



IRAQI  
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية  
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية



ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

**Journal of Language Studies**

Contents available at: <https://jls.tu.edu.iq/index.php/JLS>

## Metadiscourse Markers in Iraqi Academia: A Corpus-Based Study of Research Articles in Pragmatics Using AntConc

Lect. Sufyan Mahdi Hammood Hammash (Ph. D.)\*

Department of English, College of Education for Humanities, Tikrit University, Tikrit,  
Iraq

[sufyan.mahdi@tu.edu.iq](mailto:sufyan.mahdi@tu.edu.iq)

Received: 07/10/2025, Accepted: 22/11/2025, Online Published: 30/06/2026

### Abstract

In this study, metadiscourse markers in Iraqi academic articles within the field of pragmatics are analysed. The main objective of the study is to examine the types and frequency of metadiscourse markers and their employment in Iraqi research articles written in English. This research poses the question of ‘how Iraqi authors reach a level of engagement with their readers by using metadiscourse markers?’. Relying on Hyland’s (2005) framework to determine the types of metadiscourse markers, both types interactive and interactional in a self-constructed corpus of 106 articles. These articles are authored by Iraqi researchers and published in local journals. AntConc -‘a tool for analysis’- is used to check the frequency and distribution for each marker. Logical connectors are the frequent ones such as "and" (18,881 times) and ‘but’ (1,077 times). Strategies for exemplification like, ‘for example’ and ‘such as,’ are used to fit things together. The aforementioned findings show how English academic writing among Iraqi researchers is organized.

**Keywords:** antconc, corpus, metadiscourse, pragmatics, research article

\* **Corresponding Author:** Sufyan Mahdi Hammood, Email: [sufyan.mahdi@tu.edu.iq](mailto:sufyan.mahdi@tu.edu.iq)

**Affiliation:** Tikrit University – Iraq.

© This is an open access article under the CC by licenses <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



العلامات الما وراء خطابية في الأوساط الأكاديمية العراقية: دراسة مدونية لمقالات بحثية في  
التداولية ببرنامج انتكونك

م. د. سفيان مهدي حمود حماش

قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة تكريت، تكريت، العراق

المستخلص

تتناول هذه الدراسة تحليل العلامات الما وراء الخطابية في المقالات الأكاديمية العراقية ضمن حقل التداولية. و تهدف الدراسة إلى تحديد أنواع وتكرار العلامات الما وراء الخطابية وبيان كيفية توظيفها في المقالات البحثية العراقية المكتوبة باللغة الإنجليزية. وتطرح الدراسة التساؤل الآتي: كيف يحقق الباحثون العراقيون تفاعلاً مع قرائهم من خلال استخدام العلامات الما وراء خطابية؟

استندت الدراسة إلى إطار هاييلاند (2005) في تصنيف العلامات الما وراء الخطابية، بشقيها التفاعلي والتبادلي، وذلك ضمن مدونة بحثية أنشئت خصيصاً لأغراض الدراسة وضمت (106) مقال كتبها باحثون عراقيون ونُشرت في مجلات عراقية محلية. وقد استُخدم برنامج انتكونك - كأداة تحليل - لقياس تكرار وتوزيع كل نوع من أنواع العلامات المذكورة آنفاً. وتخلصت الدراسة إلى أن الروابط المنطقية هي الأكثر شيوعاً مثل " و " (18881 مرة) و "لكن" (1077 مرة). كما استُخدمت استراتيجيات التمثيل مثل على "سبيل المثال" و "مثل" لربط الأفكار والعناصر معاً. وتُظهر النتائج المذكورة آنفاً كيفية تنظيم الكتابة الأكاديمية باللغة الإنجليزية لدى الباحثين العراقيين. الكلمات المفتاحية: انتكونك، المدونة اللغوية، ما وراء الخطاب، التداولية، مقال بحثي.

INTRODUCTION

To share information with other researchers and to show who they are and their reputation in the field, researchers rely on academic writing. In academic writing, metadiscourse markers are used by skilled writers to express stance and get readers' attention. In Iraq which is a non-native context for English, academic writing does not follow the norms of the native language 'English' as authors are not exposed enough to authentic academic writing. Metadiscourse markers are not efficiently employed by Iraqi

professors as they face certain challenges which lead to problems in clarity, persuasiveness and engagement in discourse. Even if there are more and more English publications in Iraq, there isn't enough comprehensive research on how Iraqi authors use metadiscourse markers in their academic research articles.

The aims of this study are to examine the types and frequency of metadiscourse indicators employed in Iraqi linguistics research articles written in English. Analyze the use of metadiscourse markers in publications written by Iraqis with those published globally in the field of linguistics to highlight both similarities and differences. Discuss current pedagogical implications for improving English for Academic Purposes (EAP) training and academic writing techniques in Iraqi higher education.

Certain questions are raised in this research, which are; (1) what types of metadiscourse markers used the most by Iraqi researchers? (2) How Iraqi authors reach a level of engagement with their readers by using metadiscourse markers? (3) What pedagogical implications do the findings of this study reflect on teaching academic writing?

Iraqi academic writing is explained in this study with its rhetorical and interpersonal dimensions. Academic arguments and author-reader interactions are fostered using metadiscourse markers all are analyzed in this research which is conducted on Iraqi researchers. Global standards and local academic needs can be achieved by following the finding to construct a curriculum for academic writing. Furthermore, linguistic theory and practical instruction are integrated in academic writing to facilitate the way Iraqi researchers achieve effective communication and global visibility.

Iraqi writers reveal a reduced use of interpersonal metadiscourse markers. Their usage of interactive metadiscourse markers is more than their interactional ones. Academic writing is affected by culture and education in the use metadiscourse markers. The quality of academic writing can be improved by their capacity to effectively use metadiscourse markers and keep readers interested.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

The academic writing progression for Taylor (2009) can be achieved by different engaging the different parts of the process who are the subject, the audience the linguistic standards and the writer's role. The author is essentially required to recognize in academic writing that their articles should be structured, formal, has objective framework.

In the course of academic writing, it is imperative for the author to provide justifications and corroborating facts that reinforce the articulated principles. As a result, the author needs to express his ideas in a way that is both clear and appropriate for the audience. To write academically, you need to know a lot of words so you can make sentences that are useful and relevant, as well as how to use the right conjunctions to connect ideas and the right punctuation marks (Neamah, 2025, 191). In scholarly writing, authors utilize the linguistic idea of "metadiscourse" to guide, engage, and persuade their audience through the interactive and interactional facets of metadiscourse (Hamad and Kareem, 2023, 595).

Metadiscourse is essential for both the reader and the writer. For example, it can pique the reader's interest and keep their attention by providing texts that meet their needs

and wants while also taking into account what they already know about the subject. For example, the reader may require supplementary information about the terms and concepts employed in the text, which may not have been entirely clear to them (Al-brefkane & Fathi,2023).

## **Metadiscourse**

For the majority of researchers, 'metadiscourse' is an ambiguous phrase denoting 'discussion about discussion' or 'discourse concerning discourse.' Thus, 'metadiscourse' serves the function of examining the internal components and characteristics of the text itself. This perspective omits essential qualities required for the activation of metadiscourse, including 'linguistic elements that articulate not only the organization of our ideas but also our relationship with readers or listeners' (Hyland, 2019: 19).

Consequently, metadiscourse is perceived as a system of meanings manifested through an indefinite array of linguistic elements that serve non-metadiscoursal purposes and can only be identified in specific instances of realization. The principal characteristics of metadiscourse include: the engagement of writers with their readers and the three fundamental principles articulated by Hyland and Tse (2004:156ff):

Metadiscourse is separate from the propositional elements of discourse;  
Metadiscourse pertains to elements of the text that represent writer-reader interactions;  
Metadiscourse exclusively addresses relationships that are intrinsic to the discourse (Kareem, 2019).

The word "metadiscourse" was first introduced by linguist Zellig Harris in 1959 to refer to a method of comprehending language in practice and to signify the efforts of

writers or speakers to influence the perspectives of readers or listeners regarding a text. Hyland (2005, p. 37) defined metadiscourse as "the overarching term for self-reflective expressions employed to negotiate interactional meanings within a text, aiding the writer (or speaker) in articulating a perspective and engaging with readers as constituents of a specific community." Metadiscourse markers act as incomplete language pieces to get a point across. Their distinguished feature is that they signify the relationship between the reader and the writer (Hyland, 2005:38).

Williams (1981, p. 226) posited that metadiscourse includes "whatever does not pertain to the subject matter being discussed." Crismore (1983, p. 2) posited that most texts utilize metadiscourse to indicate a shift in topic or to suggest that the author's claims are comparatively accurate or important. Crismore contended that it is the duty of the person who writes or speaks to permit suitable transitions between concepts and to integrate signals within the text, so allowing the reader to grasp the writer's intended coherence of the text as a unified entity.

### **Pragmatics and Metadiscourse**

In Academia, the production of knowledge is a social activity as the writer tries to gain acceptance by manipulating rhetorical features and rational exposition (Hyland, 1997). Metadiscourse works as a link between texts and disciplinary cultures as it reveals the expectation and understanding of the audience for a certain text using rhetorical features (ibid).

Thus, a writer's job is to relate illocutionary acts to their perlocutionary effects. Each message is understood (an illocutionary act) and accepted (to have a perlocutionary

effect). However, readers have the option to reject the writer's point of view as a result of different interpretation of the same text (Hyland,1997: 440).

Metadiscourse is a response by the writer to the negotiability of his claims, he engages readers and intervene with the different interpretation (Hyland,1997: 440). In academia, Metadiscourse has a rhetorical role to support or avoid argument, express companionship and resolve certain difficulties.

### **Functions of Metadiscourse**

Metadiscourse plays and serves different functions in interaction especially in writing and speaking. Here are the main ones:

Clarification: clarifies the author's stance and the direction of the text.

Guidance: It provides guidance to the audience.

Interpretation: Metadiscourse aids in interpreting the text.

Interaction: It eases interaction between the author and the audience.

Audience Engagement: making the text more relatable and inviting audience to participate.

### **Metadiscourse Markers**

Metadiscourse markers are elements of language that make it easier to understand language in practice. These traits, therefore, determine the type of relationship that exists between the person who sends a message and the one who gets it (Ali, 2016). These signs are essential in delineating the relationship between the writer and the reader or the speaker and the listener.

Metadiscourse for Schiffrin (1980:231) who opposes the view by which metadiscourse includes author's proficiency and rhetorics of the text. communicative

competence and linguistic competence both demonstrate linguistic proficiency and rhetorics. Talented authors are differentiated by the writing they do. Linguistic and non-linguistic elements are both included within the writers' performance.

Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse is proposed by Hyland (2005) for metadiscourse markers. This approach hold two types interactive and interactional. Hyland asserts interaction fundamentally is produced through language, individuals have linguistic variations and metadiscourse markers are the ones which hold the relationships between the linguistic structures (Hyland, 2005). In communication, the cooperation process is intended to have an impact on audience.

Interactive metadiscourse markers are used by researchers to increase the way people comprehend while reading the text (Hyland, 2005). Hyland (2005, pp. 49–52) categorizes interactive metadiscourse markers into the following:

Transitions: words and phrases like in addition," "and," "but," and "so" are all under the umbrella of this category to link sentences or parts of a sentence together.

Frame markers: In this subcategory, phrases such as "first," "finally," "my purpose," and "to conclude," are used to show the chronological order of events.

Endophoric markers: To understand what a writer means and grasp their ideas, authors tend to use phrases which point to parts of the text, these are; "in section 2, referenced above" and "see Figure 3."

Evidentials: The degree of familiarity with outside resources and how an author is shown to know a lot about a certain resource are all included within this category. For example, you could say something like "according to X and Z, it is said that..."

Code glosses: This subcategory is used to reword, explain, or add to what the writer has already said to make it less likely that someone may misinterpret it. Some examples are terms like "namely" and "in other words."

A further significant kind of resource is interactional ones, which "engage the reader in the argument" (Hyland, 2005, p. 49). In this category, metadiscourse markers have been intentionally crafted to engage readers in the text's arguments. The interactional dimension emerges when the writer articulates their position and presence to the listener (Hyland, 2005, p. 52-54). The following list shows the subcategories of the interactional category:

Hedges: Writers or speakers use this category to avoid making a claim while still making it clear that their point of view is subjective by putting the idea out as an opinion or point of view instead of a statement of fact. Some words that hedge include "perhaps," "may," "can," and "possible."

Boosters: represent the second sub-category of the interactional category, utilized to underscore the writers' confidence in their assertions and propositions, as evidenced by markers such as absolutely, definitely, in fact, and it is apparent that.

Attitude markers: Here we have another sub-category: attitude markers. These markers convey the speaker's or writer's feelings and attitudes towards what they said. Instances of attitude markers include; hopefully, shockingly and unhappily.

Self-mentions: The fourth type, self-mentions, is the usage of pronouns like as I, my, mine, we, and 'our' to denote a direct reference to the author(s) or the subject of the current text.

5. Engagement markers: authors or speakers utilize this category to directly address the audience, fostering a relationship and involving them as participants in the discourse. Instances of engagement indicators include phrases such as "you can see that" and "consider that" (Abd & Rasheed, 2024).

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Corpus Description**

The corpus for this study consists of **106 English-language research articles** retrieved from the **Iraqi Academic Scientific Journals (IASJ)** database. The search term "*pragmatic*" was used to ensure that all texts are thematically relevant to the field of **pragmatics**. Out of a total of **783 articles** that appeared under the "pragmatic" keyword (including all years and languages), only **149** were published in **2025**, and many others were excluded because they were written in Arabic or other non-English languages.

After manually filtering, the final collection contained 106 English research publications, published in 2025, mostly by Iraqi experts. We downloaded each article as a PDF file. To find the articles, I used the keyword "pragmatic" and only included papers in English. There are 671,196 tokens in the entire corpus. This corpus reflects the contemporary research procedures and discourse styles of Iraqi scholars in English academic publishing, making it suited for examining the usage of meta-discourse markers and broader rhetorical patterns.

## **Tool of Analysis**

AntConc 4.0, a free corpus analysis tool that can count frequencies, analyze concordances, and extract keywords, was used for the analysis. The tool helped find and count metadiscourse markers based on Hyland's taxonomy.

## **Procedure**

### **Data Preparation:**

- Articles were sorted and opened in AntConc.
- All of the texts were put into one folder so they could be analyzed.

**Software:** Laurence Anthony (2022) produced AntConc (Version 4.0.7), a free corpus analysis toolbox that was used to look at the corpus.

**Search:** AntConc used a full array of metadiscourse markers based on Hyland's taxonomy.

### **Analysis Steps:**

- The Word List and Keyword List tools were used to acquire a general idea of how often and how important words are.
- Concordance searches were performed for each metadiscourse marker to confirm its contextual function (to ascertain that it fulfills a metadiscursive role rather than a propositional one).
- Following Hyland's paradigm, markers were grouped into two groups: interactive and interactional functions.

## **Rationale**

The choice of IASJ as a data source demonstrates that it is becoming more important as a national archive for Iraqi academic work. Papers are written English to

ensure that the language analyzed of Iraqi articles comply to international academic policies rather than a mere article with translation inconsistencies. Focusing on metadiscourse markers in articles is centred around pragmatics in ensures that consistency and avoid disciplinary inconsistencies.

### **Analytical Framework**

The analysis is based on **Hyland's (2005) model of metadiscourse**, encompassing two main categories:

| <b>Category</b>      | <b>Function</b>                         | <b>Examples</b>  |
|----------------------|---|--|
| <b>Interactive</b>   | Organize discourse and guide the reader | Transitions ( <i>however, therefore</i> ), Frame markers ( <i>first, in conclusion</i> ), Endophoric markers ( <i>see Table 1</i> ), Evidentials ( <i>according to Smith, 2020</i> ), Code glosses ( <i>in other words</i> ) |
| <b>Interactional</b> | Express stance and engage the reader    | Hedges ( <i>might, perhaps</i> ), Boosters ( <i>clearly, of course</i> ), Attitude markers ( <i>surprisingly, importantly</i> ), Self-mentions ( <i>I, we</i> ), Engagement markers ( <i>note that, consider</i> )           |

### **Procedure Using AntConc**

**AntConc (Version 4.0.7)** was used to analyze the corpus. The following steps are:

- Building and uploading a corpus using AntConc.
- Metadiscourse markers were made into a list to search for in the chosen corpus (using Hyland's taxonomy).

- Word and keyword in context (KWIC) searches are done for each item to make sure how they work in context.
- Interactive or interactional markers are sorted for each occurrence.

## DISCUSSION

### Interactional Metadiscourse Markers Distribution and Discussion

*Table (1) Frequency of Interactional Metadiscourse Markers*

| <b>Metadiscourse<br/>Marker</b> | <b>Freq</b> | <b>Metadiscourse<br/>Marker</b> | <b>Freq</b> | <b>Metadiscourse<br/>Marker</b> | <b>Freq</b> | <b>Metadiscourse<br/>Marker</b> | <b>Freq</b> |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| might                           | 234         | perhaps                         | 35          | clearly                         | 101         | the researcher                  | 153         |
| possible                        | 129         | possibly                        | 30          | seems                           | 81          | appears                         | 56          |
| suggest                         | 186         | assume                          | 31          | generally                       | 75          | likely                          | 84          |
| obviously                       | 18          | in fact                         | 0           | definitely                      | 8           | prefer                          | 21          |
| it is clear that                | 0           | indeed                          | 40          | of course                       | 0           | you can see                     | 0           |
| certainly                       | 10          | undoubtedly                     | 2           | unfortunately                   | 11          | I                               | 1817        |
| surprisingly                    | 1           | I agree                         | 0           | I believe                       | 72          | the author                      | 38          |
| interesting                     | 26          | importantly                     | 15          | sadly                           | 1           |                                 |             |
| hopefully                       | 8           | consider                        | 75          | note that                       | 0           |                                 |             |
| we can observe                  | 0           | remember                        | 15          | as you can see                  | 0           |                                 |             |
| pay attention to                | 0           | you may notice                  | 0           | let's                           | 0           |                                 |             |
| we                              | 742         | my                              | 383         | our                             | 342         |                                 |             |

In the above Table (1) different types of interactional metadiscourse are distributed across the corpus. They are shown in the following:

### **Self-mention markers**

"I" (1,817 times), "we" (742 times), "my" (383 times), and "our" (342 times) are frequently employed for the purpose of having an author-centric discourse. Arguments in writing are possessed by writer to highlight the main parts of human perspective. For Hyland (2005) first-person pronouns are used by writers to indicate their personal ownership and research process. "The researcher" (153) and "the author" (38) have a detached tone but they are also authorial reference as they demonstrate how English academic writing is practiced in non-native contexts.

### **Hedges and boosters**

Hedges like "might" (234), "suggest" (186), and "likely" (84) are used by researchers to have a susceptible interpretation and their claims are not so strong. Other hedges such as "perhaps" (35), "possibly" (30), and "assume" (31) are employed more for interpretation. Boosters which show certainty are less employed. Even though "clearly" (101) and "definitely" (8) show confidence, the low frequencies of "certainly" (10), "undoubtedly" (2), and "of course" (0) show that writers want to be careful. This restriction may be because academic norms prefer balanced arguments to absolute statements.

### **Attitude markers**

Limited usage of emotive or evaluative stance markers such “fortunately” (11), “interestingly” (26), “importantly” (15), and “surprisingly” (1). This suggests that authors avoid emotional appraisal and retain an impartial scholarly tone. This is supported by the low use of “sadly” (1) and “unfortunately” (11).

**Engagement markers**

Nearly no reader-focused engagement signals exist. None of “note that” (0), “you can see” (0), “let’s” (0), or “pay attention to” (0) appear. This shows writers rarely overtly involve readers in debate. Due to its rarity, the corpus authors appear to choose a monologic rhetorical style, typical of formal academic writing, that presupposes the reader's presence.

**Interactive Metadiscourse Markers Distribution and Discussion**

*Table (2) Frequency of Interactive Metadiscourse Markers*

| <b>Metadiscourse Marker</b> | <b>Freq</b> | <b>Metadiscourse Marker</b> | <b>Freq</b> | <b>Metadiscourse Marker</b> | <b>Freq</b> | <b>Metadiscourse Marker</b> | <b>Freq</b> |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| and                         | 18881       | but                         | 1077        | however                     | 366         | therefore                   | 254         |
| consequently                | 81          | in addition                 | 149         | moreover                    | 137         | first                       | 479         |
| finally                     | 78          | to conclude                 | 8           | my purpose is               | 0           | in sum                      | 6           |
| to repeat                   | 0           | to summarize                | 0           | in this section             | 0           | overall                     | 82          |
| as noted above              | 0           | see Figure 1                | 1           | in the next section         | 1           | thus                        | 281         |
| as mentioned earlier        | 0           | noted below                 | 0           | next                        | 49          | specifically                | 85          |
| according to                | 568         | as noted by                 | 7           | as stated in                | 2           | namely                      | 62          |
| argues that                 | 57          | as claimed by               | 0           | suggests                    | 186         | such as                     | 1280        |

|             |     |         |     |                |    |  |  |
|-------------|-----|---------|-----|----------------|----|--|--|
| for example | 513 | that is | 620 | in other words | 77 |  |  |
|-------------|-----|---------|-----|----------------|----|--|--|

Table (2) shows the distribution of interactive metadiscourse markers across the corpus.

These can be shown in the following:

### **Transition Markers**

The common transition markers are “and” (18,881) and “but” (1,077). Due to the great prevalence of “and,” writers may link sentences with simple conjunctions for linguistic economy and non-native English style. The contrastive markers “but” (1,077) and “however” (366) show that authors utilize adversative transitions to contrast opposing views, albeit “however” is used less often, suggesting a preference for less formal linkage. The sparse use of causal and resultive transitions like “therefore” (254), “thus” (281), and “consequently” (81) suggests implicit reasoning in sentences. Similar to very formal academic discourse, this style uses simple coordination and lacks explicit logical organization.

### **Frame Markers**

Frame markers help readers organize and structure material, but their frequency is minimal. Sometimes “first” (479) and “finally” (78) are used to denote sequence, but “to conclude” (8), “in sum” (6), and “overall” (82) are unusual. The lack of “to summarize”, “in this section”, and “my purpose is” shows writers do not explicitly state discourse structure or purpose. This minimal usage of frame markers suggests that authors favor implicit textual organization to metadiscourse direction, potentially due to a cultural or

instructional preference for conciseness or a lack of rhetorical training in explicit text navigation.

### **Endophoric Markers**

With only “see Figure 1” (1), “in the next section” (1), and no “as mentioned earlier” or “as noted above,” endophoric indicators are scarce. The short duration of articles or a lack of awareness of endophoric referencing rules in academic English writing may explain why writers rarely refer to other sections of their own texts.

### **Evidentials**

Authors use evidence to add outside sources. The corpus employs “according to” (568) and “suggests” (186) most often, but “argues that” (57), “as noted by” (7), and “as stated in” (2) are infrequent and “as claimed by” is never used. Citation and source attribution are present but not diverse, with writers adopting a few reporting verbs and formulaic words for source integration. Instead of “argues” or “claims,” “according to” and “suggests” may show a neutral and cautious stance.

### **Code Glosses**

Code glosses (which explain or illustrate) are modest. The markers “for example” (513) and “such as” (1,280) are more common than “namely” (62), “specifically” (85), and “in other words” (77). Researchers use elaborative strategies and examples to clarify their points and explain the concepts. “such as” a code gloss is used to indicate concrete example rather than abstract clarification.

### **Qualitative Analysis**

Interactive metadiscourse markers frequency is shown in the quantitative results, yet the qualitative part explains their rhetorical and functions by writers. Qualitative analysis is as follows:

**Overuse of Simple Connectors:** Paratactic structures are used as a result of the transfer from L1 into English academic writing conventions. To make longer sentences and link them together 'and' is used. It is more often used by researcher rather than "furthermore" or "therefore."

**Limited Variety in Logical Relations:** Writers use "but," "however," and "therefore" in similar contexts to show cause and effect. Lack of pragmatic awareness shows the low range of usage for the aforementioned connectors as they are mechanical rather than rhetorical.

**Underuse of Frame Markers:** To guide readers, researchers use frame markers "in this section," "to conclude," and "to summarize" in their articles. Topic words or implicit cues are used for the organization of topics. The structure is implicit rather than explicit one to indicate a text-oriented methodology.

**Lack of Endophoric Reference:** Phrases like "as previously stated" and "refer to Figure 1" are not much used as many of the articles in the corpus do not contain figures or appendices. Endophoric allusions are not used by authors as the discourse becomes less accessible.

Evidentials as Neutral Attribution: "According to" and "suggests" are used by authors to talk about past points of view and they are often employed without analysis. Information is integrated in academic writing without evaluation.

Preference for Concrete Illustration: "such as" and "for example" are used a lot by researchers to show ideas. As authors progress from general to specific as they explain instead of comprehensive investigation.

Reader Detachment: The lack of "you," "note that," and "let's" researchers see readers as passive cooperators. Information is more valued and appreciated more than interaction within academic context. Direct communication is not displayed in this corpus in contrast to other types of academic writing

Rhetorical Implications: Text density and formality in writing are more valued than helping readers and guiding them. Interactive markers are harder to employ as a result of teaching methods that focus on information rather than persuasion. Articles are structurally comprehensive but they need to focus on academic arguments.

## **CONCLUSION**

In the analysis of the corpus, metadiscourse markers explain how academic researchers hold their writing together. Interactive and interactional markers indicate that researchers prioritize information rather than engagement and persuasion.

Dominance of Interactive Markers: Interactive metadiscourse markers are analyzed quantitatively and conjunctions show consistency such as "and," "but," and "however".

textual coherence can be achieved additive or contrastive links rather than logical or structural markers.

Frame markers (like "to conclude" in this section) or endophoric references (like "as indicated above") are not much used by researchers as they do not give enough directions in their writing. The use of "according to" and "such as" show that authors know what information and where they come from yet they use no rhetorical approaches. Low-interaction style show that authors care about presenting information rather than helping readers think.

Moderate Presence of Interactional Markers: Interactional metadiscourse markers which show engagement are not common. 'I, we, my, and our' display personal involvement as the corpus is centred on self-mentions markers. A rhetorical tone is carefully noted in the usage of hedges (like "may," "suggest," and "likely") and boosters (like "obviously" and "certainly"). Authors don't engage with readers as engagement markers are not frequently present like "note that," "you can see," and "let's". Authors in their academic writing show authority without that kind of participation or an invitation to the reader to think.

Rhetorical Pattern: Authors transit form one idea into another cohesively and smoothly, as they use:

- They connect concepts and structure reasoning by their rhetorical tools.
- Readers do not fully have an input yet , they have a soft expression.

The corpus shows that academic writing skills have developed as authors have the ability to have a good attitude but they still lack to employ metadiscourse markers.

## REFERENCES

- Abd, E. K., & Rasheed, N. J. (2024). Israeli–Palestinian conflict: A metadiscourse analysis of Piers Morgan Uncensored British talk show. *Surra Man Ra’a Scientific Refereed Journal*, 20(81, Pt. 2), 45–60.
- Ahmed, H. (2019). Metadiscourse markers in Arab students’ academic writing: A contrastive corpus-based study. *Journal of Language Studies*, 12(2), 45–62.
- Al-brefkane, S. S., & Fathi, S. Y. (2023). A contrastive study of Arabic and English metadiscourse. *Adab Al-Rafidain*, 52(95), 32–59.
- Ali Qassim Ali (2016). Metadiscourse markers in advanced EFL learners’ academic writing. *Hawlyat Al-Montada Journal*, (2016), 19–38.
- Alotaibi, A. (2015). Metadiscourse in Arab postgraduate students’ academic writing in English. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20, 14–25.
- Anthony, L. (2023). *AntConc (Version 4.2.5) [Computer software]*. Waseda University. <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R., & Steffensen, M. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written Communication*, 10(1), 39–71.
- Hamad, Z. H., & Kareem, R. D. (2023). An analysis of interactional metadiscourse markers in Hawthorne's simplified novel *The Scarlet Letter*. *Adab Al-Kufa Journal*, (55, Pt. 3), 595–615.

- Harris, Z. S. (1959). The transformational model of language structure. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1(1), 27–29. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30022172>.
- Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(4), 437–455.
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. John Benjamins.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Bloomsbury.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156–177.
- Jiang, K. (2022). Metadiscourse: The evolution of an approach to texts. *Text & Talk*, 44(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2021-0156>
- Kareem, R. D. (2019). A metadiscourse analysis of “A Common Word between Us and You” persuasion strategies. *Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences*, 44(4B).
- Khadiar, R. H. (2025). Investigating the effect of metadiscourse markers in reading comprehension texts in Iraqi preparatory English books. *Journal of Basic Science (JOBS)*, 25.
- Mauranen, A. (1993). *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric: A textlinguistic study*. Peter Lang.
- Neamah, S. A. (2025). An experimental study in cultivating academic writing of EFL university students by RAFTS strategy. *Journal of the College of Education for Women, Tikrit University*, (Issue information if available), 189–204.

Schiffrin, D. (1980). Metatalk: Organization and evaluative brackets in discourse.

*Sociological Inquiry: Language and Social Interaction*, 199-236.

Taylor, G. (2009). *A student's writing guide*. Cambridge University Press.

Williams, J. (1981). *Style: Ten lessons in clarity and grace*. Scott Foresman.