



Metadiscourse: exploring interaction in writing, ken Hyland, continuum, London

Mohammad Amirousefi¹ and Hossein Barati²

¹ACECR Institute of Higher Education (Isfahan Branch), Pardis St., Manzarieh, Khomeinishahr, Isfahan, Iran

²Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 12 August 2011;

Received in revised form:

18 October 2011;

Accepted: 28 October 2011;

Keywords

Metadiscourse,
Hyland,
Continuum.

ABSTRACT

Linguists' interest in discourse in recent years is gradually shifting from the traditional focus on ideational dimension of texts and speech to the ways they function interpersonally. Such a view argues that writers or speakers do not simply produce a text to convey information and to represent an external reality. They, however, seek to ensure that the information they present is understandable and acceptable. In this regard, they draw their addressees in, and try to motivate them to follow along. To communicate effectively, they anticipate their receivers' expectations, requirements and resources, and try to engage them in their texts and affect their understandings of them. Writing or speaking is, therefore, viewed as a social and communicative process between writers or speakers and readers or listeners.

© 2011 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

Linguists' interest in discourse in recent years is gradually shifting from the traditional focus on ideational dimension of texts and speech to the ways they function interpersonally (Hyland, 2004). Such a view argues that writers or speakers do not simply produce a text to convey information and to represent an external reality. They, however, seek to ensure that the information they present is understandable and acceptable. In this regard, they draw their addressees in, and try to motivate them to follow along. To communicate effectively, they anticipate their receivers' expectations, requirements and resources, and try to engage them in their texts and affect their understandings of them. Writing or speaking is, therefore, viewed as a social and communicative process between writers or speakers and readers or listeners (Hyland and Tse, 2004; Hyland, 2004; Hyland, 2005).

Metadiscourse is a widely used term in current discourse analysis, and is a relatively new approach that refers to the ways writers or speakers project themselves in their texts to interact with their receivers. It is a concept which is based on a view of writing or speaking as a social engagement (Hyland, 2005; Dafouz-Milne, 2008).

It is, therefore, believed to play an important role in organizing the discourse, engaging the audience and signaling the writer's or speaker's attitude (Fuertes-Olivera et al., 2001). As a result, it has been taken up and used by researchers to trace patterns of interaction, and to discuss different aspects of language in use.

Appearing in continuum series, Ken Hyland's book offers an in-depth analysis of the theory and application of metadiscourse. In his book, Hyland brings into clearer focus the boundaries of metadiscourse and presents important insights into the theoretical and practical aspects of it.

This book will, therefore, be appreciated and welcomed by analysts, researchers and teachers. The book is divided into nine chapters which are organized into three sections.

Section one

Section 1 (What is metadiscourse) discusses the underlying assumptions, conceptions and classifications of the term metadiscourse and introduces its goals and rationale to provide a basis for its understanding and application. It consists of three chapters.

Chapter one

Chapter 1 (First Impression) provides a brief picture of metadiscourse by explaining its general definitions and its context of emergence. As discussed by Hyland, the term metadiscourse was first introduced by Zelling Harris in 1959 to represent a writer's or speaker's attempts to guide his receivers' perception of the text. The concept was later developed by other scholars. At first a distinction was drawn between transactional (the communication of information) and interactional (the communication of affects) functions of language. The scholars, however, tended to value the transactional function more.

They, consequently, paid their attention to the ways ideas were expressed. Sinclair, however, offered an alternative approach in 1981 by making a distinction between the interactive and autonomous planes of discourse. By the autonomous planes he meant how experiences and ideas are unfolded through the organization of the text, and by interactive plane how language is used to create a relation between the reader and the writer.

Shiffrin's (1980) notion of meta-talk helped forward the realization of the notion of metadiscourse. She believed that meta-talk lets the writer to project himself in the text and to take into account the organizational and evaluative aspects of the text to clarify the information conveyed. This is actually what metadiscourse entails.

The underlying conception of metadiscourse is that the only aim of communication is not the conveyance of information. But rather the writer and the reader interact with each other to affect the ways the information is understood.

To do so “addresses have to be drawn in, engaged, motivated to follow along, participate, and perhaps be influenced or persuaded by a discourse”(p.11). To do this, the expectations that certain readers have for certain form of interactions and engagements should be anticipated and fulfilled. Metadiscourse is, therefore, believed to play a vital role in organizing and producing persuasive writing, based on the norms and expectations of people involved. The receivers; expectations “are social, affective and cognitive based on participants’ beliefs and values, their individual goals and their experiences with similar texts in the past” (p.13). The process of communication, accordingly, is not just to clarify certain information, but to embed the information in a shared and recognized social world.

Chapter two

Chapter 2 (Definitions, issues and classifications) looks a little more closely at how analysts define metadiscourse, the distinctions that they make in defining it, and then discusses a number of problems related to it and presents different classifications that different scholars have proposed. Metadiscourse as discussed by Hyland is a fuzzy term and there is no consensus in defining it. He, however, believes that there are a set of finite language options that writers usually choose from unconsciously based on their assessment of their readers’ need for guidance and elaboration. Metadiscourse is, therefore, defined as “writer’s awareness of the reader and his or her need for elaboration, clarification, guidance and interaction” (p.17). In other words, metadiscourse can refer to those linguistic options which are employed by the writer to direct the reader through the text and to show his stance.

One threat to this definition, according to Hyland, is that it entails a distinction between propositional meaning and metadiscourse meaning. What remains difficult is how to make a distinction between metadiscourse and propositional content. Halliday (1994), for example, proposes the test of falsifiability to identify propositions. He states that “propositional material is something that can be argued about, affirmed, denied, doubted, insisted upon, qualified, tempered, regretted and so on” (Halliday, 1994:40 cited in Hyland 2005:19). The picture is somehow clouded by Mao (1993:267 cited in Hyland, 2005:19). He believes that metadiscourse and propositional content can both be falsified. The picture, therefore, remains vague. Hyland, however, concludes that “meaning of a text is not just the propositional material...It is the complete package”(p.22). By “complete package” he means both proposition and metadiscourse content, and he believes that metadiscourse is an essential and inseparable part of meaning.

Another issue which is addressed in chapter two is if metadiscourse is syntactic or functional. Hyland, however, believes that metadiscourse is a functional category that can be realized in a great variety of ways. He believes that an item which is metadiscursive in some point due to its relation with its co-text and its use may not be metadiscursive in another.

Hyland continues his discussion about the functions of metadiscourse and makes a distinction between textual and interpersonal functions. Hyland believes that textual metadiscourse is used to organize propositional information in ways that will be coherent for a particular audience and appropriate for a given context. He believes that the writer of a text predicts the receiver’s processing difficulties and requirements, and accommodates them by using certain devices. He also states that interpersonal metadiscourse allows writers to express a perspective toward their propositional information and

their readers. Halliday, however, believes that text should be seen more holistically.

Metadiscourse is essentially an open category which can be realized in numerous ways. There are huge range of linguistic items from punctuation and typographic markers (like parentheses and underlying) and paralinguistic cues which accompany spoken messages (like tone of voice and stress) to whole clauses and sentences which are used to reveal ourselves and our purposes in our texts(written or oral). A variety of metadiscourse taxonomies have, therefore, been proposed.

The first model (Table1) was introduced by Vande kopple (1985).He introduced two main categories of metadiscourse, namely “textual” and “interpersonal”. Four strategies-text connectives, code glosses, illocution markers and narrators-constituted textual metadiscourse, and three strategies-validity markers, attitude markers and commentaries-made up the interpersonal metadiscourse. Vande Kopple’s model was specifically important in that it was the first systematic attempt to introduce a taxonomy that triggered lots of practical studies, and gave rise to new taxonomies. The categories are, however, vague and functionally overlap. Citation, for example, can be used to enhance a position by claiming the support of a credible other (validity markers).They can also be used to show the source of the information (narrators).

The revised model (Table.2) was introduced by Crismore et al. (1993). They kept the two major categories of textual and interpersonal, but collapsed, separated, and reorganized the subcategories. The textual metadiscourse was further divided into two categories of “textual” and “interpretive” markers in an attempt to separate organizational and evaluative functions. Textual markers consist of those features that help organize the discourse, and interpretive markers are those features used to help readers to better interpret and understand the writer’s meaning and writing strategies (Crismore et al., 1993).

Chapter three

In chapter 3 (A metadiscourse model) Hyland starts with a more refined, holistic and functional definition of metadiscourse and then goes on to give a more theoretically robust and analytically reliable model of metadiscourse. Hyland in this chapter defines metadiscourse as “the cover term for the self reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting a writer to express a view point and engage with readers as members of a particular community”(p.37). This definition emphasizes the interpersonal function of language and sees metadiscourse as a system of meanings that can be realized in a variety of language items which can perform both metadiscoursal and non-metadiscoursal functions. He moves on to introduce three key principles of metadiscourse which build the basis of the model he proposes. These are: 1) that metadiscourse is distinct from propositional aspects of language; 2) that the term metadiscourse refers to those aspects of the text that embody reader-writer interactions; 3) that metadiscourse distinguishes relations which are external to the text from those that are internal.

The model proposed by Hyland (2005), however, comprises of two main categories of “interactive” and “interactional. The interactive part of metadiscourse concerns the writer’s awareness of his receiver, and his attempts to accommodate his interests and needs, and to make the argument satisfactory for him. The interactional part, on the other hand, concerns the writer’s attempts to make his views explicit, and to engage the reader by anticipating his objections and responses to the text

(see Table.3).

Finally, Hyland (2004), in a study on the distribution of metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing, reveals the importance of metadiscourse to students writing with an average occurrence of 184000 cases in 4 million words; one every 21 words. Its high occurrence, however, represents that it is an important part of communication without which the propositional and pragmatic content of utterances will be at danger.

Section Two

Section 2 (Metadiscourse in Practice) deals with the application of metadiscourse and its contributions to the study of language in use. It consists of four chapters concerned with the key areas of rhetoric, genre, culture and community.

Chapter four

Chapter 4 (Metadiscourse in Rhetoric) discusses metadiscourse as a rhetorical strategy used to obtain persuasion. Metadiscourse (as discussed by Hyland in this chapter) follows persuasive objectives. He believes that a persuasive discourse has three appeals; rational (explicit links between ideas and arguments), credible (the writer's authority) and affective (respect for the reader's viewpoints) appeals, and metadiscourse contributes to them. Rhetoric, on the other hand, is defined as "the art of persuasion" (p.63)." Since people are not persuaded until they are convinced that something is true, the rhetoric involves demonstrating how something is true or how it can be shown to be true"(p.64). It is believed to consist of three elements: 1) ethos: the speaker's character and credibility, 2) pathos: the audience's characteristic and 3) logos: the characteristics of the speech. Metadiscourse, in this connection, projects logos when it links ideas to arguments, ethos when it refers to the reader's authority and pathos when it considers the reader's viewpoints.

This approach is further illustrated by Hyland by focusing on two types of texts: Darwin's *Origin of Species* and *Company Annual Reports*. In the former ethos is projected through the frequent use of hedges, boosters and attitude markers. Darwin is, therefore, cautious and uncertain in his text and carefully marshals his facts by using hedges. He, however, adopts an authoritative persona through boosters and shows his humanity and his attitude towards the subject matter through attitude markers. *Company annual reports* are, on the other hand, the most prominent and widely read parts by the shareholders. They, therefore, have enormous rhetorical importance. Logos are, accordingly, expressed through interactive metadiscourse to create the rational appeal, ethos through hedges, boosters, engagement markers and evidential to create credibility appeals, and pathos through engagement markers, attitude markers and hedges together with the manipulation of pronouns to create affective appeals.

Chapter five

Chapter 5 (Metadiscourse and Genre) gives a brief introduction to genre and then goes on to explore how metadiscourse is represented in key academic genres. Genre is defined by Hyland as "a term for grouping texts together" (p.87). Writing is nowadays considered as a social engagement in which writers interact with their readers not only to convey messages, but also to help their receivers to understand them. It means that writers predict their readers' requirements and expectations, and respond to them. These expectations are within the bounds of their history; previous texts they have read, or the constraints of particular contexts. To communicate

successfully, writers must recognize these bounds, forms and constraints, and get the things done through them. Texts, accordingly, can be classified into one genre or another based on their key linguistic or rhetorical features. Metadiscourse is one such feature. Texts can be analyzed and classified based on different kinds of interactions they create with their readers, and different kinds of persuasion sought by writers or speakers.

He clarifies his discussion about metadiscourse and genre by focusing on the results and insights of some related studies including *Research Articles*, *Popular Science Articles* and *Introductory Textbooks*. Research articles are generally involved in knowledge making by negotiating agreement with the readers. It is achieved by anticipating their possible objections or difficulties and responding to them. Metadiscourse can be used in research articles "galvanize support, express collegiality, resolve difficulties and avoid disputation" (p.90). The study reported shows the significance of metadiscourse in research articles by an average of 370 occurrence per paper or one every 15 words. The study also reveals the predominance of interactive devices indicating the significance of directing and guiding the readers in such articles. In his discussion about the role of metadiscourse in popular research articles he first makes a distinction between research articles whereby "knowledge is forged and confirmed" and popularizations whereby knowledge "is transformed into news for lay readership" (p.101). In popularizations metadiscourse features were used differently from research articles. There were, for example, fewer hedges and boosters and more attitude markers and engagement markers in popularizations compared with research articles. Introductory textbooks, on the other hand, present "established views and theories of the discipline" (p. 101) and may address students with knowledge. The results of the related study reveal that metadiscourse is used differently in textbooks. While, for example, frame markers are used at regular intervals in textbook, they are mostly used in introductions in research articles. Metadiscourse is mostly used in textbooks to "reduce the weight of new propositional material ...and to present unfamiliar content more comprehensively" (p. 105). Interactive metadiscourse is, therefore, dominant in textbooks.

Chapter six

Chapter 6 (Metadiscourse and Culture) focuses on culture and the use of metadiscourse in other languages. Culture, as discussed by Hyland, has been viewed differently by different scholars, but the view which "commands the most influence in language studies sees it as a historically transmitted and systematic patterns of meanings which allow us to understand, develop and communicate our knowledge and beliefs about the world" (P.114). Cultural factors, therefore, shape our background understandings, and may affect the ways we write and the ways we organize our writing. Cultural values are carried by language and provide us with taken-for-granted ways of engaging others in writing. They can affect perception, language, learning, communication and particularly the use of metadiscourse (pp.113-115). In a writer-responsible culture like English, for example, metadiscourse markers are used to guide readers through a text; in a reader-responsible culture like Japanese, connections between various parts of a text are more commonly left implicit. In English, therefore, the person responsible for effective communication is the writer, but in Japanese it is the reader. The difficulties of comprehension may be traced back to the amount of effort the writer may expect the reader to invest. L1 and L2 writers may differ in preferred ways and patterns of

organizing their ideas and engaging their readers, and these patterns tend to be transferred from native language to the foreign language. Each culture may have its own norms, values, language, as well as way of communication. What makes a written text well-organized and coherent is different across different cultures. Contrastive studies on the use of metadiscourse can, consequently, help teachers to make students sensitive of the differences between students' national culture and the culture of the discourse or the community to which the text refers to.

The rest of the chapter, however, reviews some contrastive studies. They fall within two categories; studies comparing the use of metadiscourse in different languages like Chinese, Finnish and Spanish with that of English, and studies comparing the use of metadiscourse in different English texts written by writers of different cultures. The first group of studies presented in this chapter show variation in the use of metadiscourse in different cultures. The comparison of the essays written by US and Finnish students, for example, revealed that Finnish students used metadiscourse more. They specially used more interactive signals. Its reason can, however, be traced in the cultural differences. "Finns are enigmatic in their communication, leaving their message implicit so that others can pick out their intentions from the little they say" (p.123). By the use of interactive signals they, therefore, try to help their readers through the text to get the message. The second group, on the other hand, show that the first language and its culture may affect writing in a second language. A comparative study by Hinkle (2002), for example examined the timed essays written in English by 1457 undergraduate students from six different languages. The results revealed that self mention, boosters and engagement markers were more frequent in the essays written by non-native English speakers. The reason why boosters, for example, are more frequent is discussed to be the intention of the speakers belonging to certain cultures to use exaggeration and overstatements as ways of achieving persuasion (pp.129-133).

Chapter seven

Chapter 7 (Metadiscourse and Community) as the last chapter in this section examines how the norms and practices in different communities can help us to understand metadiscourse use. A discourse community, as discussed, can be defined as members of a social group that have common goals or interests and "shared ways of understanding and experience" (p.139) and utilize and hence possess one or more genres to communicate their aims. A discourse community, to put it in a simple term, refers to "the people the text is aimed at" (p.139). It is like a tribe with its own norms, categorizations and sets of conventions. Metadiscourse, accordingly, entails the fact that knowledge is the social justification of ideas, and writers must take into account their intended receivers' norms, expectations and responses which are embedded in the community they belong to, to construct a persuasive writing. Metadiscourse features are sensitive to these differences, and to teach students to write effectively largely depends on increasing their awareness of the existence of such differences in the use of metadiscourse markers.

Hyland, however, extends his discussion of research articles and undergraduate textbooks presented in chapter 5, to clarify the effects of communities in the deployment of metadiscourse. The studies regarding the use of metadiscourse across disciplines, for example, revealed that the overall frequency of

metadiscourse was nearly the same. The articles in soft fields like Marketing and Applied Linguistics contained more interactional signals than those of hard sciences. The reason discussed is that writers in humanities and social sciences are more reader-inclusive and personal than writers in engineering. The analysis of the textbooks also revealed nearly the same results. Textbooks in soft-sciences contained more interactional devices and philosopher appeared to be heavy users of such devices. These studies in general reveal that "writing is community situated" (p.142) and "knowledge is a social process" (p.143) which is facilitated by metadiscourse use. As there are different disciplines, metadiscourse use is different in different disciplines.

Section Three

Section 3 (Issues and Implications) outlines the advantages of teaching metadiscourse and some pedagogical implications for teachers. It also raises some issues and points for further research. It consists of two chapters.

Chapter eight

Chapter 8 (Metadiscourse in the classroom) offers some pedagogical implications to language teachers and give them some practical strategies to help them to put metadiscourse in use. The first part of the chapter deals with metadiscourse and writing. As it is discussed in the past writing was taught by either imitating sample works from experts or by focusing on elements and grammatical points, and the role of metadiscourse features was neglected. Even today these views can be observed in writing classes. Explicit knowledge of grammar and application of rules are just one part of writing. The other part, however, is accommodating the ideas within the expectations and understandings of the relevant readers through the appropriate use of metadiscourse. Unfortunately metadiscourse is not explicitly taught, and "students often have considerable trouble to flesh out an image of their readers" (p.176) and to interact properly with them. They may, for example, inadequately overuse boosters (like no doubt, easily see, will see) and engagement markers (like we, you) and turn a formal academic writing to an informal and direct argument. It is, therefore, essential that students receive appropriate instruction in metadiscourse using models of argument to practice writing within the norms and socio-cultural limitations of their readers (Hyland, 2005:175-178).

The second part of the chapter discusses the advantages of teaching metadiscourse features. Hyland believes that there are three main advantages of teaching metadiscourse features to students. First, they can recognize the cognitive demands that texts make for readers, and the ways they can help them to proceed. Second, it provides them with enough resources to take a stance toward their ideas. Third, it enables them to negotiate that stance with their readers. Highlighting metadiscourse in the classroom can have other advantages and contributions (p.178).

Finally the last part of the chapter introduces some principles and strategies of teaching metadiscourse features. Teaching metadiscourse means sensitizing students to rhetorical effects and features that exist within a given genre and community, and equip them with enough resources to interact with their readers in their own world. To teach metadiscourse features appropriately, teachers need to consider some principles and apply some strategies like 1) to understand their students' target needs; 2) to consider the students' prior writing and learning experiences; 3) to view learning to write as learning to use language; 4) to use authentic texts and expose their students

to the most productive and frequently used metadiscourse features to make them familiar with their use and functions; 5) to provide students with the tasks of manipulating and producing texts (pp.181-193).

Chapter nine

Chapter 9 (Issues and directions) concludes the whole book by highlighting some key features, and then points to some issues for future research and directions. Metadiscourse, as concluded, is based on a view of writing as a social interaction, and reveals the ways writers try to interact with their readers within the interactional functions and resources available in the community they belong to. Metadiscourse can, therefore, reveal "how writers, through, their texts, see the values, interests and assumptions of their communities" (p.195). There are, however, a range of variables such as genre, discourse community and culture which affect metadiscourse use and distribution. These variations reveal that "writing is not a unitary and stable object", texts vary based on "the socio-cultural purposes they are intended to serve", and "different cultures have different expectations of writing" (p.196). Metadiscourse is, however, believed to lack a solid theoretical framework. Most of this problem is believed to lie in a lack of "systematic attempts to characterize the relationship between metadiscourse and propositional elements of texts" and "to distinguish metadiscourse as a coherent aspect of language" (p.199).

Finally Hyland in the last part of the chapter points to some areas waiting for further research. These areas are to study the metadiscourse use and meaning in different genres written for different people; to explore expectations for metadiscourse forms in different languages or to explore the forms which are used by L2 writers in the target text to study "cross-cultural pragmatic failure"; to examine metadiscourse forms used in different communities to study different patterns of interactions and social associations; and finally to run diachronic studies of metadiscourse use "to document changing thought styles, patterns of argument, and ideological practices over time" (p.202).

Comments

Taken together, the book is a valuable resource which presents a comprehensible account of metadiscourse. The content and the organization of the book is clear and well thought-out. Metadiscourse issues and practices are clearly cut and discussed across several chapters, thus avoiding the presentation and interpretation of unwieldy amounts of information which is prevalent in some books and studies. Each chapter accordingly starts with an introduction of a related issue or aspect, usually puts it into practice by discussing the relevant studies and ends with a summary which helps the reader to process the ideas, to grasp the difficult points by considering the practical examples provided, and to preview the arguments and

the established literature by reading the summary. The book, therefore, enjoys from a diverse readership including novices. On the pedagogical level, it also has important implications for L2 writing instruction by presenting some useful principles and strategies.

There are, however, some weaknesses. Chapters 1, 2, and 3, I think, have some overlapping content which may make the reader confused. The definition of the metadiscourse is raised in chapter one and is repeated in one way or another in the subsequent chapters too. The definitions presented are not as clear as the definitions presented in Hyland's previous studies. A novice reader may, therefore, not be to get a clear understanding of it. A new model is introduced in chapter 3, but it is not analyzed and put into practice well in the subsequent chapters. Chapter 8 presents some principles and strategies for language teachers, but some of them are not stated in a practical way and interested teachers may have difficulties using them in their classes. They are not, besides, discussed in the relevant studies done to show how effective each might be and represent the possible ways they can be practiced in language classes.

References

- Crismore, A., Markkanen R., & Steffensen, M. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: a study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written Communication*, 10, 39-71. Cited in Hyland, K. (2005).
- 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.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P.A., Velasco-sacristan, M., Arribas-Bano, A., & Samaniego-Fernandez, E. (2001). Persuasion and advertising English: Metadiscourse in slogans and headlines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 1291-1307.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177. Cited in Hyland, K. (2005).
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.
- Mao, L. (1993). I conclude not: Toward a pragmatic account of metadiscourse. *Rhetoric Review*, 11(2), 265-289. Cited in Hyland, K. (2005).
- Shiffrin, D. (1980). Metatalk: organizational and evaluative brackets in discourse. *Sociology Inquiry: Language and Social Interaction*, 50, 199-236. Cited in Hyland, K. (2005).
- Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). Some explanatory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication* 36, 82-93. Cited in Hyland, K. (2005).

Table1. Vande Kopple's Classification System for Metadiscourse (1985,pp.82-92)

Category	Function
Textual metadiscourse	
Text connectives	Used to help show how parts of a text are connected to one another. Includes sequencers (first, next, 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	Used to help readers to grasp the writer's intended meaning. 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	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 attributers which enhance a position by claiming the support of a credible other (according to Einstein)
Narrators	Used to inform readers of the source of the information presented- who said or wrote something (according to Smith, the Prime minister announced that).
Interpersonal metadiscourse	
Illocution markers	Used to make explicit the discourse acts the writer is performing at certain points (to conclude, I hypothesize, to sum up, we predict)
Attitude markers	Used to express the writer's attitudes to the propositional material he or she presents (unfortunately, interestingly, I wish that, how awful that).
commentaries	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. Metadiscourse Categorization by Crismore et al. (1993, pp.47-54)

Category	Function	Examples
Textual metadiscourse		
1. Textual markers		
Logical connectives	Show connection between ideas	Therefore; so; in addition; and
Sequencers	Indicate sequence /ordering of material	First; next; finally; 1,2,3
Reminders	Refer to earlier text material	As we saw in chapter one
Topicalizers	Indicate a shift in topic	Well, now we discuss ...
2. Interpretive markers		
Code glosses	Explain text material	For example; that is
Illocution markers	Name the act performed	To conclude; in sum; I predict
Announcements	Announce upcoming material	In the next section
Interpersonal metadiscourse		
Hedges	Show uncertainty to the truth of assertion	Might; possible; likely
Certainty markers	Express full commitment to assertion	Certainly; know; shows
Attributers	Give source/support of information	Smith claims that ...
Attitude markers	Display writer's affective values	I hope/agree; surprisingly
Commentary	Build relationship with reader	You may not agree that

Table 3. An Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005, p.49)

Category	Function	Examples
Interactive	Help to guide the reader through the text	Resources
Transitions	Express relations between main clauses	In addition; but; thus; and
Frame markers	Refer to discourse acts, sequences and stages	Finally; to conclude; my purpose is
Endophoric markers	Refer to information in other parts of the text	Noted above; see figure; in section 2
Evidentials	Refer to information from other texts	According to X; Z states;
Code glosses	Elaborate propositional meaning	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 and close dialogue	
Attitude markers	Express writer's attitude to proposition	Unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly
Self-mentions	Explicit reference to authors	I; we; my; me; our
Engagement markers	Explicitly build relationship with reader	Consider; note; you can see that