METADISCOURSE STATUS AND ITS DEVELOPMENT AT A GLANCE

Kamal Jahani
Islamic Azad University, Ahar Branch

ABSTRACT
Metadiscourse, playing a key role in organizing and providing persuasive writing, refers to the context of writing about a subject. This persuasive writing is based on norms of a discourse community. Metadiscourse strategies paved the way for understanding interactional features of text types or speech samples. It is expected that the writers can control and manage metadiscourse features in their writing to frame their messages. The present study aims to take a review of previously-conducted studies and look into the present status of the metadiscourse studies and finally present some of the gaps in studies which have been done up to now. Interestingly, eighteen studies were reviewed. A careful observation of the studies demonstrates that there are three major areas of metadiscourse-related studies including metadiscourse markers use in writing in English, cross-linguistic comparison of metadiscourse and cross-cultural comparison of metadiscourse features. In the same vein, the study introduces different metadiscourse categorizations such as Hyland's and Crismore's model and investigates the factors affecting their use. The purpose of the current study is to detect what happened in the past based on the metadiscouse and what can be considered in the future.

KEYWORDS: Discourse community, Metadiscourse, Metatext, Metatalk

INTRODUCTION
Using "self-reflective linguistic expressions referring to the evolving texts" (Hyland, 2004, p. 133), writers add interactional aspects of language to the informative content of their texts (Hyland, 2005). This aspect of language which allows the speaker, or writer, to organize his or her text is referred to as metadiscourse (Jiang & Hyland, 2016). Hyland (2005) defined metadiscourse as "the cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers as members of a particular community" (p.37).

In recent years, metadiscourse has been widely used to study the rhetorical patterns of both written and spoken texts. Particularly, metadiscourse merits more investigation as regards the way non-native-English speakers (NNESs) write in English, since inevitable dissimilarities in employment of metadiscourse have been witnessed between native English speakers (NESs) and NNESs by some scholars (Hyland, 2015b, 2016).

IJLLALW

The term metadiscourse was coined by Zellig Harris, an American linguist, in 1959. To clarify the meaning of the word "metadiscourse", it can be divided into two parts, namely *meta* and *discourse*. *Meta* comes from Greek meaning "beyond" and *discourse* means "communication" whether it is written or spoken. It is worth mentioning that the word "metadiscourse" can be interchangeably replaced with metatalk or metatext. Metadiscourse states that the writers perform beyond producing texts. According to Vande Kopple (2002) metadiscourse can be defined as discourse about discourse without dealing with propositional and referential/ideational aspects of the language. The rationale behind metadiscourse is to organize the discourse and develop the relationship between the authors and the readers. Through metadiscourse, the speakers and writers not only transfer and exchange information but also they demonstrate their attitudes, personalities and emotions. It is also considered to be an extra language to be used to frame the message, shape the text and establish membership in discourse community. Vande Kopple (1985) put forward a model named *Classification System* to classify metadiscourse as follows: **textual metadiscourse** both makes a relationship between aspects of ideational elements and helps the readers or listeners make sense of a text or speech sample. On the other hand, **interpersonal metadiscourse** directs the writers and speakers to display their personalities, attitude, etc. (Table. 1)

Table 1: Vande Kopples's Classification System for Metadiscourse (1985)

CATEGORY	FUNCTION
Text connectives	They show how parts of a text are connected to one another. they include sequencers (*first, second, in the second place*), reminders (*as I mentioned in chapter 2*), and topicalizers, which focus attention on the topic of a text segment (*with regard to, in connection with*).
Code glosses	They are used to help readers to grasp the writer's intended meaning. They are based on the writer's assessment of the reader's knowledge; these devices reward, explain, define, or clarify the sense of a usage.
Validity markers	They are used to express the writer's commitment to the probability of or truth of a statement. these include hedges (*perhaps, might, may*), emphatics (*clearly, undoubtedly*), and attributes which enhance a position (*according to Einstein*).
Narrator	They are used to inform readers of the source of the information presented- who said or wrote something (*according to Smith, the Prime Minister announced that*).
Illocution markers	They are used to make explicit the discourse acts the writer is performing at certain points (*to conclude, I hypothesis, to sum up, we predict*).
Attitude markers	They are used to express the writer's attitudes to the prpositional material he or she presents (*unfortunately, increasingly, I wish that, how awful that*).
Commentaries	They are used to address readers directly, drawing them into an implicit dialogue by commenting on the reader's probable mood or possible reaction to the text (*you will certainly agree that, you might want the third chapter first*).

Table 2 shows a revised form of the above-mentioned model developed by Crismore et al's. (1993). There are some modifications to be taken into account.

IJLLALW

International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World
(IJLLALW)
Volume 16 (1), September 2017; 9-19   *Jahani, K*
EISSN: 2289-2737 & ISSN: 2289-3245   *www.ijllalw.org*

Table 2: Crismore et al.'s Metadiscourse Categorization (1993)

CATEGORY	FUNCTION	EXAMPLES
Textual metadiscourse (textual markers)		
Logical connectives	Showing connections between ideas	*therefore, so, in addition, and*
Sequencers	Indicating sequence/ordering of material	*first, next, finally, 1, 2,3*
Reminders	Referring to earlier text material	*as we saw in chapter one*
Topicalizers	Indicating a shift in topic	*well, now we discuss*
Textual metadiscourse (interpretive markers)		
Code glosses	Explaining text material	*for example, that is*
Illocution markers	Naming the act performed	*to conclude, in sum, I predict*
Announcements	Announcing upcoming material	*in the next section*
Interpersonal metadiscourse		
Hedges	Showing uncertainty to the truth of assertion	*might; possible; likely*
Certainty markers	Expressing full commitment to assertion	*certainly; know; shows*
Attributers	Giving source/supporting information	*smith claims that ....*
Attitude markers	Displaying writer's affective values	*I hope/agree; surprisingly*
Commentary	Building relationship with reader	*you may not agree that*

However, in 2005 Hyland presented a more comprehensive model to study metadiscourse. He classifies metadiscourse markers into two major parts as follows in table 3.:

Table 3: Hyland's Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse (2005)

CATEGORY	FUNCTION	EXAMPLES
Interactive(helping to guide the reader through the text) (textual)		
Transitions	Expressing relations between main clauses	*in addition, but, thus, and*
Frame markers	Referring to discourse acts, sequences and stages	*finally, to conclude, my purpose is*
Endophoric markers	Referring to information in other parts of the text	*noted above, see figure, in section 2*
Evidentials	Referring to information from other texts	*according to x, z states*
Code glosses	Elaborating propisitional meaning	*namely, such as, in other words*
Interactional (involving the reader in the text) (interpersonal)		
Code glosses	Explaining text material	*for example, that is*
Illocution markers	Naming the act performed	*to conclude, in sum, I predict*
Announcements	Announcing upcoming material	*in the next section*
Interpersonal metadiscourse		
Hedges	Withholding commitment and open dialogue	*might, perhaps, possible, about*
Boosters	Emphasizing certainty and close dialogue	
Attitude markers	Expressing writer's attitude to proposition	*unfortunately, I agree, surprisingly*
Self-mentions	Explicit reference to authors	*I, we, me, our*
Engagement markers	Explicitly building relationship with reader	*consider, note, you can see*

Due to considering reader's knowledge, textual experiences, and processing needs, Hyland (2005) believes that all metadiscourse markers are interpersonal. This paper aims to take a

review of the studies which have been done so far regarding different contexts and aspects in metadiscourse.

STUDIES CARRIED OUT ON THE USE OF METADISCOURSE

Taking two academic fields including social sciences and natural sciences into account, Abdi (2002) examined how the writers use interpersonal metadiscourse to display their identity. Fifty five research articles were selected to be compared considering the use of HEDGES, EMPHATICS, ATTITUDE MARKERS in the discussion sections of the researcher articles. The frequency of these categories was in focus. Having analyzed the data, the researcher came to this point that the hedges and attitude markers were used more frequently in social sciences than that in natural sciences. Moreover, the use of hedges and emphatics was different in each discipline. Hedges were used considerably more than emphatics in both fields. Academic members or professors used more hedges than emphatics to demonstrate their findings. The results showed that interpersonal metadiscourse markers are worthy of presenting the identity. The study also demonstrated that there were several different cultural typologies for speakers of a language.

To answer the question whether language and discipline affect metadiscourse in academic communication or not, Dahl (2004) investigated writing in three different languages including English, Norwegian, and French and three disciplines, namely linguistics, economics, and medicine. One hundred and eighty research articles taken from the above-mentioned languages and disciplines were selected. The results showed that language can be considered as a variable in linguistics and economics. English language uses more metadiscourse markers than Norwegian does. However, English and Norwegian appeared to have a similar pattern. Moreover, metadiscourse markers in French were used less than those in English and Norwegian. With regard to medicine, the number of metadiscourse markers was small in three languages. Writers' cultures can be seen in English and Norwegian. Also, readers' culture can be seen in French.

Dafouz-Milne (2008) carried out research to examine how metadiscourse markers (textual and interpersonal markers) demonstrate persuasion in newspaper genre. Having selected the newspapers, the British *The Times* and the Spanish *El Paı́s*, the researcher studied twenty opinion columns written in English and twenty opinion columns written in Spanish. One of the aims of this study was to determine the frequency and distribution of metadiscourse markers. Another aim was to know how persuasion happens. There were some differences in the distribution of the metadiscourse markers especially logical markers and code glosses. The scholars believed that it is necessary to use the metadiscourse markers to apply persuasion. The quantitative analysis shows that the texts in Spanish used a larger number of textual metadiscourse markers than the texts in English did. However, regarding interpersonal markers, the Spanish texts used a smaller number of metadiscourse markers than the English texts did. Finding also showed that hedges were the most frequently used category in both groups. The

IJLLALW

International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)
Volume 16 (1), September 2017; 9-19   *Jahani, K*
EISSN: 2289-2737 & ISSN: 2289-3245   *www.ijllalw.org*

overall findings of the study state that metadiscourse markers play a significant role in the persuasion construction in opinion columns.

Using Hyland's (2005) interactional model, Gillaerts and Van de Velde (2010) published a study in which they examined abstracts in research articles in applied linguistics. The first aim of the study was to show that abstract is a separate genre from the article. Abstracts presented more likeness with boosting instead of hedging. More importantly, summarizing is not the focus of abstracts. They attract the readers to follow the article. The second aim of the study was to find diachronic changes regarding hedges, boosters and attitude markers in abstracts. The findings show that interactional metadiscourse has been less in number in three sequential decades. It was observed in the number of boosters and attitude markers.

Mur-Duen˜as (2011) selected research articles in a discipline, Business Management, to analyze cross-culturally. The US international and the Spanish national were the context of the research articles. The corpus consisted of 24 research articles, twelve of which were written in English and the other twelve research articles were in Spanish. Frequency of metadiscourse markers was different. Metadiscourse markers were observed to be more in English research articles than those in Spanish. Considering Hyland's (2005) model, authors had used interactional categories more the interactive ones. Spanish Business Management research articles demonstrated fewer interactive metadiscourse markers. Putting the interpretation job on the readers' shoulder, Spanish authors followed a reader-responsible style. On the contrary, American authors followed a writer-responsible style.

Li and Wharton (2012) studied academic writing undergraduate students consisting of two groups in two different disciplines, Literary Criticism and Translation Studies. This study followed, to some extent, mixed method design, quantitative design coming after qualitative one. The groups of the students were native speakers of Mandarin studying in China through the medium of English and native speakers of Mandarin studying in the UK through the medium of

English. The major aim was to find out whether there are some common patterns between different contexts and different disciplines or not. The researchers found more considerable differences between contexts than between disciplines.

Following Hyland's (1998) classification of hedges, Yang (2013) conducted a research to determine the way of using hedges in different sections of articles in three different corpora, namely Chinese authored English scientific articles, English scientific writing, and Chinese scientific articles. Three main differences were observed in the study: frequency in hedges, distribution of hedges, hedging types. Hedging distribution is similar across three corpora. the results of the study indicated that distribution of hedges and forms of hedges were different in the three corpora. Putting more hedging aside in research articles, Chinese academic community tends to use a more authoritative and assertive way of making scientific claims. On the contrary, English-medium journals tend to use hedging to be cautious in claiming some knowledge.

Believing both interactive metadiscourse leads the text to be persuasive and socially engaging, Khedri, Heng and Ebrahimi (2013) used Hyland's (2005) model to analyze the research article abstracts of two different disciplines, applied linguistics and economics. The corpus consisted of sixty research articles in two disciplines. The findings showed that using interactive metadiscourse markers in two above mentioned disciplines was totally different. It was known that some of the textual features were demonstrated differently across the two disciplines. Moreover, it showed that each disciplinary community was faced with some limitations in using metadiscourse markers.

Lee and Casal (2014) followed a cross-linguistic analysis of English and Spanish thesis writers in engineering. Taking Hyland (2005) model into account, the researchers analyzed the result and discussion chapters of two hundred theses, one hundred by L1 English students and one hundred by L1 Spanish students. This study was comparative to determine the frequency of metadiscourse markers. The result showed that interpersonal features in writing were related to the specific contexts in which texts are produced. The English writers both used more metadiscourse markers and created more writer-oriented texts helping readers in going through their lines with transitions, endophorics, and evidentials.

Bruce (2014) investigated the criticality in the literature review in Introduction sections of two disciplines including applied linguistics and psychology. Using Bruces (2008) cognitive/social genre model. Fifteen research articles in each of the disciplines were analyzed. Three generic elements, content-structuring moves/attitude markers/contrasts relation between propositions, were found to show the stance. Considering the frequency, two samples were different in terms of attitude markers and a contrast relation between propositions.

Lee and Subtirelu (2015) compared the metadiscourse markers use of teachers in EAP lesson and university lectures. The corpus consists of eighteen EAP lessons and eighteen university lectures. To analyze the corpus, researchers followed Hyland (2005) model. It was shown that use of metadiscourse markers in the classroom is related to the context and content of teaching and learning. In addition, Metadiscourse plays a key role in EAP lessons rather than university lectures. EAP instruction demonstrated greater attempts to engage students to establish interactive and communicative environments so that students could be involved in different academic and linguistic tasks. On the other hand, university lecturers put more emphasis on building relationships between ideas in lectures.

Alyousef (2015) investigated the use metadiscourse markers in three multimodal management reports by ten Master's of Accounting students. This study followed Hyland's model to analyze the data. The result showed that interactive and interactional markers in the orthographic texts were highly frequent. Also, it demonstrated the students' awareness of the academic feature of this type of writing. The Master's of accounting students' application of different metadiscourse markers stresses their awareness of the audience.

Jiang and Hyland (2015) focused on an issue which had been ignored. This issue was crucial in expressing a stance. It was a Noun Complement in which a stance "head-noun" has a nominal complement clause. The study made an attempt to determine the frequency, function and forms of the Noun Complement. The corpus consists of one hundred and sixty research articles within eight disciplines. The finding showed that the structure was commonly used to show author comments and viewpoints. There were some differences in the way of using the structure to build the knowledge within the disciplines.

Kawase (2015) investigated the way of constructing metadiscourse markers both in the introductions of their PhD theses and published research articles afterwards. The result showed that most of the writers use metadiscourse markers in their article introductions. Variations result from genre-specific features. Findings presented that the interactive/interactional items construction can be related.

Bruce (2016) examined the way through which the essay writers provide a critical evaluation/stance in university essays. The researcher aimed at finding some expressions in the essay showing the critical stance. The corpus consisted of fifteen students' essays from two different disciplines, namely English literature and sociology. The researcher followed Bruce's (2008) social genre/cognitive model to analyze the data. Two generic elements were found to indicate critical thinking. First, coherence relations such as Grounds Conclusion, Concession Contraexpectation and Reason Result shaped the expressions. Second, two metadiscourse markers from Hyland's (2005) model showed a critical stance including hedging and attitude markers.

Jiang and Hyland (2016) highlighted the importance of noun in making persuasive claim. They believed that it was a gap among other markers. They called this as a "metadiscursive noun". The researchers selected one hundred and twenty research articles from six disciplines. It was shown that metadiscursive nouns give the writers a chance of organizing the text into cohesive information and creating a stance towards it.

Hyland and Jiang (2017) placed an emphasis on the informality of discourse, specifically academic writing. It is believed that both the spoken and written language is surrounded by informality. In order to examine this issue, the researcher regarding the time period selected four disciplines containing approximately two million words. As a result, some changes during the time period were identified. Ten features in applied linguistics had changed. In this study, there was an attempt to answer the question: "Are academics now freer to construct less rigidly objective texts and craft a more inclusive relationship with their readers"? The answer ultimately was it depends on the discipline and features under investigation. More importantly, although there is a slow increase in following informality in academic writing, markers of formality-nouns and adjectives- rather than verbs are considered to increase.

Believing that abstract section of the research articles is very important in persuading the readers to go ahead and continue to read, Jiang and Hyland (2017) stated that less effort has been made to enable the writers to follow this strategy. The researchers, considering "Metadiscursive Nouns" as a rhetorical strategy, selected a corpus of one hundred and twenty research articles across six different disciplines to both identify the interactional and interactive functions that nouns have in the abstract and know how they control the arguments. They rejected the Sword's (2012) idea; these nouns are "zombie nouns". The researchers thought that it was a good idea to sensitize the students to be aware of grammar tasks so that they can use anaphoric and catephoric grammatical patterns.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS
Eighteen studies of metadiscourse taken from different high quality journals were reviewed. It goes without saying that the studies on this issue are in progress. The studies which have been reviewed are, to some extent, different in terms of such features as types of research questions, methodology (descriptive vs. experimental), and casual or comparative approach. No perfect generalization can be made here since the above-mentioned studies are somehow different in nature. However, the following are the suggestions taken from the studies for further research:

Researchers may examine metadiscourse markers between native and non-native speakers, in student versus expert writing, and across different proficiency levels. Researchers may also consider using more creative methods, and more sophisticated methodologies to handle the complexities of metadiscourse in written and spoken discourse. Researchers need to make sure that their data are comparable in terms of length, purpose, setting, writer, and journal prestige. Researchers need to highlight the spoken discourse and compare it with the written one based on the use of metadiscourse strategies. Researchers need to focus on the impact of the gender on the use of metadiscourse features. Researchers need to know that their corpus/data should be comparable based on length, purpose, setting, writer groups, and journal prestige.

Some limitations of the reviewed studies as future directions
It is suggested to highlight persuasion by focusing on different disciplines and genres and subjects. Dafouz-Milne (2008) stated that a fascinating topic is to contrast two different stances, teachers' stance with that of novice readers, to find out whether their view of a persuasive text would be the same.

Dafouz-Milne (2008) put forward that it is a great job to identify the phraseological realization of the metadiscoursal functional categories rather than lexico-grammatical features. Moreover, it would be a challenging study to take transferring process of rhetorical choices into account when L2 authors publish their research articles in English.

IJLLALW

Yang (2013) suggested that it is essential to compare disciplines by speakers of different linguistic and cultural groups regarding the use of hedges in articles (cross-linguistic and cross-cultural factors).

Lee and Casal (2014) suggested a study to show differences in different languages (cross-linguistic variation) regarding metadiscourse across disciplines and how they employ metadiscourse in different thesis chapters other than results and discussion chapters. Bruce (2014) stated that it is needed to conduct a study to identify the criticality following genre-based approach in different disciplines and subgenres. Lee and Casal (2014) recommended a qualitative design through which interview should be conducted with students to obtain their viewpoints on metadiscoursal resources used in both EAP lessons and lectures to examine different aspects. In regard to whether metadiscourse is a marker of national culture, or of academic discipline, Dahl (2004) reported that as far as medical texts are concerned, metadiscourse reflects the academic discipline features as the field is more stable and mature than economics and linguistics in which language and national writing traditions seem to be much more dominant.

Iranian researchers have also studied metadiscourse over the past 15 years. Abdollahzadeh (2007) showed significant differences in use of metadiscourse between American and Persian newspapers, suggesting that Anglo-American editorials used more hedges and code glosses, while Persian editorials used more emphatics.

In another study, Abdollahzadeh (2011) explored the employment of interpersonal metadiscourse in the conclusion section of Iranian and Anglo-American RAs in Applied Linguistics, illustrating a relatively different result because Iranian writers used significantly less attitude markers and emphatics. From a different perspective, Abdi, Tavangar Rizi, and Tavakoli (2010) investigated if there is any relationship between Grice's cooperative principle (CP) and the employment of metadiscourse. Building on the findings, they presented a model of CP which might help authors to appropriately use metadiscursive resources. Moreover, Jalilifar and Alipour (2007) studied the effect of explicit teaching metadiscourse on EFL learners' reading comprehension ability and drew the conclusion that the students' reading comprehension ability would improve considerably by raising their consciousness of metadiscourse markers.

REFERENCES

Abdi, R. (2002). Interpersonal metadiscourse: An indicator of interaction and identity. *Discourse Studies*, *4*(2), 139-145. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/14614456020040020101

Abdollahzadeh, E. (2007, July). *Writers' presence in Persian and English newspaper editorials.* Paper presented at the 34th International Conference on Systemic Functional Linguistics, Odense, Denmark.

Abdollahzadeh, E. (2011). Poring over the findings: Interpersonal authorial engagement in applied linguistics papers. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(1), 288–297.

Alyousef, H. S. (2015). An investigation of metadiscourse features in international postgraduate business students' texts. *SAGE Open*, 5(4), 2158244015610796.

Bruce, I. (2016). Constructing critical stance in University essays in English literature and sociology. *English for Specific Purposes, 42*, 13-25.

Bruce, I. (2014). Expressing criticality in the literature review in research article introductions in applied linguistics and psychology. *English for Specific Purposes, 36*, 85-96.

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,*95-113.

Dahl, T. (2004). Textual metadiscourse in research articles: a marker of national culture or of academic discipline? *Journal of pragmatics*, *36*(10), 1807-1825. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.05.004

Gillaerts, P. & Van de Velde, F. (2010). Interactional metadiscourse in research article abstracts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9,* 128-139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.004.

Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(2)*,* 133–151.

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

Hyland, K. (2015b). *Academic publishing: issues and challenges in the construction of knowledge. Oxford: Oxford University Press.*

Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *31*(1), 58–69.

Jiang, K., & Hyland, K. (2015). "The fact that": Stance nouns in disciplinary writing. *Discourse Studies. 17* (5): 529-550. doi: 10.1177/1461445615590719

Jiang, K., & Hyland, K. (2016). Nouns and academic interactions: a neglected feature of metadiscourse. *Applied Linguistics*. doi:10.1093/applin/amw02

Kawase, T. (2015). Metadiscourse in the introductions of PhD theses and research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 20*, 114-124.

Khedri, M., Heng, C. S., & Ebrahimi, S. F. (2013). An exploration of interactive metadiscourse markers in academic research article abstracts in two disciplines. *Discourse Studies,15*(3), 319 331.

Lee, J. J., & Casal, J. E. (2014). Metadiscourse in results and discussion chapters: A cross linguistic analysis of English and Spanish thesis writers in engineering. *System, 46,* 39-54.

Lee, J. J., & Subtirelu, N. C. (2015). Metadiscourse in the classroom: A comparative analysis of EAP lessons and university lectures. *English for Specific Purposes, 37*, 52-62.

Li, T., & Wharton, S. (2012). Metadiscourse repertoire of L1 Mandarin undergraduates writing in English: Across-contextual, cross-disciplinary study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*(4), 345-356.

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2011). An intercultural analysis of metadiscourse features in research articles written in English and in Spanish. *Journal of pragmatics, 43*(12), 3068-3079.

IJLLALW

Vande Kopple, W. J. V. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College composition and communication*, 82-93.

Vande Kopple. (2002). Metadiscourse, discourse, and issues in composition and rhetoric. Barton E., Stygall G. (eds.) *Discourse Studies in Composition*. NY: Hampton Press.

Yang, Y. (2013). Exploring linguistic and cultural variations in the use of hedges in English and Chinese scientific discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics, 50*(1), 23-36.

Hyland, K., & Jiang, K. (2017). Is academic writing becoming more informal? *English for Specific Purposes, 45*, 40-51.

Jiang, K., & Hyland, K. (2017). Metadiscursive nouns: Interaction and cohesion in abstract moves. *English for Specific Purposes*, *46*,1-14.

IJLLALW