

American University in Cairo

AUC Knowledge Fountain

Archived Theses and Dissertations

6-1-2009

Interpersonal metadiscourse categories in two Egyptian newspapers concerning the 2007 "constitutional amendments"

Ahmad Abdelmoneim

Follow this and additional works at: https://fount.aucegypt.edu/retro_etds

Recommended Citation

APA Citation

Abdelmoneim, A. (2009). *Interpersonal metadiscourse categories in two Egyptian newspapers concerning the 2007 "constitutional amendments"* [Master's thesis, the American University in Cairo]. AUC Knowledge Fountain.

https://fount.aucegypt.edu/retro_etds/2325

MLA Citation

Abdelmoneim, Ahmad. *Interpersonal metadiscourse categories in two Egyptian newspapers concerning the 2007 "constitutional amendments"*. 2009. American University in Cairo, Master's thesis. *AUC Knowledge Fountain*.

https://fount.aucegypt.edu/retro_etds/2325

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by AUC Knowledge Fountain. It has been accepted for inclusion in Archived Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of AUC Knowledge Fountain. For more information, please contact mark.muehlhaeusler@aucegypt.edu.

The American University in Cairo
School of Humanities and Social Sciences

**Interpersonal Metadiscourse Categories in Two Egyptian Newspapers
Concerning the 2007 "Constitutional Amendments"**

A Thesis Submitted to

The Department of Teaching Arabic as a Foreign Language

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in
Teaching Arabic as a Foreign Language

By

Ahmad Abdelmoneim

May/2009

The American University in Cairo

School of Humanities and Social Sciences

Interpersonal Metadiscourse Categories in Two Egyptian Newspapers

Concerning the 2007 "Constitutional Amendments"

A Thesis Submitted by Ahmad Abdelmoneim

To Department of Teaching Arabic as a Foreign Language

May/2009

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for

The degree of Master of Arts in Teaching Arabic as a Foreign Language

Has been approved by

Dr. Zeinab Ibrahim
Thesis Committee Chair

Dr. Dalal Aboelseoud
Thesis Committee Reader

Dr. Ragia Effat
Thesis Committee Reader

Program Director

Date

Dean

Date

Contents

Abstract.....	5
Chapter One	6
1-1 Introduction	6
1.2. The Problem of the Study.....	9
1.3. Significance of the Study	10
1.4. Definition of Metadiscourse	11
1.5. Relationship between Metadiscourse and Discourse Analysis.....	14
1.6. Interpersonal and Textual Metadiscourse.....	16
1.7. Categories of Metadiscourse	18
1.7.1. Interpersonal Categories	19
1.7.2. Textual Categories	21
1.7.3. Other Metadiscursive Models	24
1.7.4. Criticism of Metadiscourse Models.....	26
1.8. The 2007 Constitutional Amendments in Egypt:.....	30
1.9. The Attitude of Newspapers in Egypt towards the Amendments:	31
Chapter Two.....	32
2.1. Literature Review	32
2.1.1. Metadiscourse and Discourse Analysis:.....	33
2.1.2. Effects of Metadiscourse:	34
2.1.3. The Importance of Metadiscourse:	39
2.1.4. Halliday's Functions of Language:.....	45
2.1.5. Metadiscourse in Writing and Reading:.....	48
2.1.6. Visual Metadiscourse:	53
Chapter Three	55
3.1. Tools Hyland's Classification of Interpersonal Metadiscourse Categories ...	55
3.1.1. Reasons for Choosing These Tools:.....	57
3.1.2. Hedges:.....	58
3.1.3. Boosters:.....	58
3.1.4 Attitude Markers:	59
3.1.5 Self- mention:	59
3.1.6. Engagement Markers:	60
3.2. The Hypothesis	60
3.3. The study.....	61
3.3.1. Methodology and Data	65
3.3.2. Framework of Analysis.....	67
3.3.3. Procedures	68
3.4. Empirical Instruments.....	69
3.5. Results and Discussion.....	78
3.6. Cultural metadiscourse markers:.....	84
Chapter Four	87
4.1. Experimental Instruments	87
4.4. Limitations of the Study	89
4.5. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications	90
4.6. Recommendation.....	93
References	94
Electronic Resources.....	97
Appendices.....	99
1.6.1. Content of the Amendments:	99
1.6.2. Context of the Amendments:	101

1.6.3. Debates Concerning the Amendments:..... 102
1.6.4. Sample Lesson 105

Abstract

This research-work aims at studying the use of metadiscourse markers by foreign learners of Arabic to enhance their writing skills. First there is an introduction which explains the role of metadiscourse markers in writing within the framework of the two paradigms of meaning suggested by Halliday, i.e. the textual and the interpersonal. Second two hypotheses on which the research-work is built are spelled out. The first hypothesis assumes that writers will always use the two basic paradigms of meaning suggested by Halliday as far as metadiscourse markers are concerned. The Second one postulates that foreign learners of Arabic acquire solid knowledge of these four categories of markers that fall within the two paradigmatic classifications, their performance in writing will be improved significantly in comparison with those who did not acquire such knowledge. Before examining these two hypotheses the research provides a full-fledged account of four basic types of metadiscourse markers and their equivalents in Arabic. Then it sets out to check the two afore –mentioned hypotheses. In order to verify the two hypotheses mentioned above, two methodologies are used correspondingly to each hypothesis. The first methodology is an empirical one and the second is experimental. The empirical method used in verification of hypothesis one, involves an analysis of a sample of twenty newspaper articles about a given subject representing different styles, cultural backgrounds, personal and political affiliations of writers. In order to verify the second hypothesis, the foreign learners of Arabic will be able to improve their performance in writing significantly by mastering the use of metadiscourse markers, an experimental methodology is applied. Two groups of non-native Arabic learners are selected randomly, one serving as a control class and the other serving as an experimental class. The results show that following a post-test given to both groups, the writing level of the experimental group, who analyzed and learned metadiscourse markers, comes out higher than that of the control group, who did not go through this experience.

Chapter One

1-1 Introduction

This study aims to highlight the use of interpersonal metadiscourse categories in journalistic writing and their function as expressive of political affiliation in two Egyptian newspapers: *Al-Ahram* and *Al-Wafd*. Through this study, the researcher aims at testing the hypothesis that interpersonal metadiscourse categories can distinguish the political affiliation of writers and/or newspapers. The researcher first highlights the theoretical grounds of metadiscourse by giving an overview of the meaning of metadiscourse and its categories. Then, he focuses on the interpersonal category because it is the concern of the thesis. In the data analysis, metadiscursive interpersonal categories are examined in 14 articles taken from two Egyptian newspapers, namely *Al-Ahram* and *Al-Wafd*. This study is highlighting the idiosyncratic interpersonal categories of each type of writing, pro or against a certain idea and this is to facilitate to the foreign reader to identify the opposing stands of authors and which articles can be seen as opposing and which as non-opposing articles. This will also help learners to comprehend passages and read between the lines. The research question is how authors use strategies in metadiscourse and how can this affect improving the writing level of foreign learners of Arabic?

Language is not to be used randomly or haphazardly but as a means of communication. That is why Matthews (1997, p.198) defines it as "The phenomenon of vocal and written communication among human beings.... in ordinary usage". The same thing is supported by Lyons (1981, p.2) who states that we do not merely use the term "natural language" for English, Chinese, etc but to a variety of other systems of communication such as "sign language" and "body language" even if they are not languages in the strict sense of the word. The preceding definitions stress the close relation between language and communication; for the former is the ideal method for the latter. That is clearly stated by Crystal (1971, p.14) as he says "While it is true that language is the most important method we have of communicating, it is manifestly not the only method". Crystal goes on to other methods of communicating such as gestures, facial expressions but he rejects considering them as languages.

Communication is the process of transferring information from one living source to another and it as a whole strives for the same goal and thus, in some cases, can be universal. System of signals, such as voice sounds, intonations or pitch, gestures or written symbols which communicate thoughts or feelings. According to the Mehrabian and Ferris

(1967), there are three major parts in human face to face communication which are body language, voice tonality, and words.

Through this chapter, the researcher gives more definitions on metadiscourse, the relationship between metadiscourse and discourse analysis and the categories of metadiscourse in addition to shedding a glimpse of light on the attitude of newspapers in Egypt towards the constitutional amendments. The chapter explores the role played by interpersonal metadiscourse in Arabic journalistic writing. By such an exploration there would be much more knowledge about how it is that newspaper writers are able to attract the largest number of people by deploying the interpersonal elements. Also, we would be able to know how much interpersonal metadiscourse is used by such writers.

The Egyptian ruling party changed the political frontier and amended the constitution. Many recent newspapers, whether owned by certain parties or not, begin to lash out at the various governmental practices. For newspaper writers to keep a high profile of interaction with their audience, they are expected to employ a group of rhetorical devices. One of such devices is metadiscourse. The term ‘metadiscourse’ refers to one of such devices. It is defined as “discourse about discourse” (Williams, 1989). Writers/ Speakers use metadiscourse to help

readers/listeners organize, understand, interpret, evaluate and react to texts the way the author/ speaker intended (Crismore et al., 1993; Hyland, 2000; Tebeaux, 1996; Vande Kopple, 1985; Williams, 1989). Metadiscourse is divided into two types: textual and interpersonal. Textual metadiscourse is responsible for creating some sort of integration and cohesion for the text created. Interpersonal metadiscourse helps writers interact with their readers (see section 1- 4 below).

1.2. The Problem of the Study

Metadiscourse is the term we use when writers refer to their own acts of thinking, writing, organization or their readers' acts of reading and understanding. We use metadiscourse to help explain our essays, to indicate our intentions, to guide our readers' responses, or organize our texts as a whole and improve our writing skills. Metadiscourse thus acts as a guide that directs readers to the way they should understand, evaluate and respond to propositional content. This study aims to highlight the concept of interpersonal metadiscourse in Egyptian journalistic writing and how this will affect learners of Arabic as a foreign language to improve their writing skills. The study will focus on articles written in two newspapers each of which represents a particular trend in the Egyptian society, namely the pro-governmental daily, Al-Ahram, and the

liberal daily Al-Wafd, the voice of Al-Wafd Party, one of the representatives of opposition in Egypt.

1.3. Significance of the Study

As far as the researcher knows, no study has been done on the role of interpersonal metadiscourse categories in the language of Egyptian or Arab newspapers and their effect on improving the writing level of foreign learners of Arabic. Different studies were conducted to investigate the use and/or effect of metadiscourse in texts. From a descriptive standpoint, metadiscourse has been shown to be a prominent feature of various types of academic discourse. These include school textbooks and the effects of metadiscourse on reading comprehension (Crismore, 1989; Crismore and Farnsworth 1990), university textbooks (Bondi, 1999; Hyland, 2000) and doctoral dissertations (Bunton, 1999). Steffensen's and Cheng's study (1996) analyze how students write after learning about metadiscourse. By dealing with such a subject, the researcher tries to open the door for other researchers who can deal with the textual function or widen the scope of research by including other newspapers.

The aim of the current study is to explore the role played by metadiscourse markers in enhancing the writing skills of foreign learners

of Arabic. By such an exploration there would be much more knowledge about how writers are able to attract the largest number of people through deploying the metadiscourse elements and how learners of Arabic can use these devices to make their writing more effective and communicative.

1.4. Definition of Metadiscourse

In this section, the researcher gives more definitions on metadiscourse. The prefix "meta" means "beyond". Such being the case, the term metadiscourse means discourse with a job that is beyond the general norm of communication. The idea is made clear by Hyland (2005, p.3) who, originally attributing the term to Harris, states that metadiscourse is a way of understanding language as an attempt on the part of the speaker or the writer to guide the receiver's perception of a text. He adds metadiscourse does not handle communication as merely an exchange of information, goods or services but it involves as well the personalities, attitudes and assumptions of those who are communicating. It is the dynamic view of language that metadiscourse stresses as we use languages as a means of interaction to show our differences from others. Metadiscourse cast light on the aspects we use as we introduce ourselves to signal our attitude towards both the content and the audience of the text.

Hyland (2005, p.16) reports that metadiscourse has always been defined as "discourse about discourse" or "talk about talk" but he regards such a definition as an unsatisfactory one

"... But this is a very partial and unsatisfactory view of a concept which has enormous potential to include features of language which describe not only how we organize our ideas, but also how we relate to our readers or listeners" Hyland (2005, p.16).

Hyland defines metadiscourse as "The various linguistic tokens employed to guide or direct a reader through a text so both the text and the writer's stance are understood"(2005, p.18).

On the other hand, Annelie Ädel states that we not only talk about the world or ourselves in our communication but also about ourselves as communicators and about the situation of communicating (2006, p.1). This is made clear when she shows the difference between "meta language" and "object language" (2006, p.215), stating that the former refers to language about another language while the latter refers to the ordinary language used to talk about things or objects in the world. The object language here means the ordinary usage of language as earlier stated by Matthews (1997, p.198) or the communicative purpose in the traditional sense.

Such being the case, Annelie Ädel (2006, p.20) defines metadiscourse (as a branch of metalanguage) as "Text about the evolving text or the writer's explicit commentary on her ongoing discourse." Yet, she agrees with Hyland on metadiscourse as being a fuzzy term and lacks definite boundaries.

According to Hyland and Tse (2004, p.156), metadiscourse is self-respective linguistic material referring to the evolving text and to the writer and imagined reader of that text. They regard it as an important means of facilitating communication as it supports the writer's position and helps build up a relationship with his audience. In their *Introductions to Metadiscourse*, Arrington and Rose state that "The effective introductions must simultaneously, in greater or lesser degrees of elaborateness, focus on a writer's subject, the intended readers, the situation invoked and the writer's own personae." Such being the case, the introductions are both text about text and text about content (1987, p.306).

Metadiscourse is seen here as the interpersonal resources used to organize a discourse or the writer's stance towards either its content or the reader (Hyland, 2000, p.109). It refers to the linguistic devices writers employ to shape their arguments to the needs and expectations of their

target readers. Some analysts have narrowed the focus of metadiscourse to features of textual organization (Bunton, 1998; Mauranen, 1993; Valero-Garces, 1996) or explicit illocutionary markers (Beauvais, 1989), metadiscourse is more generally seen as the author's linguistic and rhetorical manifestation in the text in order to "bracket the discourse organization and the expressive implications of what is being said" (Schiffrin, 1980, p.231).

1.5. Relationship between Metadiscourse and Discourse Analysis

In this section, the researcher discusses the relationship between metadiscourse and discourse analysis and how a writer of a text introduces himself, personality, attitude and the relationship to the message with metadiscourse. The term discourse analysis has been given various definitions by linguists but all such definitions come to a point of convergence. That is, it is concerned with structures above sentence level.

According to Yule (1997, p.139) it is what enables language users to make sense of what they read in texts, understand what speakers mean despite what they say, recognize organized speech as opposed to incoherent discourse. As stated by Matthews (1997, p.100) it is applying the methods of analysis mainly devised for words and sentences on larger

structures. The same idea is supported by The Oxford Companion to the English language as it is stated that discourse analysis is a wide-ranging and heterogeneous discipline but it is unified by interest in describing language "above the sentence and the context, and cultural influences that motivate language in use".

Similarly, Leech (1983, p.4) points out that both discourse analysis and text linguistics have refused the limitation of linguistics to sentence grammar. Tannen (1991) said that there are gender differences in ways of their conversation, and we need to identify them in order to avoid needlessly blaming "others or ourselves -- or the relationship -- for the otherwise mystifying and damaging effects of our contrasting conversational styles" Tannen (1991, p. 17). Tannen takes a sociolinguistic approach to these gender differences since she feels that "because boys and girls grow up in what are essentially different cultures...talk between women and men is cross-cultural communication" Tannen (1991, p. 18).

On the other hand, and as stated before, metadiscourse is concerned with talk about talk. That is, how a producer of a text introduces himself or, rather, his personality, attitude, audience sensitivity and relationship to the message with metadiscourse. The message will not

sound neutral but it will reflect the interests, the positions, the perspectives and values of those enact it.

To compare discourse analysis with metadiscourse seeking aspects of similarity or to contrast those seeking aspects of dissimilarity, it must be pointed out that both terms are concerned with the unity, cohesion or coherence of the rubric of a particular linguistic structure. The unity of a linguistic structure is the pre-requisite of discourse analysis regardless of the personality or the attitude of its producer. In contrast, recognizing the personality and attitude of a text producer is something essential to metadiscourse.

All the preceding argumentation ranks metadiscourse as a specialized form of discourse. A conclusion that is clearly stated by Annelie Ädel (2006, p.167).

1.6. Interpersonal and Textual Metadiscourse

Here in this section, the researcher introduces and discusses Halliday's three metafunctions of language and differentiate between textual and interpersonal metadiscourse.

Vande Kopple (1985, p. 87), as he believes that interpersonal metadiscourse "can help us express our personalities and our reactions to the propositional content of our texts and characterize the interaction we would like to have with our readers about that content", while textual metadiscourse, "shows how we link and relate individual propositions so that they form a cohesive and coherent text and how individual elements of those propositions make sense in conjunction with elements of the text".

According to Hyland, (2005, p.26) Halliday's three metafunctions of language, that is, the ideational, interpersonal and textual functions are the bases upon which metadiscourse rests. The ideational function represents one's experiences and ideas with the outside world and corresponds to the propositional content but such a function has nothing to do with metadiscourse and concerns the content of text, as being informational, referential and representational while the interpersonal function enables language users to establish relations and interact with their audience. The interpersonal function refers to the use of language to encode interaction and engagement with others. The textual function refers to the use of language to organize the text itself. Both the second and third functions are the cornerstone of metadiscourse and from which,

it derives its terms and classification, that is, interpersonal and textual metadiscourse.

Ädel (2006, pp. 168, 175) states that there are two approaches dealing with metadiscourse. The broad approach and the narrow approach also known as "the integrative approach" and "non-integrative approach". In the broad approach, metadiscourse is seen as "the means whereby the writer's presence in the discourse is made explicit, whether by displaying attitude towards or commenting on the text or by showing how the text is organized". On the other hand, the narrow (non- integrative) approach to metadiscourse "primarily investigates aspects of text organization, while largely excluding interpersonal elements". In such an approach, metadiscourse is replaced by the term "meta text".

1.7. Categories of Metadiscourse

In this section, the researcher introduces and discusses the categories of metadiscourse and differentiates between textual and interpersonal categories in addition to introducing other metadiscursive models and criticizing them. Metadiscourse is not only dedicated to how text producers represent themselves as they express their personalities, attitude and reactions; however, metadiscourse scholars have laid out a set of strategies that is naturally followed to do such a job. Such being the

case, categorization of metadiscourse is to be conducted in the following two subsections.

1.7.1. Interpersonal Categories

In this section, the researcher introduces the categories of interpersonal metadiscourse, Vande Kopple (1985, pp. 86-87), arguing about Halliday's three functions of language, that is the ideational, interpersonal and textual, assigns the ideational function to the propositional content through which we relate our experience of the world. The other two functions, whether textual or interpersonal are essential to metadiscourse. According to Kopple, they are communication about communication. He goes on to define interpersonal metadiscourse as a way that can help us express our personalities and our reaction to a propositional content and characterizes the kind of interaction we would like to have with our readers. He would tentatively include in such a category, 1- the illocution markers, 2- validity markers, 3- narrators, 4- attitude markers and 5- bits of commentaries. Once again to our confusion, Vande Kopple includes narrators and validity markers within interpersonal category in spite of Hyland (2005, p.32) relates them to the textual one on quoting the former's model.

According to Hyland (2005, p.32) illocution markers such as “to conclude, to sum up, I hypothesize”, are used to make explicit the act that is being performed by the writer. The same thing is stated by Kopple (1985, p.84) who points out that the sentences we write may carry signs of the broad kinds of actions we perform with them in their features of mood, whether indicative, imperative or subjunctive. Actually, Kopple's use of words like illocution, act, perform and mood reminds us of “speech act theory” which was firstly raised by the language philosopher, Austin.

According to Cruse (2000, pp. 331- 333) and Levinson (1983, p.236) the theory as it was introduced by Austin assumes that we can do acts with words. He uses three different terms: the locutionary act, the illocutionary act and the perlocutionary act. The first refers to the actual phonetic manifestation of a sentence with a particular sense and reference. The second refers to the act being performed or intended by the speaker through an utterance. The third refers to the effect we produce on the listener by such an utterance. The utterance (you left the door open) for instance, includes all such three acts. It is locutionary in its being patterned or coded according to English phonology and grammar while it is illocutionary in its being indirect request for the door to be shut. Once the door is shut, this is the perlocutionary act. The most important act of the three is the illocutionary one as it makes explicit the act being

enacted; from a metadiscursive view point, the act being performed by a discourse producer.

1.7.2. Textual Categories

Hyland (2005, p.32) states that there are different taxonomies but they are mainly based on the model that is proposed by Vandepol (1985). Such a model as offered by Vandepol consists of seven kinds of metadiscourse markers, divided into textual and interpersonal types.

As for textual metadiscourse, the first kind is text connective which shows how parts of text are connected. They include sequencers (first, next), reminders (as I mentioned), and topicalizers which focus attention on the topic of a text segment (with regard to). The second kind of textual metadiscourse is Code glosses which are used to help readers grasp the writer's intended meaning according to his assessment of the reader's knowledge, such as putting the reformulation in parentheses or making it as an example. The third kind is validity markers which express the writer's commitment to the truth-value of a proposition and encode writer's certainty about the truth of the content. They include hedges (perhaps, may, seem, to a certain extent) through which we register our doubt. Some are emphatics (clearly, undoubtedly it is obvious that) which allow us to underline what we really believe others are attributors which lead readers to respect or judge the truth value of the propositional

content as we wish them to; attributors enhance a position by claiming the support of a credible other (according to Einstein). The fourth kind is narrators which guide the reader to the source of information offered (the president announced) and provide the source of ideas and facts. They are phrases or clauses that relate the proposition to its original speaker or writer; phrases and clauses such as according to X or Y announced that help readers know who said or wrote something. Vande Kopple's taxonomy has been refined and amended by various writers and, recently, by Vande Kopple (2002) himself who has re-labeled validity markers as epistemology markers and included narrators in that category, highlighting their function of providing evidential support to statements.

The other three interpersonal types are illocution markers (I conclude, to sum up), the attitude markers (unfortunately) and Commentaries (you will certainly agree that). According to Vande Kopple (1985, p.83) text connectives are used to "guide readers as smoothly as possible through our texts and to help them construct appropriate representation of them in the memory". Kopple includes within such a type, markers of logical and temporal relationship (as a consequence, at the same time); something that is not mentioned in Hyland's quoting Kopple's model. Actually, Hyland (2005, p.33) states

that Kopple has modified his model but he (Hyland) did not mention such markers as part of Kopple's modification.

Yet, it is clear that Kopple (1985, p.83) is not determined on his classification of the seven kinds admitting that the boundaries and internal characteristics of them need to be more closely surveyed in the future.

According to Kopple (1985, p.84), Code glosses help readers grasp the appropriate meaning of a text as we do when we define the word parenthetically to show its intended meaning rather than the other possible one. Code glosses do not expand the propositional content of the text but help readers understand and interpret it. Such being the case and according to Vande Kopple, they have a metatextual function. Vande Kopple (1985, p.84) goes on to define validity markers as a kind of metadiscourse that we can use to assess the probability or truth of the propositional content.

1.7.3. Other Metadiscursive Models

In this section, the researcher discusses the metadiscursive models; actually, there are many models that have been set by metadiscursive linguists. For example, those set by Crismore and Farnsworth (1989), and by Cheng and Steffensen (1996). Such models agree, mainly, in the general sketch or framework but they differ in their deep classification and subcategories.

According to Hyland (2005, p.33) the model set by Crismore et al is an attempt to impose order on the various functions of metadiscourse and is an improvement on Kopple's model. According to Crismore and Farnsworth (1989, p.93) metadiscourse fulfills the textual and interpersonal functions of language. The interpersonal function deals with people's setting up social relations and taking part in personal interactions whereas the textual function as manifested in textual metadiscourse is essential for cohesive texts and for effectively conveying ideational meaning. According to Hyland (2005, pp. 33-34) in Crismore et al's model, textual metadiscourse has been divided into textual and interpretive markers.

Kopple (1985) affiliated illocution markers to interpersonal metadiscourse while Crismore et al (1989) affiliated it to the textual one.

On the other hand, and as stated by Hyland (2005) markers of interpersonal metadiscourse (in Crismore et al's model) included hedges which show uncertainty to the truth of assertion (might, likely), certainty markers which express full commitment to assertion (certainly, know), attributors which give the source of information (Kopple's narrators) in addition to attitude markers and commentary. It is note worthy that Kopple's narrators are textual markers while Crismore et al's attributors are interpersonal ones.

As stated by Steffensen and Cheng (1936, p.154) textual metadiscourse as an intratextual tool, is subdivided into textual markers and interpretive markers. The textual markers include logical connectives, sequencers, reminders and topicalizers. The interpretive markers include illocutionary markers and code glosses. On the other hand, interpersonal markers as an extratextual tool, include hedges, certainty markers and commentaries.

According to Steffensen and Cheng (1996, p.153), there are other important aspects that must be taken into consideration, these are metadiscourse markers; the textual markers are means that show how the text is structured and how difficult words and expressions are explained to readers. They encode, as well, the rhetorical act we perform. On the

other hand, interpersonal markers allow close interaction between readers and writers. They anticipate the reader's response to the text by showing how certain we are about the truth value of what we are saying, and by expressing our feelings about the propositional content we are presenting.

It is noted that Steffensen and Cheng's model is, to a far point, similar to Crismore et al's. The only essential difference is that Crismore et al's interpretive markers, announcements, is excluded from Steffensen and Cheng's categorization. As a minor, even nominal difference, Crismore et al use illocution markers while Steffensen and Cheng use illocutionary markers.

1.7.4. Criticism of Metadiscourse Models

In this chapter, the researcher presents the debate between writers on metadiscursive models. Commenting on Crismore et al's model, Hyland (2005, pp 33-35) points out that they substitute attributors for Kopple's narrators and shift some subfunctions to a new category of textual markers. In addition, they move code glosses and illocution markers into another new category of interpretive markers. Both the textual and interpretive markers are to account for the textual role of metadiscourse. The former helps organize the discourse while the latter

helps readers interpret and understand the writer's meaning and writing strategies.

According to Hyland (2005, pp 33:35), Textual metadiscourse does not need to be classified into textual and interpretive markers; for organizational features (guaranteed by textual markers) will contribute to the coherence of a text. Such being the case, they will help reader in interpreting it. Hyland, implicitly states that we are not in need of a category sketched as interpretive.

In addition, Hyland finds it strange classifying reminders, which refer to a matter earlier in the text, as textual marker while classifying announcements, which look forward, as interpretive. By the same token, the class logical connectives seem opaque and confusing; for while metadiscursive items must be identified functionally, Crismore et al define them syntactically despite their approving of the functionality of metadiscursive items. It is concluded from such an argument that items can only perform functional role if they are a matter of choice rather than syntactic necessity. Consequently, items can perform either functionally or syntactically.

An utterance may have different realizations or meanings according to the conscious choice of the very writer, not the syntactic item. It is the intrusion of the writer that plays the decisive role. Such being the case, grammatical choices can work in a metadiscourse way in addition to their syntactic role.

A final remark by Hyland is that while Crismore et al hold the creed that metadiscourse is the material that does not add to the propositional content, they include in it logical connectives which may justifiably be seen as part of those propositions. Hyland (2005, p.35) quotes the following example from a sociology text book.

“The new interventionist state drew its authority and legitimacy from a societal consensus which had been forged around the growth of a countervailing power bloc (the trade union and Labor movement) and its strength relative to that of the owners of industrial capital.”

According to Hyland, the inclusion of the underlined and here is crucial to the proposition and it is difficult to see how it functions metadiscoursally.

Annelie Ädel (2006, pp. 4-5) adds her own criticism stating that while most researchers recognize metadiscourse as a fuzzy term in need of better definition and clearer delimitation, they are not mainly concerned with theoretical issues. In addition, most of their investigations are carried out manually and not computer-assisted. She continues to

assail the traditional models based on the systemic functional grammar by Halliday stating that the items textual and interpersonal have different meanings in metadiscourse from those in Halliday's frame work.

According to Annelie Ädel (2006, pp. 16-17), textual metadiscourse with Halliday has meanings like theme / rhyme structure, old/ new information and the broad area of cohesion (anaphora, reference, etc). Such meanings are completely different from metadiscursive ones. On the other hand, the interpersonal function in Halliday's framework covers broad areas such as modality, connotation and intonation. Such meanings, as well, have nothing to do with the interpersonal category of metadiscourse.

Ädel proceeds with her criticism of Hallidayan argument to regard metadiscourse as opposed to the propositional one; for such a definition will imply defining it as truth- conditional phenomenon, and not as a discourse phenomenon. Arguing to the point, Annelie Ädel (2006, pp 209: 210) states that a proposition is something that can be judged as true or false, affirmed or denied . There is a syntactic restriction to the term that it must be a statement; such being the case, it could be argued that metadiscourse, being non- propositional, is syntactically optional and can

be omitted. Actually, this is not quite tenable. Besides, some metadiscourses take the form of statement.

Finally, Ädel (2006) adopts a narrow approach of metadiscourse which primarily investigates aspects of text organization while largely excluding interpersonal elements or in her own term, stance which refers to personal feelings, attitudes, judgments and assessments.

Such a model by Ädel is based on Jakobson's functional model of Language. Three functions of language are used: the metalinguistic, the expressive and the directive. The three functions have corresponding components of speech events; they are the text / code, the writer and the reader. That is to say, text/ code as a speech events has metalinguistic function; the writer has expressive while the reader has a directive function. Actually, the metalinguistic function is the indispensable one and central to the concept of metadiscourse.

1.8. The 2007 Constitutional Amendments in Egypt:

In this paper, the researcher explains metadiscourse categories as he looks into the constitutional amendments in Egypt which started to show up after President Hosni Mubark has taken the initiative to demand constitutional amendments in Egypt. Such an act was met by approval as

well as disapproval from different political parties. Some find the matter optimistic and regard it as a further step on the path of democracy and as an act of deepening the concept of citizenship; others, on the other hand, find it wholly pessimistic and regard such amendments as backpedaling on democracy especially with respect to judicial supervision and the counter-terrorism law.

1.9. The Attitude of Newspapers in Egypt towards the Amendments:

In reaction to the constitutional amendments, writers take different orientations according to their own political views. The researcher is to evaluate the attitude of non-opposing papers in Egypt taking Al-Ahram as a model as it represents the mouth piece of the ruling regime or the National Democratic Party. On the other hand, an evaluation of the attitude of opposing newspapers in Egypt will be conducted on Al-Wafd as a prototype of opposition.

Chapter Two

2.1. Literature Review

In this chapter, the researcher traces briefly the studies and research that have dealt with metadiscourse. Examples of major works and contributions are cited with the aim of highlighting the stage at which metadiscourse has arrived and where the researcher's work fits in.

Metadiscourse refers to the “aspects of a text which explicitly organize a discourse or the writer’s stance towards either its content or the reader” (p.14). It is largely based on the view that writing is a social activity dependent on the relations between writer, reader and the social context (e.g. Nystrand, 1986; Hyland, 2000; Thompson, 2001). In the following, the researcher will trace briefly the studies that have been written on metadiscourse and discourse analysis, effects of metadiscourse, the importance of metadiscourse, Halliday's functions of language, metadiscourse in writing and reading, and visual metadiscourse.

2.1.1. Metadiscourse and Discourse Analysis:

The field of discourse analysis has always been a fertile ground for researchers and linguists since it closely relates to everyday language. As its name suggests, metadiscourse should have a close relationship to discourse analysis. Writers usually seek to keep a high profile of interaction with their readers and are thus expected to employ several rhetorical devices among which appears the term "metadiscourse".

Like its "meta-" sisters, metadiscourse is simply "discourse about discourse" (Williams, 1989). Yet, the idea is not that simple. Writers do not simply tell their readers that they are going to speak about their point of view about a certain topic and then ask the readers to follow blindly. Rather, they use metadiscourse to help their readers organize, understand, interpret, evaluate and react to texts the way the authors intended (Crismore & Farnsworth, 1993; Hyland, 2000; Tebeaux, 1996; Vande Kopple 1985; Williams, 1989).

Schiffrin (1980) found that speakers use meta-talk in the sense of "metalinguistic expressions that organize and evaluate the conversation". The focus in metadiscourse then is not on the information itself but on the way the information is conveyed. In other words, the writer may want the reader to adopt his/her own way of thinking and more importantly, his/her

stance and may push the reader to adopt the same point of view by hinting at or alluding to or even by making up certain details that strike the right note in the reader's mind and heart.

2.1.2. Effects of Metadiscourse:

Halliday (1973) distinguishes three functions of language namely the ideational, the textual and the interpersonal. The ideational elements of a text refer to the ways people encode their experiences of the world. Metadiscourse, however, fulfills two of the three macro-functions of language suggested by Halliday, namely the textual and the interpersonal, but not the ideational. Textual metadiscourse, according to Vandekoppe, refers to devices which primarily play the role of organizing the text for the reader; other studies of textual metadiscourse (Mauranen, 1993; Valero-Garce's, 1996; Moreno, 1997; Bunton, 1999) use the term metatext. Textual metadiscourse is responsible for shaping language into a connected text by providing integration and cohesion for the created text. Interpersonal metadiscourse shows how authors interact with their readers in the sense that a writer's presence in a text is a sign of the interpersonal function (Crismore & Farnsworth).

Interpersonal metadiscourse is mainly used to interact with the reader about the propositional content; in addition, the term

metadiscourse tends to be used in studies discussing textual as well as interpersonal functions (Crismore, 1989; Crismore and Farnsworth, 1990; Hyland, 1998b, 1999; Fuertes-Olivera et al., 2001). The interpersonal function, Halliday (1976) explains, focuses on:

The social, expressive, and cognitive functions of language, [on] expressing the speaker's angle: his attitudes and judgments, his encoding of the role relationships into the situation, and his motive in saying anything at all.... [The] interpersonal component represents the speaker in his role as intruder. (p. 26-7)

Williams J. Vande Kopple (1985) describes metadiscourse as a new term to many composition writers and defined it as discourse about discourse or communication about communication. That means when we write, we write on two levels. On one level, we supply information about the subject of our text; thus, we expand the propositional content. On the other level, concerning the level of metadiscourse, we do not add propositional material but help our readers organize, classify, interpret, evaluate and react to such a material. Hence, as mentioned before, metadiscourse is discourse about discourse or communication about communication.

The interpersonal function is important because it deals with people's setting up of social relations and their taking part in personal interactions. It also can help people to express their personalities and their

reactions to the propositional content of texts and describe the interaction of writers with their readers about the content (Kopple, 1985, p.87). In this way, metadiscourse functions as an authorial tool in the hands of writers, and if cleverly exploited, it can have a great impact on the readers.

Vande Kopple (1985) writes that textual metadiscourse is a kind of communication about communication and that it

“can help us show how we link and relate individual propositions so that they form a cohesive and coherent text and how individual elements of those propositions make sense in conjunction with the other elements of the text in a particular situation” (p. 87).

He also adds that interpersonal metadiscourse is a type of communication about communication in that it

“can help us express our personalities and our reactions to the propositional content of our texts and characterize the interaction we would like to have with our readers about the content” (p. 87).

Other studies were carried out to examine the use and/or effect of metadiscourse. For example, Crismore and Farnsworth, (1989) discuss interpersonal metadiscourse as a dimension of ethos, relating it to Darwin's effect on his readers, especially in his *Origin of Species*. They claim that metadiscourse is the means that Darwin makes use of to influence his readers: "to create an ethos for his readers that informs them, impresses them, and wins them over to his side" (p.92).

Elly Ifantidou, (2005) has conducted a study of metadiscourse within semantic and pragmatic context. The writer argues against the traditional view that metadiscourse is concerned with non-propositional content and tries to recast the notion of metadiscourse in theoretically more justified terms. Ifantidou states that the main stream in metadiscourse is that it is either textual or interpersonal.

Elly Ifantidou, (2005) argues that apart from lexical items such as discourse connectives, adverbs or personal pronouns, metadiscourse has also been seen as linked to punctuation, to typographic markers such as parentheses and underlining (Hyland, 1999), and to visual, nonlinguistic design features such as paragraph indentations, structure layout, consistency of tone with format or with quality of paper-printing, among other things.

Ifantidou argues that the two definitions as set by Hyland, (1998) and Hyland and Tse, (2004) seem to overlap since markers in the former category convey the writer's preferred interpretations of the propositional meanings and markers in the latter category express the author's perspective towards the propositional information conveyed. In other words, the writer's attitude towards the propositional content seems to be

the key metadiscoursal function in both categories; it is not clear how the textual / interpersonal distinction is really being drawn.

Metadiscourse thus can help to understand how the public opinion is formed and the effective means that can direct it to this trend or to that view. In this regard, metadiscourse can work "at an ideological level to compel social action or communicate social norms" (Coupland & Jaworski, 2004). Metadiscourse has contributed to a range of recent work in text analysis. It has informed studies into the properties of texts, participant interactions, historical linguistics, cross-cultural variations and writing pedagogy.

2.1.3. The Importance of Metadiscourse:

Studies have suggested the importance of metadiscourse in casual conversation (Schiffrin, 1980), science popularisations (Crismore & Farnsworth, 1990), undergraduate textbooks (Hyland, 2000), postgraduate dissertations (Bunton, 1998), school textbooks (Crismore, 1989), and company annual reports (Hyland, 1998b). It appears to be a characteristic of a range of languages and genres and has been used to investigate rhetorical differences in the texts written by different language groups (Crismore, Markkanen, & Steffensen, 1993; Mauranen, 1993; Valero-Garces, 1996).

It has also been shown to be present in Early English medical writing (Taavitsainen, 1999), a feature of good ESL and native speaker student writing (Cheng & Steffensen, 1996; Intraprawat & Steffensen, 1995) and an essential element of persuasive and argumentative discourse (Crismore & Farnsworth, 1990; Hyland, 1998a).

Pérez and Macià, (1999) examined metadiscourse in lecture comprehension, in a departure from the traditional focus on written texts. Their results suggest that there are two key factors to be considered: students' proficiency in English and the different types of metadiscourse items present in lectures.

In their *Prologues to What is Possible: Introduction as Metadiscourse*, Phillop Arrington and Shirley K. Rose, (1987) stress the importance of metadiscoursal introduction as they state that introductions are crucial to the success of texts. Students are urged by the authors as teachers of writing to draw from text books lists of tricks and formulas for getting a reader's attention, introducing or providing background on a subject, or stating or implying a thesis. According to the authors, effective introductions must simultaneously focus on a writer's subject, the intended readers, the situation invoked and the writer's own personae; introductions are both text about text and text about context. To stress the rhetoric of introductions, they offer Aristotle's maxim «a good beginning is more than half of the whole course of an inquiry, and once established clears up many difficulties ... (1987, p.2).

Avon Crismore and Rodney Farnworth, (1989) offer a study of interpersonal metadiscourse as a dimension of ethos using Darwin's origin as a practical aspect. According to such a piece of literature ethos is the perceived trust worthiness of authors by readers. It is the most significant factor in determining the effectiveness of authors. A speech maker or text writer can have their ethos prior to their speech being heard or read but they must re-establish it during the course of discourse. It is

argued by Aristotle that there are three factors that comprise ethos; they are intelligence, sagacity and good will. The study concentrates on interpersonal metadiscourse grounding its investigation on Halliday's interpersonal macro functions of language, in addition to using three of William Vande Kopple's seven categories of metadiscourse: modality markers, attitude/ evaluative markers and commentary. The study concludes that Darwin's successful usage of interpersonal markers is the real reason behind the powerful success of origin.

Reaza Abdi, (2002) which is entitled *Interpersonal Metadiscourse: an Indicator of Interaction and Identity*. The study investigates the way writers use the interpersonal metadiscourse to reveal their identity and examines their selected mode of interaction in two major academic fields: the social sciences and natural sciences. A comparison of the two disciplines was made, based on the use of interpersonal metadiscourse through hedges, emphatics and attitude markers. The comparison showed that writers of social sciences employed interpersonal metadiscourse more frequently than writers of natural sciences.

Vande Kopple set Halliday's three macro functions of language (i.e. the ideational, interpersonal and textual functions) as the base of metadiscourse. This means that we use language to give expression to our

experience, to interact with our audience, and to organize our expression into a cohesive and coherent text. Kopple (1985) states that the ideational function is concerned with the expression of our experience: both the external world and the inner world of our own consciousness. The interpersonal function is concerned with language as the mediator role, including all that may be understood by the expression of our personalities and personal feeling on one hand, and the forms of interaction and social interplay with other participants in the communication situation on the other hand. Such a function carries essentially social meanings. The third function or the textual one has the enabling role of creating text. It forges words into an operative structure rather than strings of items. The writer numbers elaborately the aspects of metadiscourse such as text connectives; code glosses illocution markers, validity markers, narrators, attitude markers and commentary.

In his article, “Talking to Students: Metadiscourse in Introductory Coursebooks”, Hyland (1999) explores the possible role of university text books in students' acquisition of a specialized discipline of literacy, focusing on metadiscourse as a mainstream of the writer's linguistic and rhetorical presence in a text. In such a way, the writer provides useful information and supports his argument in addition to building a relationship with readers in different rhetorical contexts. The paper

compares features from 21 textbooks in microbiology, marketing and applied linguistics. It shows the ways textbook authors represent themselves, organize their argument, and signal their attitude towards both their statement and their readers.

According to Hyland, (2005) metadiscourse is a widely used term that refers to conceptualizing interactions between text producers and users. Hyland attributes the term, metadiscourse, to Zellig Harris who coined it in 1959 to offer away of understanding language in use, representing a writer or speaker's attempt to guide a receiver's perception of a text. Hyland, (2005) offers his own model of metadiscourse as he differentiates between interactive and interactional categories. The former concerns the writer's awareness of a participating audience and the ways he/she seeks to accommodate probable knowledge, interests, rhetorical expectations and processing abilities, while the latter concerns the ways writers conduct interaction by intruding and commenting on their message. Hyland's model includes items such as transitions frame markers, evidentials, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions and engagement markers.

In her metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English, Annelie Adel, (2006) defines reflexivity as the capacity of natural language to refer to or

describe itself. She regards metadiscourse as a kind of reflexivity in language and reserves the term, metadiscourse for written texts. The writer offers a brand-new model based on Jakobson's functions of language. She states that although there are several similarities between such a model and the most commonly employed model, that is, the model based on Halliday's functional systematic grammar, the Jakobsonian model is characterized by fewer inconsistencies and exhibits greater precision.

Annelie Adel offers the results of the investigations of the use of metadiscourse by learners and native speakers of English. She explains what she terms as personal metadiscourse and impersonal metadiscourse. The former refers to the explicit expression about the current writer or imagined reader while the latter refers to the implicit expressions doing the same job.

Such categories show how writers direct their readers' minds to where they want. Learners of Arabic as a foreign language can make use of such techniques in their evaluation of Egyptian newspapers as well as reading and writing. Thus, the study should work as a guideline for those learners and in comprehending reading and understand between lines. At

the same time, it draws a comparison between the language of opposing and non-opposing articles in Egypt.

2.1.4. Halliday's Functions of Language:

Language as a means of communication is not used randomly or as a set of lexical items that is put somehow in a linear order. Rather, there are neat systems and established functions that govern the whole matter. Consequently, many a linguist stressed the functionality of language (for example, Jakobson) but to be handled with different theoretical frameworks. Such functionality may be seen in the model set by MAK Halliday which is known as systemic functional grammar.

According to *The Oxford Companion to the English Language* (1992, p.460), the model presented by Halliday known as “systemic grammar and systemic linguistics” has an orientation towards application that emphasizes the functions of Language in use. Such a model stresses the social setting, the mode of expression and influenced selections from a language's system. It is noteworthy that the term systemic, here, means that while functionality is stressed, it is still within the system encoded in a particular language.

According to Halliday (1971, p.143) language serves three functions, the ideational, interpersonal and textual. The first serves for the expression of content. Such a function enables the speaker to relate his experience of the real world. He shows that the ideational function is “concerned with the content of language, its function as the means of the expression of our experience, both of the external world and of the inner world of our consciousness....” (58).

The second function or the interpersonal one establishes and maintains social relations such as the role of a questioner or a respondent which we take on by asking and answering. He expands that the interpersonal function is concerned with language as the mediator of role, including all that may be understood by the expression of our own personalities and personal feelings on the one hand, and forms of interaction and social interplay with other participants in the communication situation on the other hand. (66).

Finally, the textual function helps language make links with itself. Such a function enables speakers or writers to construct texts or connected passages of discourse that is situationally relevant. It distinguishes a text from random sentences. It is defined by Halliday as an enabling function, that of creating text which is language in operation as distinct from strings of words or isolated sentences and clauses. It is

this component that enables the speaker to organize what he is saying in such a way that it makes sense in context and fulfills its function as a message (66).

According to Halliday (1977, pp, 1:2) every text has a texture. The former refers to any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length; the latter refers to the property of being a text. That is to say, a text derives its texture from the fact that it functions as a unity with respect to its environment. According to Reza Abdi (2002, pp, 139: 140) such a classification by Halliday lays the foundation for the concept of metadiscourse. Such being the case, textual and interpersonal metadiscourses have their roots in Halliday's textual and interpersonal functions of language. Even the ideational function may be seen as metadiscourse.

According to Hyland and Tse (2004, p.160), (Crismore, 1989) includes referential, informational metadiscourse in her classification. Consequently, she refers to Halliday's ideational function of language or the way writers express their ideas and experiences. She reintroduces propositional material back into metadiscourse.

2.1.5. Metadiscourse in Writing and Reading:

Actually, metadiscourse, as a device dedicated to making discourse obvious and comprehensible, can be applied to both reading and writing. It enables the analyst to see how writers choose to handle interpretive processes as opposed to statements relating to the world. Yet, the term is mainly dedicated to writing. Vande Kopple (1985, p.83) quotes Williams' definition of metadiscourse as "writing about writing". Kopple goes on to explain such a definition stating that when we write, we write on two levels: on one level, we are concerned with the propositional content through which we supply information; on the other level, that is metadiscourse, we help readers organize, classify, interpret, evaluate and react to such information. Kopple concludes that metadiscourse is discourse about discourse. The term, discourse, here, means writing. As stated in *style; Clarity working with Metadiscourse and Nominalization* (p.1), a paper much of which is adapted from J. Williams (1981), "discourse about discourse" is narrowed as "Writing about writing".

Although Hyland and Tse (2004, p.1) refuse the wrong characterization of metadiscourse as discourse about discourse, they explain such a characterization as a view of writing as a social and communicative engagement between writer and reader. The authors (2004, pp: 160: 161) devoting their paper to metadiscourse in academic

writing state that academic texts may be concerned with issues other than themselves; for while, in the main, they inform readers of activities, objects or people in the world, they try to persuade such readers to these bits of information and promote the writer's scholarly claims and credentials.

Some work has focused on metadiscourse in student writing; Intaraprawat & Steffensen, (1995) analyzed ESL university students' essays and concluded that good writers used a greater variety of metadiscourse than poor writers. It has also been shown that, in L2 instructional contexts, an awareness of metadiscourse is particularly useful in helping non-native speakers of English with the 'difficult' task of grasping the writer's stance when reading challenging authentic materials. Bruce, (1989) suggests that this ability enables non-native learners to better follow the writer's line of reasoning in argumentative texts. Vande Kopple, (1997) observes that specific instruction on metadiscourse can be useful to help L2 readers learn to distinguish factual content from the writer's commentary. Moving away from the traditional concern with written texts, Perez and Macia, (1999) examine metadiscourse in lecture comprehension. Their results suggest that there are two essential factors to be highlighted: students' proficiency in English and the different types of metadiscourse items present in lectures.

Camiciottoli, (2003) discusses the influence of metadiscourse on reading comprehension levels in an L2 setting, concluding that metadiscourse can have a positive influence on comprehension.

By the same token, Steffensen's and Cheng's study (1996) analyze how students write after learning about metadiscourse. The study investigates the effects of instructions in metadiscourse on composition students' writing skills. Subjects were students of two different classes: a control class which was taught using a process approach, and the experimental class which had directed teaching of metadiscourse. The control class students worked on the propositional content of their essays while experimental class students concentrated on the pragmatic functions of metadiscourse; that is to say, experimental class students used metadiscourse markers more effectively and wrote with more attention to audience needs, thereby making global changes that improved their papers. Steffensen and Cheng (1996, p.154) state that textual categories of metadiscourse serve to mark the text structure while those of interpersonal metadiscourse support the interaction between text, reader and writer. It all goes to show that metadiscourse is mainly writing-oriented.

Hyland and Tse (2004) have dedicated their work to the study of metadiscourse in academic writing but they (2004, p.158) refer, as well, to those works such as (Schiffrin 1980) which suggest the importance of metadiscourse in casual conversation. In their piece of literature, Hyland and Tse, (2004) have conducted their study on academic writing. They offer a re-assessment of metadiscourse and hope for a more robust model as they analyze about 240 L2 postgraduate dissertations, their main argument is that metadiscourse offers a way of understanding the interpersonal resources writers use to present propositional material. The authors refuse the inaccurate definition of metadiscourse as discourse about discourse but they define it as the linguistic resources used to organize a discourse or the writer's stance towards either its content or the reader. The authors examine the propositional vs. non-propositional discourse, writer reader inter-action, in addition to the internal vs. external relations.

Crismore and Farnsworth (1989, p.92) explain the idea pointing out that when speakers talk to listeners or authors to readers in a communicative situation (the context) or a discourse (the text), they use metadiscourse. They quote Schiffrin's definition of verbal metadiscourse as "metatalk". Thus, she refers to the devices that allow a speaker to

exercise control over the principal discourse at specific junctures during its production.

On the other hand, some experimental work has been done on the effects of metadiscourse on reading comprehension. Crismore and Farnsworth (1989, p.91) define ethos as the perceived trust worthiness of authors by readers. It is a rhetorical device that determines the effectiveness of authors Crismore and Farnsworth goes on to state that authors may have the ethos prior to their speech being heard (a matter of reading). Crismore, (1989) attempted to determine whether including informational and attitudinal metadiscourse in passages of social studies textbooks would influence reading retention (among other factors) with sixth graders. She found that there was some improvement in retention after reading passages with both types of metadiscourse, but only with certain participant subgroups.

Camiciottoli, (2003) aimed at gaining more insight into the influence of metadiscourse on reading comprehension levels in an L2 setting. She concluded that, on a general level, the results of her study lend further support to the idea that metadiscourse can have a positive influence on comprehension. But she adds that “this interpretation needs to be couched with caution” and calls for “more refined experimental

work on specific aspects of metadiscourse under more controlled conditions to filter out potentially influential variables” (p. 37).

2.1.6. Visual Metadiscourse:

It is already established that many metadiscursive devices are mainly linguistic items (connectives, validity markers, attitude markers, illocution marks, etc). Kumpf (2000) highlights the concept of visual metadiscourse in his article "Visual metadiscourse: Designing the considerate text." He argues that visual metadiscourse can provide design criteria for authors when considering the needs and expectations of readers. The linguistic concept of metadiscourse is expanded from the textual realm to the visual realm, where authors have many necessary design considerations as they attempt to help readers navigate through and understand documents.

According to Ifantidou (2005), metadiscourse has also been seen as linked to punctuation, typographic markers such as parentheses, underlining and boldface. In addition, we may have other non- linguistic features such as paragraph indentation, structure layout and the format or quality of paper-printing.

Annelie Ädel (2006, p.28) implicitly states that visual metadiscourse may be on writing level or on speaking level. On the

former level, we may have typographical marking such as italics and boldface; on the latter level, we may have gesturing, for instance. Yet, she rejects such aspects as being markers of metadiscourse the only aspect of metadiscourse with her is that of wording.

In the following chapter, the researcher seeks to analyze the interpersonal or interactional category of metadiscourse in the twenty articles, making use of devices such as Hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mentions.

Chapter Three

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first is dedicated to the analysis of the interpersonal function of metadiscourse in the twenty articles in the light of Hyland's classification. The second section will provide the results that and the third section contains an interpretation and discussion of the results of the analysis of the twenty articles.

3.1. Tools Hyland's Classification of Interpersonal Metadiscourse

Categories

In the following pages, the researcher studies the metadiscursive model set by Hyland (2005). Such a model is mainly interpersonal as it regards the textual markers of metadiscourse as originally interpersonal ones.

If Annelie Ädel (2006, p.175) refers to the narrow (non-integrative) approach of metadiscourse as the one that primarily investigates aspects of text organization and largely excluding the interpersonal elements; then, Hyland (2005) holds the very opposite of such a model, that is, metadiscourse is, in the main, interpersonal.

The model offered by Hyland (2005, 49) is comprised of dimensions of interaction:

1- **The interactive dimension.** Such a dimension concerns the writer's awareness of a participating audience and the ways such a writer seeks to accommodate knowledge, interests, rhetorical expectations and processing abilities. By doing so, he tries to shape and constrain a text to meet the needs of his readers. Simply stated, such a dimension helps to guide the reader through the text. It has the following markers:

a- **Transitions** which express relations between main clauses such as “but” and “thus”, etc.

b- **Frame markers** which refer to discourse act sequences or stages such as “finally”, “to conclude”, etc.

c- **Endophoric markers** which refer to information in other parts of the text such as “noted above”, “see Fig”, etc.

d- **Evidentials** which refer to information from other texts such as “according to X”, “Z states”, etc.

e- **Code glosses** which elaborate propositional meanings such as “namely”, “e.g.”, “in other words”, etc.

2- **The interactional dimension.** Such a dimension concerns the ways writers conduct interaction by intruding and commenting on their message. The writer's goal, here, is to make himself explicit and involve readers by allowing them to respond to the text. Simply stated, such a

dimension involves the reader in the text. The researcher is to conduct his analysis by the use of the subcategories of this dimension as his tool. They are hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions and engagement markers.

3.1.1. Reasons for Choosing These Tools:

Actually, the interactional dimension, with the help of its subcategories, has some advantages about it which have attracted the researcher on its side. Firstly, and as stated by Hyland (2005, p.52) it involves readers and their open opportunities to contribute to discourse. Secondly, it helps control the level of personality in a text as writers acknowledge and connect to others by reacting according to their needs. Thirdly, such a dimension is not only a means by which writers express their views but also a way of engagement with the socially determined positions of others. That is, it is used to anticipate, acknowledge, challenge or suppress alternatives.

In other words, it is a way of expansion or restriction to the opportunities of such views. Such being the case, the researcher has chosen the features of interactional dimension in his analysis to the stance of opposing and non- opposing writers of Egyptian newspapers. These features are hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and

self-mentions. They are concerned with writers' attitude and level of personality or with tenor as Hyland and Tse (2004, p.108) have put it. The metadiscursive interpersonal resources help writers to be closer to their readers and convey their own intentions whether directly or indirectly. They also help writers direct their readers' attention to a certain message and urge them to react in a particular manner.

3.1.2. Hedges:

According to Hyland and Tse (2004, p.168) hedges shows the writer's reluctance to the proposition as an established fact. As stated by Hyland (2005, p.52) they are devices such as “possible”, “might” and “perhaps” which are used to withhold complete commitment to a propositional information. They allow subjectivity as they make information sound an opinion rather than a fact. The matter is then, a writer's plausible reasoning rather than certain knowledge.

3.1.3. Boosters:

According to Hyland and Tse (2004, p.168) such markers imply certainty and emphasize the force of a proposition. As stated by Hyland (2005, p.52) words such as “clearly” and “obviously” allow writers to close down alternatives and head off conflicting views. Boosters

emphasize certainty by marking involvement with the topic and solidarity with an audience, and by taking a joint position against other voices.

3.1.4 Attitude Markers:

According to Hyland and Tse (2004, p.168) attitude markers express the writer's appraisal of propositional information, conveying surprise, obligation, agreement, importance, etc. As stated by Hyland (2005, p.53) words such as “agree”, “prefer”, “unfortunately” and “remarkable” indicate the writer's affective, rather than epistemic attitude to proposition. As lexical items, they are much more powerful in expressing attitude than syntactic devices such as subordination, comparatives, punctuation, etc.

3.1.5 Self- mention:

According Hyland (2005, p.53), such a marker refers to the degree of explicit presence of the author in a text. Items of such a marker are the first person pronouns and possessive adjectives (I, me, mine, exclusive we, our, ours). According to Hyland, the usage of the first person pronouns is the most powerful means of self-representation. Writers use such a marker to show how they stand in relations to their argument.

3.1.6. Engagement Markers:

According to Hyland and Tse (2004, p.168) engagement markers explicitly address readers by focusing their attention or including them as participants in the text through second person pronouns, imperatives and question forms. According to Hyland (2005, p.54), engagement markers such as “consider”, “note that”, and “you can see that” may be confused with attitude markers. But engagement markers are characterized by focusing on reader's participation in two ways. Firstly, they acknowledge the need of reader inclusion and solidarity with him. Such being the case, they are addressed as participants (you, your, inclusive we). Secondly, they involve positioning the audience especially at critical points; predicting objections and guiding them to particular interpretation. This is usually achieved by questions, imperatives and obligation modals such as “should”, “must”, etc.

3.2. The Hypothesis

The current study is based upon two hypotheses. First it is assumed that writers will use the two basic paradigms of meaning suggested by Halliday as far as metadiscourse markers are concerned, i.e. the textual and the interpersonal. Second, when foreign learners of Arabic acquire solid knowledge of these four categories of markers that fall within the two paradigmatic classifications, their performance in writing will be

improved significantly in comparison with those who did not acquire such knowledge.

This study is highlighting the idiosyncratic interpersonal categories of each type of writing, pro or against a certain idea and this is to facilitate to the foreign reader to identify the opposing stands of authors and which articles can be seen as opposing and which as non-opposing articles and this will help learners to comprehend passages and read between the lines. The research question is how authors use strategies in metadiscourse and how can this affect improving the writing level of foreign learners of Arabic?

3.3. The study

The study includes ten articles from Al-Ahram written by ten different writers with a total corpus of about 5,290 words and another ten from Al-Wafd written by seven different writers with a total corpus of about 5,013 words. The chosen articles cover the period from September 2006 to April 2007. They tackle one subject: the constitutional amendments suggested by the President. The researcher has chosen opinion articles from both newspapers because they are expressive of the writers' attitudes. He picked up the first ten opinion articles that turned up

in the search engine on the official sites of both newspapers: *Al-Ahram* (www.ahram.org.eg) and *Al-Wafd* (www.wafd.org).

The choice of *Al-Ahram* and *Al-Wafd* in particular is based on their long history and on the grounds that the two papers represent a broad spectrum of writing styles, persuasion strategies and mainstream attitudes and the age-old for both of them. *Al-Ahram* is chosen as a representative of non-opposing newspapers in Egypt as it mainly supports and defends the decisions and actions of the government and explains the non-opposing stance on many issues. *Al-Wafd*, on the other hand, stands for a major opposition trend, namely the liberal trend, which primarily attacks and criticizes the non-opposing policies. The researcher studies 10 articles from each newspaper that dealt with the issue of constitutional amendments during the period from September 2006 to April 2007.

Following is a list of the chosen articles from both newspapers chronologically ordered:

From *Al-Ahram*

1- Salama, A. Salama (10/12/2006). Who has the right to amend the Constitution?

تعديل الدستور.. حق لمن؟ سلامة أحمد سلامة

2- Nafi', Ibrahim (12/26/2006). Facts.

حقائق بقلم : إبراهيم نافع

3- Salama, Abdel Mohsen (12/27/2006). Hot Issues.

نقاط ساخنة بقلم : عبدالمحسن سلامة

4- Zayda, Jamal (12/28/2006). Egypt First: Modernizing Egypt.

مصر أولاً: تحديث مصر بقلم: جمال زائدة

5- Mu'awad, Mahmoud (1/4/2007). Arab Affairs.

أحوال عربية بقلم: محمود معوض

6- Sa'id, Muhammad Al-Sayed (1/15/2007). Freedom in the Constitutional Amendments.

قضية الحرية في التعديلات الدستورية بقلم محمد السيد سعيد

7- Yasin, Al-Sayed (1/19/2007). An Amendment of the Constitution or a New Social Contract?

تعديل دستوري أم عقد اجتماعي جديد؟ بقلم : السيد يسين

8- Sa'id, Abdel Mon'em (3/12/2007). The Post-Constitutional Amendments Stage.

مرحلة ما بعد التعديلات الدستورية بقلم: عبد المنعم سعيد

9- Sakran, Muhammad (3/14/2007). The Constitutional Amendments and the Characteristics of the Egyptian Identity.

التعديلات الدستورية ومقومات الهوية المصرية بقلم: د. محمد سكران

10- Zekry, Nagla' (3/25/2006). The Constitutional Amendments and the Required Dialogue.

التعديلات الدستورية والحوار المطلوب: نجلاء ذكري

From *Al-Wafd*

1- Ouda, Ahmad (10/13/2006). Welcome to the constitutional battle.

بقلم أحمد عودة مرحباً بمعركة الدستور

2- Fahmy, Abdel Rahman. (12/7/2006). No need for Constitutional Amendments.

لا داعي لتعديل الدستور بقلم عبد الرحمن فهمي

3- Al-Taweel, Mustafa (1/11/2007). Oh my!

عجبي! بقلم مصطفى الطويل

4- Abdel Kodous, Muhammad (3/8/2007). The short-lived constitutional amendments.

التعديلات الدستورية قصيرة العمر بقلم محمد عبد القدوس

5- Al-Tarabily, Abbas (3/18/2007). Say "No!" for the sake of your children.

قولوا لا لمصلحة أولادكم بقلم عباس الطرابيلي

6- Al-Sayed, Ali (3/20/2007). Dramatization of the Constitutional Amendments.

مسرحة التعديلات الدستورية بقلم علي السيد

7. Al-Tarabily, Abbas (3/22/2007). The people will have the last word.

الكلمة الأخيرة للشعب بقلم عباس الطرابيلي

8- Sherdy, Muhammad Mustafa (3/27/2007). A question that puzzles me

9- Badawy, Jamal (29/3/2007). Topsy Turvy.

فسدت الطبخة بقلم جمال بدوي

10- Badawy, Jamal (4/1/2007). Catching the Wind.

قبض الريح بقلم جمال بدوي

3.3.1. Methodology and Data

In order to verify the two hypotheses mentioned above, two methodologies are used correspondingly to each hypothesis. The first methodology is an empirical one and the second is experimental. Empirical methodology is a research methodology used to observe the phenomena, record data about them and then analyze this data, but without interfering in the phenomenon being observed or trying to control the behavior of the objects or subjects being tested. An experimental methodology, on the other hand, interferes in the phenomenon by separating the subjects being tested into an experimental group, on which the test is done, and a control group which does not participate in the experiment but is used for comparison. The empirical method used in verification of hypothesis i.e. the hypothesis that writers will use the two basic paradigms of meaning suggested by Haliday as far as metadiscourse markers are concerned, involves an analysis of twenty newspaper articles about a given subject representing different styles, cultural backgrounds, personal and political affiliations of writers. Press discourse is favored

over other types of discourse because students like to read the newspapers as they do in their own language.

Although many researchers (e.g., Crismore et al. 1993; Vandekopple, 2002) hold that interpersonal pronouns are not to be counted as part of the metadiscourse devices, Hyland and Tse argue that these pronouns help writers/speaker engage their readers/listeners in the ongoing process of interaction, and hence are part and parcel of metadiscourse resources. Thus, the researcher decided to keep these elements as part of the framework. The interpersonal part of the classification system will thus be the basis of analysis. It should as well be noted that Hyland and Tse call the interpersonal part of metadiscourse ‘interactional’ resources, but the researcher uses the more mainstream term- ‘interpersonal’ resources.

The aim of this analysis is to find out how the metadiscourse markers, the formal and the idiosyncratic are deployed by writers in order to give their ideas a logical shape and their message a communicative effect. This is done by careful statistical analysis of the data, followed by an explanation of the significance of numbers. In order to verify the second hypothesis, i.e. the hypothesis that foreign learners of Arabic will be able to improve their performance in writing significantly by

mastering the use of metadiscourse markers, an experimental methodology will be followed. Two groups of non-native Arabic learners are selected randomly, one serving as a control class and the other serving as an experimental class. A pre-test of performance in writing is conducted by the two groups. Then the experimental class is tasked with analyzing some of the articles used in the verification of hypothesis to find out metadiscourse markers and classify them across the four categories and the two broad paradigms of textual and interpersonal markers, following an initiation by the researcher. The control class will not go through this experience. A post-test is then given to both classes. It is expected that the writing level of the experimental class will come out higher than that of the control class who did not participate in the metadiscourse analysis of the articles.

3.3.2. Framework of Analysis

The classification system offered by Hyland and Tse (2004) is used. Although many researchers (e.g., Crismore et al. 1993; Vande Kopple, 2002) hold that interpersonal pronouns are not to be counted as part of the metadiscourse devices, Hyland and Tse argue that these pronouns help writers/speaker engage their readers/listeners in the on-going process of interaction, and hence are part and parcel of metadiscourse resources. Thus, the researcher decided to keep these

elements as part of the framework. The interpersonal part of the classification system which was provided above will thus be the basis of analysis. It should as well be noted that Hyland and Tse call the interpersonal part of metadiscourse ‘interactional’ resources, but I will use the more mainstream term- ‘interpersonal’ resources. Thus, there will be four sub-categories. These are *hedges*, *boosters*, *attitude markers*, and *engagement markers*, and *self-mentions*.

The most important criterion for the analysis in the current paper will be that a linguistic item or expression be an instance of metadiscourse rather than propositional content. Thus the decision will rely on what seems to be the primary function of the linguistic item or expression, many of such items and expressions being ‘multifunctional’ (either metadiscourse or propositional content, depending on the context) and sometimes simultaneously metadiscourse and propositional content.

3.3.3. Procedures

The analysis of interpersonal metadiscourse went through the following steps:

1. Each article in the corpus was divided into dependent clauses, in order to facilitate reference and analysis.

2. The cases of interpersonal metadiscourse were identified in the corpus.
3. The cases of interpersonal metadiscourse were examined according to the taxonomy selected in the framework of analysis above.
4. The contexts and functions of each class were examined.

3.4. Empirical Instruments

Some empirical instruments are used by the researcher to verify the first hypothesis of the study. They include: Singling out the metadiscourse markers used in the twenty selected articles, classifying them in line with the four categories specified and then analyzing the data statistically.

First, the researcher examines the types of interpersonal metadiscourse categories used by opposing and non-opposing articles using two newspapers. The classification system offered by Hyland and Tse (2004) will be used. Hyland's classification focuses on two main terms borrowed from Thompson (2001): interactive resources and interactional resources. The interactional/interpersonal resources focus on the participants of the interaction and seek to display the writer's persona and allow writers to express a perspective towards their propositional information and their readers. It is essentially an evaluative form of

discourse and expresses the writer's individually defined, but disciplinary circumscribed, persona. Metadiscourse therefore relates to the level of personality, or tenor, of the discourse and influences such matters as the author's intimacy and remoteness, expression of attitude, commitment to propositions and degree of reader involvement.

The researcher compares the occurrences of such categories in both types of newspapers to be able to conclude to what extent such categories can express the attitudes of writers and/or their newspapers and how this can affect learners of Arabic as a foreign language differentiate between different types of articles and how such occurrences help learners identify the authors' attitudes. Finally, the researcher explains how such categories can help foreign learners of Arabic in writing and including metadiscourse devices as a means of stating and conveying their points of view in their writing through making use of interpersonal metadiscourse to be used in their writing and they also are useful in other fields like translation.

The study makes use of Hyland and Tse's classification of the techniques of interpersonal metadiscourse (2004) as shown in Table 3.1. This classification is chosen because it is more relevant to journalistic writing than others. The reason why the researcher has favored Hyland's

classification to other tools such as Perez and Macia's (1999) as they examine metadiscourse in lecture comprehension is related to the fact that the latter largely ignored elements almost exclusively found in written discourse because their concern was based on lecture comprehension. Hyland and Tse's classification, on the other hand, suits the purpose of this study since it highlights how the journalist or the writer interacts with the readers and helps to constitute their awareness of the status quo. The interpersonal categories focus on the participants of the interaction and seek to display the writer's persona. Metadiscourse here concerns the writer's efforts to control the level of personality in a text and establish a suitable relationship to his/her data, arguments, and audience, marking the degree of intimacy, the expression of attitude, the communication of commitments, and the extent of reader involvement. Metadiscourse functions include attitude markers, engagement markers, self-mentions, boosters and hedges.

Table 3.1 shows the metadiscourse markers used by Egyptian writers in the twenty articles, and their classificatory distribution across the articles:

Marker	Type	Newspaper	Article/author
لا خلاف	booster	الأهرام	التعديل الدستوري من حق

لا بد	booster	الأهرام	من ؟ - سلامة أحمد سلامة
من الملاحظ أن	booster	الأهرام	
بغير شك	booster		
قد يبدو ..	Hedge	الأهرام	مرحلة ما بعد التعديلات
ومن المرجح	Hedge		الدستورية - د. عبد المنعم
وبالتأكيد أنه ...	booster	الأهرام	سعيد
سوف ...	booster	الأهرام	مصر أولا/تحديث مصر - جمال زائدة
إننا وقفنا فيما مضى ..	Self-mention	الوفد	مرحبا بمعركة الدستور - أحمد عودة
ولا يفوتنا أن ننوه	Self-mention	الوفد	
وياللعجب	Attitude marker	الوفد	
آثرت	Self-mention	الوفد	عجبي - المستشار مصطفى
عجبي	Attitude maker	الوفد	الطويل
وما كنت أنتظره	Self-mention	الوفد	
أما نحن...	Engagement marker	الوفد	
ياسادة	Engagement marker	الوفد	

جربنا (3 مرات)	Self-mention	الوفد	لا داعي لتعديل الدستور - عبد الرحمن فهمي
صدقوني	Engagement marker	الوفد	
قولوا لي	Engagement marker	الوفد	
رأينا (ما حدث)	Engagement marker	الوفد	
وفي يقيني	booster	الوفد	التعديلات الدستورية قصيرة
وأقول لهؤلاء	Self-mention	الوفد	العمر - محمد عبد القدوس
حتما	booster	الوفد	مسرحية التعديلات
فعلا	booster	الوفد	الدستورية - على السيد
بالضرورة	booster	الوفد	
وها نحن نظل في خانة المتفرجين	Engagement marker	الوفد	
وهكذا تعلمنا الدرس	Engagement marker	الوفد	
وكما توقعنا	Engagement marker	الوفد	
وشخصيا لم أتوقع ..	Self-mention	الوفد	

وكتبت ذلك ...	Self-mention	الوفد	
نتعلم	Engagement marker	الوفد	قبض الريح - جمال بدوي
نبكي	Engagement marker	الوفد	
نتعجب-نصرخ	Engagement marker	الوفد	
واضح أن	booster	الوفد	الكلمة الأخيرة للشعب عباس الطرابيلي
سألت نفسي	Self-mention	الأهرام	قضية الحرية في التعديلات
على الإطلاق	booster		الدستورية - محمد السيد
والمواقع أن	booster		سعيد
ونعلم أن	Engagement- marker		
قد نندم	Engagement- marker		
وهي بالقطع لا تكفي مطلقا ...	booster		
لقد قرأت	Self-mention	الأهرام	تعديل دستوري أم عقد اجتماعي جديد السيد يس
على الإطلاق	booster		

مما لا شك فيه	booster	الأهرام	التعديلات الدستورية والحوار المطلوب نجلء ذكرى
الحقيقة أن	booster		
المهم أن	booster	الأهرام	نقاط ساخنة عبد المحسن سلامة
وفي تقديري	Self-mention	الأهرام	حقائق إبراهيم نافع
ولعلها فرصة	Hedge	الأهرام	أحوال عربية - محمود
ولعل تلك الحقيقة	Hedge		معوذ

Table 3.2 below shows a statistical distribution of the metadiscourse markers used in the twenty articles and the final statistics of the four metadiscourse categories

Marker	Al-Ahram	Alwafd	Total
booster	لا خلاف لابد من الملاحظ أن (2) بغير شك	وفي يقيني حتما فعلا بالضرورة واضح أن	19

	<p>وبالتأكيد أنه سوف على الإطلاق (2) والواقع أن بالقطع مما لاشك فيه الحقيقة أن المهم أن subtotal =14</p>	<p>Subtotal=5</p>	
Attitude marker		<p>ويا للعجب عجبي Subtotal=2</p>	2
Engagement marker	<p>ونعلم أم قد نندم Subtotal=2</p>	<p>أما نحن ياسادة (2) صدقوني قولوا لي (2) رأينا (ما حدث) وها نحن وهكذا تعلمنا وكما توقعنا نتعلم نبيكي</p>	19

		نتعجب - نصرخ جربنا (3) Subtotal=17	
Hedge	قد يبدو من المرجح ولعلها فرصة ولعل تلك الحقيقة Subtotal=4		4
Self-mention	سألت نفسي لقد قرأت وهنا أقول Subtotal=3	سؤال محيرني ولا يفوتنا أن ننوه أثرت أنا أم أحفادي وأقول لهؤلاء إننا نخشى إننا لا نريد Subtotal=7	10

Al-Ahram = 23 markers

Al-wafd = 31 markers total = 54 markers

3.5. Results and Discussion

The total number of interpersonal metadiscourse cases in the corpus was 54 items; 23 markers in Al-Ahram and 31 ones in Al-Wafd. Quite expectedly, 70 percent of these items were engagement markers and self-mentions. Table 4.3 below provides the number of occurrences as well as the percentage of each case of interpersonal metadiscourse identified in the corpus.

Table 3.3

Ranked Interpersonal Metadiscourse Categories Based on Total Interpersonal Metadiscourse Percentage

Interpersonal Metadiscourse	Number of items	Percentage of total number of metadiscourse	Al-Ahram	Al-Wafd
Self-mentions	10	18.5	30%	70%
Engagement Markers	19	35.2	11%	89%
Attitude Markers	2	3.7	0%	100%
Boosters	19	35.2	74%	26%
Hedges	4	7.5	100%	0%

Results summarized in the table reiterate the fact that Engagement markers and boosters are the most frequent categories, while hedges and Attitude markers are the least. In the following sections the various classes of metadiscourse are discussed. In each section the category considered is briefly described, and the contexts in which it occurred as well as the rhetorical functions it fulfilled are discussed.

3.5.1. Self-Mentions

Self-mentions are explicit references to the writer. Comprising about 18.5 percent of all the cases of interpersonal metadiscourse identified. The first and most important context in which self-mentions were deployed was when writers reported some of their daily life activities. Such activities were mostly an account of why a writer decided to write the present article, or why he/she reacted in a certain way in a certain situation. In other words, the activities introduced are closely related to the on-going discourse. The second major use of self-mentions was to describe a journalist's mental processes while composing his/her article.

Self-mentions are mentioned 3 occurrences in *Al-Ahram* and 7 times in *Al-Wafd*. In *Al-Ahram* we have Nafi's "وهنا أقول" (here I say) and in *Al-Wafd* we have Sherdy's "سؤال محيرني" (a question that puzzles me) which is repeated twice and "أنا أم أحفادي؟" (Me or my grandchildren?).

Nafi's self-mention is intended to stress the writer's identity and his point of view as a famous journalist while Sherdy's self-mentions are intended to stress the same function of engagement markers, namely to arouse the reader's suspense and expectation, especially when he uses "a question that puzzles me" once in the title of his article and another time near the end to make it clear that the question does not puzzle him only but his readers as well. Besides he concludes his article with (Me or my grandchildren?) also to stress his lack of optimism concerning a true democratic life in Egypt. His use of "my grandchildren" not "my sons" enhances this feeling of pessimism concerning the future of democracy in Egypt.

3.5.2. Engagement Markers

These are used to explicitly refer to or build relationship with readers. Examples of these are items like consider, you can see that, note that, etc. As indicated in the table, these devices constituted about 35.2 percent of all cases of interpersonal metadiscourse in the corpus.

Writers used these devices in various contexts. First, they used them to create a situation in which they and their audiences can be seen as if in the same boats(s), having the same fate, suffering from the same

problems, and fighting for the same (just) cause. Second, writers used engagement markers to elicit a certain reaction from their readers.

Engagement markers occurred twice in *Al-Ahram* while they occur 17 times in *Al-Wafd*). In *Al-Ahram* for example, we find "شهدنا" (We have witnessed) by Zayda during his talk about the history of the constitution in Egypt. It is clear that this item is a neutral term that refers to the writer and his readers as symbols of the Egyptian people as a whole. In *Al-Wafd* the image differs. The 17 engagement markers of *Al-Wafd* are various and multi-sided. The writers use these devices in various contexts. First, they use them to create a situation in which they and their audiences can be seen as if in the same boats(s), having the same fate, suffering from the same problems, and fighting for the same (just) cause. This appears in the use of first-person plural pronouns such as "we, our, us" (our life/our problem; what we do; they let us). Sherdy uses another technique namely second-person pronouns when he speaks directly to his reader: "your hands/feet/mouth; throw you".

3.5.3. Attitude Markers

These are items that writers use in order to express their attitudes toward either the propositional content (i.e. primary discourse) or their readers. Occurring two times in the corpus, these resources formed the

fifth most frequent type of interpersonal metadiscourse. Thus, these totaled about 3.7 percent of all the items of interpersonal metadiscourse identified. A very interesting case in point of attitude markers in the corpus is when one of the journalists very skillfully introduces an account of the status quo in Egypt to his readers and then meticulously and describes a sympathetic, and an emotionally-charged image of his own attitude toward such an account. *Al-Wafd* replaces the word "تعديلات" with the word "استفتاء" which is repeated two times in *Al-Wafd* but is not used in *Al-Ahram* at all.

The corpus from *Al-Ahram* lacks these remarks, which is enough evidence to the fact that the tone of support expressed by *Al-Ahram* aims only to praise what the government and the President have settled on. *Al-Ahram*, on the other hand, uses positive expressions that completely differ from those used by *Al-Wafd*. In this way, the corpus of *Al-Ahram* portrays an optimistic image of Egypt's future unlike the "unknown future" mentioned explicitly by Badawy and implicitly by Sherdy in *Al-Wafd*.

3.5.4. Boosters:

Boosters are devices that are used to lay emphasis on propositional content; they form 35.2 percent of interpersonal metadiscourse in the corpus; in *Al-Ahram* (14 occurrences) against (5 occurrences) in *Al-Wafd*.

Writers used boosters not to emphasize their own views, but to refute the viewpoints of others. The great majority of hedges occurring in the corpus were used also ironically: Since using hedges incorporates a degree of taking others' views into account, by presenting one's own views as non-universal.

The boosters used by *Al-Ahram* writers aim to confirm the changes that the constitutional amendments will help to achieve. The word "سوف" (will) is the most used as it refers to the expected results of the amendments. Other expressions signify the same end, namely to confirm the necessity and prospective success of the amendments as well as the support expressed by all groups (بجميع طوائفها). Using the superlative form "أهم" (the most important) also has the same effect. Similarly, "ولا مجال" (no room for bartering) aims to make it clear that the amendments should not be exploited for any other reason except to enhance the democratic process in Egypt.

In *Al-Wafd* most of the boosters used are emphatic words that signify the writer's wish to assert the truth of what he says. Emphatic words such as "إنّ/أنّ/لن". "لن" has an additional meaning of future negative to reflect the state of pessimism that the writers feel and express. Similarly, the superlative form "أخطر" (the most serious) is also used in the meaning of "the most important" to show how the government has

restricted all kinds of freedom after making sure that America has abandoned the call for reform in Egypt.

3.5.5. Hedges:

Hedges are items that writers use to show present propositional content cautiously so that they can escape blame if their views turn out to be false or misleading; they form 7.5 percent; *Al-Ahram* (4 occurrences) and 0 % of that of *Al-Wafd*. The small number of hedges signifies that the writer has nothing to fear because he supports the decisions of the government. However, this can be accounted for in terms of social and political position.

3.6. Cultural metadiscourse markers:

There is a third paradigmatic classification of metadiscourse markers besides the textual and the interpersonal, i.e. the cultural, which was discovered in the course of analyzing the twenty articles. Cultural markers include idioms and proverbs that are deeply rooted in the culture in which the language happens to be a subpart. They serve both as attitude and engagement markers since a proverb is certainly laden with cultural overtones which the writer projects on the immediate communication situation. These overtones are readily shared with his readers who exist in the same cultural context.

<i>Al-Ahram</i>	<i>Al-Wafd</i>
تفتح الباب على مصراعيه لبث العافية	قبض الريح انفض المولد يستجمع النظام قواه لتشديد قبضته الحديدية يدخل الجميع الجحور ويضعوا ألسنتهم في حلوقهم وأصابعهم في آذانهم، الجبن سيد الأخلاق قبض الريح ألقوا بك في الماء وقالوا اسبح

"الجبن سيد الأخلاق" (Cowardice is the master of all morals, is a satirical proverb which represents a distortion of another famous proverb, "tolerance is the master of all morals". It refers to the necessity to be coward to escape the government's persecution "and" قبض الريح" (catching the wind, makes it clear that everything the opposition says and does is futile. One writer shows his attitude by quoting from the Qur'an although he does not give his quote as a direct verse from Qur'an; he integrates the expression "أصابعهم في آذانهم" (they put their fingers in their ears) (Sura Noah, verse 7) into his own words. This may reflect the

writer's intention to appeal to the religious sense of his readers. It is to be observed that writers in the opposition mouthpiece (Al-Wafd) use these cultural markers much more frequently than those of the government mouthpiece, Al-Ahram. This can be explained in terms of the fact that opposition writers want to create a different attitude that runs counter to the mainstream, pro-government tide. So they appeal to the micro level of culture rather than to the macro level of politics. Al-Ahram writers, on the other hand, being champions of an already-established attitude, need only use the more formal emphatic devices belonging under the other two paradigms of expressing meaning.

Chapter Four

4.1. Experimental Instruments

Now that we have made sure that journalistic writers of standard classical Arabic use metadiscourse markers to make their writings both coherent and persuasive, we can move on to our experimental corroboration of the second hypothesis, i.e. that students level in writing will be improved by learning and applying the same strategies. In this regard the current study replicates an experiment carried out by Steffenson and Margaret. Their study investigates the effects of instruction in metadiscourse on composition students' writing skills. Subjects were students in two 100-level college composition classes. A control class (CC) was taught using a process approach, and the Experimental class (EC) had direct teaching of metadiscourse. The CC students worked on the propositional content of their essays while the EC students concentrated on the pragmatic functions of metadiscourse. Posttests written by EC students were significantly better than those of the CC, although pretest results did not differ.

Similarly in the current study, a sample of ten American learners of Arabic is selected randomly; six females and four males; their ages range between eighteen and twenty four; they are studying Arabic in the advanced level, at the American University in Cairo. Half of this sample

represents the Experimental Class (EC) and the other half function as a control class (CC). In this experiment five students make up the experimental class and the other five students form a control class. Pre-writing tests were given to both classes which revealed that students in both the CC and the EC virtually have the same level in Arabic composition. After a lengthy initiation of the subjects into the metadiscourse markers and their functions, the EC were tasked with analyzing the twenty articles analyzed by the researcher in the first phase. They were asked to highlight the metadiscourse markers in these articles and classify them both categorically and paradigmatically. The next step was for the EC students to specify the function of each metadiscourse marker each of them found, in terms of whether it serves a textual cohesion function or an interactive function. A posttest was given to both groups to write about their personal statement if they want to submit their papers to a university. The posttest after two month of analysis and discussion revealed significant improvement in the EC students' performance in writing in comparison with their CC peers. A sample writing sheet is found in the sample lesson in the Appendices section.

4.4. Limitations of the Study

One key limitation of the study in its present form is its reliance on frequency counts of metadiscourse markers within each article. Crowhurst (1987) cautions against reliance on this measure as a means of determining how usage of specified features is related to writing quality, she mentioned that the extent of utilization of a particular linguistic device in her study, “cohesive ties were analyzed” does not necessarily equate with writing quality. In analyzing essays one must pay close attention to the context in which the devices are used and the level of complexity and maturity with which they are used. This caution is a valid one and it will guide further analysis of the metadiscourse markers.

This study is limited in that it was not possible to analyze individual cultures. Coming studies may check this area. And for the results to be generalized to all newspapers, we need to analyze a larger corpus, and articles written are more journalists in a wider range of newspapers.

4.5. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

In conclusion, it can be stated that the journalist whose article up the corpus could successfully employ items of interpersonal metadiscourse to interact with their audiences and could help learners of Arabic as a second language to improve their writing and reading.

As has been noted, the students in this study wrote articles that made use of metadiscourse markers, yet these were limited in number and scope. The most commonly used marker was self mention and boosters. The results showed that students use interpersonal metadiscourse markers. It is true that, in the present study, students' use of metadiscourse markers demonstrates a certain level of awareness of the need to provide the reader/audience with a guide as to the direction of their argument and their intent as composers of written text. However, there are clear examples of markers — particularly the interpersonal markers. This indicates that, while these students are considered to be of advanced level aiming to continue their study of Arabic language with the intention of using it in further study and career paths, they are not using the full range of markers available to them.

Since interpersonal markers, in particular, convey reactions to referential material and "help us characterize the kind of interaction we

would like to have with our readers about that referential material" (Vande Kopple, 1997, p. 8), it is argued that enhanced understanding and use of these markers and their role will bring about concomitant developments in social cognition and audience awareness.

The relationship between number of metadiscourse markers used and overall articles improvement was positive, with the better articles using, on average, more metadiscourse markers. This is consistent with similar studies (Connor, 1990; Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1996; Steffensen & Cheng, 1996) and provides further impetus for developing curriculum materials that emphasize the importance and role of metadiscourse markers in enhancing the student writing. This also has implications for teacher who need to incorporate such materials into courses.

This approach has a strong bearing on the composition and teaching of argumentative writing, for it is in interrelating new material with previous relevant knowledge that the student challenges current beliefs and considers new ways of seeing the world.

Metadiscourse offers teachers a useful way of assisting students towards control over disciplinary-sensitive writing practices. Because it

shows how writers engage with their topic and their readers, exploration by students of metadiscourse in their own and published writing can offer useful assistance for learning about appropriate ways to convey attitude, mark structure, and engage with readers.

Strengthening consciousness is important in the second language writing instruction and for teachers, this means helping students to move into the rhetorical contexts. Students can be helped to read rhetorically and to reflect, perhaps through diaries, on the practices they observe and use themselves (e.g., Johns, 1990). Teachers can also allow sample texts to drive learning more directly by helping students' to explore 'expert' models, asking small groups to count the forms they find and discuss the used collocations in one article using the Arabic corpus on the internet. Students can also interview faculty experts on their own writing practices or on their reactions to the practices of others in the discipline. These findings are likely to provide a useful basis for group feedback discussions and further consideration. Finally, students need opportunities to employ these forms and to experiment with their academic writing. Only by employing these interpersonal markers in their writing will students be able to get feedback on their practices to evaluate the impact of their decisions more clearly. In all these ways, introducing students to metadiscourse markers can provide students with important rhetorical

knowledge and equip them with ways of making discourse decisions that are socially grounded in the inquiry patterns and knowledge structures of their disciplines.

4.6. Recommendation

The major recommendations of this paper are that:

- The recommendation for this study is that coming studies may check the area of culture
- The results to be generalized to all newspapers and analyze a larger corpus, and articles written by more journalists in a wider range of newspapers.
- The same framework used here on a more dependable corpus is applied and this would make results more dependable and applicable.

References

- Abdi, Reza, (2004), Interpersonal Metadiscourse: an Indicator of Interaction and Identity. *Discourse studies*: 4: 139-145.
- Ädel, Annelie (2006), *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cheng, X. and Steffensen, M.S. (1996) 'Metadiscourse: A Technique for Improving Student Writing', *Journal of Research in the Teaching of English* 30(2).
- Crismore, Avon; Farnsworth, Rodney; (1989), *Mr. Darwin and His Reader: Exploring Interpersonal Metadiscourse as a Dimension of Ethos*. *Rhetoric view*: vol. 8, No. I. pp. 91-112.
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R. and Steffensen, M.S. (1993) 'Metadiscourse in Persuasive Writing: A Study of Text Written by American and Finnish University Students', *Journal of Written Communication* 10(1): 39–71.
- Cruse, Alan (2000), *Meaning in Language: an Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatic*, Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Crystal, David (1971), *Linguistics*, England: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hassan, Ruqaiya (1977), *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group Limited.

- Holliday, M.A.K, (1977), "Language structure and Language function",
in Lyons, J. (ed), *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Harmondsworth:
Penguin Book Ltd, pp. 140-165.
- Hyland, Ken (2005), *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*.
London: Continuum.
- Hyland, Ken; Tse, Polly (2004), *Metadiscourse in Academic writing: A
Reappraisal*. *Applied Linguistics*: 25/2: 156-177. Oxford
University press.
- Infantidou, Elly, (2005), *the Semantics and Pragmatics of Metadiscourse*.
El Sevier journal of Pragmatics: 37 1325-1353.
- Leech, Geoffrey N (1983), *Principles of Pragmatics*, England: Longman
Group Ltd.
- Levinson, Stephen C (1983), *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge
University press.
- Lyons, John (1981), *Language and Linguistics An Introduction*,
Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Matthews, P.H (1997), *Concise Dictionary of Linguistics*, Oxford;
Oxford University press.
- McArthur, Tom (ed.) (1992), *The Oxford Companion to English
Language*, Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Steffensen, Margarets.; Cheng Xiaoguang, (1996), *Metadiscourse and
Text pragmatics: How students write after learning about*

Metadiscourse. Bouton, Lawrence F., Ed. Pragmatics and Language Learning. Monograph Series volume 7, p. 153-70.

Style: Clarity- working with metadiscourse & Normalizations Adapted from Joseph Williams, style: Ten lessons in Clarity and Grace 6th edition.

Vande Kopple, William J. (1985), Some Exploratory Discourse on Metadiscourse College Composition and Communication, vol. 36, No. I. pp. 82-93.

Yule, George (1997): The Study of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Mehrabian and Ferris (1967). "Inference of Attitude from Nonverbal Communication in Two Channels". In: The Journal of Counselling Psychology Vol.31, 1967, pp.248-52.

Electronic Resources

"An Open Debate over the Proposed Constitutional Amendments".

<<http://constitution.sis.gov.eg/en/e115.htm#a1>>, accessed on 25/6/2008

"The Proposed Constitutional Amendments Represent the Greatest Violation of Human Rights Over Twenty Six Years."

<<http://www.amnesty.org/ar/library/info/MDE12/008/2007/ar>> accessed on 25/6/2008

Egypt: The constitutional amendments and Article 88... And the Shura Council elections: <http://www.intekhabat.org/look/en-about.tpl>> accessed on 25/6/2008

El-Houdaiby, Ibrahim. **"Egyptian Constitutional Amendments: Everybody Loses."**

http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/egypt_constitution_webcommentary.pdf

Abou El-Magd, Nadia. **"Egyptian parliament approves controversial amendments to constitution".**

<<http://arabist.net/arabawy/2007/03/19/parliament-endorses-mubaraks-constitutional-amendments/#comments>> accessed on 25/6/2008

Latham, Judith. **"Proposed Constitutional Amendments in Egypt: A Setback to Reform Movement, Says The Opposition".**

<<http://www.voanews.com/english/2007-03-26-voa19.cfm>> accessed on 25/6/2008

Sabry, Adel. **"The Articles of Egyptian Constitutional Amendments formulated by the Parliament"**.

<http://www.islamonline.net/servlet/Satellite?c=ArticleA_C&cid=1168265499761&pagename=Zone-Arabic-News%2FNWALayout> accessed on 25/6/2008

Appendices

1.6.1. Content of the Amendments:

According to, <http://www.amnesty.org/ar/library/info/MDE12/008/2007/ar>, the proposed constitutional amendments in Egypt are nothing else than violation and undermining to human rights through 26 years. The Amnesty international called the Egyptian parliament to turn down such amendments. As stated, there are 34 articles to be amended. The core of such amendments where danger lies is that they will grant vast authority to the security regime to arrest whoever is under suspicion, and to listen in to or even to monitor private telecommunication. It is the article 179 that grants such authorities. In addition it will entitle the president the right to overlook ordinary courts and refer whoever under suspicion to special and military courts where such suspects may not have a fair trial. In turn, it will curtail, if not abrogate, the judicial interference. Another important aspect about the amendments is that they refuse the establishment of religion-based political party. Evidently, it means to undermine the Muslim Brotherhood Group.

According to <http://www.intekhabat.org/look/en-about.tpl>, the Egyptian parliament is to approve the constitutional amendments among which the amendments of the article 88, As amended, it will revoke the judicial supervisor of the election such being the case, it will invalidate

the efficiency and fairness of election process. It is stated that analysts believe that the judicial supervision of the people's Assembly elections in 2005 was behind the rise in the number of seats won by the Muslim Brotherhood Group to 88 seats compared to 17 seats won in the previous elections.

If we scrutinize the constitutional articles to be amended and their proposed amendments, as stated by Adel Sabry (pp. 1-7), we find that the proposed amendments seek to eliminate any item that refers to socialism as an economic principle but to be replaced by items such as citizenship and the freedom of economic activity (articles 1 and 4). We find also that there is a sense of capitalism or a declination towards private, rather than public property. As stated in the article 30, the former constitution defines public property as something owned by the public or the people and this is affirmed by continuous support to the public sector. On the other hand, the amended article defines it as the property of the people represented in the state and public considerable figures. All such amendments have come in an atmosphere of refusal and denunciation on the part of opposition parties and the majority of public opinion.

1.6.2. Context of the Amendments:

The constitutional amendments in Egypt have come in socio-political circumstances that make a must of such a change. According to Nadia Abou El-Magd (pp. 1-3) many critics see such a change as an attempt on the part of President Mubarak to smooth the way for his son Gamal Mubark to succeed him in power. It is also stated that it is the aim of the amendments to eliminate the effect of the Muslim Brotherhood Group as Egypt's strongest opposition movement after they have scored a surprise victory in parliament elections in late 2005, winning around the fifth of parliament's seats, showing their widespread popularity. Abou El Magd goes on to state that two years ago, the United States has made reform in Egypt a cornerstone of its policy for greater democracy in the Middle East. It urged president Mubark to change in Egypt, where almost all levels of power belong in his ruling party. Yet, the American pressure fell silent last year as Washington sought Mubark's support in the Mideast's numerous crises, including Iraq, Lebanon and Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

According to Judith Latham (pp. 1-2) U.S secretary of state Rice visited Egypt two years ago and delivered an impassioned speech in Cairo stressing the importance of democracy throughout the region,

including Egypt. But, the new changes to constitution allow civilians to be arrested and imprisoned without warrants and trials in military courts.

It may sound reasonable as well those amendments stressing citizenship rather than religion came in response to late continual clashes between Muslims and Christians. But, according to Ibrahim El Houdaiby (p.1) , the concept of citizenship is already embedded in several articles which stress equality between all citizens. Yet, it is to be violated by the regime using emergency law. El Houdaiby goes on to state that citizenship in the amendments has only meant the right to appoint two or three Christian or female ministers or governors. But it does not sound fair to stress equality among the very narrow ruling elite, rather than among all society members.

1.6.3. Debates Concerning the Amendments:

According to <http://constitution.sis.gov.eg/en/e115.htm#a1>, (pp, 1-3), in an open debate organized by Al-Ahram newspaper, the representatives of the National Democratic party, Al-Wafd and the Nasserist parties agreed to the necessity of citizenship protection and ensuring social justice. Actually, the National Democratic Party is in complete support to the amendments but the other two parties have their own reservation. As to Al-Wafd party, they find it essential that Article 77 of the constitution be

amended to ensure power-sharing. In addition, the article 89 should be amended to guarantee separation of power. Members of parliament employed in the government or public sector should be devoted to parliamentary work but judging the validity of parliament membership should be left to the courts of justice. Concerning presidential candidacy as defined in article 76 they are extremely difficult. Al-Wafd also have several reservations regarding article 88, pertaining to judicial supervision. As a final note, a counter- terrorism law should not infringe on the public freedoms, rights and duties.

As to the Nasserist Party, They deem such amendments as the own vision of president Mubark. Yet, the amendments should be drafted by a constituent assembly with the national civil institutions, the political parties and the political forces at play giving their input. The result would be then submitted to the president in order to reformulate his vision before presenting it to the parliament. In addition, the amendments should pay attention to the political climate and cultural differences existing between the people and the government. As a comment on the political scene, the Nasserist Party find independents as nothing else than paper parties although they do not lack a sense of belonging. As a final remark, the Nasserist party asks for the State of Emergency to be brought to an end.

They reject, as well, the new counter terrorism law given that acts of terror are defined in details in the Penal Code in articles such as 76, 86 and 88.

According to Ibrahim El-Houdaiby (pp. 1:4) the amendments are merely touristic reforms. They mean to market the reforms to the international community and legitimize the Western aid given to the regime. While there is a devilish reality aims at strengthening the control of the regime over the civil society and election process, and minimizing the margins of freedom. If the article 42 stipulates that every detained or imprisoned citizen should be treated in a way that preserves his own dignity, then the on-going scandals of tortures prove the opposite. The definition of terrorism is so broad that it allows the regime to crack down any kind of opposition. The rejection of religion- based political party is a step towards secularism. Article 88 which minimizes the judicial supervision over elections and establishes supra constitutional committee (half of its members are judges, appointed by the president, and the other half are independent figures, appointed to the committee by the president) will increase social discontent and political apathy, as it will raise doubts about the election process and will eventually lead to social explosion.

1.6.4. Sample Lesson

One article was collected from students in their advanced level at the American University in Cairo. Students took part in this lesson. Gender distribution across the sample was approximately equal. The writing tasks were administered by class teachers. Students were asked to write an essay on their personal statement if they want to submit their papers to a university. The topic was introduced by the class teacher in one class in which discussion of the topic took place in class and twenty reading articles were presented to them discussing the metadiscourse markers in these articles. Students were encouraged to identify and elaborate on their arguments. They were also allowed to make notes during the discussion on metadiscourse markers. After two months of discussion, students wrote the article. In all cases the article was completed during a class period of approximately one hour with no word limit or count. And here is an example of articles presented by one of the students:

يتأتى - يتفرع - يستمد- يعود- يؤول اهتمامي باللغة العربية إلى طفولتي عندما ~~كشبت~~ ^{شبابا} (preteen) جموح - متمرد بدأت تصنيف قاموسي العربي الصغير الأول. فقد وصلت - توصلت إلى عدد متواضع من الكلمات ومعظمها المسلمات والأكل والأفعال الأساسية مأخوذة من الكلام اليومي مع والديّ وجديّ. بالرغم من ذلك مواجهة للثقافة الأمريكية السائدة اللغة العربية وما يرافقها -يصاحبها من عادات فلسطين وتقاليدها استسلمت لمشاهدة كرة القدم الأمريكية مع والدي وخبز - طبخ فطيرة التفاح مع والدتي. * تراثنا المتلاشي - المضمحل - المندثر - المنقرض - المتوارى أجبرني بصورة ضمنية على المساس - القبض - الانتزاع بلغة أجدادي - أسلافي التي أعدت اختراعها لاحقا من ضمن قصي - قصتي - حكايتي - رواية الشخصية (personal narrative) وطموحاتي الفكرية.

إن تعاملي العلمي مع اللغة العربية بدأ ^{بمباشرة} ~~سرعان~~ ^{بعد أن أنهت لدرجة القاهرة} ما تخرجت من جامعة بيركلي عندما قررت الدراسة بالخارج في معهد اللغة العربية في الجامعة الأمريكية بالقاهرة (لسنة مكثفة من دراسة العربية) لكي أدرس العربية بشكل مكثف لمدة سنة قبل الالتحاق ببركلي. بالتالي ^{تكونت} ~~انصرفت~~ من البيت لأول مرة وكان عمري 18 سنة للتوجه إلى مصر خائفاً و (yet) متلهفاً إلى استكشاف جزء من العالم الذي تعارفت عليه experienced فقط من خلال الذكريات عائلتي الخاطفة. إن تجاربي في القاهرة قد نشأت الأساس الغوي القوي للعربية وأكدت التفاني * باستيعاب جميع تعقيداتها هكذا عند رجوعي بينما الكثير من زملائي كانوا ^{في الوقت الذي كان فيه} acquiring ما زالوا يحصلون على الأصول اللغوية، ^{أما} كنت أطبق ما تعلمته بالخارج في فصول الدكتوراه مخصصة لمواضيع مثل مسيرة التفسير والشعر العباسي التي -مما أتصدى لتوقعات الدراسات العليا وتحدياتها. بغض النظر عن فرص البحث والتنقيب في ^{بكرلي}، يتطلب -يستلزم التوصل إلى المستوى المتفوق في اللغة العربية المثابرة - المواظبة الثابتة والانغماس المستمر prolonged immersion. فأصبحت من أول طلاب البكالوريوس الذي أكملوا منحة كاسا الدورة الصيفية

والدراسة المتقدمة في المعهد الفرنسي بدمشق وفي نهاية المطاف ultimately دراستي ^{بلغت}
توصلت إلى ذروتها بكتابة الأطروحة النهائية التي أصوغ فيها وأعزز رسالة مميزة بتوظيف ^{أدبها}
- باستخدام المصادر الأولى الشاملة extensive. نقدي للإستشهاد الأدبي من خلال أعمال ^{الاجبية}
بشار ابن برد وابن المقفع وحياتهما قد مُنحت الجائزة العليا highest honors وجائزة القسم
الشرق الأدنى.

الآن بينما as أكمل منحة كاسا لطول السنة التي أترقب إلى المستقبل في برنامج الدكتوراه ^{وأنا}
وأستعد لصعوبتها-قسوتها-شدتها prepare myself for the rigor it entails. خلال ^{دفع حياتهما ثمنا أطلع}
الفصل الدراسي القادم سأقوم بمشروع البحث الممتد عن النثر العباسي بمساعدة الأساتذة ^{الطالب}
الخبراء من الجامعات المصرية. عبر الدراسات العليا أتمنى أن أتعلم في التراث الأدبي ^{العربي}
القديم أو بالأحرى المعالجة الاستيعادية - الارتجاعي للفحش والفتارة في الشعر والأدب ^{العجمي}
العربي.

وإن تناول أطروحتي نوعا معينا من الإلحاد أي الزندقة وعلاقتها بالسلطة الخلفية في الفترة ^{أدبها}
العباسية المبكرة وأنا أنوي إلى تمديد دور معاجم السير وروايات أخرى لمن له ميول مشكوك ^{الأدب}
فيها دينيا في صياغة الفهم السائد للتراث الأدبي العربي بمساعدة أستاذ XXX أود أن أسبر ^{أدبها}
الأغوار حول لماذا وكيف هؤلاء المؤلفون تمت باستمرار إعادة إحياءهم وإلقاء الضوء الجيد ^{أدبها}
عليهم على مر الأجيال. وأنا أثق أن جامعة XXX لديها the resources المراجع -
المصادر - المواد الضرورية للقيام بالبحث المنعش refreshing ولتحقيق أهدافي الأكاديمية
بما في ذلك الحصول على الدكتوراه. في نهاية المطاف فضلا عن البحث المخصص, أتمنى
أن أدرّس لكي أفصح عن - أنقل الحكمة والتقدير لموضوع مهم جدا شخصيا وفكريا. في
أسرتي حتى ولو تذبذبت العربية على حافة الانقراض ضحية لهجوم الثقافة الأمريكية, أنا
أسعى إلى إحياء اللغة وتراثها الثري أملا أن أمررها- أنقلها passing it on لطلاب مهلمين
الأخريين.