of quantitative and qualitative analysis, the results show that metadiscursive interaction in Eng RAs is significantly different from that of BI RAs with varying patterns across disciplines under study. As regards self-mentions, despite variations in the patterns and frequency of use, the co-text analyses indicate similar discourse functions in that writers project themselves into their discourse to signal their attempt to engage in the unfolding texts and involve the readers into the propositional content of the texts. The findings indicate high levels of contextualisation in writers' efforts to interact with readers and these appear to place high regard on the values embedded in disciplinary culture which reaffirm a previous finding by Hyland (2004), typifying the dynamic nature and fluidity of the genre of an RA, besides also showing each individual's writing style. Combined together, IMD and self-mentions revealed that metadiscursive interaction is a matter of degree of intensity and explicitness, as a result of the inherent disciplinary culture that has sanctioned each discourse community's members.

Key words: Metadiscourse, metadiscursive interaction, interpersonal metadiscourse, discourse community