

The Role of Metadiscourse Devices in Q1 Scopus-Indexed Linguistics Research Articles

Ahmed Abdulrahman Ahmed*, Juma'a Qadir Hussein

Department of English, College of Education for Humanities, University of Anbar, Ramadi, Iraq

* ahm19h1003@uoanbar.edu.iq

KEYWORDS: Articles, Linguistics, Scopus Q1 Index, Meta-discourse, Persuasion.



<https://doi.org/10.51345/v34i1.574.g348>

ABSTRACT:

The structure and production of persuasive writing are regarded to be significantly influenced by metadiscourse, a new and fascinating area of study that is based on the norms and expectations of those involved. Metadiscourse markers are observed as social activities that encourage contact among writers, readers, speakers, and listeners. In other words, authors must represent their identities in their writings in a way that makes sense to their readers. However, some words are used in writer's identity study in a way that can lead audiences to perceive them incorrectly. The primary goals of this study were to examine the metadiscourse indicators that were used most frequently in Q1 Scopus-index articles. The 10 Q1 Scopus-indexed linguistics articles from the Journal of Pragmatics that were used as study data ranged from (2020 to 2022). On the basis of Hyland's (2005a) model of metadiscourse markers, the data were qualitatively examined. The findings indicate that 2407 metadiscourse markers were employed in the entire dataset. There were 1785/74.1587 % of interactive metadiscourse markers compared to 622/25.8412 % of interactional metadiscourse markers.. Remarkably, it was found that metadiscourse markers were regarded as an essential tool for enhancing effective communication between authors and readers, establishing helpful possibilities for how well readers comprehend the material, and aiding them in differentiating facts from opinions while reading a text. Finally, the study suggests expanded use of metadiscourse-based analysis in academic writing generally and in high rank research articles in particular.

REFERENCES:

- Amiryousefi, M., & Rasekh, A. E. (2010). Metadiscourse: Definitions, Issues and Its Implications for English Teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 159-167.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Casanave, C. P. (2005). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Routledge.
- Fox, H. (1994). *Listening to the World: Cultural Issues in Academic Writing*. National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 W. Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL United State
- Hyland, K. (2002). Options of identity in academic writing. *ELT journal*, volume 56 issue (4), 351-358.
- Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of second language writing*,.volum(13)issue (2), 133-151.
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: social interactions in academic writing*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177.
- Thompson, G. (2001). *Interaction in academic writing: Learnin*

- Kopple, W. J. V. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College composition and communication*, 82-93.
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles* (Vol. 54). John Benjamins Publishing.
- 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.
- 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*, vol. 10 no. (1), 39-71.
- Williams, J. M. (1985). *Style: Ten lessons in clarity and grace* (2nd ed.). Glenview: Scott Foresman.
- Thompson, G. (2003). *Between hierarchies and markets: the logic and limits of network forms of organization*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Hyland, K. (2005a). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing, continuum guides to discourse*. London: Continuum
- Kumpf, E. P. (2000). Visual metadiscourse: Designing the considerate text. *Technical communication quarterly*, vol. 9 no. (4), 401-424.
- Jalilifar, A., & Alipour, M. (2007). How explicit instruction makes a difference: Metadiscourse markers and EFL learners' reading comprehension skill. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 38(1), 35-52.
- Rashid, R. A., Rahman, M. F. A., & Rahman, S. B. A. (2016). Teachers' engagement in social support process on a networking site. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 1(1), 34-45.
- 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.
- Harris, J. I. (1959). Studies on pituitary polypeptide hormones. 3. The structure of α -melanocyte-stimulating hormone from pig pituitary glands. *Biochemical Journal*, 71(3), 451.
- Beauvais, P. J. (1989). A speech act theory of metadiscourse. *Written communication*, 6(1), 11-30.
- 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*, vol. 10 no.

Appendices:

- 1- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378216620301594>
- 2- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378216621003805>
- 3- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378216621002496>
- 4- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378216621002721>
- 5- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378216621002472>
- 6- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378216621002435>
- 7- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378216621002666>
- 8- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378216621001351>
- 9- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378216621001727>
- 10- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0378216621001697>

1. Introduction:

Writing is one of the most essential social behaviors in the academia. Thus, text is a space where knowledge and writer's identities are built, negotiated, and created when social interactions occur in the academic community. As a result, academics spend the majority of their time writing, publishing, communicating, and disseminating their knowledge (Canagarajah, 2002). People who produce texts are not only writing-presenting ideas in textual form but also writers-creating a variety of meanings in the writing context, especially when people are thrust into a new social situation (e.g. higher education) (Casanave, 2002; Fox, 1994).

Hyland (2004) defines metadiscourse as a set of self-reflective language terms that relate to the changing text, the writer, and the text's imagined readers. It is founded on a notion of writing as a social interaction, and it demonstrates how writers project themselves into their speech to signal in academic environments their devotion and attitudes. This term is seen by Hyland (2000) as "the interpersonal resources utilized to organize a discourse or the writer's attitude toward the topic or the reader in this case"(p.109). Although metadiscourse is based on the assumption that the ultimate meaning of a text is derived from the interaction of its

constituent elements, it is still necessary to define the text's ideational content from different aspects that arrange the text and convey the author's thoughts and feelings towards the direction of metadiscourse (Hyland&Tes,2004). Thompson in his study (2001) distinguished two basic types of interaction in written texts, which is further extended by Hyland (2004) into interactive and interactional. The interactive type concerns information organization and propositional content coherence, and so seeks to guide readers through the substance of the text via transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, and code glosses. The interactional type, on the other hand, engages readers in the text's argument or spirit and invites them to comment on it. The authors attempt to create an interaction with their viewers and indicate their intentions for this reason through specific linguistic strategies, a perspective on propositional substance (Hyland, 2004). Accordingly, the interactional type depicts the reader-author interaction in texts, which is accomplished through the use of specific devices such as hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mentions by authors to express their point of view, focus reader attention, position themselves, and initiate a dialogue with the reader. Based on the above argument, metadiscourse devices are generally required to help readers understand the writers' goal or identify their identity. Based on the above argument, the study attempts to answer the following question: What is the role of metadiscourse markers in Q1 Scopus-Indexed linguistics research articles?

2. Theoretical Framework: An Overview of Metadiscourse

The value of a research article in advancing academic knowledge cannot be exaggerated. The research article remains the academy's major genre, names are made, knowledge is verified, awards are distributed, and disciplinary authority is applied on this site. A writer of an academic paper essentially wants his or her point to be understood and accepted. This requirement for confirmation demonstrates the weakness of research paper arguments, as well as the active role that readers play in their production (Hyland, 2000).

Metadiscourse is one example of an author's answer to the potential for his or her statements to be refuted, an attempt to engage the reader and anticipate probable objections or misunderstandings. Its purpose in academic discourse is to rally support, express collegiality, resolve problems, and avoid conflict. There are two main causes of reader disagreement to assertions. First, if a statement fails to meet the sufficiency criteria, readers may reject it. Writers must use their fields' epistemic standards and argument forms to guarantee that their assertions have a credible relationship with reality. Here, metadiscourse aids in the signaling of concepts and the organization of material in methods that the target audience is probable to find it acceptable and compelling. Second, in order to be persuasive, statements must meet acceptability conditions while also taking into account interactional elements. The writer adopts a professionally appropriate persona and a relationship with readers that attempts a balance between the researcher's authority as expert-knower and his/her humility as disciplinary servant, and metadiscourse caters to the requirements of the participants of the interaction (Hyland, 1998a).

3. Methodology

This section includes details of the model adopted, Hyland's (2005a) model of metadiscourse followed by research design, criteria for data selection, and procedures for data analysis.

3.1 The Adopted Model: Hyland's (2005a) Model of Metadiscourse

Metadiscourse is defined by (Williams, 1985), as "writing about writing" (p.226), and it relates to any writer's or speaker's linguistic utterances while communicating with readers or listeners. Metadiscourse is a set of linguistic terms in a text that explain the text rather than the predicate content of the text (Thompson, 2003). As a "social and communicative process" (p. 14) between writers and their readers, Hyland (2005) goes on to define metadiscourse. While structuring the materials to aid readers in understanding and responding to the material, writers provide "cues and indicators" in their work (Kumpf, 2000, p. 401). Actually, these signals and signs are known as metadiscourse devices, according to Hyland (2004, 2005).

According to Jalilifar & Alipour (2007), these metadiscourse tools make use of connectives to arrange a text's ideas and messages. This connection between authors and readers results in writings that are easier for readers to understand. Vande Kopple (1985) had already presented a similar approach. Due to the fact that writing is regarded as a social thing in which authors engage with readers to convey messages (Amiryousefi & Rasekh, 2010; Rashid, Rahman, & Rahman, 2016), metadiscourse aids audiences in comprehending the messages in text. The messages can be easily delivered to the readers by properly using metadiscourse in writing. Previous research has found that metadiscourse improves the effectiveness of writing by organizing, clarifying, and understanding the ideas in the text (Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995; Hyland, 2005; Amiryousefi & Rasekh, 2010).

According to Hyland (2005), The term "metadiscourse" was first used by Harris (1959) to refer to a system of linguistic interpretation that is used to show how a writer tries to influence the audience's perspective on the messages in a text. The term "discourse about discoursing" (Vande Kopple, 1985, p. 83; Beauvais, 1989, p. 11) also relates to the use of language by the writer or speaker to engage the listeners or readers. Actually, Crismore, Markkanen, and Steffensen (1993) defined metadiscourse as "anything that does not add anything to the text's proportional content".

Metadiscourse indicators have been classified in a variety of ways. Hyland's interpersonal model of metadiscourse (2005) is employed in this study since it includes a wide range of metadiscourse categories and subcategories. As a result, the most recent system includes a reference list of probable metadiscourse markers (498 markers) for detecting metadiscourse statements in text. Metadiscourse devices are divided into two main categories: interactive and interactional metadiscourse and sub-categories interactive recourses: transitions, endophoric markers, frame markers, evidential, code glosses while interactional recourses are hedges, attitude markers, boosters, engagements markers, and self-mentions. To analyze the metadiscourse devices employed in academic texts, Hyland (2005) presented an interpersonal model of metadiscourse. Hyland's 2004 study, which is similar to the most current scheme introduced in 2005, found the system as a model of metadiscourse in academic writings. The framework divides metadiscourse into two main categories: "interactive" and "interactional."

1. Interactional Resources

Interactional devices, that "involve the reader in the argument" (Hyland, 2005, p.49), are another major group. This category of metadiscourse markers contains signaling words and

phrases that are purposefully created to engage or draw readers to participate in any of the text's arguments. Hedges, such as modals, act as a language shield to keep the writer's words in check (might, may, and should). Other signaling words used in metadiscourse include (perhaps, possible, possibly, and about). Boosters, the second sub-category, emphasizes the authors' belief in their claims, such as the markers (certainly, actually,...). Another sub-category is attitude markers, which relates to metadiscourse devices that indicate a author's feelings and attitudes with regards to what they are writing. (Unfortunately, shockingly, and I agree) are among the marks. Engagement markers are another sub-category. Because they are employed to interest audiences, these words or phrases are regarded as engagement indicators. such as (note that, you can see that, and consider). Self-mentions are the final sub-category of interactional resources, which use pronouns like to directly proclaim the creator of the text (I, we, my, and our).

The interpretative markers category has been eliminated, although the primary groups (textual metadiscourse and interpersonal metadiscourse) have been retained. To put it another way, Hyland's (2004, 2005) renames the two primary resources interactive and interactional metadiscourse. Despite the fact that Hyland (2005) identified 498 plausible metadiscourse markers in academic prose, just a few are routinely employed by writers, particularly novice undergraduates. In one statement, a device might be a metadiscourse device; in another, it might be a predicate content marker. It is dependent on the message that a author or speaker is attempting to communicate. For researchers looking for metadiscourse markers in writing, particularly large patterns, this list is quite helpful.

2. Interactive Resources

The metadiscourse markers discovered in this study were analyzed using this paradigm as a guideline. Interactive resources, according to Hyland (2005, p. 49), "assist to guide the reader through text". Metadiscourse devices are cues that authors employ to direct and assist their audiences in understanding the messages they are reading while using interactive resources. The first subcategory of interactive resources is transitions, and they stress the connections between the semantics of key lines in the content, such as (in addition, but, so, and so on). Frame markers, the second one, include signaling expressions. such as (first, finally, in conclusion, in a nutshell) and others that indicate numbered order, sequence, or phases in the text. declarative phrases that emphasize various stages of the writing process are also included in these devices. such as (now you have to, and my purpose here is to).

The next sub-category is endophoric markers, which relate to any information the author has already expressed inside the content, such as (noted above that). Another subcategory of interactive resources is evidential markers. Some writing techniques do not fall under this subcategory since they encourage the audience to find information from other sources. Code glosses are the fifth type of interactive resource, and they "assist users in grasping the functionalities of conceptual content" (Hyland, 2005a, p. 49). Signaling words like (namely), for example, such as, and in other words) are among the markers.

Table 3.1 Hyland's (2005a) Model of Metadiscourse Markers

3.2 Criteria for Data Selection

The corpus subjected to analysis consists of thirty-five Q1 Scopus- indexed linguistics articles selected randomly from Journal of Pragmatics covering the period between (2020-2022). The reason behind choosing Journal of Pragmatics is that it is a specialized and high quality journal in linguistics, pragmatics; it is a Q1 journal since 2008 (based on information of the journal in Scopus Website). Therefore, metadiscourse use as an identity marker is expected to be highly professional that will ensure the quality and naturality of the data. To meet the objectives of the study, the articles selected contain three

main parts: Introduction, Discussion, and Conclusion.

3.3 Procedures for Data Analysis

Examining the occurrence of interactional MD and interactive MD in the data selected the analysis was based on the following procedures:

1. Collecting randomly 35 articles with the three main parts (Introduction, Discussion, and Conclusion) from Journal of Pragmatics.
2. Coding the articles selected for analysis.
3. Analyzing data based on Hyland's (2005a) model of discourse markers.
4. Tabulating the findings of frequencies and percentages of the main categories of metadiscourse markers used in the articles (RQ1).
5. Tabulating the findings of frequencies and percentages of the sub-categories on metadiscourse markers used in the articles (RQ2).

4. Findings and Discussion

The following table shows the total frequency and percentage of metadiscourse devices in the whole data as table 4.1 bellow illustrates:

Metadiscourse category	Total markers	% percentage
Interactive	1785	74.1587
Interactional	622	25.8412
Total	2407	100%

Table (4.1) The Total Frequencies and Percentages of Metadiscourse Markers in the Whole Data

Remarkably, in 10 articles, the above table shows frequencies and percentages of metadiscourse items used in the 10 Q1 Scopus-indexed articles, the frequency of two primary categories of metadiscourse was manually counted based on Hyland'(2005a) classification. According to this, metadiscourse can be classified into two categories that have subcategories interactional (*hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mention and engagement markers*) and interactive markers (*transitions, frame markers endophoric markers, evidential, and code glosses*). The total frequency and percentage of metadiscourse items involve the three key parts of the essays (*introduction, discussion, and conclusion*). The overall number of interactive metadiscourse markers found was 1785, 74.1587%, while the interactional metadiscourse markers detected 622, 25.8412%.

Introduction																				
Articles	Es.1		Es.2		Es3		Es.4		Es.5		Es.6		Es.7		Es.8		Es.9		Es.10	
Interactional	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.
Hedges	1	5	0	0	2	8.6	2	11.1	1	9.09	5	45.4	1	25	1	3.3	1	10	2	66.6
Boosters	2	11.76	2	5.88	14	34.1	6	22.2	3	17.6	8	53.3	5	15.6	3	20	2	11.7	7	36.8
Attitude Markers	3	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.2	2	18.1	2	25	1	20	3	33.3
Self-mention	21	43.8	3	14.2	2	66.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.7	0	0	3	33.3
Engagement markers	0	0	0	0	1	9.09	2	33.3	4	66.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0
Total F. &P.	120times,19292%																			
Interactive																				
Transitions	45	31.3	17	10	33	31.4	31	24.2	34	25.7	28	45.9	13	30.9	20	11.1	17	23.6	16	32.6
Frame markers	3	30	0	0	4	40	2	40	1	8.3	3	75	1	9.09	1	11.1	1	9.09	2	22.2
Endophoric markers	8	34.8	4	6.06	4	12.5	1	4.54	5	62.5	0	0	8	30.7	1	4	0	0	0	0
Evidential	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
Code glosses	17	35.4	9	24.3	20	37.03	12	20.3	11	37.9	14	48.2	8	17.3	9	25.7	1	6.6	8	57.1
Total F.&P.	415times,23.249%																			
Discussion																				
Articles	Es.1		Es.2		Es3		Es.4		Es.5		Es.6		Es.7		Es.8		Es.9		Es.10	
Interactional	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.
Hedges	16	80	6	66.6	16	69.5	14	77.7	6	54.5	4	36.3	2	50	24	80	9	90	1	33.3
Boosters	12	70.5	28	82.3	20	48.7	17	62.9	11	64.7	3	20	19	59.3	10	66.6	15	88.2	11	57.8
Attitude Markers	3	50	0	0	1	100	4	100	0	0	4	5.1	5	45.4	5	62.5	4	80	6	66.6
Self-mention	12	25	14	66.6	1	33.3	11	100	2	66.6	5	41.6	7	100	45	86.5	0 ^{***}	0	6	66.6
Engagement markers	1	100	0	0	10	90.9	4	66.6	2	33.3	1	100	1	100	5	100	3	75	0	0
Total F.&P.	406times,65.273%																			
Interactive																				
Transitions	76	52.4	131	77.05	62	59.4	80	62.5	78	59.09	12	19.6	17	40.4	127	70.5	48	66.6	23	46.9
Frame markers	5	50	10	76.9	6	60	3	60	8	66.6	0	0	8	72.7	7	77.7	9	81.8	4	44.4
Endophoric markers	9	39.1	61	92.4	28	87.5	20	90.9	3	37.5	0	0	18	69.2	24	96	18	100	7	100
Evidential	0	0	1	100	2	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100	2	100	0	0
Code glosses	26	54.2	22	59.4	30	55.5	36	61.01	16	5.1	4	13.7	28	60.8	23	65.7	14	93.3	2	14.2
Total F.&P	1112 times, 62.296%																			

Conclusion																				
Articles	Es.1		Es.2		Es.3		Es.4		Es.5		Es.6		Es.7		Es.8		Es.9		Es.10	
Interactive	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.	F.	P.
Hedges	3	15	3	33.3	2	21.7	2	11.1	4	36.3	2	18.1	1	25	5	16.6	0	0	0	0
Boosters	3	17.6	4	11.7	7	17.07	4	14.8	3	17.6	4	26.6	8	25	2	13.3	0	0	1	5.26
Attitude Markers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	28.5	4	36.3	1	12.5	0	0	0	0
Self-mention	15	31.3	4	19.04	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	7	58.3	0	0	4	7.6	0	0	0	0
Engagement markers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total F.& P.	96 times, 15.434%																			
Interactive																				
Transitions	24	16.6	22	12.94	10	9.5	18	14.6	20	15.1	21	34.4	12	28.5	33	18.3	7	9.7	10	20.4
Frame markers	2	20	3	23.07	0	0	0	0	3	25	1	25	2	18.1	1	11.1	1	9.09	3	33.3
Endophoric markers	6	26.09	1	1.5	0	0	1	4.54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Evidential	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Code glosses	5	10.4	6	16.2	4	7.4	11	18.6	2	6.8	11	37.9	10	21.7	3	8.57	0	0	4	28.5
Total F.&P.	258 times, 14.453%																			

Table (4.1) F. Frequency P. Percentage Es. article

The total findings in Es.1 for the three parts (**introduction, discussion, and conclusion**) of interactional metadiscourse were 92 times in which **Self-mention** scored the highest frequency, 48 times with 52.1%. **The hedges** occupied the second score, 20 times with 21.7%. **Boosters** came with 17 times in 18.4%, third score. **The attitude markers and engagement markers** registered the lowest frequency count of use in this essay. **Attitude markers** counted only 6 times with 6.5%. Finally, **engagement markers** showed the lowest frequency of use, only one time with 1.08%. On the other hand, in the interactive metadiscourse category, **transitions** were most frequently used in Es.1, 145 times with 64.1%. Scores with **Code glosses, endophoric markers, and frame markers** occupied 48 items with 21.2%, 23 times 10.1%, and 10 times with 4.4% respectively. Nonetheless, **evidentials** scored 0%. The final score, **discussion** section contained the highest frequency of using discourse markers, 80%, in interactional and 52.4, in interactive.

In Es.2 the total number of interactional metadiscourse was (64) times. According to the variation in the distribution of the five subcategories of interactional metadiscourse, it was shown that **Boosters** were in the first position in discussion section 28 times with 82.3% and conclusion with 4 times in 11.4%; the total percent of **boosters** for all parts (**introduction, discussion and conclusion**) was 34 times with 53.1%, the highest frequency in this essay. Unexpectedly, the three parts in this essay revealed **self-mention** in a second position were 21 items with 32.8%. **Hedges** occupied the third position with 9 times in 14.06% in three parts. There were not any **Attitude and Engagement markers** in this essay. It was the same thing with interactive metadiscourse, **Transitions** had the greatest frequency count in the table for the three parts with (17, 131, and 22 times) with (10%, 77.05%, 12.94%). The total number and percent of **Transitions** was 170 times in 59.2%, the highest frequency in this essay. The use of **Endophoric markers** seemed to be in the middle with 66 times in 22.9%. The use of **Code glosses** is in the third position with 37 times in 12.8% percentage, whereas the **Frame markers and Evidential** were the lowest position in this table for interactive metadiscourse with (13 and 1 times) in (4.5 % and 0.34%) percentages, the highest frequency counted in **discussion** part was 75% in interactional and 78.3% in interactive.

Es.3 revealed that the total number of interactional categories was 76. In this essay more than half of interactional markers were **Boosters markers** 41 times, 53.9%. The researcher observed **Hedges** in the second position with 21 times in 26.3%. **Engagement markers** were in the next position with 11 times, 14.4%. **Self-mention and Attitude markers** occupied the lowest position with 3 times, 3.9% and 1 time, 1.3 %. Similarly in interactive categories **Transitions markers** were the highest frequency 105 times with 51.2 percentage. **Code glosses** were in the next position with 54 times, 26.3%. In this essay **Endophoric markers** were in the third position with 32 times, 15.6 % percentage especially in the discussion part with 28 times, 87.5%. **Frame markers** and **evidential** were in percentage the final position of interactive metadiscourse with 10 times, 4.8% and 4 times, 1.9%. The same thing for the pervious essay, **Boosters and Transitions markers** were the most frequently used In this essay with 41 times, in 53.9% from the total number which 76 times, and with 105 times, 51.2% from the total number which was 205 times. The final score of interactional and interactive was 76 times and 205 times, the highest frequency was in **discussion** part with 48 times, 63.1% and 128 times with 62.4% percentage.

The findings of Es.4 showed that **Boosters markers** were the highest frequency in interactional metadiscourse with 27 times, 41.5%, then **Hedges** were in the next position with 18 times, 27.6%. This essay showed that **self-**

mention were in the third position with 11 items, 16.9%. *Engagement markers and attitude markers* had the lowest frequency with 6 times, 7.6% and 4 times, 6.1% respectively. On the other hand the highest frequency of interactive categories was *Transitions* with 129 times, 60%. *Code glosses* were in the second position in this essay with 59 times, 27.4%. And then *Endophoric markers* were in the next position with 22 times, 10.2%. In the final positions *frame markers and evidential* with 5 times, 2.3% and 0 %. The most frequently used were *Boosters* in interactional categories with 27 times, 41.5% from the total which were 66 times, and *Transitions* markers from interactive categories were 129 times in 60 % from the total number, 215 times. The largest frequency was found in the **discussion** section, 50 times, with 75.7 % and 139 of 64.6 %, percentage in interactive.

Es.5 revealed the total percentage that refers to the highest frequency in *Boosters* with 17 times, 45.9% for three parts, it was more than half frequency in discussion with 11 times 64.7%. The next position was *hedges* with 11 items, 29.7%, and then *engagement markers* with 6 times, 16.2 %. *Self-mention* markers were in the fourth position with 3 times, 8.1; there were not any *attitude markers* in this essay for all parts. In interactive metadiscourse, *transitions* were in the first position that referred to the highest percentage, 72.5%. *Code glosses* were the next position with 29 times, 15.9 %. *Frame markers* were in the third place with 12 times, 6.5%. The last two positions were *Endophoric markers and evidential* with 8 times, 4.3% and 1 times, 0.54% respectively. This showed the lowest frequency in interactive categories for this essay. The most frequently came with the same thing with *Boosters* and *Transitions* with 17 times, 45.9 % and 132 times, 72.5 % respectively. The highest frequency was recorded in the **discussion** section, with 50 times in interactional 75.7% and 139 times in interactive 64.6%.

Booster markers were in initial position in Es.6 with 15 times, 32.6 %. The total number for all items for the three parts (**introduction, discussion and conclusion**) were 46 items. In the second place for this essay was *self-mention markers* with 12 times, 26.08%. *Hedges* were in the third place with 11 times, 23.9%, then *attitude markers* were lower than *engagement markers* in frequency with 7 times, 15.2 % and only one time 2.1 % respectively. The total number of all items for the three parts were 94 items. Interactive categories had many differences among their markers. *Transitions* scored the highest frequency in number and percentage 61 items 64.8%. *Code glosses* were in the next position with 29 times, 30.8%. *Frame markers* were in the third place with 4 times, 4.2 %. However, the findings scored 0% for both *Endophoric and Evidential markers*. The highest frequency was recorded in the **discussion** section, with 17 times in interactional (36.9%) while the highest frequency was recorded in **introduction** section with 45 times in interactive 47.8%.

Interactional metadiscourse contained several markers in Es.7. The first position was occupied by *Boosters* with 32 times, 58.1%; then, the researcher observed that *attitude markers* were with 11 times, 20%. *self-mention* markers were in next place with 12.7%. *Hedges* were in the fourth place with 4 times, 7.2%. The final position was *Engagement markers* with 1.8%. At the same time, the researcher observed some markers for interactive categories in this essay. *Code glosses* were the most frequently used with 46 times, 36.8%. *Transitions* were in the second position with 42 times, 33.6%. *Endophoric markers* were in the next position with 26 times, 20.8%. *Frame markers* were in the fourth position with 11 times, 8.8%. In this essay, *Evidential markers* scored 0%. The **discussion** part had the highest frequency of discourse markers, (61.8 %) in interactional and 59.8 % in interactive,

according to the final score.

Es.8 showed the total number of items for all parts in interactional metadiscourse 110 items. **Self-mention markers** were the highest frequency, 52 items with 47.2 %, especially in **discussion section** that has 45 items with 86.5%. **Hedges** were in the second place with 30 times, 27.2%. **Boosters** were in the next position with 15 times, 13.6%. **Attitude markers** and **Engagement markers** register were the lowest frequency count of use with 8 times, 7.2% and 5 times, 4.5 % respectively. According to this essay especially in interactive categories **transitions** were the most frequently used with 180 times, 71.1%. **Code glosses** came with 35 times, 13.8 %, the second score. **Endophoric markers** seemed to be in the middle with 25 times, 9.8 %. **Frame markers and evidential markers** were the lowest frequency with 9 times, 3.5 % and 4 times, 1.5 % respectively. The highest frequency of using discourse markers was found in the **discussion part**, with 80.9 % in interactional and 73.12 % in interactive.

In Es.9 **Boosters** were in the first position with 17 times, 47.2%. After that **Hedges** were in the second place with 10 times, 27.7 %. In this article, **attitude markers** and **engagement markers** were in the lowest frequency with 5 times, 13.8% and 4 times, 11.1% respectively. There were no score for **self-mention**, 0%. **Transitions** seemed to be in initial position in interactive metadiscourse with 72 times, 61.01%. **Endophoric markers** and **Code glosses** were in the second and third places with 18 times, 15.2% and 15 times, 12.7% respectively. **Frame markers** and **evidential** were the final two positions with 11 times, 9.3% and 2 times, 1.6% respectively. The overall number of occurrences for both interactional and interactive metadiscourse were 36 and 118, respectively. The highest frequency was found in the **discussion section**, with 31 times (86.11%) and 91 times (77.11%).

The researcher observed that findings of Es.10 **Boosters markers** were the highest frequency with 19 times, 47.5%. **Attitude and self-mention markers** in the next positions with the same times and percentage with 9 times, 22.5%. **Hedges** were in the fourth place with 3 times, 7.5%. This essay had no occurrence with **engagement markers** with 0 %. On the other hand, in interactive categories; **Transitions** were the most frequently used with 49 times, 61.25%; the total number of items in interactive metadiscourse were 80 times. **Code glosses** were in the second position with 14 times in 17.5 %. The next place was **to frame makers** with 9 times, 11.2 %. **Endophoric markers** and **Evidential** were the lowest frequency with 7 times, 8.7% and only one time, 1.25%. The total numbers for both interactional and interactive metadiscourse for all parts (**introduction, discussion and conclusion**) were 40 and 80 times respectively. The highest frequency was found in **discussion part** 60% in interactional and 45% with interactive categories.

5. Conclusion

The objective of the current investigation was to ascertain how frequently and where metadiscourse markers appeared in Q1 Scopus-Indexed Linguistics Research Articles. This study shows that interactive metadiscourse is more prevalent in Q1 Scopus-Indexed Linguistics Research Articles. This is possibly due to the usage of *transition indicators, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, and code glosses* that guide the reader toward understanding. The simplest approach to arrange phrases and ideas is to utilize transitional words (*but, because, also*) and framing words (*first, then, finally*). Therefore, the ways the author engages the readers by drawing them into the text's conversation, the data

uses interactional metadiscourse less frequently. In order to encourage readers to participate in the reading process, these inexperienced writers (Q1 Scopus-Indexed articles) would employ fewer hedges (*may, would, possible*), boosters (*certain, believe, found*), engagement markers (*note that, refer*), attitude markers (*expected, important, usually*), and self-mention (*I, we, us*). The most significant finding of this study is that metadiscourse markers, one of the tactics used by persuaders to persuade their audience, are used to achieve persuasion in Q1 Scopus-Indexed articles.

دور أجهزة الخطاب الفوقي في مقالات البحث اللغوية المفهرسة ضمن مؤشر سكوبس كيو 1

احمد عبدالرحمن احمد*، جمعة قادر حسين

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة الأنبار، الرمادي، العراق

* ahm19h1003@uoanbar.edu.iq

الكلمات المفتاحية: مقالات، لغوية، مؤشر سكوبس كيو 1، الخطاب الفوقي، الاقناع.

<https://doi.org/10.51345/v34i1.574.g348>

ملخص البحث:

يعتبر هيكل وإنتاج الكتابة المقنعة متأثرين بشكل كبير بالخطاب الفوقي، وهو مجال دراسة جديد ورائع يعتمد على معايير وتوقعات المشاركين. تلاحظ علامات الخطاب الفوقي على أنها أنشطة اجتماعية تشجع الاتصال بين الكتاب والقراء والمتحدثين والمستمعين. بعبارة أخرى، يجب على المؤلفين تمثيل هوياتهم في كتاباتهم بطريقة تكون منطقية لقرائهم. ومع ذلك، يتم استخدام بعض الكلمات في دراسة هوية الكاتب بطريقة يمكن أن تقود الجماهير إلى فهمها بشكل غير صحيح. كانت الأهداف الأساسية لهذه الدراسة هي فحص مؤشرات الخطاب الفوقي التي تم استخدامها بشكل متكرر في مقالات مؤشر Scopus Q1 تراوحت المقالات اللغوية المفهرسة Q1 Scopus 10 من مجلة البراغماوية والتي تم استخدامها كبيانات للدراسة من (2020 إلى 2022). على أساس نموذج هايلاند (2005-أ) لعلامات الخطاب الفوقي، تم فحص البيانات نوعياً. تشير النتائج إلى أنه تم استخدام 2407 علامة للخطاب الفوقي في مجموعة البيانات بأكملها. كان هناك 1785 / 74.1587٪ من علامات الخطاب الفوقي التفاعلية مقارنة بـ 622 / 25.8412٪ من علامات الخطاب الفوقي التفاعلي بشكل ملحوظ، وجد أن علامات الخطاب الفوقي كانت تعتبر أداة أساسية لتعزيز التواصل الفعال بين المؤلفين والقراء، مما يساعد على إمكانيات المدى فهم القراء للمادة، ومساعدتهم في التمييز بين الحقائق والآراء أثناء قراءة النص. أخيراً، تقترح الدراسة التوسع في استخدام التحليل المبني على الخطاب الفوقي في الكتابة الأكاديمية بشكل عام وفي المقالات البحثية رفيعة المستوى على وجه الخصوص.