

# A Meta-Discourse Analysis on Factors Affecting the Development of Dialogue between Russia and Korea in XIX Century<sup>1</sup>

*Karamova Yuliya Yurisoyna<sup>2</sup> & Alikberova Alfiya Rafisoyna<sup>3</sup>*

## **Abstract**

This study aimed to investigate the factors affecting the development of dialogue between Russia and Korea in XIX century. In this study a meta-discourse analysis was done on the issue of the first dialogue between Russians and Koreans. Some researchers recognize the contact that occurred in the XIII century as the first contact between them, while there is also significant research which deems meetings in the XVII century as the first contact. In Russia, the first Korean language courses and lectures in the history and geography of Korea started at the Saint Petersburg University and the Eastern University in Vladivostok. Notably, the Orthodox Missionary Society in Kazan created textbooks for Russian Koreans. The following methods have been used in this paper: analysis of research literature regarding the subject; case study method for analyzing examples; instrumental observation. The results suggested a substantial difference in the use of metadiscourse markers between Russia and Korea. Furthermore, each learner group displayed the specific characteristics of metadiscourse, which offer suggestions for improving L2 learners' writings. Furthermore, this paper uses general scientific methods such as: analysis and synthesis to determine goals, resources and tools of the subject concept, as well as structural approach.

**Keywords:** Meta-Discourse; Dialogue Russia; Korea.

## **1. Introduction**

As globalization has increased intercultural and interlingual contacts, it is increasingly important to understand the varieties of English as foreign languages. Cultural differences in language have been the main topic of contrastive rhetoric, which identifies the writer's first language (L1) transfer to second language (L2)

---

<sup>1</sup> Please cite this paper as follows:

Yurisoyna, K. Y. & Rafisoyna, A. A. (2019). A meta-discourse analysis on factors affecting the development of dialogue between Russia and Korea in XIX century. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10 (SP), 1381-1389.

<sup>2</sup>Kazan Federal University; [valieva.yul@yandex.ru](mailto:valieva.yul@yandex.ru)

<sup>3</sup>Kazan Federal University

writing in terms of rhetorical strategy (Conner, 1996). Rhetorical preferences in L1 can affect various aspects of L2, such as paragraph development (Bickner & Peyasantiwong, 1988), discourse development (Reid, 1992), and metadiscourse (Crismore, Markkanen, & Steffensen, 1993). Among these aspects, metadiscourse attracts the most attention in current linguistic research and language teaching. Corpus-based studies on academic writings highlight the importance of metadiscourse to improving written communication (Kuhi & Behnam, 2011; Namaziandost & Shafiee, 2018). By using computerized learner corpora, linguists can obtain a large amount of frequency-based information on metadiscourse, which reveals overuse and underuse patterns across the interlanguages of different L1 groups. Accordingly, it can be utilized to suggest whether or not L2 metadiscourse is affected by the L1. Despite the diversity of interlanguages, academic writing has a set of preferred rhetorical conventions. Therefore, learners must conform to the conventions and acquire appropriate discourse styles.

Metadiscourse is the commentary on a text made by its producer in the course of speaking or writing and it is a widely used term in current discourse analysis and language teaching. In fact, it is perhaps now one of the most commonly employed methods for approaching specialist written texts, so that a simple Google search produces over 154,000 hits, Google Scholar returns some 185,000 documents containing the term and the Web of Science encompasses over 270 papers on the topic. It has become one of the main ways that interaction is studied in academic writing and there are hundreds of articles and postgraduate dissertations completed each year which use it. Metadiscourse, then, is a concept which seems to have found its time, yet despite this popularity, it is a hard term to pin down and is often understood in different ways. In addition, like many terms which emerge and quickly attract a wide following, it has grown without any clear idea of its general development, contribution to discourse studies or overall direction and as a result it is difficult to judge its impact or the areas where it is having most effect. The relations between Russia and the Republic of Korea today are an important part of Russia's Asia-Pacific policy and are characterized as constructive and complementary partnership. During the meetings between the heads of states, various documents were signed that contributed to the development of the relations between these two countries on the political, economic and social levels.

By applying the methodology of contrastive interlanguage analysis to a wide variety of learner corpus research, linguists identified several linguistic features characteristic of different learners groups. A relatively new area of investigation in contrastive interlanguage analysis is the study of metadiscourse. For example, Ädel (2006) revealed the overuse of both personal and impersonal metadiscourse markers in Swedish learners' English. Hong and Cao (2014) also shed light on the differences in the use of interactional metadiscourse markers among Chinese, Polish, and Spanish learners of English. Moreover, Tan and Eng (2014) and Lin (2014) investigated the use of metadiscourse markers in the writing of Malaysian English learners and in the

speech of Chinese English learners, respectively. The results of these studies suggest that learners' L2 performance is influenced by cultural factors prevalent in their L1 communities. However, few studies have examined the metadiscourse of multiple learner groups from different language backgrounds. Rather, most of the previous studies compared native language with a particular interlanguage. Thus, it is necessary to contrast different learner groups to gain a deeper insight into L1-induced rhetorical differences in L2 performance (Etemadfar, Namaziandost, & Banari, 2019). By investigating multiple learner groups, researchers can determine whether certain characteristics of metadiscourse are universal phenomena or unique traits indigenous to a specific L1.

The relations between Russia and the Republic of Korea today are an important part of Russia's Asia-Pacific policy and are characterized as constructive and complementary partnership. During the meetings between the heads of states, various documents were signed that contributed to the development of the relations between these two countries on the political, economic and social levels.

## 2. Methods

The following methods have been used in this paper:

- 1) analysis of research literature regarding the subject;
- 2) case study method for analyzing examples;
- 3) instrumental observation;

Furthermore, this paper uses general scientific methods such as: analysis and synthesis to determine goals, resources and tools of the subject concept, as well as structural approach.

## 3. Results and Discussion

One advantage of the corpus-based approach is the availability of a global description of learners' performances through the examination of a wide range of linguistic features. However, qualitative analysis is essential to unlock the full potential of corpus-based analysis (McEnery & Wilson, 2001). It can offer a rich and detailed perspective on the interlanguage, and complement quantitative analysis that can offer statistically reliable and generalizable results.

However, while this distinction is a necessary starting point to delimit a space for metadiscourse, it is difficult to apply in practice. Metadiscourse is what helps relate a text to its context by using language to take readers' needs, understandings, existing knowledge and prior experiences with texts into account and a stretch of discourse may realize both functions. A text might be an example of 'phatic communion', for instance, where the 'content' of a text is the writer--reader relationship itself. Equally, items often identified as metadiscoursal, such as therefore, in contrast and as a result of, can function in different ways. They can act

as metadiscourse by connecting steps in an argument or work 'propositionally' to connect events in the world outside the text. Metadiscourse research therefore tends to sidestep a rigid distinction and instead look for rhetorical functions which writers and speakers use to talk about their own talk (Sanderson, 2008) or to shape propositional information with their evaluations of it (Ädel, 2006).

Essentially, metadiscourse is a fuzzy category, most importantly in the sense of what it is. For there to be something called metadiscourse there needs to be something which is not metadiscourse, and this is generally posited to be propositional content. Propositional material is what is talked about: what can be affirmed, denied, doubted, insisted upon, qualified, regretted, and so on. Metadiscourse, on the other hand, is what signals the presence of a text-organizing and content-evaluating author rather than the subject matter (Vande Kopple, 1985). The meaning of a text is the result of these two elements working together: an integration of talk about the experiential world and how this is made coherent, intelligible and persuasive to a particular audience (Hyland & Tse, 2004). It is this integration, for example, that allows conference presentations to be rewritten as popularizations, textbook chapters, blogs, research articles or grant proposals for different purposes and audiences but with recognizably similar content.

Historians differ on the issue of the first dialogue between Russians and Koreans. According to some data, the first contact of Russians with Koreans might have occurred as early as in XIII century in Karakorum. At that time, Russian dukes travelled to the Mongolian capital to obtain an authorization for their continued rule, while Korea, at that time called Goryeo, paid tribute to the Mongolian empire. In "History of the Mongols, which we call Tartars", a work by the Franciscan monk Giovanni da Pian del Carpine, he describes kings, leaders and ambassadors who attended the coronation of Güyük Khan. Among them were the Grand Prince Yaroslav II and Korean noblemen who were sent to the Mongolian capital by Gojong as a gesture of peace. Although this contact between Russians and Koreans was the first one, it was not official and did not contribute to establishing permanent links.

The next contact only occurred in XVII century. Notably, many works based on the existing official documents from Russia and Korea recognize the first contact between Russians and Koreans to be the meetings during the Albazin war, namely in 1654 and 1658. Korean researchers, basing on these official sources, consider the first contacts between Russians and Koreans to have been established at that time. Notably, Russian historiography lacks any information about the Koreans participating in this battle, except the work of V. S. Myasnikov titled "The Qing Empire and the Russian state in XVII century" (Henry, 2013; Seth, 2010; Beloglasov, 2015), where he merely provides brief information about it, while Chinese historiography lacks nearly any information about the Korean squadrons participating in the Albazin war. The "country of morning freshness" devotes a significant amount of literature (including official literature, fiction and even memoirs) to the participation of Korean squadrons in that war.

Some Russian historiographers suggest that Russians were the first Europeans to establish dialogue and trade links with Koreans as early as XVII century (Eckert & Lee, 1991). This opinion is based on the information from N. P. Krisnits (Christisini) an Italian serving the Russian government and a member of L. V. Izmaylov's mission to the Qing Empire. This data was refined by S. L. Vladislavich-Raguzinsky, who was the Russian envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at the Chinese imperial court in 1727. The history of the first trade links of Russians and Koreans is based on the "Miller's Portfolios" left by Gerard Philip Miller (an important Russian historiographer of the XVII century) (Cumings, 2005), and on the "Foreign Policy of Russian and the State of Foreign Countries" by Konstantin Apollonovich Skalkovsky (Skalkovsky, 2004). B. D. Pak writes that further research is required in Russian archives and Korean sources to obtain a documented proof of Russians being the first Europeans who established trade contacts with Koreans as early as XVII century (Pak, 2004).

Another aspect of fuzziness in the metadiscourse results from the fact that metadiscourse can be realized in a variety of ways and by units of varied length, from individual words to whole clauses or sentences. The size of the linguistic unit is important as longer units might encompass smaller units, so that 'Our conclusion' could be categorized as an example of a frame marker/code-oriented metadiscourse signalling an upcoming text segment, or as two units with 'our' coded as self-mention/personal metadiscourse. Identifying individual cases is therefore difficult and, indeed, can vary from one analyst to another. Ädel and Mauranen (2010), for example, argue that researchers seeking to compare different languages or genres often employ corpus-based approaches based on predefined sets of lexical items, such as *show ever* (a connective) and *possible* (a hedge), and this approach limits them to a "heavy reliance on linguistic form coupled with the assumption that the overall function of each form searched for will not vary" (Ädel & Mauranen, 2010, p.3). They compare this quantitative method unfavorably with their own 'qualitative' approach, which also seems to involve counting features, but which sees the metadiscursive unit as larger than the search term (e.g. *we would like to suggest; it is possible that*).

While this is an interesting distinction, it is not a decisive one as identifying the smaller units does not miss the longer ones, and nor does it misrepresent the extent of metadiscourse in a text as long as analysts are transparent in their judgements and consistent in their coding. Moreover, the criticism regarding an overemphasis on form is based on an erroneous assumption that corpus studies not only give priority to surface features but make the formal realisation rather than the discourse function the object of analysis. It is true that corpus studies may begin with lists of potential metadiscourse items, but these are merely a starting point for analysis, indicating high frequency items that commonly function as metadiscourse in a particular register. The list merely suggests an opening exploration before additional items are added on subsequent sweeps through the corpus. The fact that metadiscourse is a pragmatic

category also means that all items should be examined in their sentential contexts to ensure they are performing metadiscourse functions: reading concordance lines is more important than recording frequency counts and, unfortunately, this is sometimes forgotten.

A new stage in the introduction of Russians to the Korean state is linked to Ivan Fedorovich Kruzenshtern, the Russian seafarer, admiral and the first Russian to complete an expedition around the world. In 1805, he systematically studied the Sea of Japan near the shores of Korea on board of *Nadezhda* and *Neva*. The new information received by I. Kruzenshtern during that expedition helped refine, supplement and amend the information obtained by the French sea explorer Jean Francois de Laperouse and the captain of the British navy William Robert Broughton in late XVIII century. Thus, we can state that in early XIX century, a new stage of exploring the Korean state has begun.

A third aspect of fuzziness, and related to the above, is that the formal heterogeneity of metadiscourse means that functions may be performed in different ways or individual items may perform more than one function simultaneously. One point to make here is that not all metadiscourse will be accessible to the analyst as communities have their own insider understandings of particular terms which carry insider meanings (Hyland, 2005). More generally, however, the same forms can convey different categories of metadiscourse, so that quite can be a hedge (quite good) or a booster (quite extraordinary), for example, or the word possible may function as metadiscourse by hedging a statement or drawing an inference expressing the speaker's attitude (it's possible that he was drunk) or as referring to a likelihood in the real world (it's possible to catch a bus here). Similarly, forms which realise particular functions, such as those which label concessive connections between statements, for instance, can be expressed in numerous ways (even if, of course, admittedly, although, etc.). While this kind of category overlap is well known in discourse analysis, and perhaps a consequence of the multi-functionality of language itself, metadiscourse underlines rather than resolves the problem of polypragmatic meanings

In the second half of the XIX century, the first Russian-Korean contact occurred in Korea itself, with the participation of Admiral Evfimiy Putyatin's fleet. A lot of interesting data about Korea and its residents was collected by participants of Admiral E. V. Putyatin's expedition. As an example, we can cite *The Pallada Frigate*, a collection of essays by I. A. Goncharov, the diaries of Voin Andreyevich Rimsky-Korsakov, and K. Posieta's "Letters from circumnavigation in 1852, 1853 and 1854" (Pak, 2004).

A new stage in the Russian-Korean relations is the Treaty of Aigun signed by Russian and China in 1858, which recognized the Amur River Region as part of Russia, and the Peking Treaty of 1860, which: first, confirmed all provisions of the Treaty of Aigun; second, recognized Russia's claim to the South Ussuriysk Krai

bordering Korea. Even before the 1858 Treaty of Aigun, the General Governor of Eastern Siberia N. N. Muravyev-Amursky, who was authorized to liaise with China regarding the borders of the eastern part of Russia, stated in a policy created by him that in case of a dissolution of the Qing Empire, any influence of countries hostile to Russia in Mongolia, Manchuria and Korea should be prevented. Preserving the status quo, where Korea was a vassal of the Qing China, was seen by Russia as an obstacle to the Korean state falling under the control of other countries (Barsukov, 1891). Interestingly, that treaty was signed without notifying the Korean state about now having a shared border with Russia; and for the first time in Korean history, it had a common border with a European state. In 1861, the border was demarcated in Tumangang, and the lower part of the river became the state border between Russia and Korea. The establishment of a common border led to the creation of the Russian-Korean trans-border relations.

After the Ming queen was assassinated in 1895 by Japan, Gojong and his heir to the throne moved to the Russian diplomatic mission. Gojong chose Russia because it was sharing a border with Korea and could quickly assist when needed. All of that increased the Russian Empire's influence and the weakening of China and Japan's positions (SUNDAY, 2017). To strengthen the independence of its country, Gojong sent his minister plenipotentiary Ming Yong Hwang to Moscow in 1896. The visit was successful and resulted in sending military instructors to Korea in August 1896, led in part by the Colonel of General Headquarters D. V. Putyata. Russia has also accepted Korea's request for help in building telegraph lines and resolving financial difficulties. The Russian-Korean Bank opened in December 1897 (Kim & Kim, 2005).

Late XIX century was important for the cultural relations between the Russian Empire and the Korean state. In Russia, the first Korean language courses and lectures in the history and geography of Korea started at the Saint Petersburg University and the Eastern University in Vladivostok. Notably, the Orthodox Missionary Society in Kazan created textbooks for Russian Koreans.

#### **4. Conclusions**

The present study demonstrates that the methodological approach of combining comparable learner corpora, contrastive rhetorical analysis, and multivariate statistical methods is effective in exploring L2 metadiscourse. Corpus-based analysis enables linguists to capture stylistic deviations that are not typically identified in traditional discourse analysis since it can provide the frequency-based information on discourse devices in different corpora. The statistical information is crucial for understanding the pertinence of metadiscourse markers that have been outside the scope of traditional error analysis owing to the lack of clear rules for the usage. In particular, the knowledge about co-occurrence patterns is instrumental in mastering some types of metadiscourse markers that demonstrate its maximum

rhetorical effect when used in combination with other markers in an appropriate manner. More detailed contrastive analysis of metadiscourse can reveal the relationships between learners' L1 and L2 performances. Additionally, the influence of teaching materials and teaching methods should be considered to unveil the causes of overuse and underuse found in learners' written productions.

The first contacts between Russia and Korea took place as early as XIII century. In XVIII - early XIX century, diplomatic contact between the two countries occurred in Peking. In the middle of the XIX century, the two countries started sharing a common border along the Tumangang river. After the common border was established, the contacts between Koreans and the people living in the Russian Far East increased, but at that time there were still no official diplomatic relations. The first official treaty between the Russian Empire and Korea, which became the basis for the diplomatic relations between the two countries, was signed on 7 July 1884. As for the cultural relations between Russia and Korea, Korean language was taught for the first time in Russia in 1897, at the department of Eastern languages of the Saint-Petersburg Imperial University.

### **Acknowledgements**

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

### **References**

- Ädel, A., (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Ädel, A., Mauranen, A., (2010). Metadiscourse: Diverse and divided perspectives. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9 (2), 1-11.
- Barsukov, I. (1891). *Duke N. N. Muravyev-Amursky from his letters, official documents, tales from contemporaries and printed sources (Biographical Materials)*. p. 345.
- Beloglasov, A. (2015). Russia's policy on providing security in central Asia at the beginning of the XXI century. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 219-226,
- Bickner, R., & Peyasantiwong, P. (1988). Cultural variation in reflective writing. In A. C. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 160-176). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R., & Steffensen, M. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written Communication*, 10(1), 39-71.



- Cumings, B. (2005). *Korea's place in the sun: A modern history*. London: W. W. Norton.
- Eckert, J., & Lee, K-B. (1991). *Korea old and new: A history*. Harvard Korea Institute.
- Etemadfar, P., Namaziandost, E., & Banari, R. (2019). The impact of different output-based task repetition conditions on producing speech acts among Iranian advanced EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(12), 1541-1549.
- Henry, H. (2013). *The great enterprise: Sovereignty and historiography in modern Korea*. Duke University Press.
- Hong, H.Q., Cao, F. (2014). Interactional metadiscourse in young EFL learner writing: A corpus-based study. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 19(2), 201-224.
- Hyland, K., Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in scholastic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguist*, 25(2), 156-177.
- Kim, D. K., & Kim, C-G. (2005). *The history of Korea*. p. 208.
- Kuhi, M. & Behnam, P. (2011). Generic variations and metadiscourse use in the writing of applied linguists: A comparative study and preliminary framework. *Written Commun*, 28(1), 97-141.
- Lin, W. (2014). On metadiscoursal features of Chinese university students' oral English: A perspective from chunks. *US-China Foreign Language*, 12(5), 402-410.
- Namaziandost E., & Shafiee, S. (2018). Gender differences in the use of lexical hedges in academic spoken language among Iranian EFL learners: A comparative study. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 3(4), 64-80.
- Pak, B. (2004). *Russia and Korea*. p. 520.
- Reid, J. (1992). A computer text analysis of four cohesion devices in English discourse by native and nonnative writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(2), 79-108.
- Seth, J. (2010). *A history of Korea: From antiquity to the present*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Skalkovsky, K. (2004). *Foreign Policy of Russia and the State of Foreign Countries*. p. 577.
- Tan, H., & Eng, W. B. (2014). Metadiscourse use in the persuasive writing of Malaysian undergraduate students. *English Language Teaching*, 7(7), 26-39.
- Vande Kopple, W.J., (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Compos. Commun*, 26, 82-93.