The Arts of Lobbying: Scrutinizing the Functions of Interactional Meta-discourse in Model United Nations Conferences

Muhammad Hifni Sahila Rizqy[*], Ulil Fitriyah

Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim, Malang, Indonesia

A B S T R A C T

This study explores how speakers use interactional markers in the diplomatic speech Model United Nations Conference. We used a discourse analysis approach focusing on the meta-discourse markers; the analyzed data comes from the speech utterances based on 10 representative delegates. The data was taken on 27-28 March during the conference day. The five research classifications are hedges, Boosters, Attitude Markers, Engagement, and Self-mentions. The result reveals that the speakers use 280 interactional markers. Besides, the speaker's use of interactional markers might designate a tendency that would impact the audience's agreement on the topic.

A R T I C L E   I N F O

1. Introduction

Model United Nation has become one of the furious diplomatic courses in terms of understanding the rule of the United Nations. Approximately, since 2019, almost 400.000 students worldwide comes from different academic background participating in the Model United Nations conferences to develop their insight of the current global issues especially political and economic problems (Hart & Siniver, 2020; Jesuit & Endless, 2018; Tatsuki & Zenuk-Nishide, 2019). Model United Nations, indeed, is a noticeable as a debate competition which serves a unique system where before attending the conference, every participant should prepare a text named as position paper consist of arguable opinion with self-stances regarding the issue. Afterwards, the participants should deliver an argumentation speech with regard to their position paper that has been made before the conference day.

In the Model United Nations, speech is often used to communicate the ideas among the delegates. In these circumstances, the country's representative delivers a diplomatic speech to make the other participants understand the speaker's point of view regarding the issues. In the rule of the speech of Model United Nation, every participant gets only two minutes of speaking time in every session. There are four sessions in the conference in which every delegate should participate by giving a diplomatic speech in each session. The speakers do not only share their opinion and the country's stances but also attempts to make the speech more diplomatic to gain the same voices with other representative delegates.

In a conference, the point of a diplomatic speech is to negotiate and build an understanding between the speaker and the hearer (McIntosh, 2001). Therefore, the speaker must be more sensitive in organizing the speech by selecting appropriate words and languages. In other words, how the speaker uses appropriate language while delivering speech is indeed important. Conversely, without selecting appropriate words and languages, the speech will easily be misinterpreted (Detrianto et al., 2020). Hence, the speaker needs to provide meta-discourse markers to make an understandable speech rather

[*] *E-mail addresses:* hifniriki474@gmail.com (Rizqy)

than merely exchanging information.

Meta-discourse refers to the way how the writer uses their language ability to direct readers to "get in touch" deeply in a text (Aziz & Baharum, 2021). In addition, Meta-discourse is a term that refers to the way how the writer or speaker manages a social relationship between the hearer or reader (Azijah and Gulö, 2020). The terms of meta-discourse markers were first proposed by Harris (1950) and have been developed in numerous contexts, particularly in writing (Adel, 2006; Crismore, 1983; Hyland, 1998; Hyland & Tse, 2004; Hyland, 2005; Hyland, 2017). Harris (1950) defined the meta-discourse as the relationship between reader and writer in a text, thus meta-discourse is proposed to bring an adequate resource based on the writer's voice.

Even though the taxonomy of meta-discourse seems to be useful only in a written form, some scholars believe that the occurrence of meta-discourse does not only appear in the form of written text but also in the spoken text (Ilie, 2002; Hyland, 2005; Adel, 2008; Adel, 2010). According to Hyland (2005), the meta-discourse is a kind of language feature which contains phrases or words that created by the writer to align the same concept with the reader in terms of text. Hyland (2005) categorized the meta-discourse Markers into two parts that consist of interactive and interactional markers. The interactive marker is a meta-discourse device functioned to make the hearer understand the discourse significantly.

In the 21st century, the study of meta-discourse as one of the linguistic feature has been tremendously developed through several fields (Tashi, 2020). Numerous scholars put their shed light on the use of meta-discourse markers in written text (Hasanah & Wahyudi, 2015; Duruk, 2017; Karimi, 2017; Ebrahimi, 2018; Aimah et al., 2019; Akoto & Awful, 2020; Zhang, 2016). All of them have analyzed the occurrence of both interactive and interactional markers in online news media, scientific journal, novel, poster tagline and EFL writing assignment. On the other hand, extensive literature has recently explored how language is used as a device to build a relationship in a spoken form (Kuswoyo, 2019; Ali et al., 2020; Azijah & Gulo 2020; Aziz & Baharum, 2021; Istiani & Puspita, 2020; Resnik, P. 2017; Zahro et al., 2021). These previous scholars provided meta-discourse markers as an essential device to determine the interpersonal meaning among one another. This study only focus on the subcategory of meta-discourse called interactional markers. Additionally, this paper aims to explore the rule of interactional meta-discourse as a language meaning maker in diplomatic speech Model United Nations conference.

2. Methods

This particular study adopted the descriptive-qualitative approach. This method was used to bring deep analysis through descriptive and qualitative feature in language phenomenon (Lambert & Lambert, 2017; Rahardjo, 2020). It describes every data significantly. Besides, this method could also describe a language phenomenon and giving them meaning (Creswell, 2017). The descriptive-qualitative method in language context, is purposed to describe the linguistics phenomena in detail (Rahardjo, 2020). The unit of analysis was the speech from the 10 representative delegates consist of (The delegate from Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, USA, Switzerland, Brazil, Mexico, Germany, Italy, and Netherlands) in the Foster International Model United Nations online conferences, whilst delivering their argumentation as they attempted to be diplomatic from one another. The conference was held in 27-28 March 2022, and consisted of four committee session in which each session has different topic related with the wildfire cases that happened in a recent year. I included myself as the delegate also become the researcher. My job is to observe, and record all the speech delivered by the delegates in charge. The utterances, in this study, filtered only on the part of the speech which indicated as interactional markers. Next, the speech that did not include as the data would excluded. The selected speech was interpreted deeply through meta-discourse approach by way of interactional markers consist of Hedges, Boosters, Attitude-Markers, Engagement and Self-mentions (Hyland, 2005). Lastly, the linguistics function (interactional markers) and the reason behind the usage were expounded.

3. Results and Discussion

There are five interactional markers that are used by each representative delegates when they delivered a diplomatic speech. The researcher found several data which were recognized as interactional meta-discourse markers based on Hyland taxonomy. There are 280 total data which categorized as interactional markers. Those data findings are divided into five sub-categories: hedges, boosters, engagement, attitude markers, and self-mentions. In this research, the hedges are found 51 times, whereas the boosters are found 34 times. Besides, the self-mentions are found 102 times, and the attitude markers are 65 data. Lastly, the engagement markers appeared 44 times in the data found. The self-mentions become the most frequent markers used by the speaker while booster become the lowest regular markers used by the delegate in the speech. In addition, the distinction usage of interactional markers might indicate different interpretation from the speaker. The classification of the data is described as follows,

Table 1: Distribution of Interactional Meta-discourse Markers

Name	Total
(1) Hedges	51
(2) Boosters	34
(3) Attitude Markers	65
(4) Engagement Markers	44
(5) Self-mentions	102
TOTAL	280

3.1. Interactional Metadiscourse Markers

Interactional markers refer to the speaker or the writer's intentions in creating a relationship with the audience or the hearer in terms of communication (Hasanah and Wahyudi, 2016). As an element of linguistics science, interactional markers function as a vehicle for maintaining a good relationship between the reader, writer, audience, and speaker (Adel, 2005; Adel, 2006; Hyland, 1998; Hyland, 2005). Hyland (2005) explains the five subcategories of interactional markers: hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement, and self-mentions. The researcher found several data which were recognized as interactional meta-discourse Markers based on Hyland taxonomy. Based on the table 1 above, there are 280 total data which categorized as interactional markers. Those data findings are divided into five sub-categories: hedges, boosters, engagement, attitude markers, and self-mentions. In this research, the hedges are found 51 times, whereas the boosters are found 34 times. Besides, the self-mentions are found 102 times, and the attitude markers are 65 data. Lastly, the engagement markers appeared 44 times in the data found. The self-mentions become the most frequent markers used by the speaker in Model United Nations online conferences, while booster become the lowest regular markers used by the delegate in the speech. The classification of the data is described as follows,

3.1.1. Hedges

There are 51 data that are indicated as hedges, making this marker the third most frequent marker used by the speaker. Hedging device here, plays pivotal aspect for creating a prediction and speaker commitment toward the issues. The appearance of hedges can be seen below

Datum 1
*There is a certain condition which human and natural disaster **might** increase.*

In this sentence, hedge marker appears in the word "might" Linguistically, the word "might" is indicated as modal verb which used to express certain condition such as request and advice (Halliday, 1989). The speakers use word "might" as a probability situation to explain that there is a certain condition in which human and natural disaster has a negative impact due to the high case of wildfire. The word "might" is the element to interact with the audiences by showing possibilities regarding the increase of illegal

human activity and natural disasters. It designates that the word "might" might lead to uncertainty regarding the issues. The speaker just shares his perception by using "might " which seems like a doubtful argument. Hence, it appears as a hesitation statement and makes it more questionable for the audience. Hyland (2005) stated that the hedge marker refers to the ability of the speaker in creating a possibility and put its commitment through the discourse

. This result might go against the previous research (Hasanah & Wahyudi, 2015; Aimah et al., 2019). Hasanah & Wahyudi (2015) believes that hedging device is the meaning maker for showing a self-identity of the writer. In addition, Zahro et al. (2021) claims that due to the speaker, the form of hedges might indicate some uncertainty. It also might create a prediction related with the probability of what would happen in the future. Furthermore, in this context, the interactional marker (hedges) clearly has the same function as in Zahro et al. (2021) found. Zahro et al. (2021) argues that hedging devices are the common verb/modal verb used by the addresser to predict certain situation rather than commitment.

Datum 2

*Forests now **seem** to be not human-dominated but fire-ruled ecosystems.*

The word "seem" reveals the possibility used by the speaker toward the argument. He (the speaker) implies his uncertainty regarding the issue to the audiences. The word "seem" has a similar function as the word "might" in the previous finding above. It indicates that the word "seem" is to show the speaker's prediction rather than showing some fact. Of course, it will create a chance that the hearer might disbelieve the speaker's argumentation because of the speaker's lack of reliable source. However, in this context, the word "seem" is also used to make an idiom. The speaker wants to give a description that forest, now is more likely dominated by fire than nature domination. It means that the speaker implicitly wants to tell the audience that the environment is in dangerous situation. This interpretation clearly stands against the previous finding conducted by other scholars (different from the previous finding

Datum 3

*Every government should understand that the case of wildfires is getting higher year by year. Of course, it will attack several sectors not only the forest system that **could** be broken but also the economic, the health, and the environment itself.*

In this speech, the speaker urged all of the delegates to fully understand about the high case of wildfire. Every delegate must be fully aware because the case of wildfire is getting higher year by year. In this context, the speaker tends to remind his audiences about the biggest impact wildfire might have on every sector of human lives. Then, the speaker introduced the hedging device by mentioning the word "could be". The hedge device has the function to bring the speaker's commitment into the discourse (Hyland, 2005). However, the hedge device that appeared here interprets differently. The word "could be" that is used by the speaker has a function to create a possibility. In other words, the speaker tends to use "could be" to express his prediction toward the possibility of the high case of wildfires. It also indicates that the hedge marker here has a function to express the speaker's ability to predict the situation within the speech. Overall, the audience might be led into two options, either they believe in the speaker's argumentation or go against them.

3.1.2. Boosters

Booster markers appeared 34 times which make them as the lowest frequent markers used by the delegate in Model United Nations online conferences speech. Thus, in this research, the boosters might appear into several functions. Those functions consist of an overstated claim, exaggerating the effect of the claim, and as the speaker claims. The description data are explained clearly in the datum as follows,

Datum 4

*In recent decades, the case of wildfires **strongly** increased not only from the human carelessness*

but also comes from natural aspect such as global warming.

The word "strongly" is categorized as a booster marker. In this context, the speaker attempts to explain that almost in decades, the dangerous wildfires have always increased. In purpose to give more argumentation, the speaker describes that this treacherous phenomenon would be increased due to several factors. The speaker intended that human bad habits are not the only problem related with the wildfires. In response to that, the speaker strongly believes that the increase of forest fire comes from natural and human carelessness. In this context, the speaker uses the booster marker which is indicated by the word "strongly". Besides, the use of "strongly" might indicate that the speaker attempted to avoid the audiences for underestimating the statement. This means that "strongly" is the proper word chosen by the speaker in order to build a trust worthiness of the audiences. It might lead the audience easily believe about what the speaker said. Besides, the word "strongly" would be genuinely make the audiences agree with the current statement.

Datum 5
In fact, *while tropical forests comprise only 6% of the world's surface area, they contain one-half to three-quarters of the earth's species of plants and animals.*

In this speech, "in fact" appears as booster marker. In this context, the speaker tends to state that "the time for saving the forest is only now, right here in this discussion". The speaker believes in this forum of speech every delegate would probably create an amazing solution to increase the problem of wildfire in which this condition is getting worse every year. Then, the speaker uses the word "in fact" that is indicated as a booster marker to give another explanation regarding the issues. The booster marker is used to express a certainty of the speaker within the discourse (Hyland, 2005). However, this case might have a different interpretation regarding the usage of the word "in fact". It is because the speaker tends to use booster marker "in fact" to designate factual data. Boosters are employed to emphasize the reader or audience by giving a certain argument toward them. It provides the speaker or writer a chance to make a claim opinion and prevent the counter from the audience or reader (Hyland, 2005).

Datum 6
*We also strongly agree with the idea from the delegate of Mexico that a strong policy from each country regarding the culprit of wildfire cases is **indeed** important.*

This speech reveals the speaker's agreement in regards to the strong policy maker against the criminal face which makes the case of wildfire getting higher year by year. Also, the speaker wants to remind his audiences about the terrible effect of the criminal people that make the huge case of wildfires. By using the word "indeed" directly remind his listeners about the importance of policy makers. The speaker believes that with the strong policy that was created by the United Nations body, it will decrease the forest fire as soon as possible. The function of a booster marker is to assert the speaker fully claims toward the discourse (Hyland, 2005). However, a different interpretation occurred in this speech. "Indeed" is used to exaggerate a claim and create a good trustworthiness from the audience. In other words, "Indeed" here functioned as suppression of the speaker.

3.1.3. Attitude Markers

The attitude markers appeared 65 times in the data finding. This case makes the attitude markers become the second most frequent markers used by the speakers under the self-mention with (102) data. In this present study, the attitude markers appear in three main forms that consist of adjective, attitude verb, and adverb. Those three main forms have their own interpretation related to the context. It can be an attitude, obligation, and the speaker's important speech. The description data are explained in the datum as follows,

Datum 7
*The delegate of Brazil is completely **agree** with the statement of the delegate of Mexico because*

it is really important for each country for develop the policy first.

In this study, the word "agree" is categorized as an attitude marker. In this context, the speakers questioned the existence of the country policy in facing the wildfire cases. The speaker believes that the strong policy regarding the forest especially for anticipating the wildfires is indeed important. The speaker designates an agreement for the statement that has already been delivered by the delegate of Mexico. The delegate of Mexico said that before making an international agreement regarding the issues, the first thing to do is making a good development regarding the wildfire policy. The speaker uses the word "agree" to designate his voice. According to Hyland (2005), the attitude marker refers to the element which indicates the speaker's emotion. This indicates that the use of "agree" as an attitude verb is to show the speaker's intention for the previous statement idea. This means that the speaker shows their acceptance regarding the possible solution for developing the policy maker. Besides, the speaker shows this attitude because it is also in line with its country's purpose regarding the solution. Several scholars have already found this type of attitude markers but in different areas. Due to that case, this result is similar with the latest argumentation produced by some researchers (Zhang, 2016; regarding the role of

Datum 8
No matter what, *the wildfires issues should be eliminated for getting the better world and life for making secure.*

In this context, the speaker is speaking about the wildfire in general based on every country's perspective. The speaker believes that wildfires exist in forests all around the world every year. It is because the impact of wildfires always comes from the two sides. First, wildfires happen because of natural disasters. The second, wildfires also come from human illegal environment activity and human disaster. If there is no regulation for these two sides, it will lead the world to climate change. The speaker believes that the wildfire should be eliminated soon. The speaker tends to show her emotion in the speech by using the words "no matter what" which is also indicated as the attitude marker. The attitude marker is intended to bring the speaker's expression to the discourse (Hyland, 2005). In this case, the speaker uses an attitude marker for expressing her purpose through the speech.

Datum 9
Unfortunately, *it can give the tremendous bad effect on the other countries such as the country and the human that are living in it.*

The word "unfortunately" is indicated as an attitude marker. As Hyland (2005) said, the use of an attitude marker is for attaching the speaker's emotional feelings against the discourse. The word "unfortunately" represents the speaker's emotion regarding the case of wildfire. The speaker shows his emotion on the terrible impact that happened caused by the wildfire. The speaker divided the negative effect of wildfire into three important points. The speaker, as the representative of Germany, believes that the wildfire will bring bad effects inside and outside the country such as the humans that exist in it. The attitude marker creates a pivotal aspect in making the emotion of the speaker. Grammatically, the word "unfortunately" refers to the part of speech called adjective. As an adjective word, it has a function to modify, perhaps describing a noun and give readers more specific information about material, colour and object. Despite of the definition related with adjective, this context also shows the speaker frustration. As Hyland (2005) stated that one of the functions of the booster marker is to convince the hearers with a certain argumentation toward them. This finding has the same analysis with some previous study (Wicaksono, 2020; Zahro et al., 2021). Those previous study stated that booster is the speaker emotional feeling, more than that, it also depends on how the context appeared in text.

3.1.4. Engagement

The engagement markers appeared 44 times in the data finding. It makes this marker become the most frequently used marker by the delegates after the self-mention (102), the attitude markers (65) and the hedge devices (51). In this present study, the engagement marker plays an important role to

engage the audiences into the speech. Besides, the engagement markers in this study often appeared as imperative words, interjections, second person pronouns, and possessive adjectives. The description are explained in the datum as follows,

Datum 10

*If **you** don't fight for what **you** want, don't cry for what **you** lost.*

The bold word in the datum 10 is indicated as the engagement marker. In this context, the speaker attempts to give an illustration for the audience about the meaning of a sacrifice. The speaker is trying to pursue the other delegate to find the very possible solution in preventing **or** making deforestation since the case of wildfires is getting higher over the past decade. In this speech, the speaker tends to use the engagement marker "you" that refers to all the speakers that attend the meeting. Based on Hyland (2005) perspective, the engagement marker is used to address the audience to "come in" to the discussion. The speaker uses the word "you" to make the audience get in touch with the speaker's statement. It might indicate that in this speech, the word "you" as the second person pronoun has a function to highlight the presence of the audience. However, this result goes against the previous scholars (Hasanah & Wahyudi, 2015; Istiani & Puspita, 2020; Zahro et al., 2021). I found another interpretation regarding the analysis context of the engagement marker especially in diplomatic speech. The usage of engagement here not only to engage the audience but more than that, the word "you" can be used as the motivational speech. In particular, the speaker addresses the audience to understand that the result would not betray an effort. Moreover, it could probably affect the audiences to create several possible solution to decrease wildfire cases.

Datum 11

*Every country **must be** actively involved in international cooperation in efforts to resolve the wildfires problem*

Engagement marker is found by the occurrence of the word "must be" which briefly creates the speaker's prescription either as an order or claim. In this situation, the speaker strongly mentions the United Nations rule related to the responsibility of every country due to the wildfire cases. The terms of agreement stated that every country had to actively participate and get involved with international cooperation in response to the wildfire problem. The engagement marker appeared in the word "must". The engagement marker refers to how the speaker highlights the presence of the audiences within the discourse (Hyland, 2005). However, in this case, the speaker often used the word "must" as an order to the other delegate to get involved with the statement. This analysis might serve different results with the previous data (Aimah et al., 2019; Kuswoyo, 2019; Farahani 2020). It is because in this context the speaker uses the word "must" as an order. This indicates that the word "must" as an imperative word takes a pivotal aspect in highlighting the presences of the audience. The speaker wants the audiences to get involved with the discussion. Thus, it might let the audiences keep their eyes on this statement and start to realize that every country might get involved with the international communities as the answer for preventing the case of wildfires.

Datum 12

*Often, as **you** can see together, Indonesia give bad impact of the wildfires to the neighbourhood country such as Malaysia and Singapore as the country near the Indonesian Territorial land.*

This data serves an engagement marker. It can be seen by the word "you". In this context, the speaker is able to talk about the case of wildfires that strongly increased not only from human carelessness but also from natural aspect such as global warming. It makes the speaker tend to encourage all of the delegates to give a response against these issues. The speaker gives an example of wildfire in Indonesia. The speaker believes that Indonesia has a bad impact of the wildfires on neighbour countries such as Malaysia and Singapore as the country near the Indonesian territorial land. He cited the forest fire in Kalimantan that spread its pollution to the nearest country around it such as Singapore and Malaysia. The speaker's position here is not to judge the Indonesian country but to attempt to invite the others to find the win-win solution. Then, the engagement marker was used. In this situation, the speaker

use the engagement marker to "highlight" the presence of the audience. As stated by Hyland (2005), the engagement device is used to show the existence of the audience and let them "in" to the discourse. The word "you" here refers to the audience in order to make them imagine the worst situation regarding the condition of some countries that affected by wildfires. Indeed, as said everywhere, using the second person pronoun straight forward to the audience could help strengthen the speaker's argument (Saraswati & Pasaribu, 2019). This might indicate that the speaker wants the audience to believe in his opinion by inviting others to not just "laying down on a bed" but have to share their thoughts to overcome this issue. It could also lead the audiences to get involved with the discourse and intended to give them an idea.

3.1.5. Self-mentions

In this research, self-mentions appeared 102 times in the Model United Nations speeches. Thus, it makes the self-mentions as the most frequent markers used by all the delegates while delivering diplomatic speeches. In this context, self-mention has a special function regarding the context. Self-mentions become a self-stance for the speaker in arguing an argumentation. The descriptions are explained in the datum as follows,

Datum 13
The delegate of Mexico *highly recommend to take an action for restoring the ecosystem, land degradation, and climate change.*

The bold data is classified as a self-mention marker. In this context, the speaker attempts to give a recommendation to all the delegates that attend the meeting to accelerate an action especially for restoring climate change and land degradation. In this speech, there is self-mention that appeared in the phrase "the delegate of Mexico". The self-mentions functioned as the speaker's ability in order to create a credible statement for the audiences (Hyland, 2005). The self-mention is also used as the speaker stances toward the topic. The speaker tends to use the phrase "the delegate of Mexico" as the third person pronoun for expressing himself-stances regarding these issues. However, in this case, the speaker not only uses the self-mention as the self-stance but also used it to show that she is a representative of Mexico. The speaker uses the representative of her country because in Model United Nations, the rule states that the argument must be based on their country side. In other words, this finding might be different with the latest result of the previous researchers However, the speaker still has a power to create a suggestion based on their interpretations.

Datum 14
We *must have a synergy with other multilateral agreement and processes to prevent and guarantee that the case of wildfire won't happen again in any forest in the world as **we** mention in the moderated caucus.*

The word "we" is categorized as the self-mention marker. In this context, the speaker attempts to give a possible recommendation regarding his point of view. The speaker tends to designate his intention by giving an instruction for all the delegates to bring a synergy and make an agreement with every multilateral community in preventing the forest fire cases. The most important thing is to get the guarantee that each country has its right to rebuild, reconstruct, and recharge their land forest. Also, the speaker pushed the delegate to bring a guarantee regarding wildfire that this case would not happen again in the future to the multilateral communities. In addition, the self-mention marker is used by the speaker through the word "we" as the first person pronoun. The self-mention function is to express the speaker in highlighting himself in the discourse (Hyland, 2005). Overall, "we" is used by the speaker for create his stances towards the topic. Despite of that, there is an assumption that the speaker wants to reach the same purposes with other delegate in finding the best solution to decrease wildfire issues.

Datum 15
*In addition, humans have successfully controlled and used fire in **our** efforts to domesticate forest ecosystems and landscapes for **our** own benefit.*

The word "our" is categorized as the self-mention marker. As we know that the self-mention has a function to make the speaker claim their own presence in the discourse (Hyland, 2005). In this speech, the speaker first explained about the successful impact made by humans in controlling fire as the main problem for the forest. The speaker includes himself for the effort that humans have made in possessing fire to bring stability in forest ecosystems and landscapes. In this context, the speaker attempts to make his self-representation using the word "our" in purpose to be a part of the human action for handling the fire to domesticate the forest ecosystem. This means that the speaker shows his self-mention by using the third person pronoun as the self-representation. It might indicate that the speaker is not speaking for himself, but also speaks in the name of the representative country. However, in this Model United Nations, almost all the delegates use self-mention with the third person pronoun to designate their representative for a country. The words that are often used by the delegates consist of "we", "our", and "the delegate of".

4. Conclusions

This study briefly explains that there are 280 interactional markers is used by the speakers. This reveals that a well-prepared speech makes it possible for the speaker to structure their argument well. It is because the speech is based on semi-written data. The speakers use interactional markers to create a social relationship with the audience. However, the audiences also become the speakers at the same moment. Thus, interactional markers play a pivotal part in making the speaker influence the audiences, especially with attitude and self-mention markers. For example, the audience might see the speaker's attitude in a speech to bring their agreement related to the issues in purpose to create a block in eliminating the problems together. How the speaker uses the interactional markers might designate a tendency that would impact the audience's agreement related to the topic issues.

This research only reveals the use of metadiscourse in a formal diplomatic speech to answer the research question that consists of explaining the function and describing how metadiscourse markers are used in the Model United Nations context in general. However, the researcher suggests for the next scholars to analyze the metadiscourse markers in a broader area with the focus analysis on the spoken data since this research used semi-structured written data. Besides, the next researcher can continue this research by adding new perspectives using Illie (2002) or Adel (2010) point of view regarding oral metadiscourse such as in academic debate or sitcom speeches in which the spoken discourse might appear spontaneously.

References

Ädel, A. (2006). Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia. John Benjamins.

Ädel, A. (2008). "What uh the folks who did this survey found": Expert Attribution in Spoken Academic Lectures." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 7, 3: 83-102.

Ädel, A. (2010). Just to give you kind of a map of where we are going: A Taxonomy of Metadiscourse in Spoken and Written Academic English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *9*(2), 69. https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.218

Aimah, S., Mulyadi, D., & Ifadah, M. (2019). Metadiscourse Markers Written in Introduction Section of Final Project of Unimus Efl Learners. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *7*(2), 109. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v7i2.1717

Akoto, O. Y., & Afful, J. B. A. (2020). Variations in Metadiscourse Use in English Language Introduction and Literature Review Thesis Chapters. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, *4*(2), 390–408. https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v4i2.2601

AlJazrawi, D. A., & AlJazrawi, Z. A. (2019). The Use of Meta-discourse: An Analysis of Interactive and Interactional Markers in English Short Stories as a Type of Literary Genre. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *8*(3), 66. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.8n.3p.66

Alkhathlan, M. (2019). Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: An Investigation of Saudi EFL Students' Research Articles. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, *7*(5), 220–225. https://doi.org/10.13189/lls.2019.070505

Ali, A., Rashid, A., & Abbas, S. (2020). Metadiscourse Markers in Political Discourse: A Corpus-

Assisted Study of Hedges and Boosters in Benazir Bhutto's Speeches. *Global Social Sciences Review*, *V* (III), 56–63. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2020(v-iii).06

Angraini, R., & Effrianti, M. D. (2020). Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in Speeches of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia. *Literary Criticism*, *6*(1), 1–10.

Azijah, D. P., & Gulö, I. (2020). Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in Jacinda Ardern Speech At Christchurch Memorial. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *1*(2), 70–77. https://doi.org/10.33365/llj.v1i2.594

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Dawd, K. O., & Salih, S. M. (2020). Covert Persuasion in English Advertisements and Political Speeches. *Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *3*(1), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.14500/kujhss.v3n1y2020.pp41-52

Detrianto, B., Rahardjo, M., & Susilowati, M. (2020). The Landscape of International Students' Slips of the Tongue in Indonesian Contexts. *Icri 2018*, 96–103. https://doi.org/10.5220/0009917000960103

Ebrahimi, S. J. (2018). The Role of Metadiscourse Markers in Comprehending Texts of Reading Comprehension Books Published in Iran and Oxford University Press. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *7*(3), 90. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.3p.90

Faiz, A., Yulianti, A. I., & Septiana, D. (2020). Trump's Speech about Jerusalem: An Analysis on Persuasive Strategies. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, *2*(2), 160–176. https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v2i2.160-176

Firdaus, A., & Shartika, M. (2021). Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers and Appraisal Portrayed in BBC's CoronaVirus News Report. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Social Science (ICONETOS 2020)*, *529*(Iconetos 2020), 794–802. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210421.115

Halliday. (1989). *M. A. K. Halliday-Spoken and Written Language-Oxford University Press (1989)*.

Hammad, F. M., & Hussein, J. Q. (2021). Persuasive Strategies in WHO COVID-19 Virtual Press Conferences. *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, *32*(2), 19–35. https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v32i2.1501

Hart, D., & Siniver, A. (2020). The meaning of diplomacy. *International Negotiation*, *September*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718069-BJA10003

Hasanah, U., & Wahyudi, R. (2015). Meaning-Making of Hedges in the Gossip Column of the Jakarta Post. *Jurnal Humaniora*, *27*(2), 207. https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.v27i2.8717

Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: the pragmatics of academic Metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics, 30, 437-455.*

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. Applied Linguistics, 25(2), 156-177. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156

Hyland, K. (2005). Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. Continuum.

Ilie, C. (2002). Discourse and metadiscourse in parliamentary debates. *Journal of Language and Politics*, *2*(1), 71–92. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.2.1.05ili

Istiani, R., & Puspita, D. (2020). Interactional Metadiscourse used in Bloomberg International Debate. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *1*(1), 13–20. https://doi.org/10.33365/llj.v1i1.160

Lambert, V. a., & Lambert, C. E. (2013). Qualitative Descriptive Research: An Acceptable Design. *Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research*, *16*(4), 255–256. http://antispam.kmutt.ac.th/index.php/PRIJNR/article/download/5805/5064

Jesuit, D. K., & Endless, B. (2018). Model United Nations and experiential learning: An assessment of changes in knowledge and attitudes. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, *9*(4), 198–213. https://doi.org/10.17499/jsser.99849\\

Nasution, S. S., & Sukmawati, N. N. (2019). Model United Nations: Improving the Students' Speaking Skill. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, *4*(2), 47–52. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v4i2.2100

Nugroho, A. (2019). Exploring Metadiscourse Use in Thesis Abstracts: A CrossCultural Study. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, *9*(2), 113–127. https://doi.org/10.30813/jelc.v9i2.1689

Raharjo, M. (2020), *Pengantar Metodologi Penelitian Studi Kasus Metode Campuran (Moxed Method), Penelitian dan Pengembangan (R&D)*. CV Mazda Media Publishing. Malang. ISBN: 978-623-7334-91-0.

Raharjo, M. (2020). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif untuk Ilmu – Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora dari Teori ke Praktik Republika* Media Publishing Malang. ISBN:978-623- 7334-83-5.

Resnik, P. (2017). Metadiscourse in spoken interaction in ESL: A multilingual perspective. *AAA: Arbeiten Aus Anglistik Und Amerikanistik*, *42*(2), 189–210. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26379471

Saraswati, B., & Pasaribu, T. A. (2019). Metadiscourse markers and gender variation in journal articles. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*

Tatsuki, D. H., & Zenuk-Nishide, L. (2019). MUN Perspectives on Teaching and Learning : A Focus on Negotiation. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, *9*(2), 113–127. https://doi.org/10.30813/jelc.v9i2.1689

Vasheghani Farahani, M. (2020). Metadiscourse in Academic Written and Spoken English: A Comparative Corpus-Based Inquiry. *Research in Language*, *18*(3), 319–341. https://doi.org/10.18778/1731-7533.18.3.05

Zahro, F., Irham, & Degaf, A. (2021). Scrutinizing metadiscourse functions in Indonesian efl students: A case study on the classroom written and spoken discourses. *Mextesol Journal*, *45*(2), 0–2.

Zhang, M. (2016). A multidimensional analysis of metadiscourse markers across written registers. *Discourse Studies*, *18*(2), 204–222. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24815288