LEADING THE WAY
LEADING THE WORLD
KHALIFAH · AMANAH · IQRA' · RAHMATAN LIL-'ALAMIN

AN INTERNATIONAL AWARD-WINNING INSTITUTION FOR SUSTAINABILITY

KOED

KULLIYAH of EDUCATION

**TOWARDS AN INTEGRATED AND HOLISTIC EDUCATION IN THE 21st CENTURY**

# E-PROCEEDING

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE INTEGRATION OF KNOWLEDGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION (ICIOK 2022)**

**18th - 19th MAY 2022**

**KULLIYYAH OF EDUCATION**

**INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA (IIUM)**

## **PREFACE**

The International Conference on the Integration of Knowledge in Higher Education (ICIOK 2022) was successfully organized on the 18th and 19th May 2022. With the theme "Towards an integrated and holistic education in the 21st century", the conference was a platform to gather scholars around the world to discuss and share ideas, means, efforts and strategies in integrating knowledge in various areas in education for holistic outputs.

The conference had witnessed over 40 presentations from scholars in various disciplines. Some of them contributed to this proceeding by transforming their presentations into full papers. This e-proceeding therefore documents the articles written in English language and Arabic language for future reference and a catalyst for future studies. Their contribution is significant as it shows their dedication to a holistic education while promoting a legacy of scholarly materials.

The conference thanks the contributors as well as the working committee who have put their hard work in order for this proceeding to be materialized. It is a major hope that this proceeding can contribute to the understanding of an integrated and holistic education in terms of its importance, needs, in various disciplines and at all levels of education.

# INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTEGRATION OF KNOWLEDGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION (ICIOK 2022)

## THE EDITORIAL BOARD

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

# CAN PROFICIENT TERTIARY LEARNERS OF ENGLISH SPEAK PERSUASIVELY? A DISCOVERY OF SKILLS, MISTAKES AND PROBLEMS

*Lilisuriani Abdul Latif @ Bapoo*

## ABSTRACT

Speaking persuasively is a skill needed in social and workplace communication contexts. Even though the importance of using appropriate language discourse in persuasion has been acknowledged since the time of ancient Greek, persuasive speaking strategies are not commonly taught to students who speak English as their second language. Information on the metadiscourse used by proficient second language speakers of English when speaking to persuade, also needs to be obtained. Hence, the persuasive strategies of 30 proficient undergraduates who were studying English for International Communication at an English medium university in Malaysia were investigated using Hyland's (2005) interpersonal model of metadiscourse. The students' short persuasive speeches were recorded and their use of interactive and interactional metadiscourse to show the Aristotelian rhetorical appeals of logos, ethos and pathos were analyzed. Interview sessions were also conducted after a 14-week persuasive speech course to gather information on the students' thoughts about their own abilities to speak persuasively before they attended the course. Findings show that the students could speak with appeals to emotion, but improvements are needed to build well supported arguments and to display credibility of the speaker. In the interviews, the students mentioned that prior to the course, they were not mindful of word choice, politeness, and ethics. They also felt that they had failed to focus on the audience. Moreover, they highlighted their initial problems in differentiating informative from persuasive speeches, applying good presentation skills, using appropriate persuasive appeals; and displaying confidence. These findings imply that due to the complex relationship between language and psychological factors in persuasion, speaking persuasively can be difficult even for proficient second language learners of English. Hence, instructors for language, communication and psychology courses should collaborate to come up with a persuasive speech course for tertiary learners to enhance their speaking skills.

**Keywords:** Persuasive speech, speaking skills, metadiscourse, Aristotelian rhetorical appeals

## INTRODUCTION

Persuasive speaking is commonly understood as a verbal act performed by a party with the intention to change the behaviour, feelings, or viewpoint of another (Lakoff, 1982; Gass & Seiter, 2007; Ting, 2018). Persuasive speaking is an essential and indispensable skill in social and various occupations as it enables one to communicate well with colleagues, unify a team and win their support. Through it, one would be able to explain, present problems to the audience, propose a solution and solve complex issues (Breaden, 1996; De Janansz et al., 2018, Sellnow, 2003; 3 Keys to Effective Persuasive Communication at Work, 2021). Persuasion may be frequently perceived as psychological, but psychologists have acknowledged that persuasion can only be witnessed through observable behavior namely messages conveyed in the communication using linguistics systems (Benjamins, 1997; Bettinghaus, 1994; Blankenship & Craig, 2011).

Persuasive texts can be created using a combination of metadiscourse markers to create the Aristotelian persuasive appeals of logic (logos), credibility (ethos) and solidarity or emotion (pathos). The metadiscourse markers are seen in the Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse shown in Table 1 below.

**Table 1**
**Hyland's (2005) Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse**

| Category | Function | Examples |
|---|---|---|
| **Interactive** | **Assists in guiding the reader through the text** | **Resources** |
| Transitions | Indicates relations between main clauses | in addition; but; thus; and |
| Frame markers | Discourse acts, stages and sequences | finally; to conclude; my purpose is |
| Endophoric markers | Indicates information in other part of text | as noted above; see Fig, In section 2 |
| Evidentials | Indicates information in other sources | according to X, Z states |
| Code Glosses | Elaborates propositional meanings | namely; such as; e.g.; in other words |
| **Interactional** | **Involves the reader in the text** | **Resources** |
| Hedges | Withholds commitment and open dialogue | might; perhaps; possible; about |
| Boosters | Emphasize certainty or close dialogue | in fact; definitely; it is clear that |
| Attitude markers | Express writer's attitude to proposition | arguably; unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly |
| Self-mentions | Explicit reference to author(s) | I; we; my; me; our |
| Engagement markers | Explicitly builds relationship with reader | Consider; note ; you can see that |

Jaffe (2022, p.332) mentioned that the Aristotelian persuasive appeals of *ethos, pathos* and *logos* can be independently focused on but reminded on the complex interplay of the appeals where they "overlap to form a totality of good reasons. In other words, emotion can be reasonable; reason has emotional underpinnings; and it is both reasonable and emotionally satisfying to hear a credible speaker." This implies that when speaking persuasively, one has to know the strategy of choosing and applying appropriate metadiscourse markers to build the three persuasive appeals so that persuasion can take place effectively.

Hyland (2005) showed how a combination of metadiscourse markers are often used by professional speakers to create *ethos, logos* and *pathos*, as summarized in Table 2, below. According to Hyland (ibid) interactive metadiscourse markers such as frame markers, code glosses and transitions are frequently used to organize ideas, present evidence and provide supports for arguments. In a communication to persuade, these markers would project the

appeals of logic or rational (*logos*). The appeals of competence credibility and/or authority (*ethos*) on the other hand, are created through a complex mixture of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers which can be evidentials, self-mentions, boosters, engagement markers and hedges. Emotional appeals (*pathos*) are built through all interactional metadiscourse markers to focus on the audience, to signify respect for their emotion, needs or viewpoint and to create solidarity.

**Table 2**
**Hyland's (2005) Interpersonal Metadiscourse Which Can Be Used to Build Aristotelian Persuasive Appeals**

| Aristotelian Persuasive Appeals | Interpersonal Metadiscourse | |
|---|---|---|
| | Interactive | Interactional |
| Logos (rational appeals) | Transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, code glosses. | |
| Ethos (credibility appeals) | Evidentials | Hedges, boosters, self-mention, engagement markers |
| Pathos (emotional appeals) | | Hedges, attitude markers, self-mention, engagement markers. |

## PROBLEM STATEMENT

Second language learners of English are often asked to present so that their speaking skills can be developed or improved (Sugito et al., 2017). In the case of proficient second language learners of English, an analysis of their linguistics abilities to build Aristotelian persuasive appeals in their speeches, is still scarce. Current interest to investigate the linguistics features used in persuasive speeches has led many scholars like Ali (2020), Azijah (2020), Aziz (2021), Esmer (2017), Kashiha (2022) and Yonsuk (2019) to look at the use of interpersonal metadiscourse in speeches delivered by political leaders. More studies on the metadiscourse markers used by other speakers of English when speaking persuasively such as the students who are studying at the university and are proficient in English, should be also carried out.

Morever, many researchers such as Meeks (2017), Ngang et al. (2015) and, Patacsil and Tablatin (2017) have stressed the needs for tertiary learners to have good communication skills before they join the work industry. Employers expect tertiary learners to have the abilities to speak and respond well in English (Roslee & Abdul Latif, 2021). While the problems faced by tertiary learners who lack proficiency in English have been regularly reported (Islam & Stapa, 2021; Suwartono et al., 2020), the performances and problems faced by proficient tertiary learners to communicate, are rarely investigated. Investigations on their abilities and problems to perform a specific speaking task such as speaking to persuade, would therefore add some valuable insights.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How do proficient tertiary learners of English use interpersonal metadiscourse markers to build the Aristotelian persuasive appeals?

2. What are the common problems faced by proficient tertiary learners of English when speaking persuasively?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Persuasive Speech and Interpersonal Metadiscourse

In the case of tertiary learners, there is an abundance of studies done to look at the metadiscourse markers used in persuasive writings by English speaking learners but not much can be seen in their persuasive speeches. For instance, Ho and Li (2018) studied 181 first year Hong Kong university students' use of metadiscourse to construct persuasive arguments where they found that students who wrote low rated essays used less metadiscourse markers if compared to those who produced high rated essays. As a result, they recommended for metadiscourse to be taught at an early stage of tertiary education so that students are able to produce convincing arguments. Mat Zali et al. (2020) who analysed the metadiscourse used in 200 evaluative essays produced by degree students from hard and soft science courses in Malaysia, reported that soft science course students utilized more metadiscourse markers than those from hard science, but attitude markers are hardly found in their writings. They also opined that student's awareness on the importance of metadiscourse need to be increased. Alkhathlan (2019) who studied the persuasive writing of fifty EFL Saudi college students had similar findings where the students were found to employ more interactive metadiscourse markers than interactional ones. Transitions were mostly used, followed by hedges with endophoric markers and attitude markers being rarely used. The scholar also suggested that Saudi EFL college students need more training in using interactional metadiscourse so that they can convince better. The use of metadiscourse markers in speeches by eight undergraduate English department students who were studying in an Indonesian university were investigated by Zahro etbal. (2020). The researchers also found that the students used more interactive metadiscourse than interactional metadiscourse with minimal use of engagement markers and attitude markers.

When professional speakers are concerned, the use of interactional metadiscourse markers seems to be regularly focused on. Studies on persuasive speeches of American Presidents have revealed substantial applications of interactional metadiscourse in their speeches. Donald Trump and Barrack Obama have both used interpersonal metadiscourse markers as their persuasive strategies in their political campaigns (Etamadfar & Namaziandost, 2020; Sukma, 2017). Both leaders used attitude markers frequently to create emotional ties with the public. Farghal and Kalakh (2020) who analysed three US 2016 political debates: three presidential debates and one vice-presidential debate discovered that engagement markers constituted 43.7 percent of the metadiscourse markers used in the speeches. An analysis of Mr. Tshering Tobgay, the Honourable Prime Minister of Bhutan's English speeches, has also shown that attitude markers are most used followed by engagement markers, self-mentions, boosters, and hedges (Tashi & Suksawas, 2018). Hedges and boosters have been also used by the former Prime Minister of Pakistan, Benazir Bhutto as a strategy to express doubts and certainties while persuading her audience (Ali et al., 2020). A quantitative analysis done by Farahani and Kazemian (2021) on thirty different TED talks in politics revealed similar findings where the number of interactional metadiscourse features was used more than the interactive ones.

Speeches by organizational leaders to convince others have also shown a similar pattern where interactional metadiscourse markers are the main linguistics devices used. Steve Jobs used all interactional metadiscourse markers in his 2005 speech to Stanford University students (Nan & Liu, 2015) and mainly used engagement markers to establish his relationship with his audience at the 2007 annual Macworld tradeshow while using interactive metadiscourse like transitions to mainly organize his ideas in his speech. (Kuswoyo & Siregar, 2019). The Bank Negara Malaysia Governor also employed a similar strategy where engagement markers, self- mention, hedges, boosters and attitude markers were used throughout the texts to express degree of uncertainty and certainty and attitudes (Aziz & Baharum, 2021). AlJazrawi et al. (2019) who examined the frequency of interactional metadiscourse markers in the WHO's director general's speeches regarding the COVID-19 pandemic and how those markers are used for communicative and persuasive effects discovered that interactional metadiscourse markers were heavily used where the Director "relied intensively on the use of self-mention marker and boosters to reflect the collaborative and assured attitude of the organization concerning the situation of the pandemic." (p. 1)

From the above, it can be concluded that the use of metadiscourse markers relies heavily on the speakers' rhetorical and linguistics knowledge. Experienced persuaders use more interactional metadiscourse markers (expression of social relations and personal attitude) than tertiary learners who are studying English. More investigations are needed to look at how proficient tertiary learners of English use interpersonal metadiscourse in their persuasive speech.

## PROBLEMS IN SPEAKING SKILLS

Speaking or oral communication is a skill commonly practised in language and non-language classes. It may take place in a form of conversations, discussions or presentations. Suwartono, Pertiwi and Nurhayati (2020) stated that speaking in English is difficult for tertiary learners if they are EFL learners. Islam and Stapa (2021) found that students at private universities in Bangladesh had just around IELTS band score 5 level of proficiency in spoken English. Linguistics and non-linguistics factors have been reported to be influencing learners' abilities to speak well. Linguistically, tertiary learners are similar to English learners at school, where they too have problems in pronunciation, grammar and lack of vocabulary when speaking English (Al Hassan, 2019; Kashinathan & Abdul Aziz, 2021; Suwartono et al., 2020).

Non –linguistically, there are psychological factors, affective factors, cognitive factors and situational factors that are posing problems to tertiary learners. Al Hassan (2019) found that psychological factors such as lack of self-confidence and motivation have been the problems of Saudi EFL learners. In the case of Malaysian ESL learners, mother tongue interference and inhibition are two additional psychological factors that hinders them from speaking in English (Kashinathan & Abdul Aziz, 2021). Affective factors such as anxiety, nervousness, shyness, fear of making mistakes, fear of negative evaluation and mistake-phobia are humane natural traits experienced also by tertiary learners of different nationalities as seen in investigations by Al Hassan (2019); Mohd Aba Sha'ar and Yusop Boonsuk (2021), Pizarro (2018); Quraishi and Rahimi (2019); Sadighi & Dastpak (2017); and Thao and Nguyet (2019). Cognitive factors such as student's' lack of knowledge on the topics, difficulties in expressing ideas and thought and lack of input of English outside classroom can also hinder proficient students from speaking well (Elgamal, 2018; Wahyuningsih & Afandi, 2020). Classroom climate such as noise from the environment, unsupportive environment, insufficient opportunities to speak, lack of

extracurricular activities and lack of attention from the audience have been identified to hinder undergraduate speakers to show good abilities to speak (Benraghda et al., 2017; Quyen et al., 2018; Ratnasari, 2020).

From previous studies it is clear that there are internal and external factors that influence tertiary learners' abilities to speak well in English. Non linguistics factors affecting proficient speakers of English to persuade well are yet to be explored further.

## METHODOLOGY

### The Research Design

A corpus-based descriptive analysis was employed to study the frequency of interactive and interactional metadiscourse used by thirty tertiary learners in their persuasive presentations. Interview sessions were also held as they would allow the researcher to directly listen to the learners and understand their thoughts on their persuasive speeches as well as to stimulate talk from multiple perspectives.

### The Participants

Thirty undergraduate students (N=30) from a class of Persuasive and Speech Communication in a public university which uses English as a medium of instruction, were selected for the study. The learners were academically homogenous as it is crucial in ensuring the internal and external validity. All of them were Malay Malaysian learners and thus are culturally similar. They had passed the university's English Placement Test and were in Year 1. Prior to the Persuasion and Speech Communication class, all of them had taken two communication classes which were Introduction to Communication and Public Speaking. Yet, all learners from the study had neither learnt about the Aristotelian persuasive appeals of *logos, ethos* and *pathos* nor the metadiscourse related to the three appeals.

### Data collection

At the beginning of semester, before the teaching of the Persuasion and Speech Communication course, thirty learners were asked to prepare a seven-minute persuasive presentation. In a role play, the learners were put in a context where they had to professionally convince a group of parents to allow their children to participate in a programme that they were proposing. In a group of three or four, the learners were given a week to prepare their presentations. To investigate how all the metadiscourse markers were used to create the three Aristotelian persuasive appeals, all persuasive speeches were recorded and transcribed.

After a fourteen-week teaching of the course, interview sessions were held with the learners. The researcher gained the learners' permission to video tape the interviews where each interview lasted for about an hour. The interview questions had been piloted so that the researcher could ensure that the questions were appropriate, easily understood and were not leading or judgmental. The interview started with a broad open-ended question that allowed the learners to freely answer and help to put them at ease. The interview questions generally consisted of an opening statement and small talk, information on the purpose of the interview, open ended questions, close ended questions to confirm the information given, probes and a closing statement. During the interview, the whole conversation between the

researcher and the learners was allowed to somehow take a shape of its own. The researcher, however, listened carefully, invited individual learners to speak and made sure that no one monopolized the conversation. All these were to ensure that while the learners felt encouraged to share their thoughts, the researcher would still be able to obtain answers to the research question. The research credibility is ensured when the research subjects are allowed to freely express themselves in the direction and interest. Validity of the data is provided from the believable real life and first-hand comments made by the learners as the subjects of the study.

**Data analyses**

To answer the first research question, the transcriptions of the speeches were analysed and were quantified where the frequency for all Hyland's (2005) interpersonal metadiscourse markers (interactive and interactional) used by the learners in building their persuasive appeals of logic (l*ogos*), credibility (*ethos*) and emotion (*pathos*) in their seven-minute speech, were noted. The specific functions of the metadiscourse used in the learners' presentations and their appropriacy of use was determined by looking at their co-texts or linguistic contexts as proposed by Hyland (2005).

For research question two, the themes that emerged from the interviews, were chosen based on: the words that the participants used in the conversation context (the concept shared), how often the topic is mentioned (frequency), the number of participants who repeat the point or topic (the extensiveness of the topic), any conflicting comment given (the intensity- positive and negative), the internal consistency (if there is any change of opinion by a participant or participants), the specific experience that the participant has (not a hypothetical experience) and lastly, the trend that emerge from all the themes mentioned (the big picture).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. **How do proficient tertiary learners of English use interpersonal metadiscourse markers to build the Aristotelian persuasive appeals**

*Table 3*
*Frequency of Interactive Metadiscourse Markers Used to Build Logical Appeals (Logos)*

| Interactive Metadiscourse | Frequency of Metadiscourse Markers Used to Build Logical Appeals (Logos) | Examples |
|---|---|---|
| Transitions | 1122 | Mothers can **also** help with the cooking<br>**and** we are going to eat together with the orphans |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Code glosses | 133 | If you want to give donation..it can be in terms of money ot other basic necessities **such as** rice, flour and sugar |
| Frame Markers | 393 | **First of all**, I would like to thank you all for coming |
| Endophoric Markers | 14 | **As you can see, my friend Asfi** just told you about all the activities that will be conducted.. |
| **Total** | **1662** | |

As seen in the table, the proficient tertiary learners of English used a lot transitions, followed by frame markers and code glosses to build their logical appeals. They used endophoric markers the least. Based on Hyland's explanations of the interactive metadiscourse markers, it can be interpreted that the learners knew that they had to use transitions to organize the content of their speeches and link their ideas. The high number of frame markers signals their knowledge on the words needed to sequence and label their ideas in stages. Among them, they always used code glosses, where on average four code glosses were used per learner to rephrase, explain or elaborate their points. Few endophoric markers however were utilised by the thirty learners which implies that there was a minimal effort to refer to previous or yet to come ideas which could facilitate audience's comprehension of the logics they were presenting.

These findings indicate that the proficient tertiary learners knew that transitions can help them to organize their speeches, similar to the practice by influential speakers as reported by Kuswoyo and Siregar (2019). The learners however, were making similar mistakes as other tertiary learners such as those studied by Alkhathlan (2019) where the learners rarely used endophoric markers to indicate information in other part of their speeches to enhance their logics.

***Table 4***
***Frequency of Interactive and Interactional Metadiscourse Markers Used to Build Credibility Appeals (Ethos)***

| Interactive and Interactional Metadiscourse | Frequency of Metadiscourse Markers Used to Build Credibility Appeals (Ethos) | Examples |
|---|---|---|
| Evidentials | 17 | Prophet Muhammad SAW once said, " |
| Hedges | 22 | Kids **tend** to make mistakes and … |
| Self-Mention & Boosters | 106 | **I know** you are all very busy |
| **Total** | **145** | |

The frequency of the metadiscourse markers used to build credibility appeals by the thirty tertiary learners can be seen in the table above. Compared to the markers used to build logic, there are considerably fewer markers used to build credibility. This indicates that the learners did not focus much on building the persuasive appeals of *ethos*. From the table, it can be observed that credibility was frequently built through the use of self-mention + boosters, followed by much lesser hedges and evidentials. This suggests that when persuading the audience, the learners generally expressed their certainty in what they say or think and state their thoughts with confidence. Among them, the learners neither utilize hedges much to display cautious or doubt nor use evidentials to provide reliable supports or source for their arguments. These actions can potentially weaken their credibility appeals. Moreover, the learners' approach in building credibility in persuasion is not parallel to those of professional speakers who applied hedges to express uncertainties and doubts throughout their persuasive speeches, as discovered by Ali et al. (2020), Aziz and Baharum (2021) and Tashi and Suksawas (2018).

***Table 5***
***Frequency of Interactional Metadiscourse Markers Used to Build Emotional Appeals (Pathos)***

| Interactional Metadiscourse | Frequency of Metadiscourse Markers Used to Build Solidarity/ Emotional Appeals (Pathos) | Examples |
|---|---|---|
| Self –Mention (to create solidarity) | 985 | **You** will be happy, the orphans will be happy, everyone will be happy |
| Attitude Markers | 133 | **I would like to encourage** all of you… |
| Self -Mention + Engagement Markers | 1228 | **Let's grab** this opportunity to spend time with your children |
| Hedges | 358 | What is Anjung Singgah, **You may ask?** |
| **Total** | **145** | |

The learners' choices of interactional metadiscourse markers to build solidarity or emotional appeals can be seen in the table above. A high frequency of use can be seen for self- mention with engagement markers followed by self-mention, hedges and attitude markers. On average, the learners displayed their abilities to use attitude markers to share their feelings and attitude in order to align their goals and desires with their audience but did not use the markers much if compared to others. Hedges were also used frequently to weaken expressions of propositions. This shows that the learners in general, were frequently using the marker to be tactful and courteous. Self-mention and engagement markers were used most by the learners signifying that there were great efforts to address the audience, anticipate possible rejections, avoid disputes, include them in the communication and guide them to certain interpretations of the ideas proposed. The frequent use of all interactional metadiscourse markers in the learners' persuasive speeches are in line with the actions of professional speakers studied by Aziz and Baharum (2021), Kuswoyo and Siregar (2019) and Tashi and Suksawas (2018). This finding does not support the Zahro et al. (2020) and Alkhathlan (2019) who found that students minimally use engagement markers and attitude markers in their persuasive communication.

2. **What are the common problems faced by proficient tertiary learners of English when speaking persuasively?**

During the interviews the learners implied that they initially had problems in

a) Displaying confidence

b) Applying good presentation skills, and

c) Differentiating informative from persuasive speeches

There are also some emerged findings where the learners thought to be their mistakes when they did the persuasive speech. During the interviews, three common mistakes were expressed which are:

a) Failure to consider the audience

b) Failure to understand and apply the Aristotelian persuasive appeals

c) Failure to be mindful of their words

d) Failure to consider politeness or ethics when speaking

The findings show that even though the tertiary learners in the study were proficient speakers of English and could use most metadiscourse markers to create the Aristotelian persuasive appeals of logos, ethos and pathos in their speeches, they too, had non-linguistically issues like other English learners who have been reported by scholars such as Al Hassan (2019), Elgamal (2018) and Wahyuningsih and Afandi (2020). The learners realized that when they spoke to persuade at the beginning of the semester, they had a psychological issue where they did not have enough confidence. They also highlighted several cognitive issues where they had problems in applying good presentation skills, could not differentiate between informative and persuasive speeches, were not aware about the importance of considering the audience and were unsure of the Aristotelian persuasive appeals. They also mentioned that they did not realize that they had to be mindful of their words, be polite and be ethical when persuading. During the interview, no linguistic factors were expressed by the learners to be a problem or mistake.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In conclusion, proficient tertiary learners of English who were involved in this study have the abilities to use interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers to build the persuasive appeals of logic, credibility and emotion. However, through the analysis of the metadiscourse markers used, it was evident that linguistically, the learners' abilities to build the credibility appeals and abilities to use some markers to build stronger logical appeals and emotional appeals, need to be enhanced. From the interview with the learners, it was revealed that the learners felt they had some problems and had made several mistakes when they spoke to persuade. These problems and mistakes have been found to be related to psychological and cognitive factors.

As for recommendations, all the linguistics and non-linguistics needs of proficient learners of English need to be further identified and attended to. In the case of persuasive communication, even proficient tertiary learners of English need to be taught how to use appropriate words, phrases and metadiscourse markers to build strong appeals of logic, credibility and emotion. As there are psychological and cognitive factors that can hinder proficient tertiary learners of English to persuade well, instructors for language, communication and psychology should work together to design a persuasive speech course that can serve proficient learners' specific needs.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdul Aziz, R., Chiu Jin, C., & Nordin, N. M. (2016). The Use of Interactional Metadiscourse in the Construction of Gender Identities among Malaysian ESL Learners. *3L The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *22*(1), 207-220. https://doi.org/10.17576/3l-2016-2201-16

2. Abdulmohsen Al Hassan, N. A. (2019). Saudi EFL University Instructors' Barriers to Teaching the Speaking Skills: Causes and Solutions. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3330994

3. 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

4. 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

5. Aventis Learning Group (2021, February 5). 3 *Keys to Effective Persuasive Communication at Work*. Aventis Learning Group. https://aventislearning.com/effective-persuasive- communication/

6. *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*

7. Aziz, R. A., & Baharum, N. D. (2021). Metadiscourse in the Bank Negara Malaysia Governor's Speech Texts. *Asia Pacific Journal of Corpus Research*.

8. Benraghda, A., Goudih, Z., & Abdallah, S. S. (2018). Student Engagement and adjustment to College among Undergraduate Students. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e- Journal)*.

9. Breaden, B. (1996). *Speaking to Persuade* (1st ed.). Harcourt Brace.

10. Elgamal, A. (2018). Cognitive Factors Affecting Language Learning and Acquisition of Native and Non-Native Speakers. *Journal of Research in Curriculum Instruction and Educational Technology*, *4*(4), 135–152. https://doi.org/10.21608/jrciet.2019.31960

11. Esmer, E. (2017). Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in Turkish Election Rally Speeches Delivered by Pro-Turkish and Pro- Kurdish Leaders. *ATHENS JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES*, *4*(4), 367–384. https://doi.org/10.30958/ajss.4-4-2

12. Farahani, M. V., & Kazemian, R. (2021). Speaker-Audience Interaction in Spoken Political Discourse: A Contrastive Parallel Corpus-Based Study of English-Persian Translation of Metadiscourse Features in TED Talks. *Corpus Pragmatics*, *5*(2), 271-298. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-021-00099-z

13. Farghal, M., & Kalakh, B. (2020). Engagement in Translation: Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in American Presidential Debates. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature*.

14. Gass, R. H., & Seiter, J. S. (2007). *Persuasion: Social Influence and Compliance Gaining (3rd Edition)* (3rd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

15. Hie Ting, S. (2018). Ethos, Logos and Pathos in University Students' Informal Requests. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, *18*(1), 234–251. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2018-1801-14

16. Hyland, K. (2018). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Bloomsbury Academic. Islam, M. S., & Stapa, M. B. (2021). Students' low proficiency in spoken English in private universities in Bangladesh: reasons and remedies. *Language Testing in Asia*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-021-00139-0

17. Jaffe, C. I. (2022). *Public Speaking Concepts and Skills for a Diverse Society*, *7th Edition by Jaffe* (2012–05-03) (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.

18. Janasz, D. S., Dowd, K., & Schneider, B. (2018). *Interpersonal Skills in Organizations* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

19. Kashiha, H. (2022). Academic lectures versus political speeches: Metadiscourse functions affected by the role of the audience. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *190*, 60–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.01.003

20. Kashinathan, S., & Abdul Aziz, A. (2021). ESL Learners' Challenges in Speaking English in Malaysian Classroom. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v10-i2/10355

21. Lakoff, R. (1982). Persuasive Discourse and Ordinary Conversation, with Examples from Advertising. Georgetown University Press, 25–42.

22. Meek, D. (2017, January 26). *Top 5 Skills for Millennials in 2017 - Daniel Meek*. Medium. https://medium.com/@danielmeek/top-5-skills-for-millennials-in-2017-d45fb4e9d87c

23. Mohd Aba Sha'ar, M. Y., & Boonsuk, Y. (2021). What Hinders English Speaking in Thai EFL Learners? Investigating Factors That Affect the Development of Their English Speaking Skills. *MEXTESOL Journal, 45*(3).

24. Ngang, T. K., Hashim, N. H., & Yunus, H. M. (2015). Novice Teacher Perceptions of the Soft Skills Needed in Today's Workplace. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *177*, 284–288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.338

25. Patacsil, F., & S. Tablatin, C. L. (2017). Exploring the importance of soft and hard skills as perceived by IT internship students and industry: A gap analysis. *Journal of Technology and Science Education, 7*(3), 347. https://doi.org/10.3926/jotse.271

26. Pizarro, M. A. (2018). Foreign language classroom anxiety among English for Specific Purposes (ESP) students. *International Journal of English Studies*.

27. Rahimi, A., & Quraishi, P. (2019). Investigating EFL Students' Poor Speaking Skills at Kandahar University. *American International Journal of Education and Linguistics Research, 2*(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.46545/aijelr.v2i2.76

28. Ratnasari, A. G. (2020). EFL Students' Challenges in Learning Speaking Skills: A Case Study in Mechanical Engineering Department. *Journal of Foreign Languange Teaching and Learning*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.5145

29. Roslee, N. A., & Abdul Latif, L. (2020). *Research in English for Communication*. Kulliyyah of Languages & Management (KLM).

30. Sadighi, F., & Dastpak, M. (2017). The Sources of Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety of Iranian English Language Learners. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 5*(4), 111. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.5n.4p.111

31. Sellnow, D. D. (2003). *Public Speaking: A Process Approach (with InfoTrac and Speechmaker CD-ROM), Media Edition (1st ed.*). Wadsworth Publishing.

32. Song Yonsuk (송연석). (2019). 정부 및 공공기관 연설문 번역의 메타담화분석. *The Journal of Translation Studies, 20*(1), 157–175. https://doi.org/10.15749/jts.2019.20.1.006

33. Sugito, S., Susilowati, S. M. E., Hartono, H., & Supartono, S. (2017). Enhancing Students' Communication Skills through Problem Posing and Presentation. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE), 6*(1), 17. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v6i1.6342

34. Suwartono, T., Pertiwi, W. E., & Nurhayati. (2020). How Tertiary EFL Learners Dealt with Problems in Oral Communication in the Target Language. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*.

35. 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.

36. International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 7(4.38), 975. https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i4.38.27620

37. Thao, T. Q., & Nguyet, D. T. N. (2019). Four aspects of English speaking difficulties encountered by tertiary English-majored students. *SOCIAL SCIENCES, 9(2)*, 53–64. https://doi.org/10.46223/hcmcoujs.soci.en.9.2.261.2019

38. T.T.T., Q., & N.V., L. (2018). Flipped model for improving students' English speaking performance. *Can Tho University Journal of Science*, *54*(2), 90. https://doi.org/10.22144/ctu.jen.2018.012

39. Wahyuningsih, S., & Afandi, M. (2020). Investigating English Speaking Problems: Implications for Speaking Curriculum Development in Indonesia. *European Journal of Educational Research, 9*(3), 967–977. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.9.3.967

40. Yipei, N. (2013). Investigating the Interpersonal and Textual Meaning of Steve Jobs' Stanford Speech in Terms of Hyland's Metadiscourse Theory. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *1*(4), 90. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20130104.12

41. 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).