University of Bahrain

College of Arts

Department of English Language & Literature

An Analysis of the Use of Metadiscourse Markers in Master Theses of Selected Genres

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of MA in Applied English Language Studies

Submitted by:

Sara Ghaleb Hasan Beshara

ID: 20132267

Supervised by:

Dr. Nuri Ageli

Associate Professor

University of Bahrain

Kingdom of Bahrain

February 2025

Defense Committee's Approval Page

University of Bahrain

College of Arts

Department of English Language and Literature

Master Degree in Applied English Language Studies

Student **Sara Ghaleb Hasan Beshara**, ID number: 20132267 defended her thesis by which she fulfilled the requirements for the degree of M.A. in Applied English Language Studies entitled '**An Analysis of the Use of Metadiscourse Markers in Master Theses of Selected Genres'** on this day of 27th February 2025

The committee recommends awarding of M.A. with the grade of (**PASS**).

Thesis Defense Committee:

Name:	Signature:
Dr. Nuri Ageli	Supervisor
Dr Madani Othman	Internal Examiner
Prof. Mazura Mastura Mohammed	External Examiner

Academic Department Stamp

Abstract

This study investigated the role of metadiscourse markers in academic writing in different disciplines. It investigated the functions of metadiscourse markers in sixty thesis conclusions from three disciplines: Business, Engineering, and Linguistics and Literature. Thesis conclusions are written by EFL learners, 30 from Arabic linguistic background and 30 from non-Arabic linguistic background. The researcher employed mixed-method approach, a qualitative and quantitative analysis following Hyland (2005) model. The data were analyzed using an electronic tool (Text Inspector), which helps in assigning the lexical characteristics of the texts, as well as counting the types and tokens of metadiscourse markers. The results revealed that interactive markers are used more than interactional markers in all the groups. In addition, transitions markers are the most frequently implemented metadiscourse markers among all the groups and the least used interactive markers are the endophorics. As for the interactional markers, hedges were the most frequently employed markers in all the groups except Linguistics and Literature discipline and the least used interactional markers were the engagement markers. These results assist educators to reinforce the importance of implementing interactional markers to engage the readers with the texts.

Key words: metadiscourse, metadiscourse markers, disciplines, genre

Declaration

I declare that this work, which I submitted to the University of Bahrain, contains my own investigation. This research has not been previously accepted for any degree and is not currently considered for any other degree at any other university.

Name: Sara Ghaleb Beshara

ID Number: 20132267

Signature:

Date: 24.3.2025

The thesis defense committee considered the thesis title:

An Analysis of the Use of Metadiscourse Markers in Master Theses of Selected Genres

Submitted to the Department of English Language and Literature for the degree of Master in Applied English Language Studies.

Thesis Defense Committee		**Signature**
Dr. Nuri Ageli	Supervisor	
Dr. Mdani Othman	Internal Examiner	
Prof. Mazura Mastura Mohammed	External Examiner	

Dedication

First, I thank Allah for giving me the power and the blessings to complete this great work by conquering all the challenges and difficulties. I also dedicate my work to my family and my friends who were always supporting and pushing me to do all of my best. Last but not least, I dedicate my work to my instructor who gave me the opportunity to put all of my efforts from choosing the topic until drawing the conclusions.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my heartful gratitude to all of those who supported me to complete my Master degree, especially my thesis.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my Supervisor Dr. Nuri Ageli for his guidance and expertise. I would also thank Dr. Eman Al-Doseri who supported and motivated me to start studying the Master program until I completed my thesis. I'm also grateful to my fellow colleagues who have been always with me through the pitter and sweet. I would like to encourage all the students who are completing their MA thesis, just trust and enjoy the process because the achievement deserves all of your effort.

Lastly, I would like to thank the instructors enrolled in University of Bahrain for the ongoing encouragement and support to achieve and complete my thesis.

Table of Contents

Topic		Page No.
Defense Committee's Approval Page		A
Abstract		B
Declaration		C
Dedication		D
Acknowledgment		E
Tables of Contents		F
List of Tables		K
CHAPTER ONE Introduction		
1.0	Introduction	2
1.1	Statement of Problem	4
1.2	The Questions of the Study	5
1.3	The Purposes of the Study	6
1.4	The Significance of the Study	7
1.5	The Setting of the Study	8

1.6	Definition of Terms	8
1.7	The Organization of the Study	10

CHAPTER TWO **Conceptual Framework and Literature Review**		
2.0	Introduction	12
2.1	Conceptual Framework	12
2.1.1	Metadiscourse Markers, Cohesion and Coherence	15
2.1.2	Metadiscourse Markers Classifications and Models	17
2.1.3	Hyland (2005) Metadiscourse Markers Model	21
2.2	Literature Review	27
2.2.0	Introduction	27
2.2.1	General Studies on EFL Writing	28
2.2.2	Studies Comparing Metadiscourse Markers by Native Speakers and Non-native Speakers	30
2.2.3	Studies of Comparing Metadiscourse Markers Across Disciplines	33
2.2.4	Studies of Comparing Metadiscourse Markers Across Genres	40
2.2.5	Studies on Metadiscourse Markers in Speeches	44
2.3	Summary	45

CHAPTER THREE **Methods and Procedures**		
3.0	Introduction	47
3.1	Research Design	47
3.2	Research Sample	47
3.3	Procedure of Data Collection	49
3.4	Data Analysis	50
3.5	Summary	51
CHAPTER FOUR **Results and Discussion**		
4.0	Introduction	53
4.1	Lexical Profile and Level of Texts	53
4.1.1	Business Texts	54
4.1.2	Engineering Texts	55
4.1.3	Linguistics and Literature Texts	55
4.1.4	Business – EFL Leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Backgrounds	56
4.1.5	Business – EFL Leaners from Arabic Linguistic Backgrounds	57
4.1.6	Engineering – EFL Leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	59
4.1.7	Engineering – EFL Leaners from Arabic Linguistic Background	60

4.1.8	Linguistics and Literature – EFL Leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	62
4.1.9	Linguistics and Literature – EFL Leaners from Arabic Linguistic Background	64
4.1.10	Similarities and Differences of Vocabulary Level and Profile of Texts	65
4.2	Categories and Functions of Metadiscourse Markers	68
4.2.1	Business – Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	68
4.2.2	Business – Arabic Linguistic Background	72
4.2.3	Engineering – Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	75
4.2.4	Engineering – Arabic Linguistic Background	78
4.2.5	Linguistics and Literature – Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	81
4.2.6	Linguistics and Literature – Arabic Linguistic Background	84
4.2.7	Similarities and Differences of the Types and Tokens of Metadiscourse Markers	87
4.3	The Correlation Between Lexical and Text Complexity and Metadiscourse Markers	90
4.3.1	Lexical and Text Complexity and Metadiscourse Markers	90
4.3.2	Regression Analysis of Level of Texts and the Use of Metadiscourse Markers	91
4.4	Summary	94
CHAPTER FIVE Conclusion		
5.0	Introduction	97

5.1	Summary of the Findings	97
5.2	Limitation of the Study	99
5.3	Recommendations for Further Research	100
REFERENCES		
APPENDICES		
Appendix (1): A Letter to the Supervisor of this Study to use MA Theses from University of Bahrain		I
Appendix (2): A letter to the Chairperson of English Language and Literature Department to use MA Theses from University of Bahrain		II
Appendix (3): A letter to the Vice President for Academic Programs & Graduate Studies to use MA Theses from University of Bahrain		III
ABSTRACT TRANSLATED TO ARABIC		

List of Tables

No.	Table	Page No.
CHAPTER TWO Conceptual Framework and Literature Review		
1	Hyland's Taxonomy: Functions of Interpersonal Metadiscourse in Academic Texts (1998)	21
2	Hyland's (2005) Metadiscourse Markers Model	22
CHAPTER THREE Methods and Procedures		
1	Sample of the Study	48
CHAPTER FOUR Results and Discussion		
1	Lexical Characteristics of EFL Thesis Conclusions by Linguistic Background and Discipline	54
2	Business Thesis Conclusions from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	57
3	Business Thesis Conclusions from Arabic Linguistic Background	58
4	Engineering Thesis Conclusions from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	59
5	Engineering Thesis Conclusions from Arabic Linguistic Background	61
6	Linguistics and Literature Thesis Conclusions from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	63
7	Linguistics and Literature Thesis Conclusions from Arabic Linguistic Background	64

8	Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Business Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	69
9	Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Business Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Arabic Linguistic Background	73
10	Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Engineering Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	76
11	Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Engineering Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Arabic Linguistic Background	79
12	Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Linguistics and Literature Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	82
13	Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Linguistics and Literature Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Arabic Linguistic Background	85
14	Summary of Results – Discipline and Metadiscourse Markers	90
15	Thesis Conclusions Lexical Profile and Functions of Metadiscourse Markers	91
16	Regression Analysis of (“Type”) and (“Level”)	92
17	Regression Analysis of (“Token”) and (“Level”)	93

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

CHAPTER ONE
Introduction

1.0 Introduction

Interaction is a way of communicating with others through a specific language and a significant means to express ideas and feelings, therefore, interaction can be through written or spoken discourse. Written texts by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners need to be filled with words and expressions to build good interactions with readers and to construct a paper. The written text is a way of interacting with readers through developing texts with the appropriate transition words and through the flow of the text. The concept of metadiscourse was first used in 1959 by Zellig Harris to facilitate the style of expressing the writer's or the speaker's perspectives about a text (Hyland et al., 2022; Farahani, 2020).

Therefore, metadiscourse can be implemented in written or spoken texts as transition words; where they help in organizing the text and let the writers or speakers show themselves through their style of addressing the discourse and their way of connecting ideas by implicating the suitable metadiscourse markers based on their functions. Metadiscourse is also reflected by the writer's or speaker's manner of expressing arguments, personality, attitudes and feelings (Hyland, 2005). A writer or speaker includes metadiscourse due to its functions and effectiveness in building the relationship with the audience, as well as building a positive engagement with the discourse (Al-Rubaye, 2015). Literally, metadiscourse is important and has significant aids

in developing good communication with readers, as well as in delivering the writers' attitude (Williams, 1981 as cited in Binmahboob, 2022).

Metadiscourse is used in academic writing according to the metadiscourse markers appropriateness to the context. Moreover, academic written texts are designed to build an interaction between the writer and the reader through having interactive and interactional resources (Thompson, 2001). The use of metadiscourse markers does not depend on the level of education, discipline, topic or academic level of the writer; it depends on how the writer wants to support the discussed ideas and let the reader make connections while reading a text. According to Yea et al., (2020), higher education focuses on the writing structure rather than raising the learner's awareness of using metadiscourse in academic writing.

Metadiscourse markers are used in written texts based on their functions and based on the author's sake of interpreting the ideas and constructing the text. According to the implemented model in this study, which is Hyland (2005) model, metadiscourse markers are divided into two main categories, which are interactive and interactional markers. Hyland (2005) model has interactive markers to facilitate the guidance of the reader with the text's ideas and interactional markers involve the reader with the text's arguments. Wongsa et al., (2024) state that interactive markers will help in making the writer's intentions explicit in a text to make it comprehensible, while interactional markers make the reader involved with writer's attitudes towards the context of the text.

Hyland (2005) divided five sub-types of metadiscourse markers for each main category. The interactive markers include transitions, endophorics, evidentials, code glosses and frame markers. As for the interactional marker,

there are also five sub-types i.e. hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mention. Under each sub-type there are many words that represent the main function of it, which will be discussed in chapter two in this study.

This study intends to analyze and discuss their use through selecting thesis conclusions from different disciplines, which are Business, Engineering, Linguistics and Literature. The analysis will be performed on two groups of EFL learners, from Arabic linguistic background and from non-Arabic linguistic background. This study will also attempt to identify the most used and least used metadiscourse markers based on the linguistic background and the text complexity. In addition, find out the correlations between lexical profile of text, discipline and linguistic background in implementing metadiscourse markers. These aims will be achieved through following Hyland (2005) model.

3.5 Statement of Problem

Communicating with readers through a text is affected by multi aspects. One of the most important aspects is the flow of the text which is constructing the written discourse by using the adequate transition words, specifically, metadiscourse markers (Farahani, 2020). However, the implementation of metadiscourse markers depends on the linguistic background of the writer, the discipline of the written text, as well as the genre of the text. Therefore, non-native speakers tend to use metadiscourse markers in their written texts based on their intentions they want to express to readers and there writing style. The differences are based on the writer's linguistic background, whether they share the same background with the reader, or they share similar academic discipline and genres of texts.

This study attempts to explore metadiscourse markers variation among different linguistic backgrounds and disciplines at the Master level of postgraduate EFL learners from Arabic and from non-Arabic linguistic backgrounds. Furthermore, the study will also reinforce using the least frequent metadiscourse markers in order to develop well-written academic writings, especially MA theses, to build good interactions with the reader and to design teaching materials. It is expectable to find some differences among the analyzed thesis conclusions because each writer has a different academic level, different intentions and different writing style, which set different standards.

The current study will reinforce the use of metadiscourse markers because EFL learners tend to face difficulties in applying metadiscourse in academic writing. Nevertheless, this study will fill the gap in analyzing thesis conclusions of non-native speakers (EFL learners) with different linguistic backgrounds, thereby making a positive contribution to the literature. However, most of the published literature have studied non-native speakers use of metadiscourse markers within the same cultural context, nevertheless, this study will focus on the differences between non-native speakers from Bahrain and from random universities in the world to prove that linguistic background affects the use of metadiscourse markers in MA thesis conclusions. Therefore, the writer of this study will focus on the cross-linguistic background aspects, cross disciplines, and selected genres.

3.5 The Questions of the Study

I. What is the relationship between lexical characteristics of texts and linguistic backgrounds of EFL learners?

II. What are the most and frequent metadiscourse markers in EFL learners' thesis conclusion research at the Master level in different disciplines?

III. What is the relationship between linguistic background and academic disciplines on the one hand and the use of metadiscourse markers, on the other?

IV. What is the correlation between lexical and text complexity and metadiscourse markers variation?

1.3 The Purposes of the Study

The purpose of the study is to highlight the importance of having metadiscourse markers to engage readers with texts, as well as to raise EFL teachers and learners' awareness about developing well written texts using the appropriate metadiscourse markers and designing suitable materials.

Recent studies shed light on the use of metadiscourse markers in different genres, different disciplines and different linguistic backgrounds. For instance, analyzing metadiscourse markers in academic writings such as research articles, book reviews and dissertations, as well as, analyzing metadiscourse markers in business, science, and humanities. As for different linguistic backgrounds, most studies focus on texts written by native and non-native speakers within the same culture. Therefore, recent studies have rarely studied the use of metadiscourse markers in different disciplines by EFL learners with different linguistic backgrounds based on collecting data of EFL learners' papers in Bahrain and comparing it to data of EFL learners from other countries.

The writer of this thesis tends to tackle the differences of using metadiscourse markers among EFL learners who share different linguistic backgrounds in

order to be aware of the importance of publishing academic writings that contain suitable transition words to maintain good coherence of the text. Furthermore, the current study aims to investigate the implementation of metadiscourse markers by EFL learners from Bahrain and EFL learners from universities around the world in their master thesis conclusions through exploring the shared cultural linguistic aspects of the postgraduate students. The purpose of this study is to find the differences in using metadiscourse markers in MA thesis conclusions within a selected genre but from dissimilar disciplines, which are Business, Engineering, and Linguistics and Literature.

The main purposes of this study are:

1. To investigate the cross-linguistic background differences of using metadiscourse markers in MA thesis conclusions.
2. To explore cross-disciplinary differences in implementing metadiscourse markers.
3. To find the correlation between the lexical and text complexity in implementing metadiscourse markers.

1.4 The Significance of the Study

The aspect of metadiscourse has gained a considerable attention in academic writing these days. Therefore, this work will continue explaining that metadiscourse will have a positive effect on academic writing and will also have an impact on designing teaching materials for EFL learners. This is because this study looks at metadiscourse from a different angle from previous studies.

The results of this study are also significant in filling the gap of identifying the most used and the least used metadiscourse markers in MA thesis

conclusions, which are done by EFL learners from three different disciplines in the University of Bahrain and other universities out of the Kingdom of Bahrain. It will also shed light on how linguistic background affects the academic writing style whether the writer and the reader share the same linguistic backgrounds or the same discipline. It is also important for educators to keep in consideration that the use of suitable metadiscourse markers affects the lexical profile and the proficiency level of the written text, which help in preserving the flow of the discourse, as well as in having good writer-reader interactions. This will help educators in designing and teaching how to use metadiscourse markers in MA theses.

1.5 Setting of the Study

The current study uses a total of 60 MA thesis conclusions which were collected from three disciplines: twenty thesis conclusions from each discipline. To study the differences regarding linguistic background, ten thesis conclusions in each discipline were collected from the library of University of Bahrain and the other ten from random universities in the world, like University of South Florida, University of Massachusetts, and Mishgan State University . The selected conclusions were from three different disciplines, which are Business, Engineering, Linguistics and Literature written in the period from 2003 and 2023. Furthermore, all the thesis conclusions were written by non-native speakers with a different first language.

1.6 Definition of Terms

Metadiscourse is the interaction happens through a written or spoken discourse using rhetorical devices to express attitudes and maintain the structural elements of the text (Crismore, 1985). It guides and engages the receivers of the discourse with writer's or speaker's intentions, perspectives

and attitudes. As stated by Hyland (2005, p.3) “Essentially metadiscourse embodies the idea that communication is more than just the exchange of information, goods or services, but also involves the personalities, attitudes and assumptions of those who are communicating”.

Metadiscourse markers are the functions employed to organize the text and give the audience opportunity to interpret and be engaged through reading (Hussein et al., 2018). Metadiscourse markers include two categories according to Hyland (2005) model that will be utilized in this study , which are interactive markers and interactional markers. *Interactive markers* are employed to organize the propositional content of the text based on the reader’s knowledge and the writer’s guidance (Tashi, 2019). This category includes transitions, endophorics, evidentials, code glosses and frame markers (Hyland, 2005). *Interactional markers* are implemented to serve the writer’s communicative aim and the purpose of text (Bax et al., 2019). The interactional markers are composed of hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mention markers (Hyland, 2005).

Genre is a Latin originated word which refers to a ‘kind’ or a ‘sort of a thing, like essays, fiction, biography, academic writing, thesis, dissertations, etc. (Beghtol, 2001). In this study, gerne reflect the type and part of text to be analyzed, which is the conclusion chapter in Master theses, to achieve the purpose of the study. In addition, *academic discipline* is the specialization of knowledge and study that learners are enrolled in. Some examples of disciplines are applied linguistics, business, psychology, engineering, humanities, art, literature, etc.

1.7 The Organization of the Study

The current study consists of five main chapters. Starting with an introduction about the main topic, which is metadiscourse. Chapter one states an overview about metadiscourse markers with a definition, main points about metadiscourse and the following model. It also discusses the problem of the study, purpose of the study, questions of the study, significance of the study, setting of the study, and definitions of terms.

The next chapter, which examines the conceptual framework of the study with the implemented model and the literature review, which highlights other studies related to the main points of the study's topic.

Chapter three states the design of the study with the sample of the study, which is used to complete the analysis and draw conclusions. In addition, the instruments use to complete the analysis with the procedures of collecting the data and analyzing the data.

As for chapter four, it demonstrates the results of the study by presenting tables of the analyzed thesis conclusions regarding word count, sentence count, lexical profile and proficiency percentages. It also illustrates the types and tokens analysis regarding the 60 thesis conclusions and the three disciplines each with two groups. Thus, there are a total of 6 tables for the types and tokens analysis. The analysis sections also provide answers to the questions of the study.

To end with, chapter five concludes the results by relating them to the answers to the questions. It also provides recommendations for further studies based on the current study limitations.

CHAPTER TWO

Conceptual Framework and Literature Review

CHAPTER TWO

Conceptual Framework and Literature Review

2.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the writer of the present study will discuss the conceptual framework of metadiscourse, followed by the literature review which will highlight other studies have been done by other researchers in field of sociolinguistics, especially metadiscourse. The researcher will start with defining metadiscourse and shed light on the relationship between metadiscourse, cohesion and coherence. Then, the classifications and models of metadiscourse markers.

3.5 Conceptual Framework

Metadiscourse is a broad area in the field of sociolinguistics. As it is difficult to capture all the aspects of the term in one single definition, a number of definitions have been proposed. In addition, different models have been suggested to specify and explain the various types and functions of metadiscourse markers. As mentioned in the introduction, in 1959, metadiscourse was first used by Zelig Harris to describe the linguistic devices used by authors and presenters to influence how receiver and audiences understand the discourse (Hyland et al., 2022; Albalat-Mascarell, 2023). Later, in 1985 metadiscourse was defined by Vande Kopple as “discourse about discourse” (Vande Kopple, 1997). He claims that the reason behind this definition is that some types of metadiscourse markers support writers to show their reactions and personalities about the referential topic which will help in constructing the interaction with the reader. This is highly linked to the

interpersonal markers based on his model, which is going to be explained in this study. Vande Kopple states another argument of why metadiscourse is considered "discourse about discourse". This perspective can be reflected how various types of metadiscourse markers contribute to conveying the meanings of words chosen in constructing a text and in maintaining its coherence.

In fact, this is linked to the second type of metadiscourse markers in his model, which is textual markers. In a rejection of Vade Kopple's definition "discourse about discourse'' Vande Kopple, (1997), Hyland & Tse (2004) believe that "metadiscourse focuses our attention on the ways writers project themselves into their discourse to signal their attitude towards both content and the audience of the text". In other words, metadiscourse is not only used as a textual tool for discourse; it is also used by writers to express themselves and contact with the readers. Moreover, metadiscourse refers to the text itself by assisting the receiver in organizing and evaluating the text, as well as, supporting the writers to merge evaluation to express their decisions about an idea, a point of view, or feelings in order to meet the community expectations (Hyland, 2005). This can be addressed through including metadiscourse markers in text based on their classifications and functions which will be explained in detail in this study.

These metadiscourse markers are classified into two main categories. For instance, Hyland's (2005) model has a classification of two main categories, which are interactive and interactional (Hyland, 2017). He assumes that all metadiscourse markers are interpersonal because all the metadiscourse markers help in building good communication between the writer and the reader through showing their personalities (Kuswoyo & Siregar, 2019). Therefore, he modified previous models and came up with the Interpersonal

model in (2005), which is the most utilized model in recent studies. The current study will follow Hyland (2005) that is divided into two main types of markers with five-subtypes in each.

Defining metadiscourse, basically, depends on the type of analysis and the focus of a discourse. It differs when the analysis is on a spoken or written text. According to Hyland (2017) "Metadiscourse is the commentary on a text made by its producer in the course of speaking or writing and it is a widely used term in current discourse analysis and language teaching". Therefore, metadiscourse analysis can be accomplished in spoken discourse, as well as in academic written texts. Recently, Hyland came up with a clearer definition, i.e. "Metadiscourse is the commentary on a text made by its producer in the course of speaking or writing, revealing something of how communication involves the personalities, attitudes and assumptions of those who are communicating" (Hyland, 2022). The previous definition highlights the focus on interacting and building good relationships with the receiver of the discourse using metadiscourse in expressing personalities and points of view.

Remarkably, metadiscourse has been defined in both broad and narrow definitions. The broad definition serves the textual interaction because of its importance as an interactive model, while the narrow one is related to reflexivity and serves the reflexive model (Ädel & Mauranen, 2010; Albalat-Mascarell, 2023).

Metadiscourse is used in a text to organize its ideas by expressing the writer's attitudes, experiences, and personality. It also helps in building good interactions with the reader in making connections through the text and making the audience familiar with the context of the discourse (Hyland, 2017). Nevertheless, metadiscourse markers help the writer to organize the

discourse by adding interpersonal resources, such as transitions, logical connections, attitude markers. These resources facilitate the way of delivering the stance towards the content. Duruk (2017) states that metadiscourse does not only organize a text but it also helps in engaging the readers with the context and makes the writer's perspective and stance obvious. Moreover, metadiscourse markers are linguistic devices the writer uses in order to deliver his or her expressions about certain context, as well as to meet the reader's expectations and knowledge through making the written discourse more persuasive.

According to Hyland (2022), metadiscourse markers are "the ways in which writers and speakers interact with readers and listeners through their use of language". Therefore, metadiscourse markers refer to the linguistic devices used in a text to express the writer's stance and understanding about the content and the effects on the audience. According to Alharbi (2021), metadiscourse markers function as devices where readers can interpret the text and be actively engaged with the writers. In agreement, Binmahboob (2022) clarifies that metadiscourse markers are also used to build a good communication between the writer and the community through fulfilling the text with writer's opinion and attitudes.

3.5.5 Metadiscourse Markers, Coherence and Cohesion

Metadiscourse markers, coherence and cohesion are closely related to each other in the academic writing field, as all these three language devices support the text's clarity and effectiveness of communication. To begin with, metadiscourse is used in a text to show how the receiver will be involved with

the producer's messages and feelings about the context through the text's coherence and cohesion (Abusalim et al., 2022). To move on with the next aspect, coherence is the logical flow of the text concerning its organization of ideas, as well as the linkage between the ideas to make it smooth for the reader to grasp the aim behind the text. Liao (2020) states that language teachers can have explicit instructions regarding implementing metadiscourse markers to ensure coherence and organization of a text. Therefore, explicit use of metadiscourse markers will facilitate coherence in emphasizing the textual organization like using frame markers, for example (firstly, in conclusion), or in making connections between the ideas like using transitions (in addition, thus, and). Finally, cohesion is the connection between the ideas, sentences and paragraphs of the text. It is the overall structure of the text that can be addressed through using metadiscourse such as self-mention, transitions, and repetition of key terms.

Liao (2020) discussed the two types of cohesion one is explicit, and the other one is implicit. He cited that explicit cohesion markers are logical connectives where the writer uses conjunctions to draw the links between paragraphs and sentences clear, while the other type is implicit cohesion markers where the writer will use global cohesion features, such as the interference of lexical and semantics analysis. To conclude, coherence and cohesion are strongly attached with metadiscourse markers since both support delivering the meaning of a text and the intention of the writer in a logical way by making it comprehensive and reinforcing the quality of the written text.

2.1.2 Metadiscourse Markers Classifications and Models

Metadiscourse markers have been classified into many categories and subcategories based on the metadiscourse models. There are several models each with its own classification of the markers utilizing slightly different terms, concepts or number of categories.

The beginning of metadiscourse markers was by Zelig Harris in (1959), followed in the 80's by Williams's classification, Vande Kopple and Crismore (Albalat-Mascarell, 2023; Hyland, 2017). Williams (1980) classification included four types of metadiscourse. According to Crismore (1982), the first type is the hedges, which are words used to show a sense of assurance or caution about certain things, like (usually, seem, could), etc. The second one are emphatics, which are utilized by writers to express what they believe and want to engage the readers in the same context, for example, (indeed, as you know, in fact that).

The third type is the sequencers where the writer includes them to show the order or sequence and to assure the coherence of the text, like using (in the next part, in this paper). The last type of Williams (1980) classification is the topicalizers, which are used to show a change of a referring part in the text, like (in regard to, turning now to).

Furthermore, in 1981 there were two more types added to the classification of Williams (1980) model (Crismore, 1983; Rubaye, 2015; Şen, 2021). Firstly, the narrators, which are used by the writer to mention the source of information or what the writer concluded, like using I have concluded, or I think. Secondly, attributors when the author indirectly includes opinions or ideas, like it was found, noticed or noted. In addition to the previous added

types, the six types of Williams (1981) classification were divided to three main types in Williams (1982) classification. The three main types are: advance organizers, which help in highlighting beginnings, ends or summaries, connectives, which help in linking the ideas in the text, and interpersonal discourse to show the writer's attitude and stances (Crismore, 1983; Şen, 2021).

According to metadiscourse markers classifications and models, Mawlood et al., (2024) state that Vande Kopple's (1985) model has two main categories: textual and interpersonal markers. Therefore, the textual markers help in organizing the text and assist the reader to make connections because of the text coherence. According to Binmahboob (2022), there are four categories in the textual markers: illocutionary markers (to sum up, I argue that, etc.), text connectives (first, next, etc.) code glosses (in other words, etc.), and narrators (someone announced that, etc.). While the interpersonal markers focus on delivering the author's personality, attitudes, experiences and help in engaging the audience. The interpersonal markers are attitude markers (I like this, etc.), commentaries (you may go back to, etc.) and validity markers (may, perhaps, etc.).

A reviewed classification of Vande Kopple's was in 1997 by Vande Kopple himself. Vande Kopple (1997) added a new kind to the classification, which is epistemology, and it is divided into two sub-types: modality which is used to show that the referential ideas might not be true to some extent which is similar to the use of hedges and evidentials, which act as evidence the writer uses regarding the referential ideas.

Crismore et al., (1993) came up with a reviewed model based on Vande Kopple's (1985) model. They possessed the main types of Vande Kopple's

model, which are textual and interpersonal, but they alter the subcategories. Furthermore, the textual markers are separated into sub-types of textual markers and interpersonal markers. To begin with, textual markers include sequencers, logical connectives, topicalizers and reminders. Whereas the interpretive markers include code glosses, announcements and illocution markers. This is linked to the significant use of textual markers in encouraging the reader to with the writer's message (Al-Rubaye, 2015). In other words, the textual markers help in organizing the discourse and make it coherent for the reader using the appropriate lexical items like words and phrases, while the interpretive markers help the reader to grasp the writer's intention through having a good interaction with the text. Highlighting the change in the second main type, the interpersonal metadiscourse markers were divided to three sub-types, which are hedges, certainty, attitudes, attributors and commentary.

Interestingly, Crismore (1984) reported metadiscourse is not only interpersonal, but also informational and referential since it helps the readers to be directed to comprehend the author's message, as well as the author's aim behind the text. She also stated that metadiscourse is attitudinal because it spreads the attitudes and point of views of the author about the context. Since that, Crismore (1983) came up with a typology with two categories, which are informational metadiscourse and attitudinal metadiscourse.

Informational metadiscourse serves in stating the information in a direct way like the main points of the discourse, the goals of the discourse, and the organization of the text. The informational metadiscourse contains three subtypes: goals, which are used to explicitly state the aim of the discourse. Second, pre-plans where they are used to show what the next discourse will be about and post-plans to state what already has been mentioned in the text.

Furthermore, there are four subtypes of attitudinal metadiscourse, which are like the interactional metadiscourse markers according to Hyland (2005) model, however, they are used in a discourse to show the author's stance and attitude. First, saliency, which highlights the importance of a point. Second, emphatics to show the surety of an idea. Third, hedges to express if there is a suspicion. Fourth, evaluative serve to reveal the attitude about the ideas.

To add on the most popular metadiscourse markers models, a powerful model was published by Hyland in 2005. It is like Hyland and Tse's (2004) taxonomy of metadiscourse markers in academic writing. Nevertheless, there are some sub-types that were altered. To begin with, logical connective changed to transitions, person markers to self-mentions, relational markers to engagement markers and emphatic to boosters (Ötügen et al., 2021). The modified version changed these types based on the belief that metadiscourse is interpersonal because the writer takes into consideration the reader's background and experiences and based on that the writer implies a variety of metadiscourse markers (Hyland & Tse, 2004). Therefore, Hyland (2005) model is considered in the literature to be the most comprehensive model for analyzing academic written text. Ötügen et al., (2021) reported that this model was modified based on Hyland (1998) interpersonal markers model as shown in table (1).

The previous model consisted of textual and interpersonal markers, which are similar to Vande Kopple's (1985) model in general function, but it is different regarding the sub-types. As mentioned earlier in this study, Vande Kopple's (1985) model and Hyland's (1998) model include textual markers, which help in organizing the text and they are illocutionary, text connectives, code glosses and narrators. Adding to that, the interpersonal markers, which assist the

reader to grasp the reader's attention and encourage the reader with the text, include attitude markers, commentaries and validity markers (Binmahboob, 2022; Vande Kopple, 1997).

Table (1) Hyland's Taxonomy: Functions of Interpersonal Metadiscourse in Academic Texts (1998)

Interpersonal Metadiscourse		
Hedges	Withhold writer's full commitment to statements	Might, perhaps, it is possible, about
Emphatics	Emphasize force of writer's certainty in messages	In fact, definitely, it is clear, obvious
Attitude Markers	Express writer's attitude to propositional content	Surprisingly, I agree, X claims
Relational Markers	Explicitly refer to/build relationship with reader	Frankly, note that, you can see
Person marker	Explicitly reference to author(s)	I, we, my, mine our

(Duruk, 2017), pp. 3

Hyland's (2005) model is the latest metadiscourse markers model used for analyzing the implications of the markers based on their functions.

2.1.3 Hyland (2005) Metadiscourse Markers Model

In the modified version of Hyland (2005) model, the two main categories have been changed to interactive and interactional. To begin with, the interactive functions support the discourse organization which guide the reader to understand the writer's goals, while the interactional functions help in expressing the writer's presence, evaluation and attitudes toward the discourse (Hyland & Jiang, 2020). Based on the different resources that were published by the linguist Hyland, such as (Hyland, 2017; Hyland, 2022), the functions

of the interactive markers and interactional markers are explained below according to Hyland (2005) model as presented in table (2).

Table (2): Hyland's (2005) Metadiscourse Markers Model

Category	**Function**	**Examples**
Interactive	**Help to guide the reader through Resources the text**	**Resources**
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 prepositional meanings	namely; e.g.; such as; in other words
Interactional	**Involve the reader in the text**	**Resources**
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

(Hyland, 2005), pp.49

1. **Interactive Markers**:

Hyland believes that "all metadiscourse is interpersonal in that it takes account of the reader's knowledge, textual experiences, and processing needs and that it provides writers with an armoury of rhetorical appeals to achieve this" (Hyland & Tse, 2004). On the one hand, the interactive markers help in building the text and maintain the coherence and coherent of the ideas, as well as helping the reader to be directed while reading the text. The subcategories of the interactive markers are discussed below according to Hyland's (2005) model.

- **Transitions**

Transitions markers are the tools utilized by the writer to function as the use of the conjunctions in connecting and sequencing the ideas to show the coherence and cohesion of a text. They are also "use to mark additive, contrastive, and consequential connections between clauses, as opposed to events in the external world" (Hyland & Jiand, 2020). As well as they convey the meaning of the text that the writer wants to deliver to the reader. Examples of transitions markers are in addition, however, and, therefore, accordingly, similarly, etc.

- **Code glosses**

They are used to restate or reformulate ideational ideas with clarifying the intended messages to be delivered to the audience. According to Akoto &

Afful (2020), the inclusion of code glosses helps the readers to understand the exact meaning of the expressions utilized by the writer. Some examples of code glosses are for example, for instance, such as, this means that, in other words, etc.

- **Endophoric**

Endophoric markers are utilized by authors to refer to mentioned information in the text like referring to tables or part of the text. They help the reader in making connections among the text by referring to previously mentioned important ideas. For instance: referring to table 1, as mentioned earlier, referring to paragraph 2, etc.

- **Frame markers**

Frame markers are used to highlight the components of a text. They assist in guiding the reader among the sequential ideas, parts of the texts or construction of the text. The use of frame markers will help in showing the cohesion of the ideas in the overall text like connecting paragraphs or points. For example: in conclusion, to sum up, in the next paragraph, etc.

- **Evidentials**

They are interactive markers because they are used in a text to show the relativeness of certain ideas with another text in another source. These markers have a wider connection than the endophorics, which are used to refer to materials in the same source. Basically, it is restating materials from another reference or source. Evidentials are like citation due to the implication of using them (Hyland & Jiand, 2020). For example: according to, in his opinion, he argues, they report, etc.

2. Interactional Markers:

On the other hand, Kuswoyo & Siregar (2019) state that interactional markers are the tools the writer or the speaker use to deliver discourse to the audience by building a good interaction and showing the author's attitudes and experiences. (Table 2) shows the five subcategories on the interactional markers based on Hyland (2005) model.

- **Hedges**

Hedges are interactional markers because they refer to the writer's perspective about certain propositions in the text. They are used as "withhold writer's full commitment to proposition" (Hylan, 2017). Some of the hedges writers use in their discourse are: appear, may., might, seems, perhaps, about, etc.

- **Boosters**

They are used to highlight the author's certainty about a proposition in the discourse. Therefore, the writer uses boosters to show their confidence and that they are sure about the stated materials. Some of the boosters are clearly, definitely, in fact that, it is true that, etc.

- **Attitude markers**

These markers are used to show the author's evaluation towards an issue discussed in the discourse. It can assist the writer in comparing ideas based on his or her attitudes regarding the discussed issue. Some of the attitude markers are I agree, surprisingly, unfortunately, etc.

- **Engagement markers**

Engagement markers are interactional devices utilized by the writer to encourage the reader with the discourse and to build positive relationships with the reader. Therefore, the writer uses engagement markers which are important to make the reader feel as a part of the text. Such as using note that, you can tell that, consider, think of, etc. They can also be stated as question form, like Do you agree? These makers can be used more in persuasive essays to convince the readers.

- **Self-mentions**

They refer to the writer's presence in context and the discourse using pronouns. It can be either by mentioning an experience or personal thoughts. For example: I, we, our, my, etc.

The current study will follow Hyland (2005) model because it is inclusive and straightforward in its inclusion of sub-types. These types serve the different functions the writer employs to make the text persuasive and grab the reader's attention at certain points by expressing attitudes and personalities, which help in making the text coherent. In addition, the model is helpful because it is designed to serve the analysis of academic written texts by EFL (English as a foreign language) and ESL (English as a second language) learners. It also has a significant effect on the readers' engagement. Adding to the benefits of Hyland (2005) model, the use of different metadiscourse markers will lead to have a coherent text that has logical sequences using the appropriate transitions and appropriate concepts. Furthermore, this model serves the needs of writers by sending their intentions and messages they want the reader to understand, either by their experiences, attitudes or personalities.

Nevertheless, the employment of Hyland (2005) model helps in analyzing different genres, like book reviews, dissertations, research articles, journal articles and others. It also expands the analysis of texts or speeches from different disciplines, like humanities, engineering, business, technology and other disciplines. In conclusion, this study will employ Hyland (2005) model because of its effectiveness regarding the analysis of academic written text by analyzing the use of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers in conclusion chapters of MA thesis conclusions of postgraduate students.

2.2 Literature Review

2.2.0 Introduction

In recent years, metadiscourse has been used in academic writings differently. This is due to the writer's stance that is being addressed to the readers. Hence, studies of metadiscourse focus on a variety of areas through using different research methodologies, questions, objectives and hypotheses. Therefore, some studies explore metadiscourse models through the oldest to the newest, such as Halliday's (1973) model, Vande Kopple's (1985) model, Hyland's (1998) and (2005) model and Crismore et al. (1993) model, as well as using a particular model to accomplish their studies and achieve their aims. Many studies examine the frequency of metadiscourse markers whether they are interactive, interactional or both types with their functions. Adding to that, some studies analyze the uses of metadiscourse markers in different genres, like the Bachelor level, Master level or PhD level. Some papers study the varieties of the markers in relation to the text's construction and level of persuasion. In the following chapter, the writer will discuss the different

studies on metadiscourse markers in regard to EFL writing, cross-culture, cross-discipline, cross-genres and metadiscourse markers in speeches.

3.5.5 General Studies on EFL Writing

To begin with, metadiscourse studies have an essential purpose, which is focusing on academic written texts rather than spoken discourse. This is due the high and low frequencies of metadiscourse markers in the academic texts. In relation to analyzing the most and least used markers, Akoto (2020) studied 10 theses from the sociology department, focusing on the introduction and literature review chapters. Akoto implemented Hyland (2005a) model to study the frequencies of using metadiscourse markers and find out the most used words of metadiscourse markers and the effectiveness of the markers in constructing academic texts to raise the level of persuasion. The results of the study recorded that there were variations in using the subcategories of interactive and interactional markers in both analyzed chapters of the theses, but transitions and hedges were the highest used markers in both chapters (Akoto, 2020).

Adding to the previous study, Yea et al., (2020) examined the use of metadiscourse to find out how writing has improved over time. The study was accomplished through analyzing 8 PhD papers in the stage of preparing the full proposals of first-year Malaysian students from four different genres. Using a quantitative and corpus-based approach with the integrating Hyland (2004) model, therefore, the researchers found that evidentials and transitions were the most used ones from the textual markers, which are interactive markers according to Hyland's (2005) modified model. On the other hand, the less used ones were the engagement markers, which are writer- oriented

markers, reader- oriented markers and writer-reader oriented markers. Moreover, the results of Yea et al., (2020) and Akoto (2020) are aligned regarding using more transition markers.

Considering using metadiscourse markers, Duruk (2017) implemented a study on Turkish learners' dissertations from English language teaching discipline. Duruk analyzed 20 dissertations with focusing on three chapters: methodology, results and discussion.

The study implemented a quantitative approach to explore the statistics of the most used metadiscourse markers. However, Duruk completed the study through using Hyland (1998) metadiscourse model because she believes that it is comprehensive and clear. Moreover, the researcher used software (WordMetry tool) to count the frequencies of the words and then find the total of metadiscourse markers. The results of the analyzed corpus reported that from the interactional markers; attitude markers were the most used markers in contrast to hedges and boosters, as well as the writers shared common number of using some of the interpersonal markers.

In conclusion, most studies on metadiscourse markers are corpus based since researchers shed light on analyzing academic written discourse, whether written by native speakers or non-native speakers. The current study will discuss the different focus areas of analyzing metadiscourse in relation to academic writing to highlight the importance of using metadiscourse markers to engage readers with the writer and the text. However, the next section will specify the use of metadiscourse markers by native and non- native speakers.

2.2.2 Studies Comparing Metadiscourse Markers by Native Speakers and Non-native Speakers

According to the literature of analyzing metadiscourse, there are some studies comparing the use of metadiscourse markers with highlighting the cross-cultural aspect of native speakers and non-native speakers. For instance, Al-Rubaye (2015) compared between 10 EFL Iraqi students, 5 ESL Iraqi students and 10 American students, which are the control group. Furthermore, the participants were all at the MA level and the researcher analyzed their research papers. Al-Rubaye investigated the differences between the native and non-native speakers in using metadiscourse markers, as well as the differences between ESL and EFL in relation to their environments. The investigation was completed through a case study and mixed methods of quantitative and qualitative. The researcher concluded that all the three groups included interactive markers more than interactional markers. Adding to that, the control group (native speakers) used more endophoric markers, hedges and attitude markers in contrast to the EFL and ESL groups. Al-Rubaye also found that EFL and ESL groups used more booster markers (such as definitely, in fact that) than the control group.

Likewise, Binmahboob (2022) study is another example of comparing the use of metadiscourse markers between native and non-native speakers. The researcher conducted an analysis of 20 research articles except the abstract and the introduction parts. Half of the articles were done by Saudi writers, while the other half were done by British writers, which are native speakers in the field of applied linguistics. The two groups have different cultural backgrounds but share the same discipline, which is applied linguistics. The articles were collected from trusted resources like well-known journals and

libraries. Binmahboob implemented a quantitative approach to analyze the data, as well as using a descriptive approach where he can link and interpret the collected data. To accomplish the aim of the paper, the writer discussed the different models of metadiscourse, like Vande Kopple's (1985) model, Crismore et al. (1993) model, and Hyland (2005) model. Hence, he depended on Hyland (2005) model. In addition, the researcher stated that metadiscourse is highly needed in academic writing as in research articles or dissertations of higher studies in the introduction, discussion and conclusion. This is because the writers express their opinions freely in these parts where they make connections and evaluate other parts in the paper, like connecting the literature review with the results and then including their analysis in the discussion part. Binmahboob also discussed about other studies that focused on using hedging markers in written texts by native and non-native speakers, which are British and Saudi students. Therefore, hedges are used more in social texts. According to Hyland (2005), hedges are used in a text to show the writer's opinions based on his or her reasoning, but not based on facts.

One of the interesting focus points in Binmahboob (2022) study is comparing abstracts written in Arabic and Abstracts written in English. This is due to the aims of his study which focus on the inclusion of metadiscourse by non-native speakers who speak Arabic. Nevertheless, the use of interactive markers was more than the interactional markers in Arabic and English abstracts, and both languages have less use of interactional markers, especially self-mention markers. The reason behind the rare use of self-mention markers is that an abstract, basically, is a summary of the whole paper which does not have to include the writer's point of view by using pronouns. In addition, Arabic abstracts use transition and code glosses markers more than English abstracts.

Finally, following Hyland (2005) model, Binmahboob focused on the types of metadiscourse markers used by Saudi and British in applied linguistics, the frequencies of used markers in the same field, as well as the differences and similarities in using them in the research articles. Therefore, the findings revealed that the Saudi writers used a total 870 from both types of markers, while the British writers used 668 metadiscourse markers and the most used ones in both groups were the transitions interactive markers. Some of the examples of interactive markers by British writers are in addition, the instances above, like, etc. while some of the interactive markers used by Saudi writers are thus, in conclusion, such as, etc.

According to Al-Zubeiry (2019), a similar study was implemented to examine the frequency of using metadiscourse markers by English native speakers and Arab non-native speakers in scientific research articles. The researcher collected 40 research articles from international and Arab journals. The concentration was on two disciplines, which are medical sciences and engineering. This study sought to explore how metadiscourse markers are being studied by others according to different cultures, languages, genre and fields. By adopting Hyland (2005) model, the researcher concluded that there is a significant difference in the use of interactive markers. Native speakers, which are English speakers, tend to use more interactive markers. The most used ones by both groups were transitions markers. Similarly, native speakers used more interactional markers, especially the hedges, but the researcher believes that native speakers use more markers because they are more proficient in the language.

Al-Zubeiry's results are aligned with the studies discussed in the literature review where native speakers apply more metadiscourse markers of both

types. The researcher believes that this analysis will fill the gap of analyzing scientific research articles of English field only. However, the writer investigated that some studies focus on certain types of metadiscourse markers like attitude markers, hedging and emphatics markers. Whereas some studies analyzed PhD dissertations and found that the implementation of using interactional markers is more. Al-Zubeiry (2019) discussed some of the studies which compare the use of metadiscourse markers by native and non-native speakers. Some of the studies found that American writers apply more metadiscourse markers in general and the use of them is affected by their first language. Another inference is that English writers use more hedging markers than Persians, which is highly related to cultural differences. Because of cultural differences, this study will tend to explore how cultural differences affect the use of metadiscourse markers by non-native speakers.

According to the studies that compared the implementation of metadiscourse markers by native speakers and non-native speakers, the analysis of all is corpus-based because the data were collected from written texts done by researchers who have different linguistic backgrounds and different academic levels.

2.2.3 Studies Comparing Metadiscourse Markers Across Disciplines

Metadiscourse markers' employment develops over the years due to its dynamic implementations through writing or speaking. Moreover, metadiscourse markers are used in academic writing to maintain cohesiveness and help the reader to follow the logic of the context. They are also used in speeches to guide listeners and engage them with the context. Over the years,

the use of them has changed, whether raising the use of interactive or interactional markers or decreasing the use on the metadiscourse marker types. Hyland and Jiang (2018) found that the application of metadiscourse markers changed over 50 years. They analyzed 360 research articles from journals published in 1965, 1985, 2015 in four disciplines, which are sociology, biology, applied linguistics and electrical engineering. The results revealed that there was a remarkable decrease in interactional markers, except for the self-mention markers, and an increase in interactive markers over the three periods. In more detail, the use of code glosses and evidentials have been increased across all the disciplines tested. This represents the writers' need to be direct and convince the reader. As for the interactional markers, the use of attitude markers and boosters was low, whereas self-mention markers were more in sociology, biology and electrical engineering but less in applied linguistics.

Hyland and Jiang (2018) reports that metadiscourse is a language that refers to itself while using the two types of metadiscourse markers. Metadiscourse is also being used by writers while thinking of the readers' objections, backgrounds and levels. However, effective implementation supports the writer's purpose in involving the readers with the text and delivering his or her stance. The researchers claimed that the increased use of interactive markers indicates the writer's awareness in designing a coherent and cohesive text to achieve the writer's and the reader's aims. Therefore, the organization of a text depends on the writer's appropriate use of metadiscourse in connecting the text's parts logically.

Completing the previous study has some limitations that can be fixed for further research. First, the sample of the articles, which is 360, is not enough

to come up with generalizations about using metadiscourse markers in academic writing over the years. Second, each discipline has its own features where writers organize their text based on the audiences. Third, the disciplines analyzed do not have the same results, whereas some show an increased use of one type of marker and the others show a decreased use.

Relating to analyzing metadiscourse markers among different disciplines, a similar study by Mawlood et al., (2024) analyzed interactional markers in research articles written by students from two disciplines, which are political science and religious studies. The researchers collected 25 peer-reviewed articles from each discipline over the period of 2019 to 2023. Therefore, the researchers chose the discussion and conclusion parts only to be analyzed by utilizing Hyland's (2005) model, which is the most referred to in recent years by many researchers, such as Al-Zubeiry (2019), Tahsi (2019), and Hussein et al., (2018). Moreover, interactional metadiscourse markers are important since they help the writer to communicate with the reader through a good interaction and build positive relationship with the reader through using engagement markers, such as you can see that, self-mentions like using pronouns to express presence of the writer, or attitude markers, like I agree to express opinions. Mawlood et al., (2024) focused on the different models of metadiscourse like Vande Kopple's (1984) which has the textual and interpersonal markers, the modified version of Vande Kopple's model by Crismore et al. (1993) and Hyland's (2005) model which include the interactive and interactional markers. This study focused on the importance of well-developed academic writing and highlighted that metadiscourse is also seen in spoken discourse. With regard to the results, the researchers concluded

that hedges were the most used markers by both disciplines, while attitude markers were the least used ones.

Mawlood et al., (2024) discussed other studies that focused on analyzing interactional markers. One of the studies analyzed only interactional markers in engineering discipline only, while the other study tested four disciplines. Estaji and Vafaeimehr (2015) study focused on engineering, and he had another study and found that there is no difference in the use of interactional markers because the disciplines are connected. This claim is not accurate since other studies found significant differences among disciplines even if they are connected. Analyzing interactional markers has also been done in Chou et al., (2023) study. They found that English articles of prose, news, fiction and academic articles implement more hedges and boosters, on the other hand translated texts of the same genres used more attitude markers. Moreover, the results of the previous studies may differ from the results of Mawlood et al., (2024) study even if both studies focused on analyzing interactional markers. This is because one of the studies focused on interactional markers in different genres, while the other focused on interactional markers in different disciplines.

To conclude, the number of corpora of the study are limited to come up with generalizations, which is a similar limitation to Hyland and Jiang (2018), as well as analyzing only one type of markers prevents the researchers to generalize about the implementation of metadiscourse markers in the chosen disciplines.

A study by Prasetyanti et al. (2023) was conducted to explore the different applications of interactive and interactional markers in dissertations. The sample of the study was 200 introductions from English dissertations. These

dissertations were written by English native speakers and Indonesians from four different disciplines, which are linguistics, education, engineering and physics. From each the researchers collected 100 dissertations. The researchers chose to analyze the introduction part in dissertations because it is an inclusion of basic parts like definitions, objectives and significance.37ffect37, the researchers aimed at investigating the different use of metadiscourse markers by natives and non-natives, as well as the application of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers in four different disciplines.

The results indicate that linguistic discipline used more interactive markers than education discipline like transitions and frame markers. In contrast, education discipline implied more interactional markers, like self-mention and engagement markers. Moreover, the linguistic discipline used more engagement markers. Based on the previous results, the non-native speakers, who are the Indonesian PhD students, used more interactive and interactional markers. This result is aligned with Binmahboob (2022) study where he found that Saudi researchers used more metadiscourse markers than British researchers. However, the most repetitive interactive markers were the transitions in both groups. This result is aligned with Binmahboob (2022) and Al-Zubeiry (2019) studies which found that transitions markers are the most used ones by native and non-native speakers. As for the interactional marker, hedges were the most used one by both groups. This is based on the comparison between the aspect of natives and non-natives. Furthermore, the writers recommend using more discipline to analyze the frequencies and choose writers who do not share the same cultural backgrounds.

The writers of the previous study discussed Hyland and Tse (2004) metadiscourse taxonomy and used Hyland (2005) model that consists of interactive and interactional markers and emphasized the subcategories of the main types of markers. For instance, epistemic verbs and expressions under hedges, or transitions like addition, comparison and consequence. After deciding on Hyland (2005) model, the researchers discussed interactive and interactional markers with defining each subcategory purpose. Therefore, this study did not include other studies on the same topic in literature; it only referred to the literature in discussing the conceptual framework and the implemented model.

The mentioned studies in this study almost share similar conceptual framework, which is following and implementing Hyland (2005) model because of its effectiveness and directness, as well as, because of its availability in the previous and recent literature.

An investigation by Keshavarz & Kheirieh (2011) implemented Hyland and Tse (2004) model to find out the effects of discipline and language on the use of metadiscourse elements, which are metadiscourse markers, in research articles. The sample of the study was 120 research papers, 30 from each group. The groups are native and non-native speakers from applied linguistic discipline and civil engineering discipline. The researchers referred to a descriptive analysis to figure out groups use metadiscourse elements in research articles that were done during the period of 2005 and 2008. As well as how the use of a second language gets affected by the first language. However, Keshavarz & Kheirieh aimed to find out if the cultural background of the Iranian researchers and English researchers will affect the use of metadiscourse elements in both disciplines.

As a result, the greater use of metadiscourse markers was by the applied linguistic discipline, but the native speakers of applied linguistic group used the highest number of markers. The only greater use of metadiscourse markers by civil engineering discipline was the use of endophoric interactive markers. Moreover, the most frequent markers transitions (interactive markers) in all groups and hedges (interactional markers) for all the groups as well. There was a slight difference among native and non-native levels of academic writing which led both groups in applied linguistics to score more than civil engineering. For further research, Keshavarz & Kheirieh (2011) suggested a similar study can be implemented on graduate and undergraduate students to find more differences.

Keshavarz & Kheirieh (2011) discussed that the direct instructions of metadiscourse markers in academic writing help in implementing more metadiscourse markers which construct a cohesive text and a good interaction between the writer and the reader. The researchers mentioned that direct instructions of metadiscourse markers depends on student ability. As the previous study implemented Hyland and Tse (2004) model, the researchers reported that the study of Hyland and Tse (2004) found that PhD students from different disciplines had a greater use of metadiscourse markers than MA students of similar disciplines. In addition, Keshavarz & Kheirieh mentioned that reading comprehension relates to metadiscourse markers based on previous studies which found that students perform better in answering some comprehension questions based on texts with metadiscourse markers.

2.2.4 Studies Comparing Metadiscourse Markers Across Genres

The previous studies were discussed according to the cross-cultural use of metadiscourse by native and non-native speakers in the same field, as well as cross-disciplinary differences. Considering analyzing and comparing the use of metadiscourse markers, there are some studies focused on investigating the differences between genres, like research articles, theses, dissertations, persuasive essays, book reviews, etc. An example of a comparative study was between two types of academic genres, which are book reviews and research articles, Bal-Gezegin & Baş (2020) study analyzed the conclusion part of 24 research articles and 24 book reviews from seven disciplines, for example economy, politics, law, literature, etc. These articles were written by Turkish English learners. Therefore, the writers of the study used quantitative, qualitative and corpus-based approach, as well as using software (UAM) to find the types of metadiscourse markers used. This is to achieve the aim of the study, which Is to investigate how the writers used the interactional metadiscourse markers only in two different genres, which are research articles and book reviews. The researchers found that book reviews have remarkably more attitude markers to show the writer's evaluation. Conversely, the research articles appear to have a greater use of hedges markers, which made the writers appear more circumspect in their endorsement of the ideas.

The writers of the previous paper shed light on the 40ffectrent use between the two genres, which are research articles and book reviews. They defined each type, as well as discussed previous studies which focused on analyzing metadiscourse markers in different disciplines, such as Hyland's (1998) study

and Abdi's (2011) study. Therefore, research articles have certain outlines and certain academic purposes. Research articles can focus on a topic including the writer's critique and interpretations. While the book reviews are used to evaluate books in regard to their structure and content which will include interactional markers.

Bal-Gezegin & Baş (2020) believe that the number of conclusions, which is 48, constitutes a restriction to form generalization. As well as the type of speakers because they all share the same mother language, which is Turkish. Another limitation is that analyzing the conclusion part is different from analyzing the whole paper. As this study will analyze the conclusion section only, it is not enough to make generalization, but it helps in finding the different use of metadiscourse markers by writers from different disciplines. However, the type of genre restricts the writers from using the different types of markers. For instance, book reviews need more evaluative markers which help the writers to express their viewpoints and critical analysis.

Further research on the same focus, which is analyzing metadiscourse markers in different genres comprises similar studies with the same aims. For instance, Chou et al., (2023) conducted a comparative study among translated Chinese texts to English and non-translated academic texts that are in English. The study focused on examining the frequencies of interactional metadiscourse markers in only 500 texts from four genres of academic writing, fiction, prose and press. However, the study adopted Hyland (2005) model to find out the differences in using interactional metadiscourse in the translated and non-translated texts. This is by using electronic analyzing tools, which are Syntactic Complexity Analyzer and Authorial Voice Analyzer to count the frequencies of interactional metadiscourse markers.

The findings indicated that there is a variety in the use of interactional metadiscourse markers in the non-translated and the translated ones. In addition, the non-translated texts have a greater use of interactional markers. In detail, the non-translated texts used more hedges, boosters and attitude markers, while the translated texts used reader pronoun and self-mention markers more. These findings are aligned with previous studies which found that attitude markers are rarely used in texts. Such as Mawlood et al., (2024) study where they found that attitude markers were the least used ones by native and non-native speakers. This can be evidence that the process of translation is difficult since it deals with the language, as well as the meaning of the text. The researchers have also found that non-translated news articles used less reader pronoun markers but more hedges, attitude markers, boosters and directives. Furthermore, the use of hedges and boosters in non-translated texts in the genre of fiction and academic articles was the highest and attitude markers were the most used ones in news articles. The results also showed that translated texts used more attitude markers in fiction articles and more self-mentions, reader pronouns, and directives markers in prose articles.

However, Chou et al., (2023) discussed previous studies on translated texts in the literature review and reported that translated texts use fewer markers. For instance, Swedish non-translated texts have more metadiscourse markers of both types. Adding to this study, American speech transcripts used more metadiscourse markers than Persian. Similar studies with similar results support the analysis of translating Chinese texts to English and compare between the usage of metadiscourse markers.

Evidently, there are some factors that limit researchers in studying the differences between the use of interactional markers in translated and non-

translated texts. The texts are all translated by Chinese which they all share the same background. In addition, the difficulty of the Chinese language can hinder the use of some interactional markers which might be unsuitable. Furthermore, less analysis of metadiscourse markers have been on translated texts, especially from Chinese to Englis and this is highly linked to the various use of metadiscourse markers across genres and language of texts.

Previous studies by Bal-Gezegin & Baş (2020) and Chou et al., (2023) analyzed the use of one type of metadiscourse markers, which is interactional markers. Both studies found different results since each of which analyzed different types of texts. For instance, Bal-Gezegin & Baş (2020) found that book reviews have more hedges markers, while the other genre, which is research articles use more attitude markers. As for Chou et al., (2023) study, they found that English news articles, prose, academic and fiction used more both types more than others, like boosters, self-mentions and engagement markers.

In relevance to studying the different uses of metadiscourse markers in different genres, Alharbi (2021) analyzed two genres, which are research articles and MA's dissertations in applied linguistic discipline. Alharbi analyzed the sections that come after the method section in 20 research articles and 20 MA's dissertations in applied linguistics. The researcher focused on the different uses of metadiscourse markers based on the length of the papers. This is because the findings revealed a notable difference in the results which is related to the number of words. Another reason is that the aims of each genre are different based on the target audience. On the other hand, the researcher implemented Hyland (2005) model since it is the most used one in recent literature. By implementing this model, the results of Alharbi's study

appeared that, in general, MA's dissertations apply more metadiscourse markers, mainly boosters and hedges. While transitions markers (interactive markers) and hedges (interactional markers) were the most used ones in MA's dissertations and research articles. The length of each genre is a prospect of having more markers. Moreover, the researcher relates his study to other studies by providing an overview of metadiscourse markers in applied linguistics, particularly academic writing, as well as reporting what influences the deployment of metadiscourse in research articles and MA's dissertations.

In conclusion, the researcher suggests a larger number of texts can be analyzed to infer generalizations over different genres, disciplines and cultures. In addition, using his results considering the effect of teaching materials on the MA programs.

2.2.5 Studies on Metadiscourse Markers in Speeches

Metadiscourse markers are used in written discourse, as well as in spoken or oral discourse. As speeches scripts can be classified one of the genres which metadiscourse markers can be found in. Therefore, persuasive speeches scripts can have a wide range of metadiscourse markers. This is due to the intention of the addresser, which is to build good social interactions and effective relations with the addressee. Abusalim et al., (2022) analyzed political speeches to find out the frequencies of metadiscourse markers token in four speeches, which are done by Hillary Clinton. The researchers implemented Dafouz-Milne (2008) model and a qualitative approach to include examples of the metadiscourse markers used in the political speeches. The aim of the study was to find the relationship between 44ffecttive use of metadiscourse markers and the way they help in achieving persuasion.

However, they found that the most frequent textual markers were the logical markers, which are transitions based on Hyland (2005) model, with a percentage of 47.6%. Such as and, in addition, furthermore, etc.

In reference to the previous study, Kashisha (2022) conducted an analysis of 26 political speeches by Barak Obama. The transcribed texts were taken from American Rhetoric website with their audios. Kashiha completed this study using Hyland (2005) model by implementing a quantitative approach to find the frequencies of metadiscourse markers and a qualitative approach to identify the function of the markers in persuasive speeches. He found that interactional markers have a wider range than interactive markers. Moreover, this shows that speeches help in building good relationships with the audience due to the higher use of attitude markers, self-mentions, and engagement markers to that attitude of the addresser. On the same hand, Obama also used a variety of interactive markers to maintain the cohesive and coherence of the discourse.

3.5 Summary

This chapter discussed the conceptual framework of metadiscourse markers regarding its classifications and models. It also emphasized the implemented model in this study which is Hyland (2005) metadiscourse markers model. The second section of this chapter summarizes previous studies on metadiscourse markers across disciplines, genres, speeches and studies on native and non-native speakers, which related to the gap that will be filled in analyzing metadiscourse markers in relation to linguistic background, disciplines, genres and text complexity. Therefore, other studies showed a variety of results that might be aligned with the current study results.

CHAPTER THREE

Methods and Procedures

CHAPTER THREE
Methods and Procedures

3.0 Introduction

This chapter provides a detailed description of the design followed to complete the study, states the sample of the study that consists of 60 thesis conclusions of EFL learners from Arabic and non-Arabic linguistic background. It also presents the electronic tool used to complete quantitative data analysis.

3.5 Research Design

The following study was completed by adopting a mixed method approach a quantitative analysis by counting the frequencies of metadiscourse markers and qualitative based on the corpus analysis by following Hyland (2005) model, as in other studies like, Mawlood et al., (2024), and Al-Rubaye (2015). This approach was selected to achieve the aims and answer the questions of the current study by following certain procedures in selecting, collecting and analyzing the data, after that connecting the data to draw conclusions about the most and least used metadiscourse markers at the MA level in selected genres and disciplines.

3.5 Research Sample

The samples of this study are EFL MA graduates who completed their theses from different universities and from different disciplines. The sample of the

study included 60 MA thesis conclusions from three different disciplines: Business, Engineering, and Linguistics and Literature. The researcher chose these three disciplines based on their availability in most of the universities around the world. This sample included 20 thesis conclusions from each discipline with 10 of EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background and 10 of EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background from other universities out of Kingdom of Bahrain. As can be seen in Table (1). The data were collected from each discipline were equally to maintain the consistency of analysis.

Table (1): Sample of the Study

Discipline	**Thesis Conclusions from Arabic Linguistic Background**	**Thesis Conclusions from Non-Arabic linguistic Background**
Business	10	10
Engineering	10	10
Linguistics and Literature	10	10
Total	**30**	**30**

The collection of data process was completed through looking for MA theses in the central library of University of Bahrain by selecting the disciplines and genres, then scanning the conclusion chapter. Moreover, data of EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic backgrounds were collected through visiting a variety of universities websites, like University of South Florida, University of Massachusetts Amherst and Michigan State University. the reason of

choosing these universities because they are accredited universities, they include non-native speakers, and they have the selected disciplines in the current study. The theses conclusions were written in different periods of time from 2003 to 2023.

3.3 Procedure of Data Collection

The procedure of collecting the data of this study started with writing an approval letter to the supervisor of the current study, then to the chairperson of English language and literature department in the university of Bahrain, and lastly to the Vice President for Academic Programs & Graduate Studies in the university of Bahrain. This is to get permission to use MA theses in counting the frequencies of metadiscourse markers in the conclusion chapter among selected disciplines.

After that, collecting published theses on the web from different universities while ensuring they were written by non-native speakers through focusing on the MA postgraduate names. Moreover, the focus was on three different disciplines, which are Business, Engineering, and Linguistics and Literature. Adding to finding theses in the selected disciplines, the most important chapter was the conclusion chapter where writers express their attitudes towards the whole work and try to re-engage the reader by summing up the main objectives, results and answering the questions.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data analysis of the current study was completed through the analytical quantitative method by analyzing the descriptive statistics of the data collected from the conclusion part of MA theses by using an electronic method (Text Inspector). In fact, the electronic method helps in counting the functions (types) and frequencies (tokens) of metadsicourse markers, as well as counting words and sentences with labeling the lexical profile and proficiency percentage. This will also help addressing the most used and less used metadiscourse marker at the MA level in thesis conclusions by the corpus analysis. This electronic tool is a paid web tool that follows Hyland (2004) model. However, this analysis will help in answering the first three questions of the current study.

The data collected from this study are analyzed by taking the PDF files of the MA thesis conclusions and transferring the intended text, which is the conclusion chapter, to the electronic tool (Text Inspector). Furthermore, the output of (Text Inspector) was analyzed using the qualitative method by referring to Hyland's metadiscourse markers in academic writing model. The researchers Bax et al., (2019) used (Text Inspector) to analyze 900 scripts and record the use of metadiscourse markers. The electronic tool analyzes the lexical characteristics of text. For instance, the word count, sentence count, lexical profile and proficiency percentage. These characteristics are essentials to analyzing the data and identifying connections regarding the linguistic backgrounds and lexical profiles of the MA thesis conclusions.

In addition, Regression analysis was used utilizing SPSS ANOVA analysis to find the correlation between the level of text and metadiscourse markers types and tokens. The data of the lexical profiles of texts, functions and

frequencies of metadiscourse markers were put in the SPSS software to find if there is a correlation between them and answers the fourth question of the current study.

Therefore, there are minor changes in naming the subtypes of metadiscourse markers in the model that is being used in the electronic tool (Text inspector). To begin with, the interactive markers changes are logical connectives in Hyland (2004) model have changed to transitions in Hyland (2005) model, frame markers have not been changed except dividing the sub-type into sequencing, label stages, announce goals and topic shift. As for the interactional markers, persona changed to self-mentions, relational to engagement markers, and emphatics to boosters.

The researcher of this study will analyze the data according to Hyland (2005) model. Therefore, the naming of the sub-types from the electronic tool will all be presented according to Hyland (2005) model.

3.5 Summary

This chapter discussed the research design to be implemented, the sample of the study, which are MA thesis conclusions collected from accredited universities. In addition, the data collection procedures and the steps of data analysis using the electronic tool and SPSS ANOVA analysis. It also discussed in detail steps of using the utilized electronic tool (Text inspector), which helps in analyzing the data and answering the questions of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the quantitative data of MA thesis conclusions of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners with different linguistic backgrounds and different disciplines. This chapter will discuss the use of metadiscourse markers in thesis conclusions regarding the lexical profile, level of texts, categories and functions of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers. The data were analyzed following Hyland (2005) of metadiscourse markers, as well as using an electronic tool (Text Inspector).

4.1 Lexical Profile and Level of Texts

The lexical profile of texts produced by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners is significantly influenced by their linguistic backgrounds. This analysis focuses on the lexical characteristics of texts written by EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background compared to those from non-Arabic linguistic background across different academic disciplines: Business, Engineering, and Linguistic and Literature. The findings are summarized in Table (1), which provides an overview of word count, sentence count, lexical profile, and proficiency percentage for each category.

Table (1): Lexical Characteristics of EFL Thesis Conclusions by Linguistic Background and Discipline

Thesis Conclusions	Word Count	Sentence Count	Lexical Profile	Percentage
Business (Arabic Linguistic Background)	3406	147	C2	0.75
Business (Non-Arabic Linguistic Background)	3688	151	C2+	0.79
Engineering (Arabic Linguistic Background)	4530	205	C1+	0.69
Engineering (Non-Arabic Linguistic Background)	4021	192	C2+	0.79
Linguistics and Literature (Arabic Linguistic Background)	3983	188	C2	0.74
Linguistics and Literature (Non-Arabic Linguistic Background)	4921	190	C2+	0.81

4.1.1 Business Texts

In the Business discipline, texts produced by EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background demonstrate a lexical profile of C2, with a word count of 3406 and a sentence count of 147. This indicates a solid command of business-related vocabulary and structures. However, the non-Arabic linguistic background group exhibits a higher lexical proficiency (C2+) with a word count of 3688 and a sentence count of 151. The increased complexity and richness of vocabulary in the non-Arabic linguistic background texts and

may be attributed to their familiarity with the complexity of the English language, which often includes idiomatic expressions and specialized terminology that are prevalent in global business contexts.

4.1.2 Engineering Texts

The Engineering texts reveal a similar trend, with Arabic linguistic background learners achieving a C1+ lexical profile (4530 words, 205 sentences) compared to their EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic backgrounds counterparts, who attain a C2+ level (4021 words, 192 sentences). The higher lexical proficiency in the non-Arabic linguistic background texts, unsurprisingly, suggests that this group is better equipped to engage with the specialized vocabulary and complex structures often found in Engineering writing. This may be due to more extensive exposure to English language in their educational experiences, allowing them to incorporate more sophisticated language into their writing.

4.1.3 Linguistics and Literature Texts

In the Linguistics and Literature category, the texts produced by EFL learners of non-Arabic linguistic background also show a higher lexical profile (C2+), with a word count of 4921 and a sentence count of 190. This indicates a rich engagement with the language and complex narrative structures. Conversely, the Arabic linguistic background EFL learners achieve a C2 profile with a word count of 3983 and a sentence count of 188. While both groups demonstrate proficiency, non-Arabic linguistic background texts reflect deeper familiarity with literary conventions and stylistic devices, which may enhance their overall language competence.

The next section analyses the lexical characteristics of thesis conclusions according to the six groups from the three disciplines. The data discussed in six tables are based on the linguistic backgrounds and disciplines of the EFL learners.

The data presented in Table (1) answer the first question of the current study, which is the relationship between the lexical characteristics of texts and the linguistic backgrounds of the EFL learners from Business, Engineering and Linguistics and Literature disciplines.

4.1.4 Business - EFL Leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Backgrounds

To begin with, table (2) presents data of 10 thesis conclusions from business discipline of EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background. This discipline shows a variety of lexical profiles from lexical profiles of (C2) and (D1+), with a variety of word count from 200 to 569 and sentence count from 7 to 27.

Some of the conclusions consist of a high word count showing a higher level of lexical profile, which is (C2+), but some show a high lexical profile with less word and sentence count. For instance, thesis (5) has the C2+ lexical profile with word count of 569 and sentence count of 19. This shows that the lexical profile is affected by the word and sentence count. Whereas thesis (2) shows the lexical profile (C2) with word count of 513 and sentence count of 27.

Table (2): Business Thesis Conclusions from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

Thesis	Word count	Sentence count	Lexical profile	Percentage
1	239	14	C2	74%
2	513	27	C2	71%
3	304	13	C2	73%
4	445	18	C2	76%
5	569	19	C2+	77%
6	288	7	C2+	79%
7	200	9	C2+	81%
8	429	15	C2	75%
9	392	18	C2	73%
10	309	11	D1+	94%
Total	3688	151	C2+	79%

This reveals that lexical profile is not affected by the word and sentence count. Another example is in thesis (7), the lexical profile is (C2+) but it has the lowest word count (200) and low sentence count of 7. Thesis (10) shows the highest lexical profile (D1+) with a mid-word count of 309 and sentence count of 11, as well as the percentage of proficiency is the highest one, which is (94%).

4.1.5 Business - EFL Leaners from Arabic Linguistic Backgrounds

In the group of EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background from the Business discipline, the word and sentence count do not correlate to the lexical profile of the thesis conclusions because each conclusion has different level of lexical profile and different word and sentence count. The data in table (3)

provide lexical profiles levels from (C1) to (C2+). However, the word count ranges from 631 to 146 and sentence count from 6 to 29.

A notable observation is that the lexical profile is not consistently linked to word and sentence count. For instance, thesis 2 has a word count of 274 and the highest level of lexical profile in this group, which is (C2+). On the other hand, thesis 7 has the highest word count of 631 but a lower lexical profile (C2). As in thesis 4, the word count is the lowest (146), but it has the same lexical profile level, which is (C2), of thesis 7 that has the highest word count of 631. Furthermore, this conclusion is also applicable on the sentence count and lexical profile. In thesis 4 the sentence count is the lowest (6) and the lexical profile is (C2), and in thesis 6 the sentence count is 29, which is the highest, the lexical profile is lower (C1+).

Table (3): Business Thesis Conclusions from Arabic Linguistic Background

Thesis	Word count	Sentence count	Lexical profile	Percentage
1	201	12	C1+	69%
2	274	14	C2+	80%
3	216	9	C2	76%
4	146	6	C2	75%
5	384	15	C2	76%
6	474	29	C1+	67%
7	631	24	C2	74%
8	394	14	C1	62%
9	443	16	C2	71%
10	243	8	C2	73%
Total	3406	147	C2	75%

In summary, the lexical profiles in table (3) indicate a relationship between the use of English vocabulary and business contexts. This is because most of the thesis conclusions have the lexical profile (C2), and the word count and sentence count are not necessarily considered to predict proficiency level.

4.1.6 Engineering - EFL Leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

In the Engineering discipline of non-Arabic linguistic background of EFL leaners, the word count varies from 148 to 583, the sentence count ranges from 6 to 30 and lexical profile from (C2) to (D1). The variety of these three factors does not reveal any links between word count, sentence count, lexical profile and proficiency percentage.

Table (4): Engineering Thesis Conclusions from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

Theses	Word count	Sentence count	Lexical profile	Percentage
1	543	25	C2+	79%
2	397	19	C2+	81%
3	512	29	D1	84%
4	155	6	D1	84%
5	457	22	C2+	81%
6	148	8	C2+	82%
7	255	12	C2	76%
8	583	30	C2	72%
9	428	21	C2+	82%
10	543	20	C2+	77%
Total	4021	192	C2+	79%

For instance, thesis 1 has a high word count of 543 with 25 sentences and lexical profile (C2+), while thesis 6 has the lowest word count with 8 sentences and a similar lexical profile of thesis 1, which is (C2+). Another example of the slight correlation, thesis 4 has the highest lexical profile in this group and it is (D1) with a low word count of 155. Another evidence is shown in thesis 8, which has the highest word count and sentence count, but it has the lowest lexical profile level in this group of (C2). This leads to the lowest proficiency level of (72%) among all the analyzed thesis conclusions, while thesis 4 has low word count of 155 and the percentage of the proficiency level of (84%). Therefore, the lexical profiles in table (4) illustrate a good proficiency level of English in Engineering texts and it is not necessarily to have higher word count to have higher proficiency level.

4.1.7 Engineering - EFL Leaners from Arabic Linguistic Backgrounds

The group of EFL learners from Arabic linguistic backgrounds shows a variety of word count, sentence count and lexical profiles, similar to the previously analyzed groups. The word count ranges from 302 and 893. As for the sentence count, it is from 12 to 41. A similar indicator the word count, sentence count and lexical profile do not reflect a strong relationship.

Table (5): Engineering Thesis Conclusions from Arabic Linguistic Background

Theses	Word count	Sentence count	Lexical profile	Percentage
1	302	12	C2+	79%
2	397	12	C2	72%
3	893	41	C2	73%
4	524	24	C2	76%
5	312	12	C2	76%
6	394	19	C2	75%
7	405	18	C1+	66%
8	541	27	C1+	67%
9	357	22	C2	71%
10	405	18	C1+	66%
Total	4530	205	C1+	69%

As an example, thesis 1 has the lowest word count and sentence count, but it has the highest lexical profile (C2+) and highest percentage of proficiency level of (79%). In comparison, thesis 3 has the highest word and sentence count but a lower level of lexical profile of (C2) and lower percentage of proficiency level of (72%). Conversely, thesis 4 has a word count of 524 and 24 sentence count, but has similar lexical profile (C2) and higher percentage of proficiency level. Another example is in thesis 5. It has a similar lexical profile, which is (C2) but different word count and sentence count. Therefore, the lexical profile levels indicate the effective use of English language by EFL learners with Arabic linguistic backgrounds regardless the word count and sentence count. It also reveals that EFL learners in Engineering discipline can reach higher lexical profiles by the wise use of English vocabulary.

4.1.8 Linguistics and Literature - EFL Leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

The data in table (6) represents the differences among 10 thesis conclusions from Linguistic and Literature discipline of EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background. The word count starts from 274 to 644, the sentence count varies from 12 to 29. However, the highest lexical profile is (D1) and the lowest lexical profile is (C2). As for the proficiency percentage, it ranges from (71%) to (88%).

The analysis indicates that EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic backgrounds from Linguistic and Literature discipline have a higher proficiency level in using vocabulary and complexity. Furthermore, the word count and sentence count show the different writing styles but not proficiency level. For instance, thesis 4 has the lowest word count and the lowest lexical profile of (C2) while thesis 8 has a word count of 596 and a similar lexical profile (C2) and lower proficiency level of (71%).

Table (6): Linguistics and Literature Thesis Conclusions from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

Theses	Word count	Sentence count	Lexical profile	Percentage
1	336	12	C2+	77%
2	354	18	C2	76%
3	470	29	C2	76%
4	274	17	C2	76%
5	644	24	C2+	80%
6	617	24	C2+	80%
7	475	19	C2	71%
8	596	19	C2	71%
9	540	14	D1	88%
10	615	14	D1	88%
Total	4921	190	C2+	81%

Theses 7 and 8 have lexical profiles (C2) and proficiency level of (71%) but different word count and sentence count. Theses 9 and 10 have the same sentence count of 14, highest lexical profile (D1) and the highest proficiency level of (88%), it can be a sign of effective use of the language, but this cannot generalize that sentence count is correlated with proficiency level.

Therefore, the difference between word count and sentence count between the theses appears that strong proficiency level can still be achieved despite the different word and sentence count, and it plays crucial role in increasing text's level.

4.1.9 Linguistic and Literature- EFL Leaners from Arabic Linguistic Backgrounds

The data of Linguistic and Literature discipline of EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background shows variety of word count, sentence count and lexical profile. The word count is 830 and the lowest is 146. While the sentence count ranges from 8 to 35, the lexical profile from (C1) to (D1) and proficiency percentage of (60%) and to (89%).

Table (7): Linguistics and Literature Thesis Conclusions from Arabic Linguistic Background

Theses	Word count	Sentence count	Lexical profile	Percentage
1	830	30	C2	76%
2	290	9	C1	60%
3	415	18	C2+	82%
4	396	12	D1	89%
5	243	14	C2	76%
6	146	8	C2	73%
7	407	19	C2	76%
8	266	13	C1+	69%
9	379	30	C2	74%
10	611	35	C1+	65%
Total	3983	188	C2	74%

As in previous groups' analysis, the word and sentence count represent the diversity of writing styles and complexity and there is no relationship with the lexical profile. Discussing this in more detail, thesis 1 has the highest word count with a (C2) lexical profile and (76%) proficiency. While thesis 5 and 6 have the lowest word count but they have the same lexical profile (C2) of

thesis 1 with a proficiency of (76% and 73%). Moreover, thesis 10 has 611 of word count, which considered as a high level compared to the others in this group, but it has the highest sentence count and a lexical profile of (C1+). Conversely, thesis 6 has the lowest word count of 146 and significant lexical profile (C2). Another example is thesis 4, it has word count of 396, sentence count of 12 and it achieves the highest lexical profile (D1). Eventually, the effective use of the vocabulary is correlated with proficiency level in Linguistic and Literature texts of EFL learners and it is not correlated with the quantity of the words.

4.1.10 Similarities and Differences of Vocabulary Level and Profile of Texts

The tables from (1) to (7) present the data of word count, sentence count, lexical profile and proficiency percentage. The corpus analyzed was collected from MA thesis conclusions of EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background and from non-Arabic linguistic background. Hence, they were selected from three disciplines: Business, Engineering and Linguistic and Literature. The data displayed in previous tables answer the first question of this study which is finding the relationship between lexical characteristics (such as the word count, sentence count, lexical profile and profiecincy percentage) and linguistic background.

The next section will discuss the similarities and differences between the six groups to address general analysis about the lexical characteristics of the analyzed corpus.

- **Similarities between the six groups**

The conclusions of the MA thesis conclusions of the six groups share some similarities regarding their word count, sentence count, lexical profile and proficiency. To begin with, all the tables illustrate a variation in word count starting from 146 to 893 and a variation in the sentence count from 6 to 35. This indicates that each writer has a different writing style in all the disciplines (Business, Engineering, Linguistic and Literature) and it does not affect the lexical profile based on the results. In addition, the lexical profile in tables ranges from (C1) to (C2+) and most disciplines achieve (D1) level in few conclusions except the Business discipline from Arabic linguistic background and non-Arabic linguistic background. However, lexical profiles represent effective vocabulary proficiency among all the disciplines. It is also can be shown through the proficiency percentage where it can be high despite the discipline, word count, and sentence count. Lastly, all the disciplines demonstrate that there is no strong relationship between word count, sentence count and lexical profile. In summary, the quality of written text is more important than quantity because higher word count and sentence count are not necessarily to achieve higher lexical profiles and proficiency percentages.

- **Differences between the six groups**

The six groups share some elements, like variation in word count, sentence count, lexical profile and proficiency percentage. Nevertheless, there are some differences between the six groups.

To begin with, each table is based on a specific discipline with a different linguistic background. Some are specified as EFL leaners from Arabic linguistic background, and some are from non-Arabic linguistic background.

Adding to that, the lexical profiles in some tables range from (C2) to (D1), which reflects a higher ability level, like the EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic backgrounds of the Linguistic and Literature discipline in table (6). While some show lower abilities, like the EFL learners from Arabic linguistic backgrounds of the Business discipline. In addition, the highest proficiency percentage of the thesis conclusions in the six groups differ as evidence of the language mastery among the different disciplines and contexts. For instance, table (2) of EFL learners from Business discipline of non-Arabic linguistic has the highest proficiency percentage of (94%) in thesis (10) among the 60 analyzed thesis conclusions, while highest proficiency percentage in table (5) of EFL learners of Engineering discipline from Arabic linguistic background is (79%). Therefore, the higher word and sentence count does not correlate to higher proficiency. For instance, in table (6) there are some thesis conclusions that have high word count but moderate lexical profiles of (C2), while some have lower word count but lexical profile of (D1).

EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background from Business, Engineering and Linguistic and Literature show higher lexical profiles, like tables (2), (4) and (6). The minimum lexical profile in these tables is (C2) and the maximum is (D1+), while other tables of thesis conclusions from Arabic linguistic background the lexical profiles are starting from (C1) to (D1). This indicates that the level of EFL learners with non-Arabic linguistic background is higher than EFL learners with Arabic linguistic background. In light of the lexical profile, a study by Erarslan (2021) reveals that the level of analyzed research essays by Turkish ELT learners' range between (A1) to (C2). This result conflicts with this study's result because the lexical profiles of the two

main groups (EFL learners from Arabic and non-Arabic linguistic background) is higher than the level of the Turkish learners.

To conclude, the different disciplines have preferences in using the language in their written texts based on their linguistic backgrounds, as well as proficiency outcomes. Moreover, the relationship between the lexical profile, word count, sentence count and proficiency is slightly weak because some of the conclusions of the MA theses have high number of word count but a low lexical profile and proficiency percentage, while others scored higher in lexical profile and proficiency level with low word count.

4.2 Categories and Functions of Metadiscourse Markers

4.2.1 Business - Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

The data presented in table (8) reveal several key observations regarding the metadiscourse markers identified in the MA thesis conclusions of EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background in the Business discipline. The analysis identified ten distinct types of metadiscourse markers including the sub-types of the frame markers, which are four, resulting in 86 types and 351 tokens.

Table (8): Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Business Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

Word List	Types	Tokens
Total	86	351
Announce goals (frame markers)	1	1
Attitude marker	5	10
Code gloss	6	9
boosters	11	19
Endophoric	3	6
Evidential	8	36
Hedge	14	35
Label stage (frame markers)	2	8
transitions	20	182
self-mention	4	22
engagement marker	4	8
Sequencing (frame markers)	7	12
Topic shift (frame markers)	1	3

The interactive markers (frame markers, code glosses, endophoric, evidential, and transitions) and interactional markers (hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mention and engagement markers) have been seen in the ten conclusions of the MA theses in the Business discipline. A total of 48 types of interactive markers, contributing 257 tokens, and a total of 38 types of interactional markers with 94 tokens. Therefore, the frequency of the interactive markers is more than the interactional markers, which is aligned with studies in the literature review, such as Binmahboob (2022), Al-Zubeiry (2019), and Al-Rubaye (2015).

Interactive markers are used in text to maintain coherence by organizing the ideas and focusing on directing the reader with the discourse (Nugrahani & Bram, 2020). In this case, they are implementing more interactional markers

to assure that the reader is engaged with the text organization more than the experiences and attitudes of the writer.

However, the significant presence of transitions of 20 types and 182 tokens reveals their crucial role in clarifying and connecting the text, which are important characteristics for the communication between the writer and the reader. Hyland (2005) states that transitions are used to connect main clauses and show the relations between them by having the three distinct types (addition, comparison and consequences). Some of the examples used in the Business MA thesis conclusions from non-Arabic linguistic background *are and, as a result, since, even tough, similarly, besides, while*.

In the interactive markers category, the second most used type is the frame marker. Therefore, 11 types of frame markers were noticed with a frequency of 24 tokens. Frame markers are divided into four types: topic shift (*well, with regard to*), sequencing (*first, second*), label stages (*to conclude, overall*) and announce goals (*the aim, in this section*). Williams (2010) points out that frame markers can be seen in a text to help in sequencing the ideas or arguments. Some examples of the frame markers from the Business thesis conclusions are *in conclusion, well, overall, the aim, first*.

The next most used markers are the evidentials, where the writer includes them in a text to cite other work or ideas from other sources. There are 8 types of evidentials, and the frequency was 36, which is higher than the frame markers. Furthermore, the writers refer to using this type of marker to make the text powerful with others' studies. Some of the examples of evidentials from the analyzed thesis conclusions are *according to, found that, suggests, literature, research, believe*.

The infrequent use of endophoric markers, which are 3 types contributing 6 tokens, as well as the use of code glosses, which are 6 types with 9 tokens suggest the low level of presenting details, like using figures and sections. This is because the analyzed part is the conclusion where the author concludes everything in the thesis without referring to the details. Some examples of endophorics are *see, chapter, noted*, and some examples of code glosses are *such as, for example, namely, for instance*.

Table (8) presents the types and tokens of interactional markers in thesis conclusions. The type and token analysis presents the linguistic richness and complexity of academic writing. Nevertheless, the frequency of the interactional markers was less than the interactive markers. This is because the writers use interactional markers to express their attitudes about certain topics. They also help with enhancing the positive interaction with the reader, especially when using self-mention markers and engagement markers, like *we, our, my, let us, your*.

In the Business thesis conclusions of EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background, the identification of the hedges is seen as the second type of markers in general after the transitions. It is considered high compared to other types. It has 14 types with 35 tokens. Hedges are used to not show the writer's full certainty about the topic (Nugrahani & Bram, 2020). Some of the hedges were found in the analyzed Business thesis conclusions are *seem, might, indicate, could, likely, somewhat*.

Moving to the second most frequent type of markers, which is boosters, they are seen in 11 types with 19 tokens. Boosters are being implemented in written text to express the writer's certainty about the topic and they are being used with hedges to engage the reader and convey the meaning of the discourse in

a balanced way (Hyland, 2005). The boosters used in the Business thesis conclusions are *should, sure, well known, always, essential*.

The other types of interactional markers, which are attitude markers and engagement markers, were rarely found in the analyzed Business thesis conclusions. According to Kuswoyo & Siregar (2019), the attitude markers are effective because they are used to support the writer's attitude about the topic explicitly and in convincing the reader. Some of the examples from the corpus analyzed are *even, have to, important, must.* The engagement markers as well, they are important because they help in communicating and engaging the reader with the written discourse. The engagement markers in the Business thesis conclusions are *think about, one's, your, you*.

Lastly, the self-mention markers were seen in 4 types with 22 tokens, which is higher than the boosters. Self-mention markers are being used to make the presence of the writer clear with context and text. The self-mention markers used were *I, me, my, we*.

To conclude, the observable results of the EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background in Business discipline are the interactive markers they are more frequent than the interactional markers. In addition, the most used markers are the transitions followed by the hedges. This result is aligned with Hyland (2005) and Akoto (2020) studies. Whereas the less used ones are endophorics from interactive markers and from interactional markers are the self-mention and the engagement markers.

4.2.2 Business - Arabic Linguistic Background

Table (9) exhibits the implementation of metadiscourse markers in EFL learners MA thesis conclusions, these learners are from Arabic linguistic

background in the Business discipline. This group used a total of 69 types of metadiscourse markers with a total of 322 tokens.

Table (9): Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Business Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Arabic Linguistic Background

Word List	Types	Tokens
Total	69	322
Attitude marker	4	5
Code gloss	5	11
booster	7	13
Endophoric	3	16
Evidential	8	36
Hedge	10	16
Label stage (frame markers)	1	3
transitions	20	192
self-mention	1	1
Sequencing (frame markers)	9	21
Topic shift (frame markers)	1	8

The interactive markers can be seen in 47 types with 287 tokens, and the interactional markers include 22 types with 35 tokens only. This indicates that the use of interactive markers is more effective since it is also the highest in the Business discipline of the non-Arabic linguistic background group. This result is like Yea et al., (2020) results, where interactive markers are more than interactional markers.

To begin with, interactive markers include 5 types and all of them have been seen in the analyzed thesis conclusions except the sub-type of frame markers, which are announce goals. The most frequent interactive type are the transitions; 20 types with 192 tokens. This indicates that the writers employed transitions to connect ideas in a logical way. This will also assist in making

the text coherent and understandable for the reader (Liao, 2020). Some of the examples from the Business conclusions are *also, hence, however, or, even though, accordingly, similarly, besides*.

The second frequent type is the frame marker with its 3 sub-types (topic shift, label stage and sequencing). A total of 11 types with 32 tokens were found in the analyzed thesis conclusions. There were no announce goal markers in Business discipline of the non-Arabic linguistic background group. However, the frame markers are used to connect sentences, as well as in constructing the text in a specific sequence. Examples of frame markers are *finally, first, well, overall, thirdly*. Another frequent type of interactive markers is the evidentials. There are 8 types represented by 36 tokens. Evidentials are being included in MA thesis conclusions to refer to reliable sources and cite them in the text. This type will also help in making the text more effective and persuasive (Hyland, 2005). The evidentials that were found in the analyzed thesis conclusions are *research, shows, found that, literature, established, studies, according to, points out.* Furthermore, the less frequent type of interactive markers is the code glosses. They are used to add information or make ideas evident. Like using *such as, known as, specifically, in fact, that is.*

Moving on the interactional markers, where they were employed to fulfil the text with opinions and attitudes in constructing good writer-reader communication. The most frequent types in the interactional markers were the hedges, a total of 10 types with 16 tokens were found in the Business thesis conclusions of the Arabic linguistic background group. The hedges were used to attract the reader with the text and give an opportunity to express their own viewpoint with other viewpoints (Williams, 2010). For instance, *would, estimate, could, certain, generally, indicate, may*.

Another frequent type is the booster, a total of 7 types with 13 tokens. Hyland (2005) points out that boosters are used to reinforce the writer's perspective and experiences about a certain point. Some examples of the boosters from the conclusions are *determine, always, should, establish, it is clear,* etc. However, the less frequently used interactional markers are the attitude markers (4 types and 5 tokens) self-mention (1 type and 1 token), and there was no appearance in the 10 thesis conclusions for the engagement markers.

In summary, the results tend to be similar to the EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background with a slight difference. Both groups have interactive markers more than interactional markers and both groups employed transition markers more than others. The previous group have the hedges as the second frequent markers, while this group have the frame markers. In addition, the previous group resulted that endophoric is the less used type from the interactive markers, as well as this group. Nevertheless, this group have the same less used interactional markers, which are self-mention as only 1 type and 1 token, as well as engagement markers because they were not used at all.

4.2.3 Engineering - Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

The data in table (10) reflects the use of metadiscourse markers in MA thesis conclusions written by EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background in the Engineering discipline. The interactive markers were implemented more than the interactional markers with a total of 36 types and 202 tokens, while the interactional markers were used with 27 types contributing 67 tokens. Well, writers tend to use interactive markers more to preserve the coherence of the ideas in the text, as well as to avoid distracting the reader from the text.

Table (10): Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Engineering Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

Word List	Types	Tokens
Total	63	269
Attitude marker	5	9
Code gloss	5	9
boosters	7	12
Endophoric	3	7
Evidential	5	12
Hedge	11	33
Label stage (frame markers)	1	2
transitions	15	157
self-mention	2	10
engagement markers	2	3
Sequencing (frame markers)	6	10
Topic shift (frame markers)	1	5

In the interactive markers, transitions are the most frequent markers were used in Engineering thesis conclusions of non-Arabic linguistic group. They were used with 15 types with 157 tokens. According to Hyland (2005) transitions are divided into three types: addition is used to add information to the clauses like using (*and*), comparisons are used to connect similar distinct ideas like using (*similarly and in contrast*), and consequences to draw attention to conclusions like using (in conclusion). The transitions which were used in the analyzed thesis conclusions are *furthermore, hence, leads to, therefore, also, but, and, whereas.*

The second notable type of interactive markers is the frame markers. They were seen in 8 types with 17 tokens. As mentioned earlier, frame markers are being implemented by their four sub-types, but the announce goals were not used at all in the Engineering thesis conclusions. For example, *the aim, my*

purpose, I seek, we will focus on. Other types of frame markers were utilized to sequence ideas, label parts of the text and to draw the reader's attention to specific ideas (Liao, 2020). Some of the frame markers in the analyzed thesis conclusions are *first, second, well, last, overall*.

Other types of interactive markers were less frequent than others. For instance, code glosses were used by 5 types with 9 tokens, and they are used to elaborate more on the ideas. Some code glosses from the analyzed thesis conclusions are *in fact, such as, that is, this means*.

Moreover, the evidentials were also implanted by 5 types with 12 tokens. The evidentials are used to support the writers' goal (Kuswoyo & Siregar, 2019). Some examples used in the analyzed corpus are *studies, shows, established, research*.

Lastly, the endophoric markers were the least frequent interactive markers with a total of 3 types represented by 7 tokens. If the writer wants to direct the reader to a specific part of the text the endophorics will used more. The employed endophorics are *chapter, example, noted*.

Although interactional markers were employed less frequently than interactive markers, the total types were recognizable with a total of 27 types reflected in 67 tokens. The most common type is the hedge, where they are used to engage the reader with author's knowledge rather than facts (Hyland, 2005). The types of hedges were 11 types with 33 tokens. Some of them *indicate, perhaps, possible, may, could, likely, possible, estimate, might*.

On the other hand, boosters were utilized by 7 types and 12 tokens. The boosters show the confidence of the writer in stating narrowed perspectives

about the context (Hyland, 2005). For instance, *indeed, should, prove, show, determine, essential*.

The less frequent employed markers were reflected in attitude markers with 5 types and 9 tokens, in self-mention markers with 2 types and higher number of tokens, which is 9. As well as, engagement markers, which are important to be seen in a text, involve the reader from the writer's perspective, contributing 2 types with 3 tokens. The engagement markers from the analyzed thesis conclusions of Engineering discipline are *note* and *consider*. However, the attitude markers help in elaborating the writer's attitude using specific verbs, adverbs and adjectives. Some of the examples are *important, must, correctly, hopefully*.

Surprisingly, the results of the Engineering thesis conclusions of the EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background are identical to the Business thesis conclusions of EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background. The most frequent main type are the interactive markers, adding to that, transitions were the most common type and from the interactional markers the hedges were the most frequent type. These results are also aligned with other studies like Binmahboob (2022) and Al-Zubeiry (2019).

4.2.4 Engineering - Arabic Linguistic Background

Table (11) presents the data of MA thesis conclusions of EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background in using metadiscourse markers. The EFL learners are specialized in Engineering discipline. A parallel noticeable result in the use of interactive markers more than interactional markers. A total of 47 types of interactive markers were found in the analyzed thesis conclusions with 273 tokens and a total of 25 types of interactional markers with 39 tokens.

The interactive markers support the consistency and the flow of the ideas in a discourse.

Table (11): Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Engineering Thesis Conclusions of EFL learners from Arabic Linguistic Background

Word List	Types	Tokens
Total	72	312
Announce goals (frame markers)	2	3
Attitude marker	2	4
Code gloss	4	8
boosters	10	13
Endophoric	3	7
Evidential	7	52
Hedge	11	20
Label stage (frame markers)	2	7
transitions	17	158
self-mention	2	2
Sequencing (frame markers)	11	31
Topic shift (frame markers)	1	7

Interestingly, the transitions markers were applied by 17 types with 158 tokens and frame markers were found with 16 types contributing 48 tokens. The slight difference between the two types shows the effective relations between the ideas by sequencing and labelling the stages of the text. Some examples of the transitions are *since, while, so, moreover, hence, leads to, and, thus, while, yet*.

Adding to that, examples of frame markers are well, in conclusion, overall, subsequently. The third frequent type is the evidential, with a total of 7 types represented by 52 tokens, which is higher than the frame markers. The evidentials support the text's ideas since they refer to other sources in order to achieve persuasiveness (Williams, 2010). Some of the evidentials pointed

from the analyzed thesis conclusions are *research, studies, according to, shows, established, found that*.

Th endophorics and code glosses were rarely found in Engineering thesis conclusions. A total of 4 types and 8 tokens of code glosses and a total of 3 types and 7 tokens of endophorics. As mentioned above, code glosses help in extending the meaning of the ideas discussed in the discourse like giving examples and the knowledge of the writer about the context. Some of them are *such as, that is, specifically*. As for the endophorics, they direct the reader to have a wider view of the content and the details like refereeing to figures, tables and sections. The 3 types from the Engineering MA conclusions are *chapter, section* and *noted*.

The implementation of the interactional markers in the Engineering thesis conclusions of EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background is less than the interactive markers, which is comparable to previously analyzed tables. In addition, the frequent application of hedges as the third frequent type is similar to table (9), which discusses the data of EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background in the Business discipline. The hedges help the writer in involving the reader reasoning more than certainty (Hyland, 2005). However, the hedges were noted in 11 types with 20 tokens. Some of them are *almost, could, frequently, may estimate, might, approximately, indicate*.

Surprisingly, the frequency of boosters was nearly the same as hedges with a total of 10 types reflecting 13 tokens. According to Hyland (2005), “The balance of hedges and boosters in a text thus indicates to what extent the writer is willing to entertain alternatives and so plays an important role in conveying commitment to text content and respect for readers.”

Although the presence of attitude markers and self-mentions was low, the engagement markers were not seen at all, which is like table (9) data. The Engineering thesis conclusions from Arabic linguistic background implemented 2 types of attitude markers with 4 tokens. Furthermore, attitude markers were used to express the writer's arguments about certain context with considering how to convince the reader. The attitude markers employed in the analyzed conclusions are *even* and *fortunately*. However, the result of low occurrence of attitude markers is the opposite of Duruk (2017), where the attitude markers were found more than other types of interactional markers. As for the self-mention markers, they are found to prove the existence of the writer in the discourse. The used self-mention markers are *my* and *I*.

To sum up, the results of table (11) are aligned with all the tables regarding the higher frequency of interactive markers, but in contrast the second frequent type in general is the frame marker and then the hedges. This result is like table (9), which presented data of EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background in the Business discipline.

4.2.5 Linguistics and Literature - Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

Linguistics and Literature discipline presents the highest total of tokens in using metadiscourse markers, but not the highest amount of metadiscourse markers because the business discipline of non-Arabic linguistic group showed a higher score in the using the types of markers. Table (12) shows a total of 83 types with 478 tokens. The total interactive marker types 50 contributed 355 tokens, which is the highest of all tables. It also represents 33 types of interactional markers with 123 tokens.

Table (12): Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Linguistics and Literature Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Non-Arabic Linguistic Background

Word List	Types	Tokens
Total	83	478
Attitude marker	4	12
Code gloss	3	6
boosters	11	20
Endophoric	6	21
Evidential	6	12
Hedge	9	31
Label stage (frame markers)	1	1
transitions	20	271
self-mention	4	53
engagement markers	5	7
Sequencing (frame markers)	12	38
Topic shift (frame markers)	2	6

To begin with, the frequent interactive markers are the transitions, which is identical to all the analyzed tables. This highlights the importance of implementing transition markers construing a well-written discourse. In some cases, the unusual use of transition could lead to misunderstandings and affect the flow of the text.

The total transition types are 20 with 271 tokens. Transitions in this table are the highest among all the tables. This conclusion can associate to the word count, which is 4921, and it is the highest as well in the six groups. Some of the examples are *though, moreover, and, similarly, yet, also, but, so, although, however, thereby, hence*.

The second frequent interactive markers are the frame markers. They are reflected in 15 types with 45 tokens. Some of the frame markers employed are *overall, well, finally, fourth, with regard to, last, secondly, next*. Hence, frame

markers are effective when they are applied accurately in text like sequencing and stating the ideas (Hyland, 2005).

The types of endophorics and evidential were equivalent by 6 types, but the endophorics have a higher number of tokens, which is 21, and the evidentials are reflected in 12 tokens. Some of the endophorics from the conclusions analyzed are *figure, see, chapter, page, noted*. In addition, some of the evidentials are *said, literature, argues, proves*. Both types are essential because endophorics will guide the reader to information mentioned in the text, while the evidentials will assist the reader to have a wider understanding about the topic from other sources (Liao, 2020).

However, the less frequent interactive markers are the code glosses, and they are less used in both types of metadiscourse markers. They were found with 3 types and 6 tokens. The used code glosses are *for example, specifically, namely*.

The interactional markers of EFL learners' MA thesis conclusions in the Linguistic and Literature discipline from non-Arabic linguistic background show a lower frequency of 33 types and 123 tokens. Remarkably, the booster markers are the highest types used in the analyzed conclusions. The use of booster is essential because "It strengthens the speaker's argument by directing the audience into the same conclusion as the speaker has (Kuswoyo & Siregar (2019)".

Furthermore, the second frequent interactional markers are the hedges, a total of 9 types and 31 tokens. The hedges are important to be included in a text to express the writer's viewpoint. Some of the hedges *are likely, often, could, might, would, perhaps*. Interestingly, self-mention markers have the second

highest number of tokens, which is 53, after the transition. This articulates the effective presence of the writers in the conclusion chapter. It also aids in building a positive relationship between the writer and the reader. The pointed types of self-mention are *I, we, our*, and *my*.

Moreover, the attitude markers were utilized by 4 types with 12 tokens, and the engagement markers were reflected by 5 types and 7 tokens. The attitude markers are effective to support the writer's perspective towards the topic and engagement markers make the presence of the reader in the text clear. Both categories help in building good interaction between the writer and reader. Some of the attitude markers are *apparent, must, unfortunately, even*. Adding to that, some examples of engagement markers are *us, your, consider, one's*.

The table of Linguistic and Literature EFL learners with non-Arabic linguistic background shows that this group scored higher than others regarding tokens in interactive metadiscourse markers and in self-mention, which is in the interactional markers. This reflects the high achievement level of EFL learners specializing in Linguistic and Literature discipline. It also represents that this group have an advanced level in employing English vocabulary and transitions words (metadiscourse markers).

4.2.6 Linguistics and Literature Arabic Linguistic Background

Table (13) demonstrates the analysis of MA conclusion of EFL learners from Arabic linguistic background in the Linguistic and Literature discipline. Total metadiscourse markers is nine and the unused type is the engagement markers from the interactional markers. However, this group shows a total of 50 types from interactive markers with a total of 300 tokens. With regard to interactional markers, a total of 25 types with 39 tokens were implemented. This result has been seen among all groups, where the interactive markers are

more frequent than interactional markers. This indicates that interactive markers are more effective than interactional markers because they assist the writer in building the intended ideas in a logical and coherent manner.

Table (13): Functions and Frequencies of Metadiscourse Markers in Linguistics and Literature Thesis Conclusions of EFL leaners from Arabic Linguistic Background

Word List	Types	Tokens
Total	75	352
Attitude marker	3	7
Code gloss	5	10
boosters	8	17
Endophoric	3	6
Evidential	10	20
Hedge	12	23
Label stage (frame markers)	3	6
transitions	19	220
self-mention	2	5
Sequencing (frame markers)	9	35
Topic shift (frame markers)	1	3

To start with, transition markers are the highest frequent markers in this group with a total of 19 types contributing 220 tokens. According to Hyland (2005), the inclusion of transitions supports the reader to recognize the relationships between the ideas in the text. For instance, comparing between the ideas, elaborating some arguments, and being exposed to conclusions. Some of the transitions found in the analyzed conclusions are *consequently, thus, while, and, on the other hand, moreover, furthermore, also, as a result, whereas, accordingly*.

The second frequent type is the frame marker. A total of 13 types with 44 tokens were found in the conclusions. The frame markers in this group were

implemented by three types only. The announce goals, like (my purpose, the aim, I would like to) were not used at all. Furthermore, the frame markers help in drawing the reader's attention to the text's phases. For example, *first, second, to sum up, in conclusion, finally, well.*

The next frequent type from the interactive markers are the evidentials, 10 types with 20 tokens were found. Hence, the evidentials were used to strengthen the writers' arguments and to persuade the audience (Abusalim et al., 2022). Some of the evidentials are *argue, literature, studies, research, believe, found that, according to.*

To move on with the less frequent interactive markers, code glosses were found in 5 types and 10 tokens endophorics with 3 types and 6 tokens. This reflects the unnecessary need to add information or to refer to figures and more details. Nevertheless, in the conclusion chapter writers sum up their results and answers to the questions. In this case the use of endophorics and code glosses is less effective. Code glosses were used in the texts are *in other words, for example, for instance, such as. As for the endophorics: chapter, see, and section*.

The interactional markers in this group scored 25 types with 39 tokens. The only unused type is the engagement marker, which can be seen in tables (9) and (11). The most implemented interactional markers are the hedges, which like all the previously analyzed except table (12). However, the hedges in this group were recognized by 12 types and 23 tokens. Accordingly, hedges reflect the partial commitment of the writer about the context (Abusalim et al., 2022). Some examples of hedges from the analyzed conclusions are *might, generally, mostly, frequently, often, sometimes, in general.*

The second frequent interactional markers are the boosters, with a total of 8 types resulting in 17 tokens. Furthermore, boosters are used to express the writers' commitment in narrowing the possible arguments (Mawlood et al., 2024). The presence of boosters is important in discussing facts and obvious conclusions. Examples of boosters are *the fact that, know, obvious, never*.

Moving to the least frequent types are the attitude markers, which include 3 types and 7 tokens, and the self-mentions have 2 types with 5 tokens. Both types help in raising the involvement of the reader in the discourse by using words like *hopefully, interestingly, surprisingly*. Adding to that the of self-mentions, which are pronouns, engage the reader with writer's situation, experiences and perspectives towards the topic. The attitude markers that were employed are *prefer, important, always*. As for the self-mentions *I* and *we*.

To conclude, the data of the EFL learners' MA thesis conclusions from Arabic linguistic background contributes that the results like other tables which demonstrated higher occurrence of interactive markers, especially transitions, and hedges markers from the interactional markers. This concludes that interactive markers are highly required in constructing a well written discourse.

4.2.7 Similarities and Differences of the Types and Tokens of Metadiscourse Markers

The above tables demonstrate the analysis of types and tokens of metadiscourse markers in MA conclusions of EFL learners from three disciplines Business, Engineering and Linguistics and Literature from Arabic linguistic background and non-Arabic linguistic background. The tables from (8) to (13) answer the second question of this study which investigates the

frequent and the least metadiscourse marker in three disciplines with different linguistic background and the third question of the study which highlights the relationship between the linguistic background, the academic discipline and the inclusion of metadiscourse markers.

The next part in this study will discuss the similarities and differences between the six groups regarding types and token.

- **Similarities between the Six Groups**

The six tables above all share the two main types of metadiscourse markers, which are interactive and interactional. In addition to the sub-types of each metadiscourse markers. The interactive markers are the most frequent main type in all the groups. In more detail, transition markers, which is a type of interactive markers, is the most used type among all the groups. This indicates the coherence and clarity of written discourse, especially academic writing.

As for the interactional markers, hedges were the most employed interactional markers in all the tables except table (12) which is of EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background in the Linguistic and Literature discipline. This group scored higher in boosters. Therefore, this reflects the effective use of them in showing the writers' reasoning about certain assertions.

- **Differences between the Six Groups**

The previously analyzed tables have common elements, as well as distinct elements. To begin with, the groups have different totals of types and tokens. For instance, the Linguistic and Literature discipline from non-Arabic linguistic background has 8 types of metadiscourse markers and 478 tokens, while the Engineering discipline of non-Arabic linguistic background has 63

types reflecting in 269 tokens. This result could be linked to the word count, sentence count, lexical profile and proficiency percentage.

In addition, the less frequently used markers vary from group to group. For example, Business discipline from non-Arabic discipline has endophorics as the less used markers. While Linguistics and Literature discipline has the code glosses as the least employed markers. Like the rest of the groups, they share the self-mention markers as less frequent markers.

A noticeable difference between the non-Arabic linguistic background groups and the Arabic linguistic background groups, the engagement markers were not used at all in the discipline of the Arabic linguistic background groups. The nonexistence of engagement markers can lead to mis-involving the reader with the written discourse. Hyland (2005) states "Engagement markers explicitly address readers to selectively focus their attention or to include them in the text (100)". In addition, the use of self-mentions in the Linguistic and Literature discipline from non-Arabic linguistic background has a very high score of 53 tokens.

To sum up, the results of the data analyzed reveal a clear reliance on using interactive markers among all tables. Furthermore, the academic discipline and the linguistic background influence the implementation of specific types and tokens of metadiscourse markers. Thus, highlighting the similarities and differences will help in designing teaching materials to improve EFL learners' writing skills.

The noticeable results of the analyzed thesis conclusions reveal that the Business discipline from non-Arabic linguistic background has the highest score of metadiscourse markers, which is 86 types. As the Linguistic and

Literature discipline from Arabic linguistic background and non-Arabic linguistic group have the highest frequency of tokens (478). The high frequency of tokens in the Linguistic and Literature discipline in both groups reflects the high exposure to English vocabulary and to academic writing skills richness. Furthermore, the less used types and tokens were by the Engineering discipline from non-Arabic linguistic background, which were 63 types and 269 tokens. As can be seen in table (14).

Table (14): Summary of Results - Discipline and Metadiscourse Markers

Most Used Metadiscourse Markers	Business – Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	86 types
Less Used Metadiscourse Markers	Engineering - Non-Arabic Linguistic Background	63 types

Therefore, the results of analyzing the types and tokens address the second question, which is about the most and less frequent metadiscourse markers in thesis conclusions of EFL learners from Business, Engineering and Linguistics and Literature disciplines.

The most frequent types of interactive markers are transitions, and the hedges from the interactional markers. This result is like Mawlood et al., (2024) results where the use of hedges was the highest among political science and religious studies disciplines. In addition, Alharbi (2021) has also found that transitions and hedges are the most used markers in the MA dissertations from the applied linguistic discipline.

As for the less frequent types of interactive markers are the endophorics, whereas from the interactional marker are the engagement markers. This

result is the opposite of Prasetyanti et al. (2023), where the engagement markers were the most frequent ones in the linguistic discipline. Therefore, the results revealed that the implementation of metadiscourse markers differ based on the linguistic background, as well as disciplines regarding the linguistic exposure to the foreign language.

4.3 The Correlation Between Lexical and Text Complexity and Metadiscourse Markers

4.3.1 Lexical and Text Complexity and Metadiscourse Markers

Table (15) addresses the lexical profiles and the use of metadiscourse markers of the 60 thesis conclusions from the six groups in three disciplines. Based on the data presented in the table, the higher application of types and tokens of metadiscourse markers is not reflected by a higher lexical profile.

Table (15): Thesis Conclusions Lexical Profile and Functions of Metadiscourse Markers

Thesis Conclusions	Lexical Profile	Types	Tokens
Business (Arabic Linguistic Background)	C2	69	322
Business (Non-Arabic Linguistic Background)	C2+	86	351
Engineering (Arabic Linguistic Background)	C1+	72	312
Engineering (Non-Arabic Linguistic Background)	C2+	63	269
English Language and Literature (Arabic Linguistic Background)	C2	75	352
English Language and Literature (Non-Arabic Linguistic Background)	C2+	83	478

On the one hand, thesis conclusions from Engineering discipline with non-Arabic linguistic background have the highest lexical profile (C2+) and the lowest totals of types (63) and tokens (269). On the other hand, thesis conclusions from Business discipline with non-Arabic linguistic background have the same lexical profile (C2+) with the highest total of metadiscourse marker types. Therefore, the relationship between lexical profile and functions of metadiscourse markers is not seen among the analyzed thesis conclusions.

4.3.2 Regression Analysis of Level of Texts and the Use of Metadiscourse Markers

The data presented in table (16) reflect the results of ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) to examine the correlation between the types of metadiscourse markers found in the 60-thesis conclusions from the three disciplines. The dependent variable is the ("Type"), and the predicator is the ("Level") of the texts.

Table (16): Regression Analysis of ("Type") and ("Level")

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.510	1	2.510	.027	.877[b]
	Residual	370.824	4	92.706		
	Total	373.333	5			

a. Dependent Variable: Type

b. Predictors: (Constant), Level

The sum of squares for regression (2.510) reflects the variance of the predicator (“Level) which is reflected by the residual sum of squares (370.824). The F-statistic is 0.027, and the p-value is 0.877. This is a high p-value which indicates that there is no statistically significant correlation between the predictor variable ("Level") and the dependent variable ("Type"). The model provides a poor fit to the data.

Table (17) shows the results of ANOVA to highlight the relationship between tokens (frequencies) of metadiscourse markers and level of texts. The (“Token”) is the dependent variable, whereas the (“Level”) of text is the predicator.

Table (17): Regression Analysis of ("Token") and ("Level")

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	75.922	1	75.922	.012	.918[b]
	Residual	25059.412	4	6264.853		
	Total	25135.333	5			

a. Dependent Variable: Token

b. Predictors: (Constant), Level

The provided ANOVA tables display the results of two separate regression analyses, each examining the relationships between a dependent variable (Type and token) and a single predictor variable ("Level"). Similar to Table 1, the regression model in Table 2 presents a slight variance in the dependent

variable ("Token"). The sum of squares for regression (75.922) is reflected by the residual sum of squares (25059.412).

The F-statistic is 0.012, and the p-value is 0.918. This remarkably high p-value indicates a lack of statistically significant relationship between the ("Level") and ("Token"). The model provides a poor fit to the data.

Both ANOVA tables reveal that the predictor variable "Level" does not significantly predict either "Type" or "Token." This indicates that other factors are likely responsible for the variance observed in both dependent variables (type and token).

4.4 Summary

Chapter four presented the process of analyzing thesis conclusions from three disciplines: Business, Engineering and Linguistics and Literature. To begin with, section (4.1) provides a general analysis about the conclusions regarding their lexical characteristics, such as the lexical profile, word count, sentence count and proficiency percentage. This is to help the readers of this study to draw the connections based on the general characteristics of the text and then link them to the use of metadiscourse markers. This section also answers the first of the study.

To move on with the next section (4.2), it addresses the answers for questions number two and three of this study. First, the frequent and least used metadiscourse markers. The interactive markers were the highest used ones in all the groups, specifically transitions. As for the less used ones in the interactive markers, the endophorics. In addition, in the interactional markers the hedges were the most used ones, and the engagement markers were the least frequent markers. Second, the third question answer can be noted form

the tables from (8) to (13), as there is no relationship between the linguistic background, academic discipline and the use of metadiscourse marker.

Regarding the first 3 questions of this study, which is about the relationship between the linguistic background and academic discipline in employing metadiscourse markers, the groups from non-Arabic linguistic background showed higher lexical profiles but varies in using metadiscourse markers. For instance, EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background in Business discipline showed the highest total of metadiscourse types, while EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background showed the least used types. From the previous results, a generalization based on the use of metadiscourse markers linguistic background and discipline cannot be definitive because it refers to writers' style of writing, as well as academic level.

Remarkably, the answer to question number four of this study, which studies the correlation between the lexical and complexity and use of metadiscourse markers, is addressed in section 4.3 by the regression ANOVA analysis using SPSS. The results of the ANOVA suggested that the level of text is not significantly related to the functions and frequencies (types and tokens) of metadiscourse markers.

To conclude, the questions of this study have been explicitly answered by analyzing and discussing the results of the analyzed thesis conclusion based on their lexical characteristics, and the categories and functions of metadiscourse markers.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

5.0 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the results of the study in relation to the questions addressed in the introduction chapter. The first section will present the results found based on the analysis on the 60 thesis conclusions written by EFL learners from three disciplines: Business, Engineering and Linguistics and Literature. After presenting the findings of this study, the limitations faced in the process of preparing this study will be addressed and recommendations for further research based on the limitations will be provided.

5.1 Summary of the Findings

This study has examined the effective role of metadiscourse markers in enhancing the relationship between the reader and the writer by employing the two main categories of metadiscourse markers, which are interactive and interactional markers. To begin with, interactive markers, which are used to maintain good coherence and to guide the reader through the sequence and the links between the ideas in the text (Hyland, 2005). The second main category is the interactional markers, where the writers express their attitudes in a persuasive situation to engage the reader and enhance a positive interaction (Liao, 2020).

Furthermore, the results of this study revealed that some metadiscourse markers are being implemented more than others, such as transitions, hedges and frame markers. This result highlights the need to foster EFL learners at the MA level to use other sub-categories of metadiscourse markers, such as

the boosters, code glosses, self-mention, engagement markers, attitude markers, evidentials and endophorics.

The results of the present study are summarized in five points. In regard to the level of texts, first, the lexical profile and proficiency percentage of the text are not correlated to the word count and sentence count. In addition, the linguistic background has a positive impact on the lexical profile. In more detail, the three groups from non-Arabic linguistic backgrounds from the three disciplines scored higher lexical profiles. Second, regarding the employment metadiscourse markers, the interactive markers are used more than interactional markers. This result is linked to other studies, like Al-Rubaye (2015), Yea et al., (2020), Binmahboob (2022). Third, the transition markers are the highest among the six groups and engagement markers and the least used ones. Fourth, the use of metadiscourse markers has no significant relationship with discipline or linguistic background. Fifth, there is no definitive correlation between the level of text and implementation of metadiscourse markers regarding types and tokens.

The analysis and findings of the current study have explicitly answered the required questions which will make positive contribution to literature. Therefore, question number one addressed a general analysis with the highest lexical profile and it concludes that EFL learners from non-Arabic linguistic background have higher level of C2+. This can be seen in section (4.1). Moving to question number two, it shed light on the most used markers and the least used one to assure that MA EFL learners focus on all the types of metadiscourse marker to enrich their thesis conclusions. As for question number three, it showed that the use of metadsicourse markers is slightly related to linguistic background, but it is not an essential aspect. Therefore,

the implementation of metadiscourse depends on the writing style of the EFL learner. The answers of question number two and three can be found in section (4.2). Finally, the ANOVA analysis showed precise results that the frequencies and functions of metadiscourse markers are not related to the level of text. The SPSS regression analysis can be seen in section (4.3).

5.2 Limitations of the Study

The process of completing the current study has some limitations to be taken into consideration to build up adequate analyses and conclusions. To begin with, the sample of the study, which is 60 thesis conclusions, is not enough to draw general conclusions among the three disciplines (Business, Engineering, Linguistics and Literature). However, this point is related to the selected part of the thesis. The conclusion chapter is a chunk of the whole paper where the writer summarizes the main points of the thesis. Thus, generalizations cannot be assigned based on one analyzed chapter because writers cannot include some types of the metadiscourse markers. For instance, the use of self-mention markers (pronouns) is limited because expressing opinions is applicable on certain topics of theses. A similar limitation regarding the corpus size can be found in Kuswoyo & Siregar (2019) study.

Another point limiting the generalizations is the number of disciplines and the relationship between them. Each of them has its own concepts and vocabulary, as well as writing style. In other words, Linguistics and Literature might have a larger exposure to the application of metadiscourse markers since they are also required in speeches.

In addition, one of the limitations faced is the model of metadiscourse markers assigned in the electronic tool (Text Inspector). The electronic tool analyses

the data according to Hyland (2004) metadiscourse markers model, while this study implemented Hyland (2005) model. Therefore, the sub-categories labels were different where the researcher needed to make some changes in the analysis tables. This point can be seen in section 3.4.

Lastly, the process of finding MA theses written by EFL learners with non-Arabic linguistic background was challenging since the only factor to depend on is their names. As you noticed, theses written by EFL learners with Arabic linguistic background were collected from universities in the Kingdom Bahrain, and others were possessed from universities out of Kingdom of Bahrain.

5.3 Recommendations for Further Research

The current study examined the implementation of metadiscourse markers by EFL learners with Arabic and non-Arabic linguistic backgrounds, which has rarely been studied in literature. Most of the studies analyze the use of metadiscourse markers by natives and non-natives, non-native within the same linguistic background, or genre written in two languages such as Alotaibi (2015) analysis. Regarding the scope of analysis, the researcher of the present study recommends some points to be taken into consideration for future research on similar topics.

One suggestion is to perform a specific analysis on EFL learners from Kingdom of Bahrain and from one specific linguistic background out of Bahrain can be accomplished through following similar procedures. Another suggestion is analyzing a whole thesis written by an EFL learner would be more effective to draw some conclusions if the sample from each discipline was higher than 20. Therefore, researchers can also choose more disciplines

to collect the corpus from. For instance, the study that was done by Hyland and Jiang (2018) among four disciplines: biology, sociology, electrical engineering and applied linguistics.

On the other hand, an experimental study can be completed to assess the changes in using metadiscourse markers, for example analyzing research paper at the bachelor's degree and master's degree for the same EFL learner. In addition, qualitative data can be composed through interviewing EFL learners to assess their understanding about metadiscourse and on this data some suggestions regarding instructional methods can be assigned.

In summary, metadiscourse markers are devices implemented in written and spoken discourse to facilitate interaction with the audience and maintain the clarity and coherence of the discourse. Regardless the variations were found in the analyzed data, a greater use of metadiscourse markers is needed especially on the less frequent types, such as engagement markers and code glosses. Nevertheless, educators must take into consideration the effectiveness of employing metadiscourse in all types of genres whether persuasive essays, research papers or dissertations. By overcoming the limitations and applying the recommendations, a better understanding about enriching the curriculums with metadiscourse will be spread among EFL educators.

References

Abdi, R. (2011). Metadiscourse strategies in research articles: A study of the differences across subsections. *Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)*, *30*(1), 1-16.

Abusalim, N., Zidouni, S., Alghazo, S., Rababah, G., & Rayyan, M. (2022). Textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in political discourse: A case study. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *9*(1), 2124683.

Ädel, A., & Mauranen, A. (2010). Metadiscourse: Diverse and divided perspectives. *Nordic journal of English studies*, *9*(2), 1-11.

Akoto, Y., & Afful, A. (2020). Variations in metadiscourse use in English Language introduction and literature review thesis chapters. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, *4*(2), 390-408.

Albalat-Mascarell, A. (2023). Approaches to the analysis of metadiscourse features in political discourse. *Complutense Journal of English Studies*, *31*, 1-11.

Alharbi, S. H. (2021). An Investigation of Metadiscourse Features in Applied Linguistics Academic Research Articles and Master's Dissertations. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *12*(1), 46-54.

Alotaibi, H. (2015). Metadiscourse in Arabic and English research article abstracts. *World Journal of English Language*, *5*(2), 1.

Al-Rubaye, M. H. K. (2015). *Metadiscourse in the academic writing of EFL and ESL Arabic-speaking Iraqi graduate students*. Missouri State University.

Al-Zubeiry, H. (2019). Metadiscourse devices in English scientific research articles written by native and non-native speakers of English. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *11*(1), 46-61.

Bal-Gezegin, B., & Baş, M. (2020). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A comparison of research articles and book reviews. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 6*(1), 45-62.

Bax, S., Nakatsuhara, F., & Waller, D. (2019). Researching L2 writers' use of metadiscourse markers at intermediate and advanced levels. *System*, *83*, 79-95.

Beghtol, C. (2001). The concept of genre and its characteristics. *Bulletin of the American society for information science and technology*, *27*(2), 19-17.

Binmahboob, T. (2022). The use of metadiscourse by Saudi and British authors: A focus on applied linguistics discipline. *English Language Teaching*, *15*(2), 78-89.

Chou, I., Li, W., & Liu, K. (2023). Representation of interactional metadiscourse in translated and native English: A corpus-assisted study. *Plos one*, *18*(7), e0284849.

Crismore, A. (1982). *The Metadiscourse Component: Understanding Writing about Reading Directives.*

Crismore, A. (1983). Metadiscourse: What it is and how it is used in school and non-school social science texts. *Center for the Study of Reading Technical Report; no. 273*.

Crismore, A. (1984). The rhetoric of textbooks: Metadiscourse. *J. Curriculum Studies*, *16*(3), 279-296.

Crismore, A. (1985). Metadiscourse in social studies texts. *Center for the Study of Reading Technical Report; no. 366*.

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.

Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008). The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: A cross-linguistic study of newspaper discourse. *Journal of pragmatics*, *40*(1), 95-113.

Duruk, E. (2017). Analysis of metadiscourse markers in academic written discourse produced by Turkish researchers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *13*(1), 01-09.

Erarslan, A. (2021). Correlation between Metadiscourse, Lexical Complexity, Readability and Writing Performance in EFL University Students' Research-Based Essays. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, *9*, 238-254.

Estaji, M., & Vafaeimehr, R. (2015). A Comparative Analysis of Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in the Introduction and Conclusion Sections of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Research Papers. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *3*(1), 37-56.

Farahani, M. (2020). Metadiscourse in academic written and spoken English: a comparative corpus-based inquiry. *Research in Language (RiL)*, *18*(3), 319-341.

Hussein, K. A., Khalil, J. A., & Abbas, N.F. (2018). Metadiscourse Markers in Master Thesis Abstracts of American and Iraqi English Theses. *Arab World English Journal, 9* (4),347-360.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London; New York: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse studies*, *7*(2), 173-192.

Hyland, K. (2017). Metadiscourse: What is it and where is it going?. *Journal of pragmatics*, *113*, 16-29.

Hyland, K. (2022). Preface: Nouns, metadiscourse and academic writing. In *Metadiscursive Nouns: Interaction and Persuasion in Disciplinary Writing*. Routledge.

Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (2018). "In this paper we suggest": Changing patterns of disciplinary metadiscourse. *English for specific purposes*, *51*, 18-30.

Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (2020). Text-organizing metadiscourse: Tracking changes in rhetorical persuasion. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, *21*(1), 137-164.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied linguistics*, *25*(2), 156-177.

Hyland, K., Wang, W., & Jiang, F. K. (2022). Metadiscourse across languages and genres: An overview. *Lingua*, *265*, 103205.

Kashiha, H. (2022). On persuasive strategies: Metadiscourse practices in political speeches. *Discourse and Interaction*, *15*(1), 77-100.

Keshavarz, M. H., & Kheirieh, Z. (2011). Metadiscourse elements in English research articles written by native English and non-native Iranian writers in applied linguistics and civil engineering. *Journal of English Studies*, *1*(3), 3-15.

Kuswoyo, H., & Siregar, R. A. (2019). Interpersonal metadiscourse markers as persuasive strategies in oral business presentation. *Lingua Cultura*, *13*(4), 297-304.

Liao, J. (2020). Metadiscourse, cohesion, and engagement in L2 written discourse. *Languages*, *5*(2), 25.

Mawlood, B., Tahriri, A., & Razmjoo, S. A. (2024). Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in the Discussion and Conclusion Sections of Research Papers in Political Science and Religious Studies. *Quarterly Scientific Journal of Language Research, 15* (49), 221-242.

Nugrahani, V. E., & Bram, B. (2020). Metadiscourse markers in scientific journal articles. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, *6*(1), 1-16.

Ötügen, R., Takkaç, M., & YAĞIZ, O. (2021). Genre analysis in ESP: A review of move analysis models and metadiscourse taxonomies. *e-Kafkas Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(1), 67-85.

Prasetyanti, D. C., Tongpoon-Patanasorn, A., & Sahan, A. (2023, June). Analyzing Metadiscourse Markers in Introduction Chapters of Dissertation in Various Disciplines. In *1st Lawang Sewu International Symposium on Humanities and Social Sciences 2022 (LEWIS 2022)* (pp. 386-398). Atlantis Press.

Şen, E. (2021). Metadiscourse: A review of definitions, models and analyses. *Journal of Cultural Studies*, (8), 275-299.

Tashi, T. (2019). Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse: What is it and Should it be Taught in EFL Writing Classrooms?. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, *1*(3), 43-48.

Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in Academic Writing: Learning to Argue with the Reader. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 58-78.

Vande Kopple, W.J. (1997) *Refining and applying views of metadiscourse*.

Williams, M. (2010). Translating Metadiscourse: An Explanatory Analysisof Problems in Students' Work. *Mutatis Mutandis. Revista Latinoamericana de Traducción*, *3*(1), 73-90.

Wongsa, J., Chuenchaichon, Y., & Suwannasom, T. (2024). A Comparison of Metadiscourse Markers Used in English Research Article Introduction and Literature Review Sections Across Two Disciplines. *Journal of Community Development Research (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, *17*(1), 74-88.

Yea, L. Y., Othman, J., & Wei, L. J. (2020). The use of metadiscourse in academic writing by Malaysian first-year ESL doctoral students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(1), 271-282.

Appendices

Appendix (1): A Letter to the Supervisor of this Study to use MA Theses from University of Bahrain

Dear Dr. Nuri Ageli

I am a postgraduate student (Master in Applied English Language Studies) from college of Arts.

I am in the process of preparing my thesis, which is titled as (An Analysis of the Use of Metadiscourse Markers in Master Theses of Selected Genres).

For my data analysis, I will need MA theses of graduate students from the University of Bahrain from different genres. I will just count and analyze the number of using Metadiscourse markers, which are similar to transition words, with no critiquing or mentioning students' names. The analysis will be on the theses from the University of Bahrain as finding the most frequent metadiscourse markers. The reason of choosing UOB students' theses is due to the need to analyze non-native speakers' use of metadiscourse markers.

I need your permission to collect random theses (around 60 or more) from different disciplines from the University Library to do my analysis.

Sara Ghaleb Beshara
ID: 20132267
Contact No.: 33276777

Appendix (2): A letter to the Chairperson of English Language and Literature Department to use MA Theses from University of Bahrain

Dear Dr. Ghada Ahmed Jassim

Chairperson of English Language and Literature Department

I am a postgraduate student (Master in Applied English Language Studies) from college of Arts.

I am in the process of preparing my thesis, which is titled as (An Analysis of the Use of Metadiscourse Markers in Master Theses of Selected Genres).

For my data analysis, I will need MA theses of graduate students from the University of Bahrain from different genres. I will just count and analyze the number of using Metadiscourse markers, which are similar to transition words, with no critiquing or mentioning students' names. The analysis will be on the theses from the University of Bahrain as finding the most frequent metadiscourse markers. The reason of choosing UOB students' theses is due to the need to analyze non-native speakers' use of metadiscourse markers.

I need your permission to collect random theses (around 60 or more) from different disciplines from the University Library to do my analysis.

Sara Ghaleb Beshara
ID: 20132267
Contact No.: 33276777

Appendix (3): A letter to the Vice President for Academic Programs & Graduate Studies to use MA Theses from University of Bahrain

Dear Dr. Mohammed Ridha Qader

Vice President for Academic Programs & Graduate Studies

I am a postgraduate student (Master in Applied English Language Studies) from college of Arts.

I am in the process of preparing my thesis, which is titled as (An Analysis of the Use of Metadiscourse Markers in Master Theses of Selected Genres).

For my data analysis, I will need MA theses of graduate students from the University of Bahrain from different genres. I will just count and analyze the number of using Metadiscourse markers, which are transition words, with no critiquing or mentioning students' names. The analysis will be on the theses from the University of Bahrain and native speakers' theses as a comparison of using the metadiscourse markers.

I need your permission to collect random theses (around 25 or more) from the University Library to do my analysis.

Sara Ghaleb Beshara

ID: 20132267

Contact No.: 33276777

ملخص البحث

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى إبراز دور روابط الخطاب في النصوص الأكاديمية في التخصصات المختلفة وهي إدارة الأعمال، الهندسة، واللغويات التطبيقية والآداب. تسلط هذه الدراسة الضوء على وظائف روابط الخطاب في ستين خاتمة من رسائل ماجستير كتبت من قبل متعلمي اللغة الأنجليزية، ثلاثون منهم لغتهم الأم هي اللغة العربية وثلاثون لغتهم الأم غير العربية. تم تحليل البيانات باستخدام البرنامج الألكتروني (Text Inspector) وباستخدام نموذج Hyland (2005) لروابط الخطاب. يساعد هذا البرنامج في تحليل مستوى النصوص وحساب الروابط المستخدمة بأنواعها العشر وعدد مرات تكرارها. لوحظ في النتائج ان روابط الخطاب التي تساعد على ربط وتسلسل الاكفار هي الاكثر استخداماً وبالأخص الانتقالات والسياقات التي تساعد على خفة إدعاءات الكاتب والاقل استخداماً الروابط التي تشير إلى اقسام معينة في النص والروابط التي تعزز دمج القارىء في النص. تساهم هذه النتائج في إبراز أهمية روابط الخطاب في الكتابة الأكاديمية التي تساعد على إشارك القارىء في النص.

جامعة البحرين

قسم اللغة الانجليزية وآدابها **كلية الآداب**

تحليل استخدام روابط الخطاب في رسائل الماجستير لأنواع مختارة من النصوص

أطروحة مقدمة كجزء من متطلبات الحصول على درجة الماجستير في الدراسات التطبيقية في اللغة النجليزية

إعداد:

ساره غالب حسن بشارة

20132267

إشراف:

د. نوري العجيلي

أستاذ مشارك

جامعة البحرين

مملكة البحرين

فبراير ٢٠٢٥