

Metadiscourse in Students' Academic Writing: Case Study of Umaru Musa Yar'adua University and Al-Qalam University Katsina

Hamisu Hamisu Haruna¹, Bello Ibrahim¹, Musa Haruna¹, Bashir Ibrahim² & Kamariah Yunus²

¹ Al-Qalam University Katsina, IBB Way off Dutsin-ma Road Katsina State of Nigeria, Nigeria

² Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Gong Badak Campus, 21300, Kuala Nerus, Terengganu, Malaysia

Correspondence: Kamariah Yunus, Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Gong Badak Campus, 21300, Kuala Nerus, Terengganu, Malaysia. E-mail: kamariah@unisza.edu.my

Received: May 23, 2018 Accepted: June 20, 2018 Online Published: November 27, 2018

doi:10.5539/ijel.v8n7p83

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n7p83>

Abstract

Studies on writing, thus, become crucial because when students make the transition from Secondary School to a Tertiary Institution, they encounter many challenges. One of them is the writing of B.A projects. Most of these undergraduate students both in L1 (English as a first language) and L2 (English as a second language) still find it difficult to argue, discuss or evaluate competently as well as persuasively in English essay writing. The present study aimed at exploring metadiscoursal choice and its influence on the success of students' academic writing. The study was conducted within the framework of Appraisal Theory. The data was randomly generated from the written essays by thirty selected Level 400 students both from Umaru Musa Yar'adua University and Al-Qalam University Katsina. Also, the data was descriptively analysed and presented. It was discovered that six (6) of the essays do not contain the relevant elements for this study, thus excluded from the analysis. To achieve the main objective of this study, the first six categories of the most successful essays and the least successful ones were taken for in-depth analysis. They were analysed paragraph by paragraph and then each interactional metadiscourse element was separately discussed as a whole. The findings showed that many of the students were not exposed to these elements, thus, they write academic essay the way they speak. It is against these findings that the present study unravels that embedding the teaching of metadiscourse in cumulative learning practices could consequently empower students to develop both linguistically and intellectually.

Keywords: metadiscourse markers, interactional metadiscourse, academic writing, students' writing

1. Introduction

The ever-growing concern about the falling standard of English by examining bodies and university lecturers/researchers in Nigerian Universities is not unusual, since similar anxiety has, for years, been voiced out by lecturers and teachers about students' poor academic performance. This is because writing is the medium through which students are assessed academically (Kamal, 2004). This fact becomes more serious because English language is considered to be the international language and the universal language of communication, as its proficiency becomes an essential aspect for those aspiring for academic success. In particular, effective writing skills are paramount for success in higher learning, work and society (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). This form of writing is particularly problematic for non-native speakers of English, who are often linguistically and rhetorically inexperienced when it comes to writing essays in English (Mohamed & Bahari, 2017; Thompson, 2001). This is because many researchers come to conclusion that students at university often perform poorly in text generation, not because they do not have the content, but because their mode of cognitive function is weak.

This fact makes many scholars to emphasise that, developing the skill of successful writing involves, among other things, an awareness of audience in academic writing and the ability to exploit this awareness in written text (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Thompson, 2001; Swales & Feak, 2004). However, others focus on the correlation between students' awareness of audience and the quality of their writing (Golden, 1980, in Shiyuan 2016). It is this sense of audience, possessed by a good writer, using persuasive language is termed "metadiscourse" (Hyland, 2004).

Mahammed and Rawian (2018) posit that the pressing need for effective writing skills, thus, has led to an increasing interest in the study of interaction in written texts in the previous decades. This is because cases often

arise of university students' essays failing to fulfill certain requirements. This is largely caused by the fact that, metadiscourse, which establishes ways of organising a message and facilitating the communication quality in the text, is not only quite a new concept in the area of text analysis but also a degree of opacity that leads to the paucity of linguistic dexterity and research on its important use in essay writings (Mohamed & Rashid, 2017). Drawing on earlier classifications of writer and reader interactions (Kopple, 1985), Hyland (2005) created one of the most complete models for the study of interaction in written texts: the metadiscourse model. Thus, prompted by the fact that metadiscourse, a rhetorical domain that regulates the communicative function of language, can be used to convey a message and create solidarity between a writer and a reader in academic writings. This paper attempts an analysis of metadiscoursal choice to examine the degree to which the final year students of Umaru Musa Yar'adua University and Al-Qalam University Katsina produce the persuasive efficacy of metadiscourse markers in their essays. The main objective of the research is to discover how the choice of hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mentions affect students' marks scored in their essays (Mahammed & Rawian 2018).

2. Proliferations

2.1 Studies on Metadiscourse

Although metadiscourse is relatively a new concept, it has generated a lot of research in recent years. There have been numerous studies of various aspects of metadiscourse (e.g., hedging, imperatives, self-mention) in a range of genres. A range of recent studies in text analysis have been devoted to the presence and functional role of metadiscourse markers in various genres including science popularisations (Crismore & Farnsworth, 1990, p.58), textbooks (Crismore, 1983, 1984; Hyland, 1999; Noorian & Biria, 2017), students writing (Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995), and research articles (Hyland, 1998, 1999; Abdi, 2002; Theroova, 2018). Metadiscourse has also been used to examine rhetorical differences in the texts written by different first language groups and those produced by ESL and native writers. In his comparative study of the use of metadiscourse between introductory textbooks for tertiary students and research articles, Chen, Song, & Heo, (2018) findings showed that, although both types of texts exhibited a greater use of *textual* metadiscourse, there was an increase in the use of *interpersonal* metadiscourse in the research articles. This is not surprising as research articles, being persuasive in nature, would employ a greater use of interpersonal metadiscourse. Apart from this, Hyland (2004) examined the metadiscourse use in 240 Masters and Doctoral dissertations of six disciplines; Computer science, Electronic Engineering, Business Studies, Biology, Applied Linguistics, and Public Administration. The results indicated that the use of metadiscourse is an important rhetorical device in the academic genre particularly in postgraduate dissertations where the students used slightly more *interactive* than *interactional* forms.

Besides postgraduate dissertations, metadiscourse has also been examined in undergraduate academic writings. Chen and Flowerdew (2018) for instance, compared the use of metadiscourse in good and poor undergraduate essays and found that good essays employed more *interactional* metadiscourse while the weak essays exhibited more of the use of *interactive*. Furthermore, good essays were found to have more and a wider range of metadiscourse forms. Ho and Li (2018) hold that this led them to conclude that, metadiscourse use has a bearing on the quality of the essays. Despite these studies, there is still dearth of in-depth study which explores interactional metadiscourse choice especially in the final year undergraduate students of B.A English. This paper, therefore, highlights the need for the present study and proposes to extend the current research by applying Hyland's (2005, pp. 75-100) model of interactional metadiscoursal choice on the writings of the students' essays.

The study is therefore significant in that, it focuses on exploring interpersonal components in the students' writing from a perspective of writer and reader interaction. This is because the correlation between academic success and exploitation of the interpersonal aspect of academic argument and persuasion has been significantly under-researched (Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995). Hence, the research will contribute in extending the frontiers of linguistic appreciation through better understanding of meanings and appropriate usages in writing especially in the areas of Applied Linguistics, Discourse Analysis, English for Academic Purposes, English for Specific Purposes and Advanced Composition. This claim is supported by Hyland (2005) who holds that interactional metadiscourse elements, in particular, play a crucial role in contributing new knowledge and "making academic claims".

2.2 The Concept of Metadiscourse

As a linguistic construct, metadiscourse has received much attention in Applied Linguistics over the past few decades, particularly in the fields of Composition, Academic writing and Discourse Analysis. For this reason, writing scholars have been fascinated by the role of metadiscourse in writing and each has defined metadiscourse in their own way. However, despite the proliferation of definitions, it has been lamented that metadiscourse "has

always been something of a fuzzy term” (Hyland, 2005, p. 16). This is especially true considering its various definitions which are usually vague or elusive, such as “writing about writing” (Williams, 1985, p. 226), and “discourse about discourse” (Kopple, 1985, p. 83). The fuzziness of this term, as observes, can be partly attributed to the “heterogeneity of the features of spoken and written discourse which can signal the dimensions of context that metadiscourse refers to, as remarked by Swales (1990, p. 188) that while the concept is easy to accept in principle, it is more difficult to establish its boundaries:

The word ‘metadiscourse’ may have a reassuringly objective, ‘scientific’ ring, but its usage suggests boundaries of definition no more firmly drawn than those of, say, ‘rhetoric’ or ‘style’. One reader may perceive a clear stylistic intention in something which another reader dismisses as a commonplace, ‘automatized’ use of language. (Nash, 1992, p. 100)

Although the arguments surrounding metadiscourse have not been resolved, researchers, notwithstanding, have made attempts at the phenomenon more systematically by drawing upon various theoretical perspectives. For Kopple (1985), metadiscourse functions as a linguistic device in writings which indicates the writer’s presence but does not add any additional propositional information. In a similar vein, Overbeck (2017) explicates the roles of the term in its interactive value as they see metadiscourse as “a writing device that helps writers to structure their writing discourse and display their stance towards the text or the reader.” More recently, Williams (2007, p. 65) comments that metadiscourse is the language that refers “not to the substance of your ideas, but to yourself, your reader, or your writing.”

Similarly, the concept of metadiscourse is based on a view of writing (and speaking) as a social and communicative interaction, offering a means of understanding the ways we project ourselves into our texts to manage our communicative intentions. Metadiscourse is, therefore, an important concept that seems to offer a motivation for collecting, under one heading, the range of devices writers use to explicitly organise their text, engage readers and signal their attitudes to both their material and their audience. Hyland (1998, p. 80) opines:

Hence, metadiscourse is an umbrella term to include a heterogeneous array of cohesive and interpersonal features which help relate a text to its context by assisting readers to connect, organise, and interpret material in a way preferred by the writer and with regard to the understandings and values of a particular discourse community.

Crucial to metadiscourse, according to Hight and Harindranath (2017) as cited in Hyland (2005), is the writer’s conscious engagement with the reader as creating a convincing reader environment that involves deploying metadiscoursal resources so that the final text is *co-produced* by the author and the members of the audience to which it is directed:

Metadiscourse reveals the writer’s awareness of the reader and his or her need for elaboration, clarification, guidance and interaction. In expressing an awareness of the text, the writer also makes the reader aware of it, and this only happens when he or she has a clear reader-oriented reason for doing so (p. 17).

The discussions above reveal that every writer interacts with readers in their texts. The interaction may be encoded explicitly or implicitly by some linguistic expressions called metadiscourse (Latif, Hadi, Yusof, & Rahman, 2018).

Sclafani, Bektik, Wilkins; Chen & Flowerdew; Chen, Song & Heo; Therov; Ho & Li (2017; 2018) are of the view that Metadiscourse can therefore be regarded as a way of understanding how academic writers express their interpersonal understandings, how they shape their propositions to create convincing, coherent discourse in particular social and institutional contexts (Kızıl, 2017). An orientation to the reader is crucial in securing rhetorical objectives in research writing as writers have to anticipate and respond to the potential negation of their arguments. Moreover, Sclafani, et.al adds that Metadiscourse is fold into two useful terms, interactive and interactional resources, and are elaborated below.

Interactive resources allow the writer to manage the information flow to explicitly establish his or her preferred interpretations. They are concerned with ways of organising discourse to anticipate readers’ knowledge and reflect the writer’s assessment of what needs to be made explicit to constrain and guide what can be recovered from the text. These resources include the following:

- 1) Transitions comprise an array of devices, mainly conjunctions, used to mark additive, contrastive, and consequential steps in the discourse, as opposed to the external world.
- 2) Frame markers are references to text boundaries or elements of schematic text structure, including items used to sequence, to label text stages, to announce discourse goals, and to indicate topic shifts.

- 3) Endophoric markers make additional material salient and available to the reader in recovering the writer's intentions by referring to other parts of the text.
- 4) Evidentials indicate the source of textual information which originates outside the current text.
- 5) Code glosses signal the restatement of ideational information.

Interactional resources focus on the participants of the interaction and seek to display the writer's personal and a tenor consistent with the norms of the disciplinary community. Metadiscourse here concerns the writer's efforts to control the level of personality in a text and establish a suitable relationship to his or her data, arguments, and audience, marking the degree of intimacy, the expression of attitude, the communication of commitments, and the extent of reader involvement. They include:

- 1) Hedges mark the writer's reluctance to present propositional information categorically.
- 2) Boosters express certainty and emphasise the force of propositions.
- 3) Attitude markers express the writer's appraisal of propositional information, conveying surprise obligation, agreement, importance, and so on.
- 4) Engagement markers explicitly address readers, either by selectively focusing their attention or by including them as participants in the text through second person pronouns, imperatives, question forms and asides (Hyland, 2001a).
- 5) Self-mentions suggest the extent of author presence in terms of first person pronouns and possessives case.

3. Methodology

The study was carried out by administering a test to the subjects of the research (Level 400 students of UMYU and AUK). They were given the same topic and asked to write an essay of not more than a page for publication in the University Bulletin, on the topic: "*The Collapse of Education is the Collapse of the Nation*". For the essays to be analysed, descriptive research design as suggested by Tavakoli, 2012. A total of one hundred and six (106) students served as the population of the research and by adopting Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) equal and fair chance of all the subjects opportunity of being selected in the sample, the researchers used simple random sampling and selected thirty (30) subjects to form the sample size. After the test, with the help of research assistants, the essays underwent two levels of analysis. The first was made by the veteran English Language teachers who used the five point web criteria of scoring contained in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) which are: Communication Quality, Organisation, Argumentation, Linguistic Accuracy and Linguistic Appropriacy; while the second was conducted as shown in the analysis and discussions.

4. Data Analysis

As mentioned earlier, the corpus was analysed based on the five classifications of interactional metadiscourse elements, proposed by Hyland (2005), as set out in the following table:

Table 1. Interactional model of metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005)

Category: Interactional Metadiscourse	Function: Involve reader in the text.	Example: Resources
Hedges	withhold commitment and open dialogue	might; perhaps; possible; about
Boosters	emphasize certainty and close dialogue	in fact; definitely; it is clear that
Attitude markers	express writers' attitude to proposition	unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly
Self-mentions	explicit reference to author(s)	I; we; my; me; our
Engagement markers	explicitly build relationship with reader	consider; note; you can see that

The main essence of the analysis was to indicate the possible deployment of these elements in the essays. Hence, they were photocopied four times, making the sum total of one hundred and twenty copies (120). Each of the thirty set of essays was given to each of the four experienced teachers of English language from the two Universities selected for marking and evaluation. The researchers used simple percentage table to classify the frequency of interactional metadiscourse elements in the respondents' essays.

4.1 Result Findings

After the data coding was completed, the number of clauses for the thirty essays totaled to five hundred and eighty four (584). Based on the presentation and analysis of the data obtained, virtually all the forms of interactional metadiscoursal elements were found in the essays with varying degree of frequency. Thus, of the three hundred and seventy (370) markers found in the twenty four (24) analysed essays, engagement markers

occurred one hundred and nine (109) times which have the highest percentage of instances with 18.7% discovered. This is followed by hedges occurring ninety eight (98) times which represents 16.8%. Then, self-mentions that occurred seventy five (75) times representing 12.8%. in addition, boosters appeared sixty six (66) times accounting for 11.3%. Finally, attitude markers which has the least frequency of twenty two (22) times in the overall texts, account for 3.8%.

Table 2. Total number of the elements that appeared in the texts

Items	Raw Numbers	Percentages
Hedges	98	16.8%
Boosters	66	11.3%
Attitude Markers	22	3.8%
Engagement Markers	109	18.7%
Self-Mention	75	12.8%
Total Markers	370	63.4%

The first six categories of the most successful essays and the least successful ones were taken for in-depth analysis. The texts were analysed paragraph by paragraph and through this intra-paragraph examination, each interactional metadiscourse element was separately discussed as a whole. For the research validity purpose, all the clauses extracted from the students' essays were written directly from the original sources without alteration.

4.2 Findings and Discussions

Based on the presentation and analysis of the data, this study showed that the interactional metadiscoursal choices that the final year students of UMYU and AUK made affected how their writing was perceived and scored. Thus, even if the students did not realise that they were making incorrect metadiscoursal choices, because of their limited knowledge, these features had negative effects on the reception of their essays.

For example, the findings from this study revealed a significant difference between the most successful students and the least successful ones. The former, for instance, interacted more with their imagined recipients (examiners) in a more academic way and, where necessary, open room for negotiation by way of weakening their claims (through hedges), sometimes, occasionally expressing their certainty on their claims (through boosters), and more often engage their readers as discourse participants (through engagement markers). However, they minimised their explicit presence in the essays and, thus, were more successful. The results of this study are in line with those obtained by Intaraprawat, P., and Steffensen, M. S. (1995) who compared and contrasted between good and poor ESL Essays in the use of metadiscourse.

In contrast, the latter boosted their claims and closed down alternatives awkwardly by using words like *true*, *clear*, *without any doubt*, *always*, *never* etc, without respecting proper social relationships with their teachers and creating too high of the degree of authority as supported by Noorian & Biria, (2017). Similarly, they write in the way they speak through the explicit use of pronouns “I” and “we” that create informal and direct argument which made them as “opinion holders” or “arguers” (which is considered as relatively high-risking discourse functions). This, in addition to wrong spellings and collocations, put much strain on the examiners and therefore affected their marks negatively. For example, some clauses made by the least successful essayists portrayed such instance:

- i. At this juncture let me *discourse* (discuss) about teaching profession in Nigeria, whereby almost sixty percent to seventy percent are having severe *headech* (headache). (Text 6)
- ii. A weeked (*weak*) teacher can provide a *weeked* (weak) society. (Text 6)
- iii. In a *not shell* (nutshell), corruption is not a certain thing that we have to be *proud with* (of). (Text 3)

As can be seen from the above examples, majority of the least successful essays have in them incidence of grammatically deviant sentences characterised by punctuations and mechanical errors in tense, concord, wrong collocations and even spellings. These findings are similar to the findings of Lee (2010) who also indicated that interpersonal features used by her ESL writers created a voice that was too conversational.

4.3 Summary of the Findings

In the light of the above, the following are the researchers' findings as follows:

- 1) While some students made a good choice of interactional markers in their essays and, by implication, positively affected the high marks scored, it was found that many of them were not exposed to these

elements which directly affected the wrong choice of the elements.

- 2) It was discovered that the wrong choice of these elements has a link in the way they write the way they speak (in informal context).
- 3) The paper, finally, unravels that embedding the teaching of metadiscourse in cumulative learning practices could consequently empower students' right choice of the elements.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

As broached, this paper was undertaken to examine the influence of interactional metadiscourse choice in students' essays. This followed the realisation that, in the past writing was taught by either imitating sample works from experts or by focusing on elements and grammatical points, and the role of metadiscourse features was neglected. The textual analysis was made by the researchers in which the elements were described, interpreted and analysed. Based on the findings of this study it can be claimed that university students will write better and more successfully if they are given formal teaching about metadiscourse.

References

- Abdi, R. (2002). Interpersonal Metadiscourse: An Indicator of Interaction and Identity. *Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 139-145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456020040020101>
- Bektik, D. (2017). *Learning Analytics for Academic Writing through Automatic Identification of Meta-discourse* (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University).
- Chen, C., Song, M., & Heo, G. E. (2018). A scalable and adaptive method for finding semantically equivalent cue words of uncertainty. *Journal of Informetrics*, 12(1), 158-180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.12.004>
- Chen, M., & Flowerdew, J. (2018). Introducing data-driven learning to PhD students for research writing purposes: A territory-wide project in Hong Kong. *English for Specific Purposes*, 50, 97-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.11.004>
- Crismore, A., & Farnsworth, R. (1990). Metadiscourse in Popular and Professional Science Discourse. In W. Nash (Ed.), *The Writing Scholar: Studies in Academic Discourse*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- 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(1), 39-71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088393010001002>
- Faghih, E., & Rahimpour, S. (2009). Contrastive Rhetoric of English and Persian Written Texts: Metadiscourse in Applied Linguistics Research Articles. *Rice Working Papers in Linguistics*, 1, 92-107.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. New York: Longman.
- Hight, C., & Harindranath, R. (Eds.). (2017). *Studying Digital Media Audiences: Perspectives from Australasia* (Vol. 35). Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315402062>
- Ho, V., & Li, C. (2018). The use of metadiscourse and persuasion: An analysis of first year university students' timed argumentative essays. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 33, 53-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.02.001>
- Hyland, K. (1998). Boosting, Hedging and the Negotiation of Academic Knowledge. *Text*, 18, 349-382. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1998.18.3.349>
- Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary Interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 Postgraduate Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 133-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.02.001>
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: A Reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156>
- Intaraprawat, P., & Steffensen, M. S. (1995). The Use of Metadiscourse in Good and Poor ESL Essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 253-272. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743\(95\)90012-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(95)90012-8)
- Kamal, A. (2004). *Writing Academic English in an ESL Situation: A Case Study of Students of Bayero University, Kano*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Bayero University, Kano.
- Kızıllı, A. Ş. (2017). Spoken corpora and corpus-informed language pedagogy: Implications arising from research.
- Kızıllı, A. Ş. (2017). The use of metadiscourse in spoken interlanguage of EFL learners: A contrastive analysis.

- Latif, M. A. N. A., Hadi, A. Z. S. A., Yusof, S., & Rahman, M. H. A. (2018). Al-Khabar Language Alphabet in Two Ways Dialogue in Al-Qur'an (Laras Bahasa Al-Khabar Dalam Ayat-Ayat Dialog Dua Hala Al-Qur'an). *Malaysian Journal for Islamic Studies*, 2(1), 11-24.
- Mahammed, A., & Rawian, R. M. (2018). English Learning Motivation of First-Year Students in Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin (UniSZA). *ASIAN TEFL: Journal of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1).
- Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP Rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish English Economics Texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 3-22. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(93\)90024-I](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(93)90024-I)
- Mohamed, A. F., & Rashid, R. A. (2017). The metadiscourse markers in good undergraduate writers' essays corpus. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(6), 213-220. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n6p213>
- Mohamed, M., & Bahari, A. A. (2016). ESL instructors and learners' views on the use of Dropbox as a sharing tool in writing lessons. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 1(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol1iss2pp1-10>
- Noorian, M., & Biri, R. (2017). Interpersonal metadiscourse in persuasive journalism: A study of texts by American and Iranian EFL columnists. *Journal of Modern Languages*, 20(1), 64-79.
- Overbeck, A. (2017). Orality and Literacy of Online Communication. *Manual of Romance Languages in the Media*, 23, 176. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110314755-010>
- Sclafani, J. (2017). *Talking Donald Trump: A Sociolinguistic Study of Style, Metadiscourse, and Political Identity*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315276885>
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Glasgow: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, M. J., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic Writing for Undergraduate Students: Essential Skills and Tasks*. Machingan. Retrieved from <http://www.umich.edu/titleDetailDesc.do?>
- Therova, D. (2018). *What difference does one academic year make? Features and development of international foundation students' academic lexis in assessed writing at a UK university* (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University).
- Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in Academic Writing: Learning to Argue with the Reader. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 58-78. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.1.58>
- Vande-Kopple, W. J. (1985). Some Explanatory Discourse on Metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 82-93. <https://doi.org/10.2307/357609>
- Wilkins, E. M. (2018). *Exploring change: oral metadiscourse of advanced learners of Russian in extended study abroad* (Doctoral dissertation).

Appendix A

Table 1. Total number of the elements occurred in the individual texts

Text(s)	Clauses	Hedges	Boosters	Attitude markers	Engagement markers	Self-mentions
Text 1	17	2 (11.8%)	1 (5.1%)	1 (5.1%)	3 (17.6%)	1 (5.1%)
Text 2	29	2 (6.9%)	2 (6.9%)	0 (0%)	5 (20.7%)	0 (0%)
Text 3	23	3 (13.0%)	4 (17.4%)	0 (0%)	4 (17.4%)	8 (34.8%)
Text 4	15	2 (13.3%)	1 (6.7%)	3 (20%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)
Text 5	13	2 (15.4%)	3 (23.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (23.1%)	3 (23.1%)
Text 6	25	3 (12%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	5 (20%)	2 (8%)
Text 7	24	5 (20.8%)	3 (12.5%)	1 (4.2%)	2 (8.3%)	5 (20.8%)
Text 8	21	5 (23.8%)	4 (19.0%)	0 (0%)	10 (47.6%)	4 (19.0%)
Text 9	22	11 (50%)	2 (9.1%)	2 (9.1%)	4 (18.2%)	1 (4.5%)
Text 10	20	4 (20%)	8 (40%)	2 (10%)	6 (30%)	0 (0%)
Text 11	13	6 (46.2%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (7.7%)	1 (7.7%)
Text 12	26	5 (19.2%)	1 (3.8%)	2 (7.7%)	0 (0%)	4 (15.4%)
Text 13	16	4 (25%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Text 14	30	5 (16.7%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)	10 (33.3%)	6 (20%)
Text 15	19	5 (26.3%)	2 (10.5%)	1 (5.3%)	7 (36.8%)	0 (0%)
Text 16	18	1 (5.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.6%)	0 (0%)	3 (16.7%)
Text 17	16	3 (18.8%)	4 (25%)	1 (6.3%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0%)

Text 18	16	3 (18.8%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0%)
Text 19	30	2 (6.7%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)
Text 20	18	1 (5.6%)	1 (5.6%)	1 (5.6%)	1 (5.6%)	1 (11.1%)
Text 21	34	1 (2.9%)	2 (5.9%)	0 (0%)	3 (8.8%)	6 (17.5%)
Text 22	29	2 (6.9%)	4 (13.8%)	2 (6.9%)	12 (41.4%)	3 (10.4%)
Text 23	37	10 (27.0%)	3 (8.1%)	0 (0%)	8 (21.6%)	12 (32.4%)
Text 24	30	2 (6.7%)	3 (10%)	1 (3.3%)	8 (26.7%)	1 (3.3%)

Table 2. Summary of scores for all the essays by examiners

Text	Communication Quality	Organisation	Argumentation	Linguistic Accuracy	Linguistic Appropriacy	Total Scores
Text 1	02½	02½	03	02	03	13
	01	02	01	02	02	08
	03	03	02	03	02	13
	02	01	01	02	02	08
Total	08½	09½	07	09	09	43
Text 2	02½	02	02	02½	03	12
	04	02	04	03	03	16
	04	04	04	04	02	18
	03	02	02	02	01	10
Total	13½	10	12	11½	09	56
Text 3	00	01	02	02	02	07
	02	01	01	02	01	07
	03	03	02	01	01	10
	02	01	01	01	01½	06½
Total	07	06	06	06	05½	30½
Text 4	01½	02	01	02½	02½	10
	04	04	03	05	03	19
	04	04	04	03	03	18
	02	02	02	02	01	09
Total	11½	12	10	12½	09½	55½
Text 5	02	01½	02	02	01½	09
	02	02	02	01	01	08
	04	03	03	02	02	14
	02	01	02	01	02	08
Total	10	07½	09	06	06½	39
Text 6	02½	2½	02½	02	02½	12
	02	02	02	01	01	08
	02	03	01	02	02	10
	02	03	02	01	01	09
Total	08½	10½	07½	06	06½	38½
Text 7	02	02	02	02½	02½	11
	02	03	02	02	01	10
	03	03	02	02	02	12
	03	02	02	01	01	09
Total	10	10	08	07½	06½	42
Text 8	03	03	03	03	03	15
	04	03	03	04	03	17
	03	02	02	03	02	12
	03	02	02	01	01	09
Total	13	10	10	11	09	53
Text 9	02½	02	02½	02½	02½	12
	04	03	03	02	02	14
	03	02	02	03	03	13
	04	02	03	01	02	12
Total	13½	09	10½	08½	09½	51
Text 10	03½	02½	03	03	03	15
	04	04	04	03	03	18
	03	03	02	03	02	13
	04	02	02	02	02	12
Total	14½	11½	11	11	10	58
Text 11	02½	02½	02½	02½	03	13
	03	03	02	03	02	13
	04	03	03	04	03	17
	03	02	02	01	01	09
Total	12½	10½	09½	10½	09	52

Text 12	03½	03	03½	03½	03½	17
	02	01	01	01	01	06
	04	04	03	02	03	16
	02	01	1½	01	02	05½
Total	11½	09	09	07	09½	46
Text 13	03	03	03	02½	02½	14
	03	04	03	03	03	16
	04	03	03	03	02	15
	04	02	03	02	02	13
Total	14	12	12	10½	09½	58
Text 14	03	02	03	02	02	12
	04	03	04	03	03	17
	04	04	04	02	03	17
	03	02	01	01	02	09
Total	14	11	12	08	10	55
Text 15	02½	02½	03	03	03	14
	03	02	03	02	01	11
	02	01	01	02	02	08
	02	02	02	01	01	08
Total	09½	07½	09	08	07	41
Text 16	03½	03½	03½	02½	02½	12½
	03	03	04	03	03	16
	03	03	03	02	02	13
	04	02	04	02	01	13
Total	13½	11½	14½	09½	08½	57½
Text 17	03	02½	02½	02½	02½	13
	02	01	01	01	01	07
	02	01	02	01	02	08
	03	02	01	02	01	09
Total	10	06½	06½	06½	06½	36
Text 18	02	02	02	02	02	10
	02	01	01	02	01	07
	03	02	02	03	03	11
	02	01	02	01	01	07
Total	09	06	07	07	06	35
Text 19	03	03	03	02½	02½	14
	02	02	03	02	02	11
	03	03	03	02	02	13
	04	02	03	01	02	12
Total	12	10	12	07½	08½	50
Text 20	03	03	03	03	03	15
	04	03	03	04	04	18
	03	03	04	03	03	16
	04	04	04	02	02	16
Total	14	13	14	12	12	55
Text 21	03	02	02½	02½	03	13
Total	04	04	03	03	04	18
	03	02	02	02	02	11
	04	02	03½	02	02	13½
	14	10	11	09½	11	55½
Text 22	03	02½	02½	03	03	14
	03	03	02	03	03	14
	03	02	02	04	03	14
	03	02	02	01	02	10
Total	12	09½	08½	11	11	52
Text 23	02½	02½	02	02½	02½	12
	02	01	01	01	01	06
	04	04	03	02	03	16
	02	01	02½	01	01	07½
Total	10½	08½	08½	06½	07½	47½
Text 24	01½	01½	02	02	02	09
	03	03	02	03	03	14
	04	03	04	02	01	14
	02	01	02	01	01	07
Total	10½	08½	10	08	07	44

Table 3. Summary of scores by success rate

Text	Total raw marks	Average	Percentage
Text 13	58	58	58%
Text 10	58	58	58%
Text 16	57½	57½	57½%
Text 2	56	56	56%
Text 4	55½	55½	55½%
Text 21	55½	55½	55½%
Text 14	55	55	55%
Text 20	55	55	55%
Text 8	53	53	53%
Text 11	52	52	52%
Text 22	52	52	52%
Text 9	51	51	51%
Text 19	50	50	50%
Text 23	47½	47½	47½%
Text 12	46	46	46%
Text 24	44	44	44%
Text 1	43	43	43%
Text 7	42	42	42%
Text 15	41	41	41%
Text 5	39	39	39%
Text 6	38½	38½	38½%
Text 17	36	36	36%
Text 18	35	35	35%
Text 3	30½	30½	30½%

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).