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Welcome to the Metadiscourse Across Genres Conference (MAG 2017) organized by individual researchers from the field and held at METU NCC, Cyprus between 30 March-01 April 2017.

The initial idea for this book of abstracts to appear is strongly linked to our attempt to organize a first-of-its-kind conference for the researchers who are into Metadiscourse and related concepts from different contexts. The conference of Metadiscourse Across Genres: Mapping out interaction in spoken and written discourses (MAG 2017) was first announced in February 2016 to take place in Cyprus in late March 2017 with the participation of Prof. Ken Hyland, Prof. Anna Mauranen and Prof. Annelie Ädel. While contacting well-known researchers from the field to ask them to join our scientific committee, we were given various compliments on coming forward to arrange such an initiative academic platform for scholars to focus on and delve into purely the notion of Metadiscourse.

Before continuing with the conference programme and the abstracts to be presented at MAG 2017, we would like to take the opportunity to our sincere appreciation and thanks to each one of the contributors sending their proposals and the anonymous reviewers who spent their invaluable time to help us and authors with their comments and knowledge in relation to abstracts. Without their support and experiences, it would have been impossible to bring this conference to completion.

Erdem Akbaş
Yasemin Bayyurt
Çiler Hatipoğlu

February 2017, Turkey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00-10:00</td>
<td>Conference Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>Welcome and Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prof. Nazife Baykal, Rector, METU NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prof. Yasemin Bayyurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:30</td>
<td>Plenary Session by Prof. Ken Hyland, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metadiscourse: What's new?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-13:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 1</td>
<td>ROOM A Chair: Jane Hodson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual and Pragmatic Functions of Hedges in Argumentative Paragraphs in Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hatipoglu, C. &amp; Algi S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-13:25</td>
<td>Room B Chair: Betul Bal Gezegin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metadiscourse in Research Article Introductions and Conclusions Aotaibi, H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:25-13:50</td>
<td>Room C Chair: Sheena Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A comparative study of metadiscursive manner markers in Psychology and Biology research articles Abdi, R. &amp; Maraghi, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:50-14:15</td>
<td>Room D Chair: Annelie Adel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Exploratory Study on Authorial (in)visibility across Postgraduate Academic Writing: Dilemma of developing a personal or impersonal authorial self Akbas, E. &amp; Hardman, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should I boost or should I hedge: the use of hedges and boosters in the writing of argumentative essays by Japanese university students Macintyre, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15-14:30</td>
<td>TEA and COFFEE BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 2</td>
<td>ROOM A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:55-15:20</td>
<td>Stylistic differences between closely related disciplines: Metatext in Linguistics and Literary Studies&lt;br&gt;Andresen, M. &amp; Zinsmeister, H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45-16:00</td>
<td>TEA and COFFEE BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 3</td>
<td>ROOM A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:25</td>
<td>Hedges and Boosters in Supervisory Discourse: A Case Study&lt;br&gt;Gumusok, F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:25-16:50</td>
<td>Contrastive genre analysis of academic book reviews of linguistics in English and Arabic&lt;br&gt;Bencheikh, Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:50-17:15</td>
<td>A Comparative Study on Attitude and Engagement Markers in Hotel Reviews in English and Turkish&lt;br&gt;Karatepe, C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00-20:30</td>
<td>WELCOME COCKTAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-10:00</td>
<td>Conference Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-10:30</td>
<td>Plenary Session by Prof. Anna Mauranen, University of Helsinki, Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:40</td>
<td>TEA and COFFEE BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:10</td>
<td>SESSION 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:10</td>
<td>Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: A Comparison of Research Articles and Book Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:10</td>
<td>Metadiscourse markers in English and Spanish journalistic texts: a contrastive annotation study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:10</td>
<td>Automatic Classification of Metadiscourse as used in Presentational Settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:35</td>
<td>Evaluative Markers in the Book Reviews Published in the Pakistani English Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:35</td>
<td>Mapping voice in two academic Business writing genres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:35</td>
<td>Automatic analysis of metadiscourse on undergraduate student writing across genres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:35</td>
<td>A study of Interactional Metadiscourse Features in Texts Written by Undergraduate students at the University of Botswana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35-12:00</td>
<td>Metadiscourse in British and Saudi Newspaper Column Writing: Native / Non-native Differences in Language Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35-12:00</td>
<td>Generality and certainty in undergraduate writing over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35-12:00</td>
<td>MetaPak: An Exclusive Corpus Tool for Metadiscourse Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conference Hall**

**Room A**

**Room B**

**Room C**

**Room D**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION 5</th>
<th>ROOM A</th>
<th>ROOM B</th>
<th>ROOM C</th>
<th>ROOM D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Gulsum Songul Ercan</td>
<td>Chair: Ling Shi</td>
<td>Chair: Larissa D’Angelo</td>
<td>Chair: Demet Gul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-13:30</td>
<td>Different audiences, different writing: Improving genre in popular science and academic writing among graduate STEM students Rakedzon, T.&amp;Baram-Tsabari, A.</td>
<td>An Exploration of the Mysteries of Hedging in Academic Writing Hancioglu-Eldridge, N.</td>
<td>Normative and Non-Normative Metadiscourse in the Classroom 1: History of Rhetoric Steadman-Jones, R.</td>
<td>Evidentiality and commitment in modern English history texts (1700-1900) Alonso-Almeida, F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-14:00</td>
<td>Revisiting the Metadiscursive Aspect of Definitions in Academic Writing Triki, N.</td>
<td>A corpus-based Comparison of Albanian and Italian Student Papers in L1 and L2: the Case of Hedges and Boosters Dheskali, V.</td>
<td>Normative and Non-Normative Metadiscourse in the Classroom 2: Dialect and Literature Hodson, J.</td>
<td>From “ignorant opinions” to “the truest rules”: Citation practices in Early Modern English military treatises Tuominen, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-15:00</td>
<td>Knowledge and professional identity construction in weblogs by healthcare professionals Małgorzata, S.</td>
<td>Positioning as seen through hedging in academic researchers’ spoken discourse Hah, S.</td>
<td>Young researchers writing in ESL and the use of metadiscourse: Learning the ropes Bogdanović, V. &amp; Mirović, I.</td>
<td>Legitimization devices in dialogic structures of male and female voices in 20th century popular romance fiction novels González-De La Rosa, M. P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15:15</td>
<td>TEA and COFFEE BREAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### METADISCOURSE ACROSS GENRES 2017
**Day 2- Friday-31 March 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION 6</th>
<th>ROOM A</th>
<th>Chair: Reza Abdi</th>
<th>ROOM B</th>
<th>Chair: Nilgun Hancioglu-Eldridge</th>
<th>ROOM C</th>
<th>Chair: Ken Hyland</th>
<th>ROOM D</th>
<th>Chair: Robert MacIntyre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16:15-16:30</strong></td>
<td>Short Break for Tea!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SESSION 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOM A</th>
<th>Chair: Reza Abdi</th>
<th>ROOM B</th>
<th>Chair: Nilgun Hancioglu-Eldridge</th>
<th>ROOM C</th>
<th>Chair: Ken Hyland</th>
<th>ROOM D</th>
<th>Chair: Robert MacIntyre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16:30-17:00</strong></td>
<td>Persuasion in tourist discourse: A model of metadiscourse</td>
<td>Persuric Antonic, M.</td>
<td>A model of reflexive metadiscourse in reading comprehension across disciplines (Economy, Chemistry and Linguistics)</td>
<td>Wichka, M.S.</td>
<td>The use of Metadiscourse Devices by Non-native Speakers in Research Articles</td>
<td>Khalili, A.</td>
<td>Stance accrual through oral academic discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17:00-17:30</strong></td>
<td>Transforming communication skills by the request for information</td>
<td>Reinsalu, R.</td>
<td>Bundle-driven metadiscourse analysis: Sentence initial bundles in Chinese and New Zealand postgraduates’ thesis writing</td>
<td>Li, L., Franken, M. &amp; Wu, S.</td>
<td>Hedging across genres: an investigation of hedges in the discipline areas of BAWE</td>
<td>Vincent, B. &amp; Trkija, A.</td>
<td>Framing in NLP: The significance of Metadiscursive Elements used by Neuro-Linguistic Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19:00-23:30</strong></td>
<td>DINNER at Acapulco Resort Hotel followed by a Turkish Night “Fasil” at Neyzen Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session/Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-10:00</td>
<td>Conference Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-10:30</td>
<td>Plenary Session by Prof. Annelie Adel, Dalarna University, Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metadiscursive 'you' across genres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:40</td>
<td>TEA and COFFEE BREAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:10</td>
<td>ROOM A Chair: Leyla Marti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metadiscoursal features of academic feedback: avoiding the fluff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malone, C. &amp; Austen, L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROOM B Chair: Pamela Olmos-Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metadiscourse in Electronic Advertising: A Comparative Analysis of TV and Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gul, D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROOM C Chair: Vesna Bogdanović</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Exploration of Modality and Hedging in Academic Discourse: Focusing on Kurdish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omer, T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROOM D Chair: Carmen Sancho-Guinda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping cross-disciplinary textual and visual metadiscourse strategies in academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>posters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D'Angelo, L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:35</td>
<td>ROOM A Chair: Leyla Marti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metadiscoursal features of electronic feedback in graduate level academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayyurt, Y. &amp; Yigitoglu, N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10-11:35</td>
<td>ROOM B Chair: Pamela Olmos-Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metadiscourse in Films: The employment of hedges and boosters in the Turkish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comedy film Recep Ivedik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hatipoglu, C &amp; Oktay, S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10-11:35</td>
<td>ROOM C Chair: Vesna Bogdanović</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constraints on authorial stance in accounting PhD theses in a Nigerian university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uba, S. Y. &amp; Baynham, M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:30</td>
<td>Round Table (Discussion): “Past, Present and Future of Metadiscourse Studies”</td>
<td>Discussants: Prof. Ken Hyland; Prof. Anna Mauranen; Prof. Annelie Adel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Dr. Erdem Akbas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-14:45</td>
<td>TEA and COFFEE BREAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45-15:15</td>
<td>SESSION 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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PLEANERY SPEAKERS
Research into the meanings and expression of metadiscourse in writing has become something of a minor industry among those interested in how interaction works in academic persuasion. We have seen a proliferation of studies in recent years using the interactive model to reveal some of the ways that writers monitor their ongoing text to make it coherent, relevant and persuasive to a particular community of imagined readers. Despite this abundance of studies, however, we have little idea how disciplinary preferences for particular features, categories, or even metadiscourse itself has altered over the years. In this presentation I explore how metadiscourse has changed in recent years, asking whether academic texts are becoming more interactional and if so in what ways and in what fields. Based on a corpus of 2.2 million words from the same leading journals in four disciplines from the humanities, social sciences and physical sciences at three periods over the past 50 years, I examine changes in the use of metadiscourse. The results are somewhat unexpected and seem to suggest changes in rhetorical conventions which accommodate more explicit argumentation overall, more interactional intrusion in the sciences and more detached practices in the soft fields.
Reflexivity, the capacity of using language to talk about itself, is a distinctively human trait. It brings about a special layer of sophistication to our language, which enables us to indicate explicitly how we intend our speech to be taken and how it relates to our interlocutors’ contributions. It gives us a chance to evaluate what we’re saying while we’re saying it, or to evaluate each other’s talk. Moreover, it allows us to say we didn’t mean what someone else took us to mean or that although we said something we didn’t really mean it. In brief, it comes in very handy in everyday encounters. Discourse reflexivity, or metadiscourse, is also a very important part of academic discourse where refined argumentation requires advanced linguistic means to win the day.

Metadiscourse has been studied widely in linguistic research, but although it is essentially an interpersonal, dialogic feature of language, it has nevertheless been almost exclusively studied in the written text. In this talk, I address discourse reflexivity in dialogue. More specifically, I will be looking into spontaneous dialogic speech and the roles that discourse reflexivity assumes for speakers in co-constructing speech, meaning, and knowledge. The data that I draw on is English as a lingua franca, which comes from the ELFA corpus of spoken academic ELF.
This talk takes the conference theme—metadiscourse across genres—as a point of departure. To illustrate variation in the use of metadiscourse, reflexive uses of second person 'you' are examined in different genres, all of which represent academic discourse. The material includes university lectures, research articles, advanced university student essays and teacher feedback on student writing. The data is analysed both quantitatively, taking frequency into consideration, and qualitatively, taking discourse function into consideration. The extended units in which 'you' occurs are compared across genres to highlight the considerable variability of metadiscursive uses.

One of the implications of the variation found—which was brought to the fore especially by the study of teacher feedback—is that our conceptualisations of metadiscourse are overly influenced by the type of data that have been in focus in research to date: highly visible written genres at the highly monologic end of the continuum. The metadiscourse in teacher feedback was found to be primarily about solving communication problems rather than organising the discourse and telling the reader how to respond to it. Interestingly, the feedback material fits in with Roman Jakobson's original conceptualisation of the metalinguistic function as solving communication problems.
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Writing is usually a consciously learned skill through formal instruction in a school setting. The training in writing is culture specific (Galtung 1981) and it is often done following the expectations and needs of the every society (Uysal 2008). Therefore, each society has unique writing conventions that differentiate it from the others (Hirose 2003; Kadar Fülop 1988). Writing also means assimilation of subtle but at the same time pervasive cultural norms about ways of arguing, ways of addressing an audience, ways of expressing authority (Wu & Rubin 2000) as well as ways of toning down uncertainty or potentially risky claims (Hyland 2000). Using these statements as a starting point and taking metadiscourse as an analytical framework, this paper looks at one specific language/culture (i.e., Turkish) and one specific genre of academic writing (i.e., the argumentative paragraph) and tries to uncover where, how and why (i.e., in which contexts with what pragmatic functions) native speakers of Turkish utilise the discourse modulation devices known as hedges. Participants in this study were 52 university students (34 female and 18 males) with age range 18-20. All of the informants were monolingual native speakers of Turkish coming from different geographical regions in the country. None of the participants had lived in a foreign country for more than six months. The data for this study were collected in two stages. First, the students were asked to fill in a detailed background questionnaire and choose an argumentative essay topic they felt most comfortable with. The majority of the students chose Çocuklar okula başlar başlamaz yabancı dil öğrenmeye başlamalı mı? [Should children start learning a foreign language as soon as they start school?]. Then, the students were asked to write 180-200 word long argumentative essays on this topic in class and they were instructed to use specific reasons and examples to support their positions. The 52 essays written by the students had 7,861 words in total. All paragraphs were coded and formatted for analysis in CLAN CHILDES after which the hedges in the paragraphs and their contextual and pragmatic functions were determined and classified. Later, the analysis of the quantitative data was done in PASW. The findings of the study showed that hedging devices in the Turkish language are a rich, multifaceted and multifunctional group of metadiscoursal tools which can assume various and sometimes contrasting roles in the different sections of the argumentative text.
Metadiscourse is a term broadly used for the linguistic resources which are internal to the text and contributing to the interactional meaning of it, therefore enabling writers/speakers to express their viewpoints and engage with readers/listeners as members of a particular community (Hyland, 2005: 37-38). Hedges are one of the devices of the interactional aspect of metadiscourse used by writers/speakers when presenting a proposition as an opinion rather than a fact (Hyland, 1998: 5). Thus, they withhold their commitment to the proposition and avoid confrontation. In her study on the usage of hedges in Turkish op-ed articles (Ercan, 2003) found that hedges are used by writers with different strategies. In our study, hedges are investigated in argumentative discourse, which is similar to the discourse of op-ed articles in that it involves persuasive and argumentative moves (Walton, 2006). Our objective is of two folds: with what function(s) hedges are used and on which stage(s) argumentation (i.e. confrontation, opening, argumentation and concluding, following van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004) the use of hedges is more frequent in Turkish argumentative discourse. To this end, three TV debate programs broadcast on three different channels have been chosen as the database. A total length of 312 minutes of recordings was transcribed and hedges were investigated in accordance with our objectives. Then, they were classified according to their functions, and the relationship between the functions of hedges and the part of the argumentative discourse was set forth. Our findings reveal that in line with Ercan’s findings (2003) hedges are used with six different functions: (i) to blur the source of information; (ii) to avoid to assume the full responsibility of the proposition made; (iii) to pretend not to inform the reader and remind them indirectly; (iv) to reduce the risk of confrontation, (v) to imply that the proposition is made tentatively to test the water; (vi) to allude to the limited nature of propositional content. Relating the second objective, hedges are found to be most frequently used on the opening stage in Turkish argumentative discourse.
This chapter examines how non-native student writers use hedges and boosters in the writing of argumentative essays. Over the course of a fourteen-week writing course, a learner corpus of 3 argumentative essays written by seventeen participants in a Japanese university was collected and coded for hedges and boosters. The final corpus consisted of 44764 words and was coded according to the definitions of hedges and boosters from Hyland (2005). The data was then independently coded by another researcher familiar with metadiscourse and, after discussion, agreement was reached on the examples of hedges and boosters. To discover more about how and why these features were used, think-aloud protocols and stimulated-recall interviews were also conducted. The results indicate that non-native student writers use far more boosters and fewer hedges when compared to corpora of native expert writing. Previous research has suggested factors such as the transfer from L1, L2 pedagogical materials, and the influence of spoken discourse which help to cause this difference. However, while acknowledging these as potential factors, the participants in this study have used hedges and boosters in a variety of different ways, for a variety of different reasons. Factors such as the way an argument is constructed, the participants’ knowledge of academic writing, and their English proficiency have also contributed to their use in this corpus. It is suggested that as educators we need to be aware of the variety of factors which shape our students’ use of this important feature of academic writing.

---
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Little is known about metadiscourse in Arabic and English research articles written by Arabic-speaking writers. Therefore, this paper uses Ådel’s (2006) framework to investigate metadiscourse markers in the introduction and conclusion sections of research articles written in Arabic and in English by native speakers of Arabic. The findings indicated that the text-oriented metadiscourse was more preferable across corpora and particularly was more prominent in introductions compared to conclusions. The findings also revealed cross-linguistic variations as English texts used a higher number of metadiscourse markers than their Arabic counterparts. The study closes with several recommendations for future studies and addresses pedagogical implications.
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF METADISCURSIVE MANNER MARKERS IN PSYCHOLOGY AND BIOLOGY RESEARCH ARTICLES

REZA ABDI, UNIVERSITY OF MOHAGHEGH ARDABII, IRAN

SOUDABE MARAGHI, UNIVERSITY OF MOHAGHEGH ARDABII, IRAN

Academic writing, particularly writing research articles, is considered of great importance among the academic discourse community. According to Hyland (2004), an analysis of metadiscursive features and the related conventions of different discourse communities is among the important characteristics in investigating and comparing academic writings. This study examined the employment of manner metadiscourse markers, as introduced in Abdi, et al (2010) in research articles across the two disciplines of Psychology and Biology. To this end, 200 research articles (100 from Psychology, 100 from Biology) were selected from twenty internationally accredited journals. Ten journals from each discipline and ten articles from each journal were randomly selected in order to build the corpus. Following the model introduced by Abdi, et al (2010), we analyzed transitions, frame markers, and code glosses as manner marking strategies in the corpus. A Chi-square test was used to compare the data extracted from the corpus. The results showed that there are significant differences between the two sciences in the use of manner metadiscourse markers. Besides revealing the differential perspective of the authors in terms of manner, the findings of this study suggest some pedagogical implications in teaching the related ESP courses, especially writing research papers.
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Evidentials and boosters are common rhetorical strategies that lend credibility to arguments either by drawing on external sources of information or by emphasising one’s own certainty about a proposition. Both strategies are part of a strong interpersonal view of metadiscourse comprising the ways speakers can organise a discourse and adopt a stance towards what is being discussed and their audience (Hyland, 2004, 2005, 2010; Hyland and Tse, 2004; Dafouz-Mine, 2008; Mur-Dueñas, 2011). But while a useful tool in explaining the interactional features of language in different domains and genres, metadiscourse has mostly been examined in relation to academic writing (Hyland, 2015), and little attention has been given to the role of metadiscourse markers in non-academic discourses with an overtly persuasive component such as political discourse. We address this gap by analyzing the presence and function of evidentials and boosters in the 2016 campaign debates on the United Kingdom European Union membership referendum (also known as the ‘Brexit’ referendum). In this vein, our objectives are, first, to extract the frequencies of the words and phrases performing these particular metadiscourse functions in broadcast debates featuring different politicians from both sides of the campaign before polling day on 23 June; second, to compare the most frequently used expressions in these debates and relate them to the speakers’ purpose; third, to contrast the use of these evidentials and boosters with the surprising results of the referendum. In the methodology set for this study, the quantitative use of evidentials and boosters was analyzed with the tool 'Metool' developed specifically to detect metadiscourse strategies. The results show how the strategies identified tend to work in combination towards the representation of a credible self with something plausible to say that challenges opposing views on the same issue. Furthermore, differences in the use of these metadiscourse devices between the political actors involved and the mixed positions they publicly adopt are also examined so as to conclude the study with a possible correlation with the speaker’s communicative characteristics and the referendum result.
Metadiscourse is only one of a number of discourse managing and interpreting tools available for use by writers. Other tools which help orient readers through text include paragraph indentation, discourse markers, and prediction pairs. Goutsos (1997) provided taxonomy of 7 discourse managing tools, and argued that in expository text a hierarchy of topic shifting and continuation operated. According to his research findings metadiscourse was ranked higher than prediction pairs but lower than paragraphing in terms of its topic framing and topic introduction strength. At the same time he noticed in his corpora that multisignalling was the norm, i.e. two or more discourse managing signals often co-occurred. However, more recent research (e.g. Charolles, 2005) has proposed a dynamic (rather than hierarchical) understanding of the relationship between discourse managing tools; for example, the decision to use a particular cohesive device (e.g. under-, or over-referencing) in paragraph-initial position may be seen to affect the discourse-managing role of the paragraph break in such an instance. Surprisingly little research has investigated metadiscourse and textual position (though note Ädel, 2006). Accordingly, in this presentation I report on research investigating the relationship between indentation and metadiscourse (both interactive and interactional, Hyland and Tse, 2004) in newspaper fundraising appeals, from a corpus collected from the Daily Telegraph newspaper between September 2015 and June 2016. While a number of researchers have considered moves within this or similar genres (e.g. Bhatia, 1998), I am not aware of any research which has considered the relationship that exists between moves and paragraphs, or moves, paragraphs and metadiscourse usage. The questions I seek to address in the presentation are: What are the types of metadiscourse present in this genre? Is there a discernible relationship between metadiscourse function and paragraph position? How, if at all, are moves, paragraphs and metadiscourse working in concert with one another? In discussing the findings I consider the patterns of usage that emerge, and what these findings mean for our understanding of discourse management in this genre, and how writers of such texts use the discourse managing tools available to them to persuade readers to make donations.
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ASIDES IN TURKISH POLITICAL NEWSPAPER INTERVIEWS

ELCIN ESMER, MERSIN UNIVERSITY, TURKEY

Metadiscourse is broadly defined as the discourse about discourse. There are two levels of metadiscourse: the textual and interpersonal metadiscourse. Interpersonal metadiscourse is recognised as an important means of facilitating communication between the text, producer and receiver. Asides are one of the interpersonal metadiscourse markers. Markociv (2013) defines them as short “dialogues” between the writer and his potential reader. They are generally presented in the brackets or parantheses in the written text. Writers use them to insert their comments on the subject. This way they emphasize their point of views and shape their readers’ opinion. Newspaper genre is generally accepted as one of the most important samples of persuasive text genre. Interpersonal metadiscourse plays a vital role for journalist in persuading his readers and interact with them. Interviews are the characteristic feature of newspaper discourse. They consist of three participants and they involve four directional communications (interviewer-interviewee, interviewee-interviewer, interviewer-reader, and interviewee-reader). Temmerman (2013) stated in her study of newspaper interviews, “asides are used as a way of corroborating the competence of the interviewer and they have five different functions in text:

1. adding factual information the reader is not presupposed to have,
2. describing the setting in which the interview takes place
3. describing non-verbal behaviour of the interviewee,
4. describing emotions shown by the interviewee,
5. assessing the conversational behaviour of the interviewee (p.371)”

The study aims to analyze the usage of asides in the political interviews conducted with the prominent politicians in Turkey. The data consists of eight political interviews published in four elite newspapers which have different ideology. In the study quantitative and qualitative methods will be applied using the methodologies both Corpus Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. The asides in the interviews will be identified based on Temmerman (2013)’s classification of asides. Also, the corpus will be analyzed by using the NooJ linguistic engine module. It is expected that there will be some variations in the use and distribution of asides in the data according to the politicians’ and the newspapers’ ideologies.
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The paper aims to investigate the interaction between the senders and recipients of workplace request emails. Drawing upon Hyland’s (2005) interpersonal metadiscourse model as the analytical tool, a small corpus of 659 workplace request emails containing almost 90,000 words was analyzed to reveal how professionals interact with the recipients of their workplace request emails. The analysis was conducted first electronically by using Wordsmith which generated all the concordance lines containing potential metadiscourse markers, and second manually by the author and a second rater who read each concordance line in its context to determine if the markers were actually performing a metadiscourse function. The findings suggested that in the construction of the workplace request email discourse, professionals used metadiscourse for three purposes: (1) to make the logic of their justification for requests clear to the email recipients; (2) to construct for themselves desirable personal identities – that of an accountable professional and a credible professional (Simon, 2004; Spencer-Oatey, 2007); and (3) enhance rapport with the email recipients (Spencer-Oatey, 2008). The common and strategic use of metadiscourse in workplace emails should have implications for both professionals and ESP practitioners.
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Metadiscourse Across Genres
Mapping out interactions in spoken and written discourses
The writers of any scientific community are inherently expected to fulfil some agreed-upon discourse conventions of the academic discourse community (Molino, 2010) in the sense of creating a successful dialogic interaction through their texts. In line with this, Akbas (2014b) raised the question of “how and to what extent writers foreground their explicit manifestations or hide their personal projections with impersonal forms” (p. 56). Considering the fact that academic writing is closely linked to the representation of authorial self (Hyland, 2002) and the voice of the postgraduates has received relatively less attention, in this paper, we explored the notion of explicit (via I and we-based instances) and implicit (via passive and impersonal instances) representation of postgraduates as the novice writers in the Social Sciences; namely, Turkish native speakers, Turkish speakers of English and English native speakers. Therefore, the focus of the paper shall be on the variations of personal (first person pronouns) or impersonal (agentless passives and inanimate subjects) uses of authorial references as well as their discourse functions in the postgraduate writing. In total, 90 successfully-completed dissertations of three postgraduate groups were randomly selected to compile the corpus of the study, and a corpus-informed discourse analysis approach was applied in the identification of choices of authorial representation in this genre. Following an extensive manual analysis of the texts from the corpus for each group, a list of explicit and implicit authorial references was extracted from sample texts to be explored in the analysis of the whole corpus. As was applied by Fløttum (2012), during the identification of authorial references, all verbs collocating with the explicit or implicit authorial references were examined carefully to see if the references performed author visibility in the texts. The quantitative analysis clearly showed that Turkish L1 and Turkish writers of English preferred to build mainly an impersonal impression over what they were presenting to the reader by employing a greater number of implicit authorial references whereas English L1 writers chose to create a more self-prominent academic prose. The qualitative analysis provided some evidence to argue that three groups employed explicit or implicit authorial references to accomplish particular discourse acts (i.e. guiding readers through the texts, elaborating an argument & making a claim, restating data collection, analysis and other methodological issues) strongly associated with the nature of discussion section.
The undergraduate dissertation in Mexico is often a key step in developing an academic identity. Hence, the idea of portraying an authorial identity at this level might cause some struggles for undergraduates and some researchers as well (see Helms-Park & Stapleton, 2003; Stapleton, 2002). In dissertation writing, writers are expected to show knowledge of the domain of academic discourse as well as of the genre they are writing, the content of their topic and research skills (Read, et al. 2001; Bartholomae, 1985). It is also expected that in this genre writers show their position towards their topic, i.e. take a stance. The integration of these elements makes dissertation writing a challenging endeavour, especially when facing it for first time, as the case for undergraduates. In addition, writing academically becomes more challenging when the writing is in a foreign language (FL). In this paper I analyse how undergraduates show their stance-taking in their EFL undergraduate dissertation. I focus on the analysis of stance-taking through reporting verbs (i.e. writer reporting other author’s ideas) and first person pronouns (i.e. writer claiming new knowledge or presenting his/her ideas) (Thomas & Hawes, 1994; Thompson & Ye, 1991; Hyland, 2001).

The corpus consists of 30 dissertations written by Non-native speakers of English in the area of English Language Teaching. I follow a discourse analysis approach using corpus linguistics tools such as concordances (using WordSmith) for the analysis of stance-taking which makes the expressions observable into their context. The findings show that in both cases, i.e. first person pronouns and reporting verbs, undergraduates use a variety of ways to reveal stance-taking, and this stance-taking varies along the chapters of their dissertations. My study contributes to research on a category of verbs that are commonly used in EFL academic writing and suggests some educational implications which reinforce the need to make students and instructors aware that the choice of reporting verbs is not just a matter of stylistics choice, but it can be an expression of authorial identity.
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This study is a corpus-based textual analysis of self-mentions in the introduction parts of research articles (RAs) and PhD theses written in the field of English Language Teaching. The analysis aimed to compare how first person pronouns were used to establish authorial presence in PhD theses and in RAs within a single academic discipline. Two sub-corpora were compiled, a 85226 word corpus of 25 PhD thesis introductions written in English by Turkish graduate students in six Turkish universities, and a 23006-word corpus of 25 RAs published in five mainstream international journals. First person pronouns and determiners in the two sub-corpora were identified using AntConc 3.4.3 (Anthony, 2014), a concordance software program. Discourse functions of the self-mentions were identified in their context using Hyland’s (2002) framework for discourse functions of first person pronouns. Findings indicated extensive variations in the frequency and functions of the self-mentions used across the two sub-corpora. There were significantly less self-mentions in PhD theses compared to RAs. In addition, the authors of PhD theses markedly employed more inclusive first person pronouns in their texts in comparison to RA authors who tended to prefer using exclusive first person pronouns in most cases. Analysis of the discourse functions of self-mentions indicated that the authors of RAs utilized first person pronouns to express their opinions with authority. The authors of PhD theses, on the other hand, tended to use first person pronouns in non-risk functions such as explaining research procedures. Findings in previous studies indicate that use of self-mentions help writers display a powerful and credible authorial presence in their texts (e.g. Hyland, 2002). In this respect, adoption of authorial voices prevalent in research articles would empower the novice authors in their access to international disciplinary communities. This study has implications for novice writers who would like to publish their research in international academic journals and more specifically, who would like to recontextualize their PhD theses as RAs.
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This cross-disciplinary and cross-linguistic/cross-cultural study intends to explore how interpersonal meaning is constructed in published Turkish and English academic book reviews (BR). To identify interpersonal meaning in the target BRs, it draws on the analytical and theoretical framework of Appraisal (Martin & White, 2005) within Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). This tripartite system includes attitude, engagement and graduation as main levels of evaluative resources and this study aims to answer how academic book reviewers employ appraisal resources of attitude in Turkish and English BRs. In addition, how appraisal resources of attitude (with its sub-resources of affect, judgment, and appreciation) are distributed in the target disciplines in these BRs. The specialized BR corpora collected for this study were comprised of 191 Turkish (283,208 words) and 194 English (280,224 words) book reviews from each of 10 disciplines: Educational Sciences (ES), History (HS), Law (LAW), Language (LN), Literature (LIT), Medical Sciences (MED), Philosophy (PH), Political Sciences (POL), Sociology (SOC), and Theology (THEO). The identification and annotation of appraisal resources in TBRs and EBRs was performed by an intensive annotation of each text individually UAM (Universidad Autonoma de Madrid) Corpus Tool. The findings reveal that overall English BRs had more appraisal resources (57% in English and 42% for Turkish) for attitude resources. The detailed analysis of each resource type revealed that in English book reviews it was more common to find expressions revealing reviewers’ own opinions of how they felt about the book, and the value they gave to the book. In addition English BRs provided more information on how the book can/cannot contribute to the field, society, and potential readers, which was one of the most vital purposes of book reviewing. In regards to disciplinary differences, it was found that Law was observed to have the most appraisal resources among all of the disciplines in both languages, which shows that field is heavily evaluative when compared to other fields such as Educational Sciences and Literature which had the least appraisal resources in both of the languages. The study can contribute to cross-linguistic studies in academic genre by showing how interpersonal meaning and authorial voice is constructed in a particular sub-genre of academic book reviews in two different languages. It can also provide bases for further investigation of appraisal resources in different genres and languages since it provides an elaborate list of all resources found both in Turkish and English BRs.
The objective of this talk is to compare the use of metadiscourse (e.g. Ådel 2006, Hyland 2005) in academic German in the disciplines of Linguistics and Literary Studies. Though often considered closely related, the two disciplines are associated with different methods, academic cultures and, consequently, writing styles. The description of these differences is of special practical importance for students who study both disciplines jointly in study programs like “German Studies” and accordingly have to acquire the two writing styles simultaneously. In a purely data-driven analysis of German PhD theses from Linguistics and Literary Studies, we compared the frequencies of all word trigrams (=combinations of three adjacent words) and evaluated them for their potential of distinguishing the disciplines (using the measures log-likelihood (Dunning 1993) and Craig’s Zeta (Craig/Kinney 2009)). Among the most distinctive trigrams for Linguistics, we found the combinations “in dieser Arbeit” (in this text), “an dieser Stelle” (at this point) and “im Folgenden werden” (in the following). These expressions belong to the group of metatext (Ådel 2006:20) that give the reader information on text organization. These findings suggest that expressions of metadiscourse make up a substantial part of the disciplinary differences between Linguistics and Literary Studies. This is in agreement with Hyland’s (2005:57) finding for English that “the more discursive ‘soft’ fields employed more metadiscourse overall”. This observation was taken as a starting point for a more comprehensive investigation of metatext in the two disciplines. For this purpose, the texts were searched for the three patterns mentioned above and additional text comment patterns (see Fandrych/Graefen 2002). The results were classified as metadiscoursive or intertextual (Ådel 2006:28) and analyzed for differences in frequency and in their combination with other aspects of metadiscourse, namely reporting verbs and self-mentions. First analyses on a pretest corpus of 23 texts confirm that metatext is more common in Linguistics. Additionally, instances used in Literary Studies are often intertextual or introduce an abbreviation or source text instead of commenting on text structure. These findings will be used as hypotheses for an in-depth study using a larger corpus.
Academic language is traditionally regarded as impersonal and strictly objective and these characteristics are also expected from university coursebooks, the indispensable components of higher education. However, the assumption that academic language avoids interaction with the readers and expressing personal stance has long been recognised as false by linguists (see e.g. Hyland, 2005). Nevertheless, focusing on textbooks, scholars may find quite limited resources to rely upon, particularly if their endeavour also includes the study of translated texts. Hopefully somewhat remedying this situation, this presentation would like to reflect on how metadiscourse markers, especially those signalling stance and engagement, behave during the translation of textbooks and how the resulting text compares to the source text and an independent target language text. The texts used for this purpose are samples of the original (English) and the translated (Hungarian) editions of Richard Feynman's Lectures on Physics and a Hungarian physics textbook. The framework of the study is supported by the system of transformation operations by Klaudy (1991) and Biber's typology of lexico-grammatical features (2006). Feynman’s style is widely regarded as particular not the least because the readers of his famous textbook can feel as if they were participants of his lectures, listening to him live. This is in great contrast to the tradition of Hungarian textbook authors, who tend to itemise knowledge in numbered paragraphs. Therefore, it can be hypothesised that the moderately colloquial language of the original text is somewhat formalised in translation in order to fit the target language culture's expectations.
DAY 1
30 March 2017
Session 2
14:30-15:15
ROOM B
This study deals with the use of metadiscourse by Italian university lecturers who teach through the medium of English (EMI, English-Medium Instruction). The main objective is to verify whether lecturers demonstrate sensitivity to the situational demands of the EMI classroom, paying attention to the needs of the audience irrespective of possible shortcomings in their mastery of the language. Metadiscourse will be investigated following Ådel's (2006; 2010) reflexive model and using corpus-assisted methods for the identification, classification and quantification of relevant markers. A small, specialised corpus of university lectures in the fields of Physical Sciences and Technology will be analysed. In particular, I will concentrate on references to the discourse, the code, the lecturer as speaker and the students as listeners, considering both metatextual uses and instances of interaction with the audience. I will investigate what discourse functions metadiscourse markers may perform; what form-function associations can be identified; and whether any manifestations of “shaky entrenchment” (Mauranen 2012: 217) of language structures can be noticed. In addition, I will carry out a quantitative analysis to assess for what function (e.g. to announce goals, to comment on terminology, to introduce topics, to anticipate the audience's reactions) metadiscourse tends to be used by the Italian lecturers in the sample. While this study is intended as a contribution to the expanding field of English-medium instruction (see Doiz et al. 2013 and Dimova et al. 2015), it also aims to discuss how metadiscourse can be analysed in spoken academic monologue. Hence, another goal is to verify to what extent Ådel's (2010) “lumping approach” to metadiscourse (i.e. using the same framework for spoken and written language) and Ådel's (2006) taxonomy for impersonal metadiscourse can capture the uses found in EMI lectures.
Over the last two decades an increasing number of academic discourse studies have placed great emphasis on citation practices in research and on the tools of reporting (e.g. Swales 1986; Thompson and Ye 1991; Tadros 1993; Thompson 1996; Hyland 1999; Borg 2000; Groom 2000; Thompson and Tribble 2001; Hunston 2004; Bondi 2005). It is recognised that many of the activities within academic communities see scholars who often report and comment on other scholars’ discourse. This leads to the complex interplay between ‘averral’ and ‘attribution’ (Sinclair 1987). In Sinclair’s terms, a text is made up of propositions which may be put forward by the writer (averrals) or attributed by the writer to some other person or entity (attributions). Citation practices have become a popular area of research in written academic discourse (e.g. Thomas and Hawes 1994; Thompson 2000, 2005; Hyland 2002; Fløttum 2003; Bondi and Silver 2004; Charles 2006; Pecorari 2006; Diani 2009; Hewings, Lillis, Vladimirou 2010; Samraj 2013; Swales 2014; Luzón 2015). Little attention, however, has been paid to citation in spoken academic discourse (Anderson and Piazza 2005; Bamford 2009). Using a corpus of student presentations by native English speaking students taken from the MICASE corpus (The Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English), the present paper investigates the citation practices that are most typically used by students in managing intertextuality. Attention will be paid to those instances of talk in which students signal explicitly or implicitly the existence of a relationship between their own ongoing string of talk and the written discourse of “absent others”. Findings suggest that citation favours argumentative interaction in the world of discourse and disciplinary debates among students.
This paper investigates the use of metadiscourse to organize and structure lectures across three different lecturing styles: reading style, conversational style and rhetorical style (Dudley-Evans, 1994). Metadiscourse in spoken lectures has received increasing interest by researchers in the last decade (Ädel, 2010; Crawford-Camiciottoli, 2004; Dafouz Milne & Núñez Perucha, 2010; Lee & Subtirelu, 2015). Nevertheless, to our knowledge, there is no study comparing the use of metadiscourse throughout different lecturing styles. Dudley-Evans’s (1994) classification is based on how much lecturers rely on notes; different levels of spontaneity in the lecturer’s commenting might vary the amount and types of metadiscourse produced. A second aim of this paper is to explore the use of metadiscourse from the perspective of the lecturer by means of a multimodal analysis. In order to obtain a comparison of the use of metadiscourse in these lecturing styles we set out to investigate organizational metadiscourse instances following Ädel's (2010) taxonomy of metadiscourse in academic English. The data comes from a larger project in which we examine 152 lectures from six distinct courses in Social Sciences extracted from Yale University’s OpenCourseWare. These courses consist of face-to-face sessions that include two reading-style lecturers, two conversational-style and two rhetorical-style. These lectures have been meticulously examined one by one in order to identify and classify all instances of organizational metadiscourse. For the multimodal analysis, we follow Norris’ (2004, 2011) Multimodal (Inter)action Analysis methodology, which allows us to explore communication from a holistic perspective, thus providing valuable insights on the actual role of metadiscourse from the speaker’s perspective. A series of representative video clips and transcriptions are shown to demonstrate the multimodal use of metadiscourse in lectures of different styles: reading style, conversational style and rhetorical style. The final aim of this paper is to shed new light on the differences in the use of metadiscourse that occur in spoken academic lectures through a multimodal analysis. Different approaches towards lecturing might imply distinct uses of organizational metadiscourse, and we intend to account for these variations.
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A FUNCTIONAL INVESTIGATION OF SELF-MENTION IN SOFT AND HARD SCIENCE MASTER THESES

DAVUD KUHI, ISLAMIC AZAD UNIVERSITY OF MARAGHEH, IRAN
SOMAYE AFSARI, ISLAMIC AZAD UNIVERSITY OF TABRIZ, IRAN

This study is a quantitative and functional corpus-based study of self-mention in soft and hard science master theses. One important purpose of this study was to find out the functions of self-mention in soft and hard science master theses. For this purpose, 40 soft and hard science master theses in eight disciplines were randomly selected out of the library of four top universities. Five master theses were selected in each discipline, in a period of seven years (2007-2014). This study analyzed only the discussion section of master theses. The quantitative analysis of the corpus showed that the frequency of the various forms of self-mention in soft science is higher than hard science master theses. Based on Tang and John’s (1999) taxonomy of the discourse roles of personal pronouns, self-mentions were also functionally analyzed. The finding of the functional dimension of the present study showed that the most frequent discoursal role of self-mentions in the corpus was the recounter of research process, whereas the least frequent role was originator.
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Engagement, one of the key rhetorical features of academic writing, is the way academic writers explicitly acknowledge the presence of their prospective readers in their texts, through ‘reader-mention, personal asides, appeals to shared knowledge, questions and directives’. Despite its importance in enhancing reader involvement in and contribution to the interactional dimension of the reading process, little has been done to probe into the discoursal and/or cultural aspect of it, especially on Turkish academic writers’ deployment of engagement. Driven by this apparent need, we, in this qualitative study, aim to investigate, using a specific taxonomy developed by other scholars, the relationship between cultural background and academic engagement in academic writing, drawing on a corpus of 50 English research articles by Turkish and American academic writers. The results draw attention to some interesting differences between the two groups as well as some similarities, few though they are. Discussions and suggestions are made with regard to academic writing
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USES OF REFERENCE CHAINS IN L1 AND L2 ARGUMENTATIVE WRITINGS: A CORPUS-BASED STUDY OF COHESION AND DIFFERENT LINGUISTIC TRAITS

JUNGYEON KOO, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, KOREA

Referene Chains (RC) are created largely by the use of personal and demonstrative pronouns, determiners and comparatives, linking elements within a text through anaphoric, and to a lesser extent cataphoric relations (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). In particular, RCs have a great importance because it is related to cohesiveness and coherence, which lead to a good quality of writing (Yang, 1989). I chose thirteen grammatical and lexical items (pronouns, demonstratives, and determiners) of creating cohesion which Halliday refers to as ‘cohesive devices’. Nineteen highly advanced college students joined this study. The participants were asked to write an English essay on the first day then Korean one on the fourth day after choosing one of three argumentative topics. The corpora were analyzed by two corpus tools: For Korean writings, I used KLT2000 corpus analysis tool, and for English one, I employed Antconc 3.4.4. The findings are as follows: 1) L1 writings showed small portion of pronouns other than I and we but L2 writings demonstrated large portion of ones, 2) L1 writings demonstrated more use of demonstratives compared to L2 ones, 3) relatively rare use of determiners (definite and indefinite articles) were observed in L1 writings, and 4) overall scores between L1 and L2 writings showed little difference. Based on the results, RC does not play a crucial role in determining the writing quality of Korean compositions. However, RC has a great importance in deciding the overall quality of English writings(Yang, 1989). The difference might be caused by the fact that Korean is one of languages that have neither subject nor object agreements, which regularly allow argument omission like Chinese(Huang, 1984) . In addition, Korean is “discourse oriented language”, in which empty arguments can be identified through discourse topics, with less reliance on sentence-internal cues than is the case for “sentence oriented” languages like English(Kwon & Stuart, 2013). This research has pedagogical implications in teaching college students translations/L2 writings (Yuk, 2005). The study also implies that L2 advanced EFL learners reflect their L1 cultural/linguistic features (Uysal, 2012) in their L2 composition and that they might be aware of the differences between two languages.
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A CORPUS- BASED STUDY ON EXPRESSION OF EPISTEMIC MODALITY THROUGH THE USE OF LEXICAL VERBS IN ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING

PINAR KARAHAN, ANADOLU UNIVERSITY, TURKEY 32
GUL DURMUSOGLU-KOSE, ANADOLU UNIVERSITY, TURKEY 33

This study investigates how Turkish student writers (the first year English Language Teaching Department students) employ lexical verbs as epistemic devices in order to make argumentation in their writing. The research aims to understand the ways in which the use of lexical verbs as epistemic devices by Turkish student writers is compared with the use of these same rhetorical features by American student writers. Two sets of databases (one for the American students and the other for the Turkish students) were analyzed by the researcher in order to compare epistemic lexical verbs between the two groups of students in terms of frequency of use, diversity of use and co-occurrence patterns of some specific lexical verbs. The quantitative aspects of the study were mainly based on frequency counts of lexical verbs and Log-likelihood tests to determine significant differences of use between the two groups of students. The qualitative aspects relied mainly on a close examination of concordance lines. Findings of the study revealed that the Turkish student writers exhibit a more personal and straightforward writing style and they seem to rely more frequently on spoken discourse features compared to their American counterparts. They were also observed to use certain lexical verbs—particularly ‘think’ and ‘believe’—more frequently than the American students.
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TRANSITION MARKERS OF CONTRAST IN CHINESE AND ENGLISH UNIVERSITY STUDENT WRITING

SHEENA GARDNER, COVENTRY UNIVERSITY, UK

CHAO HAN, COVENTRY UNIVERSITY, UK

Following research on the transition marker however in the writing of Chinese and English university students (Han and Gardner 2016), this paper will examine the group of ten transition markers (TMs) in the Han CH-EN corpus that belong to Hyland’s category of Comparison and that ‘mark arguments as different’ (Hyland 2005: 50). We call this subset of Comparison markers ‘Contrast’. In addition to however, this includes but, while, on the other hand, whereas, in contrast, on the contrary, rather, conversely, and by contrast. The Han CH-EN corpus was created as a subset of the BAWE corpus to investigate the characteristics of L1 Chinese students’ academic writing. It includes 78 pairs of texts by L1 Chinese students and L1 English students that are highly matched in terms of discipline, genre and level. In total, 44 transition markers were identified, of which ten belong to the Contrast group. However is the most frequent TM in the Comparison group as a whole, for both Chinese and English writers. It was found to be significantly more frequent in English writing in the discipline of Engineering, and more frequent in English in the Case Study, Methodology Recount and Essay Genre Families. As very few of the Engineering assignments are from the Essay Genre Family (most in Engineering are Methodology Recounts and Design Specifications), distinct rhetorical functions of TM however were identified. In order to investigate whether the significant Chinese-English differences in the use of TM however are balanced by differences in the use of other TMs which have similar function and sense, this research is designed to consider the use of the other TMs in the Contrast group. It emerged that four of the remaining nine TMs in the Contrast group (while, on the other hand, whereas, in contrast) are used significantly more by Chinese writers. This paper provides details of their distribution and use. Anecdotal evidence, and our extensive experience as teachers of EFL, both suggest that as these TMs have similar functions and sense, L1 Chinese students can be slightly confused about their accurate use. This research thus also aims to clarify where exactly the source of such confusion might lie.
A METADISCURSIVE INVESTIGATION OF ENGLISH AND PERSIAN ACADEMIC ARTICLES

AIDA ARIANNEJAD, EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN UNIVERSITY, CYPRUS

ÜLKER VANCI OSAM, EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN UNIVERSITY, CYPRUS

Recently many academic genre analysts have focused on exploring the differences between the discursive patterns, reader-writer relationships, and argumentation methods used by native speakers of different languages in different disciplines (Basturkmen, 2012; Gillaerts, & Van de Velde, 2010; Kim, & Lim, 2013; Salar, & Ghonsooly, 2016). However, due to the diversity of disciplines, there are still many overlooked academic fields whose rhetorical patterns need to be explored. One of the fields which is widely ignored in genre analysis studies is architecture, and there is a clear need to explore the rhetorical features of architecture articles written in both English and other languages. Thus the researchers of the present study intend to explore the rhetorical features as well as the differences between English and Persian academic articles in the field of architecture by drawing on Hyland’s (2005) ‘interpersonal model’ of metadiscourse markers in academic texts. To this end, the use of interactional metadiscourse markers by the two groups of English and Persian academic writers is investigated through analyzing the “post method” sections of 100 articles (50 Persian articles written by Iranian writers and 50 English articles written by English writers). The compiled corpora is analyzed through Wordsmith (6th version) concordance program. In the next phase, the results are followed by discussions on culture-specific characteristics of English and Persian articles. Finally, the research concludes with some pedagogical implications for English for Academic Purposes (EAP) teachers and material developers in this field.
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Post-teaching conferences in teacher education programs draw particular attention as institutional talk. The hierarchical positioning of student teachers and supervisors in the supervision system has driven researchers to focus on supervisors’ speech and investigate their discourse since supervisors are considered to be the source of power. Although supervisors are considered as superior to student teachers, which may lead to uncensored supervisor talk, it is seen that supervisors try to mitigate their speech as much as possible in order create a positive atmosphere (Vasquez, 2004; Wajnryb, 1994, as cited in Bailey, 2006). In addition, in most of the contexts, student teachers attend these conferences as a pair/group, this platform becomes public and more dynamic, which may drive supervisors to filter their speech. In that sense, this study examines the discourse of a supervisor in post-teaching conferences. More specifically, this case study tries to demonstrate qualitative and quantitative analyses of the functions of hedges and boosters in supervisor talk as a politeness marker. The naturally occurring data for this study come from 145 minutes-long post-teaching conference sessions. These conferences occurred within the context of an English medium university’s foreign language teacher education program in Turkey. The supervisor held four conferences with ten student teachers in Turkish, their native language. The transcription of video recordings will be analyzed quantitatively to count the frequency of hedges and boosters, and qualitative analysis will be conducted regarding their functions. The results will demonstrate a supervisor’s utilization of hedges and boosters in post-teaching conferences, which may drive other teacher educators to examine and reflect on their own practices.
The present paper is a contrastive genre study which investigates the rhetorical structure together with the act of praise and criticism in academic book reviews (henceforth, BRs) of linguistics written by L1 experts of English and Arabic. The corpus consists of 20 BRs, 10 each language, elicited from two reputable journals: *Journal of Linguistics* and *الجامعة حوليات* (Annales de l’Université Tunisienne). The study adopts two models as analytic frameworks: Motta-Roth’s (1998) rhetorical model of academic BRs moves and Hyland’s (2000) model of praise and criticism, respectively. The overall aim is to test whether, in view of cultural differences reflected in the Anglo-Saxon and Arab intellectual style and the disciplinary culture of linguistics, the rhetorical organization hand in hand with the act of praise and criticism in the academic BRs would vary between the aforementioned languages. The results show that, though the Motta-Roth’s (1998) model captures the macrostructure of academic BRs, it fails to account for additional constituents that were employed by the reviewers. Move 1: Introducing the book and move 4: Providing closing evaluation was present in all the BRs. Nevertheless, they were realized differently. The Anglo-Saxon reviewers favour the first two sub-functions of move 1. On the contrary, the Tunisian reviewers have tendency to employ the last sub-function of this move. With respect to move 4, the Anglo-Saxon reviewers adopt a recommendatory approach while the Tunisians have less and/or no tendency to recommend the reviewed book. The common feature is found in the treatment of move 2: Outlining the book and move 3: Highlighting parts of the book. The two languages reviewers tend to keep separate these two moves and not to fuse them as reported in previous studies. Further, outlining the book was the only move deleted in the selected BRs. The linguistic analysis of the acts of praise and criticism shows that the two languages employ number of strategies to realise these acts. Regarding the use positive adjectives as a strategy to communicate praise, the analysis reveals that both the English and Arab reviewers utilize positive adjectives in the opening and closing sections of their reviews: useful, valuable, excellent, interesting, and important were frequent in the English BRs. مفيد, مثير, مفيد, and مثير, مثير were recurrent adjectives in the Arabic ones. Concerning criticism, the epistemic verb seem and the modal verb might were frequently used in the English BRs to mitigate criticism. On the other hand, The Arab reviewers opt for يبدو and لعل in addition to praise-criticism pair in order to tone down their criticism. The findings of the present study show the efficacy of multi-level analysis in arriving at a thorough description of a given genre. They also fill in the gap in the rhetorical studies of the Arabic academic discourse. Further, these findings may be of use for EAP teachers to include this genre in their academic writing courses to develop their students’ critical and effective writing and
The purpose of this work is to report on some initial findings of the usage of ‘attitude markers and engagement markers’ (Hyland 2005) in negative reviews of hotels on the website, TripAdvisor in Turkish and English. The data consists of two sets of 100 reviews in both languages. The entries in Turkish corpus are much shorter than the ones in the English corpus. Not much information about authors exists. The analysis shows that a significant proportion of negative reviews in both groups co-occurs with some positive comments such as praising the location of the property. Many of the non-Turkish reviewers appear to have been careful about the image of both the country and the Turkish tourism industry. That is, they show positive attitudes towards Turkey and Turkish people in general. Besides, some reviewers in both groups did their best to make sure that this particular hotel was not a good representative of the industry. A small number of reviewers preferred making some sarcastic comments on the quality of features and the services offered. Some Turkish reviewers claimed that members of staff at hotels somewhat favoured foreigner customers. Some just reported that the place was suitable for tourists. A small number of Turkish authors also made negative remarks openly about fellow tourists coming from particular countries. Both groups of authors expressed their evaluation as a speech act ‘recommendation and suggestion’. Majority of authors in both groups attempted to engage with their readers by not recommending the hotel and suggested that the readers should stay somewhere else. They tended to compare the accommodation with other hotels. In face-to-face interaction, complaining is performed delicately. It is avoided when possible to protect the image of the complaining party and the addressee. However, online platforms like TripAdvisor provide a space where authors and addressees are anonymous. This gives them some kind of freedom to express their opinions in quite a blunt way. They blamed the hotel, the circumstances and the travel agency in both directly and indirectly. The data is rich with unmitigated complaints, which can be investigated as a defining characteristic of this type of text.
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Epistemic modal markers are frequent in medical discourse (Salager-Meyer, 1992 and Vold, 2006) as they are used to construct the rhetorical strategies of hedging and boosting through which authors position themselves on the continuum of (un)certainty. The choice of these expressions is dictated, among others, by the communicative purpose of the discourse and the level of claim the authors wish to make (Salager-Meyer, 1996). Research article abstracts serve as a basis for medical decision-making (Yavchitz, 2015) and their communicative function is the accurate transmission of research results into medical practice. In Cochrane medical abstracts, epistemic modal markers such as ‘probably’ or ‘may’ are used to convey different levels of proof and confidence in the results (Glenton, Santesso, Rosenbaum, Nilsen, Rader, Ciapponi & Dilkes, 2010). The use of hedging and boosting strategies differs between English- and French-language authors, the latter having a reputation for being less hedged and more affirmative than the former (Salager-Meyer, Ariza & Zambrano, 2003). These differences in modalisation strategies are also reflected in translations from English to French, and crucial in the correct decoding of the target language (Pilegaard, 1997). The modal auxiliary ‘may’, for instance, is used in medical abstracts as an epistemic as well as evidential marker (Alonso-Almeida & Cruz-García, 2011). In the Cochrane abstracts corpus compiled for our preliminary study (Martikainen, 2017), ‘may’ is translated mainly (49%) by the indicative mode of the verb ‘pouvoir’, which is naturally more affirmative than the conditional mode used in 35% of the cases. The first translation solution is therefore likely to positively bias readers’ interpretation of results, in regard of the level of certainty conveyed by ‘may’. Using a context-specific typology drafted for this purpose (Martikainen, 2017), we will conduct a corpus study on sources of bias in translated Cochrane abstracts that will establish the frequency of modal sources of bias by type (auxiliaries, epistemic verbs, adjectives and adverbs, modal clusters) and comparatively to other sources of bias, namely certain translation errors. We will also encode their impact (positive/negative) on the level of certainty. We hypothesize that the more affirmative writing style of French scientific discourse will also be perceptible in translated abstracts, in which we expect to see a tendency towards positively biased translations of epistemic modal markers of hedging and boosting.
This paper seeks to explore the uses and functions of adverbial metadiscourse devices in history scientific texts from the Modern English period (1700-1900), as compiled in The Corpus of English History Texts, a subcorpus within the Coruña Corpus of English Scientific Writing (University of A Coruña, Spain). There are some interesting attempts to study metadiscourse features in texts from this and earlier periods of the English language (cf. Moskowich and Crespo 2014; Alonso-Almeida and Mele-Marrero 2014; Gray, Biber and Hiltunen 2011). Following this tradition, I focus on adverbials as metadiscourse devices in the sense in Hyland (2005). The main reason to select adverbials as the target linguistic devices of our analysis is based on the fact that there seems to be widespread agreement that adverbials stand as one of the grammatical categories that most clearly contribute to the expression of interpersonal meanings (Biber and Finegan 1988). Their use by eighteenth and nineteenth century writers of history texts will be described so as to characterise them in terms of authorial presence, and to check how authors use those devices to negotiate interactional meanings with their potential readers, mostly colleagues. It will be shown that, depending on the context, they can fulfil several pragmatic functions, such as the indication of different degrees of authorial commitment or detachment towards the information presented, persuasion, and politeness, among others.
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This study draws on the Appraisal framework and on the concept of text orientation to investigate the linguistic resources Russian/Ukrainian-speaking undergraduate students use to project their stance when writing business letters in their foreign language (English). It also investigates whether there is a difference between high-grade (HG) and low-grade (LG) students with respect to the type and frequency of linguistic resources they use to project stance. The findings reveal that, in general, to express their stance, these students make a more frequent use of impersonal subjects, you and we pronouns, Judgement+, Appreciation+, [T-Affect]+, [T-Affect]-, and [T-Judgement]+ than of any other resources. The resources they use assist them in building good will in their interpersonal communication with the audience. The study also reveals that in Letter 1 (a letter containing negative information), HG students use I and [T-Judgement]- less frequently but rely on Appreciation+ more frequently than the LG group. In Letter 2 (a persuasive letter), HG students use impersonal subjects, you pronouns, [T-Affect]+, Judgement+, [T-Judgement]+, and Appreciation+ more frequently but [T-Affect]- less frequently than LG students. These findings suggest that in writing business letters, LG students take an unnecessarily direct and subjective stance that portrays a negative image of the writer and the situation, while HG students appraise the situation more objectively and more positively. The findings are further discussed in light of the students' level of English language proficiency and their understanding of writing in particular disciplines and genres.
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Intersex people, (i.e. people born with bodies that are not classifiable under a binary male/female construct) are increasingly embracing intersex identities, but intelligibility in society can be difficult to realize because cultural models, language, and discourses serve to render their bodies unintelligible. In response to this quandary, the present study focuses on the metadiscourse of intersex research collaborators in the USA concerning narrative practices and how these practices intersect (or do not) with the intelligibility of intersex experience. Data for discourse analysis is taken from Google Hangout discussions of the Intersex and Language Research Group and supplemented by face-to-face ethnographic interactions. Analysis focuses on the participants’ metadiscursive awareness rather than their performance, providing valuable insight into how narrative practices function in their social lives as they work to render their stories ‘tellable’ in diverse communities of practice for diverse purposes; political, pedagogical and personal. Awareness of communicative practices gives insight into how language use functions as part of their “social economies” (Brown 2006). Participants’ assessments of their varied uses of narrative practices suggest a negotiation between the situational ‘tellability’ of intersex experience and the assertion of various identities, leading to recontextualizations of their stories. Attitudes of the participants towards narrative, which have emerged from their socialization into certain ways of narrating, are revealing and demonstrate that their ‘folk’ metadiscourse about narrative practices is both ideological and useful (Cameron 2004). In this case it opens up further vistas for the empirical study of narrative.

bwking@cityu.edu.hk
When building terminological or ontological resources, terminologists or knowledge engineers must be able to understand the important concepts of the domain in question and the semantic or conceptual relations which link them. For that purpose they may rely on specialized corpora and retrieve Knowledge-Rich Contexts. A Knowledge-Rich Context (KRC) is described by Ingrid Meyer (Meyer, 2001) as “a context indicating at least one item of domain knowledge that could be useful for conceptual analysis”. It may embed one term and a conceptual relation about this one or two terms linked by a relation (hyperonymy or meronymy for example). The notion of KRC is often linked to the notion of markers of conceptual relations. These markers correspond to lexico-syntactic patterns, typographic or dispositional elements (Auger & Barrière, 2008), that is, metadiscursive elements used more or less consciously by the writer in order to highlight a relation between terms. For example, the marker \[X, y compris (DET) Y\] can be used to identify a hyperonymic relation, as in: “des douleurs (...) sont traitées par des antalgiques, y compris la morphine et / ou les anti-inflammatoires”. In this context, “antalgiques” is the hyperonym of the hyponyms “morphine” and “anti-inflammatoires”. In the CRISTAL project framework, we identified the French “candidate-markers” (which we have intuitively considered as capable to indicate a relation) for three relations (hyperonymy, meronymy, causality) and systematically analyzed their linguistic functioning within corpora varying according to the domain (breast cancer vs. volcanology) and the text genre (popular science texts vs. specialized texts). More than 10 000 contexts containing a candidate-marker have then been analyzed. For each of them, the capacity of the candidate-marker to really indicate the required relation was evaluated. This broad study confirms our hypothesis that KRCs vary depending on these parameters (Aussenac-Gilles & Condamines, 2012; Condamines, 2008; Flowerdew, 1992; Pearson, 1998). We identified the stable KRCs, that is, not depending of the genre or domain, and that can systematically be used in order to spot conceptual relations, versus the KRCs that vary. These observations allow us to correlate the extra-linguistic features characteristic of the text genre and the domain with the observed variation phenomena and to study the “portability” (Marshman, L’Homme, & Surtees, 2008) or “reuse” (Agbago & Barrière, 2005) of these markers, that means the use of markers through different domains or text genres.
The choice of a reporting verb is not only a lexical but also a rhetoric one in academic discourse (Bloch, 2010; Rowley-Jolivet & Carter-Thomas, 2014). These verbs can have various functions that show how writers position themselves within their research context or disciplines. The writer can neutrally report previous research or take an evaluative stance towards the cited work or the author (Hyland, 1999, Swales, 1990, Thompson & Yiyun, 1991). There have been numerous studies that addressed reporting verbs in order to explore disciplinary differences in citation practices (Ådel & Garretson, 2006, Charles, 2006, Hyland, 1999) or learner writing in the form of dissertations (Lang, 2004, Zhang, 2008). However, the use of reporting verbs in non-native expert and novice student writing remain unexplored.

Therefore, this study aims to compare the use of reporting verbs in 4 different corpora of research papers on foreign language education and/or applied linguistics (1) 30 research articles that were written by native writers of English and published SSCI-indexed journals in native English contexts, (2) 30 articles that were written by Turkish writers of English and published in SSCI-indexed journals in Turkey, (3) 30 research papers written by graduate student, Turkish writers of English, and (4) 40 research papers written by graduate native students. Following Charles (2006) and Friginal (2013), AntConc 3.4.4 was used to extract all reporting that-clauses where reporting verbs were used. The study showed that expertise in writing may play an important role as native and non-native expert writers showed little variation in their reporting practices. Although both native and non-native novice writers were found to differ from expert writers considerably, remarkable differences were found between native expert and non-native novice writers. This finding indicates that being a native speaker becomes less important as the expertise level increases. Furthermore, the findings support the view that non-native writing is discursively hybrid, which is more evident in novice writing. Implications for teaching and researching English for Academic Purposes writing will be discussed.

47 selahattin.yilmaz91@gmail.com
48 marti@boun.edu.tr
49 bayyuryt@boun.edu.tr
DAY 1
30 March 2017
Session 3
16:00-17:15
ROOM D
Much research in the field of second language (L2) writing studies has been devoted to understanding the needs and experiences of various student writer populations than the current or future teachers of these L2 writers. Hirvela and Belcher’s (2007) special issue of the Journal of Second Language Writing (JSLW) “initiate[d] a process of drawing attention to the teacher education realm of the L2 writing field” (p. 126) by highlighting the intersections of teacher education and the writing instruction areas of language, genre, response, and assessment. More recent literature has shed light on how these thematic areas play out in non-U.S. contexts (e.g., Manchón, 2009; Cimasko & Reichelt, 2011) but little is still known about how L2 writing teacher education is shaped and disseminated in global contexts.

Aiming to broaden the scope of L2 writing teacher education research, the presenters share preliminary results from a collaborative study on writing teacher education in Turkey where the presenters explore how Turkish EFL teacher candidates develop bilingual genre knowledge and expertise in a first year composition course. The guiding research question of the broader study is: How do Turkish EFL teacher candidates acquire genre knowledge and eventually develop some genre expertise in academic writing in the initial years of their teacher education program? Adopting Hyland’s 2004 model of metadiscourse analysis, this presentation focuses on the textual and interpersonal elements (specifically attitude markers and self-mentions) within the reflective writing journals that the teacher candidates were asked to keep at a first year composition course. Some of the guiding questions for these journals are: What was your assumption about this writing skill/genre? What have you learned about this particular skill/genre this week? How has your previous knowledge helped you to make sense of this skill/genre? Through analyzing the textual elements in these entries, the presenters discuss student writers’ attempts to understand the rhetorical expectations of academic writing across genres and their search for a disciplinary identity. The presentation ends with a discussion on how teacher candidates’ tacit knowledge about genre-based writing could translate to pedagogical knowledge relevant to their local teaching context.
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Reflective writing in higher education has increasingly become an important component of teaching and assessing students. It is used to encourage students to take ownership of their learning and make connections between what they learn in the classroom (theory) and practice. Students are required to examine their beliefs, values, experiences and assumptions about their learning and evaluate their performance. Research suggests that Reflective writing aids deep learning, life-long learning, self-empowerment, critical thinking and metacognition (Sen, 2010; Carlile & Jordan, 2007; Rogers 2001; Moon, 1999) and leads to proficient writing. This study seeks to explore students’ use of metadiscourse features in their reflective essays and their apparent intentions in using such features. The data for this study were a text analysis of students’ assessed reflective essays they produced in a counselling course. The aim of the study is to better understand how reflective writing as a genre influences the choices students make in the use of metadiscourse features, which features occur frequently and how the features are used. The implications for teaching this genre will be discussed. The findings will inform the teaching of the genre and help develop students’ awareness of metadiscourse features to make their writing more effective.
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Iranian EFL students entering university face many difficulties reading and comprehending their academic materials. They tend to rely mostly on lower level text processing strategies like word for word translation and syntactic decoding which are not sufficient and effective strategies required to read and comprehend academic texts at tertiary level. One way to help these students cope with their academic reading materials is to teach them higher level text processing strategies that help them in getting the overall meaning of a text. The present study investigated the effect of teaching metadiscourse strategies on students’ reading comprehension performance and explored this effect from the students’ point of view. Using a quasi-experimental research design, 57 undergraduates received metadiscourse instruction in their reading classes. The analysis of data indicated that students in the experimental group outperformed their counterparts on a post reading comprehension test. The analysis of a questionnaire revealed that most students with different levels of language proficiency believed that the intervention was beneficial to them in many ways. The findings of this study suggest that in order to help students become better text processors, EFL reading instructors incorporate metadiscourse instruction into their reading classes.
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Interpersonal metadiscourse markers are employed to create an interaction between text users. In writing, these markers help the writers to enhance the readers’ involvement with the text, to claim solidarity with the reader, and to control the level of personality in the text. The significance of interactive metadiscourse features in written discourse has been underscored in many recent studies, which show how writers interact with the readers. The purpose of this comparative study is to investigate the deployment of interactional metadiscourse features in two different genres. For this purpose, 24 research articles and 24 book reviews written by Turkish academic writers of English from various disciplines were randomly selected to investigate how the conclusion sections of these two text types are constructed in regards to metadiscourse features. Drawing on Hyland’s (2005) metadiscourse framework, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions and engagement markers were identified in both of the sub-corpora with the help of a corpus tool. Based on the contrastive analysis, attitude markers and boosters were observed to differ between two genres. Close examination reveals that these variations derive from genre-specific features. Since book reviews are expected to provide critical evaluation of the book, they were found to include a rich variety of particularly attitudinal markers. Similarly, since the conclusion sections of the book reviews include a high number of positive evaluations of the book, boosters describing the book were observed to occur more frequently than research articles. This study not only offers a detailed account of interactional metadiscourse in these two genres, but also illustrates how interpersonal connections are accomplished for particular purposes in different academic texts. The findings of this study may render some pedagogical implications for ESP courses and especially writing research papers.
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EVALUATIVE MARKERS IN THE BOOK REVIEWS
PUBLISHED IN THE PAKISTANI ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS

ATTEYA SHAHNAZ, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES,
PAKISTAN

WASIMA SHEHZAD, AIR UNIVERSITY, PAKISTAN

Review genres (movie reviews, drama reviews, restaurant reviews, ceremony reviews, talk show reviews and book reviews) comprise a significant body of knowledge as they are the simpler, easily accessible and less time-consuming mean of getting preliminary and useful information about the things being reviewed. Book reviews published in academic journals have been widely studied for the patterns of their moves and evaluative markers. However not much attention has been given to the study of book reviews published in newspapers which carry much significance because of the role they play in the promotion of a newly published book and in shaping their readers’ opinion about whether to buy the book for detailed reading or no. Hence, this article focuses on the study of evaluative markers as found in the book reviews published in the Pakistani English newspapers. Naturally occurring corpus of 162 book reviews from seven different Pakistani English newspapers (The Nation, Pakistan Observer, Daily Times, Pakistan Today, The News International and Dawn) is taken for this research. These are the daily national newspapers accredited by All Pakistan Newspapers Society (APNS). Detailed manual analysis of the third and the fourth moves (the two evaluative moves) of Motta-Roth's model (1995a) as found in the Pakistani English newspaper book reviews has been done and all the evaluative markers have been noted down. The analysis of these evaluative markers has been done both qualitatively as well as quantitatively. The qualitative analysis has dealt with finding out all the positive and negative evaluative markers (including adjectives, adverbs, nouns, verbs, noun phrases, prepositional phrases and clauses) as found in the 162 Pakistani English newspaper book reviews. In the quantitative analysis, each book review has been tagged as having positive, negative, neutral evaluation or a combination of any of the three types of evaluation. The results have shown that the evaluation of the books in the Pakistani English newspaper book reviews is mostly positive, one principal reason of which is the inherent promotional character of these book reviews in comparison to the book reviews published in the academic journals.
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Metadiscourse is a relatively new concept, which has received a growing interest in linguistic/discourse research. This paper seeks to examine the use of metadiscourse markers in newspaper opinion columns written by British and Saudi columnists. Metadiscourse was explored in a corpus of 320 opinion columns totaling 206,461 words, 160 columns written by British writers and 160 columns by Saudi writers. The corpus was selected from four elite newspapers, the British The Times and The Guardian, and the Saudi ones The Saudi Gazette and The Arab News. Drawing on Hyland’s (2005) model of metadiscourse, the study has identified which metadiscourse categories predominate in this type of newspaper discourse and how they are distributed according to cross-linguistic preferences. Results confirmed that there were 33,754 metadiscourse tokens in the corpus, an average of 105.49 occurrences per opinion column or 3 elements of metadiscourse in every 25 words in each of the two corpora: British and Saudi. Results also revealed that both groups of writers used high frequencies of metadiscourse elements in their opinion articles, with British writers tending to use more interactional metadiscourse markers than Saudi writers, while the reverse is true for Saudi writers. In addition, results showed that transitions stand out as the most frequently used sub-category of metadiscourse in both corpora, as they comprise 80% of all the interactive resources. Statistically significant differences were also found between the two groups with British columnists using more frame markers, boosters, and engagement markers, and Saudi columnists using more transitions, attitude markers, and code glosses. English writers were more cautious (using more hedges), more certain (using more boosters), and more personal and visible (using more self-mentions) compared to Saudi writers. In contrast, Saudi writers employed far more interactive metadiscourse markers, with much higher use of transitions and code-glosses. In most of the cases, results were consistent with previous research of metadiscourse. The study reported that metadiscourse is a useful concept in the journalistic discourse of opinion columns because, through its devices, it helps to expose the presence of a writer, organize the text, facilitate communication, aid comprehension, and allow the writer to build a relationship with readers.
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As part of a larger research effort on the multidimensional annotation of different genres of the contrastive English-Spanish MULTINOT corpus (Lavid et. al. 2015), and as an extension of previous work on the analysis of metadiscourse markers in the journalistic genre of Letters to the editor in English and Spanish (Lavid and Moratón 2015), in this paper we report on the contrastive annotation of metadiscourse markers in a subpart of this corpus, consisting of sixty-two journalistic texts -sixteen news reports, sixteen editorials and twenty letters to the editor- evenly divided into English and Spanish texts, all of them collected from British and Spanish high-circulation newspapers between 2009 and 2013 and preprocessed with the GATE platform (Cunningham et al. 2002). Using Hyland’s distinction into interactive and interactional markers as the basis for our annotation scheme, our analysis reveals interesting generic and language-specific variation in the distribution of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers in the three journalistic genres and provides some possible explanations for the results obtained. Thus, it was found that interactional markers (both Stance and Engagement) are mainly used in Editorials and Letters to the Editor, but with a very low frequency in News Reports, probably due to the the fact that in this genre, writers must be ‘impartial’ and ‘objective’ and avoid – or at least minimize – showing their interpersonal involvement in the text’s construction. It was also found that evidentials are used more frequently in News reports and Editorials in comparison with Letters to the Editor, probably due to the tendency to rely on other sources for attribution of information; transition markers are used differently depending on the text’s communicative purpose: higher frequency of temporal markers in News Reports in English and Spanish in comparison with Editorials and Letters; high frequency of adversative markers in English Editorials vs Additive in Spanish, and similar frequency of cause, concession, adversative markers in Letters to the editor. As to interactional features, the annotation revealed that Editorials and Letters to the editor present a higher proportion of interactional markers in both languages, although the Spanish letters present a higher degree of engagement in comparison with the English ones. These results reveal that the interactive and the interactional metadiscourse markers are valid categories which can be fruitfully used for characterising and distinguishing different journalistic genres in English and Spanish.
Documented and anecdotal evidence suggests that students find discipline specific uses of genres and register difficult to recognise and negotiate (Bhatia & Bremner, 2012), adding to their struggle to express a credible disciplinary voice or identity in their writing (Hyland, 2012). The proposed paper is set in the context of postgraduate Business studies and of a research project designed to investigate interdisciplinary differences and similarities in knowledge-making and academic writing practices, particularly in the disciplines of Human Resource Management, Management/Leadership, Marketing, Organizational Behaviour, and Strategic Management. Data collection is ongoing: the corpus currently comprises 35 texts, spanning eight disciplines and ten assessment genres. This paper reports the findings of an in-depth analysis of a sub-set of the Marketing data, namely, three native English speaking students’ argumentative essays and a total of nine of their online forum contributions, at three grade levels. The key analytical tool is a model of voice I have developed (Isaac, 2012), with voice defined as the writer’s self-portrayal and construction of a relationship with the projected reader. The model draws on Systemic Functional Linguistic theories of genre (Martin, 1984) and register (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2005) and the interpersonal Appraisal and Involvement systems (Martin & White, 2005); and, from a Pragmatic perspective, on self- and reader-references and other metadiscoursal resources (Hyland, 2005, 2007). Appraisal maps evaluative resources that more or less authoritatively or persuasively express the writer’s stance towards the subject matter and projected reader, aligning and/or disaligning the latter in relation to the writer’s argument. Involvement includes specialised and technical terms, that assist academic writers to negotiate disciplinary affiliation. The analysis results highlight how configurations of interpersonal and metadiscoursal resources differ across and within genres, shaping the voices and impression of authority projected by the student writers, their relationship with readers and the effectiveness of their writing. The study contributes to existing research on voice and stance across disciplines and genres (e.g. Chatterjee, 2007; Delahunty, 2012; Flottum, 2007; Hood, 2010; Hyland & Sancho-Guinda, 2012; Sanderson, 2008; Swain, 2007), extending the Appraisal framework and providing insights for teaching Business Communication skills.
Although there is increasing attention to undergraduate writing in corpus-based research, there are still few studies that examine stance in undergraduate writing by both L1 and L2 students. Instead, corpus-based research on academic stance tends to focus on advanced and developing L2 writers. It also tends to treat epistemic stance markers as related to certainty--how true a statement is--without separately examining generality--the extent to which a statement can be generalized. Based on a corpus linguistic analysis of writing by 168 undergraduate students over four years of university writing instruction in different disciplines, this study examines certainty and generality as overlapping but distinct aspects of academic stance and considers to what extent these aspects of stance change over the course of four years of students' undergraduate learning.
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AUTOMATIC CLASSIFICATION OF METADISCUSSION AS USED IN PRESENTATIONAL SETTINGS

RUI CORREIA, LANGUAGE TECHNOLOGIES INSTITUTE - CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY, PORTUGAL
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This paper addresses issues related to the function of metadiscourse in English spoken language, more specifically in a presentational setting, where it is used “to help the listener […] organize, interpret and evaluate the information given” (Crismore et al., 1993). The objective of the current work is twofold: to collect a corpus of metadiscourse and to provide machine learning solutions to automatically classify the phenomenon. On the first front, we describe the collection of a freely available corpus of metadiscursive acts in spoken language. 180 randomly chosen English TED talks were annotated via crowdsourcing using 16 categories of metadiscourse. These categories were adapted from Ädel (2010), accounting for which metadiscursive functions are used in TED talks. We describe the crowdsourcing setup, including training and quality control considerations. The collected data is evaluated in terms of quantity of occurrences, inter-annotator agreement, and annotation related measures (such as average time on task and self-reported confidence).

To further assess the collected material, a subset of the annotations was submitted to expert appreciation, who validated which of the marked occurrences truly correspond to instances of the metadiscursive act at hand. The second part of this work relates to using the aforementioned annotations in order to train classifiers that detect and assign a function to occurrences of metadiscourse in presentation transcripts. This task was strategically divided in two steps: the training of Support Vector Machines to generate a list of candidate sentences that can contain metadiscourse; and applying Conditional Random Fields to those candidates to detect the exact terms used by the speaker for the corresponding act. The performance analysis of this classification chain is discussed with respect to two possible applications: as an aid to common Natural Language Processing tasks (such as summarization and topic detection), and as part of a presentational skills curriculum. In the former, the tradeoff between precision and recall can be explored and, ultimately, be a tuning parameter of the classifiers. On the other hand, in a learning setting precision is valued over recall, since it is imperative not to present incorrect material to students.
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Argumentation is a key requirement of successful writing, which is the most common genre that undergraduates have to write. Students need to present and pursue well-reasoned and strong arguments through scholarly argumentation, which is articulated by meta-discourse. Today, there are some natural language processing systems which automatically detect authors’ rhetorical moves in scholarly texts. Therefore, students and educators could benefit from the available automated textual analysis that can detect rhetorical meta-discourse. However, there is a need to validate such technologies in higher education contexts, since they were originally developed in non-educational applications. The studies presented in this paper investigates to what extent can the automated rhetorical parsing technology be used to identify indicators of good academic writing in undergraduate student essays from different disciplines. This paper describes an evaluation study of a particular language analysis tool, the Xerox Incremental Parser (XIP) as an exemplar of this type of automated technology, on undergraduate student essays across genres. The XIP detects and labels rhetorically salient sentences in scholarly writing based on the identification of meta-discourse conveying the author’s rhetorical strategy. The labels are: SUMMARY, EMPHASIS, BACKGROUND, CONTRAST, NOVELTY, TENDENCY, and OPEN QUESTIONS. The dataset used in this study us The British Academic Written English (BAWE) corpus, a collection of good quality student writing which were marked as either gaining merit or distinction, collected from three universities in England. 1114 texts were collected from 35 disciplines in four broad disciplinary groupings (arts and humanities, life sciences, physical sciences, social sciences), and from students in each of three undergraduate years. These texts were run through the XIP and binary logistic linear regression analysis was carried out with the BAWE dataset; that was processed with the XIP. The results demonstrated that XIP did not perform well on BAWE essays drawn from the pure Physical Sciences but work well with social sciences. Different XIP labels were identified across genres for each student level. The results also demonstrated that the use of meta-discourse devices increases the essay grade; undergraduates use more meta-discourse cues when they get experienced in following years of their studies.
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METAPAK: AN EXCLUSIVE CORPUS TOOL FOR METADISCOURSE ANALYSIS
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Dependence of Corpus based analyses on computational tools of language is unquestionable these days. Though the analysis of natural language demands involvement of human intuition, the importance of corpus analysis tools cannot be overlooked as they are meant to explore material structure of language with optimum precision and accuracy. Several corpus tools including AntConc and Wordsmith have been developed as an intellectual and skilled nexus of corpus linguistics and computational linguistics in the realm of language studies. However, these generic tools do not fulfill the demand of corpus analysts in some situations demanding cost effectiveness of time and labour. AntConc, for example, produces total hits of concordance of list of searched items through application of advance search option; however, the frequency of individual items are not produced in the same search action. Similarly, Wordsmith tool does not fill this gap also. The software we have developed which we named MetaPak fulfills this gap and explore all the selected items along with their frequencies, concordances and customized normalized values. The tool has been developed to do metadiscourse analysis only based on the interactive and interactional categories proposed by Hyland (2005). The search is made both at the level of category and at an individual-item level. Customized Normalization of value (1000-10,000) has also been added here owing to considering size of corpus. Comparative values of metadiscursive and non-metadiscursive items can also be produced through MetaPak. Though the version is on trial basis but it is being used by us in different projects of metadiscourse with maximum satisfaction. The values generated at one click of self-mention category of Hyland (2005) in one of the tested files are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Normalized Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.2180768376637797024206080000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the authors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the researcher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4804944851580427862906210000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the writer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.14271968369235245984160000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the writers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1480494485158042786290620000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.4388185654000843881856540000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>26.3528018358131615959730550000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the researchers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8882966910948256717743730000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2960988970316085572581240000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the author</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5921977940632171145162480000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.5895329039899326375009250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.8466207713376267673402920000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Metadiscourse embodies interaction between writers, text and readers. This interaction involves positioning. Boosters, hedges and self-mentions are three main features of Hyland’s (2005) model of intersubjective positioning that writers use to express their judgments and presence in the text in a balanced way taking into account their readers’ objections, beliefs and rhetoric expectations. Writers’ lingua-cultural variations may affect writers’ employment of these metadiscoursal markers. The paper aims to compare tokens and types of boosters, hedges and self-mentions written by MA postgraduate Egyptian students with (Arabic L1) at Egyptian universities with their English native writer counterparts in British universities. Thirty theses (discussion chapter) were searched electronically using Text Inspector tool (Bax, 2011) to identify patterns of boosters, hedges and self-mentions. Furthermore, discourse-based interviews were conducted with ten postgraduate Egyptian students of the text writers to investigate Egyptian writers’ awareness of the functions of certain boosters, hedges and self-mentions and the factors that could affect their understanding and use. The findings indicate that there are statistical significant differences in terms of hedges and self-mentions between the two groups. The Egyptian writers employed fewer hedges (tokens and types) and self-mentions (tokens) than their English counterparts. The conducted interviews show that Egyptian postgraduate writers have a fuzzy perception of certain metadiscoursal items. Lack of EAP courses, individual knowledge of the genre and institutional practices are found to be the main factors that could affect Egyptian students’ use of metadiscourse. The paper concludes with some pedagogical implications for EFL Egyptian and Arab students’ academic writing instruction that may contribute to raise EFL Arab students' awareness of these norms of metadiscourse so as to adjust their writing practices and meet disciplinary readers' expectations.
In recent years there has been an increased emphasis on the interpersonal function of metadiscourse features in academic texts. This means that research on writing in academic contexts began to focus on the rhetorical features, such as interactional metadiscourse, that writers use to present their voice in writing. These developments in academic writing have also considered the socio-cultural context in which specific genres are produced. Using a multiple-methods approach to genre analysis, this article compares students’ use of interactional metadiscourse features to present voice in two undergraduate courses, Media Studies and Primary Education at the University of Botswana. A total of 40 student essays (70,397 words corpus) were analysed using a computerised text analysis program, (Wordsmith Tools version 5). Interviews with students and lecturers in the two departments were also done to understand the socio-cultural context in which the essays were produced. The comparison of interactional metadiscourse features in the two corpora indicated that interactional metadiscourse markers were present, but that there were variations in the use and distribution of these features by the learners. Contextual information shows that such variations reflect the different values and beliefs about academic writing of the discourse communities that students belong to. These values and beliefs can be problematic for EAP tutors who have to prepare students for writing in the various disciplines in L2 contexts.
Scientific discourse bears some unique linguistic features. The use of inanimate subjects with active verbs is one of the linguistic devices in academic writing (Baker, 1996; Hunston 1989, 1993, 1994; Hyland, 1996; Johns, 2001; Low, 1999; Master, 1991, 2001; Mauranen, 2001; Šeškauskiené, 2009) frequently applied to achieve impersonality and objectivity. The present study attempts to analyze lexico-grammatical features in research article abstracts focusing specifically on active verbs with inanimate subjects (e.g., The present study attempts to) to examine how Turkish and English academic writers construct writer’s stance.

The corpus consists of 720 randomly selected abstracts from the disciplines of economics, sociology, psychology, linguistics, engineering, physics, chemistry and biology. Considering variations in scientific languages across cultures and disciplines, this study presents an analysis of journal article abstracts written in Turkish (n=240) and their corresponding translations into English (n=240) as well as abstracts originally written in English (n=240). Thus, this study sets out to explore the extent to which Turkish and English academic writers in the social and natural sciences use inanimate subjects with active verbs to construct writer’s stance in the abstracts of their papers. The findings indicate cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary similarities and differences. The results revealed that an objective stance was established in Turkish as well as in English parallel abstracts by frequently referring to inanimate subjects. English original abstracts, however, highlighted the authoritative stance and competition for space in the scientific discourse community with a more frequent use of personal pronouns matched by a high use of active voice. In addition, disciplinary comparisons revealed that abstracts in the soft sciences frequently referred to inanimate subjects, whereas hard sciences more frequently preferred the passive voice. Consequently, it could be concluded that lexico-grammatical choices constructing writer’s stance are determined by cultural and disciplinary writing expectations.
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The role of genre is well documented to properly function at work and in academia (Swales, 1990; Hyland, 2007). Specifically, in the field of science, genres such as the scientific research article are imperative in communicating research and promoting one’s career. However, to fulfill one’s duty of public engagement with science, scientists should share their research with other audiences, including scientists from other fields and industry, policymakers and the public. Research has shown that the public is highly interested in science, and needs science to make informed decisions. Moreover, writing for the public has been correlated with higher academic publishing and citation rates. To measure graduate STEM students’ acquisition of genre in an Academic Writing course, we have conducted three projects: The first project (Rakedzon & Baram-Tsabari, 2016) analyzed 177 students’ progress in writing academic abstracts and popular science press releases based on their pre- and post-performance tasks rated using a newly developed rubric. The rubric included aspects of text structure, organization and English proficiency, and was based on course material, previous research, and a pilot study. Findings indicated significant improvement in academic and popular science writing, with higher rates of improvement on genre structure compared to English language proficiency. The second project, concentrating on jargon and audience, was designed to aid graduate students and scientists in adapting and writing science for the public by identifying technical jargon. To this end, we have designed a user-friendly program based on a corpus of the BBC online news site that identifies which word may be inappropriate and problematic in a text for specific audience. This program has been validated in previous work and subsequently tested on 888 writing samples from 222 students’ work in a science communication intervention in an academic writing course. Results show that while there is an improvement, i.e. use of less jargon in texts for lay public, it is not nearly clearly enough. The third stage of this work will deal with identifying the use of authorial stance and hedging in students STEM pre and posttest writing in popular science and academic writing, comparing their usage between genres and before and after the course.

74 hutzipl@gmail.com
75 ayelet@technion.ac.il
In metadiscourse studies, the discourse function of definitions has often been considered as a type of code glossing (Vande Kopple, 1985; Adel, 2006; Hyland, 2007). In Hyland’s (2007) model of code glossing, definitions are considered as cases of explanations and are accordingly regarded as reformulations that have expanding power “These are situated clarifications which elaborate the meaning of a preceding unit to make a concept more accessible by providing a gloss or a definition” (Hyland, 2007: 274). As such, definitional segments are thought to be part of the non-propositional side of discourse. Yet, it has been argued that deciding for the metadiscursive aspect of some stretches of language based on the propositional versus non-propositional meaning is not convenient (e.g., Adel 2006; Il’antidou, 2005). Adel (2006), for example, opts for a definition of metadiscursive categories based on their functional characteristics rather than their propositional aspect “The basic discourse functions of metadiscourse are to guide the reader through the text and to comment on the use of language in the text” (Adel, 2006: 20). Definitions in her model could be realized in the two forms of personal and impersonal metadiscourse. These two models for the study and classification of definitional elements however, do not account for definitional units of the type (x = y) where the equal sign generally conflates with the copular verb be and where y stands as a form of gloss or a defining unit to a specific term or concept present in x, generating as such types of classical or formal definitions. These structures seem to be discarded from Hyland’s and Adel’s respective models because the verb be is not categorized as an explicit metadiscourse marker and does not appear in their lists of search items used with their corpora. Based on their functional similarity with other forms of code glosses signaled by items like define, mean, name etc. these classical definitions make part of the investigation to be carried in this paper. For this, a corpus of 40 research article introductions is compiled from leading journals in two research fields: Applied Linguistics and Computer Science. The corpus yields a total number of 33000 words. The texts are manually annotated using UAM corpus tool software (O’Donnell, 2008). The coding process involves a lexicogrammatical and a functional identification of all definitional segments relying on overt markers of definition like verbs: define, name, call, refer to etc., punctuation signals like brackets and colons and syntactic realizations within relational identifying clauses of the form (x = y) (Harvey, 1999) and embedded relative clauses. Instances of definition are categorized in terms of their structural description, with defined units, defining signals and defining units being described separately. A second classification considers the functional aspect of defining units (Triki, 2014) which yields five broad definitional types that could be in the form of naming, classifying, composition, function or explanation. The overall purpose of such a syntactic and functional classification is to account for the choices made
by academic writers in the soft-hard disciplines and to study the ideational, interpersonal and textual implications those choices could have in research article introductions. Accordingly, the study relies on quantitative and qualitative approaches and draws mainly from the frameworks offered by Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014), Metadiscourse studies (Hyland, 2005 and 2007; Adel 2006) and Discourse Markers studies (Blakemore, 2002; Fraser, 1999).
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KNOWLEDGE AND PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION IN WEBLOGS BY HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS

MAŁGORZATA SOKÓŁ, UNIVERSITY OF SZCZECIN, POLAND

The ecologies of social media environments have created challenging spaces for the construction and exchange of medical knowledge, and for negotiation of medical professionals’ identity. Similarly to other specialist weblogs, the medical weblog genre serves to realize the objectives of educating the non-specialist audience, of the popularization of medical knowledge, and also of self-expression. Following the discourse-based, interactional approaches to modality (e.g. Kärkkäinen 2003; Marín-Arrese et al 2013; Thompson and Alba-Juez 2014) and identity (e.g. de Fina et al 2006; Benwell and Stokoe 2006), and recognising that knowledge is social, relative and contextual (van Dijk 2014), this paper aims to explore epistemic modality expressions in a corpus of Polish academic weblogs run by healthcare professionals. The focus is put on how the employment of epistemic predicates contributes to the negotiation of the medical bloggers’ professional identity. For the study of the use of epistemic predicates I draw on Danielewiczowa’s (2002) classification of Polish epistemic verbs. More specifically, a qualitative exploration of the use of epistemic predicates allows us to study how medical bloggers construct their professional identity, authority and responsibility in the hybrid institutional context of the digital medium, and how they negotiate their relations with patients. A pilot study has revealed that the variety of epistemic predicates in use reflects medical bloggers’ discursive choices in how they disseminate knowledge both within a given epistemic community, across disciplines and to the non-specialist audience. Medical professionals position themselves as expert advice givers who are willing to share knowledge with their non-specialist audience and educate their patients. They authenticate their expertise through references to their own experience and medical practice. In this way, they also aim to minimise the distance between the patients through solidarity and empathy. In general, the study proves that medical bloggers treat their online identity, regardless of whether it is anonymous or not, as an extension of their offline professional self, crafted carefully in order to maintain their good reputation in the potentially threatening and malleable communicative context.
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Scientific research is normally expected to be presented through a precise, factual, impersonal and objective style. In publishing our research, we generally give credit to those who have explored the field before us, formally acknowledge the limits of our own contributions, and lay out directions for future study. Stylistically, skilled academic writers thus defer to the judgement of the wider research community, and mitigate the conclusiveness of their own findings in a language rich in modalities. For researchers whose native language is not English, mastering conventions that are not merely linguistic but also profoundly cultural, is no easy task (Englander, 2013; Hyland, 1995; Jordan, 1997). In avoiding being definitive, and constantly hedging claims, the research findings and conclusions themselves can be undermined. However, in being over-definitive, the research can be highly vulnerable to attack. In other words, ‘writers need to invest a convincing degree of assurance in their propositions, yet must avoid overstating their case and risk inviting the rejection of their arguments’ (Hyland, 2004, p. 87). There are hence legitimate scientific reasons for hedging, and cultural and linguistic conventions of academic politeness that need to be absorbed and positioning considerations that may come into play. All this represents a complex and ambiguous challenge for any writer, let alone a non-native trying to establish a reputation for high level, original research. In this corpus-informed study, a comparison is conducted between approaches to hedging that emerge in thesis abstracts composed respectively by native speakers of English (post-graduate students in English-speaking countries) and non-native speakers of English (post-graduate students at a university in North Cyprus). The outcomes of the study provide some insight as to why, when and how writers from each group may opt to either hedge or be definitive in their claims, and consider the effects of their choices. The presentation concludes with some samples and discussion of how to develop hedging skills in academic writing courses.
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The conveyance of certainty and uncertainty is crucial to the interactive and rhetorical nature of academic writing. It is relevant because scholars achieve approval by finding the right balance between the investment of statements with the confidence of reliable knowledge and the tentativeness to convey doubt and adequate social interrelations (cf. Hyland 1998: 1). Holmes (1983, 1984, 1990), and Hyland (1998: 1) referred to this as hedges and boosters. The major aim of this comparative study is to investigate the differences and similarities in the usage of hedges and boosters between Albanian and Italian students expressed in their academic writings. Firstly, a separate analysis L1-L2 within the two samples will show the impact of their L1 on their L2. Secondly, a comparison between the two nationalities will reflect the differences and similarities between them. I have compiled two corpora of Italian student writings, respectively in Italian and English, with 3 million words each. Additionally, I have created two corpora of Albanian student writings in Albanian (2.2 million words) and in English (550,000 words). A similar amount of males and females, academic level (for Master and PhD theses) and number of words for each discipline is presented in all corpora with disciplines from soft and hard sciences (Social Sciences, Languages and Literature, Medicine, Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics and Informatics). My mixed-method study will be grounded in the field of epistemic modality. As Toska (2015: 164) stated, very little research (e.g. Toska, Panajoti, Edusei 2015) has been conducted on academic writing by Albanian scholarly circles. That is why it is essential to initiate research in this field and to analyze (culture-) specific features of these two language groups more deeply. First results indicate that Italian students show a higher use of hedges and boosters in their L2 writings compared to the Albanian students.
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Hedging in academic discourse has been much studied especially in academic writing. The need for researchers to be precise and to word their claims carefully is understandably deeply entrenched in our discursive practices. Greg Myers goes as far as to assert “a sentence (in scientific writing) that looks like a claim but has no hedging is probably not a statement of new knowledge” (1989: 13). Hyland et al have studied disciplinary differences in which hedging and other metadiscourse are mobilised in different academic communities and how researchers’ identities are intricately linked with academic writing (Hyland 2012). Whilst most existing studies pertain to hedging in academic writing, I propose to share new insights of how hedging in academic researchers’ spoken discourse can shed light on their identities as researchers. This paper examines hedging and ways of mitigation in academic researchers’ spoken discourse. This is done through an analysis of interviews with around 20 researchers in the fields of social sciences and humanities in UK institutions. These interviews were carried out with the aim of studying how researchers perceive their research environments. It can be seen that researchers position themselves in various ways in the interviews as they construct their multiple identities as researchers in relation to the fields or disciplines that they want to be seen as working in. This construction of identities or positioning occurs on both utterance and performative levels of their discourse. I found that hedging and mitigation often belie a performative level of the researchers enacting their identities. I argue that certain attempts to mitigate or hedge reveal a dialogue within a dialogue, where the speaker addresses not just his/her immediate interlocutor but some other voices representing larger discourses outside the interview. They sometimes do so by resisting or addressing certain tacit expectations about what it means to be a researcher, or to belong to an academic community. This ongoing need to position oneself or to shift one’s position constantly seems to be something that all researchers need to deal with. I would attempt to show how this dialogue within a dialogue could be examined by applying conversation analytic tools (Heritage and Clayman 2010) and polyphonic analysis (Angermuller 2014), inspired by Bakhtinian notions of heteroglossia.
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This paper discusses the experience of teaching the History of Rhetoric to undergraduate students of English Language and Literature, focusing particularly on the layering of normative and nonnormative metadiscourses within classroom discussions of the field. Students of the History of Rhetoric engage with two types of primary material: historical texts that employ traditional rhetorical techniques (Philip Sidney's poetry, for example) and critical, i.e. metadiscursive, texts which were produced in the same period and which both influenced and responded to the first type of material (texts such as The Arte of English Poesie by George Puttenham). These metadiscursive primary texts have a strongly normative character. Puttenham does not simply describe Sidney's rhetorical practice but evaluates it with reference to concepts such as the 'virtues' and 'vices' of style. In classroom settings, students are required to produce metadiscursive talk of their own in response to both kinds of primary text. Since they work within disciplines that are avowedly non-normative in orientation – Stylistics, Narratology, Semiotics – they face the challenge of developing a response to an earlier metadiscourse which was fundamentally different from the one within which they themselves operate. This is conceptually difficult and students take time to develop confidence in negotiating the contrast between historical and contemporary metadiscourses in a way that 'fits' the expectations of the disciplines within which they work. The conceptual difficulty of the task produces further complexity since it requires that teachers themselves engage in metadiscursive commentary on their students' talk and this teacher-produced talk is characterised by its normativity in that its function is to bring students' discourse into line with contemporary disciplinary understandings of how scholars 'should' talk about texts. After outlining these issues, the paper will offer frame-analytic readings of recorded classroom talk and thus explore the process by which students negotiate and develop their understanding of the complex discursive structure of contemporary rhetorical scholarship.

Note: This is submitted as one of a pair of papers. The other is: ‘Normative and Non-Normative Metadiscourse in the Classroom 2: Dialect and Literature’. We discussed this with the conference team before submitting.
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Within the academic field of literary dialect study there has been a move in recent years from discussing dialect representation in terms of linguistic authenticity and towards discussing dialect representation as a form of metadiscourse which “links accent to social persona” (Agha 2003, 247). From a teaching point of view, this shift presents a challenge. In my own institution, students attending seminars on ‘Dialect in Literature’ are in the third year of a program which aims to equip them with a properly descriptive account of language variation. When the focus is on authenticity in dialect representation, there is a good fit between their linguistic training and the types of analysis they undertake in class. When the focus is on literary dialect as a form of metadiscourse, however, students are required to negotiate several competing layers of metadiscourse. The texts themselves emerge from (and are typically read within) a strongly normative linguistic culture, which privileges Standard English, and interprets nonstandard varieties as ‘incorrect’ or ‘uneducated’. Students have been brought up within this normative way of thinking about language, but have been taught at university to consider it as ‘incorrect’ and ‘nonacademic’ and to adopt a non-normative set of metadiscourses. Engaging with literary dialect therefore requires them to access both their normative cultural knowledge and their non-normative linguistic training, recognising how the former shapes readings of literary texts while using the latter to subject those readings to critical analysis. In this paper I take recordings data from a seminar of third year ‘Dialect in Literature’ students to examine how they negotiate this complex layering of normative and non-normative metadiscourses, and I consider whether conceptualising the task in these terms can help us to better support students in developing informed and nuanced responses to literary dialect.

Note: this is submitted as one of a pair of papers. The other is: ”Normative and Non-Normative Metadiscourse in the Classroom 1: History of Rhetoric”. We discussed this with the conference team before submitting.
Entering the world of academic writing can be a troublesome experience for young researchers, especially for those writing in ESL. In addition to mastering the specific language of their disciplinary community, they also have to adopt an array of metadiscourse features which help them organize their writing and position themselves towards their content and their readers. Research on the use of metadiscourse in academic writing has indicated that ESL writers generally do not use metadiscourse elements to the same extent and in the same way as native English speakers (Mauranen, 1993; Ådel, 2006, Mirović & Bogdanović, 2013). The paper will focus on the process of developing the awareness of metadiscourse features with young researchers and will attempt to gain an insight into how they adopt and apply these linguistic elements in their writing. It is based on a case study with three young researchers from the Faculty of Technical Sciences in Novi Sad, Serbia, whose research articles will be analyzed in relation to the correct usage of metadiscourse as well as its potential absence, using Hyland’s (Hyland, 2005) framework. In the subsequent analysis, a questionnaire and interviews will be used to determine the degree of young authors’ awareness of their use of metadiscourse and their approach to applying it in their writing. The triangulation between the corpus analysis and the questionnaire and interview data will try to address the issues of the reasons for using specific markers, the importance they attach to the use of metadiscourse in relation to the content of the research articles, and the methods of learning them, in order to unfold the correlation of beginnings of academic writing and the use of metadiscourse. It is hoped that the results of the analysis can be applied in teaching academic writing.
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The objective of this paper is to identify and categorise evidential devices as used in the Coruña Corpus of English History Texts (1700-1900), compiled at the University of A Coruña (Spain). My intention is to evaluate their use in these texts to be able to assess whether these forms contribute either to mitigate (Caffi 2007), or to strengthen (Brown 2011), a particular claim. In the light of earlier studies (cf. Alonso Almeida 2015), results will show that evidential devices are used to indicate perspectivization of knowledge (Cornillie and Delbecque 2008). This perspectivization may lead to different degrees of authorial commitment with their texts. From a pragmatic standpoint, I want to highlight the potential of evidential devices as negative politeness strategies to avoid the imposition of ideas in the texts analysed (Brown and Levinson 1987). These strategies report on collegiate attitudes to communicate scientific knowledge within the specialised community of historians in the late Modern English period.
Citations are an integral part of the social process of constructing knowledge within a discipline. As an interactive resource used to guide the projected readers' interpretation of the text, these evidential markers reflect the communicative ends of the writer as well as his or her understanding of the needs of the readership (Hyland 2005). The contextually situated communicative functions of citations are realized in texts in a range of grammatical structures and lexical elements that vary according to genre and discipline as well as the individual (Hyland 1999; Harwood 2009). The citation practices of a specific discourse community are thus part of the conventions that authors need to master and creatively exploit in their writing to establish and project a credible professional identity (Hyland 2015).

Although recent research shows cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences in citation practices, relatively few studies have focused on diachronic comparisons and the development of metadiscourse conventions over time (see, however, e.g. Arendholz et al. 2015). More work is needed to map the metadiscourse practices of earlier periods, which may call into question the applicability of models based exclusively on present-day material (cf. Taavitsainen 2006). The same holds for multilingual writing with switches from one language into one or more other ones: while quotations from and references to other works have been identified as typical uses of multilingual text elements (e.g. Pahta and Nurmi 2006), such passages have not been systematically investigated from a specifically metadiscursive perspective. The paper examines citation practices in a historical discourse domain that has received very little attention from linguists: non-literary texts on warfare from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. Using a combination of qualitative and quantitative corpus-based methods to analyse the genre of military treatises, the study addresses the following questions: What are the formal characteristics of citations in the genre, and what functions are associated with them? To what extent do these conform to conventions identified in present-day writing? Answers to these questions will help to elucidate the dynamics of a previously uncharted emerging professional domain and the interplay of genre conventions and authorial positioning in multilingual writing.
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The aim of this paper is to analyze the mitigation devices found in two contemporary romance fiction novels set in the Canary Islands. While being one of the most popular but widespread dismissed literary genres, Popular Romance Fiction is characterized by formal features easily identifiable and focusing on emotion between the main characters: a heroine and a hero. In fact, in Regis’ words (2003), “A romance novel is a work of prose fiction that tells the story of the courtship and betrothal of one or more heroines”. In our study we provide a list of the strategies used by the female characters in order to mark modality and evidentiality while showing the differences in their frequency of use in relation to the male characters’. Manual analysis is carried out in order to disambiguate pragmatic meaning but also to verify that this genre seems to be ideal to use mitigation for the characterization of the female characters. It also highlights the essential elements of the genre and the recurrent nature of the dialogical patterns of male and female characters and of the female authorial self.
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Following research on the Contrastive transition marker however in the writing of Chinese and English university students (Han and Gardner 2016), this paper will examine the group of 18 transition markers (TMs) in the Han CH-EN corpus that belong to the semantic category of Consequence and that, in Hyland’s words, ‘tell readers that a conclusion is being drawn or justified (thus, therefore, consequently, in conclusion) or that an argument is being countered (admittedly, nevertheless, anyway, in any case, of course)’ (2005: 50). The Han CH-EN corpus was created as a subset of the BAWE corpus to investigate the characteristics of L1 Chinese students’ academic writing. It includes 78 pairs of texts by L1 Chinese students and L1 English students that are highly matched in terms of discipline, genre and level. In total, 44 transition markers were identified; of which 18 belong to the Consequence group. Both Chinese and English writers used Consequence transition markers more frequently than those of Addition or Comparison. Interestingly, however, there was no significant difference between Chinese and English writers in overall frequency of use, and this was true also for the Consequence marker used most frequently by Chinese writers, because. This changes when we look at individual transition markers. Among the 18 transition markers identified in the corpus, one, TM therefore, was used considerably more by English writers, and was the most frequent transition marked used by English writers. Three transition markers were used significantly more by Chinese writers: TM since, TM thus and TM nevertheless. This paper explores where exactly there are significant differences of use in terms of these five (because, therefore, since, thus, nevertheless) transition markers (i.e., in which genres and in which disciplines), and through analysis of specific examples in context identifies patterns of use (including sentence initial vs sentence medial) that will prove useful for those teaching academic writing in university contexts.
Cause paragraphs are ‘expository texts’ that give information explain or describe why or how things happen. They are also the heart of the causal analysis in the academic world (Meyers 2009). In cause texts, writers frequently employ discourse markers which enable them to communicate causal relationships between the ideas. Lack of or insufficient and inappropriate use of causal markers can lead to significant problems related to the cohesion of the paragraphs (Crossley et al. 2016). Therefore, a detailed analysis related to the patterning of causal markers in the different language is needed. The current study aims to contribute to this field of research and focuses on causal markers used by native speakers of Turkish in their causal paragraphs. The research tries to identify, classify and analyse the frequencies with which and the functions fulfilled by these markers in Turkish since as far as the authors are aware, despite the importance of these markers, no study so far has examined and determined their features. The data for the study were collected from 63 university students (40 males and 23 females) with age range 17-22. All of the participants were monolingual native speakers of Turkish coming from different parts of Turkey. Students were asked to write cause paragraphs of about 150-180 words in Turkish. These were coded; transcribed and analysed using the CLAN CHILDES program and a list of causal markers employed by native speakers of Turkish was compiled for the first time. Later, to gain a more comprehensive insight of the when, why and how of the use of causal markers in Turkish, semi-structured interviews with students were conducted. Students were asked to reflect on the reasons and conventions which regulated their employment or non-employment of cause markers in their cause paragraphs. The interviews were transcribed, and the common topics in those were identified and examined. The findings of the study show that, similarly to Flowerdew’s (1998) categories for English, in Turkish there are six main categories of causal markers whose functions and places of use show multifaceted patterns. What is more, it was seen that the reasons for the employment or lack of employment of cause markers given by the participants in the study were various and sometimes incidental rather than well-established or learned; which, in turn, pointed, to the lack of or incomplete training in writing in Turkish. It is hoped that the findings of this study will provide insights to experts researching and practitioners teaching writing so that a more efficient tailor-made training programs and materials are developed.
A great deal of research has been done to capture the intricacies of stance taking in academic writing. One way through which the stance of an author is reflected is the use of epistemic and attitudinal stance markers of certainty or uncertainty of the informational content of propositions or the affective evaluation of other propositions. The present study targeted the distribution of epistemic and attitudinal stance markers across disciplines and over time in the canonical subsections of disciplinary research articles in mechanical engineering, philosophy, physics, and finance. The corpus included 240 English research articles published during two time periods, namely, 1990 and 2010. We included 60 articles for each distinct field, 30 articles from 1990 and 30 from 2010 yielding a total number of 1,494,889 words. The findings suggested that stance taking is a common feature of academic writing through epistemic and attitudinal stance markers in the sampled disciplines regardless of the nature of the discipline. Also, the Introduction and the Discussion sections ranked first in the density of stance terms. Furthermore, there was an increasing pattern in the use of such stance markers. Then, some implications are drawn with plausible applicability in academic writing and EAP syllabus design.
INTERACTIONAL METADISCUSSION FEATURES OF THE
UK LABOUR PARTY MANIFESTOS (2010 AND 2015)

HATEM SEBEI, FACULTY OF LETTERS ARTS AND HUMANITIES MANOUBA,
TUNISIA

During the last two decades there has been a growing interest in the evaluative and
interactive features of language. The way writers transmit their personal feelings and
assessments was a matter of concern for linguists. Such studies have been conducted
under different names as “hedging” (Hyland 1996), “evaluation” (Hunston 1994, 2000),
“Appraisal” (Martin and White 2005) and “stance” (Biber & Finegan 1988, 1989). The
present work employs both quantitative and qualitative analyses to explore Labour
Manifestos (2010 and 2015). Manifestos are primary sources and they have been retrieved
from the internet. I selected one Manifesto when the Party was in power and one when it
was in opposition to examine change or consistency in engagement. For the methodology, it
includes two major descriptive parts: analysis of a questionnaire and text analysis using the
UAM Corpus Tool. This study is based on a survey through a questionnaire on 188
respondents in Manchester, Liverpool and Nottingham. The goal of the survey is to explore
whether people read Manifesto or not, to test the attitude of respondents to Manifestos, and
also to see people attitudes to certain domestic and foreign affairs. The second descriptive
tool is the UAM Corpus tool which is employed to count the frequency distribution of the
engagement contract and expand in the 2010 and 2015 UK Labour Party Manifestos and to
test the hypothesis that the engagement sources and functions are constrained by context
(in power/in opposition). The current presentation uses the Martin and White (2005)
Appraisal Framework. It employs precisely the Engagement Framework. The engagement
system deals with the writer’s attitude, presence and commitment in and to the text. The
current presentation focuses on the linguistic options used to engage voters. The general
findings show that few people are interested in Manifestos, a large number of the
respondents were interested in the question of the economy and larger differences are
visible in the distribution of the engagement sources across the Manifestos.
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The objective of this talk is to compare the use of metadiscourse (e.g. Ädel 2006, Hyland 2005) in academic German in the disciplines of Linguistics and Literary Studies. Though often considered closely related, the two disciplines are associated with different methods, academic cultures and, consequently, writing styles. The description of these differences is of special practical importance for students who study both disciplines jointly in study programs like “German Studies” and accordingly have to acquire the two writing styles simultaneously. In a purely data-driven analysis of German PhD theses from Linguistics and Literary Studies, we compared the frequencies of all word trigrams (=combinations of three adjacent words) and evaluated them for their potential of distinguishing the disciplines (using the measures log-likelihood (Dunning 1993) and Craig’s Zeta (Craig/Kinney 2009)). Among the most distinctive trigrams for Linguistics, we found the combinations “in dieser Arbeit” (in this text), “an dieser Stelle” (at this point) and “im Folgenden werden” (in the following). These expressions belong to the group of metatext (Ädel 2006:20) that give the reader information on text organization. These findings suggest that expressions of metadiscourse make up a substantial part of the disciplinary differences between Linguistics and Literary Studies. This is in agreement with Hyland’s (2005:57) finding for English that “the more discursive ‘soft’ fields employed more metadiscourse overall”. This observation was taken as a starting point for a more comprehensive investigation of metatext in the two disciplines. For this purpose, the texts were searched for the three patterns mentioned above and additional text comment patterns (see Fandrych/Graefen 2002). The results were classified as metadiscoursive or intertextual (Ädel 2006:28) and analyzed for differences in frequency and in their combination with other aspects of metadiscourse, namely reporting verbs and self-mentions. First analyses on a pretest corpus of 23 texts confirm that metatext is more common in Linguistics. Additionally, instances used in Literary Studies are often intertextual or introduce an abbreviation or source text instead of commenting on text structure. These findings will be used as hypotheses for an in-depth study using a larger corpus.
The extreme encapsulation of contents required today in the dissemination of science and technology has led to the use of communicative modes alternative to the verbal text. Graphical abstracts are currently demanded by many journals in both the hard and soft sciences and assumed to reproduce the rhetorical IMRD structure (Introduction > Method > Results > Discussion) typical of scientific narratives. However, transduction (Kress 2010)—that is, the translation of meanings from one communicative mode to another—makes it difficult for scientific authors to convey metadiscoursal meanings. This paper explores the major problems posed by visual metadiscourse regarding the expression of logical relationships and subjectivity, and intends to find out what strategies are predominantly and spontaneously employed by 'digital natives' (Prensky 2011) without any previous training, as well as to examine their efficacy and discern which of them are coincident with the ones proposed by Kress and van Leeuwen in their 'visual grammar' (1996). A corpus of 56 visual abstracts produced by aerospace engineering students in their last year was examined following Kress and van Leeuwen’s (1996) and Machin’s (2007) frameworks for multimodal analysis. For methodological reasons, the scientific topic chosen was a standard procedure performed by the informants as laboratory practice: the chemical preparation of aluminium surfaces for adhesive bonding in aircraft construction. Due to their strict sequential nature, which does not allow any descriptive or argumentative interference, standard procedures ensure higher rhetorical homogeneity and an easier assessment of variation than a full IMRD narrative, more susceptible of rhetorical fusions and embeddings. Findings reveal a high metadiscourse concern among the informants, whose majority resorted to frames, vectors and typography as main metadiscursive devices, while colour and trope icons were much less frequent. Subjectivity was achieved through the choice of reading paths, compositional arrangements, and the stylization of visual metadiscursive items, although with little awareness of its pragmatic repercussions. These comprise inappropriate register shift and the trivialization and misinterpretation of the message owing to rhetorical ambiguity and wrong emphases. As a conclusion, explicit training in visual literacy (Trumbo 2006) is claimed for in university environments.
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A CROSS CULTURAL INVESTIGATION OF THE PERSUASIVE EFFECT OF TEXTUAL AND INTERPERSONAL METADISCOURSE MARKERS IN ARABIC AND ENGLISH OPINION PIECES

FATMA ISMAIL, HELWAN UNIVERSITY, EGYPT

The aim of this paper was to investigate the persuasive effect of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in a corpus of Arabic and English opinion pieces, by means of triangulation. 20 opinion pieces (10 Arabic and 10 English), covering economic and political affairs, were randomly selected from Arabic and English newspapers. First, based on the quantitative analysis of the corpus, the study seeks to identify which categories of metadiscourse markers are predominant in the genre of opinion pieces, taking into account the respective cross-linguistic and cross-cultural patterns. Second, the study further explores the perceived persuasiveness of the opinion pieces by (potential) readers. To achieve this aim, a group of participants were asked to take a questionnaire to rate extracts from the corpus on a scale of persuasiveness (i.e. from the least to the most persuasive) and provide open comments explaining their ratings. The participants were also asked multiple choice questions about the perceived specific function of metadiscourse markers in context. The preliminary findings suggest that both textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers are frequent in opinion pieces. However, there are cross-linguistic and cross-cultural variations in the patterns of metadiscourse markers in Arabic and English opinion pieces. The study is expected to underscore the correlation between the frequency and distribution of metadiscourse markers and the perceived persuasiveness of Arabic and English opinion pieces.

---

98 fatmaismael@hotmail.com
Paraphrasing is based on one’s comprehension and interpretation of the source text (e.g., Yamada, 2003). It is not clear, however, how academic writers paraphrase to project individual views. In other words, we know little about how academics, especially students who might want to disguise their responsibility when giving opinions (Hyland, 2002), sustain and construct knowledge through paraphrasing as they interact with source texts. Also, since many L1 graduate students write in a context (e.g., Chinese) where individual identity seems problematic (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999) and textual borrowing is common in source-based writing (e.g., Shi, 2006), it is important to compare students’ paraphrasing across language contexts. This study compares Chinese-language and English-language paraphrasing involving 17 graduates who spoke Chinese as their first language. Five were from a Chinese university and wrote their research papers in Chinese, and 12 were from a North American university and wrote their research papers in English. The participants were each asked to identify, from a research paper they had recently written, paraphrases with matching source texts, and explain how they paraphrased each example. A total of 117 paraphrases were identified. Of these paraphrases, 66 were Chinese-language paraphrases identified by participants from the Chinese university, and 51 were English-language paraphrases identified by participants from the North American university. Data analyses were conducted to compare the Chinese paraphrases with the English paraphrases in terms of the amount of textual borrowing (words identical in the paraphrase and matching source text), and content re-contextualization (by omitting, interpreting, or adding information). Findings illustrate that the percentage of textual borrowing in Chinese paraphrases (Mdn = 40.5) is significantly higher than that of the English paraphrases (Mdn = 22) (Mann Whitney U test, U = 1191, p = .007). Participants’ comments on their paraphrases generated a total of 80 mentions of how the content of the source information were re-contextualized in their paraphrases (55 mentions by Chinese-language writers and 24 mentions by English-language writers). The English-language writers commented mostly on how they omitted or selected information from the source text in their paraphrases (24, 96%), whereas Chinese-language writers commented mostly on how they interpreted the source text (17, 31%) or added new ideas (22, 40%) in their paraphrases. In addition, compared to English paraphrases which were all acknowledged, some of the Chinese paraphrases (16, 24%) did not attribute the source information to the original author. Implications of these cross-linguistic findings will be discussed.
The importance of metadiscourse has been proven in various discourses (for instance Mauranen 1993a and 1993b, Cheng and Steffensen, 1996, Hyland 1998, Hyland and Tse 2004, Dafouz-Mine 2008). Not to be neglected is also the role it plays in tourist discourse. In a genre with the communicative purpose of not only informing the reader but also persuading him to visit a certain site or perform an activity, metadiscourse is essential for attaining persuasion. It is defined here as a rhetorical strategy used by the writer (or in the case of translations: the translator) to persuade the reader. Since previous contrastive rhetorical studies have revealed significant differences in the use of rhetorical strategies, persuasive rhetoric and reader-writer responsibility in different languages (for instance Čmejrková 2007, Dafouz-Mine 2008, Hoorickx-Raucq 2005, Pisanski Peterlin 2005 and Limon 2008), certain differences in the use of metadiscourse in the tourist discourse were expected between the Germanic and Slavic languages. In this study, a model of metadiscourse with a persuasive function was developed for the tourist discourse, with an emphasis on Germanic and Slavic languages, exploring the differences and similarities in the use of metadiscourse, as well as challenges in identifying it. Hyland and Tse's (2004) model of metadiscourse in the academic settings was taken as a base and adapted to the tourist discourse. The model was amended following a manual discourse analysis of tourist brochures in English and Croatian and then tested on a corpus of tourist brochures with the help of SketchEngine. In the amended model, categories of metadiscourse were further divided into subcategories including some of the subcategories proposed by Dafouz-Mine (2008), as well as new subcategories and one new category. The model was developed primarily for the English and Croatian language and was also tested on a corpus of German language.
The Public Information Act came into force in Estonia in 2001. Accordingly, a new genre was established in public communication sphere: a request for information. The request for information is an application a citizen presents to a public office (state and local government agency) in order to receive certain information (either in the form of a document or its validated copy), and to which a particular office or agency (holders of information) is obligated to respond within five working days. The type of citizen referral, which aims at asking for an evaluation, or advice, or at highlighting certain shortcomings, or at requesting to perform special tasks on citizen's behalf, is not considered as request for information and the agencies have a right to prolong their response time to such specific undertakings. The request for information reflects upon the traditions of public sphere communication. While the explicit roles of given communication subjects are predetermined by the traditions of the genre (citizen is the one who asks, office is the one who answers), the implicit roles only emerge in the close analysis of texts. For example, a citizen's question to an office can be actuated from his/her dissatisfaction with the practices of the office (the role of the critic), or/and from a desire to give instructions to the office (the role of the teacher). The offices and agencies, in turn, can choose to answer either from the position of authoritative know-all or rather neutral middle man. The language use of the questions and answers gives us directions as to what particular role has been chosen. The overall aim of my presentation is to analyse as to how the roles of the parties of the request for information actually emerge on textual level. The research shows that the information requesters are mostly in the role of a neutral inquirer (wishing to obtain information/knowledge) and local governments, the ones who possess the info (in the role of a knowledge holder), are willing to offer it to citizens. However, in certain information requests, citizens express their dissatisfaction with particular actions of local governments (the role of a critic or a teacher) but instead of direct confrontation they limit themselves to hints and insinuations. Local governments react to such hints in a neutral manner, justifying their activities in some cases by references to the existing laws.
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This paper describes an analytical model of reflexive metadiscourse in reading comprehension. The model draws basically on the works of Adel (2006), Salas (2015) and Toumi (2009) to analyze how Tunisian doctoral students process empirical research articles in their respective domains: Economics, Chemistry and Linguistics. The metadiscourse functions of the model are mainly drawn on Adel (2006) taxonomy of metadiscourse functions while their linguistic representations are mainly adopted from Salas (2015) and Toumi (2009). The model -contrary to other reflexive metadiscourse taxonomies- provides clear-cut distinctions between reflexive metadiscourse functions and their lexical representations and focuses on two major categories: meta-text and writer-reader interaction. A coding scheme would then be developed to represent the elements of these two categories to help the analyst code and analyze the participants’ reading protocols. The study employs qualitative methods; a questionnaire, reading test, subject background knowledge quizzes, a post reading interview to first assess participants’ reading level. A retrospective think aloud method would then be used to elicit the readers’ awareness of metadiscourse instances in their actual reading of the three research articles in their respective domains. This study represents one of the fewest attempts at analyzing reflexive metadiscourse from a reading comprehension perspective and would help for a functional analysis of its instances in the actual reading performances.
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Metadiscourse and lexical bundles are two closely related concepts and both operate as overlapping functional units in texts. Metadiscourse analysis always takes a top-down approach, in which discourse analysts begin from pre-determined metadiscourse items down to the analysed texts. Lexical bundle analysis usually uses a bottom-up approach, in which the analysis begins with bundles, extracted automatically from texts, up to generate metadiscourse items to reach an understanding of the discourse. The bundle-driven bottom-up approach is likely to lead to the discovery of longer metadiscourse units and create new categories, while at the same time allowing for the verification of existing researcher-generated metadiscourse lists. While many researchers have focused on examining metadiscourse in academic writing, few studies have used a bottom up approach beginning with lexical bundles in this way to explore the use of metadiscourse. Moreover, research on sentence initial bundles is rare. The present study explores the metadiscourse functions of generated four-word sentence initial bundles from the corpora of Chinese L2 and New Zealand L1 masters and PhD theses, and compares bundle distributions between L1 and L2 thesis writing. Except for a few propositional bundles, all the other bundles were identified as metadiscourse bundles and two new categories (introduction bundles and condition bundles) were created in to supplement those in Hyland's (2005a, 2005c) metadiscourse model. In contrast to New Zealand thesis writing, both the Chinese masters and PhD corpora were characterised by the heavy use of code gloss bundles (e.g. In other words, the), condition bundles (e.g. In the case of) and booster bundles (e.g. It is obvious that), and a relatively low use of endophoric bundles (e.g. The use of the), introduction bundles (e.g. There are a number), attitude bundles (e.g. It is interesting to), hedge bundles (e.g. It is possible that) and self-mention bundles (e.g. In this chapter, I). These findings indicate how productive bundle-driven metadiscourse analysis is in expanding the scope of current metadiscourse studies. It also suggests that L2 students could benefit from having attention drawn to lexical bundles as metadiscourse devices to support their academic writing.

---

103 li160@students.waikato.ac.nz
104 franken@waikato.ac.nz
105 shaoqun@waikato.ac.nz
DAY 2
31 March 2017
Session 7
15:15-17:30
ROOM C
As a part of pragmatics of language, Metadiscourse (MD) has been widely recognized as playing a pivotal role in the expression and comprehension of messages in academic writing. In view of its significance in effective communication, there have been a lot of attempts to categorize different MD devices within manageable models, alongside some descriptive works to demonstrate the use of MD devices on the basis of these models. However, despite all the centrality accorded to MD markers in academic writing, few ESP practitioners have tried to explore the use of these devices by non-native speakers (NNS) who are known to be producing dry, incoherent and sometimes confusing papers - the very shortcomings which might easily be managed by judicious use of MD elements. With the absence of systematic works on the use of MD markers by NNS, there is a paucity of information on their use of MD devices in their productions. This is what the present paper seeks to uncover. Drawing on the Hyland & Tse (2004) “Interactive and Interactional” model of MD, and his description of the use of MD devices in research articles produced by native speakers (NS) in Hyland (1998), we set out to document the frequency of MD markers in papers produced by NNS of English and contrast it with that observed in Hyland (1998). For this purpose, we picked 20 RAs written by NNS which had been accepted for publication in the Tabriz Journal of Dentistry after extensive stylistic and linguistic editing, and compared them against Hyland (1998) with respect to the frequency of particular MD elements. The results showed huge discrepancy in the use of all MD devices in general, and some in particular. It is believed that the findings could provide useful insights in materials development for Academic Writing classes where learners could receive explicit instructions on the use of MD elements which have been found to be used least frequently.
Hedging is an aspect of metadiscourse that has attracted much attention, in particular in academic prose, where writers frequently need to qualify their commitment to a claim, taking into account the expectations and knowledge of their audience. The identification of the resources and functions of hedging is an important task in the area of English for Academic Purposes (EAP), so that EAP learners may be more effectively instructed in how to ‘express doubt and certainty appropriately’, an area which they typically struggle with (Hyland and Milton 1997: 183). However, despite the availability of corpora of successful student writing such as MICUSP and BAWE, little research has been carried out into hedging in such texts, or investigated variation in terms of exploitation of hedging resources across discipline areas. This study uses Hyland’s well-known hedging model (Hyland 1996, 1998) to investigate hedging in the British Academic Written English (BAWE) Corpus, a balanced corpus composed of student assignments in a range of disciplines divided into four discipline areas: Arts & Humanities, Social Sciences, Life Sciences and Physical Sciences. Hyland’s functional framework identifies 4 main functions hedges perform: specification, verification, reader-orientation and writer-orientation, which we hypothesise will vary by discipline area in terms of overall frequencies of realisations as well as specific devices used. Having manually annotated a randomly selected sample of 50 texts from the corpus - comparing annotations for reliability purposes – we tentatively identify the principal hedging devices used. These forms identified are then used to compose queries to retrieve hedges from the corpus so that they may be compared across the discipline areas. Our presentation will discuss the main findings of this research and the implications for EAP students and practitioners. We will also discuss the issues faced in conducting the research and how they were addressed: annotation, adaptation of Hyland’s framework to a different text type, and the issue of syncretism as it applies to hedging devices.
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The research to date on academia has become increasingly interested in how international students especially at the postgraduate level become apprenticed into their discipline-specific discourse through expression of various stances. The related studies have mostly investigated the linguistic markers of stance in graduate candidates’ academic writing, while stance and its accrual on their part in spoken academic discourse have received scant attention. The current paper reports on an attempt to explore how international graduate candidates express and accrue stance through oral academic discourse in an EFL context in Northern Cyprus. The study involved collecting a corpus of oral academic discourse data over a period of a semester in one of the postgraduate ELT courses. It focused on the lexi-co-grammatical markers of stance in the transcription of the oral academic discourse in the graduate classroom. By drawing on the concept of community of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991), the study also examined the accrual of stances by the graduate candidates through their classroom interactions with more experienced members/peers. The analysis of the data revealed the instances of stance variation across the candidates’ contributions to the oral academic discourse. Specifically, the results showed the prevalence of grammatical markers of epistemic stance while moderate employment of some lexical markers of stance in the oral academic discourse data suggesting the contextually situated nature of stance. Finally, the paper offers implications for postgraduate contexts to afford various opportunities for international graduate students to develop their linguistic repertoire for adequate stance expression through engagement in oral academic discourse.
NLP, Neurolinguistic Programming, developed by Bandler and Grindler (1973, 1975, 1983) is known to be a system where neurology, linguistics and psychology work together to guide a person in a desired direction. Basically, it can be evaluated as "a form of modeling that offers potential for systematic and detailed understanding of people's subjective experience" (Tosley and Mattison, 2003). Despite controversial studies which claim that NLP is not capable of affecting people the way it offers (i.e. useless in reality), the methods offered by the system are still frequently applied in many environments from psychotherapy to teaching/learning. This study, though, is not concerned with neither all of the stages of the system nor the success rates of the applications. The basic concern of this study is the language patterns used during NLP applications. NLP makes use of Milton-Ericsonian Hypnosis techniques, especially the linguistic patterns that the programming language uses. Through a linguistic point of view, the first thing about these patterns to be noticed is that they are all elements of metadiscourse. The so-called Milton Model patterns include phrases such as “You probably already knew...”, “Maybe you’ll...”, “You might notice how good ... feels when...” etc. What makes NLP relevant to metadiscourse studies is nothing but these patterns. All of these linguistic units belong to some relevant category of metadiscourse. These linguistic structures are not only listed on numerous webpages, but also are used in countless number of public videos where different applications of the system are exemplified. Surprisingly, linguistics did not ask many questions on the linguistic structure of these formulated expressions. This motivated us to search for answers to the following questions:

1. Which metadiscourse categories do NLP patterns fall into?
2. What statistical results will come up in the analysis of internal and interactional metadiscourse of NLP patterns?
3. Is one of the different categories of metadiscourse more frequent?

To answer the questions, the Milton Cards published online are going to be analyzed and categorized according to the metadiscourse categories. Furthermore, we are going to analyze 10 different public videos where experts apply NLP techniques on different cases. We hope to define the language of NLP patterns in linguistic terms. Such an analysis may add a lot more to the understanding of NLP theory, more importantly the nature of human-being (Cyna et al., 2009). The huge numbers of video views about NLP applications, tutorials, and examples of practices prove that such an analysis is required. There is no doubt that a neuro-linguistic analysis is vital to complete the whole picture of the analysis. But within the limits of this paper, we exclude such questions.

---
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In the UK assessment and feedback has consistently been one of the lowest scoring elements of students' experience of Higher Education nationally (HEFCE 2014:25). Feedback that students receive in UK universities is made up of short written texts with relatively limited ideational content (Halliday 1994) which are stylistically closer to conversation than academic written text. A major function of these texts is evaluative, to provide a critical commentary on student performance. The quality of these texts is seen as a key means to engage students and support academic development; "It is impossible to overstate the role of effective comments on students' progress in any discussion of effective teaching and assessment' (Ramsden 2003: 187). This research used a corpus driven approach to clarify features and qualities of text that students value in feedback. Two mini corpora were created from a collection of feedback in one subject area, across three years of an undergraduate social science degree. Student evaluations based on Nichols & McFarlane-Dick (2006) were used to rank texts and distinguish between feedback students rated highly and poorly. A contrastive analysis was conducted examining frequency counts, keyword analyses as well as concordances, collocations and semantic analyses. Contrastive corpus analysis brings the metadiscoursal features strongly into focus. Findings confirmed the highly interpersonal nature of academic feedback with distinct patterns emerging in the use of modals, personal pronouns and the mitigation of criticism. These findings generally confirm much research into qualities of effective feedback (Nichols & McFarlane 2006), however a tension emerged between stated student desire for clarity and the skill of staff in "valuing student performance and enacting tenor: power and solidarity" (Martin 2009:13). This research sheds light on the means by which relationships are signalled through evaluative text. It adds to previous research on evaluation (Hunston 2011, Martin & White 2005, Hyland and Tse 2004) and explores the relationship between the interpersonal and evaluative, in particular student sensitivity to framing of criticism. A deeper understanding of the nature of this relationship and patterns in student readings of these may help inform the way staff communicate feedback.
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The bulk of research on written corrective feedback has explored the feedback practices for novice second language (L2) writers. As the number of graduate students in English-medium universities has increased in the last 25 years, the focus of written feedback research has shifted from studies on the writings of language learners to studies on the writings of graduate students. In an attempt to address this area in the literature, this study investigates electronic written feedback provided to graduate students during their master’s thesis and doctoral dissertation writing stages. The study specifically focuses on the linguistic features of feedback provided on graduate students’ writing and how such feedback is constructed throughout the writing process. To investigate this issue, a small corpus of feedback (previously) given to MA and PhD students in an ELT department was created. In addition, a subset of graduate students was asked to complete a brief survey on their expectations/experiences of electronic feedback provided to them during their thesis writing processes. The feedback data were then compared with graduate student surveys in an attempt to highlight possible differences between student expectations and electronic written feedback practices. The results suggest that most of the electronic feedback provided at the graduate level writing were related to content and organization and feedback took the form of statements and imperatives. The analysis of student surveys revealed that graduate students felt more motivated to revise their writing when they received synchronous electronic feedback. Based on the results, implications for research on the interface between second language writing and computer assisted language learning will be discussed. The presentation will conclude with a discussion of what ways, if any, such implications might relate to only feedback practices at the graduate level.
In any writing pedagogy, an explicit understanding of rules can be undoubtedly useful, but this needs to be supplemented with an understanding of the rhetorical strategies that create a successful text for specific contexts and audiences. An awareness of the role of metadiscourse in developing an argument seems to be a key element, therefore, in improving L2 academic writing, and students need to be encouraged to see writing as interactive, to understand reader expectations, and to engage with their readers appropriately if they are to achieve effective argumentation. As part of an ongoing practitioner inquiry, I propose that the elements of linking to prior experience/pointing forward and increasing prospectiveness from the interactional contingent level of Hammond and Gibbons’ (2005) scaffolding model can be realised through dialogic written commentary feedback, and thus potentially scaffold the high challenge task of argumentation. Such scaffolding through dialogic interactional feedback has the potential to raise consciousness of the interpersonal writer-reader relationship that is crucial to the internal development of argument in a written text, especially when it ‘bridges’ to classroom “rhetorical consciousness raising” (Swales, 1990, p. 213). Academic writing pedagogy “then becomes a process of raising students’ awareness of the functions of different metadiscourse forms, the choices that are available to them in given genres, and the consequences of making those choices in particular contexts” (K. Hyland, 2005a, p. 193). More precisely, firstly, I propose that dialogic written commentary feedback can help to bring a sense of a reader’s response to the text and of their ability to cohere the writer’s intended meaning in the development of the argument; and secondly, that by building on previous rhetorical consciousness raising classroom instruction in metadiscoursal use, written commentary feedback can also provide the bridging necessary to scaffold the changes required to help the student writer create a more interactive and dialogic argumentational text. This will be evidenced in examples from classroom metadiscoursal awareness activities and subsequent written commentary feedback as part of a dialogic feedback cycle.
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METADISCOURSE IN ELECTRONIC ADVERTISING: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TV AND RADIO COMMERCIALS

DEMET GUL, MERSIN UNIVERSITY, TURKEY

Metadiscourse- as defined by Hyland (2005, p.3)- is “a framework for understanding communication as social engagement. It illuminates some aspects of how we project ourselves into our discourses by signaling our attitude towards both the content and the audience of the text.”. It is obvious that many of the questions on metadiscourse focus on academic discourse (Mauranen, 1993; Hyland, 2001; Dahl, 2004; Hyland and Tse, 2004; Ådel, 2006; Aguilar, 2008; Cao and Hu, 2014; Andrusenko, 2015 and many others), print media (Bell, 1991; Dafouz-Milne, 2008, Kuhi & Mojood, 2014, Fuertes-Olivera et al. 2001 etc.), language in the classroom environment (Hyland, 1999; Thompson, 2003; Bernad-Mechó, 2015; Lee and Subtirelu, 2015 ) and language of advertising (Fuertes-Olivera et al. 2001; Wahl, 2014). As one of the means of social communication involving “personalities, attitudes and assumptions of those who are communicating” (Hyland, 2005: 3), advertising makes one of the most interesting subject matters to study metadiscourse. As for the studies of language of advertising (specifically electronic advertising within the limits of this study) TV commercials seem to be a popular topic for metadiscourse studies (Meinhof, 2004, Dastjerdi, 2014). It is easy to understand the reasons why: TV commercials are extremely frequent (almost 7/24, almost everywhere), easy to broadcast, easy to reach (for the consumers), easy to understand, use most important available channels: vision, sound, language (i.e. they appeal to both ears and the eyes). Radio commercials and commercial on the web are less frequently studied versions of electronic advertising. Web commercials are relatively recent; therefore, it is easy to foresee that many more studies will follow in the next few years. Radio commercials, on the other hand, are on since 1922. They existed much before TV commercials. However, the studies on the structure of radio commercials, or on any kind of radio shows seem to be embryotic (Wahl, 2014). Moreover, as far as our research shows, none of the studies that compare TV commercials and radio commercials are discussing the metadiscursive structures of the pair. Within the metadiscursive elements, we include the intonation patterns used in the commercials. Thompson (2003: 1) notes that “both metadiscourse and intonation are used by academic speakers to help an audience form a coherent ‘mental map’ of the overall talk and how its parts are interconnected.” Thus, we evaluate the intonation patterns of the commercials as relevant to the metalinguistic structure. Motivated by this fact, what we claim in this study is that TV commercials and radio commercials (focusing on the ones used in cross media advertising ) will differ in terms of the metadiscursive structures and strategies. To test the claim, we conduct the data analysis on 30 cross media advertising texts: 30 TV commercials and their radio versions.
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The study will follow a mixed approach. The quantitative analysis includes the analysis of interactive and interactional metadiscourse elements in statistical terms. A qualitative analysis will be conducted on the use of paralinguistic elements, on the other hand. ELAN (EUDISTIC Linguistic Annotator) software is going to be used in order to analyze the TV commercial texts. As for the radio versions of the commercials, we are going to use PRAAT to analyze the paralinguistic features of the recordings, such as voice quality or voice qualification, and intonation patterns. Within the limitations of this very study, we exclude web-based commercials, SMS advertising, e-mail marketing and the such, and, hopefully, keep them for another (many other) one(s). Needless to say, those versions of trade language will make any linguist curious.

DAY 3 - SESSION 8 - ROOM B-2

METADISCOURSE IN FILMS: THE EMPLOYMENT OF HEDGES AND BOOSTERS IN THE TURKISH COMEDY FILM RECEPT IVEDIK

CILER HATIPOGLU, MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, TURKEY

SUHAN OKTAY, HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY, TURKEY

It is believed that top rated/popular films represent the culture of the time they are made (Acland 2003). Through their dialogues, they also show the interactional expectations and rules of the societies where they are produced. The way the speakers present their opinions and distinguish them from facts or gossip, the way they argue or express authority, and the manner in which they address their audiences reveal subtle but at the same time pervasive cultural norms that differentiate one nation from the other (Dahl 2004; Millan 2008; Wu & Rubin 2000). The current study looks at one such film (i.e., Recep İvedik 1 directed by Togan Gökbakar) and aims to uncover how the main characters in the film employ hedges and boosters to construct and position speaker identities, and frame texts depending on their own and audiences’ needs and expectations. Using the CLAN CHILDES program the data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively, and patterns in the employment of the hedges and boosters were uncovered. In addition, contexts in which the use of metapragmatic tools follow cultural norms were identified and contrasted with situations where the uses of hedges and boosters deviate in various degrees from the expected patterns. The findings of the study reveal a number of the cultural preferences related to the employment of hedges and boosters in the Turkish culture but also show how and why patterns in broadcast discourse, in general, and comedy films, in particular, could deviate from the expected cultural norms.
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The central aim of this study is to attempt to take a preliminary step towards broadening the scope of ‘metadiscourse’ and reinforce its explanatory agenda through the evidence from conversational storytelling. Conversational storytelling is a part of everyday conversations and can be performed in conversations as spontaneous and interactional achievements of (the) teller(s) and (the) listener(s) (Ochs and Capps, 2001; Schegloff, 1986). Culturally shared narratives which are the anonymous stories learnt from the social environment and do not belong to any specific person (Schank, 1990, pp. 29-40) are also an object of storytelling in everyday conversations. However, introducing them to the recipients in the flowing talk has some peculiarities in terms of the internal structures of the stories. Here, the present study endeavours to illustrate how culturally shared conversational narratives can be introduced in talk-in-interaction by referring to a specific set of interpersonal options (Hyland, 2004; 2005), the tellers’ organisation of discourse and the textual implications of what is being talked (Hyland, 2015). The analysis of the conversational data which comes from the audio recordings of 11 different conversations (with a duration of ten hours and eight minutes in total) has based on the interpersonal model of metadiscourse (Hyland, 2004; 2005; Hyland & Tse, 2004) and it has imported the methodological tools from the General Theory of Verbal Humor (Attardo, 1994; 2001; 2003) and Narrative Analysis of Labov and Waletzky (1967). It is shown by the analysis that the ‘punch line’ of the stories may be given as the introductory part of the culturally shared narratives and this introduction serves as an ‘Abstract’ which gives signals about the coming narrative, makes the audience ready for the narration and creates a chance for the recipients to participate to the telling activity. In the course of storytelling, by the tellers, the recipients are predominantly expected to know the prospective story if it is a culturally shared one. Henceforth, culturally shared narratives provide the individuals of a community with a familiarity and it is therefore suggested that this familiarity mostly signalled by the introductory parts is also convenient for a co-narration (collaborative storytelling) by allowing participants to modulate rapport and demonstrate group membership (Norrick 1997, p. 199).
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Over the decades, Hedging and Modality have been discussed by linguists and researchers as a basic concept in English for academic purposes. There have been many studies conducted, of which purpose is to discuss hedging and modality as they are used in foreign contexts. Few of them have been conducted so as to understand their roles, functions and forms as they apply to academic writings in the Kurdish universities’ English context. This study investigates the importance of using hedging and modality in academic discourse. It also explores how modality and hedging have been taught, and to what extent students are aware of the appropriate use of hedging and modality in their writing. With regards to data analysis and collection, the qualitative method was used for creating the research paradigm. The results from literature review and data analysis show that Kurdish students are not conscious of the use of hedging and modality as it is significant for L2 learners. The findings also revealed that students were taught modal auxiliary verbs and adverbs explicitly. This paper suggests that teaching hedging and modality by using inductive examples, and by focusing on forms and functions will help Kurdish learners to distinguish themselves by using more boosters and tentative language in their academic discourse.
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Scholars have argued that disciplinary discourse, linguistic features and epistemology vary across disciplines, contexts, as well as genres. In this paper, we investigate what stance linguistic features accounting PhD authors use in Bayero University Kano and what factors might constrain their use. Baynham (2001) has argued there are three perspectives on the study of academic writing, a skills-based perspective, a text-based perspective and a practice-based perspective. In this paper we draw primarily on a text-based analysis but complement this with a consideration of institutional and disciplinary factors which might explain why the writers investigated write as they do. The study combines text analysis using a corpus methodology and contextual information on the institutional and disciplinary context within which the students are writing. We employ nine participants: six accounting PhD authors and three accounting PhD supervisors. We compile a corpus of six accounting PhD theses from Bayero University, Kano (BUK corpus), as well as two other accounting sub-corpora written by native speakers of English in the same discipline of accounting for comparative analysis with the BUK corpus: a thesis of accounting PhD thesis (UK corpus); and a corpus of eleven journal articles of accounting (JAA corpus). The corpus analysis shows that all the three corpora frequently use hedges with a higher frequency than the other stance linguistic features categories, followed by boosters, then attitudinal markers, and explicit self-mention features. However, the chi-square results show that the differences among the three corpora use of stance linguistic features are not significant. The contextual data suggests that several factors might have constrained the accounting PhD authors’ use of stance linguistic features, such as a lack of teaching of EAP/ESP to the postgraduate students. We finish by advocating more broadly a genre-sensitive, functional approach to the teaching of academic writing which would include explicit teaching of stance linguistic features for example by using concordance software. Learners could in this way explore a wide range of stance linguistic features, and could see and analyse the text looking at the context. We conclude by emphasizing the value of raising the awareness of both teachers and students regarding the use of stance linguistic features in their academic writing.
The abundant use of metadiscoursive strategies is a typical feature of academic writing for two reasons (Hyland 2005; Feilke 2010): first, the scientific discourse requires that any academic text – probably more so than texts of any other genre – is required to make transparent under what conditions it was generated (Feilke 2010, pp. 6-7), for example, how the writer positions his research in the research field, what methods he used, but also how he is going to present his project and results. Second, academic writing is not about presenting facts but rather about presenting „extra-factual, extra-logical arguments concerned with probabilities rather than facts“ and is therefore a “particular form of persuasion” which requires metadiscoursive strategies (Hyland 2005, p. 66).

Metadiscoursive strategies are often realised by routine expressions, i.e. recurrent lexical patterns, also called academic formulas, such as multi-word units, bundles or collocations (cf. Simpson-Vlach & Ellis 2010; Hyland 2008). For example, routine expressions are used to refer to the text at hand such as in this paper or in the present study. Metadiscoursive routines are an indication of a certain register or genre, as has been shown for routines in general by Biber (2006) and Hyland (2008). For students confronted with academic writing for the first time, it can be quite challenging not only to handle content matters appropriately, but also to master form and function of genre specific metadiscoursive strategies. The aim of this paper is to investigate how students are aware of and make use of metadiscoursive routines in German academic writing. The first part of the study investigated how and to what extent freshmen of German Studies use metadiscoursive routines in their first student papers when writing in their native language. To this end, a corpus of 100 papers of freshmen of the University of Basel was compiled and analysed by corpus-linguistic methods (Hyland 2008, Bondi 2010, Römer & Wulff 2010) as well as genre-analytical methods (Swales 1990, Hyland 2005) in regard to two research questions: Which metadiscoursive functions are realised? And which routines are applied to realise these metadiscoursive functions? The second part of the study is dedicated to student’s awareness of metadiscoursive strategies in academic writing. 20 students (1st year, L1, German Studies at the University of Basel) were shown various types of introductions to research articles and asked about the meaning and function of certain paragraphs which contained metadiscoursive routines, e.g. evaluative formulas such as zu kritisieren gibt es an X Y (‘X must best criticized in regard to Y’), X stellt eine Forschungslücke dar (‘X constitutes a research gap’). Preliminary results show that student’s academic writing is still shaped by the conception of writing as either the expression of a personal interest or as textbook writing (cf. Hyland 2005, p. 101) rather than by the idea of writing as shaping and generating knowledge or connecting to a research community.
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Numerous studies have, over the years, confirmed that academic discourses have unique features revolving around the concept of ‘community’ (Hartley 2006; Hyland 1998a, 2001, 2004a; Swales 2004; Thompson 2001), revealing that authors belonging to different disciplinary fields display different writing techniques and are urged early on in their academic career to conform to discipline-specific conventions and genre-specific rules. Continuing a cross-disciplinary research on the academic poster genre (D’Angelo 2016), I seek here to highlight significant differences, in terms of word count, portrait/landscape orientation and layout of posters, as well as discipline-specific patterns for what concerns the use of textual interactive and interactional metadiscourse resources and visual interactive resources. The framework of analysis, drawn in part from Kress (2010) and Kress and van Leeuwen’s (2001, 2002, 2006) visual analyses, will be applied to different disciplines such as Applied Linguistics, Medicine, Economics, Engineering, Biology and Geography. The results widen the current knowledge on academic poster presentations by mapping which textual and visual metadiscourse strategies are employed where and why, and as a consequence, which textual and visual metadiscourse strategies should be well known to poster authors, depending on their academic community.
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As time goes by, it is believed that novel writers can demonstrate a mastery of using appropriate discipline-specific conventions in their writing to communicate with their target disciplines, making themselves as one of the expert writers for their own fields of study. Such writing journey is the point of the investigation for the current study. This study looked into the development of the undergraduate students’ use of metadiscourse features across their studies especially within a particular field, civil engineering in this case. Two corpora of civil engineering writing were created: (1) a corpus of early writing including the assignments (such as laboratory reports and site-visit reports) produced by novice writers, such as first-, second-, and third-year undergraduate students; (2) a corpus of advanced writing including the dissertations and published research articles written by expert writers, such as master and doctoral postgraduates and article writers. Both corpora were produced by Chinese second language (L2) writers, and then analysed through the interpersonal metadiscourse model formulated by Hyland and Tse (2004) and Hyland (2005, 2010) with the help of Wordsmith Tool 6.0. By studying the use of metadiscourse features in the corpus of advanced writing, it was possible to reveal some specificities in civil engineering. One of them was the frequent use of endophoric markers, which is in line with Hyland (2005, 2010)’s studies by suggesting the multi-modal character in engineering writing. Thus, this metadiscourse feature can be classified as one of the disciplinary norms in engineering writing. Such frequent use of endophoric markers was also revealed in the corpus of early writing, whose frequency of use increased the most from the first- to third-year assignments. This can be regarded as a positive development in the use of metadiscourse features, especially if the frequent use of endophoric markers was considered as one of the civil engineering norms by studying the corpus of advanced writing and drawing upon the previous results on the use of metadiscourse in research article writing in civil engineering. To conclude, this study can be considered to make a contribution by identifying some possible metadiscourse features used in civil engineering writing, and may shed new light on the design of English for Civil Engineering courses at undergraduate level.
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Given the significance of metadiscourse in written communication (Crismore, Markkannen & Steffensen, 1993; Jiang & Hyland, 2016; Zhang, 2016), the aim of the present research is to compare the use of metadiscourse devices in high-and low-rated undergraduate essays written by Turkish EFL university students. Although the students received a formal instruction on writing during the academic year, they have not been provided with any information on the concept of metadiscourse to increase the level of authenticity in relation to such linguistic elements allowing writers to achieve various textual and authorial roles. The motivation behind our study is to see whether there is a difference in the quality and selection of particular interactive and interactional resources in successful and less successful essays as a relatively under-researched genre. The data consisted of 75 high-rated and 75 low-rated argumentative essays from TUWE corpus (Turkish Undergraduate Writers of English), totalling approximately 120,000 words and will be analysed based on Hyland’s interactive and interactional metadiscourse framework (Hyland, 2005). It is noteworthy that most of the studies on metadiscourse tended to be based on textual analysis. For the validity of our study, we employed both qualitative and quantitative methods. Following the quantitative analyses of the essays, we carried out a semi-structured interview among randomly selected undergraduate students (5 from each group) to explore the awareness of learners related to metadiscourse while writing in the target language. The findings are anticipated to be applied in teaching writing to undergraduate writers in L2 and contribute to the theories of learner language in the mainstream classrooms.
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The metadiscourse of discourse markers has been extensively studied (Maschler 1994, Torres 2002, Verdonik, Rojc and Stabej 2007), but no major metadiscourse studies of Vietnamese discourse markers have ever been conducted. The present paper fills this gap by presenting a substantial conversation corpus of Vietnamese speakers, by presenting a new, metadiscourse-based methodology of defining discourse markers, and by concluding with further insight into the relationship between the metadiscourse and the selection of discourse markers. The study includes 30 recordings of 5-10 minute naturalistic conversations between native Hanoian Vietnamese speakers of both genders, ages 19-57. Using this data, I focused on the language by looking at its Discourse Markers. I found that Discourse Markers are inextricably bound to metadiscourse, but in Vietnamese that metadiscourse is more overt than in other languages. By dividing the identified markers by intended usage, I clarify the definition of Discourse Markers into two different types: Discourse Linkers and Discourse Particles. Nhĩ is an example of a Discourse Particle, as in (1).

(1) Conversation 4:C

B: Cũng lắng ngình nhĩ. Also complicated DM That sounds complicated.

Based on Wierzbicka’s (1999) universal semantic metalanguage, I created a descriptive template to identify these markers through the amalgamation of contexts in which they can be used. As nhĩ can also be used in other contexts, it would be defined by my proposed template as possessing the following discourse-contextual features:

- Discourse Particle
- Intonation Unit-Final
- Semi-rhetorical or rhetorical interrogative
- Indicative mood
- Scope over directly preceding word
- Feeling confirmation
- Decreased Psychological Distance
- Neutral politeness
- Turn-holding Opening device

In this paper, I theorize how metalinguistics provides a key to reformulating descriptions of Discourse Markers, and present a case for metadiscourse-based selection hierarchies. Maschler describes this hierarchy when he states: “[u]tterances, lingual or metalingual, are always simultaneously constrained by...contextual realms; but often we find that, for a particular utterance, constraints of one particular realm are more pronounced than others” (Maschler 1994:238). Using the proposed template to look at these metalinguistic attributes of a marker can help further understand this hierarchy.
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A CROSS-CULTURAL INVESTIGATION OF CODE GLOSSES IN ACADEMIC WRITING

HUSEYIN KAFES, AKDENIZ UNIVERSITY, TURKEY
MUSTAFA CANER, AKDENIZ UNIVERSITY, TURKEY

Drawing on the interactional and interactive functions of meta-discourse in academic writing, this corpus-based qualitative study aims to investigate how academic writers from different cultural backgrounds elaborate prepositional meanings. It examines the use of code glosses in the research articles, published between 2000-2015 and written by Turkish and American academic writers. The data of the study come from randomly selected corpus of 100 research articles from the field of English Language Teaching, 50 by Turkish academic writers, 50 by American academic writers. The corpus was analyzed and all instances of code glosses were noted and recorded manually by the researcher. The frequency of code gloss use by both groups were counted and analyzed. The results of the analysis have shown that American academic writers use more code glosses than their Turkish counterparts to elaborate prepositional meanings. This study may have pedagogical implications for Turkish academic writers, especially novice writers as well as academic writing instructors.
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Stance and voice has been exploited through the use of personal metadiscourse in general and first person pronoun ‘I’ in particular by several discourse analysts (Hyland & Guinda, 2012; Adel, 2006 and Shehzad, 2007). These analyses have revealed displaying façade of ‘self’ grounded into several voices including footing, positioning, personal stamp, signature, observers, critics, participants, recounters, academic arguer and interpreters and several more (Hyland, 2012). Theories of metadiscourse and Systemic Functional Linguistics along with some other dovetailing with broader scope of semantics, pragmatics, and contrastive analysis, have produced robust exegeses in this intellectual enterprise of self-display. However, the larger contextual diversity of a discourse community demands more attention on analyzing discourse of self-mention. After having this realization we explored discourse functions of the first person pronoun ‘I’ in Pakistani research discoursers of social sciences. Twenty articles each from the disciplines of Education, English Studies (linguists and literature) and History were analyzed by following the Adel’s (2006) framework of personal metadiscourse which is based on Jakobsonian functions of metadiscourse, i.e. code/text, the writer and the reader. 45 instances of self-mention through the use of ‘I’ was found rendering to different discourse functions. In addition to discourse functions identified by Adel, some more discourse functions were explored by us. These discourse functions are contextualization of the writer/researcher in methodological procedures, Stance I and Focusing on aim/goal of the study.
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Since the early development of interest in the interpersonal dimensions of academic communication in the 1980s, the analytic potentials of the concept of metadiscourse have motivated a large number of investigations. Although these analytic potentials have facilitated the study of diverse academic genres, there has always been a risk of detachment of textual analyses from the contextual origins and motivations. In some cases, this detachment has been so observable that the true discoursal nature of the interpersonal dimensions of academic communication has been reduced to classifications of a large number of pure textual properties. As a reaction to this reductionist trend, the present article provides a preliminary framework within which the contextual origins of metadiscourse features can be understood. It is suggested that if the findings of metadiscourse research are meant to be interpreted in meaningful ways, they should be contextualized within such process-oriented frameworks.