

Metadiscourse Markers in Linguistic Abstracts by American and Iraqi Students of English

Kawther Abdul Ameer Hussein

aljanabi.k@yahoo.com

Jinan Ahmed Khalil

jinan_ahmad60@yahoo.com

Nawal Fadhil Abbas

nawal_fa71@yahoo.com

College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad

Abstract

Metadiscourse markers are means for organizing a writer's information and create a connection with her/his readers. When students write, they usually focus on one type of these markers that is the interactive markers and belittling the use of the other type which is the interactional markers. That is to say, they emphasize on presenting and organizing their information only. Therefore, this study is conducted to bridge this gap. The researchers have selected 18 thesis abstracts. Nine of them are written by Iraqi students of English and the rest by American students. The aims of the study are to examine the types and sub-types of metadiscourse markers used by American and Iraqi students; investigate comparatively the impact of the metadiscourse markers used in organizing the given information and engaging the readers. To accomplish these aims, Hyland's model (2005) is adopted. The results show that both Iraqi and American students use the interactive markers more than the interactional ones and the American use of the interactional markers is higher than Iraqi students. The Iraqi students are unable to engage their readers because of the low use of the interactional markers. The American students are able to engage their readers by using different subtypes of the interactional markers. Consequently, the researchers recommend the following: it is important to add Metadiscourse markers to M.A courses; instructors of B.A fourth stage also need to put emphasis on this topic which will aid B.A. students in making their research paper more coherent; teaching this topic within Essay writing.

Keywords: interactive resources, interactional resources, metadiscourse markers, abstracts.

ادوات الربط النصية لخلاصات اللغوية للطلاب العراقيين والامريكيين للغة الانكليزية

نوال فاضل عباس

جنان احمد خليل

كوثر عبد الامير حسين

جامعة بغداد - كلية التربية للبنات

الخلاصة

ادوات الربط النصية هي وسائل لتنظيم المعلومات ولخلق تواصل مع القراء. عادةً عندما يكتب الطلاب يتمحور تركيزهم على نوع واحد من انواع ادوات الربط النصية وهو النوع المخصص لتنظيم المعلومات ويهملون النوع الاخر الذي يسهم بمشاركة القراء. بمعنى اخر انهم يركزون فقط على عرض وترتيب المعلومات. ولهذا تهدف هذه الدراسة الى تخطي هذه الصعوبة من خلال اختيار البحوث لثمانية عشر خلاصه، تسع منها قد كتبت بواسطة الطلاب العراقيين والبقية لطلاب الامريكيين. اهداف هذه الدراسة هو تقصي ومقارنة ادوات الربط النصية بأنواعها وفروعها للطلاب الامريكيين والعراقيين وكذلك دراسة ومقارنة أثر أدوات الربط النصية المستخدمة في تنظيم وربط المعلومات ومشاركة القراء. ولتحقيق هذه الاهداف اعتمدت الباحثات على النموذج التحليلي لهيلند (2005). النتائج تظهر ان كل من الطلاب العراقيين والامريكيين يستخدمون ادوات ربط وتنظيم النص اكثر من استخدام ادوات مشاركة القراء ولكن كان استخدام الطلاب الامريكيين لادوات مشاركة القراء اعلى بالمقارنة مع نظرائهم. الطلاب العراقيون لم

يكونوا قادرين على مشاركة القراء بسبب قلة استخدامهم للادوات المخصصة لهذا الغرض بينما تمكن الطلاب الامريكيون من مشاركة القراء من خلال التنوع باستخدام ادوات مشاركة القراء. تبعاً لذلك الباحثات يوصن بما يلي: انه من الضروري التركيز على ادوات الربط النصيه ضمن حصص الدراسات العليا, وعلى كل من اساتذة واستاذات الكليات لطلاب المرحلة الرابعه ايلاء اهتمام اكثر بهذا الموضوع لما له من اهميه بمساعدة طلبة الكليات بأعداد بحوثهم بشكل اكثر وضوحاً, وكذلك ضرورة تدريس هذا الموضوع ضمن حصة كيفية كتابة مقاله.

1. Introduction

Discourse analysis considers the analysis of language according to the context in which it is used whether spoken or written. Paltridge (2007, p.1) defined discourse analysis as “an approach to the analysis of language that looks at patterns of language across texts as well as the social and cultural contexts in which the texts occur”. It is regarded as an umbrella term under it comes many notions one of them is ‘metadiscourse markers’

In any communication, whether between a speaker and listeners or a writer and readers, the participants do not focus only on the message but they try to use several techniques that help them to make their message organised and to influence and engage their audience at the same time. ‘Metadiscourse markers’ is one of these tactics.

‘Meta’ means beyond the text, i.e. the relation that one of the major types of markers (interactional resources) helps to form between writers and readers. In other words, how writers use the markers to assist in engaging their readers, while ‘discourse’ refers to text. It refers to the connection that another major type of markers (interactive resources) constructs between writers and their texts. In other words, how they organise, arrange and present their information.

2. What are Metadiscourse Markers

Harris (1970, p.464) used the term “metadiscourse kernels” to refer to words used by investigators to clarify the discussion of the certain material. Such a term was, later on, developed by a number of linguists, scholars and writers. Williams (1990, p.40) who defined it as "writing about writing". Crismore (1983, p.2) presented metadiscourse markers as “the author's intrusion into the discourse, either explicitly or non-explicitly, to direct the reader rather than inform”.

Hyland stated that “[m]etadiscourse is a widely used term in current discourse analysis and language education, referring to an interesting, and relatively new, approach to conceptualising interactions between text producers and their texts and between text producers and users” (2005, p.1). Adel (2006, p.2) defined metadiscourse markers as a term that “refers to linguistic items which reveal the writer’s and reader’s (or speaker’s and hearer’s) presence in the text, either by referring to the organization of the text or by commenting on the text in other ways.”

Burneikaite (2008, p.39) delineated metadiscourse markers as “the language used to express the author’s awareness and management of the discourse-as-process” this “includes management of the organization of the text, of the participants of the discourse process: the reader and the self, and of the author’s attitude towards the discourse process”. Khodareza and Shabani (2015, p.906) stated that audience awareness aids in the use of metadiscourse markers. According to them, “[t]he audience awareness helps writers/speakers gain a better understanding of what they can assume their reader or hearer knows and also enables them to present their attitudes perspectives, and positions more convincingly and appropriately”. Accordingly, the use of metadiscourse markers helps writers to direct their audience to a better understanding and engaging them in the given information.

3. Taxonomies

There are several taxonomies emerged with the aim of classifying metadiscourse markers, most of them started from Halliday’s notion (1973) of language who pointed out that when a person uses a language s/he is going to achieve three functions: the ideational function which refers to the information that one has; the textual function which makes plain the way a certain person is going to organize her/his

proposition; and the interpersonal function which shows the interaction that will take place between the producer and the audience through the understanding of what is being said or written.

Some linguists depended on the last two functions in their classification of metadiscourse markers since such markers play a role in organizing the text and engaging the audience. For example, Williams (1981) categorized them into three groups: hedges and emphatics; sequencers and topicalizers; and attributors and narrators. The first class shows certainty and uncertainty which can be regarded as interpersonal function according to Halliday. The second class of markers helps in directing the readers, while the third class, which tells readers about the source of the information is known as the 'textual function' according to Hallidayan ordering.

VandeKopple (1985), who exactly adopted Hallidayan terms, categorized metadiscourse markers into two major types: textual and interpersonal. Under the textual comes the subtypes which are text connectives, code glosses, illocution markers, and narrators, while under the interpersonal comes validity markers, attitude markers, and commentaries. So this taxonomy is more developed than that of Williams but still one can find many overlaps in its subtypes because of its limited sorts.

Crismore, Markknen and Steffensen (1993) adopted the same major types of VandeKopple (1985) but they adapted the subtypes either by adding or deleting classes. They further divided the textual into textual and interpretive in order to separate the organization function (textual) from evaluative function (interpretive) which helps readers to understand the writer's point of view by offering a further explanation and clarification. So, both of them are used in organizing the text in order to be coherent for the audience. Hyland (2005) saw that there is no need for such a division and merged them under one term which is 'textual'. Crismore et al. (1993) included the subtypes: logical connective, sequencers, reminders, topicalizers under textual and the subtypes: code glosses, illocution markers, announcements under the interpretive. While under the major type, interpersonal, comes hedges, certainty markers, attributors, attitude markers, and commentary.

Thompson and Thetela (1995) and Thompson (2001), have influenced the way Hyland shapes his model in 2005. Both of these models are concerned with the major types of metadiscourse markers. In the first one, Thompson and Thetela (1995), used the term writer-in-text to denote the textual resources and reader-in-text for interpersonal resources. By writer-in-text, they meant the interaction between the writer and the information that s/he is organizing. While the second term, reader-in-text, they indicated that the writer should take into consideration her/his imagined readers while organizing her/his text. Both of these terms worked together and were separated only for the sake of clarity in this paragraph. Thompson (2001) classified the major categories into interactive markers (textual) and interactional markers (interpersonal) which were later included in Hyland's model (2005).

4-Hyland's model (2005)

The researchers of the present study have adopted Hyland's model (2005). The reason behind this is that this model is designed specifically for academic writing as stated by Zarei and Mansoori (2011, p.45) when they described it as "a model of metadiscourse in academic texts." In addition to this, the model makes use of previous models as stated by Hyland (2005). This means that it overcomes the gaps and overlaps in them. The following table clarifies Hyland's model with all its major and minor types.

Table 1: Hyland's model of Metadiscourse Markers:

	Function	Examples
Interactive Markers		
Transitions	To express relation between main clauses.	Therefore, and, but, thus ... etc.

Frame markers	To limit and frame the proposition content.	My purpose is, first,...etc.
Endophoric markers	To direct readers to information in other parts of the text.	As noted earlier, see figure 1,...etc.
Evidentials	To direct readers to information outside the text.	X (2005) states, According to Z,...etc.
Code glosses	To expand the propositional meaning.	In other words, such as, is defined as,...etc.
Interactional Markers		
Hedges	To withhold writers' commitment to the proposition	Might, perhaps, possible,...etc.
Boosters	To emphasize certainty	It is a fact that, certainly,...etc.
Attitude markers	To express writers' attitude	Fortunately, surprisingly,...etc.
Self-mentions	To explicitly refer to writers	I, me, my,...etc.
Engagement markers	To explicitly involve readers	You can see that, note that,...etc.

5- Data collection and Analysis

The researchers have selected 18 abstracts divided into nine abstracts written by Iraqi students and the other nine abstracts written by American students. The nine abstracts of each data are taken from the linguistic field. They are divided equally into three genres: discourse analysis, pragmatics and semantics. Each abstract (henceforth A) in each discipline was selected in an arbitrary way but with a focus on years only to ensure the fairness of the comparison between native and non-native data for which the researchers did the same. The scope of the years was from 2005 till 2015.

After analysing the Iraqi and American data comparatively, the researchers will tabulate the results in order to show the frequency of the metadiscourse markers for both linguistics field of both data. The percentages of the data are calculated according to the following equation:

$$\frac{\text{The number of the subtype}}{\text{The total number of the major category}} \times 100$$

5.1. Analysis of Interactive Markers

5.1.1 Transitions

Hyland (2005, p.50) indicated that transitions' functions are to "signal additive, causative and contrastive relations in the writer's thinking, expressing relationships between stretches of discourse." The student researchers use different sub-subtypes of 'transitions':

5.1.1.1 Additive Markers

There are different metadiscourse markers within this sub-subtype. For example, the Iraqi researchers (and the native English researchers) exploit the marker 'and' in different ways as indicated below -It is used to add information. The use of 'and', in the following quotation from A2 Semantics, adds another factor, "power of asymmetries", which affects the formality or informality of the interaction

between participants. Therefore, the Iraqi researcher is able to exploit this marker to direct her readers for more factors. At the same time, readers will be able to understand the additional factors that the researcher wants to present about the level of formality. Accordingly, the researcher is able to accomplish the aim of this interactive marker.

- (1) The level of formality in an interaction is influenced by familiarity **and** power asymmetries among the participants which in turn influence their choice of language forms.

-It is also used to link two verbs, as in the following quotation from A8 Semantics/ the Iraqi data

- (2) The data selected for the analysis is (5) caricature images that reflect some of the social issues in Iraq. The analysis will take two forms: qualitative and quantitative. The main conclusions that the study arrived at are: First, [...] Fourth, students need to learn **and** develop their visual literacy; especially when they are living in the era of image and digital.

The researcher, in presenting her conclusions of caricature images, provide her readers with a deep meaning through the combination of the verbs 'learn' and 'develop' that indicate a continuous cognitive process in order to master visual literacy. Thus, the researcher is able to organise her ideas comprehensibly to readers and this is the main aim of the interactive markers.

-In the following quotation from A6 Pragmatics, 'and' is used to link comparatively two parts of a sentence

- (3) This study attempts to answer the question how there exists consistency between naturally occurring conversation **and** movie dialogues.

The researcher use 'and' to compare the consistency of a conversation in the real life situations with that of the movie. Thus, readers can easily understand what one of the argument will be about.

There are other exploitations of 'and' that are found only in the Iraqi data as denoted below:

-'and' used to present aside information as in the following quotation from A6 Pragmatics

- (4) Assuming a stock of components that are significant to NOC, which are rife in movies talk as well, this study pins down the textual cues which lead to die formation of naturalness of dialogue in movies. Therefore, **and** to achieve this, It is indispensable to generate a list of components (practices) found in NOC, and these presumably are included in scripted talk in order to evoke an illusion of realism.

'And', in this aside sentence shows the writer's intention and it is used to frame the achievement towards a specific aim. This is one of the difficulties denoted by Hyland (2005) which shows that it is difficult to find a marker that acts as belonging to a certain type. This aids the researcher to inform her readers that what follows will be devoted to fulfil that aim.

-In the following quotation from A2 Semantics, 'and' is used with 'vice versa' to avoid repetition.

- (5) In other words, the more personal involvement between the participants in an interaction the less formal it is, **and** vice versa.

The use of 'and' followed by 'vice versa' assists in stating the same mentioned statement but in opposite sense. The researcher in doing so avoids tautology which may mislead her readers to understand her proposition. Thus, the researcher is able to be concise and guide her readers without losing them in the details.

There are also markers that fulfil the additive function but exist only in the Iraqi data (except for 'also' and 'as well as' which exist in both data) such as "furthermore", 'besides', 'moreover', 'further' and 'in addition'. The Iraqi researchers use these markers in the same sense that they may use 'and' to add facts to the proposition. The only difference is that the Iraqi researchers usually use them to show the connection between sentences or even paragraphs. For example the use of 'in addition' in the following quotation from A4 Pragmatics aids in adding another aim of the chapter in regard to the

previous two aims. The researcher provides a well-organized piece of writing to her readers who will not face any difficulty in getting the aim of the researcher in that chapter.

(6) Chapter One specifies the problem. It also defines the hypotheses of the study, and its aims. **In addition**, it outlines the procedures adopted and the value of the study.

Moreover, the Iraqi researchers employ 'or' to present additional facts as in the following quotation from A8 Semantics in which 'or' is used to define the characteristics of group of students who comprehend 'the denotative meaning',

(7) [T]he denotative meaning was grasped by some of the students, who share the same cultural background **or** who belong to the same province or state.

Sometimes the marker 'or' preceded by 'either' or 'whether' to minimise the options into only two as in the following quotation from A6 Pragmatics,

(8) A turn is repairable and is **either** preferred **or** otherwise dispreferred.

The native English researchers use 'or' not only to present additional facts and give options but sometimes to exchange the verb as in the following quotation from A1 Discourse Analysis.

(9) In order to understand the meaning of what is said in this special form of women's talk, the female speaker expects **or** forces the female hearer to refer to the participants' mutual knowledge.

The researcher uses the marker 'or' to present two choices of verbs to clarify for her readers the fact in the previous sentence, that is what a female speaker needs to do for a female hearer in order to comprehend the meaning of women's speech.

In the following quotation from A7 Discourse Analysis/ the native English data, one can notice a different use of 'whether..or'

(10) The purpose of this study was to look into the way federal refugee resettlement policy mandated by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) construes the notion of self-sufficiency in policy documents; and **whether or** not that constructed version of self-sufficiency is reflected or reinforced in the local attendant English language training, provided by the Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization's (IRCO) Pre-Employment Training's English language training courses.

The use of the markers 'whether or' can never be regarded as purely interactive markers because the researcher engages her readers in the expectation of the options. This was one of the difficulties that mentioned by Hyland (2005) who argued that it is difficult to find a marker that purely belongs to one type. In the above quotation the markers 'whether or' can be considered as interactive markers more than interactional. It is true that they are used to engage readers in giving options but they will not bring them from their own belief since the researcher provides her readers with the choices.

5.1.1.2 Consequent Markers

Some markers, performing consequent function, are used by the Iraqi researchers (and the native English researchers) such as 'thus' in the following quotation from A8 Semantics/ the Iraqi data

(11) [I]mages as words are ambiguous; they convey layers of meanings. **Thus**, it is not precise to say that images have a universal language all over the world.

The utilising of 'thus' aids the researcher to derive her conclusion to her readers based on the previous sentence. Therefore, 'thus' directs readers not only to the following sentence but also let them investigate the previous one to be convinced with the final conclusion.

Other markers such as 'accordingly', 'hence', 'therefore' and 'so' are only used in the Iraqi data. It is important to note the use of 'so', in the following quotation from A9 Discourse Analysis/ the Iraqi data

(12) A discourse politeness theory has proven its efficiency, because it concentrates on

examining politeness at the discourse level, **so** it gives a clear picture of the characters' choices in using different politeness devices in every turn.

'So' is regarded as a 'consequent marker'. It displays a final result which is the chosen of a 'theory' to analysis the character's choices of politeness strategies. This choice based on the previously stated facts which present the 'theory' as a helpful tactic in analysing such areas.

5.1.1.3 Causative Markers

Some of the causative markers are used by the Iraqi and native English researchers such as 'because'. Other markers are used differently between the Iraqi and native English researchers. For example 'in order to' is used only show reason in the Iraqi data as in the following quotation from A9 Discourse Analysis

(13) Hence, people apply the politeness maxims as proposed by Leech (1983), more specifically, Tact and Approbation **in order to** establish harmonious relationships.

The researcher's use of 'in order to' let her readers sense what preceded the marker as a type of question and what will follow is the reason. Thus, readers are directed in a way that will let them understand the cause and the effect to increase their curiosity. The researcher achieves the major cause of using interactive markers which is to comprehensibly organise a researcher's proposition.

The native English researchers use 'in order to' not only to show reason but also to show purpose as in the following quotation from A8 Pragmatics

(14) Recommendations for the implementation of adult literacy services included advice against the library becoming a direct service provider and advocated instead for the use of community relationships **in order to** pool resources, generate new ideas, and improve access to services.

The researcher exploits the marker 'in order to' to direct her readers to the purposes of the library that make it preferable to 'community relationships'. A well-organized piece of writing presented by the researcher to guide her readers through her proposition.

Some words cannot be regarded as markers as in the following quotation from A7 Discourse Analysis/ the native English data

(15) **Since** the 1951 United Nations Convention, nations have dealt with refugee issues in various ways. In the United States, **since** the Vietnam War, there has been great debate and a significant amount of research on issues of refugee resettlement, with these discourses inherently involving issues of power and ideology.

In the quotations above, the words in bold do not count as metadiscourse markers since they have external relation to the text. That is to say, they are used to reflect activities from the world outside that have an indirect relation to the topic under discussion. The focus of discussion in the above quotation is about issues of refugees. 'Since' also does not regard as an interactive marker because it does not express a relation of cause and reason. It is used to refer to time only and such use does not indicate by Hyland (2005).

5.1.1.4 Contrastive Markers

Some of the contrastive markers such as 'though' used only in the Iraqi data. Other markers used only in the native English data such as 'by contrast' and 'despite'. Some markers used by the Iraqi (and native English) researchers to present contrastive ideas such as 'otherwise' and 'while' as in the following quotation from A5 Discourse Analysis

(16) They [critics] argue that Shakespearean drama described as wordy, **while** cinema is described as visual. Accordingly, Shakespearean plays should never be adapted into cinema.

The Iraqi researcher exploit the marker 'while' to let her readers notice how the critics differentiate between Shakespeare's writing and the cinema. Then, the Iraqi researcher directs her readers to the

final result based on that contradiction. The Iraqi researcher skillfully guides her readers from the contradictory part till the final result.

The marker 'on the other hand' employed only in the Iraqi data as in the following quotation below from A2 Semantics

- (17) The term "formality" is used in a variety of ways in the literature, but it is most commonly used to refer to the occurrence of certain language forms which are considered to be more formal than others in an interaction such as the use of plural personal pronoun *you* [V] instead of singular *you* [T] and deferential address form Sir/Madam instead of first names (FNs).

The concept of informality, **on the other hand**, can be defined as the opposite of formality - i.e. the occurrence of certain language forms which are considered to be less formal than the others, such as, the use of the pronoun you[T] instead of the pronoun you[V] and the use of FNs instead of titles.

The marker 'on the other hand' used without preceding it by 'on the one hand'. This affects the organisation of the proposition to readers. The researcher begins her discussion by referring to the term 'formality' then the researcher parallels it with another concept which is 'informality'. Readers will not understand the researcher's perspective until they reach the interactive marker. This will mislead her readers for a short time. 'On the other hand' is exploited to denote informality's antonym and provides a definition for it. The researcher does not properly direct and guide her readers' thinking.

The marker 'however' is used differently between the Iraqi and native English researchers. 'However' shows contrastive points of view in two paragraphs as in the following quotation from A5 Discourse Analysis/ the Iraqi data

- (18) Shakespeare's most popular play, Hamlet was written over 400 years ago. The play contains many universal themes that are still relevant in today's society, namely revenge, greed, anger, love, passion, ambition, self- destruction and compassion. This timelessness of the play has attracted the twentieth- and twenty-first century filmmakers to adapt Hamlet in a modern way. One of these productions- is Michael Almercyda's 2000 version of Hamlet.

However, many critics have come to argue against such cinematic production of Shakespeare plays claiming that Shakespearean drama is originally written for theatre not to be presented in cinema. They argue that Shakespearean drama described as wordy, while cinema is described as visual. Accordingly, Shakespearean plays should never be adapted into cinema.

The Iraqi researcher exploitation of 'however' indicates a connection with previous paragraph and assists to display a new point of view represented by the critics. This shows the researcher's ability to organise her text and provide her readers with more than one view without misleading them in these details. 'However' is used in the native English data to change the focus of the point of the discussion as in the following quotation from A8 Pragmatics

- (19) Although the collaboration literature distinguishes between partnership and collaboration, the participants in this study used both terms interchangeably.

However, they typically referenced and had experience with relationships between individuals (partnership) as opposed to relationships between organizations (collaboration).

The focus of the discussion shifts from how the terms (partnership and collaboration) are exchangeable to the opposite relationship between these terms. The researcher is skilful enough to shift her readers from one point to another without misleading them.

'But' is exploited by the Iraqi (and native English) researchers to present pure contrast as in the following quotation from A4 Pragmatics,

- (20) In fact, pragmatics offers a powerful tool when analyzing due to the fact that it accounts for elements that are not present on the face of the utterances **but** have to be inferred.

The contrast is clear in differentiating between elements that exist on the surface of utterances and those that need to be derived. Thus, the researcher, through this contrastive meaning, will assist her readers to comprehend why 'pragmatics' is a 'powerful tool'. The researcher is able to present her proposition cohesively and coherently.

Other markers used only in the writing of native English researchers such as the use of 'conversely' to state that what will follow is the opposite to what has been mentioned as in the following quotation from A8 Pragmatics

- (21) Although the community participants believed in the benefits of collaboration, they did not often pursue collaboration, and they did not see the library as a partner. **Conversely**, engaging with the community was part of the library's mission, and each library participant confirmed that the goal of the library was to reach out to those who did not already know about the library.

The use of 'conversely' assists the native English researcher to present two ideas, one is the common sense that people do not seek collaboration in libraries in spite of the fact that they know its benefits. The second idea is that the library's mission to put people in such collaboration. The researcher is able to direct her readers from one idea to a contrastive idea without confusing them.

Some combinations of transitions' sub-categories can be noticed only in the writing of the Iraqi researchers such as 'and thus' to add a consequential result as in the following quotation from A6 Pragmatics.

- (22) An exchange consists of turns which are ordered **and thus** describable.

The native English researchers also combine the markers 'and so' that helps them to derive the final conclusion as in the following quotation from A2 Pragmatics

- (23) Language always poses a threat to individual, deific, and institutional identity, **and so** society attempts to control it through ritual.

Other combinations such as 'and also', in A2 Semantics/ the Iraqi data, is used to emphasise the additive function (also found in the native English data)

- (24) The objective of this study is to trace the development of address forms **and also** to find out the changes, if any, which have taken place.

Thus, the Iraqi researcher puts an emphasis on the second objective of the study to show her readers that even the changes in address forms, which may not be existed, will be detected.

The combination 'but also' is found in A6 Pragmatics/ the Iraqi data (also used by the native English researchers). It is preceded by negation 'not' followed by frame marker 'only' to negate the limitation of the first information and to extend it by the employment of 'but' followed by 'also' for more emphasis.

- (25) The study hence **not only** contributes to the fields of linguistic stylistics and media studies, **but also** to discourse analysis, in particular through revising the concept of naturally occurring conversation.

5.1.2 Frame markers

Hyland (2005, p.51) indicated that the 'frame markers' can be used "... to sequence, label, predict and shift arguments" Moreover, 'frame markers' are used to "... label text stages"; to "... announce discourse goals"; and to "...indicate topic shifts". The examples below show 'frame markers' functions' which are:

1-to Label text stages

The native English researchers employ the markers ‘primarily’, ‘after all’, ‘lastly’, ‘eventually’ and ‘ultimately’ of this sub-subtype to guide readers to the essence of the argument as a first or final stage of the discussion

Other markers in the Iraqi data are used to indicate readers to a first or final stage such as ‘ultimately’, ‘eventually’, ‘primarily’ and ‘finally’. For example ‘Finally’ is used by the Iraqi researchers to indicate the last stage in the thesis as a whole. This assists readers in having knowledge about the parts that will be included in that stage which have relation to the current argument as in the following quotation from A5 Discourse Analysis

(26) Through the research, relevant conclusions are drawn on the basis of the analysis which proved that the adapted text maintains the literal themes of the original text. Furthermore, the former manifests new meanings in order to reflect the problems of modern society. **Finally**, the conclusions are followed by pedagogical implications and suggestions for further studies.

So, the writer is able to direct her readers’ thinking to a specific part of the thesis and the information that will be included in it.

If the markers ‘lastly’, ‘finally’ and ‘eventually’ preceded by a sequence such as ‘first, second, ...etc.’ then they will be included under ‘sequential markers’ since the goal will be to limit the proposition with certain points.

2-to Limit a text boundaries and indicate the topic shift

Some frame markers frame and limit the proposition to a certain period or event, so the presented information will be accurate. The Iraqi researchers fulfil this function by using one word as a marker such as ‘particularly’, ‘especially’ and ‘only’ (also used by the native English researchers). For example the use of ‘only’ in the following quotation from A4 Pragmatics/ the Iraqi data to present one of the findings of the study

(27) The use of ambiguity in both Shakespeare's sonnets and in Al-Mulik'smoushehat flouts the maxim of manner **only**”

The Iraqi researcher’s use of the marker ‘only’, in the above quotation, limits the effect of ambiguity to one maxim which will ultimately present her finding in a precise way to her readers without any kind of confusion.

Other markers present a shift in the topic of the discussion from more general to more specific or from the past to the present time such as ‘nowadays and now’ (only in the Iraqi data) as in the following quotations from A8 Semantics

(28) Visual messages have been used by human beings as a natural means for expressing themselves. For instance, in the prehistoric period and before the evolution of language, man produced myriad murals, rock inscriptions, and pictures (Pettersson, 1988, 141-142). **Nowadays**, photos and images also have a significant role in people’s life; especially with the vast advancement in mobiles and cameras technologies.

The use of ‘nowadays’ limits the time of discussion to the present time. In the above quotation, the Iraqi researcher starts presenting the ‘visual messages’ in general and its importance for human beings then moves to discuss the term in a more specific way by using the marker ‘nowadays’. In that way, readers will never get lost as the researcher moves from the general to the particular in directing her readers for more information about the term ‘visual messages’ and its significant role for humans. The Iraqi researchers are able to comprehensibly organise and present their arguments.

The use of the word 'today' in the following quotation from A5 Discourse Analysis/ the Iraqi data is not a marker but a part of the proposition since it does not use to report on the researcher's proposition.

(29) Shakespeare's most popular play, *Hamlet* was written over 400 years ago. The play contains many universal themes that are still relevant in **today's** society, namely revenge, greed, anger, love, passion, ambition, self- destruction and compassion.

3-to denote a sequential relation

The Iraqi researchers use markers such as 'first', 'then', 'before' (also used by the native English researchers), 'second', 'third', 'fourth', 'after' and 'after that'. The following quotation from A8 Semantics/ the Iraqi data indicates the use of some of them to show sequence.

(30)The analysis will take two forms: qualitative and quantitative. The main conclusions that the study arrived at are: **First**, the denotative meaning was grasped by some of the students, who share the same cultural background or who belong to the same province or state. **Second**, images as words are ambiguous; they convey layers of meanings. Thus, it is not precise to say that images have a universal language all over the world. **Third**, the impact of the non-linguistic key-signs is similar to the linguistic ones; simply because they have the ability to generate layers of denotative meaning. **Fourth**, students need to learn and develop their visual literacy; especially when they are living in the era of image and digital.

The markers in the above quotation present the conclusions of the study into specific points. The researcher in doing so provides her readers with the essence of the thesis in a limited and comprehensible way that will never confuse them.

4-to announce discourse goals

The Iraqi and native English researchers use markers of this sub-type represented by a group of words to declare goals that they intended to achieve. The markers in bold draw readers' attention towards the text's goals as in the following quotations from the Iraqi data

A2 Semantics

(31)**The objective of this study is** to trace the development of address forms and also to find out the changes, if any, which have taken place.

The native English researchers use the attributive adjectives which are inherent such as 'additional and primary'. The use of the adjective 'additional' does not regard as an additive marker since it is part of the propositional content. Thus, there is only one marker that is the 'frame marker' as in the following quotations from the native English data

A5 Semantics

(32)**The primary focus of this paper is** to examine whether sign languages organize their locative expressions similarly to spoken languages.

A6 Semantics

(33)**An additional objective of this study** was to develop normative data for the Lakota people on phonemic (letter P) and semantic (animal) verbal fluency tasks in Lakota and in English.

The Iraqi researchers are able to announce the main focus of their studies to their readers by using different synonyms such as 'aim', 'objective' and 'purpose' which guide readers to the goals that the researcher intends to fulfil. The same with the native English researchers who use slightly different synonyms such as 'focus' or precede it by an adjective such as 'an additional objective'. Another way of announcing goals that is adopted by the Iraqi researchers which is the orientation towards achieving

goals. This is applied through the use of non-finite clauses such as ‘to achieve this aim, ...’, ‘to enrich this chapter,...’,...etc. as in the following quotation from A9 Discourse Analysis

(34) **To achieve the objectives of the study**, the present study adopts an eclectic model, i.e., the application of politeness model as presented by Leech (1983), Lakoffs model (1975), Short and Leech’s perspective of politeness strategies in literary conversations (1981), Brown and Levison’s model (1978), beside Blum-Kulka et al.’s model in analyzing politeness devices in requests (1989).

The Iraqi researcher is able to draw her readers’ thinking towards a specific goal. Thus, the researcher increases her readers’ curiosity to know more about how the researcher will fulfil her aim. Accordingly, the Iraqi researcher organises her piece of writing in a way that will direct and encourage her readers to read more and this is the main focus of interactive markers.

5-to delineate a text in order to predict and shift argument

The Iraqi researchers employ other frame markers to delineate the boundaries of the discourse. The researcher first delineates the text by specifying the part that she will argue about whether a whole thesis or a study or by specifying a section whether it is a chapter or conclusion. Then, the researcher follows it by verbs or phrasal verbs such as seek to, intended to, pin down, investigate, highlight...etc. that aim at directing readers to the researcher’s arguments as in the following quotations from

A7 Semantics

(35) **The chapter includes** the significance of the study as well as hypotheses raised.

A6 Pragmatics

(36) **[T]his study pins down** the textual cues which lead to die formation of naturalness of dialogue in movies.

The same technique is also used by the native English researchers but sometimes they are more specific by using ‘double markers’ as in the following quotations from

A1 Discourse Analysis

(37) Rooted in a theoretical framework in discourse analysis, **my thesis seeks to** analyze how women, having participated in an interview with a female interlocutor who lost a child herself, narrate their experiences of reproductive loss.

The native researchers combine the self mention ‘my’ with the frame markers ‘thesis seeks to’. Such combination in the above quotation aids not only to make the following argument limited for readers but also to display it as the researcher special work which distinguishes hers from that of others. Thus, readers will comprehend what is the thesis about and what it is about will be that researcher’s fingerprint.

5.1.3 Code glosses

This sub-category is used to elaborate, expand and exemplify or to illustrate facts in other ways. The Iraqi researchers use the marker ‘in terms of’ to expand the illustrations with examples as in the following quotation in A3 Discourse Analysis

(38) Types of questions asked in interrogation are similar in English and Arabic **in terms of** their topic, content and speech acts.

‘In terms of’ assists to answer a possible an enquiry that may raise by readers which is in what way the questions are similar in both languages. Then, the use of ‘in term of’ answers the enquiry by giving examples that indicate the areas of similarity. The native English researchers do not use this marker in their abstracts.

Moreover, the Iraqi researchers use the marker ‘in other words’ (also used by the native English researchers) to clarify an idea, that has already stated in another way as in the following quotation from A2 Semantics

(39) The analysis reveals that address forms have undergone many changes and become more informal through time and that the sociopragmatic factors play a major role in determining the level of formality of a situation. **In other words**, the more personal involvement between the participants in an interaction the less formal it is, and vice versa.

The researcher utilises the marker 'in other words' to offer more simple illustration without the need to use terms such as 'sociopragmatic factors' that could be difficult for readers to understand. Accordingly, the researcher's exploitation of the marker aids in shifting her readers from the complexity to the simplicity.

The markers 'like' and 'for instance' are utilised only by the Iraqi researchers to illuminate with examples as in A1 Pragmatics

(40) The layout of the study comprises two parts: First, the theoretical part that explicates the notions **like** interaction, context, discourse components, etc.

and in A8 Semantics

(41) Visual messages have been used by human beings as a natural means for expressing themselves. **For instance**, in the prehistoric period and before the evolution of language, man produced myriad murals, rock inscriptions, and pictures.

Both of the markers 'like' and 'for instance' are used to clarify the proposition with examples. These markers do not use at all by the native English researchers because they are non-academic words and that justifies their use by the Iraqi researchers only.

The marker 'such as' is utilised by the Iraqi (and American) researchers as in the following quotation from A2 Semantics

(42) The term "formality" is used in a variety of ways in the literature, but it is most commonly used to refer to the occurrence of certain language forms which are considered to be more formal than others in an interaction **such as** the use of plural personal pronoun you [V] instead of singular you [T] and deferential address form Sir/Madam instead of first names (FNs).

'such as' is used to offer a further explanation with examples to support the previously stated idea.

The Iraqi researchers use the verbs 'defined' in A2 Semantics as a marker to elaborate on the meaning of certain terms as in the following quotations

(43) The concept of informality, on the other hand, can be **defined** the opposite of formality.

The markers, 'defined' is exploited to elaborate on certain concepts. 'Defined' explains the term 'informality' by paralleling it with its antonym.

The native English researcher, in A5 Semantics, does the opposite, that is to provide the definition first then the term by using the marker 'which is called'. The native English researcher, by doing so, is able to organise her proposition in a way that will increase her readers' curiosity to read more. Accordingly, the researcher is not only able to direct them but also increases their desire to get more knowledge as in the following quotation

(44) Paving the way in the study of spatial relations by focusing on the structuring of ON and IN locatives in spoken languages, Bowerman and colleagues (Bowerman 1980; Melissa Bowerman & Eric Pederson 1992a; Bowerman 1993; 1994; 1996a; 1996b; Bowerman & Levinson 2001) found that spoken languages organize the locative phrases representing the relationships of ON and IN in a continuum **which is called** the ON-IN continuum

5.1.4 Endophoric markers

This sub-type aims at directing readers to other parts within a text. The Iraqi researchers achieve this function by referring to chapters of a thesis as in A4 Pragmatics “**Chapter One**”, “**Chapter Two**”, “**Chapter Three**”, “**Chapter Four**”, “**Chapter Five**” or by referring to ideas in a previous paragraph, within a paragraph or in the upcoming paragraph as in A9 Discourse Analysis

(45) On the basis of **the above results**, some recommendations and suggestions for further research are put forward” and in A1 Novel “Science fiction deserves serious study since, as an outlet, it provides answers **to the questions above**.

There is no use of ‘endophoric markers’ at all by the native English researchers. Through the researcher reading of the Iraqi’s and the native English’s abstracts, she finds that native English researchers do not include in their abstracts what each chapter will be embodied. They just give hints on contrary to the Iraqi researchers who usually give a clear idea about what a thesis will contain.

5.1.5 Evidentials

In the Iraqi (and native English) data, ‘evidentials’ are used to direct readers to sources such as scholars’ books outside the text to ensure the reliability of their arguments and to direct readers for more information. This is ensured by Hyland (2005) who stated that this sub-type is used to guide readers to reliable sources other than a text and aids a writer to support her/his argument. Thomas and Hawes (1994, p.129) also referred to this type as “the metalinguistic representation ... of an idea from another source” as in the following quotations from A8 Semantics/ the Iraqi data

(46) Visual messages have been used by human beings as a natural means for expressing themselves. For instance, in the prehistoric period and before the evolution of language, man produced myriad murals, rock inscriptions, and pictures (**Pettersson, 1988, 141-142**).

and from A5 Semantics/ the native English data

(47) The primary focus of this paper is to examine whether sign languages organize their locative expressions similarly to spoken languages. Paving the way in the study of spatial relations by focusing on the structuring of ON and IN locatives in spoken languages, Bowerman and colleagues (**Bowerman 1980; Melissa Bowerman& Eric Pederson 1992a; Bowerman 1993; 1994; 1996a; 1996b; Bowerman& Levinson 2001**) found that spoken languages organize the locative phrases representing the relationships of ON and IN in a continuum which is called the ON-IN continuum.

In the both data the evidential markers are provided between parentheses introducing the name of the scholar followed by the year instead of embodying these markers within the proposition by placing the cited author in subject position. This way of using evidentials assists the native English researchers to provide more than one reliable source to support the reliability and authentication of their argument.

Hyland (2005, p.158) stated that “[c]itation is a means of integrating new claims into current knowledge while drawing on previous work as supporting testimony, situating new work in a scaffold of accredited facts.”

5.2 Analysis of Interactional markers

5.2.1 Self mentions

This sub-type does not employ by the Iraqi researchers in the linguistic field. The native English researchers exploit this sub-type in linguistics as indicated by markers such as ‘my’ and ‘I’ as in the following quotation from A4 semantics/ the native English data

(48) Traditionally, numeral incorporation has been viewed as a process of combining a numeral sign with a noun, which **I** call a source sign. Instead, **I** found that the source signs are separate lexical items and are different than the bases used in numeral incorporation.

The use of the first personal pronoun 'I' in the above quotation, instead of using words such as the 'writer's thesis' or 'the researcher', explicitly reflect the researcher personally. This sends a message to readers that what will follow these pronouns will distinguish the researcher from the others. Hyland (2005, p.53) argued that self mentions refer "to the degree of explicit author presence in the text measured by the frequency of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives."

The use of the first personal pronoun 'I' helps the writer to show her personal findings to distinguish them from that of others and to share them with her readers. The researcher will engage her readers by expecting to get their positive responses to such findings. Accordingly, she achieves the aim of the marker which is the writer-reader interaction.

Kuo (1999, p.123) emphasised this idea by stating

that the choice of a certain personal pronoun for a given context, or even the presence or non-presence of a personal pronoun ... can often reveal how writers view themselves, their relationship with readers, and their relationship with the discourse community they belong to.

5.2.2 Attitude markers

This subtype is used only by a native English researcher who exploits it by applying the marker 'essentially' as in the following quotation from A5 Semantics

(49) This thesis shows that sign languages do not linguistically pattern similarly to spoken languages along the ON-IN continuum. One reason for this could be the vast difference in modality between signed and spoken languages. **Essentially**, locative constructions in sign languages contain visual representations which resemble real world spatial relationships, while spoken languages tend to use arbitrary locative constructions which do not resemble real world spatial relationships.

The 'attitude markers' are represented by 'essentially' which for the first glance indicates how the writer is keen to build a relationship with readers to the extent that she shows her emotion. The researcher in her reaction towards the proposition not only shows her attitudes but she expresses them from readers' perspective so she can experience the same emotions.

In the above quotation, the researcher also expects to get agreement from her readers when she states her attitude using the marker 'essentially' to show it is important for visual messages, send by those who use sign language, to reflect the real world on contrary to spoken messages which have no relation to that world. Thus, the researcher states her feeling and expects her audience to share the same attitude towards the proposition which will ultimately engage them in the argument and this is the main purpose of the interactional markers.

This can be supported by Martin and White (2005, p.95) who stated that when writers exploit 'attitude markers', they do not only intend to show their feelings towards the proposition but also "invite others to endorse and to share with them the feelings, tastes or normative assessments they are announcing. Thus declarations of attitude are dialogically directed towards aligning the addressee into a community of shared value and belief."

Hyland (2005, pp.149-150) also argued that "[b]y signalling an assumption of shared attitudes, values and reactions to material, writers both express a position and suck readers into a conspiracy of agreement so that it can often be difficult to dispute such judgements."

5.2.3 Hedges

The Iraqi researchers utilise markers of this type such as 'often', 'sometimes' (also used in the native English data), 'about', 'almost', 'presumably', 'kind of' and 'somehow'. Other markers utilised only by the native English researchers such as 'sort of' as in the following quotations from A4 Semantics

(50) Numeral-incorporated signs involve some **sort of** simultaneity of the base and the numeral

Through the researcher uses of the marker 'sort of', she expresses her desire to discuss her plausible thinking with her readers. The researcher achieves this when she reveals her uncertainty and releases her responsibility to the information that she provides to her readers through the use of the marker 'sort of'. At that juncture, she shows respect to readers' alternative point of views. That is why some scholars such as Mauranen (1993) argued that the use of such markers view the writers as being polite since they take their readers' points of view into consideration. Hyland (2005, p.52) clarified that the writer uses this sub-type to express her/his "decision to recognize alternative voices and viewpoints and so withhold complete commitment to a proposition."

Other markers fall within 'hedges' are the modal verbs only when showing uncertainty. Most frequent hedges in both data are 'can, could, may and might' as in the following quotation from A5 semantics/the American data

(51) This thesis shows that sign languages do not linguistically pattern similarly to spoken languages along the ON-IN continuum. One reason for this **could be** the vast difference in modality between signed and spoken languages

The writer includes this sub-category in the above quotation when she states the reason for her argument with possibility through the use of 'could be'. 'Could be' means it is possible to identify but not certain. Thus, through the writer's uncertainty which is indicated by that marker, readers will be in a circle of responses whether it could or could not that will ultimately draw them in the argument.

Sehrawat (2014, P.380) stated "these markers [hedges] perform an important interpersonal function: they allow the writer to avoid absolute statements, which makes the text more polite by giving readers the opportunity to form their own judgments. This involves the reader more deeply in the processing of the text."

5.2.4 Boosters

The Iraqi researchers utilise markers such as 'it is not precise to say that', 'clearly', 'indeed' and 'in fact' and as in the following quotation from A4 Pragmatics

(52) The present study investigates the application of the pragmatic theory to lyrical poetry in both Shakespeare's sonnets and in Al- Mulik'smoushehat. **In fact**, pragmatics offers a powerful tool when analyzing poetry due to the fact that it accounts for elements that are not present on the face of the utterances but have to be inferred.

The researcher takes the advantage of this sub-type through the usage of 'in fact' which aids in both, engaging readers and closing suspicions in their mind. The researcher achieves this by allowing readers first to express different responses then the writer excludes them all by using the marker 'in fact' to produce the most logical one. Hyland (2005, pp.52-53) stated that "[b]oosters suggest that the writer recognizes potentially diverse positions but has chosen to narrow this diversity rather than enlarge it, confronting alternatives with a single, confident voice."

The Iraqi researchers make use from the model verbs that fall within 'boosters' only when express certainty and obligation such as 'should' (also used in the native English data in addition to the marker 'must be') and 'never' as in the following quotation from A5 Discourse Analysis

(53) However, many critics have come to argue against such cinematic production of Shakespeare plays claiming that Shakespearean drama is originally written for theatre not to be presented in cinema. They [critics] argue that Shakespearean drama described as wordy, while cinema is described as visual. Accordingly, Shakespearean plays **shouldnever** be adapted into cinema.

The obligation and certainty that the reader gets from the writer through the marker ‘should never’ in the above quotation excluded all the possible alternative voice that readers may think of. Crismore (1983. P.40) argued that “[e]mphatics are used by a writer to persuade readers to ‘believe me’ .” Thus, the researcher engages her readers by allowing them to expect probable responses and then the researcher provides the most authentic judgement. Hyland (1999, p.101) made this point clear by indicating that boosters perform two functions at the same time. First, they “can mark involvement with the topic” and second, “indicate solidarity with readers.”

Hyland (1998, p. 358) stated that “[h]edges and boosters are interpersonal aspects of language use, complex textual signs by which writers personally intervene into their discourse to evaluate material and engage with readers”.

5.2.5 Engagement markers

There is no use of engagement markers in both data. This can be justified due to the nature of these markers. The writer usually uses the second personal pronoun ‘you’ and the ‘imperatives’ such as ‘note’, ‘consider’, ...etc. to engage her/his readers. The use of ‘you’ and ‘imperatives’ in texts other than books and manual, where a writer has authority, can be regarded as offensive as clarified by Kuo (1999, p.126) “**you** [emphasis mine] could sound offensive or detached since it separates readers, as a different group, from the writer” and “imperatives are frequently used in textbooks or manuals where a writer would like to sound authoritative.” “[H]owever, imperative you would sound offensive and impair the reader–writer relationship.” (ibid, p.127)

5.3 The Frequency and Percentage of Metadiscourse Markers in the Iraqi and Native English Data for the Linguistic Field

Tables one and two show the frequency and the percentage of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers for each sub-type of three genres of the linguistic field: pragmatics, discourse analysis and semantics. Table one is concerned with the Iraqi linguistic data and table two with the native English ones.

Table 1: Analysis of Abstracts of Iraqi students

	Pragmatics	Discourse Analysis	Semantics	Score Number	Percentage
Interactive Markers					
Transitions	63	49	36	148	58.73
Frame markers	18	19	22	59	23.41
Endophoric markers	5	5	5	15	5.95
Evidentials	2	13	4	19	7.53
Code glosses	3	4	4	11	4.36
Total Number				252	
Interactional Markers					
Hedges	10	1	3	14	77.77
Boosters	2	1	1	4	22.22
Attitude markers					
Self mentions					
Engagement markers					
Total number				18	

Table one shows that the Iraqi researchers use interactive markers more than interactional ones in the linguistic field. They exploit all of the interactive resources' sub-types. More specifically, they frequently use transitions and frame markers, then come the other sub-categories: evidentials, endophorics and code glosses. Iraqi researchers use only two sub-types from the major type interactional markers and with low frequencies as the table above shows.

Table 2: Analysis of Abstracts of Native English students

	Pragmatics	Discourse Analysis	Semantics	Score Number	Percentage
Interactive Markers					
Transitions	43	40	46	129	86.57
Frame markers	6	5	3	14	9.39
Endophoric markers					
Evidentials					
Code glosses	2	2	2	6	4.02
Total Number				149	
Interactional Markers					
Hedges	4	1	11	16	51.61
Boosters	2			2	6.45
Attitude markers			1	1	3.22
Self mentions	2	6	4	12	38.70
Engagement markers					
Total Number				31	

Table two shows that the native English researchers use three sub-types from interactive markers which are transitions, frame markers and code glosses. They employ four sub-categories from interactional ones, namely, hedges, boosters, self mentions and attitude markers. In spite of their short abstracts, the native English researchers are able to a certain extent balance between the sub-types from interactive and interactional resources.

6. Discussion of Results

With regard to 'interactive resources' in linguistic field, the Iraqi students employed 'transitions' specifically the marker 'and' which could be justified due to the importance of this marker in connecting, organising and adding information, then came 'frame markers'. This was also applied to the native English students. Concerning the other interactive markers, the Iraqi students used 'evidentials', 'endophoric' and 'code glosses'. The native English students used the 'code glosses' only. The native English students were able to engage their readers by utilising different sub-types of 'interactional category' in the linguistic field such as 'hedges', 'boosters', 'attitude markers' and 'self mentions'. The Iraqi students used only 'hedges' and 'boosters'.

The results show that the interactive resources are highly used by the Iraqi researchers when compared to the interactional ones. More specifically, the transitions subtype has been used (148) times and the frame markers subtype (59) times, then comes the other markers. As for the interactional markers, hedges have been used (14) times and boosters only (4) times. The other subtypes are neglected. This indicates that the Iraqi researchers are able to organize their information more than engaging their readers. In the American data, only 3 subcategories of interactive markers have been used; transitions (129) times, frame markers (14) times and code glosses (6) times. The interactional markers are

represented by 4 subtypes that are hedges (16) times, boosters twice, attitude markers only once and self-mentions (12) times.

7-Conclusion

The Iraqi students tended to use ‘interactive markers’ extremely more than the ‘interactional ones’. The American students tended to use both of the two major types. Although, their use of ‘interactional markers’ was not as high as the ‘interactive markers’ but it was higher in comparison with the Iraqi students’ results. The Iraqi students’ low use of metadiscourse markers can be justified according to the little emphasis on this topic during M.A and B.A courses. In addition to this, the Iraqi students use English as a foreign language which means that they do not have adequate knowledge of using it.

The native English’s abstracts of linguistic field tend to be short and give general ideas about the discussed topic. In spite of the shortness of their abstracts, they were able to organise their information and engage their readers by making use of both major categories that were ‘interactive and interactional’. The Iraqi students wrote long abstracts with more details and were unable to engage their reader because of the low use of the ‘interactional markers’. They only utilised two sub-types of interactional markers. This could be due to the effect of their first language (Arabic) whereby they tend to be tautologous.

References

- Adel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. Amsterdam: John.
- Burneikaite, N. (2008). Metadiscourse in Linguistics Master's Theses in English L1 and L2. *Kalbotyra*, 59(3), 38-46. Retrieved from http://www.kalbotyra.flf.vu.lt/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Kalbotyra_59_38-47.pdf
- Craig, R.T. (2008). Meta-Discourse. In W. Donsbach (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of Communication, VII*, 3707–9. Oxford, UK, and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Crismore, A. (1983). *Metadiscourse: What is it and How is it Used in School and Non-School Social Science Texts*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.
- Crismore, A., Markknen, R., & Steffensen, M. (1993). Metadiscourse in Persuasive Writing: A Study of Texts Written by American and Finnish University Students. *Written Communications*, 10(1), 5:39-71. Sage Publications. Retrieved from <http://booksc.org>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Harris, Z. S. (1970). *Papers in Structural and Transformational Linguistics: Formal Linguistics Series*. Pennsylvania: Springer-Science+Business Media, B.V.
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Boosting, Hedging and the Negotiation of Academic Knowledge*. *Text*, 18(3) 349-382.
- Hyland, K. (1999). *Disciplinary Discourses: Writer Stance in Research Articles*. In C. Candlin and K. Hyland (Eds), *Writing: Texts, Processes and Practices*(pp. 99-121). London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Meta-discourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Khodareza, M. R. & Shabani, G. (2015). A Study of the Directions in Discourse Analysis: Theory and Methods. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 5 (2), 905-916. Retrieved from <http://www.cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2015/02/116-JLS-S2-119-GHOLAMHOSSEIN-DISCOURSE.pdf>
- Kuo, C.-H. (1999). The Use of Personal Pronouns: Role Relationships in Scientific Journal Articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(2), 121-138.
- Martin, J. & White, P. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP Rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish–English Economics Texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 3-22. Retrieved from <http://booksc.org/>
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: continuum.

- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied linguistics*(4thed.). Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
- Schiffrin, D. (1980). Meta-Talk: Organizational and Evaluative Brackets in Discourse. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, 199-236. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1980.tb00021.x/epdf?r3_referer=wol&tracking_action=preview_click&show_checkout=1&purchase_referrer=search.avira.net&purchase_site_license=LICENSE_DENIED
- Sehrawat, A. (2014). Metadiscourse in ESL Writers' Persuasive Writing. *International journal of English language, literature and humanities*, 2(4), 374-384. Retrieved from <http://ijellh.com/papers/2014/August/33-374-384-August-2014.pdf>
- Thomas, S. and Hawes, T. (1994). Reporting Verbs in Medical Journal Articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13, 129-48. Retrieved from bookzz.org
- Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in Academic Writing: Learning to Argue with the Reader. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 58-78. Retrieved from http://www.drronmartinez.com/uploads/4/4/8/2/44820161/geoff_thompson_interaction_in_academic_writing_learning_to_argue_with_the_reader_2001.pdf
- Thompson, G., &Thetela, P. (1995). The Sound of One Hand Clapping: The Managment of Interaction in Written Discourse. *Text*, 15(1), 103-127. Retrieved from <http://www.isfla.org/Systemics/Print/Thompson/Thompson Thetla 1995 The sound of one h and clapping.pdf>
- VandeKopple, W. (1985). Some Exploratory Discourse on Metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*,36(1), 82-93. Retrieved from <http://booksc.org>
- Williams J. (1981). *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Williams J. (1990). *Style: Towards Clarity and Grace*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Zarei, G. R. & Mansoori, S. (2011). A Contrastive Study on Meta-Discourse Elements Used in Humanities VS. Non humanities Across Persian and English. *English Language Teaching*,4(1), 42-50. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/viewFile/9663/6909>