

# Metadiscourse in Persian and English Research Article Introductions

Mohammadamin Sorahi

Department of English, University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran

Mansour Shabani

Department of English, University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran

**Abstract**—This study aims to investigate the use of metadiscourse in Persian and English research article introductions in the field of linguistics. The corpus of the research consists of 40 introductions of linguistics research articles, 20 Persian and 20 English. The analytical framework for this study is Hyland's (2004) model of metadiscourse in academic text. In order to investigate the similarities and differences in the implication of metadiscourse (i.e. the interactive and interactional resources) between these texts, both qualitative and quantitative methods will be used. On the qualitative basis, this study identifies and categorizes metadiscourse markers and a comparative analysis is conducted to determine the frequency of different types of metadiscourse. The results are analyzed carefully and quantitatively which include the general distribution of metadiscourse in each category and then the density of metadiscourse in both sets of data. They are scrutinized based on the number of sentences and words in the corpora. The similarities and differences between two sets of data are looked at from a sociocultural view. The results of this study make some perspectives into the teaching and learning of writing for EFL learners.

**Index Terms**—metadiscourse, interactive resources, interactional resources, article

## I. INTRODUCTION

It is becoming increasingly difficult to ignore the interactive role of metadiscourse in assisting writers to write better and also facilitating the reading process for readers, especially from pragmatic perspectives. In fact, as Simin and Tavangar (2009) rightly assume, metadiscourse is considered as a set of pragma-linguistic devices which are used to represent attitudes as well as to exhibit the structural properties of every text. According to different definitions of metadiscourse, it is "the second level of discourse that fulfills the textual and interpersonal functions of language in order to direct and guide the readers rather than inform them" (Simin & Tavangar, 2009, p. 230). Textual functions are used to organize a text and take cohesion and coherence of the texts into consideration. Then, interactional functions refer to the ways authors express their attitudes towards the text and evaluate the propositional content of that text.

Metadiscourse has been an object of research since the 1990s and due to its importance, a considerable amount of literature has been published on the role of metadiscourse in academic writing and research articles (e.g. Crismore, and Farnsworth, 1990; Crismore, Markkanen, and Steffensen, 1993; Abdi, 2002; Dafauz, 2003; Hyland, and Tse, 2004; Blagojevic, 2004; Simin and Tavangar, 2009; Noorian and Biria, 2010; Sultan, 2011; Kim and Lim, 2013; Khedri, Chan Heng, and Ebrahimi, 2013). Most of the foregoing studies conducted on metadiscourse are of comparative and contrastive nature. They have been conducted to compare and contrast the use of metadiscourse in writing of different branches of science within one language or even in different languages and cultures. The studies presented thus far provide evidence that the implication of metadiscourse is highly language- and culture specific (e.g. Crismore et. al., 1993; Mauranen, 1993).

However, far too little attention has been paid to the use of discourse markers in academic research articles of linguists themselves who are responsible for all these debates over metadiscourse! This paper seeks to remedy this shortcoming by analyzing the introduction sections of 40 Persian and English linguistics articles. In doing so, it develops a view of metadiscourse which has a great interest in the interactive character of academic writing and focuses on the study beyond the ideational dimension of the texts. The primary aim of this contrastive study is therefore to investigate the similarities and differences in the use of metadiscourse in Iranian and English research article introductions from a sociocultural point of view. In other words, it seeks to address the following two questions: what similarities and differences can be found in the use of metadiscourse between English and Persian research article introductions? And what are the factors relating to the use of metadiscourse in both Persian and English data?

As for the organization of this article, it falls into five sections excluding the introduction. This paper begins by explaining the types of data and method of investigation. It will then go on to the theoretical basis of the work which is set by explaining Hyland's (2004) model of metadiscourse in academic texts. They will be followed by the results of the study, discussion, and finally, conclusion.

## II. METHODOLOGY

This research is a descriptive study which aims to investigate the use of metadiscourse in 40 research article introductions-20 English and 20 Persian- in the field of linguistics both qualitatively and quantitatively based on the frequency of interactive and interactional metadiscourse elements. Articles were searched from January 2010 until December 2014. The writers of these articles were all monolingual speakers of English and Persian. The 20 English articles were selected from the *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. The 20 Persian articles were chosen from the *Journal of Linguistic Researches* [məʃjæle-ye pæzhuheš-ha-ye zæbanšenasi], *Journal of Contrastive Linguistic Researches* [næšriye-ye pæzhuheš-ha-ye zæbanšenasi-ye tætbiqu] and *Linguistic Researches in Foreign Languages* [pæzhuheš-ha-ye zæbanšenaxtidærzæban-ha-ye xareji].

The starting point for analyzing the present study is Hyland's (2004) model of metadiscourse in academic texts. Hyland categorizes metadiscourse used in academic texts according to the interactive resources (transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials and code glosses) and interactional resources (hedges, boosters, attitude markers and self-mentions). According to Hyland (2004), the interactive dimension concerns "the writer's awareness of a participating audience and the ways he or she seeks to accommodate its probable knowledge, interests, rhetorical expectations and processing abilities" (p. 115). Hyland believes that the writer's main purpose is to produce a text so that it can meet the needs of particular readers. The most important thing about the interactive dimension is the extent to which the writers consider the readers' needs in mind.

The interactional dimension concerns "the ways writers conduct interaction by intruding and commenting on their message" (Hyland, 2004, p. 115). This dimension makes the writer convey their views explicitly and involve readers to respond to the unfolding text. According to Hyland (2004), "Metadiscourse here is essentially evaluative and engaging, expressing solidarity, anticipating objections and responding to an imagined dialogue with others" (p.115).

The table below (Table 1) presents the summary of Hyland's model of metadiscourse in academic texts:

TABLE 1.  
A MODEL OF METADISOURSE IN ACADEMIC TEXTS

Category	Function	Examples
<b>Interactive resources</b>	help to guide reader through the text	
1. Transitions	express semantic relation between main clauses	<b>In addition/ but/ thus/ and</b>
2. Frame markers	Refer to discourse acts, sequences	<b>Finally/ to conclude/ my purpose is</b>
3. Endophoric	Refer to information in other parts of the text	<b>Note above/ see Figure/ in Results section</b>
4. Evidentials	Refer to source of information from other texts	<b>According to X (Y, 1990)/ Z states</b>
5. Code glosses	Help readers grasp meaning of	<b>Namely/ e.g./ such as</b>
<b>Interactional resources</b>	Involve the reader in the argument	
1. Hedges	Withhold writer's full commitment to proposition	<b>Might/ perhaps/ possible/ about</b>
2. Boosters	Emphasize force or writer's certainty in proposition	<b>In fact/ definitely/ it is clear that</b>
3. Attitude markers	Express writer's attitude proposition	<b>Unfortunately/ I to agree</b>
4. Engagement markers	Explicitly refer to or build relationship with reader	<b>Consider/ note that</b>
5. Self-mentions	Explicit reference to author(s)	<b>I/ we/ my/ our</b>

Source: Hyland (2004, p. 139)

As it was earlier said, this study is a qualitative- quantitative method to study the use of metadiscourse markers, i. e. aspects of a text which reflect the writers' position towards both the content in the text and the reader (Noorian and Biria, 2010, p. 64), in the corpus of English and Iranian research article introductions. On the qualitative basis, this study identifies and categorizes metadiscourse markers. On the quantitative basis, a contrastive analysis is conducted to determine the frequency of different types of interpersonal metadiscourse and to find out the similarities and differences between the two sets of data.

The results of this study will be analyzed quantitatively to include the general distribution and also the density, i.e. the number of metadiscourse per sentence, of metadiscourse in each category. In doing so, first all interactive and interactional resources will be counted and their frequencies will be illustrated in four tables. The first and second tables indicate the number of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers used in Iranian and English research article introductions respectively. After that, they will be calculated according the number of sentences in the corpora of the study. Then, the average density of each of the resources will be calculated. Finally, the similarities and differences are investigated in a careful way. The third and fourth tables illustrate the number of interactive and interactional metadiscourse resources based on the number of words in the corpora. The data are examined according to the number of all interactive and interactional metadiscourse resources presented in the texts. In other words, the proportions of interactive and interactional resources of the total numbers of them in each corpus are assessed and are compared in two sets of data.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As noted earlier in the introduction, the first research question of the present study is to examine the similarities and differences in the use of metadiscourse between English and Iranian research article introductions. In this regard, the study has compared two sets of data in three phases. In the first stage, metadiscourse markers have been examined thoroughly according to the total number of interactive and interactional resources in Iranian and English research

article introductions. The following table (Table 2) illustrates the number of interactive and interactional metadiscourse resources in Iranian research article introductions:

TABLE 2.  
METADISCOURSE IN PERSIAN RA INTRODUCTIONS (BASED ON THE NUMBER OF SENTENCES)

Interactive Resources					
	Transitions	Evidential	Code glosses	Frame markers	Endophorics
Counts	246	256	41	78	150
No. of sentences	465	465	465	465	465
Average density	0.52	0.55	0.13	0.16	0.32
Total for interactive = 791					
Average density = 1.7					
Interactional Resources					
	Engagement markers	Hedges	Boosters	Attitude markers	Self-mentions
Counts	3	56	29	1	30
No. of sentences	465	465	465	465	465
Average density	0.00	0.12	0.06	0.00	0.06
Total for interactional = 119					
Average density = 0.25					

The table below (Table 3) represents the number of interactive and interactional metadiscourse resources in English research article introductions:

TABLE 3.  
METADISCOURSE IN ENGLISH RA INTRODUCTIONS (BASED ON THE NUMBER OF SENTENCES)

Interactive Resources					
	Transitions	Evidential	Code glosses	Frame markers	Endophorics
Counts	329	643	133	116	116
No. of sentences	635	635	635	635	635
Average density	0.51	1.01	0.20	0.13	0.18
Total for interactive = 1308					
Average density = 2					
Interactional Resources					
	Engagement markers	Hedges	Boosters	Attitude markers	Self-mentions
Counts	40	91	52	2	34
No. of sentences	635	635	635	635	635
Average density	0.06	0.14	0.08	0.00	0.05
Total for interactional = 219					
Average density = 0.34					

As can be seen, both tables 2 and 3 illustrate average densities of all subcategories of metadiscourse resources according to the number of sentences in the corpora. The numbers of sentences in Iranian texts are 465 and in English's are 635 sentences. From the tables above one can see that both Iranian and English RA introductions are more interactive than interactional.

### Interactive Resources

#### Evidentials

Evidentials that refer to source of information from other texts are the most frequent interactive resources. They are about 32% of all interactive uses in Iranian RA introductions. For example:

1. **Haper** væ**Tampson** ?æqide darænd [**Haper and Thampson believe that**] .....

These functions are also abundant in English RA introductions, about 49% of all interactive resources. For example:

2. **Vygotsky's (1978)** sociocultural theory, in which social interactions.....

#### Transitions

Transitions that express semantic relation between main clauses are 31% of all interactive resources in Iranian introductions. Such as:

3. **Bænabær ?in [therefore]** jomle-ye motæmmem-e eltezami **be dælike [because of]** naqesbudæn-e zæman....

They are represented in English RA introductions in a high scale of frequency with about 25% of all interactive uses. For instance:

4. The importance of time is **also** explicitly recognized in a number of ways.

#### Endophoric markers

Endophoric markers are information in other parts of the text. They are more abundant in Persian introductions than English introductions. They make up about 18% of all interactive resources in Persian texts. For example:

5. **?in nemune-ha** [these examples] dær zæban-ha-ye donya kæm nistænd.

Although they are less frequent than in Iranian introductions, endophoric markers have been indicated in English texts too. They are 8.8% of all interactive uses. Such as:

6. The gap between **these two languages** makes the acquisition process difficult for children.

#### Frame markers

Frame markers refer to discourse acts, sequences or text stages. The analysis of our data shows that in Persian article introductions, they are used more than English texts. They have been approximately 9.8% of all interactive resources. Such as:

7. **Bæxš-e ?axær-e** [the last part of] ?in mæghale be bæyan-e nætayej-e tæhqi? ?extesas daræd.

English texts also utilize frame markers but fewer than the Persian texts. Their percentages are like endophoric markers, about 8.8% of all interactive metadiscourse. For example:

8. **The first** difference is related to prestige. **The second** difference relates to the language acquisition process. **The third** difference is functional.

#### Code glosses

Code glosses assist readers grasp meaning of ideational material. According to the tables 2 and 3, they are more frequent in English RA introductions than Persian texts. The numbers of code glosses in both texts have been calculated 10% and 5.1% of all interactive resources respectively:

9. **Be ?ebaræt-e digær [in other wods]** rabete-ye kontoroli be vabæstegi-ye ?erj â?ibein-e fa?el-ebæyannæšod-e...

10. SNSs **such as** Facebook afford individuals novel means of communicating to both mass and interpersonal audiences, and **as such** represent an interesting new medium in which to extend previous research into speech acts. (Taken from Carr, Schrock & Dauterman, 2012)

#### Interactional resources

##### Hedges

Hedges withhold writer's full commitment to proposition. They are the most frequent interactional function in both sets of data. Due to the percentage of their use, Iranian RA writers deploy them more than English writers. The percentages of hedges used in both sets of data are 47% and 41.5% of all interactional resources respectively:

11. **Be næzær miresæd [it seems]** næzæriye-ye dæstur tænhâ do ?emkan-e motæfavet ra dær ?in zæmine mojaz mišomaræd.

12. These studies **tend to** conclude that children have acquired all the interrogative forms and functions of English and other European languages prior to starting school. (Taken from Li, Tse, Sin Wong, Mei Wong & Leung, 2013)

##### Boosters

Boosters emphasize force and writer's certainty in proposition that is revealed in both sets of data, too. Regarding the percentage of all interactional metadiscourse, Persian RA introductions are more, about 24.3%, than English introductions with about 23.7%. Examples:

13. dær kontorol-e ?ejbari **?elzam æn** [its necessity] mæqule-ye tohi, zæmir-e mostæter nist.

English RA writers have employed boosters in their researches, about 23.7% of all interactional resources. Such as:

14. Whereas Whalen, Pexman, and Gill (2009) claimed that none of these types of speech is **necessarily** ironic.

##### Self-mentions

Self-mentions are explicit references to the writer and are noted in both sets of data. Persian RA writers use self-mention markers approximately 25.2% of all interactional resources. They have indicated low frequencies across the two sets of introductions. This may reflect that in this genre (academic writing), writers prefer to appeal to readers in an impersonal way using the inanimate subject construction (e.g. the present study investigates....) instead of we- or I-pronoun patterns (e.g. we investigate..., we have found....) (Kim & Lim, 2013, p. 135).

According to Hyland's (2004) model, the propositions like I and we, possessive adjectives like my and our, are named in this category. Different markers of self-mentions in Persian and English are represented that is one of the discipline-specific differences. Persian writers employ some affixes at the end of the verbs to indicate their personal proposition. For instance, "am" and "im" are the affixes of first person pronouns that are attached to the end of verbs. In the present study these affixes have been counted and calculated as self-mentions markers. For example:

15. Dær bæxš-e dovvom tosi?e jame? tæri ?æz væzn-e hejjara ?era?e midæhim [1<sup>st</sup> person plural affix].

The English self-mentions cover about 15.2% of all interactional metadiscourse markers such as:

16. **Our** concern here is with elaborations that take place subsequently, during the school years.

##### Engagement markers

Engagement markers explicitly refer to or build relationship with reader. They have shown very low frequencies in both sets of data. English writers use 18.1% of all interactional markers. For example:

17. Some scholars suggest that irony has various subtypes (see Gibbs and Colston, 2007).

Engagement markers are just 2.5% of all interactional resources in Persian RA introductions. The low frequency of these markers may indicate that Iranian academic writers do not interact with their readers in an explicit way.

##### Attitude markers

Attitude markers express writer's attitude proposition and their feeling toward something. Our data shows that Persian and English writers have used very few attitude markers in their introductions.

The great diversity in the length of the sentences can be seen in RA introductions. Some sentences are too short and some are so long. For this reason, the metadiscourse markers were depicted according to the numbers of words in the corpora to gain the exact results. In second phase, the numbers of words in the corpora have been counted and the average densities have been assessed. The table 4 indicates interactive and interactional metadiscourse in Iranian RA introductions based on the numbers of words in the corpus- 14892 words. Table 5 shows metadiscourse markers of

English RA introductions based on the numbers of words in English texts-19764 words. Finally, the average densities in tables have been compared.

TABLE 4.  
METADISOURSE IN PERSIAN RA INTRODUCTIONS (BASED ON THE NUMBER OF WORDS)

<b>Interactive Resources</b>					
	<b>Transitions</b>	<b>Evidential</b>	<b>Code glosses</b>	<b>Frame markers</b>	<b>Endophorics</b>
<b>Counts</b>	246	256	41	78	150
<b>No. of words</b>	14892	14892	14892	14892	14892
<b>Average density</b>	0.017	0.017	0.004	0.005	0.010
<b>Total for interactive = 791</b>					
<b>Average density = 0.053</b>					
<b>Interactional Resources</b>					
	<b>Engagement markers</b>	<b>Hedges</b>	<b>Boosters</b>	<b>Attitude markers</b>	<b>Self-mentions</b>
<b>Counts</b>	3	56	29	1	30
<b>No. of words</b>	14892	14892	14892	14892	14892
<b>Average density</b>	0.000	0.004	0.002	0.000	0.002
<b>Total for interactional = 119</b>					
<b>Average density =</b>					

TABLE 5.  
METADISOURSE IN ENGLISH RA INTRODUCTIONS (BASED ON THE NUMBER OF WORDS)

<b>Interactive Resources</b>					
	<b>Transitions</b>	<b>Evidential</b>	<b>Code glosses</b>	<b>Frame markers</b>	<b>Endophorics</b>
<b>Counts</b>	329	643	133	116	116
<b>No. of words</b>	19764	19764	19764	19764	19764
<b>Average density</b>	0.017	0.032	0.007	0.004	0.006
<b>Total for interactive = 1308</b>					
<b>Average density = 0.066</b>					
<b>Interactional Resources</b>					
	<b>Engagement markers</b>	<b>Hedges</b>	<b>Boosters</b>	<b>Attitude markers</b>	<b>Self-mentions</b>
<b>Counts</b>	40	91	52	2	34
<b>No. of words</b>	19764	19764	19764	19764	19764
<b>Average density</b>	0.002	0.005	0.003	0.000	0.002
<b>Total for interactional = 219</b>					
<b>Average density = 0.11</b>					

As tables 2 and 3 represent, the number of sentences in Persian and English corpora consist of 465 and 635 sentences. According to tables 4 and 5, the numbers of words in Persian introduction are 14892 and 19764 in English. Although the numbers are different, the conclusions are approximately the same. Evidentials and transitions are the most frequent metadiscourse used (3% and 1.7% of all interactive resources respectively) and engagement and attitude markers are used the least by English and Persian writers.

#### *Interactive resources*

##### **Evidentials**

As tables 2 and 3 represent, the average densities are 0.55 in Persian and 1.01 in English. As a result, English evidentials are about two times more than Persian evidential markers. Tables 4 and 5 represent the average density of 0.017 and 0.033. These statistics show that English RA writers use source of information from other texts around two times more than Iranian's.

##### **Transitions**

As tables 2 and 3 illustrate, the average density of transitions are 0.52 in Persian and 0.51 in English respectively. This shows that the average density of transitions in Persian articles is a little more than English's based on the numbers of sentences. As it was mentioned, tables 4 and 5 show the average density of 0.017 in both Persian and English texts. Therefore, according to the average density, the use of transitions is approximately the same. It means that both Persian and English academic writers use almost the same numbers of transitions to express semantic relation between main clauses.

##### **Endophoric markers**

The figures represented in tables 2 and 3 show densities of 0.32 and 0.18. Thus, Persian RA writers employ endophoric markers two times more than English RA writers. Tables 4 and 5 represent the average densities of 0.010 and 0.006 in both sets of data. According to these tables, Persian academic writers use endophoric markers in order to show information in other parts of the texts more than English RA writers.

##### **Frame markers**

Tables 2 and 3 represent average densities of 0.16 and 0.13. That is, according to the number of sentences, frame markers are more used in Persian RA introductions. Based on the number of words, average densities of 0.005 and 0.004 have been illustrated in tables 4 and 5. Thus, the employment of frame markers to indicate discourse acts, sequences or text stages in Persian texts is a little more than English texts.

##### **Code glosses**

The registered code glosses figures in tables 2 and 3 indicate the average density of 0.13 and 0.20 respectively. Here, English academic writers employ more code glosses to help their readers to get the message of ideational material than Persian academic writers. Tables 4 and 5 have represented the same results (i.e. 0.004 and 0.007).

### *Interactional resources*

#### **Hedges**

The average densities of 0.12 and 0.14 in tables 2 and 3 show that hedges are more represented in English than in Persian RA introductions. Tables 4 and 5 have displayed the same outcome (i.e. 0.004 and 0.005). Therefore, English academic writers withhold their full commitment to proposition using hedges a little bit more than Persians.

#### **Boosters**

The figures of boosters in tables 2 and 3 have marked the average density of 0.06 and 0.08 respectively. This shows that English RA introductions have represented a bit more boosters than Persian RA introductions. Tables 4 and 5 have indicated the average density of 0.002 and 0.003 that is the indicative of the same results. Therefore, sometimes English academic writers emphasize force and their certainty in proposition a little more than Iranian academic writers.

#### **Self-mentions**

The registered average densities of self-mentions in both sets of data are approximately the same, 0.06 and 0.05 in tables 2 and 3. They have the same average densities of 0.002 in tables 4 and 5. Although both Iranian and English RA writers deploy the same amount of self-mentions to explicitly refer to themselves in the texts, the discipline-specific differences revealed in the form used by Iranian writers.

#### **Engagement markers**

The figures in tables 2 and 3 have indicated the average densities of 0.00 and 0.06. As it is noted in tables 4 and 5, the employment of engagement markers is not much in both sets of data (i.e. 0.000 and 0.002). The writers rarely use the engagement markers to explicitly build relationship with their readers.

#### **Attitude markers**

Tables 2 and 3 have indicated barely any employment of attitude markers in the texts (i.e. 0.002 and 0.00). The registered numbers in tables 4 and 5 have illustrated the same results (i.e. 0.000 and 0.000). Therefore, none of them has attitude markers in academic writings.

The second research question is to figure out the factors relating to the employment of metadiscourse in both sets of data. In this regard, the metadiscourse examples mentioned in the corpora have been scrutinized initially and then the related factors have been investigated. Table 6 illustrates some examples deployed in the corpora. The most frequent examples used in the corpora are mentioned in the table.

TABLE 6.  
EXAMPLES OF METADISDISCOURSE USED IN THE CORPORA

Category	English	Persian
<b>Interactive</b>		
<b>Transitions</b>	and; thus; also; however; since; because; moreover; whereas; further more; whether; while; although; while; therefore; in addition to; instead; in hence; as well as; though; contrast; hence; as well. regarding; as such; of course; even; unlike; in spite	zira; chera-ke; ?albæte; væ; bænabær ?in; ?æmma; be hæmindæilil; zira; chera-ke; hæmchenin; ?æzanja-ke; be hæmin ?ellæt; be hæmindæilil; hærchænd; ?æla-ræqm-e ?in-ke
<b>Frame markers</b>	First; second; third; latter; eventually; then; consequently; the purpose of the study; (a) (b) (c)....; finally; the goal of the study is...	?ebteda; dærbæxš-e noxost; dovvom; sevvom; noxostin gam, dærpayan; dær ?enteha; noxostin bar; ?in tæhqiqræpey-e yaftæn-e...; dæstebændi-ye (1) (2)...
<b>Endophoric markers</b>	these type of attitude; the present experiment; that is; these results; similar findings; their actions and motivations; these lines of research; these three hypothesis; such populations; refer to; this phenomenon	?in ?estelah; ?in tæmayoz; yæ?ni; be ?ebaræt-e digær; ?in tæ?birat; ?az ?in qæbilvazhe-ha; næzæriye-ye ?era?ešodædær ?in mæqale;
<b>Evidentials</b>	(Ferguson & Charles, 1959), other studies have reported that; following previous research; Davis's (1939) analysis; Wong and Ingram (2003) conducted that; according to Vygotsky's work; for this framework; researchers have argued that; as Tomasello 1992 showed that.	?anhamo?tæqædænd; bær ?æsas-e ?in næzær; be tæ?bir-eTolorof (1382: 33); (HapervæTampson, 1980) ?æqidedarænd; ?æznæzær-e ?æsatid-e ?ædæb-e farsi; batævæjjoh be ?æslæ...; be næql ?æzVygotskey; ?æzdidgah-e besyari ?æzzæbanšenan-an; zæbanšenan-an bær ?in baværbudændke ...
<b>Code glosses</b>	for example; such as; for instance; like; likewise; as; such	Bæray-e mesal; ?æzjomle; mesl-e; manænd-e; be ?onvan-e nemune; æmsal-e ?an
<b>Interactional</b>		
<b>Hedges</b>		
<b>Boosters</b>		
<b>Attitude markers</b>	interestingly; disagree	
<b>Engagement markers</b>	see also Korat et.al. , 2007; c.f. 1995; considered; note that	yeki ?æzjalebtærinmæsadiq-e....
<b>Self mentions</b>	we; our	bærræsimikonim; mipærdazim; ?ešaremikonim, bæhs-e ma; mozu?-e ma; bæyanxahimkærd; qærarmidæhim

As mentioned before, the evidentials and transitions are the most interactive resources. The evidential forms used in both sets of data refer to other sources to prepare one's research to support the writers' statement. Citations and quotations are employed in most cases.

There are also an abundant number of transitions in these corpora. Coordinating conjunctions such as "and", "also", "therefore", "væ" (and), "hæmchenin" (also), "bænabær ?in" (therefore) are employed by writers to express the link between clauses. The links allow writers to define the key concept and provide a clarification (Kim and Lim, 2013, p. 136). "And" is the most frequent coordinating conjunctions both Iranian and English writers' introductions. Transitions are used to make interaction and to indicate cause and effect such as "because", "be dæilil-e" (because). Transitions comprise some contrastive forms as such, "but", "however", "although", "væli" or "?æmma" (but), "?ægær-che" (however or although).

In interactional metadiscourse, hedges are the most frequent resources in the corpora. According to Hyland (2004, p. 139), this subcategory is used to 'withhold writer's full commitment to proposition' in order to construct 'a relationship with readers to persuade them of interpretations'. Some hedges employed in the texts are "could", "may", "mitævan" (could), "momken ?æst" (may) that take the great numbers in the texts.

It can be concluded that two main factors influence the differences in the use of metadiscourse markers; (a) cultural-specific differences that in the following part it will be stated, and (b) some discipline-specific tendencies which appear to exist in academic articles regardless of the author's language and cultural background. Some examples in the texts revealed the differences, as it was noted about self-mentions.

Since the use of metadiscourse is closely related to its socio-rhetorical contexts, it is not surprising to find variations across the two degree corpora (Hyland, 2004, p. 141). Numerous studies on academic discourse report that academic writing norms vary from one cultural community to another and often reveal traditional writing habits and rhetoric preferences which exist in different writing cultures (Blagojevic, 2004, p. 60). The rhetoric habits from author's writing culture are easily transmitted to writing activities done in a foreign language, as for example, in English, which is nowadays, an "academic lingua franca" for international readership. To Blagojevic (2004, p. 60), however, these habits might become a hindrance to effective international communication, either by causing "discourse expectations" failure, or misunderstanding of the author's personal expression.

As Crismore (1993) mentioned the employment of metadiscourse is related to its socio-cultural contexts. As noted in the present study, Iranian academic writers use more interactive metadiscourse than interactional. This indicates that Iranian writers emphasize on exchanging information in the texts to make their argument explicit. 'Reader responsibility' is that the writer controls the level of personality in a text to construct a more distant relationship between writer, text and reader. It is essential for the writers to organize their texts in a way that readers are most likely to understand. As it is supposed that the academic writings should be as formal as possible the writers in both RA introductions use less interactive markers than interactional to not have intimacy and keep social distances to the readers.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The present study was based on a thorough examination of Iranian and English research article introductions in the field of linguistics. The central goal of this research was to provide a description of English and Iranian RA introductions in the use of metadiscourse. Its primary objective was to explore the similarities and differences in the employment of metadiscourse in Iranian and English research article introductions. The Hyland's (2004) model of metadiscourse in academic texts was used as the main framework.

The results of this study revealed some similarities and differences in the use of metadiscourse in both sets of data. On the basis of the examined corpora and the data gained from them, it can be concluded that in spite of some differences in the way Iranian and English writers use metadiscoursal groups in their academic research article introductions, the Iranian used metadiscourse resources does not differ enormously from the metadiscourse used by English writers. The results have indicated that the similarities in the deployment of metadiscourse between two sets of data emerge from the influence of English as an international language and academic lingua franca. The factors influenced the similarities and differences were assumed to be culture-driven preferences, discipline-driven preferences, and reader-responsibility.

The results of this study are in line with Hyland (2004) who argues that metadiscourse represents how writers seek to represent themselves, their texts and their readers as they frame, scaffold, and present their arguments and research findings in ways recognized and valued by their disciplines. Metadiscoursal analysis is therefore a significant means of exploring academic writing and of comparing the rhetorical preferences of different discourse communities. For this reason, it is offered that teachers are supposed to help students to control their writing practices by using metadiscourse markers in their texts to evaluate the impact of their decisions more clearly. Therefore, assisting students to an awareness of metadiscourse can provide them with important rhetorical knowledge and equip them with ways of making discourse decisions which are socially grounded in the inquiry patterns and knowledge structures of their disciplines.

As noted above, EFL Iranian students are supposed to be aware of this change. The awareness of metadiscourse assists teachers and instructors to have a useful teaching approach by introducing students to both interactive and interactional resources of metadiscourse. It is recommended that before teaching metadiscourse resources, the students

need to be asked to engage in a metadiscourse analysis in research article in a selected discipline. This will assist students understand how metadiscourse can guide the reader through the text and involve the reader in argument- as Hyland (2010) best put it, 'metadiscourse,...reveals how writers seek to represent themselves, their texts, and their readers as they frame, scaffold, and present their arguments and research findings in ways recognized and valued by their disciplines'(p. 144). Therefore, the response to the second research question of this study is undoubtedly YES, the knowledge and understanding of metadiscourse markers are essential for Iranian EFL students.

This study stresses the need for including metadiscourse markers in EFL/ESL courses since they are an indispensable feature of various types of texts such as newspaper discourse, research articles, textbooks, and student writing.

And finally, the findings of the study might have been influenced by two important limitations: the first problem was the multifunctionality of many metadiscourse categories and the fact that they can serve several functions simultaneously in a given context; and the second was the small-scale nature of the research, i.e. the limited number of selected articles, was the other limitation of the study. Although the corpus of 20 Iranian and 20 English RA introductions is not small considering the qualitative and quantitative nature of the study, it provides in sufficient findings to allow generalization about the rhetorical structures of all Iranian and English RA introductions in the field of linguistics. The verification of the results is one way to undertake investigations using larger sample sizes from various journals.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Abdi, R. (2002). Interpersonal metadiscourse: An indicator of interaction and identify. *Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 139-145.
- [2] Biria, R. & Noorian, M. (2010). Interpersonal metadiscourse in persuasive journalism: A study of texts by American and Iranian EFL columnists. *Journal of Modern Language*, 20, 64-79.
- [3] Blagojevic, S. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic prose: A contrastive study of academic articles written in English by English and Norwegian native speakers. *Studies about Languages*, 5, 60-67.
- [4] Carr, C. T., Schrock, D.B. & Dauterman, P. (2012). Speech acts within Facebook status messages. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 32, 121-141.
- [5] 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.
- [6] Crismore, A. & Farnsworth, R. (1990). Metadiscourse in popular and professional science discourse. In W. Nash (Ed.), *The writing scholar: Studies in academic discourse* (pp. 118-136). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- [7] Dafouz, E. (2003). Metadiscourse revisited: A contrastive study of persuasive writing in professional discourse. *EstudiosIngleses de La Universidad Complutense*, 11, 29-52.
- [8] Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.
- [9] Hyland, K. & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25 (2), 156-177.
- [10] Khedri, M., Ebrahimi, S. F. & Chan, S. H. (2013). An exploration of interactive metadiscourse markers in academic research article abstracts in two disciplines. *Discourse Studies*, 15 (3), 319-331.
- [11] Kim, C. L. & Lim, J. M. H. (2013). Metadiscourse in English and Chinese research article introductions. *Discourse Studies*, 15 (2), 129-146.
- [12] Li, H., Tse, S.K., Sin Wong, J.M., Mei Wong, E.C & Leung, S.O. (2013). The development of interrogative forms and functions in early childhood Cantonese. *First Language*, 33 (2), 168-181.
- [13] Mauranen, A. (1993). *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric: A textlinguistic study*. New York: Peter Lang.
- [14] Simin, S., & Tavangar, M. (2009). Metadiscourse knowledge and use in Iranian EFL writing. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 11(1), 230-255.
- [15] Sultan, A. H. J. (2011). A contrastive study of metadiscourse in English and Arabic linguistics research articles. *Acta Linguistica*, 5, 28-41.



**Mohammadamin Sorahi** is currently assistant professor of linguistics teaching at Guilan University, Rasht, Iran. His main interests are Cognitive Linguistics, Semantics, Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis. He has published many articles in Iranian and English journals.

**Mansour Shabani** is currently assistant professor of General Linguistics at Guilan University in Iran. He specializes in Syntax, Pragmatics, and Dialectology. He has published a variety of articles on these topics in Iranian and foreign journals of linguistics.