

METADISCOURSE MARKERS IN GRETA THUNBERG'S SPEECHES

Sona Kholifah¹, Rosyida Ekawati²

^{1,2}Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Trunojoyo Madura

¹sonakholifah@gmail.com, ²rosyida.ekawati@trunojoyo.ac.id

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk membahas jenis penanda *metadiscourse* dan menjelaskan *metadiscourse* yang digunakan dalam pidato Thunberg. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif untuk mendeskripsikan jenis dan fungsi penanda *metadiscourse* dalam pidato Greta Thunberg. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan adanya *metadiscourse* yang interaktif dan interaksional dalam tuturan. Penanda *metadiscourse* interaktif dalam tuturan adalah transisi, *frame marker*, penanda endoforik dan *code glosses*. Transisi menjadi penanda tertinggi, karena transisi adalah konjungsi yang berfungsi koheren dan menghubungkan antara argumen dengan argumen lain. Sedangkan penanda *metadiscourse* interaksional dalam tuturan adalah *hedges*, *booster*, *attitude marker*, *engagement marker*, dan *self-mention*. Pada kategori interaksional, *engagement* dan *self-mention* dominan, karena *engagement marker* membantu Thunberg untuk membangun hubungan dengan audiens dan menyapa audiens ke dalam wacana, sedangkan saat mengungkapkan pendapatnya dan menekankan dirinya sebagai pembicara dalam tanggung jawab pribadi. Untuk argumennya, Thunberg menggunakan penanda *self-mention*.

Kata Kunci: *Metadiscourse; Interactive; Interactional; Thunberg.*

Abstract

This study aims at discussing the type of metadiscourse markers and explain the metadiscourse used in Thunberg's speeches. This study used qualitative method to describe the types and the function of metadiscourse markers in Greta Thunberg's speeches. The result shows that there are interactive and interactional metadiscourse in the speeches. Interactive metadiscourse markers in the speech are transition, frame marker, endophoric marker and code gloss. Transition became the highest marker, because transition is conjunction that functions to coherent and to relate between argument with another argument. Meanwhile, interactional metadiscourse markers in the speech are hedges, booster, attitude marker, engagement marker, and self-mention. In the interactional category, engagement and self-mention are dominant, because the engagement marker helps Thunberg to build a relationship with the audience and address the audience into the discourse, while when to express her opinion and to emphasize herself as a speaker in personal responsibility for the argument, Thunberg used self-mention marker.

Keywords: *Metadiscourse; Interactive; Interactional; Thunberg.*



Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

INTRODUCTION

Language is one of the prominent things in human life (Tutuarima, Nuraeningsih, & Rusiana, 2018). It is important since people can communicate to find out the information and can convey ideas and feelings through language. According to Agarwal and Garg (2012), communication itself is the activity of conveying information. It has two ways to convey information by using written language and spoken language. Written language is the language in written form such as magazine, books, journal, and newspaper. Meanwhile, spoken language is in form of presentation, speech, discussion, and interpersonal communication. It can be inferred that language to communicate with other human, primarily through spoken and written communication.

The phenomenon of spoken language is speech. Speech describes how creative human minds can be in expressing idea, intention and thought (Pasaribu, 2017a). It is the way to express opinion and communicate in public. Further, language in speech is a language that contains information. It is in line with Kusumawati (2011), language in international forum text uses of grammar that delineate how the words linked in intent and specific purpose, word selection and the sentence formation have strongly influenced the meaning conveyed.

One of the examples of speech delivered in International arena is Thunberg's speech. Thunberg bluffed with some of her speeches at United Nation, Climate Change COP24 Conference and in the other forum. She has criticised European Union leaders in Starsbourg. Her speech has been watched by 4,4 million viewers in YouTube. It is mostly about climate change and the world leaders for their inaction on protecting the environment. Her action inspired other school children and adults in the world about climate change. In August, 2018, Thunberg was willing to quit from her school in order to save earth and give awareness to the world's leader to solve the climate change issue. Thunberg also has been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. Thunberg's speech on climate change also inspires other people, especially youth. In delivering speech, there are relationship between language and context and also speech is one of the examples of discourse in use. In delivering speech Thunberg used metadiscourse markers.

According to Hyland (2005), metadiscourse marker is a term in scope of discourse analysis and language education, referring to an interesting, and relatively new, approach conceptualizing interaction between writer or speaker and audience. It means metadiscourse as essential means of facilitating communication between the writer or speaker to express the idea and involve the audience get the information. Metadiscourse is the way of understanding language in use, presenting a writer's or speaker's attempt to guide a receiver's perception of a text (Hyland, 2005). To utilize metadiscourse markers is an essential part of a writer's rhetorical techniques. They reveal the writer's engagement of the readers or audience and their need for explanation, clarification and guidance (Nasiri, 2013). They are actually those linguistic markers in order to make the writer or the speaker aware of the needs of the audiences.

According to Adel (2006), metadiscourse is text about the evolving text or the author's explicit commentary on author ongoing discourse. It is use to conveys information and show the writer's opinions based on the content. It is in line with Hyland (2005) who stated that metadiscourse marker is the way of understanding language in use which help writer guide the receivers understanding of a text.

From the statements above, it can be deduced that metadiscourse marker is a concept in field discourse analysis that has relationship between the writer or the speaker with the audience to help the writer or the speaker to express the idea and involve the

audience getting the information. In other words, writer or speaker uses metadiscourse marker to connect themselves into their discourse to signal their opinions and commitments (Hyland, 2005).

Metadiscourse has two broad categories. There are interactive metadiscourse and interactional metadiscourse. Interactive features concern with the writer's or the speaker's to organize propositional information in ways that the target reader should find coherent and convincing. Meanwhile, interactional metadiscourse concerns with the reader or listener involve the discourse and give opportunity to contribute and respond what they convey from writer's or speaker's perspective on propositional information, orientation, and intention.

Furthermore, Hyland (2005) classifies interactive metadiscourse into five markers. They are transition marker, frame marker, endophoric marker, evidential, and code gloss. Interactive resources allow the writer or the speaker to help the reader to correctly interpret the text or utterance by managing information flow. They are concerned with ways of organising discourse to anticipate reader's or listener's knowledge and reflect the writer's assessment of what need to be made explicit to contain and guide what can be recovered from the text.

Transition markers are mainly conjunction and adverb which help readers interpret semantic relation between main clause. To count as metadiscourse, they must perform a role internal to the discourse rather than the outside world and helping the reader interpret links between idea. According to Martin and Rose (2003), the different discourse role toused in internal and external transition has three relations. First is addition for add element to an argument and potentially consist the item, second is comparison mark elements either similar or different, and third is consequence to tell the readers that a conclusion is being justified or an argument is being countered. Table 1 below shows the internal and external transition markers.

Table 1. Internal and External Transition Marker

Relation	External	Internal	Element
Addition	Adding activity	Adding argument	Furthermore, moreover, by the way, etc.
Comparison	Comparing and contrasting event, thing, and quality	Comparing and contrasting argument and evidence	Similarly, likewise, equally, in the same way, correspondingly, in contrast, however, but, on the other, etc.
Consequence	Explaining why and how thing happen	Drawing conclusion or countering argument	Thus, therefore, consequently, in conclusion, admittedly, nevertheless, anyway, in any case, of course, etc.

In addition, Milne (2008), frame marker is used to mark something in argument and guide the audience in the presentation of different in particular orders signal text boundaries or elements of text structure. It is in line with Hyland (2005) who stated that frame marker is for making the discourse clear to reader or listener. It covers a term for a variety of linguistic devices and can be further classified into four subtypes according to their functions. First is sequence parts of the text to explicit additive relation such as, *first, next, lastly, that, 1/2, a/b, at the same time*. Second is discourse labels to explicitly label in the texts such as, *to summarize, in sum, by way of introduction*. Third is announcer whose function to announce discourse goals such as *I argue here, my purpose is, I began with, i hope to persuade, there are several reason, my focus, objectives is to*. Fourth is

shift topic in which the frame marker can indicate topic shift in the text such as *well, right, Ok, now, let us return to, back to*.

Endophoric markers refers to other parts of the text in order to make additional information available, provide supporting arguments, and thus steer the reader toward a preferred interpretation. This theory is also supported by Milne (2008) who argued that endophoric marker refers to previous text and future text. Such as, *below, as note above, in chapter X, in the following section, as noted, let us return, mentioned before, in section X*.

Evidential marker typically takes the form of citation or academic attribution. In other words, this marker claimed other resources. This marker has two functions. They mention explicitly the source of the information and use these references of authoritative value with persuasive goals (Milne, 2008), such as *according to Z, as the President indicate, X states, cited, in Y's study, X claimed that*.

Code glosses grant information by rephrasing, explaining, or elaborating what has been said, to ensure the reader or the listener is able to recover the writer's or the speaker's intended meaning (Hyland, 2005). Code gloss has two ways to explain, rephrase or exemplify the discourse. As Milne(2008) said that this marker is about the writer's expectation about the reader's ability to follow the discourse with way punctuation devices and exemplifiers. Such as, *called, defined as, in other words, that is, for instance, namely, such as, for example, etc*.

Interactional markers concern with the writer's efforts to control the level of personality in a text and establish a suitable relationship to his or her data, arguments, audience, marking the degree of intimacy, the expression of attitude, the communication of commitments, and the extent of reader involvement (Hyland, 2005). There are five interactional features; they are hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mention.

Hedge is a resource that writers use to recognize alternative voices and viewpoints with hold commitment to the proposition. It allows the writer or the speaker to present information as an opinion or a plausible reasoning rather than a fact. According to Milne(2008), this marker also expresses in part of commitment original meaning in the text. Hedge can be classified into three subcategories. First is epistemic verb, such as *may, might, would, could*. Second is probability adverb such as, *probably, perhaps, maybe, possibly, apparently*. Third is probability adjective such as, *possible, it is likely*.

If hedges express partial commitment, in booster the writer conveys all the information with certainty. According Milne(2008), booster expresses all of commitments original meaning of the text. It also allows to close the argument. According to Hyland (2005), this marker allows the writer to close down alternative, emphasize certainty and organize different view by the audience, such as, *clearly, obviously, demonstrate, in fact, definitely, it is clear that, undoubtedly, certainly, it is an established fact*.

Attitude marker expresses the writer's or the speaker's appraisal of propositional information, conveys surprise obligation, agreement, importance and frustration. This is also supported by statement from Milne (2008) who stated that attitude marker is about how the writer expresses the message of the text towards the reader and how the content is presented in the text. This marker can explicit the signal to audience by deontic verb such as *have to, must, needs to*, attitudinal adverb such as *hopefully, unfortunately, remarkably, pathetically*, attitudinal adjective such as *it is absurd, it is surprising*, and by cognitive verbs such as, *I feel, I think, I believe*. verb,

Engagement marker explicitly addresses readers to focus their attention or include them into the discourse. In other words, it explicitly builds relationship with the reader in two ways. First, addressing the audience in argument with reader pronouns such as, *you, your, inclusive we* or with interjection such as, *frankly, not, by the way, you may notice*. Second, pulling and guiding the reader to discourse also with two ways. First, give question such as *you can see that, note, consider*. Second with obligation modal such as *should, must, have to, etc*. It is in line with Milne (2008) who stated that this marker is used to help establish reader and writer rapport through the text.

Self-mention refers to explicit author presence in the text and give information about the character and stance. It can be realized by the use of first-person pronouns and the possessive adjectives, such as, *I, me, we, our, you, mine, us, the author, the researcher and the writers*.

There are related studies about Metadiscourse that were conducted by Intraprawat & Steffensen (1995), Rustipa (2014), Yazdani (2016), Davoodi (2016), Mohammed and Rashid (2017), Pasaribu (2017b), Susanti et al. (2017), and Suhono and Haikal (2018). But none of them use speeches as the object of the analysis. In addition, another previous study conducted by Mai (2016), use speech as the object the analysis, but Mai's (2016) study took the data from two speakers in each speech, while the present study took the data from one speaker in five speeches. Thus, this study is new and important to be conducted to provide different insight about the use of metadiscourse markers.

Therefore, this study is aimed to discuss about metadiscourse markers used by Thunberg's speeches both types and their function. This study is intended to understand the use of metadiscourse markers in Thunberg's speeches. In addition, this study is also intended to elucidate the function of each category of metadiscourse markers in Thunberg's speeches.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used qualitative research to identify and classify the data that has metadiscourse markers in speech. According to Moloeng (2009), qualitative method is a research manner that obtains descriptive data in written or spoken from the people and their attitude which is being observed. Therefore, the research design above appropriate to identify and classify in Thunberg's speeches about climate change.

The sources of data in this study are five speeches of Thunberg as follows:

- a. Speech at the UN Climate Action Summit 2019 that is available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KAJsdpTPJpU>,
- b. Speech at the EU Parliament in Strasbourg that is available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=14w8WC1I3S4&t=12s>,
- c. Speech at the TED Conference that is available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EAmUIEsN9A>,
- d. Speech at the UN Climate Change COP24 Conference that is available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VFkQSGyeCWg>,
- e. Speech at the UN Climate Change COP25 Conference that is available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Eo_-mxvGnq8&t=44s.

The data in this study are sentences from Thunberg's speeches about climate change that consist of metadiscourse markers. The data of this study comes from five Thunberg's speeches. The steps to collect the data were downloading speeches from Thunberg about climate change in YouTube, watching Thunberg's speeches, transcribing

the speeches from video in YouTube, finding sentence which contains metadiscourse markers in Thunberg's speeches, putting the data into a table to assist in data collection.

In this study, the data are analyzed based on Hyland's (2005) theory about metadiscourse markers. This study used content analysis that is used for describing and analysing written, spoken, or visual material. Thus this study takes the data from Thunberg's speeches. Since, this study uses content analysis as research method, then this study giving code to each marker. Miles and Huberman (1994) defined that qualitative data analysis is done simultaneously with data collection, data reduction, data display, and conclusion. The steps of analyzing the data in this study are counting sentences of metadiscourse markers in Thunberg's speeches, providing the codes to the each marker such as S1= Thunberg's speech in UN Climate Change Action Summit 2019, S2= Thunberg's speech in The EU Parliament in Strasbourg, S3= Thunberg's speech in TED Conference, S4= Thunberg's speech in UN Climate Change COP24 Conference, S5= Thunberg's speech in UN Climate Change COP25 Conference, C= Sentence in speech, T= Transition, FM=FrameMarker, EM= Endophoric Marker, CG= Code Gloss, E= Evidential, H= Hedge, B= Booster, AM= Attitude Marker, SM= Self-Mention, and EGM= Engagement Marker. After that, displaying the findings into type of metadiscourse markers and explain how metadiscourse markers used in Thunberg's speeches, and the last is presenting the result of the research.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

After collecting the data from Thunberg's five speeches, there are four types of interactive markers and five types of interactional markers. For interactive metadiscourse markers, there are 179 transition markers, 13 frame markers, 1 endophoric marker, and 30 code glosses. Meanwhile, for interactional metadiscourse markers there are 64 hedges, 15 boosters, 36 attitude markers, 243 engagement markers, and 131 self-mentions. The details of the types of metadiscourse markers for each speech are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Type of Metadiscourse Markers in Thunberg's Speeches

No	Metadiscourse Marker	Thunberg's Speeches					Total
		S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	
Interactive Marker							
1.	Transition	18	44	46	17	54	179
2.	Frame Marker	3	3	1	-	6	13
3.	Endophoric Marker	-	-	-	-	1	1
4.	Code Gloss	-	9	11	1	9	30
Interactional Marker							
5.	Hedge	4	21	22	7	10	64
6.	Booster	1	2	6	2	4	15
7.	Attitude Marker	3	9	9	3	6	36
8.	Engagement Marker	28	77	60	29	49	243
9.	Self-mention	19	25	46	22	19	131

Table 2 above provides the number of each category of metadiscourse markers both interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers in each Thunberg's speech and

the total number for each category for all speeches. The markers used for each category are displayed in the following table 3. The table shows the variant of metadiscourse markers used by Thunberg in the five speeches.

Table 3 Variant of Metadiscourse Markers

No	Category	Markers
1	Transitions	Yet, and, also, furthermore, but, because, so, while, since, therefore, however, even though, or
2	Frame Markers	My message..., we will..., I want..., Well, Now, I will...,
3	Endophoric Markers	In Chapter 2...,
4	Code Glosses	in other words, called, that basically means, like, such as, as, that means, that is,
5	Hedges	Shouldn't, likely, wouldn't. almost, may, apparently, would, maybe, should, could, possible, might
6	Boosters	Clearly, of course, never, in fact
7	Attitude Markers	I do not want to believe, I refuse to believe, I agree, I hope, need to, has to, I think, have to, I still believe,
8	Engagement Markers	We, have to, you, our, please note, your, us, ourselves, must, should, please tell, How...?, Why...? Are we...? Please don't
9	Self-Mentions	My, me, us, we, myself, I, mine

Each type of metadiscourse markers was used in five Thunberg's speeches. There are nine markers of metadiscourse used in her speeches. In this section, it is presented the analysis the use of metadiscourse markers in Thunberg's speeches in term of types and functions of metadiscourse markers in the speeches.

Interactive Metadiscourse Markers

Interactive metadiscourse allowed the writer or the speaker to help audience to correctly interpret the text or utterance by managing information flow (Hyland, 2005). They consist of transition marker, frame marker, endophoric marker, evidential, and code gloss. But there are no evidential marker in the speeches.

Based on the findings, there are 13 markers of transition in Thunberg's speeches. They are *yet, and, also, but, since, or, therefore, even though, however, while, furthermore, so, because*. All of these markers are conjunctions which are in accordance with Hyland's (2005) statement that transition markers are conjunction and adverb to help the audience express semantic relation between main clauses. Some examples of the expressions using transition markers are below.

- (1) "... **Yet** you all come to us young people for hope." (008/S1/C5/T).

Thunberg used this marker *yet* to compare and contrast the arguments in her speech.

- (2) "The facade was so beautiful **but** the foundations are far from solid." (112/S2/C11/T).

Transition marker *but* in the speech is used to contrast. It is used to contrast between clauses in a sentence or between sentences. In this example (2), transition marker *but* to contrast between clauses in the sentence.

- (3) “People keep doing what they do **because** the vast majority doesn't have a clue about the actual consequences of our everyday life, and they don't know that rapid change is required”(415/S3/C46/T).

The transition marker *because* in the example (3) shows the logical relationship between clause to introduce cause or reason. In this matter, Thunberg tried to relate the cause and effect for a particular condition. All of the transitions used in five speeches are intended to make logical connection between propositions, clauses or sentences.

Another marker that is used in the speeches is frame marker. There are 5 frame markers in Thunberg speeches, i.e. *my message*, *we will*, *I want*, *well* and *now*.

- (4) “**My message** is that we'll be watching you” (002/S1/C1/FM).

The frame marker *my message* is announcer. It means Thunberg used this marker to announce discourse goals in order her argument is clear for the audience.

- (5) “**Well** our house is falling apart and we are rapidly running out of time.” (220/S2/C63/FM).

The frame marker *well* is used to shift topic. Thunberg used this marker to shift her argument for framing information about element of the discourse in her speech.

- (6) “**Now** we're almost at the end of my talk, and this is where people usually start talking about hope, solar panels, wind power, circular economy, and so on, but I'm not going to do that.” (504/S3/C77/FM).

The frame marker *now* was used by Thunberg to shift her argument and guide the audience in the discourse with different element of the argument. The frame marker is used to guide the audience in the presentation of different in particular order signal text boundaries (Milne, 2008). In Thunberg's five speeches, the functions of the frame markers are commonly to announce and shift topic.

Instead of transition markers and frame marker Thunberg also used endophoric marker in her speech although only one marker used.

- (7) “**In chapter 2** on page 108 in the SR 1.5 IPCC report that came out last year, it says that if we are to have a six to seven percent chance of limiting the global temperature rise to below 1.5 degrees Celsius we had on January 1st 2018, 420 gigatons of CO₂ left to meet in that budget and of course that number is much lower today as we emit about 42 Giga tons of CO₂ every year including land use” (646/S5/C10/EM).

In example (7), Thunberg explains about the global temperature according IPCC. In her speech, she used endophoric marker *in chapter 2* to support her argument and preferred interpretation of information in her speech in UN Climate Change COP25 Conference. Thunberg used this marker to help the audience directly refer toward the speaker preferred interpretation information.

Another interactive metadiscourse markers used in the speech was code glosses. There are 8 markers of code gloss in Thunberg's speeches, i.e. *in other words*, *called*, *that basically means*, *like*, *such*, *as*, *that means*, and *that is*. The examples of the use of code glosses are below.

- (8) “**In other words**, it will take cathedral thinking.”(278/S2/C91/CG).

The code gloss *in other words* rephrases an argument in the discourse. Thunberg used this marker to provide information by paraphrasing. It is in line with Hyland's (2005) statement that code gloss grants information by paraphrasing what has been said to ensure the audience understand.

- (9) "And that is so that people in poorer countries can have a chance to heighten their standard of living by building some of the infrastructure that we have already built, **such as** roads, schools, hospitals, clean drinking water, electricity, and so on." (396/S3/C39/CG).

The marker *such as* is used to exemplify something in the discourse. Thunberg used this marker to exemplify about infrastructure for standard of living. It is in line with Milne's statement (2008) that code gloss to lead the audience to follow the discourse by paraphrasing argument and exemplifiers.

Code glosses that were used in five speeches provide information by paraphrasing, explaining, or elaborating on what she has been said to ensure the reader or listener can retrieve the meaning that is intended by the author or speaker.

The uses of interaction metadiscourse markers in Thunberg's five speeches were in line with Hyland's (2005). The markers have their functions to communicate the speaker's ideas or intended meaning to the listener. It has to do with the speaker's awareness of the participating audience and the way the speaker tries to accommodate knowledge, interests, rhetorical expectations, and processing skills. The purpose of the speaker is to produce a text to meet the specific needs and understanding of listeners, building arguments for them to understand the speaker's objectives. Hence, the use of metadiscourse markers in this interactive category addresses ways of organizing discourse, not experience, and reveals the extent to which texts are constructed with the listener's needs.

Interactional Metadiscourse Markers

Interactional metadiscourse focused on the speaker's efforts to control the level of personality in a discourse and establish a suitable relationship to the speaker's data, arguments, audience, marking the degree of intimacy, the expression of attitude, the communication of commitments, and extent of reader involvement (Hyland, 2005). There are five markers in interactional metadiscourse that were used by Thunberg in her speeches.

Hedge is one of the interactional metadiscourse markers in the speeches. Based on the finding there were 12 hedge markers in Thunberg's speeches. There are *should*, *shouldn't*, *likely*, *would*, *wouldn't*, *almost*, *may*, *apparently*, *maybe*, *could*, *possible*, and *might*. Some uses are presented in the following examples.

- (10) "I **shouldn't** be up here." (004/S1/C3/H).

Hedge marker *shouldn't* is epistemic verb. Epistemic verb is one way to express the discourse as the author opinion. Thunberg used this marker to express argument in her speech based on her point and presented the argument as her opinion. It is in line with Hyland's statement (2005) that hedges is a resource that the speaker uses to recognize alternative voice and viewpoints with hold commitment to the proposition. It allows the speaker to present information as an opinion.

- (11) “Around the year 2030, 10 years, 259 days, and 10 hours away from now we will be in a position where we set off an irreversible chain reaction that will most **likely** lead to the end of our civilization as we know it.” (126/S2/C19/H).

The hedge marker *likely* is epistemic adjective. Epistemic expression is one way to convey possible reasoning. Thunberg used this marker to give possible reasoning rather than fact. This is in accordance with Hyland (2005) who stated that hedges allows the speaker presents possible reasoning rather than fact.

- (12) “**Apparently**, that was something humans have created by our way of living.” (301/S3/C2/H).

In the example (12) above, *apparently* is probability adverb. Probability adverb is one way to present possible reasoning rather than a fact. Thunberg used this marker to express possible reasoning rather than fact based on her point of view.

All of the hedge markers in Thunberg’s speeches are in accordance with Hyland’s (2005) statement that hedge markers were used to express commitment and open dialogue which means that the speaker’s statements were not the fixed propositions and there can be some possibilities.

Another interactional metadiscourse marker used was boosters. There were 3 booster markers in Thunberg’s speeches. There are *of course*, *never*, *in fact* and *clearly*. The examples of the use of booster in Thunberg’s speeches are presented below.

- (13) “Nor the aspect of equity or climate justice **clearly** stated throughout the Paris Agreement.” (139/S2/C26/B).

The marker *clearly* is included in booster because this marker was used by Thunberg to convey original meaning of the discourse. It has the same as what Hyland (2005) stated that booster expresses all commitments that are original meaning of the text.

- (14) “And yes, we do need hope, **of course** we do.” (522/S3/C83/B).

The marker *of course* includes booster because this marker was used to strengthen Thunberg’s argument. So, the audience can draw the same conclusion with her. Thunberg used this marker to convey her ideas to the audience that she and the audience do need hope that is important in doing something. It is in agreement with Hyland’s (2005) statement that this marker allows the writer to close down alternative, emphasize certainty, and organize different view by the audience.

- (15) “But I’ve learned that you are **never** too small to make a difference and if a few children can get headlines all over the world just by not going to school” (548/S4/C5/B).

Thunberg used the marker *never* to convey her ideas with certainty to the audience when she has already learned that the audience made no changes at all. From the examples of the use of boosters in Thunberg’s speeches, it can be understood that Thunberg used the boosters whenever she is very confidence to express about certainty.

For the use of attitude markers, there were 7 attitude markers in Thunberg speeches. They are *I do not want to believe*, *I refuse to believe*, *I still believe*, *I agree*, *I hope*, *need to*, *I think*, *have to* and *has to*. The examples of the use of transition markers in Thunberg’s speeches are presented below.

- (16) “**I do not want to believe** that because if you really understood the situation and still kept on failing to act, then you would be evil and that I refuse to believe.” (035/S1/C18/AM).

The marker *I do not want to believe* in this sentence includes into attitude marker because this marker is cognitive verb. Cognitive verb is one way to explicit the signal to audience. Thunberg used this marker to express the propositional information in her speeches.

- (17) “**And I agree**. To panic, unless you have to, is a terrible idea.” (101/S2/C8/AM).
(18) “**I hope** that its foundations are strong.” (117/S2/C17/AM).

There are attitude markers *I agree*, and *I hope* in the examples (17) and (18). Attitude marker is to convey proportional information, convey surprise obligation, agreement, importance and frustration. Thunberg used attitude markers when she wants to indicate her affective, attitude to propositions.

Engagement marker is another interactional metadiscourse marker in the speeches. The markers were *we*, *have to*, *you*, *our*, *please note*, *please don't*, *your*, *us*, *ourselves*, *ask*, *must*, *should*, *how...?*, *why...?* *are...?* and *please tell*. The examples of the use engagement markers in the speeches are below.

- (19) “Entire ecosystems are collapsing; **we** are in the beginning of a mass extinction and all you can talk about is money and fairytales of eternal economic growth.” (017/S1/C11/EGM).

Inclusive *we* includes in engagement marker because *we* indicates the speaker and the audience. It is to engage between the speaker and the audience. In this case, Thunberg used inclusive *we* to build relationship with the audience to pay their attention to the speaker.

- (20) “**We have to** change.”(365/S3/C28/EGM).

The marker *have to* is obligation modal that was used by Thunberg to pull the attention and guide the audience. It means *have to* is part of engagement markers. It is in line with Hyland's (2005) idea that engagement marker is to pulling and guiding audience into the discourse at critical points.

- (21) “**And please note** that these calculations are depending on inventions that have not yet been invented at scale.” (133/S2/C22/EGM).

The use of *please note* in (21) was for addressing audience with interjection. The function is to build relationship with the audience.

- (22) “The bigger **your** carbon footprint the bigger your moral duty.” (235/S2/C69/EGM).

Thunberg as the speaker used the pronoun *your* when she wants to build relationship with her audience by addressing audience with reader pronoun. *Your* in the example (22) indicates audience participant. The function is to get audience attention on Thunberg's speeches.

Related to the function of engagement marker that explicitly to address the audience to focus their attention or include them into the discourse, Thunberg used engagement markers also to build relationship with her audience through various engagement markers.

The last interactional metadiscourse marker used in Thunberg speech was self-mention. It refers to explicit speaker's presence in the forum and gives information about the character and stance. It was realized through the use of *my*, *I*, *me*, *we*, *us*, *mine*, and *myself*.

(23) “**My** name is Greta Thunberg.” (085/S2/C1/SM).

In the example (23), *my* is a possessive adjective. Thunberg used this marker to introduce herself as the speaker. Personal pronoun *my* has a function to provide information about the speaker. It is line with Hyland's (2005) argument that self-mention is to give information about the character or stance and it can be realized by use possessive adjective.

(24) “**We** aren't very good at lying, and we usually don't enjoy participating in this social game that the rest of you seem so fond of.” (343/S3/C21/SM).

It is different from the use of *we* as an engagement marker, *we* in the example (24) includes in self mention because it refers to Thunberg as the speaker and people who have spectrum, excluding the audience. It means, this marker provide information about Thunberg who diagnosed with asperger syndrome, OCD and selective mutism. Thunberg mostly used this marker to explicit reference herself as the speaker in those forums.

Thunberg used almost metadiscourse markers in her speeches. There are nine markers which used by Thunberg, such as, transition markers, frame markers, endophoric markers, code glosses, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mentions. Meanwhile, Thunberg never used evidential marker in her speeches. The majority markers that appears in Thunberg's speeches are transition markers, engagement markers and self-mentions.

CONCLUSION

Thunberg delivered a speech at United Nation Climate Action summit 2019, The EU Parliament in Strasbourg, TED Conference, UN Climate Change COP24 Conference and UN climate Change COP25. She used more transition markers to make her speeches coherent and to relate between argument with another argument. She also used more engagement markers in her speeches to build a relationship with the audience and addressing the audience into the discourse. Thunberg also used more self-mention in her speeches because she tried to emphasize herself as a speaker in personal responsibility for the argument.

REFERENCES

- Adel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Agarwal, S. & Garg, A. (2012). The Importance of Communication Within Organizations: A Research on Two Hotels in Uttarakhand. *Journal of Business and Management*. 3(2), 40-49. www.iosrjournals.org
- Davoodi, Kobra. (2016). On the Use of Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in Conclusion Section of Language Testing Articles. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*. 3 (4), 211-216.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London:Contium.

- Intraprawat, P., & Steffensen, M. S. (1995). The Use of Metadiscourse in Good and Poor ESL Essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 253-272. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743\(95\)90012-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(95)90012-8)
- Kusumawati, A. J. (2011). A Discourse Analysis of SBY's Interactional Speech Text: A Study on Critical Linguistics. *Journal of English and Education*, 5(1), 1-28.
- Mai, H. (2016). An Intercultural Analysis of Metadiscourse Markers as Persuasive Power in Chinese and American Political Speeches. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4(6), 207-221.
- Martin, J. and Rose, D. (2003) *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. London: Continuum.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Coursebook of new method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Milne, E. D. (2008). The Pragmatic Role of Textual and Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in the Construction and Attainment of Persuasion: A Cross-linguistic Study of Newspaper Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 40(1), 95-113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.10.003>
- Mohammed, A. F., & Rashid, R. (2017). The Metadiscourse Markers in Good Undergraduate Writers' Essays Corpus. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(6), 213-220. <http://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n6p213>
- Moleong, L. J. (2009). *Metodology Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nasiri, S. (2013). Exploring the Significant Role of Metadiscourse in Academic Writing for a Discourse Community by Academic Members. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 2(1), 67-74.
- Pasaribu, T. A. (2017a). Domains of Political Metaphors in Presidential Speeches. *Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 19(2), 96-104.
- Pasaribu, T. A. (2017b). Male and Female Students' Use of Textual Discourse Markers in Writing Academic Essays. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 17(1), 74-81.
- Rustipa, K. (2014). Metadiscourse in Indonesian EFL Learners' Persuasive Texts: A Case Study at English Department, UNISBANK. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 4(1), 44-52.
- Suhono & Haikal. (2018). Interactive Metadiscourse and Interactional Metadiscourse Categories of Students' International Program School Based on Gender. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 5(1), 81-91, <http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v5i1.5505>
- Susanti, Y., Kurnia, FD and Suharsono (2017). Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in the Introduction of Dissertations: Differences across English Proficiency Level. *A Journal of Culture, English Language, Teaching and Literature*. 17 (2), 270-292.
- Tutuarima, Nuraeningsih, & Rusiana. (2018). An Analysis of Speech Act Used in London Has Fallen Movie. *Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 7(2), 160-169. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21580/vjv/7i23022>
- Yazdani, A. (2016). Metadiscourse Markers of Online Texts: English and Persian Online Headlines Use of Metadiscourse Markers. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 4(3), 41-46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.4n.3p.41>