

**INTERACTIVE METADISOURSE MARKERS IN
HORROR STORY PODCAST**

THESIS

By:
Yoshi Nur Rahmawati
NIM 16320096



**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK
IBRAHIM MALANG
2020**

**INTERACTIVE METADISCOURSE MARKERS IN
HORROR STORY PODCAST**

THESIS

Presented to
Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of *Sarjana Sastra* (S.S)

By:
Yoshi Nur Rahmawati
16320096

Advisor:
H. Djoko Susanto, M. Ed, Ph.D.
NIP 196705292000031001



**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK IBRAHIM
MALANG
2020**

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

I state that the thesis entitled **Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in Horror Story Podcast** is my original work. I do not include any materials previously written or published by another person, except those cited as references and written in the bibliography. Hereby, if there is any objection or claim, I am the only person who is responsible for that.

Malang, 26 December 2020



Yoshi Nur Rahmawati
NIM: 16320096

APPROVAL SHEET

This to certify that Yoshi Nur Rahmawati thesis entitled **Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in Horror Story Podcast** has been approved for thesis examination at Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, as one of the requirements for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S).

Malang, 26 December 2020

Approved by
Advisor



H. Djoko Susanto, M. Ed, Ph.D.
NIP: 196705292000031001

Head of Department of English
Literature,



Rina Sari, M.Pd.
NIP 197506102006042002

Acknowledged by
Dean,

H. Hafid Hafiyah, M.A.
NIP 196609101991032002



LEGITIMATION SHEET

This is to certify that Yoshi Nur Rahmawati thesis entitled **Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in Horror Story Podcast** has been approved by the Boar of Examiners as the requirement for the degree of *Sarjana Sastra* (S.S) in English Letter Department.

Malang, 26 December 2020

The Board of Examiners

Signatures

1. Prof. Dr. H. Mudjia Rahardjo, M.Si.
NIP. 19590101 199003 1005

(Main Examiner)



2. Abdul Aziz, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP. 19690628 200604 1004

(Chair)



3. H. Djoko Susanto, M. Ed, Ph.D.
NIP. 19670529 200003 1001

(Advisor)



Approved by

Dean of Faculty of Humanities



H. Syafiyah, M. A.
NIP. 196609101991032002

MOTTO

Allah knows and that's enough for me.

Success is the best revenge.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this undergraduate thesis to:

My beloved mother, father, and sister.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, the most graceful, and the most merciful. All the deepest gratitude and praise are always to Allah SWT. *Shalawat* and *salam* are always delivered to prophet Muhammad SAW who has brought to us a peaceful and rightness Islam to the entire world. Praised be to Allah, due to his blessings through his Prophet, I can complete my thesis entitled *Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in Horror Story Podcast*, as the requirement for the *Sarjana Sastra (S.S)* in English Letters Department, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.

Furthermore, I realized that this thesis could not be accomplished without any support from others. From this opportunity, I would like express my greatest gratitude for my advisor who has helped me, willing to guide me, and spend his busy time for this thesis, H. Djoko Susanto, M. Ed, Ph. D. I also would like to extend my gratitude to:

1. Dr. Hj. Syafiyah, M.A as the Dean of Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
2. Rina Sari, M. Pd as the head of English Letters Department, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
3. All respectful lecturers for the unlimited knowledge given.
4. My beloved family who always support me, my mother Siti Marfu'ah, my father Bagiyo, and my sister Yustiara Nur Febrianti.
5. All my partners of sharing, friends in English Letters Department 2016 who know me that I cannot mention them one by one. Especially to Laily Rahmah and Ulfa Nur Fitriya. They are the greatest friend I have in this University since they always accompany, support, and help me in problems I have.
6. All my friends in Taekwondo UKM, my best regard to them which have been my new family in Malang also give me worth experiences.

7. Finally, since this research is imperfect and has some weaknesses, the researcher is very welcome for the criticism and suggestions to make it better. Hopefully, this thesis will be useful for all the readers who are interested in illocutionary act and for the next researcher who will fulfilled the gaps.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER	i
STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP	iii
APPROVAL SHEET	iv
LEGITIMATION SHEET	v
MOTTO	vi
DEDICATION.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
ABSTRACT	xii
ABSTRAK	xiii
CHAPTER I.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Background of the study.....	1
B. Problem of the Study	7
C. Objectives of the Study	7
D. Significance of the Study	8
E. Scope and Limitations of the Study.....	8
F. Definition of Key Terms	8
G. Previous Study.....	9
H. Research Method.....	13
1. Research Design.....	13
2. Research Instruments	14
3. Data Source	14
4. Data Collection	15
5. Data Analysis	16
CHAPTER II.....	17
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	17
A. Metadiscourse.....	17
1. Interactive Metadiscourse	20
2. Interactional Metadiscourse.....	23
CHAPTER III	25
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	25
A. Findings.....	25

B. Interactive Metadiscourse Used in Delivering Horror Podcast.....	28
1. The Kinds of Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in Delivering Horror Podcast	28
C. Discussion.....	43
1. The Kinds of Interactive Metadiscourse in Telling Horror Story Trough Podcast.....	43
2. The Used of Interactive Metadiscourse Marker in Telling Horror Story Trough Podcast	46
CHAPTER IV.....	50
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	50
A. Conclusion.....	50
B. Suggestions.....	51
REFERENCES	52
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	54

ABSTRACT

Rahmawati, Yoshi Nur. 2020. *Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in Horror Story Podcast*. Skripsi. Jurusan Sastra Inggris. Fakultas Humaniora. Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Pembimbing: H. Djoko Susanto, M.Ed, Ph. D.

Key words: podcast, *Interactive Metadiscourse Marker*. Horror Story.

This study aims to describe how the use of Interactive Metadiscourse markers in the delivery of horror stories through podcast media hosted by Sapphire and Markeia in their channel "*Something Scary Podcast*". Researchers used the Hyland (2005) model in analyzing this research. The data used were taken from ten episodes of "*Something Scary Podcast*". Then, the research was carried out using a qualitative descriptive method. This is because this research is arranged in words to make it easier to describe the use of Interactive Metadiscourse markers.

The resulting findings are in the form of phrases, words, and sentence parts that meet the criteria as markers for Interactive Metadiscourse which are classified into two; kinds and functions. Researchers identified several cases. First, the researchers identified the kinds of Interactive Metadiscourse markers used in the delivery of horror stories through podcasts. Second, identifying the function of using these markers is according to the theory proposed by Hyland (2005).

From the research that has been done above, in order to increase the topic to be broader, researchers hope that further research can study and understand Metadiscourse markers in different objects and topics so as to create more interesting.

ABSTRAK

Rahmawati, Yoshi Nur. 2020. *Penanda Inetractive Metadiscourse Dalam Cerita Horror Melalui Podcast*. Skripsi. Jurusan Sastra Inggris. Fakultas Humaniora. Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Pembimbing: H. Djoko Susanto, M.Ed, Ph.D.

Kata Kunci: podcast, Penanda *Interactive Metadiscourse*. Cerita Horor.

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan bagaimana penggunaan penanda *Interactive Metadiscourse* dalam penyampaian cerita horror melalui media podcast yang dibawakan oleh Sapphire dan Markeia dalam channel mereka "*Something Scary Podcast*". Peneliti menggunakan model Hyland (2005) dalam menganalisis penelitian kali ini. Data yang digunakan diambil dari sepuluh episode "*Something Scary Podcast*". Kemudian, penelitian dilakukan dengan menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif, hal ini dikarenakan penelitian ini dirangkai dengan kata-kata agar lebih mudah menggambarkan penggunaan penanda *Interactive Metadiscourse*.

Temuan yang dihasilkan berupa frasa, kata, dan bagian-bagian kalimat yang memenuhi kriteria sebagai penanda *Interactive Metadiscourse* yang diklasifikasikan menjadi dua; macam dan fungsi. Peneliti mengidentifikasi dari beberapa kasus. Pertama, peneliti mengidentifikasi apa saja macam-macam penanda *Interactive Metadiscourse* yang digunakan dalam penyampaian cerita horror melalui podcast. Kedua, pengidentifikasian fungsi dari penggunaan penanda tersebut sesuai teori yang diungkapkan oleh Hyland (2005).

Dari penelitian yang telah dilakukan diatas, untuk meningkatkan topic agar lebih luas, peneliti berharap untuk penelitian selanjutnya dapat mempelajari dan memahami penanda *Metadiscourse* dalam objek dan topik yang berbeda sehingga menciptakan penemuan yang lebih menarik.

المستخلص البحث

رحموتي، يوشي نور. 0202. العالمت Metadiscourse التفاعلية في قصة الرعب من خلال المناقشة (podcast). البحث الجامعي، قسم الإنجليزية وأدبها، كلية العلوم الإنسانية، جامعة مولنا مالك إبراهيم الإسلامية الحكومية مالنج. المشرف: جوكو سوسانتو الحاج الماجستير
الكلمات الأساسية: عالمت Metadiscourse التفاعلية، قصة الرعب، مناقشة.

التفاعلية في توصيل قصص الرعب Metadiscourse تهدف هذا البحث إلى وصف كيفية استخدام عالمت التفاعلية التي ناقشتها لسفير و مركيا على قناتهم (podcast) من خلال وسائط المناقشة في تحليل هذا البحث. البيانات المستخدمة مأخوذة هي (0222) استخدمت الباحثة نموذج هيلاند "Something Scary Podcast" وبعد ذلك، تم إجراء هذا البحث باستخدام المنهج "Something Scary Podcast". من من عشر حلقات Metadiscourse الكيفي والوصفي، وذلك لأن هذا البحث مرتب بالكلمات لتسهيل وصف استخدام عالمت التفاعلية.

حصلت النتائج في شكل عبارات، وكلمات، وأجزاء من الجمل واجترحتهم المعايير لعالمت التفاعلية التي تصنيفها إلى قسمين؛ ألنوا والوظائف. حددت الباحثة عدة حالات. أوال، Metadiscourse التفاعلية التي استخدامها في توصيل قصص الرعب Metadiscourse حددت الباحثة أنواعا من عالمت ثانيا، تحديد الوظيفة من استخدام تلك العالمت وفقا للنظرية بينه هيلاند (podcast). المناقشة من خلال (5002).

ليكون أوسع، أملت الباحثة البحث التالي يستطيع أن يدرس و من البحث الذي إجراؤه أعاله، لتطور الموضوع في الموضوع Metadiscourse يفهم عالمت

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the research background, research question, research significance, scope and limitation, definition of key terms, and research method.

A. Background of the study

This research examines the use of Metadiscourse Markers in speaking. Metadiscourse markers are general terms such as words, phrases, or sentences used by writers to convey their ideas and to engage readers effectively through their writing. In addition to the functions above, the metadiscourse marker can also be used in an oral context, such as speeches, debates, job interviews and so on. According to Hyland (2005) metadiscourse as a closing term for self-reflective expression that is used to negotiate interactional meaning in a text, helps the author (or) speaker to express his point of view and engage with readers as members of a particular community. "Metadiscourse embodies the idea that communication is more than the exchange of information, goods or services, but it involves the personalities, attitudes, and assumptions of people who communicate" (Hyland, 2005).

The first comprehensive functional classification method was introduced by Vandaele (1985). He suggested two main categories for metadiscourse: textual and interpersonal. Textual metadiscourse, sometimes called metatext (Bunton, 1999), serves the function of organizing text and directing the reader and fulfilling Halliday's textual function. The interpersonal metadiscourse is used to develop the relationship between the reader and the writer and to increase the

personal confidence of the writer and the level of commitment to the ongoing proposition (Cheng and Steffensen, 1996). In this study, it is only focuses on the model of Hyland (2005) defined that metadiscourse was ordered into two classifications, the first is Interactive and the second is Interactional. Talking about the function of the interpersonal marker method in writing, they enable readers to express their thoughts, interpret content or inform readers about their perspectives on propositional content. With interpersonal functions, the writer can determine the relationship that wants to be built with the reader, either choosing a style with strong people or distant attitudes. Also, this helps the writer to directly refer to the reader so he can involve the reader in the text and make it more interactive. While the interactive is metadiscourse elements that enable the writer to manage the information to explicitly construct interpretations of his choice.

There have been several previous studies conducted on different topics besides this research with different research problems and of course with different subjects. Most researchers research academic writings (Eda Duruk, 2017) This study aims to examine the frequency of metadiscourse markers which are focused on interpersonal metadiscourse markers, namely in MA dissertations from one major academic field; Teaching English (ELT). He used Hyland's Taxonomy: Functions of Interpersonal Metadesis in Academic texts (1998), secondly was about speeches from important people in their countries (Tshen Tashi, Wannaprapha Suksawas; 2018), this study focuses on the metadiscourse markers used by state leaders in delivering public speeches. This research contributes to the body of existing literature related to the analysis of methods, especially oral

texts, and the third study was about research on spoken interlanguage (Aysel Şahinin Kizi, 5017(the researcher investigated the metadiscourse spoken by Turkish EFL staff, which is based on two well-known inter-language corporations (LINDSEI-TR and LOCNEC) as data sources.

The first previous research conducted by Tashi and Suksawas (2018) with the title *An Analysis of Interactional Metadiscourse In Public Speaking: A Case Study In English Speeches of The Prime Minister of Bhutan*, this study principally investigated interactional metadiscourse markers used in the English speeches of Mr. Tshering Tobgay, the Honourable Prime Minister of Bhutan, delivered to international audiences on a variety of different topics. The present qualitative descriptive research focused on textual analysis using the metadiscourse model of Hyland [2] and the Appraisal theory of Martin and White [3]. The results of the study showed attitude markers ranked the highest followed by engagement markers, self-mentions, boosters, and hedges. Moreover, the study also revealed that the topics of his speeches influenced the use of the interactional metadiscourse markers of the speaker. In general, this study highlighted elements of metadiscourse markers used by the leader of the country in delivering public speeches. The present study contributed to the existing body of literature related to metadiscourse analysis, especially of spoken texts. The information from this research can be of benefit to language learners, teachers and speakers in general, who are passionate about developing speaking skills.

The second previous research is conducted by Duruk (2016) with the title *Analysis of Metadiscourse Markers In Academic Written Discourse Produced By*

Turkish Researchers, this research aims at examining the frequency of interpersonal metadiscourse markers in academic written discourse and investigating the way Turkish writers use interpersonal metadiscourse, namely in MA dissertations from one major academic field; English language teaching (ELT). A corpus based research is applied by examining a total of 20 dissertations written recently by Turkish writers writing in a second language. The dissertations were searched for all these expressions and further analysis was made by examining three sections of dissertations -methodology, results, and discussion. In-depth analysis based on the use of interpersonal metadiscourse markers showed that while ‘hedges’, ‘emphatics)boosters(’ and ‘attitude markers’ are all used by Turkish writers to a certain extent, ‘attitude markers’ are found to be the most frequent ones. On the other hand, with respect to the use of personal markers, differences were found among the writers. The analysis of dissertation sections revealed common results.

The third previous research is conducted by Güçlü (2020) with the title *Interactive Metadiscourse Markers In Turkish Research Article Abstract: A Diachronic Analysis*, this research aims to explore the interactive markers such as transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidential, code glosses employed in Turkish research article abstracts published in *Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, *Journal of Linguistics Research*, *Language Journal* in 2008-2009 and 2017-2018 years and takes Hyland’s (2005) *Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse* as the theoretical framework. The findings of this study illustrate that 2017-2018 writers guide the readers in their research article abstracts much

more than 2008-2009 writers with the use of evidential by which they refer to the other researchers' ideas. This result reveals the diachronic evolution in the degree of writer-reader relationship from the perspective of social relations so that 2017-2018 writers are more inclined to declare being member of a specific discourse community with the use of evidential. This research is expected to contribute to the understanding of Turkish academic discourse from a diachronic perspective and to provide useful implications in the fields such as foreign language teaching, corpus linguistics and text analysis.

The fourth research conducted by Kan (2021) with the title *Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in the Turkish Article on Science and Social Sciences*, this research aims to identify the interactive metadiscourse markers in the main sections of the articles (introduction, method, findings, results, discussion and conclusion) in the fields of science and social sciences. Designed as a descriptive research, this study employs the survey model. The articles analyzed in this study are a total of 16 articles, 8 science and 8 social sciences articles selected from the science and social sciences journals at DergiPark. The study group of this paper includes 54,253 words, 16,301 of which are in the articles on science and 37,952 are in the articles on social sciences. To achieve, this study draws on Hyland and Tse's framework of metadiscourse model. The data are analyzed through descriptive analysis method. A Mann-Whitney U test is performed to find out whether there is a significant difference in the use of metadiscourse markers identified in the descriptive analysis of the articles on science and social sciences. The analysis indicate that more interactive metadiscourse markers are used in the

articles on social sciences compared to the articles on science; yet, this difference is not significant. Furthermore, the use of code glosses is significant for social sciences; nonetheless, there is no significant difference in the use of other interactive metadiscourse markers.

The fifth research conducted by Akoto (2020) with the title *Metadiscourse within a Discipline: A Study of Introduction and Literature Review Chapters of Sociology Master's Theses*, this research investigates the differences and similarities in metadiscourse use between the Introduction and Literature Review (LR) chapters in Sociology masters' thesis from an English-medium university. The Introduction and LR Chapters of ten theses constituted the corpus for this study. The metadiscursive devices were manually coded, drawing on the modified version of the Hyland's (2005a) interpersonal model of metadiscourse. It was realized that there are both differences and similarities between the two chapters in terms of metadiscourse use. In the ranking, the interactive and interactional devices, transitions, and hedges respectively recorded the highest frequencies in the two chapters. Besides, there were significant variations across the two chapters in terms of both interactive and interactional subcategories. The findings have implications for the teaching of English for Research Purposes, and the theory of metadiscourse.

Based on the previous studies above, researcher decided to choose story of horror to be analyzed. The marker methodology in story telling has an important purpose. The goal is the researcher wants to know how strong the function of using metadiscourse markers in horror story podcast. Therefore, researcher took

the story of horror has its own interests, and makes people curious. Here, the metadiscourse marker is really needed because to express the speaker, so that it reaches the listener's ears can be understood and follow what the speaker felt. Typically, research using metadiscourse markers is used for academic writing or newspapers, but this time the researcher will examine the use of the metadiscourse markers in horror stories taken from podcast. Podcast itself is rarely used as objects of research, moreover about Horror Stories. The object of this study was taken from the "*The Something Scary Podcast*" channel that delivered by Sapphire and Markeia. It is because the channel has high rating and often to update the new story.

B. Problem of the Study

Based on the background of this study above, the writer has the research questions bellow:

1. What are the kinds of interactive metadiscourse markers used in "*The Something Scary Podcast*"?
2. What are the functions of interactive metadiscourse markers used in "*The Something Scary Podcast*"?

C. Objectives of the Study

Based on the research question, this research have two aims. The aim is to classify the use of the metadiscourse marker course on "*The Something Scary Podcast*". In addition, this research will also provide an understanding of the functions of the use of the marker metadiscourse in delivering of horror stories through podcasts.

D. Significance of the Study

Theoretically, this research is expected to provide additional knowledge about how to analyze the use of metadiscourse markers on a story through a podcast based on the theory of Hyland (2005). While in practically, this research is expected to be useful for the reader, especially for linguistic students to understand the use and function of the metadata marker in speaking. In addition, they also know how to interpret the intentions of speakers. From this study, the authors hope that they become good linguists.

E. Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study only focuses investigations in story telling within the scope of horror stories. This research takes several episodes from the podcast "*The Something Scary Podcast*" in the period 2019 to 2020. Researchers use data from podcasts because at present the podcast is much in demand by people especially about horror stories. In addition, in this study researchers used a theory by Hyland (2005) in analyzing data where according to Hyland there are two types of markers, namely Interactional and Interactive Metadiscourse. Therefore, researchers only focus their research on the criteria for the Metadiscourse Markers by Hyland (2005).

F. Definition of Key Terms

In order to avoid misunderstanding about the terms which used in this research, the researcher defines the key terms which are used in this research as follows:

1. Metadiscourse Markers:

Metadiscourse markers are general terms such as words, phrases, or sentences used by writers to convey their ideas and to engage readers effectively through their writing. In addition to the functions above, the metadiscourse marker can also be used in an oral context, such as speeches, debates, job interviews and so on.

2. Horror Story:

That is a story where the narrator tells something that creates a feeling of fear.

3. Podcast:

A podcast is a digital multimedia file that is available on the Internet for download and then played on a media player, computer or mobile phone.

4. “*The Something Scary Podcast*” Channel:

One of the channel podcasts about horror that has a high rating, this podcast is hosted by Sapphire and Markeia.

5. YouTube:

A video sharing website created by three former Paypal employees in February 2005. This site is used to upload and share videos.

G. Previous Study

In every research, there is always discussion about relevant previous research, because this is very important to avoid the similarity with the previous research. Therefore, the researcher needs to find differences from the previous research. The first previous research conducted by Tashi and Suksawas (2018) with the title *An Analysis of Interactional Metadiscourse In Public Speaking: A Case Study In English Speeches of The Prime Minister of Bhutan*, this study

principally investigated interactional metadiscourse markers used in the English speeches of Mr. Tshering Tobgay, the Honourable Prime Minister of Bhutan, delivered to international audiences on a variety of different topics. The present qualitative descriptive research focused on textual analysis using the metadiscourse model of Hyland [2] and the Appraisal theory of Martin and White [3]. The results of the study showed attitude markers ranked the highest followed by engagement markers, self-mentions, boosters, and hedges. Moreover, the study also revealed that the topics of his speeches influenced the use of the interactional metadiscourse markers of the speaker. In general, this study highlighted elements of metadiscourse markers used by the leader of the country in delivering public speeches. The present study contributed to the existing body of literature related to metadiscourse analysis, especially of spoken texts. The information from this research can be of benefit to language learners, teachers and speakers in general, who are passionate about developing speaking skills.

The second previous research is conducted by Duruk (2016) with the title *Analysis of Metadiscourse Markers In Academic Written Discourse Produced By Turkish Researchers*, this research aims at examining the frequency of interpersonal metadiscourse markers in academic written discourse and investigating the way Turkish writers use interpersonal metadiscourse, namely in MA dissertations from one major academic field; English language teaching (ELT). A corpus based research is applied by examining a total of 20 dissertations written recently by Turkish writers writing in a second language. The dissertations were searched for all these expressions and further analysis was made by

examining three sections of dissertations -methodology, results, and discussion. In-depth analysis based on the use of interpersonal metadiscourse markers showed that while ‘hedges’, ‘emphatics (boosters)’ and ‘attitude markers’ are all used by Turkish writers to a certain extent, ‘attitude markers’ are found to be the most frequent ones. On the other hand, with respect to the use of personal markers, differences were found among the writers. The analysis of dissertation sections revealed common results.

The third previous research is conducted by Güçlü (2020) with the title *Interactive Metadiscourse Markers In Turkish Research Article Abstract: A Diachronic Analysis*, this research aims to explore the interactive markers such as transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidential, code glosses employed in Turkish research article abstracts published in *Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, *Journal of Linguistics Research*, *Language Journal* in 2008-2009 and 2017-2018 years and takes Hyland’s (2002) (Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse) as the theoretical framework. The findings of this study illustrate that 2017-2018 writers guide the readers in their research article abstracts much more than 2008-2009 writers with the use of evidential by which they refer to the other researchers’ ideas. This result reveals the diachronic evolution in the degree of writer-reader relationship from the perspective of social relations so that 2017-2018 writers are more inclined to declare being member of a specific discourse community with the use of evidential. This research is expected to contribute to the understanding of Turkish academic discourse from a diachronic perspective

and to provide useful implications in the fields such as foreign language teaching, corpus linguistics and text analysis.

The fourth research conducted by Kan (2021) with the title *Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in the Turkish Article on Science and Social Sciences*, this research aims to identify the interactive metadiscourse markers in the main sections of the articles (introduction, method, findings, results, discussion and conclusion) in the fields of science and social sciences. Designed as a descriptive research, this study employs the survey model. The articles analyzed in this study are a total of 16 articles, 8 science and 8 social sciences articles selected from the science and social sciences journals at DergiPark. The study group of this paper includes 54,253 words, 16,301 of which are in the articles on science and 37,952 are in the articles on social sciences. To achieve, this study draws on Hyland and Tse's framework of metadiscourse model. The data are analyzed through descriptive analysis method. A Mann-Whitney U test is performed to find out whether there is a significant difference in the use of metadiscourse markers identified in the descriptive analysis of the articles on science and social sciences. The analysis indicate that more interactive metadiscourse markers are used in the articles on social sciences compared to the articles on science; yet, this difference is not significant. Furthermore, the use of code glosses is significant for social sciences; nonetheless, there is no significant difference in the use of other interactive metadiscourse markers.

The fifth research conducted by Akoto (2020) with the title *Metadiscourse within a Discipline: A Study of Introduction and Literature Review Chapters of*

Sociology Mater' Theses, this research investigates the differences and similarities in metadiscourse use between the Introduction and Literature Review (LR) chapters in Sociology masters' thesis from an English-medium university. The Introduction and LR Chapters of ten theses constituted the corpus for this study. The metadiscursive devices were manually coded, drawing on the modified version of the Hyland's (2005a) interpersonal model of metadiscourse. It was realized that there are both differences and similarities between the two chapters in terms of metadiscourse use. In the ranking, the interactive and interactional devices, transitions, and hedges respectively recorded the highest frequencies in the two chapters. Besides, there were significant variations across the two chapters in terms of both interactive and interactional subcategories. The findings have implications for the teaching of English for Research Purposes, and the theory of metadiscourse.

Based on previous research, the researcher used these study materials to supplement and develop this research study. The previous studies above have in common with this research that is using the approach of linguistic and metadiscourse.

H. Research Method

Research method is the way to collect to data and to analyze them. It relates to the research design, data source, research instrument, data collection, and data analysis.

1. Research Design

In this study, researcher conducted a qualitative descriptive study because researcher wants to conduct research by providing a description of the analysis and explanation related to the proposed topic. That statement refers to the opinion John W. Creswell (1994), in which he states that qualitative research is used to investigate the process of social phenomena where it is necessary to compare and classify research objects. On this research, the researcher will need more explanations, thus the researcher use qualitative methods to complete this research clearly.

2. Research Instruments

Researcher uses human instruments and the researcher themselves as the main instrument to conduct this research. In this study, researcher become the main instruments that are active in conducting research and participate directly in the process of collecting data, analyzing data, and providing the results of analysis. Furthermore, researchers try to do a brief and clear analysis so that the analysis is easily understood by the reader.

3. Data Source

In the data source, the researcher takes the horror channel with a good rating on a YouTube. Hence, the data was taken taken from the Podcast through the YouTube with the channel "*The Something scary Podcast*".

These are some episodes would be taken for this research:

1. The Doll In The Wall

https://youtu.be/2grIty_VwMQ

2. Spirits of the Season

https://youtu.be/PX5WW_M6auM

3. Yuki Onna

<https://youtu.be/tkmTyErEWG4>

4. My Family Hates Me

https://youtu.be/AsZIkvuT_sw

5. A Game Hide-and-Seek Gone Wrong

<https://youtu.be/O382bJqSaoM>

6. Not Alone

<https://youtu.be/hMQsjChpYTw>

7. The Korean Bathroom Ghost

<https://youtu.be/xzrxXtKFnsQ>

8. Indonesian Horror Story

<https://youtu.be/qE6sJWONDNM>

9. My Lucky Boy

https://youtu.be/8gf_xQKaORc

10. Don't Silence Her

<https://youtu.be/LgyvYi0L3DY>

4. Data Collection

The researcher used several steps in the data collection process. In collecting the data, researcher obtained the data from podcast under the channel title "*The Something Scary*" such as searching for video in several episodes contained in that channel. Then take some podcasts from the

program as a reference to find the metadiscourse markers. After finding, the researchers wrote it down on paper and find out the kinds and the functions of metadiscourse used on that podcast.

5. Data Analysis

In conducting research, researchers conducted several ways in analyzing data. The first step researcher analyzes the data by focusing on analyzing the markers of metadiscourse used by the speaker during telling their horror story which delivered by Markeia and Sapphire. Then, the researcher transcript what they said using Hyland's theory. After finding out the markers, the researcher continued analyzing the influence using metadiscourse markers through podcast to the listener. Then, researcher makes conclusions related to the results of data analysis. For the last step, the researcher in analyzing the data also makes the conclusion based on the data analysis to find out the result of the research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter would explain comprehensively and elaborately about theoretical background that related to metadiscourse used in speaking especially for delivering horror story in podcast.

A. Metadiscourse

Metadiscourse is a cover term for words that writers or speakers use for the purpose of indicating the direction and purpose of text. The term was first used by Harris in 1959 to refer to a way of understanding language in use. In this sense, metadiscourse represents the attempts of the writer or speaker to guide the perception of the text receiver (Hyland, 2005: 3). In other words, metadiscourse enables the writer to “guide, direct and inform” the reader in the way he (the writer or speaker) wants the reader or hearer to respond to the text content. Consequently, it is an important category not only for creating a text, but also for reading the content (Crismore, 1989: 64). Adel (2006: 2) argued that metadiscourse refers to “linguistic items that indicate the existence in the text of either the writer and reader (or speaker and hearer) through reference to the text organization or by using other ways to comment on the text.

Thus, metadiscourse is based on the idea that communication involves the personalities, attitudes and assumptions of its participants, and is not merely an exchange of information. Crismore et al. (1993: 40) state that metadiscourse enables readers and listeners to “organize, interpret and evaluate the information given”. Whereas Crismore’s definition puts emphasis on the role of metadiscourse

in conveying ideas or information, that of Williams (2007: 65) puts emphasis on the role of metadiacourse in referring to the writers and readers in that, according to Williams (2007: 62), metadiscourse is “the language that writers use to refer not to the substance of their ideas, but to themselves, their readers, or their writings.”

Metadiscourse is a topic often discussed with a departure point in Vande Kopple (1985) with a rather vague definition as a discourse about discourse or communication about communication. Related to this topic, it will be discussed by providing the concept of Hyland (2005). Apart from Hyland, these are some metadiscourse analysts such as Vande Kopple (1985) and Crismore et al (1993) several categories to the metadiscourse. According to Vande Kopple (1985) and Crismore (1993), metadiscourse markers are divided into two types: textual metadiscourse and interpersonal metadiscourse. Textual metadiscourse is responsible for creating some sort of integration and cohesion for the text created. Meanwhile, interpersonal metadiscourse helps writers interact with their readers. According to Hyland (2005; 50-52) metadiscourse has only two types; they are interactive metadiscourse and interactional metadiscourse. Based on the theory described by Hyland, the researcher will explain the notions of textual and interpersonal functions

1. Textual Function: Used in setting the text, to relate between what is said to the world and to the readers.

2. Interpersonal Function: It used to assist readers / listeners in expressing their thoughts, interpreting what is in the content or informing readers about their perspectives on content.

As mentioned above that the first concept was brought by Vande Kopple (1985) that metadiscourse divided into two types. Those are textual metadiscourse and interpersonal metadiscourse which have functions of each. Textual metadiscourse has the responsibility to make some kind of integration and cohesion for the text created. It has four sub-parts; text connectives, validity markers, narrators, and code glosses. Meanwhile for interpersonal metadiscourse, it helps writers to more easily interact with their readers. Interpersonal metadiscourse also has several sub-parts; commentaries, illocution markers, and attitude markers.

Crismore *et al'* was the next conceptor for the function of metadiscourse. He kept the two major categories of textual and interpersonal, but collapsed, separated, and reorganized the subcategories. The textual metadiscourse was further divided into two categories of "*textual*" and "*interpretive*" markers in an attempt to separate organizational and evaluative functions. Textual markers consist of those features that help organize the discourse, and interpretive markers are those features used to help readers to better interpret and understand the writer's meaning and writing strategies (Crismore et al., 1993).

The next model is proposed by Hyland (2005), which consists of two main categories namely "interactive" and "interactional". The interactive part of the metadiscourse relates to the author's awareness of the recipient, and his efforts to

accommodate his interests and needs, and to make arguments satisfying to him. The interactional part, on the other hand, concerns the author's efforts to make his views explicit, and to engage the reader by anticipating his objections and responses to the text (Hyland, 2005).

Most of the models above follow Halliday's tripartite conception of the metaphor that distinguishes between ideational elements of the text - the way we encode our experiences of the world - and textual and interpersonal functions. He distinguishes between two main types of metadiscourse; "Metatext" and "Writer-reader interaction". Metatext details the speech acts of the writer or reader. Metatext can also represent aspects of the text itself such as the organization, the words, or the writing of it. The writer-reader interaction embodies that linguistic expression used by writers to engage readers.

In this study the researcher focused on two major categories of metadiscourse that proposed by Hyland (2005). He divided with interactive and interpersonal which have five features on each category. Next, the researcher will discuss about those two categories on the following section.

1. Interactive Metadiscourse

Interactive metadiscourse has the characteristic which is the awareness of the writer about the way how the writers share their ideas to the reader. It will guide the reader to understand the related text and build relationship between the writer and the reader through the text (Hyland, 2005). Interactive metadiscourse has five broad sub-categories. The first is transition markers, it will help readers to understand and interpret the pragmatic connections and

structural relation in every step. It also makes the reader easier to understand what writer has stated. These are the examples of addition markers such as *furthermore, in addition, further, next, moreover, and etc.* While for comparison markers those are *correspondingly, similarly, equally, likewise, and etc.* Furthermore, the consequence markers like; *thus, therefore, in conclusion and etc.* which is used to tell the readers for a conclusion. The second is about frame markers border text or schematic text structure elements. Frame markers here are used primarily to organize texts for listener or audience and also could be called as a cover for the diversity of linguistic devices. Frame markers are classified into four subtypes according to the function: sequencer, topicalizer, discourse label, and announcement. Sequencers (eg, first, second) are used to arrange text into sequences; topicalizers (for example, in connection with, concerns) to signal a shift from one topic to another; discourse-labels (eg, in summary, so far) to mark the stages of textual development; and announcers (i.e., aim to, strive) to show are cursive goals. In this study, “linguistic elements relative to space”(Hempel and Degand, 2008:681), such as on the one hand and on the other hand, were included as spatial sequencers when they introduced new sequences in a text, but were classified as comparative transitions when used to indicate logical relations. Together, frame markers can be used to achieve the pragmatic function so for organizing a text locally/globally and reducing readers’ processing effort by explicitly marking textual structures and boundaries (Aguilar, 2008). Endophoric markers are reflexive language used to refer to other parts of a text. Also known as text references (Bunton, 1999)

or locational metatext (Dahl, 2004), this type of metadiscourse is used as signposts that help readers recover the writer's intended meanings. Informed by Mauranen's (1993) notion of text reflexivity and Bunton's (1999) work on linear and non-linear metatext, we make a functional extension of Hyland's (1998b, 2002a) category of endophoric markers by drawing a distinction between linear and non-linear references. Linear references (e.g., in the following paragraphs, as presented in the previous section) function as previews, reviews, or overviews in the unfolding text and encode "reflexivity of high explicitness" (Mauranen, 1993: 180), whereas non-linear references (e.g., as summarized in Table 1, see Excerpt 1 for an example) refer to additional textual materials such as tables, figures, stand-alone examples or extracts. From a pragmatic perspective, endophoric markers can reduce unnecessary textual repetitions (Abdi et al., 2010) and guide readers toward an intended interpretation of the discourse by referring to the different parts of an unfolding text (Hyland, 2005a). Finally, evidential markers present information from other texts (Hyland, 2005a). In academic discourse, evidential markers typically take the form of citations (Swales, 1990) or academic attributions (Hyland, 1999). Two subtypes of evidential markers can be distinguished according to surface forms: integral and non-integral citations (Swales, 1990). An integral citation incorporates a cited source as part of the reporting sentences, whereas a non-integral citation places a cited source within parentheses or via a superscript number leading to a footnote, end note or bibliography. Pragmatically, a judicious use of evidential markers in academic writing can open up or close down a dialogic space to alternative

view point (Hu and Wang, 2014), “strengthen readers’ assumptions of adequate documentation” (White, 5011:3347), and indicate one’s membership of a particular disciplinary community (Hyland, 1999).

2. Interactional Metadiscourse

Interpersonal metadiscourse helps the writer to lead the reader (Hyland 2005). Here, the object of this research is not about between the writer and the reader, but the speaker and listener. The interpersonal function: the use of language to encode interaction, allowing us to engage with others, to take on role and to express and understand evaluations and feelings.

Interpersonal metadiscourse divided into five major subcategories. Those are hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mention and engagement markers. The first is hedges, inside hedges there are *possible, might and perhaps* as the devices of hedges. They have the functions a hedge indicating that the speaker wants to drift to another topic or stop the previous one. Hedges here also insisted that every statement uttered by the speaker was based on plausible thinking and reasons rather than existing science. It could be “*seem, may, etc*” are some instances of that markers.

The second one goes to boosters. Boosters are the words used by the speaker to cover up or head off the opposing views of the listener. They also use boosters to convince listeners of what they say. That words, for instance; *obviously, clearly, and demonstrate*. The third is attitude markers. It indicates the speaker’s affective than epistemic, the use of attitude to propositions. The speaker expressed by the use of subordination, comparatives, progressive particles, text location, punctuation, and so on. The attitude-markers are *agree, unfortunately,*

hopefully, prefer, etc. Then the fourth is self-mention. It refers to an explicit sentence stated by the speaker and usually used first-person pronouns; *I and We*, also possessive adjective; *I, me, mine, our, ours, you, your, yours*. The last is engagement markers that aimed explicitly at the listener in order to manipulate and focus their attention as well as involving them as characters in the story. For instance; *have to, should, consider that, note that, you may notice, etc.*

CHAPTER III
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher would explain about the findings and discussion. The findings are based on research taken from podcasts on horror content and it would be analyzed using metadiscourse markers theory that proposed by Hyland (2005). Afterwards, the researcher will provide a description of the results of the data analysis.

A. Findings

The findings here would provide the description of two things; the kind of metadiscourse marker and the functions of using metadiscourse marker in podcast absolutely for Horror content. Storytelling through podcasts is different from presenting stories in essays. Hence the findings herein describe and investigate the use of metadiscourse markers in the form of speech especially in interactive metadiscourse.

This table below shows the data results of this study.

No	Data	Kinds of Interactive Metadiscourse Markers
1	<i>“That following morning, Evan told his parents about the noises in the wall, they checked but nothing was amiss plus they had slept soundly all last night.”</i>	Transition Markers

2	<i>“To zone out even further he grabbed a flashlight and curled up under the covers with his favorite manga.”</i>	Transition Markers
3	<i>“The ladies should have been more careful in their practice however, because they caught the attention of someone sinister.”</i>	Transition Markers
4	<i>“The village had much to whisper about Minokichi after that, they say there are many tales about his adventures as he sold his family’s end and began searching for his family among the snowy wilderness. However, he never returned to the village ever again.”</i>	Transition Markers
5	<i>“Frantically, I cried trying to release myself. The expressions of each of my family members turned to sadness”</i>	Transition Markers
6	<i>“They say that if Leslie Ann sees you and likes you agree to be her friend, otherwise you’ll be like the one person from the clique who didn’t and was punished”</i>	Transition Markers
7	<i>“Immediately, Ari put the phone on the besides table and turned on the bedroom lights”</i>	Transition Markers
8	<i>“Jen abruptly turned around and sped out the door, grabbing me...”</i>	Transition Markers
9	<i>“You must hug and hold it tight, thus it will bestow your family with good luck and a riches”</i>	Transition Markers
10	<i>“I’ve never been to a psychic’s house before, but Lana’s place didn’t look at all like what I was expecting it to look like”</i>	Transition Markers
11	<i>“In short, Juliana still watches over the camp protecting those who speak up and punishing</i>	Transition Markers

	<i>anyone who dares to silence them”</i>	
12	<i>“The next morning Evan’s parents there is no sign of their son, just the creepy old doll in his bed wearing his pajamas”</i>	Frame Markers
13	<i>“The seasons change many times and finally the man one day met a beautiful young lady named Oyuki.”</i>	Frame Markers
14	<i>“On this episode, the following story is based on a submission from Desiree that talking about her family.”</i>	Frame Markers
15	<i>“The next night, there was a knock on our store. Ary knocked back and the door opened, it was time for the next video”</i>	Frame Markers
16	<i>“I’m going to tell you the horror experiences of two twelve-year-old girls from South Korea”</i>	Frame Markers
17	<i>“In the end of the story, after the reality of what had just happened sank in, I oddly felt relieved to know that he was no longer scared of suffering. I just wish I could save him, just one more time”</i>	Frame Markers
18	<i>“Everything I had put up the night before, was now on the ground, shattered in pieces”</i>	Endophoric Markers
19	<i>“The choke cough and set on the ceiling, it was the woman like figure that Jen had seen before. Lifting her new prey up into her arms”</i>	Endophoric Markers
20	<i>“According to Gilda, “you can believe whatever you want to believe, but don’t be surprised when you see Leslie Ann. She wants to best friend forever”</i>	Evidential Markers
21	<i>“The most liked comment read 13 seconds had me dead and other comments had skull reactions and</i>	Evidential Markers

	<i>ghost emojis afterwards like creepy when you see it”, Ary stated”</i>	
22	<i>“They looked that Juliana still alive but with different looks. She was covered in dirt and blood, her clothes were torn with twigs and leave scattered all over, her eyes were filled with rage and was still some shut her voice echoed inside of their (Dustin and Trevor) heads”</i>	Evidential Markers
23	<i>“Turning back to his bed to get his flashlight, Evan pulled back his covers and there was such as large doll in his bed”</i>	Code Glosses
24	<i>“I had a pretty bad dream last night felt like there were people in my room or something”</i>	Code Glosses
25	<i>“.... but I was starting to really worry about his mental health like he was losing sleep and he wouldn’t eat”</i>	Code Glosses

B. Interactive Metadiscourse Used in Delivering Horror Podcast

The researcher conducted a comprehensive analysis of these findings. This finding includes data originating from 10 episodes of horror podcast where each episode has a different title. It will be analyzed by words, phrases, or part of sentences to cover the criteria of interactive metadiscourse markers that proposed by Hyland (2005).

1. The Kinds of Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in Delivering Horror Podcast

a. Transition Markers

Podcast 1.1 The Doll in The Wall

*“That following morning, Evan told his parents about the noises in the wall, they checked **but** nothing was amiss plus they had slept soundly all last night.”*

The bold word above, in Interactive Metadiscourse is categorized as transition markers. **But** is to demonstrate the affirmative sense what the first part of the sentence implied in a negative way (sometimes replaced by the reverse). However, the word “**but**” here that was used by the speaker has a function to give comparison and opposition argument or to show the contrast or difference unexpected. The first statement explained about something noise in the wall, while the parents denied that statement because they slept soundly and heard nothing. Therefore, the speaker used **but** to compare the statement. This is explained in the sentence “*Evan told his parents about the noises in the wall, they checked **but** nothing was amiss*”. This sentence shows that actually Evan heard something and then he told his parents to check it, but there was nothing there. So, the word **but** here is clearly explained that two sentence is implied the opposite way.

Podcast 1.2

*“To zone out even further he grabbed a flashlight **and** curled up under the covers with his favorite manga.”*

The word **and** is an event or clause and is used as a result of an event that occurs. The word **and** is also describing a sequence of events in a sentence. However, the function of transition markers “*and*” on that statement above is to give connection between one activity to another activity. Here, the speaker invites the listener to feel what the character is doing in the story. Therefore, the speaker used “*and*” to make a connection. This is explained in the word “*he grabbed a*

flashlight and curled up under the covers with his favorite manga". This sentence shows that he is doing two things in the same time. This sentence is also described as a sequence of events in a sentence. So, as explained above, this sentence is included in the transition makers.

Podcast 2.1 Spirits of the Season

*"The ladies should have been more careful in their practice however, **because** they caught the attention of someone sinister."*

The word "**because**" above in interactive metadiscourse markers is categorized as transition marker. The speaker used "**because**" to give strong argument to the previous statement. Thus, the speaker used "**because**" it can help the reader imagined what the women mentioned by the speaker would feel. This is explained in the sentence *"The ladies should have been more careful in their practice however, **because** they caught the attention of someone sinister"*. This sentence shows that the ladies should do things carefully so that unwanted things do not happen such as getting the attention of someone sinister. This is in accordance with the use of the word because which is referred to as a conjunction which functions as an indication of reason, where an effect is caused by having a certain reason. So, in this case, the reason the ladies get the attention of someone sinister is because the ladies did something carelessly.

Podcast 3.1 Yuki Onna

*"The village had much to whisper about Minokichi after that, they say there are many tales about his adventures as he sold his family's end and began searching for his family among the snowy wilderness. **However**, he never returned to the village ever again."*

The next datum on podcast 3.1 has the word “**however**”, it is part of the metadiscourse marker as a transition marker. The previous statement talked about Minokichi's life journey before he finally decided not to return to his village. In this sentence the speaker uses “**however**” to give the listener a conclusion about the character of the story. This is explained by the sentence “*The village had much to whisper about Minokichi after that, they say there are many tales about his adventures as he sold his family's end and began searching for his family among the snowy wilderness. **However**, he never returned to the village ever again*”. This sentence shows that the conjunction that is displayed is a conjunction that has a function as a link between two contrasting sentences or contradicting each other. As explained in the sentence above, after the news about Minokichi who sold his family's end and began searching for his family among the snowy wilderness, he never returned to the village ever again. In accordance with the function of the word **however** above, that sentence connects two contrasting sentences.

Podcast 4.1 My Family Hates Me

*“**Frantically**, I cried trying to release myself. The expressions of each of my family members turned to sadness”*

The datum of podcast fourth uses the word “**frantically**” which is part of interactive metadiscourse as a transition marker. The speaker uses the word to explain that the character is scared and panicked about something. “**Frantically**” helps the listener to feel the situation experienced by the character in the story. Hal ini dijelaskan dalam kata “*Frantically, I cried trying to release myself. The*

expressions of each of my family members turned to sadness". Dalam kalimat ini dijelaskan bahwa speaker merasa emotionally out of control. Speaker is also marked by fast and nervous, disordered, or anxiety-driven activity or condition. Sehingga, speaker menggunakan kata frantically sebagai bentuk rasa mengungkapkan bahwa dirinya sedang dalam bad condition. Dia merasa bad condition, hal ini dikarenakan the expressions of each of her family members turned to sadness when speaker wanted to realese herself.

Podcast 5.1 A Game Hide-and-Seek Gone Wrong

*"They say that if Leslie Ann sees you and likes you agree to be her friend, **otherwise** you'll be like the one person from the clique who didn't and was punished*".

The datum above on podcast 5.1 has the word "**otherwise**". The word is categorized as a transition marker on interactive metadiscourse markers. Referring to the sentence uttered by the speaker, the use of the word "**otherwise**" serves to indicate cause and effect where the first statement is the cause and the next sentence is the result. This can make it easier for listeners to understand the content of the story being told. This is described by the sentence "*if Leslie Ann sees you and likes you agree to be her friend, **otherwise** you'll be like the one person from the clique who didn't and was punished*". This sentence expresses that if someone does not do something as specified, then there will be other consequences that he will get. This is in accordance with the use of the word **otherwise**.

Podcast 6.1 Not Alone

*"**Immediately**, Ari put the phone on the besides table and turned on the bedroom lights"*

The next datum of this podcast uses the word “**immediately**” which is part of interactive metadiscourse as a transition marker. In this session the speaker said that the character in the story was in a hurry and was trying to protect himself because something was following him. The word “**immediately**” could influence the listener and give effect to their fear when they listen to the story. The sentence “*Immediately, Ari put the phone on the besides table and turned on the bedroom lights*” shows that Ari did something that had to be done as soon as possible and it was impossible to postpone it because it was really needed at that time. The word “**immediately**” represents the speaker to express his state of urgency.

Podcast 7.1 The Korean Bathroom Ghost

“Jen abruptly turned around and sped out the door, grabbing me...”

The word “**abruptly**” in the datum above is categorized as a transition marker. The speaker used “**abruptly**” which has the same function as the word “**immediately**”, an action that occurred in a short time which indicates that the character in the story was scared or shocked. It is as described in the sentence “*Jen abruptly turned around and sped out the door, grabbing me...*”. In this sentence, it is known that Jen suddenly performs an action on the speaker without the speaker knowing. Like the use of the word **abruptly** itself, that **abruptly** is a word that reflects someone doing something suddenly or doing something rudely, the sentence above also implies that someone suddenly turned around and sped out the door and roughly holding the speaker's hand so as to make the speaker shocked.

Podcast 8.1 Indonesian Horror Story

*“You must hug and hold it tight, **thus** it will bestow your family with good luck and a riches”*

Datum 8.1 in interactive metadiscourse is categorized as a transition marker. In this case the first statement is an order and then the speaker uses the word **“thus”** to reinforce the previous statement. Its function is to indirectly make the listeners believe what the speaker is talking about. This is explained in the sentence *“You must hug and hold it tight, **thus** it will bestow your family with good luck and a riches”*. In this sentence, the speaker must do something so that something good happens in his life and his family. In this sentence, the word **thus** is used to explain the result described in the previous sentence, which is to explain when the speaker has to hug something tight, so that his family will be blessed with good luck and a riches.

Podcast 9.1 My Lucky Boy

*“I’ve never been to a psychic’s house before, **but** Lana’s place didn’t look at all like what I was expecting it to look like”*

The next datum is on the ninth podcast, there is the word “but” which is an interactive metadiscourse marker which is categorized as a transition marker. The speaker used the word **“but”** to distinguish between the first statement and the second statement. She compares that Lana's house isn't what she expected when she was going to visit a psychic's house. Therefore, the word "but" here serves as a sign of comparison. It is as described in the sentence *“I’ve never been to a psychic’s house before, **but** Lana’s place didn’t look at all like what I was expecting it to look like”*. This sentence shows that the speaker shows two opposite opinions. The speaker expressed the opinion that the speaker had never

actually seen or visited a psychic's house before, so he thought that psychic's house was very strange, scary, and smelled of mystical things, but Lana's place was very different from what the speakers imagined. This is in accordance with the use of the word **but**, where the word indicates two opposite things.

Podcast 10.1 Don't Silence Her

“In short, Juliana still watches over the camp protecting those who speak up and punishing anyone who dares to silence them”

The bold word on the 10.1 is categorized as transition markers in metadiscourse marker. **“In short”** here indicates the summary of the story. In the previous question the speaker explained that after Juliana's death, she punished the culprit who had killed her. Thus, whoever has opened the veil of who the perpetrator is will be protected by Juliana but not by who asked to be silent. It helps the listener to more clearly capture the summary of the story conveyed by the speaker. It is as described in the sentence *“In short, Juliana still watches over the camp protecting those who speak up and punishing anyone who dares to silence them”*. In accordance with the use of the word **in short**, this sentence indicates that the speaker wishes to shorten a conversation or a story so that the listener does not listen to a story that is too long. In this case, speakers usually want to directly talk about the most important things in the story.

b. Frame Markers

Podcast 1.1 The Doll in The Wall

*“The next morning Evan’s parents **there is no sign** of their son, just the creepy old doll in his bed wearing his pajamas”*

The datum on the podcast above in the metadiscourse marker is classified as frame markers. The speaker said explicitly that the main character had actually died and was replaced by an old doll in Evan's room. The use of frame markers above serves to make listeners guess what is really happening, so that it arouses curiosity when hearing it. This is explained in the sentence *“The next morning Evan’s parents **there is no sign** of their son, just the creepy old doll in his bed wearing his pajamas”*. In this sentence, the word **there is no sign** means suddenly something happens without any previous sign or sign.

Podcast 3.1 Yuki Onna

*“The seasons change many times and **finally** the man one day met a beautiful young lady named Oyuki.”*

The next datum is found on the third podcast with the use of the word **“finally”**. The word **“finally”** is part of the interactive metadiscourse as frame markers. The use of the word **“finally”** here means that the speaker is racing to the previous act of discourse. Therefore, this can help listeners reduce their curiosity when listening to the story. This is explained in the sentence *“The seasons change many times and **finally** the man one day met a beautiful young lady named Oyuki”*. The word **finally** here means that something happens after a long period of time, usually later than expected or expected. The word finally is usually used after a long time or at the end of a certain period of time. In this sentence, the speaker wants to express that after the sad times have passed, one day good and happy things will come.

Podcast 4.1 My Family Hates Me

“On this episode, the following story is based on a submission from Desiree that talking about her family.”

The sentence which bold word uttered by the speaker is classified as frame markers in interactive metadiscourse marker. By using the frame markers above, the speaker explicitly invites the listener to listen to the stories of the characters in the story and follow the plot brought by the speaker about the family of sender. It is as described in the sentence *“On this episode, the following story is based on a submission from Desiree that talking about her family”*. In this sentence, the speaker wants to explain that the story he will bring is related to desiree which is related to her family.

Podcast 6.1 Not Alone

“The next night, there was a knock on our store. Ary knocked back and the door opened, it was time for the next video”

The next datum is found in podcast 6.1 **“there was a knock ...”** which is categorized as a frame marker for interactive metadiscourse. The sentence above is the last sentence uttered by the speaker in the story. The purpose of the frame marker above is that the speaker communicates explicitly to the listener by not mentioning who knocked on the door, thus adding to the impression of horror in the story. It is as explained in the sentence *“The next night, there was a knock on our store. Ary knocked back and the door opened, it was time for the next video”*.

Podcast 7.1 The Korean Bathroom Ghost

“I’m going to tell you the horror experiences of two twelve-year-old girls from South Korea”

Datum on podcast 7.1 above is part of interactive metadiscourse as frame markers. By using this marker, the speaker aims to invite the listener to discuss the horror experiences of the two girls. In telling horror stories, the speaker always delivers it explicitly in order to attract the attention of the listeners. This is explained in the sentence “*I’m going to tell you the horror experiences of two twelve-year-old girls from South Korea*”. In this sentence, the speaker wants to tell listeners about the bad events that have been experienced by two twelve-year-old girls from South Korea. The word **I’m going to tell you** indicates that the speaker wants to tell the listener something.

Podcast 9.1 My Lucky Boy

“In the end of the story, after the reality of what had just happened sank in, I oddly felt relieved to know that he was no longer scared of suffering. I just wish I could save him, just one more time”

For the next datum on podcast 9.1 is categorized as frame markers in interactive metadiscourse. The sentence above is the last sentence on the podcast. After telling the story of the boy, the speaker ended with a frame marker "in the end of the story" which marks the end of a story. This conclusion contains regret, thus adding to the impression of sadness for the listeners. It is as described in the sentence “*In the end of the story, after the reality of what had just happened sank in, I oddly felt relieved to know that he was no longer scared of suffering. I just wish I could save him, just one more time*”. In accordance with the meaning of the word "**in the end of the story**" itself, the speaker wants to tell the listener how the story ends.

c. Endophoric Markers

Podcast 4.1 My Family Hates Me

*“Everything I had put up **the night before**, was now on the ground, shattered in pieces”*

The datum on podcast 4.1 is part of interactive metadiscourse as endophoric markers. "The night before" is used by the speaker to explain what happened before. The use of this marker is needed when telling a story so that it is easier for the listener to digest and understand the contents of the story. This is explained in the sentence *“Everything I had put up **the night before**, was now on the ground, shattered in pieces”*. In this sentence, the speaker wants to tell the listener that something he has done before has been broken or even broken into pieces. In this case, the speaker describes a story where the speaker experiences bad things.

Podcast 7.1 The Korean Bathroom Ghost

*“The choke cough and set on the ceiling, it was the woman like figure **that Jen had seen before**. Lifting her new prey up into her arms”*

Bold sentences in the podcast datum above in interactive metadiscourse are categorized as endophoric markers. The speaker uses this marker to reinforce his point of view so that the listener can see what happened before. This datum is in the near final sentence towards the conclusion. This is explained in the words *“The choke cough and set on the ceiling, it was the woman like figure **that Jen had seen before**. Lifting her new prey up into her arms”*. In this sentence, the speaker explains that Jen has experienced bad things such as seeing a figure of a woman on the ceiling. This is proved by the expression **that Jen had seen before**. It means that Jen has experienced an incident by seeing something that makes her never forget it.

d. Evidential Markers

Podcast 5.1 A Game Hide-and-Seek Gone Wrong

“According to Gilda, “you can believe whatever you want to believe, but don’t be surprised when you see Leslie Ann. She wants to best friend forever”

The word "**according to**" on the datum above fulfills the criteria as evidential markers in interactive metadiscourse. It is used by the speaker to inform the listener before getting to the point in the story. The topic brought up by the speaker is myth, in this case she tried to make the listener sure and curious about the topic she brought. This is explained in the sentence "**According to Gilda**, “you can believe whatever you want to believe, but don’t be surprised when you see Leslie Ann. She wants to best friend forever”. In this sentence, the speaker wants to show the listener something based on an opinion or opinion that is not the view of the speaker himself. In this sentence, the speaker explained that Gilda had told him about Lesli Ann who wanted to be best friend forever. Gilda also advises speakers regarding trust in others.

Podcast 6.1 Not Alone

*“The most liked comment read 13 seconds had me dead and other comments had skull reactions and ghost emojis afterwards like creepy when you see it”, Ary **stated**”*

The next datum in podcast 6.1 has the word “stated” which is the evidential marker in interactive method court. The sentence above was said by the speaker at the beginning of the story. The speaker uses the word as a starting point as information before entering the core of the story so that it is easier for the listener to understand. This is explained in the sentence “*The most liked comment read 13 seconds had me dead and other comments had skull reactions and ghost emojis*

*afterwards like creepy when you see it”, Ary **stated***”. In this sentence, the speaker explains his feelings when he gets comments that contain skull reactions and ghost emojis. The word **stated** indicates that the sentence was delivered by a certain person.

Podcast 10.1 Don’t Silence Her

*“**They looked that** Juliana still alive but with different looks. She was covered in dirt and blood, her clothes were torn with twigs and leave scattered all over, her eyes were filled with rage and was still some shut her voice echoed inside of their (Dustin and Trevor) heads”*

The next datum in 10.1 is a phrase which is categorized as evidential marker in interactive metadiscourse. Hereby, the speaker uses the marker to give the listener details about Juliana's change. The evidential marker helps the listener to more easily describe the character being told. This is explained in the sentence *“**They looked that** Juliana still alive **but with different looks**. She was covered in dirt and blood, her clothes were torn with twigs and leave scattered all over, her eyes were filled with rage and was still some shut her voice echoed inside of their (Dustin and Trevor) heads”*. In this sentence, the speaker wants to tell that there is someone who looks like Juliana when she was alive. The person looks very tragic with the bandage of wounds and blood on his body. His anger was visible from the corner of his eye, and his voice still echoed inside Dustin and Trevor's heads.

e. Code Glosses

Podcast 1.1 The Doll in The Wall

*“Turning back to his bed to get his flashlight, Evan pulled back his covers and there was **such as** large doll in his bed”*

The phrase “*such as*” in the podcast datum 1.1 is categorized as code glosses in interactive metadiscourse. The speaker uses the code glosses to provide additional information to the listener so that it is easier for them to describe the situation that occurs in the story. It is described in the sentence “*Turning back to his bed to get his flashlight, Evan pulled back his covers and there was **such as** large doll in his bed*”. In this sentence, the word **such as** means that it is used to mention an object that can represent the previous explanation. In that sentence, Evan experienced a stressful thing like seeing a big doll sitting on his bed when he was about to take his flashlight. So, the word **such as** in the sentence explains that when Evan does something and finds an object, the word **such as** emphasizes the type of object.

Podcast 4.1 My Family Hates Me

*“I had a pretty bad dream last night felt **like** there were people in my room or something”*

The word "like" in podcast datum 4.1 is categorized as a code glosses marker in interactive metadiscourse. The use of this words aims to provide the speaker with additional information about what the characters in the story feel. Therefore, the speaker marked it with the word "like". This is explained in the sentence “*I had a pretty bad dream last night felt **like** there were people in my room or something*”. In this sentence, the speaker wants to tell him that he has nightmares while sleeping. In his dream, the speaker felt that there were many people in a room. The word **like** in this sentence is used as an example that is conveyed by the speaker to the listener, so that the listener can feel what the speaker feels like.

Podcast 9.1 My Lucky Boy

*“....but I was starting to really worry about his mental health **like** he was losing sleep and he wouldn't eat”*

The next datum is in podcast 9.1, namely the use of the word "like" in the middle of the sentence. It is part of interactive metadiscourse as codegloses. Just like the previous analysis, here the speaker tries to provide additional information to the listener about the character's mental health. The word **like** here is used as an example of two different things that the speaker says to the listener, but they have some things in common. In this sentence, the speaker wants to tell that the speaker is worried about someone's condition, where his mental health is not fine. The speaker is also concerned about the person's eating and sleeping patterns. This is explained in the sentence *“.... but I was starting to really worry about his mental health like he was losing sleep and he wouldn't eat”*.

C. Discussion

After conducting the analysis, researchers found 25 data from 10 podcast episodes. The findings above show the kinds and uses of interactive methods in the delivery of horror stories. The findings refer to the formulation of the problem. To carry out the above research, the sentence must meet the criteria as interactive metadiscourse. There are words, phrases, and sentences that meet the criteria as interactive metadiscourse.

1. The Kinds of Interactive Metadiscourse in Telling Horror Story Trough

Podcast

a. Transition Marker

In delivering horror stories through podcasts, as described above in 3.1.1 there are various kinds of interactive metadiscourse in the sentences delivered by the speaker. Crismore (1983) defines the term of metadiscourse as the author's intrusion into ongoing discourse to direct rather than inform the readers. The most important is about how to make the readers follow and go along with the the writer's piece of writing work. For instance, the use of transition markers in datum 3.1.1.1, the researcher found various kinds of transition markers such as "*but, and, because, thus, however, otherwise*", although their usage was different in each sentence, but their roles were the same as a connector for the previous sentence. However, conjunctions and adverbial phrases are feature of transition markers that help readers to interpret pragmatic connection between steps in an argument signaling additive, causative, consequence, and contrastive relations in the writer's thoughts to express relationship stretches of discourse. To count as metadiscourse, they must perform internal role to the discourse to help readers interpret links between ideas.

b. Frame Markers

The next finding is in the frame markers section, for the use of frame markers in this case is not easy and only found in few episodes, this may be because how the way to tell story trough podcast is not same as an essay. Those are podcasts 1.1, 3.1., 4.1, 6.1. 7.1, 9.1 such as *there is no sign; finally; on this episode, the following story; there was a knock; I'm going to tell you*. This may be because how the way to tell story trough podcast is not same as an essay. However, this feature indicates text boundaries or schematic elements of text

structure. There has to be care to identify feature that belong to argument rather than events in time.

c. Endophoric Markers

After analyzing the frame markers, the researchers continued to analyze the various endophoric markers used in delivering horror stories through podcasts. In fact, not all episodes use endophoric markers. Researchers found only two out of ten episodes, namely podcasts 4.1 and 7.1. The markers used include "*the night before* and *that Jen had seen before*", they fill the criteria as endophoric markers in interactive metadiscourse. However, this features additional material prominent and therefore the readers obtain to recovery of the writer's meaning by referring to earlier material or anticipating something yet to come. These features help readers to steer them to a preferred interpretations of reading of the discourse.

d. Evidential Markers

The next analysis is about what evidential markers the speaker used in the podcast. Unlike the previous analysis, hereby the researcher found three out of ten episodes, namely podcast 2.1, 6.1, 10.1. These markers include "*according to*, *stated*, and *but with different looks*", although the placement in each sentence is different, they have the same function and fill the criteria as evidential markers in interactive metadiscourse. However, the feature of this sub category is the representations of an idea from another source (Thomas and Hawes, 1994:124) which guides the readers to interpret and establish an authorial command of the subject.

e. Code Glosses

The last marker analysis in interactive metadiscourse is code glosses. Finding code glosses in this podcast is not as easy and as much as when analyzing transition markers. Researchers also found only three out of ten episodes, namely podcasts 1.1, 4.1 and 9.1. These markers include “*such as, like, and like*”. However, by rephrasing, explaining or elaborating, the speaker’s thoughts, they indicate additional information to assure the listeners are able to recover the writer’s meaning.

2. The Used of Interactive Metadiscourse Marker in Telling Horror Story Trough Podcast

Metadiscourse is a cover term for words that writers or speakers use for the purpose of indicating the direction and purpose of text. The term was first used by Harris in 1959 to refer to a way of understanding language in use. In this sense, metadiscourse represents the attempts of the writer or speaker to guide the perception of the text receiver (Hyland, 2005: 3). In other words, metadiscourse enables the writer to “guide, direct and inform” the reader in the way he (the writer or speaker) wants the reader or hearer to respond to the text content. Consequently, it is an important category not only for creating a text, but also for reading the content (Crismore, 1989: 64). Adel (2006: 2) argued that metadiscourse refers to “linguistic items that indicate the existence in the text of either the writer and reader (or speaker and hearer) through reference to the text organization or by using other ways to comment on the text.

Metadiscourse is based on the idea that communication involves the personalities, attitudes and assumptions of its participants, and is not merely an

exchange of information. Crismore et al. (1993: 40) state that metadiscourse enables readers and listeners to “organize, interpret and evaluate the information given”. Whereas Crismore’s definition puts emphasis on the role of metadiscourse in conveying ideas or information, that of Williams (2007: 65) puts emphasis on the role of metadiacourse in referring to the writers and readers in that, according to Williams (2007: 62), metadiscourse is “the language that writers use to refer not to the substance of their ideas, but to themselves, their readers, or their writings.”

The interactive metadiscourse helps the writer to sort out propositional substance to make it clear. Interactive Metadiscourse markers have their respective functions in each element. According to previous research conducted by Rohmah Nur Romadhonia, who examined the use of metadiscourse markers in argumentative essays, she revealed the difference in the use of metadiscourse markers between argumentative and descriptive essays. Here, research was conducted to examine the use of interactive method court markers in the delivery of horror stories through podcasts.

After analyzing the various markers of interactive metadiscourse, the researcher analyzed the usefulness of each element in interactive metadiscourse. These elements include; *transition markers*, *frame markers*, *endophoric markers*, *evidential markers*, and *code gloses*.

First, the utility of transition markers for storytelling is found in ten episodes (2.1.1.1). For instance, in the 9.1 podcast entitled "My Lucky Boy", there is the word "but". Hereby, but has the function, that is to distinguish between the first

statement and the second statement. The speaker compares that Lana's house isn't what she expected when she was going to visit a psychic's house. Therefore, the word "*but*" here serves as a sign of comparison.

The second one was about frame markers, as explained in 3.2.1.2 that the researcher found only six out of ten episodes. The six episodes have different markers, but they have the same function. Can be seen in the 6.1 podcast entitled "*Not Alone*", there is a sentence "*there was a knock ...*". The speaker used the marker for its purpose, that is communicates explicitly to the listener by not mentioning who knocked on the door, thus adding to the impression of horror in the story.

Next is the use of endophoric markers in the delivery of horror stories. Although the researcher did not find in every episode, these markers are also important to use. For example, in the 4.1 podcast entitled *My Family Hates me* in section 3.2.1.3. There is the sentence "*the night before*". It is used by the speaker to explain what happened before. The use of this marker is needed when telling a story so that it is easier for the listener to digest and understand the contents of the story.

After endophoric markers, researchers analyzed the usefulness of the evidential markers. As with endophoric markers, researchers did not find many of these markers in every episode, only three episodes out of ten episodes. You can see an example in the 3.1.1.4 podcast 5.1 entitled "*A Game Hide-and-Seek Gone Wrong*". The speaker uses the word "*according to*", this word functions to inform the listener before getting to the point in the story. The topic brought up by the

speaker is myth. It could make the listener would sure and curious about the topic she brought.

The last is about the function of the code glosses. Researchers found some of these markers in 3.1.1.5, including “*such as and like*”. For an instance in podcast 1.1 entitled “*The Doll in The Wall*”, the speaker uses the phrase “*such as*” which works to provide additional information to the listener so that it is easier for them to describe the situation that occurs in the story.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter here conceives general perspectives related to the study. It would be explained by two things; conclusion and suggestion. Conclusion covers how the way of researcher answered the research question and the suggestions for further research, researchers provide something potential related to this study.

A. Conclusion

This study is found out the kinds of interactive metadiscourse markers used in delivering horror stories through podcasts taken from several episodes, as well as the function of their use. They are from the “*The Something Scary Podcast*” channel that delivered by Sapphire and Markeia.

From the study that has been done, the researcher has the following conclusions:

1. From the data result, the researcher found that there are five kinds of interactive metadiscourse used in the “*The Something Scary Podcast*” channel that delivered by Sapphire and Markeia. They are transition markers, frame markers, endphoric markers, evidential markers and code glosses used by speakers in the delivery of horror stories
2. In addition to mentioning the types of interactive metadiscourse used, in this case the researcher also found the function of using interactive metadiscourse and to strengthen their opinion about the function of these metadiscourse markers whether they have the same function when used in the

form of news delivery in the form of argumentative or descriptive essays. By explaining the functions of interactive metadiscourse, it can help listeners in interpreting the sentences conveyed by the speaker.

B. Suggestions

Limitation in this study is that the researcher takes the horror podcast object with different episodes and topics using interactive metadiscourse. In previous studies, metadiscourse markers were used to research essays both argumentative and descriptive essays, therefore researchers took different subjects. For further research, the researcher hopes to carry out research with the same object, namely horror stories, which can be written or oral from the interpersonal aspect of metadiscourse and the influence obtained from the listener, can take samples from students with the lowest to highest toefl scores. Therefore, this gap will be even more interesting.

REFERENCES

- Ädel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i2.28588>
- Aysel Şahin Kizil)5017(. The Use Of Metadiscourse In Spoken Interlanguage Of Efl Learners: A Contrastive Analysis. *ISBN 978-80-87927-36-6, IISES*
- Beauvais, P.J. (1989). A speech act theory of metadiscourse. *Written Communication*, 6, 11-30
- Crismore, A. (1989). Talking with readers: Metadiscourse as rhetorical act. New York: Peter Lang. <https://books.google.com/books?id=BXsFAQAAIAAJ>
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R. & Steffensen, M.S. (1993). Metadiscourse in Persuasive Writing: A Study of Texts Written by American and Finnish University Students. *Written Communication*. 10(1). 39-71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088393010001002>
- Duruk, E. (2017). Analysis of metadiscourse markers in academic written discourse produced by Turkish researchers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(1), 1-9.
- Feng Cao, Guangwei Hu (2014) Interactive Metadiscourse in Research Article; A Comparative Study of Paradigmatic and Disciplinary Influences. *Journal of Pragmatics* 66 (2014) 15-31
- GÜÇLÜ, R. (2020). Interactive metadiscourse markers in Turkish research article abstracts: a diachronic analysis. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten*, (70)Aralık((, 511-238.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction In Writing Continuum Discourse*. East Anglia: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum. <https://books.google.com/books?id=kyzfT1czUfMC>
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and Engagement a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, Vol 7 No 2.

- Kan, M. O. (2021). Interactive Metadiscourse Markers in the Turkish Articles on Science and Social Sciences. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 16(3), 56-66.
- Tashi, T., & Suksawas, W. (2018). An analysis of interactional metadiscourse in public speaking: A case study in English speeches of the Prime Minister of Bhutan. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(4.38), 975-979.
- Williams, J. (2007). *Style: Ten lessons in clarity and grace*. New York: Pearson-Longman.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Yoshi Nur Rahmawati was born in Kediri on 25 February, 1997. She lives at Wonorejo Indah Timur II/50, Surabaya. She graduated from SMAN 16 Surabaya, 2015. She started the higher education in 2016 at the English Letters Department of Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang and finished in 2020. She extremely motivated to constantly develop her skills and grows professionally. Although she still has a little experience in working, but she will prove once the opportunity comes. The organizational experience she had while in college was being treasurer and secretary in TaeKwonDo activities in 2018 and 2019. From this short experience, it was enough to help her control herself both socially and emotionally as well as learn to solve problems. In addition, she got new knowledge in the field of administration that might be applied in the world of work.

Her other experiences, she was being an intern teacher in MAN 2 Malang. Similar to the experience of participating in taekwondo activities, being an intern teacher also teaches her how to control her emotions well, and how to convey knowledge to students. From the experience she has done, she has created skills which include good communication, the ability to work in team as well as independently, also the ability to attempt to follow instruction and deliver the quality results.