

# American Journal of Literature Studies (AJLS)



## **A Corpus-Based Study of Metadiscourse Features Across Pctb Textbooks at Primary and Secondary Levels**

*Ata ul Ghafar, Iqra Shehzadi, Iqra Tahir*



## A Corpus-Based Study of Metadiscourse Features Across Pctb Textbooks at Primary and Secondary Levels

Ata ul Ghafar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>M.Phil scholar (Applied Linguistics) Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan

Corresponding author: [ataulghafer56@gmail.com](mailto:ataulghafer56@gmail.com)

### Abstract

Metadiscourse markers (MMs) are linguistic features that scholars use to express their messages compellingly and persuasively. Metadiscourse not just aides the peruser to comprehend the essential message of the message through construction and content, rather its suggest the peruser with the specific inclinations and points of view in the essential talk. The basic purpose of this study is to explore metadiscourse markers division and frequency designed by Pakistani authors Punjab curriculum textbook board at primary and secondary level students for the academic year 2018-2019. And also try to encompasses appropriate and inappropriateness as well. An adhock corpus comprises at primary and secondary levels Punjab textbook board English language books. Ken Hyland's taxonomy Metadiscourse (2005) was selected to investigate the frequency of metadiscourse features though famous AntConc 3.5.8 software is used for text analysis. According to obtained results, interactive metadiscourse features has more frequently used rather interactional metadiscourse features in Punjab curriculum textbook board English language books. The total numbers of interactive markers are 10,429 likewise interactional metadiscourse markers total numbers are 94,91. The research indicates the worth of metadiscourse features in Punjab curriculum textbooks board English language books and opens the door for syllabus designers and researchers that they should considered the worth of metadiscourse in pedagogical perspective.

**Keyword:** Metadiscourse, Corpus, interactional features, interactional markers, PCTB, Transition Markers.

## Introduction

Metadiscourse is "talk about talk" (Williams, 1981, p. 40) Metadiscourse features utilized as one of the tools that make writings more worth full in the natural environment and are viewed as perhaps the principle ascribes of correspondence between individuals to pass data in a sound and prudent way on through different semantic expression . In order to create and develop strong and useful composition, the linguistic features Metadiscourse plays a significance role in the learning of pedagogical English composition. Hyland's propounded a model of metadiscourse features he gave a total edge work how scholars can make there compositions more understandable and valuable for the second language learners. As we noticed our pedagogical or business English there could be no appropriate utilization of metadiscourse features. Has a matter of fact these discourse markers plays very important role in developing different discourse. Imran, Ghafer [3]. Wei, et al dealt with investigating interactive features and interactional metadiscourse features and its utilization in scholarly writings however in Pakistan not many scholars inspired by this field no one looked at metadiscourse markers in Punjab curriculum textbook English language books so this study fills the gape of discourse features use in scholastic works and distinguish the inappropriate use of these markers in Pakistani scholarly compositions.

Hyland and Tse states that we have two levels of meta-discourse: one is the interactive and the second is the interactional. The Interactive metadiscourse features guide the reader through text and arranged the speech in an organized way in which the writer's conveyed his knowledge to the readers and the evaluation of the reader's capability to recoup from the text. In the Interactive features of Hyland model are included transitional markers, code glosses, frame markers, and evidential markers endophoric markers. The reader contribution in developing the text involve through interactive expedient. On the other hand interactional metadiscourse features built reader and writer relationship the use of these markers make an engagement between the reader and writer, In the interactional features of Hyland model are included as boosters, hedges, engagement markers, attitude markers and self-statements (Hyland, 2010).

The present study investigates the frequencies of discourse markers based on Hyland's taxonomy 2005 among secondary and intermediate level Punjab curriculum textbook board English language books. The frequency has been be investigated famous tool Ant Conc 3.5 8 Different categories of discourse features propounded by Hyland's in his model. This research indicates the worth of metadiscourse features in Punjab curriculum textbooks board English language books and opens the door for syllabus designers and researchers that they should considered the worth of metadiscourse in pedagogical perspective.

## Literature review

The taxonomy of metadiscourse features developed by Hyland [6] has assisted with conceptualizing the speculation of the study. Hyland states that hedges are generally used in text to express the Uncertainty, ambiguity, probability, caution instead of full accuracy surety and decisiveness. Hedges also has some categories like Epistemic Model action word like compose, composed, composed, and so on), Adjective (happy, enchanting, awesome), Adverbs (totally, unobtrusively, and so on), Noun as a possibility, hazard, elective, and so on) and another semantically unique investigation. For capabilities stamping (similarly, essentially generally and so on).Code glosses is one of interactive feature that indicate the interpretation of writers mostly writer used this feature to elaborate their discourse of the content or make it clear for the audience.

Code glosses' has two sub categories: to construct or explain the words. Code glosses are used the discourse more exemplify and more elaborative in text which is more comprehensive and understandable for the audience or readers. Code glosses can be a decent source and may become supportive for audience members and perusers to comprehend the significance and proposed data. Transitional markers Signal logical links as causative, consequential prepositions, additive, and conflict by the use of the variety, like the conjunction, transition markers assists to build textual cohesion.( Hasan & Halliday, 1976; Rose & Martin, 2003), Linking adverbs (Biber et al., 1999), discourse connective (Blakemore, 2002), and logical markers (Dueñas, 2009) with their functions of contextual, transitional markers may be more categorized into three sub forms: 1) Addition 2) Comparison 3) Inference (for example interestingly, or accordingly, therefore)

Frame markers are indicating the units of the schematic writing structure and the writing limits or boundaries. The text for the readers basically arranges by Ken Hyland,(1998). The text including speech target announcement, item sequence, concept shifting, and text stages are internalized by frame markers. Endophoric markers indicated other side of the text. They add additional prepositional information in the text to make it understandable for the readers. There are two types of endophoric markers, the cataphoric and the anaphoric Cataphoric markers. The motivation behind endophoric is to help cognizance through supporting materials to help clarify an argument. Evidential markers are used to represent and show that idea has come to another source and to help establish the auctorial command of the writer.

Attitude markers portray the author's evaluation of the proposed information, which passes on shock responsibility, getting, importance, and so on (Hyland, 2004; p.) These markers are set of expression in language and can be achieved through lexico-syntactic resources, including modals verbs (for instance need to, should), attitudinal adjectives(for case alluring, awful), emotional intensifiers (e.g., unusually, amazingly), and various enunciations passing on position or evaluation (for instance., what is huge, it is significant).Self-mentions markers are the markers that the author is used to the extent that first-person pronouns and possessives, addressing the decision of the essayist to stay behind the proclamations or to avoid such liabilities (Hyland, 2004, p. 6). The writer used first person pronoun (e.g., we, I), possessive pronouns (e.g., our, my), Writers can perform different social limits in their identity, from the relationship of talk to the piece of the author in research. Self-mentions markers are valuable features which can built a important image in academic writing. Boosters are more uncommon in scholarly composition, yet they are utilized to reinforce the position when essayists are totally dedicated to their assertions. A few instances of promoters incorporate without a doubt, totally, positively, and I immovably accept. Underline words and expressions that are utilized to support and lift claims.

Table 1: Hyland’s Model of Meta-discourse markers

Category	Function	Examples
<b>Interactive</b>	<b>Help to guide the reader through the text</b>	<b>Resources</b>
Transitions	express relations between main clauses	in addition; but; thus; and
Frame markers	refer to discourse acts, sequences or stages	finally; to conclude; my purpose is
Endophoric markers	refer to information in other parts of the text	noted above; see Fig; in section 2
Evidentials	refer to information from other texts	according to X; Z states
Code glosses	elaborate propositional meanings	namely; e.g.; such as; in other words
<b>Interactional</b>	<b>Involve the reader in the text</b>	<b>Resources</b>
Hedges	withhold commitment and open dialogue	might; perhaps; possible; about
Boosters	emphasize certainty or close dialogue	in fact; definitely; it is clear that
Attitude markers	express writer's 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

### Research Question

The current investigation has addressed four following questions:

- 1) What type of Metadiscourse markers used in the adhoc corpus?
- 2) What are the Frequencies of Metadiscourse markers in the primary and secondary PCTB English language books?
- 3) What jobs do these Metadiscourse features in the textbooks?
- 4) How far the use of Metadiscourse markers is appropriate or inappropriate in the textbooks?

This work on the use of Metadiscourse features is unique at secondary and intermediate PTB books. The study has high educational significance and open new horizon for academicians authors, it would also contribute to syllabus designing, and academic writings. If Pakistani

researchers understand the value of metadiscourse features their works would be more intelligible at an worldwide level acknowledgment.

### Methodology

The researcher has selected post positivist approach because the research investigation is based on a particular theory propounded by Hyland’s model metadiscourse markers 2005. The corpus was retrieved at primary and secondary level Punjab curriculum textbook board academic English books. Hyland's model has been used to investigate meta-discourse markers in primary and secondary PCTB books. Quantitative research approach has been used to find out the frequency of Metadiscourse features in the corpus. All corpora was taken from English language Punjab textbook board primary to secondary levels students for the academic year 2018-2019 to identify the meta-discourse (MM). These books published under the supervision of PCTB. Step first, we find out the relevant primary and secondary level Punjab textbook board academic English books. Then, we built two sets of corpora one comprises at secondary levels books and on the other hand intermediate level Punjab curriculum textbook board academic English books. After the preparation of corpus, this corpus has been uploaded on AntConc3.5.8 software and investigated frequencies of meta-discourse features through manual tagging. In the fourth step, concordance has been noticed and the proper utilization of metadiscourse highlights distinguished through examining in light of Hyland's model discourse features (2005) actually take a look at list. In the next step, discourse features characterized into interactional and interactive markers in light of Hyland's taxonomy 2005. Finally the frequencies of discourse markers have been examined in the corpus.

### Results

The results has been shown in the form of tables interactive and interactional markers frequency has been mentioned in the form of tables. The total numbers of interactive markers are 10,429 likewise interactional metadiscourse markers total numbers are 94,91. The sub category of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers has been mentioned in these result tables. As obtained results showed, the frequency of interactional markers is less frequently used in PCTB English language books.

Table.2 Interactive Discourse Features

Interactive Categories	Interactive Features Frequency
	Primary and secondary textbooks
1. Transition Markers	
a) addition	4355
b) comparison	1371
c) consequence	396

2. Frame markers	
a) Sequencing	653
b) label stages	139
c) announce goals	148
d) shift topic	205
3. Endophoric markers	267
4. Evidential	501
5. Code glosses	2394
Total numbers of interactive markers	10,429

Table 3. Interactional Discourse Features

Interactional categories	Interactional Features Frequency	
	Primary and secondary textbooks	
1. Hedges		
a) Epistemic verbs	1673	
b) Probability adverbs	79	
c) Epistemic Expression	178	
2. Boosters		
a) intensifier adverbs	298	
b) intensifier adjectives	87	
c) intensifier verbs	677	
3. Attitude markers	500	
a) attitude verbs	77	
b) Attitudinal adverbs	148	
c) Attitudinal adjectives		
4. Self-mentions	2890	
5. Engagement markers		
a) reader pronoun	2390	

b) interjection	224
c) directive imperatives	270
d) obligation modals	
Total numbers of interactional markers	94,91

## Discussion

The current research purpose is to explore the use of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers division and frequency in (PCTB) English language books at primary and secondary levels based on Hyland's model (2005). Results and discussions are presented according to the research questions. The first question answered that metadiscourse markers has used in (PCTB) English language books at primary and secondary levels. The second question answered the division and frequency of metadiscourses markers used by Punjab curriculum textbook board English language books. According to obtained results, interactive metadiscourse features has more frequently used rather interactional metadiscourse features in Punjab curriculum textbook board in English language books. The total numbers of interactive markers are 10,429 likewise interactional metadiscourse markers total numbers are 94,91. The sub category of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers has been mentioned in the result tables. 1&2. The frequency of interactive features Transitions markers 6122, frame markers 1145 , and code glosses 2394 , in Punjab curriculum textbook board English language books has been observed, but there was no significant difference in applying the endophoric markers and evidential markers. As obtained results showed, the frequency of interactional markers is less frequently used in PCTB English language books. Nevertheless PCTB authors has used interactional metadiscourse markers more frequently in their textbook designing. The frequency of Engagement markers 2884, Self-mentions 2890, hedges 1930, boosters 1062, and attitude markers 725 has been observed. As a result the most frequent feature Transitions markers 6122 and Endophoric markers 267 these are the category of Interactive Metadiscourse markers and least used in PCTB English language books.

Our third query was what jobs do these discourse features in the text? The results shows that Transitions markers, frame markers, and code glosses from interactive categories likewise Engagement markers and Self-mentions interactional categories more frequently used in PCTB English language books. As we noticed our pedagogical or business English there could be no appropriate utilization of metadiscourse features. Has a matter of fact these discourse markers plays very important role in developing different discourse. Transitions, frame markers Interactive metadiscourse creates the interaction between lexical item and phrases of the content. Frame Markers indicates different writing and discourse steps, Transition markers used to connect different elements that help the readers for strong connections between propositions. The interactive and interactional markers are used to make writer writing comprehensive and understandable. Endophoric markers are used to explain written work such as stated above, in this section, etc. It has been observed that Self-mentions, engagement markers frequently used in Interactional metadiscourse markers these features developed a connection between audience and



speaker and the use of Self-mentions in PCTB English language books are constructed social engagement between students and books.

The final research question was How far the use of Metadiscourse markers is appropriate or inappropriate in the PCTB textbooks? The last question has been answered the results of study shown that Punjab curriculum textbook designers were aware of the usage of discourse features. Pakistani Curriculum designers are topically involved in traditional aspects of writings. The use of Metadiscourse markers indicate the worth of metadiscourse markers. They do errors while using them as to represent and show that idea has come to another source and to help establish the auctorial command of the writer. Transitions markers Self-mentions and code glosses were used more frequently which shows ambiguousness on the part of curriculum. Syllabus designers should keep the check and balance on textbook designers when they design the textbooks instead of defining worth and functions of Metadiscourse markers.

### **Conclusion**

Pakistani syllabus designers , writers , authors generally ignored Metadiscourse features in their writings .Pakistani writers especially the researchers, syllabus designers they did not consider the value of metadiscourse markers while forming their textbooks, research articles etc. The current study explored the use of discourse features division and frequency in (PCTB) English language books at primary and secondary levels based on Hyland's taxonomy (2005) The results, shows interactive metadiscourse features has more frequently used rather interactional metadiscourse features in Punjab curriculum textbook board English language books. If Pakistani researchers understand the value of metadiscourse features their works would be more intelligible at an worldwide level acknowledgment. If they were very much aware of the use of these linguistics features they could have better writing abilities in their fields. Consequently, metadiscourse markers should be included as part of course work in English at university level. It will help the researchers updating their writing and designing abilities.

## REFERENCES

1. Anthony, L. (2016). AntConc (Version 3.5.8) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Retrieved from <http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/>
2. Cuenca, M. J., & Bach, C. (2007). Contrasting the form and use of reformulation markers. *Discourse Studies*, 9(2), 149-175.
3. Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum
4. Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of Academic Metadiscourse. *Journal of pragmatics*, 30(4), 437-455.
5. Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. Vol. 13, 133–151.
6. Hewings, M. (2006). Introduction. In M. Hewings (Ed.). *Academic writing in context: Implications and applications* (pp. 79–92). London: Continuum.
7. Hyland, K. (2007). Applying a gloss: Exemplifying and reformulating in academic discourse. *Applied linguistics*, 28(2), 266-285.
8. Mina, K. Biria ,R. (2017). Exploring Interactive and Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in Discussion Sections of Social and Medical Science Articles. *International Journal of Research in English Education (Vol2)*, [www.ijreeonline.com](http://www.ijreeonline.com).
9. Mahmood, R. ( 2017) Analysis of Metadiscourse Features in Argumentative Writing by Pakistani Undergraduate Students *International Journal of English Linguistics; Vol. 7, No. 6; 2017*
10. Siddique, A. (2018). Metadiscourse Analysis of Pakistani English Newspaper Editorials: A Corpus-Based Study. *International Journal of English Linguistics; (Vol. 8), 1923-8703*.
11. Shah, M. I., Ghafar, A. u., & Iqbal, A. (2021). Role of Meta-discourse Markers in Academic Writings of Pakistani Scholars: An Interdisciplinary Comparative Content Analysis. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies*, 3(6), 210-216.
12. Schiffrin, D. (1980). Meta-talk: Organizational and evaluative brackets in discourse. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50(3-4), 199-236
13. Wei, J. Gong, Y. (2016). Studies on Metadiscourse since the 3rd Millennium *Journal of Education and Practice*. (Vol.7), [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org).
14. Williams, J. (1981). *Style: Ten lessons in clarity and grace*. Boston: Scott Foresman.