

INTERACTIONAL METADISCOURSE IN TURKISH POSTGRADUATES' ACADEMIC TEXTS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF HOW THEY INTRODUCE AND CONCLUDE

By

ERDEM AKBAS

Department of Education, University of York, United Kingdom.

ABSTRACT

This study explores interactional metadiscourse resources in master's dissertations (introductions and conclusions) of Turkish students written in Turkish and English. Interactional resources were identified according to Hyland and Tse's (2004) framework by using WordSmith Tools (5.0). A statistically significant difference between two groups of writers was found in their introductions in terms of overall five subcategories whereas their uses of interactional metadiscourse in conclusions were statistically insignificant. Further analysis showed that Turkish writers of English predominantly used hedges, attitude markers and self-mentions. It is interesting to note that Turkish writers, while writing in their mother tongue, tended to build a strong relationship with their target readers in both of the sections by employing approximately twice engagement markers compared to their peers writing in English.

Keywords: Metadiscourse, Academic Writing, Corpus, Contrastive Rhetoric.

INTRODUCTION

Metadiscourse

There have been increasingly high numbers of research studies carried out in the area of academic discourse analysis. This makes it a great deal easier for writers of any community to realise that the interchange of academic knowledge is thoroughly connected to the specific ways of the academic community to which the writers belong. In other words, the social practices of any community attract writers' attention to particular strategies for successful communication through texts. For researchers in this area, the notion of metadiscourse has been one of the most researched issues in order to identify community-based differences or culture/linguistic-bound uses of metadiscourse. Recent studies have shown that metadiscourse features are the essential component of academic writing with its priority and utilization to establish the dialogical aspect of a text for the interactions between writer, text and reader.

A very significant point in exploring metadiscourse has been to focus on definitions and classifications of potential resources as metadiscourse. There have been a variety of definitions and classifications of metadiscourse proposed by several researchers. Researchers who have produced

different typologies about the phenomenon could be chronologically listed: Vande Kopple (1985); Crismore (1985); Beauvais (1989); Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen (1993); Hyland (1998); Thompson (2001); Hyland and Tse (2004); Dahl (2004); Rahman (2004); Ifantidou (2005); Dafouz-Milne (2008); Burneikaité (2008). The importance of MD has been emphasised by many scholars. For instance, Kumpf (2000) illustrated the key functions of MD in understanding discourse as a whole by recommending that his readers remove a device in an example in the text resulting in an incoherent and less comprehensible discourse. Therefore, it is highly possible to deduce that making use of metadiscourse resources assists writers to achieve a cohesive and coherent text by connecting and relating individual propositions within text. A range of researchers with a consensus over the characteristic of originating writer-reader interaction in texts agreed on the effect of making interaction between language users and the text. For instance, Hyland and Tse (2004) highlighted the fact that metadiscourse has been regarded as the concept of putting together all the devices that writers make use of for the explicit organisation of their texts, reader engagement, and signalling attitudes towards the readers and the research itself. They offered a robust model of metadiscourse by reassessing the notion

and putting forward a range of key principles and analysing postgraduate students' texts. They named it the 'Interpersonal model of metadiscourse'. I shall refer to their model as the framework of the present study as such a well-rounded and complete model is in line with the purpose of my study. However, the study will be limited to 'interactional metadiscourse', that is, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mentions.

According to Abdollahzadeh (2011), metadiscourse produces a social engagement in which writers are aware of the fact that readers should find new information through their guidance and points of view. However, student writers who are new to any community may not be fully aware of the strategies used to achieve that engagement and consequent global comprehension. As Marandi (2003) stated, writing is obviously the unheeded skill that is given more importance at very late stages of acquiring any language. So students intending to take a step towards academia start being faced with problems while writing their dissertations to be confirmed by the experienced researchers (mostly by the markers) in their community. If they are writing in English as EFL writers, they are inclined towards tracing their own culture and mother tongue in accomplishing their task to explain their research by creating a dialogic space. Mostly, they may not be entirely conscious of the mode by which they are transferring their academic knowledge to their intended audiences. This issue becomes more noteworthy in contexts such as Turkey, where very little or maybe no formal L1 or L2 (English) instruction about how to write dissertations is given at university contexts. Most universities in Turkey have guidelines on how to write a dissertation but these are all about the structure and text formatting of the dissertation. This makes students more responsible for how to appeal to their readers and to insert themselves into their texts to clearly show their stance and engagement. Therefore, learners should focus on acquiring an awareness of when and how to use appropriate metadiscourse resources by reading literature in their fields and becoming more familiar with the language used. This has been raised in Akbas (2012) and suggested to be a learners' awareness of making them harmonised with the target language use from similar texts. In other words, in case of absence or

insufficient dissertation writing instruction, learners might need to accomplish developing their autonomous skills in producing such an academic text through observing/analysing others or recalling their past experiences for similar cases. In terms of the undisputable significance of English as the language of global scientific communities, writers of this language (L1 or L2) are supposed to be achieving discourse expectations and norms of the community of which they are members. In line with this, the argument by Connor (1996) highlights that non-native speakers of English, who are -to some extent-unaware of linguistic and cultural differences of English, could have trouble in introducing their particular work and getting approved by the global stream of academia. This could be the referees in a journal's system of review process or examiners/markers of a dissertation to evaluate the academic work in order to let it gain credibility. As the current study is looking at successfully completed master's dissertations, which were already evaluated by the markers and agreed to give the proper academic degree or title to the owner of the study, it is supposed that the language and style used is appropriate enough to pass the marking process as well as the value of the study itself.

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to find out how Turkish student writers as novice members of the community to which they belong engage their readers and establish interactional relations in the genre of dissertations in the social sciences. This will make it clear to see how close or how different Turkish students are in producing suitable texts although the language changes. Not only do they need to persuade their examiners to accept their claims or ideas but they also need to create an interaction through which readers could easily understand what kind of stance the student writer possesses and is standing up for. In addition, it shall be describing the patterns and frequencies of interactional metadiscourse resources and comparing how they are used. By comparing the types and frequencies of the resources, it is hoped that it is going to become clearer whether Turkish students writing in English are following the rhetorical choices used in their own culture and language while producing their dissertations. As there is not much

information about metadiscourse in Turkish and how it is used by Turkish student writers, the study will be exploratory, thus I shall not be able to compare the results with other studies.

Research Questions

As Kaplan (1966) suggested, it is widely known that L2 students writers tend to follow the rhetorical forms and strategies commonly used in their mother tongues. To make the validity of this suggestion updated for the selected context, this study explore whether non-native English writers (Turkish) follow Turkish writers in terms of interactional metadiscourse. The study is aimed at answering the following research questions

- What are the frequencies and forms of interactional metadiscourse operated in the introduction and conclusion sections of master's dissertations written by Turkish writers?
- Is it evident that Turkish writers of English share the similar use of interactional metadiscourse with Turkish writers in order to claim that they are following Turkish rhetoric?

Methodology

The present study focuses on two parts of master's dissertations (introduction and conclusion) written in Turkish and English by Turkish students in the social sciences. The data used for the study consisted of 25 dissertations per group (L1 and L2) and was retrieved from the Turkish National Thesis Centre (<http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/>) randomly. The required sections of dissertations were taken by splitting pdf files. However, there were three conclusions missing from English dissertations, and two introductions and three conclusions in Turkish dissertations were not found in the randomly selected corpora. Thus, although the analyses were intended to be based on 25 introductions and 25 conclusions per group, I had to limit the analyses to 23 introductions and 22 conclusions for the Turkish corpus, and 25 introductions and 22 conclusions for the English corpus. The number of words in the corpora was calculated.

The Turkish introduction sections contained 64,000 words whereas the English introductions contained a total of 70,000 words. For the conclusion sections, the Turkish corpus had 22,000 words compared with considerably

longer conclusions in the English corpus, with 40,000 words. Thus, the total corpus size was 196,000 words. The quantitative analysis was carried out using Wordsmith Tools (5.0) to identify the 'candidate' metadiscourse resources. After quantitative analysis, all of the instances in the two languages were carefully and qualitatively examined in order that the 'candidate' items could be confirmed as potentially functioning as metadiscourse but were not in the non-metadiscoursal category. The next step was to run a Chi-square analysis to see whether the differences were statistically significant or not.

Results and Discussion

The analysis of the introduction and conclusion sections of 25 randomly selected dissertations per language group showed that there was a great difference among the use of interactional resources in the Turkish students' writing. The quantitative analysis revealed the amount of resources employed across the two languages by Turkish writers and their statistical differences (Table 1). As can clearly be seen, overall, EC writers used considerably more interactional resources in both sections (36.73% of the texts vs. 28.76% of the texts). However, the difference between the two sub-corpora in the conclusion section was not statistically significant (0.383) whereas a statistically significant difference (0.625) was observed in terms of all the interactional resources between the two groups of writers in the Introduction sections of their dissertations. For the particular interactional resources employed by Turkish writers in both of the sections included in the study, hedges, attitude markers and self-mentions were more frequently used by EC writers whereas TC writers made use of engagement markers almost twice as often. The use of boosters in Turkish introduction sections was nearly

	Introductions (per 1000 words)			Conclusions (per 1000 words)		
	TC	EC	Chi Square	TC	EC	Chi Square
Hedges	8.60	13.81	*1.211	8.90	20.95	*4.860
Boosters	3.25	4.32	0.151	12.50	7.75	*1.114
Attitude M.	5.14	6.70	0.206	7.86	9.80	0.213
Engagement M.	7.12	3.44	*1.282	9.45	4.90	*1.443
Selfmentions	0.60	1.65	0.49	1.59	2.65	0.319
Total	24.11	29.92	*0.625	40.30	46.05	0.383

Critical Level: 0.455P<0.5* Significant

Table 1. The Number of Interactional Metadiscourse used across two groups of Turkish writers in Introduction and Conclusion

quadrupled in the conclusions. Similarly, there was an increase in the use of boosters in the English conclusion sections compared with those used in the introductions. One of the similarities between Turkish writers was in the use of hedging resources (30.1 of all resources in TC; 44.6% of all resources in EC) found to be prioritized in both of the languages and both of the sections. The two sections which follow will present the results and a discussion in terms of the sections versus the languages.

Metadiscourse in Introductions

As Table 1 shows, the most salient resource was hedges in the texts of both groups of writers. Turkish writers of English generally preferred modals and particular verbs (such as claim, appear, argue, indicate, tend to and so on) to hedge. The modals employed by them constituted 31% of all hedges whereas those particular verbs were used slightly less than modals (24% of all hedges). In terms of the modals, when EC writers were seeking for acceptance for their claims in their introductions, they reduced the force of their claims by employing 'may' and 'can' as the most commonly-used hedging devices. Full verbs, as an even more common component of hedging in the selected texts, were employed to introduce other researchers' ideas and claims taken from other sources. In addition, some full verbs, such as seem, indicate, appear, were used by Turkish writers of English to show that what was being said was tentative as it included the judgements of other writers. However, TC writers made use of such full verbs less than their peers. In other words, Turkish writers used comparatively less tentative (*görülmektedir* [it seems], *söylenmektedir* [it is said that]) and non-factive reporting verbs (*ortayaatmıştır* [X claims], *savunmaktadır* [X argues], *ileri sürmektedir* [X claims]) to express what they were reporting from other sources or their own judge mental statements about the idea being reported. The use of a specific hedging suffix in Turkish (-ebil/-abilmek) was found to be employed by TC writers either for reducing the validity of truth to gain acceptance or for expressing the degree of epistemic possibility. As this particular suffix is always added to the main verb of a sentence, the instances in which writers were making their own claims with some full verbs (such as *ileri sürmek*, *savunmak*) mostly appeared with a

hedging suffix in a passive construction without disclosing their presence. Turkish writers also tended to hedge by employing greater use of adverbs to tone down the propositions they produced, for instance, '*büyük ölçüde* [to a great degree/almost]', to limit the value given by the writer or the accomplishment of the action mentioned to some extent.

In the examination of the booster in the introduction sections of Turkish writers' texts, the level of being certain was found to occur very frequently. Both groups of writers operated boosters to persuade their readers about the extent to which they were certain about the proposition being presented. The instances were mostly about what their research might contribute to their fields in a way that showed that they wanted to highlight the importance of why the research had been carried out and why the readers should continue reading. There was slightly less use of boosters in Turkish introduction sections compared to the EC writers, although this has not been confirmed as a statistically significant difference (0.151). The examples given below clearly demonstrate writers full of commitment to their readers and how they let them discover the contribution of their research.

'..bilgisayar oyunlarının saldırganlık eğilimine etkisinin belirlenmesi özellikle ailelere ve eğitimcilere bu konuda nasıl davranmaları gerektiği konusunda önemli katkılar sunacaktır. [...determining the effect of computer games over the tendency of aggression will considerably contribute towards...]

'..gibi konuların araştırılması öğrencilere etkili öğrenme alışkanlıkları kazandırmada yol gösterici olacaktır. [Exploring such issues will help students in...]

'Dil öğretimine şüphesiz ki verileri ve geliştirdiği kuramlarıyla katkı sağlar.[...contributes to language teaching undoubtedly with the data and theories.]

'Therefore, the study will contribute to the theoretical description of Turkish.'

'If a country seeks ways to improve its adult education, without doubt it must enhance its educational quality by considering all dimensions.'

Three of the most common attitude marker

functions found in the analysis of EC introductions were emphasising the importance of the propositions ('more significantly'), presenting obligations (X is 'inevitable', it is 'necessary'), and making readers aware of disappointment ('unfortunately') which writers had towards the ideas discussed. Explicit judgement values (positive or negative) of TC writers were commonly found in their Introductions by the employment of a range of adjectives as the main predicate of sentences (önemlidir [it is vital], sınırlıdır [it is limited], yeterlidir [it is adequate], çarpıcıdır [it is striking]) to describe what they felt towards their research/topic or their readers. The examples below show Turkish writers' explicit use of judgement values.

'Yurtdışında konu ile ilgili yapılan araştırma sonuçları ise çelişkilidir. [The results of the studies carried out abroad are contradictory.]'

'..Dersin özelliklerine uygun biçimde birtakım geliştirme çalışmalarına bağımlı tutulması doğaldır. [..it is natural/unsophisticated keeping it dependant to development activities in accordance with characteristics of the course.]'

Use of explicit attitude markers to express the extent to which writers wanted their intended audiences to perceive the proposition as an obligation was moderately frequent in TC introductions. Turkish writers not only used an obligation suffix (-meli,malı) but also again employed an adjective (gerekli) or the verb for necessity (gerekir) to describe their attitudes to add another angle to the interaction which they hoped to establish between themselves and their target readers within their texts. This kind of attitude marker makes writers express their judgements as they seek to position themselves in the argument in order to make it less disputable.

To build solidarity with the intended audience, Turkish writers of Turkish employed engagement markers more significantly than Turkish writers of English. According to the results of the Chi-Square tests, a statistically significant difference was obtained (1.282). The quantity of engagement markers in the introductions of TC writers constituted 28.7% of all interactional resources whereas it was 11.4% of all interactional resources detected in the introductions of EC writers. EC writers tended to address their

readers with an occasional strategy of addressing them directly ('you'). Although recognition of target readers by addressing them directly using second-person reader pronouns was not found in TC introductions, 54.7% of the engagement markers found in TC texts was about calling readers' attention by employing first person plural pronouns. By equating themselves with their readers in that way, Turkish writers pulled their audiences along with the arguments they wanted to create. This strategy enables readers to focus on what is being said as the writers are introducing something by including readers in their thinking and referring to 'our'. Some of the frequent examples of this were *günümüzde, kültürümüz, ülkemiz, değerlerimiz, sistemimiz, tarihimiz*, and so on. On the other hand, EC writers used the inclusive 'we' significantly less than their peers, and it constituted 23% of the engagement markers used in EC writers' introductions. Another way of drawing the attention of the intended audience might be asking rhetorical questions. By putting questions into texts without presenting an answer which is intended to be taken into consideration by the intended audience, EC writers accomplished including the reader as a discourse participant and requiring their audiences to think about those no-answer-needed questions.

One of the most common uses of self-mentions in the introductions of both corpora was the employment of first person pronouns to inform readers about their presence as the researcher of their studies. Although there was no statistically significant difference in Turkish writers' use of self-mentions, the devices they mostly used were really different. It is therefore interesting to note that all of the dissertations were researched by single researchers, however in contrast to what might therefore be expected, there was no occurrence of first person singular pronouns in the TC texts compared with the frequently used 'I'-based pronouns (85 times, 73.2% of self-mentions) in the EC introductions. All of the occurrences in TC texts (43 times) were 'we'-based pronouns used when writers were explicitly referring to themselves to establish their presence in the texts as the researcher, writer or arguer of the texts.

Metadiscourse in Conclusions

Turning back to Table 1, as can clearly be seen, the overall

difference between the five subcategories is not statistically significant. However, different numbers of uses among hedges, boosters and engagement markers makes the differences statistically significant. In other words, the differences between the use of attitude markers and the use of self-mentions between the two groups of writers are statistically insignificant. The dissertations were opened by the introduction sections in which different amounts of interactional resources were employed and were closed by the conclusion sections which were found to be richer in terms of interactional metadiscourse. Although conclusion sections were shorter compared with the introductions of Turkish writers, the number of devices was fairly intense in both groups (53% more for EC writers and 60% more for TC writers).

Turkish writers of English employed greater numbers of hedging resources in their conclusion sections than TC writers by making frequent use of lexical items such as 'it can be said that', 'it can be concluded that', 'it can be deduced that', 'it can be speculated that', 'it can be argued that'. This shows that while making a closure for the entire research, writers wanted their readers to find possible interpretations after labelling them so explicitly, and looked for their approval by employing intensive hedging resources. In addition to the use of 'can' in those lexical bundles, EC writers operated 'can' (32% of the modal hedges and 14% of all hedges) to tone down their commitment towards the claim they were introducing to their intended audience. 'May', known to be the strongest hedging device, had the highest frequency in the conclusion sections of EC writers, with 141 hits. Turning back to TC writers, the analysis showed that they were less prudent than the other group. As the conclusion section plays an important role in covering and summarising the main points of the complete research, TC writers attentively presented and repeated what they had done and claimed in previous sections to get the approval of their target readers. To do that, they mostly employed full verbs such as 'çalışılmıştır' (meaning that it is now the readers' decision to accept whether the writer has accomplished revealing the points in the sentences in which that verb is used). Compared with high use of modal hedges in EC texts, TC writers used '-ebil/-abilmek' from time to time to

reduce the force which they put on their propositions.

After the analysis of the use of boosters in the conclusion sections of the two groups of writers, I came up with a very interesting result which was also statistically significant comparing the two languages. The boosters used by TC writers were 30% more than the amount those writers used as hedging resources in their conclusions. It was surprising that TC writers more or less wanted to be seen as more assertive in their conclusions. Some of the devices they mostly used were full verbs referring to what their results showed (göstermiştir, ortayaçıkmiştir) or what their research proved (kanıtlamıştır, bulunmuştur). In addition, they tended to show clearly the main points of their research findings suggesting future investigations with complete commitment. The examples given below clearly exemplify their commitment:

'Türkiye için; sosyal devlet, bölgesel eşitsizliklerinin ve gelir dağılımındaki dengesizliğin giderilmesi, etkili istihdam politikaları kavramları ön plana çıkacaktır. [For Turkey, the concepts such as the social state, regional inequalities and imbalance in income distribution will come into prominence.]'

'Öğrencilerin disiplin sorununun az olması ve dersin verimli geçmesi öğretmenin işinden aldığı doyumunu arttıracaktır. [Having less discipline problems of students and productive courses will increase the job satisfaction level of the teacher.]'

Turkish writers of English, on the other hand, were found to be less assertive in their conclusions although they employed more boosters compared with their introductions. One of the most common strategies by which they reinforced the truth of their propositions was employing lexical bundles such as 'the fact that', 'it is evident that', 'it is clearly seen that', and so on. What EC writers also boosted was the findings of their research and what they proved, as TC writers did. The examples below illustrate this:

'The thesis has proved that students are so interested in folk tales.'

'The overall finding of this case study reveals that although the teachers are aware of the importance of the role and place of the native cultures in the classroom.' It was found

that both groups of writers employed attitude markers in their conclusions considerably more frequently compared with their introductions. This strategy was an inevitable indication of expressing their attitudes towards what they are talking about in terms of their overall findings and complete research while bringing it to an end. The proportion of attitude markers used in EC texts to guide the intended audience was around 22% of the all interactional resources in the conclusion sections. However, it was slightly and insignificantly less in TC conclusions (19.5% of all). Although EC writers mostly presented their affective values while inserting the limitations of their research and points which had failed to be answered into their conclusions, this was not so common in Turkish conclusions, except for a few incidences. Some of the devices used in English conclusions while adding their negative judgemental values to their propositions included items such as 'limited to', 'lack of', 'fail', whereas they used a range of expressions (for example, X is 'compatible with', 'in congruence with', 'similar to', X 'supports') to show the congruency of their research which they felt towards the results in the existing literature. TC writers tended to draw their target readers' attention to the points they regarded as striking (*dikkat çekici*) or important (*önemli*) in order to maximise readers' interpretation to the wanted level by expressing their clear affective. That is also a way of guiding intended readers to figure out what point of view writers have. It is quite important in establishing engagement in academic writing and brings a little bit of subjectivity to academic writing from the writer's point of view.

There was a statistically significant difference between the frequencies of engagement markers in the conclusions of the sub-corpora. As can clearly be seen in Table 1, the forms for anticipating their readers, therefore, were more intensively employed in TC conclusions. Nevertheless, compared with the findings of engagement markers in the introduction sections, there was still high use of the inclusive 'we' to invite target readers explicitly to interact with what writers had said by making readers and themselves parallel discourse participants and stressing the relationship between them. It was found that imperative forms and the reader pronoun 'you' to guide target readers were not favoured by both groups of writers in their conclusions.

Instead, they positioned themselves and the discourse participants to approximately the same extent (53% for TC texts and 52% for EC texts of engagement markers) to the points they considered as obligations not only for carrying out future work but also suggesting their solutions in order that the problems identified during their research could be solved.

The exclusive 'we' was the most salient self-mention used in the conclusions of both of the sub-corpora. It was used 35 times (97% of all self mentions) in TC texts and EC writers preferred it twice as frequent as 'I' (33% of all self mentions) in the conclusion sections. It is interesting to note that there was only one incidence of the first person singular pronoun employed as a self-mention in a TC conclusion. The writer on that occasion explicitly expressed that s/he hoped that the study would fill the gap to a certain extent, using a suffix belonging to first person singular pronouns in Turkish as shown below.

'Bu çalışmanın, eksikliği bir nebze de olsa kapatacağı kanısındayım.[I believe that this study would fill the gap to some extent.]'

On the other hand, the rest of the self-mentions in the EC conclusions identified were mostly about cases in which the writers would like to be ostensibly seen as the researcher ('I provided', 'I investigated', 'I analysed') and the arguer ('I claimed', 'I suggested', 'I proposed') of the research. This suggests that EC writers exhibited a different rhetorical choice compared with writers who produced texts in their mother tongue, as the EC writers interchangeably employed 'I' and 'we' at different positions. Therefore, it was found that it is EC writers' choice whether to change their views from exclusive 'we' to 'I', although TC writers preferred to underline their presence by predominantly employing the exclusive 'we'.

Conclusion

This paper has made an attempt to compare the introduction and conclusion sections of dissertations written in Turkish and English by Turkish writers. The findings of the overall study suggest that the two groups of Turkish writers used interactional metadiscourse resources in their introductions with statistically significant differences whereas the differences found between writers were not

statistically significant for the employment of overall interactional metadiscourse. Why interactional resources in the introductions varied considerably might be linked to the fact that TC writers had a different style of introducing the topic and their research to the intended audience. They did want to establish and stress the relationship with their readers by operating more engagement markers and attempting to be less tentative while reporting important bits of the existing literature for their research. In contrast, EC writers made use of a considerable number of hedging devices to express their uncertainty and tentativeness when they started holding the ground for their research. Additionally, by referring to themselves more explicitly than TC writers (remember there was no instance of 'I'), Turkish writers of English made themselves more ostensible as researcher and arguer of the texts, using not only 'I' but also the exclusive 'we'.

For the interactional resources used in the conclusion sections of Turkish students' dissertations, it was found that EC writers preferred a style in which they would like to be more tentative and cautious with higher use of hedges; and less assertive. Therefore, the predominance of hedging resources with less use of boosters made them soften their claims to expect personal credibility and approval from the intended readers. In contrast, TC writers took over their authorial presences with considerably predominant use of boosters over hedges to project conviction. As a result, it is clearly shown that Turkish writers displayed totally different ways of revealing their stances as EC writers by following a style of scientific caution compared with the scientific assurance of TC writers. Another point that I would raise for the examination of interactional resources is the use of engagement markers. In spite of the fact that the EC writers conveyed interactional meanings by encouraging their readers explicitly to take part in the texts and engage with the investigation of the research, TC writers established a more engaging way of addressing their target readers to be included in the text.

In a study of three groups of student writers, what Akbas (2012) suggested for the Turkish novice writers were also confirmed in the current study. Limiting the study to

abstracts of postgraduates' academic texts, Akbas (2012) suggested that Turkish postgraduate writers follow a different convention than British writers. As Table 1 simply illustrates, Turkish L1 writers preferred to sound more confident while making some concluding remarks although they started with a comparatively more cautious way of introducing their study. This could mostly be related to the fact that they reach more concrete findings based on their data and analysis, which genuinely makes them feel confident enough to utter such remarks at a higher degree of certainty for the sake of persuading readers. In contrast, no matter how similar the introduction sections in terms of hedging and boosters, Turkish writers of English tend to follow strikingly different style in the closing phase of their actual study. Even though some boosted prepositions were still presented to highlight the bits they were far authoritative to claim, L2 writers seem to create their credibility by stressing their tentativeness in their conclusions as British writers do (pointed by Akbas, 2012). In terms of expressing authorial identity with explicit use of personal pronouns, Turkish L1 postgraduates did minimize their involvement in their discourse in both of the sections. Nevertheless, whenever possible they managed to enrich their involvement with exclusive use of we based pronouns (except one instance of first person singular pronoun) as the researcher, arguer or discourse participant. This was also salient in Turkish writers of English although they did not reduce their personal intrusion as low as their peers do and seem to bring their authorial identity and voice in front by employing first person singular pronouns. Such a difference could be attributed to the use of first person pronouns available to see in the texts written in English by experienced writers. As mentioned in the introduction, in case of absence or insufficient dissertation writing instruction, postgraduate students may acquire the use of strategic patterns from the academic texts they make use of in order to employ them autonomously in their own discourse.

To conclude, although there were a range of similarities, it is not yet clear to claim that Turkish student writers are tracing a particular rhetorical preference while writing their dissertations on the basis of the statistically significant differences identified above. To find answers to the

questions arising from this study, more research could be carried out, for instance, exploring at which points the interchangeable use of 'we' and 'I' occur in EC writers' texts. To explore more about Turkish students' academic writing, this might be a significant point of departure. In addition, to discover the effect of the English language, texts written by native English writers might also be included in a three-way comparative study for the selected sections.

Note: The earlier version of this paper has been presented at the 8th International METU Postgraduate Conference, Ankara, Turkey, 2011.

References

- [1]. Abdollahzadeh, E. (2011). Poring over the findings: Interpersonal authorial engagement in applied linguistics papers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(1), 288-297. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.019.
- [2]. Akbas, E. (2012). Exploring Metadiscourse in Master's Dissertation Abstracts: Cultural and Linguistic Variations across Postgraduate Writers. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 1(1), 12-16. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.1p.12>.
- [3]. Beauvais, P. (1989). A speech act theory of metadiscourse. *Written Communication*, 6(11), 11-29.
- [4]. Burneikaite, N. (2008). Metadiscourse in linguistics master's theses in English L1 and L2. *Kalbotyra*, 59(3), 38-47.
- [5]. Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-Cultural Aspects of Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: CUP
- [6]. Crismore, A. (1985). Metadiscourse in social studies texts (Technical Report No.336). Retrieved September 29, 2012 from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED275986.pdf>
- [7]. Crismore, A. Markkanen, R. & Steffensen M.S. (1993). Metadiscourse in Persuasive Writing: A Study of Texts Written by American and Finnish University Students. *Written Communication*, 10, 39-71.
- [8]. Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008). The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of Persuasion: A cross-linguistic study of newspaper discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 95-113.
- [9]. Dahl, T. (2004). Textual metadiscourse in research articles: A marker of a national culture or of academic discipline. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 95-113.
- [10]. Hyland, K (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30: 437-455.
- [11]. Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: A Reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177.
- [12]. Ifantidou, E. (2005). The semantics and pragmatics of metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1325-1353.
- [13]. Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education. *Language Learning*, 16(1-2), 1-20. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x
- [14]. Kumpf, P.E. (2000). Visual metadiscourse: Designing the considerate text. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 9(4), 401-424.
- [15]. Marandi, S. (2003). Metadiscourse in Persian/English Master's Theses: A Contrastive Study. *IJAL*, 6(2), 23-42.
- [16]. Rahman, M. (2004). Aiding the reader: The use of metalinguistic devices in scientific discourse. *Nottingham Linguistic Circular*, 18, 29-48.
- [17]. Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in academic writing: learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 58-78.
- [18]. Vande Kopple, W.J. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36(1), 82-93.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Erdem Akbas is a Ph.D Student at the Department of Education, University of York, UK. He received his B.A degree in ELT from Selcuk University, Turkey (2008) and his MA degree in TESOL from University of York, UK by getting a full scholarship from Turkish Republic (2010). He has contributed to a range of National and International Conferences via his research papers and poster presentations and Published Articles in Reputable Journals. His research interests include Discourse Analysis & Language Education, Written Discourse Analysis, Contrastive Rhetoric, Language Curriculum Design and Evaluation.

