

**AWARENESS OF METADISCOURSE MARKERS IN WRITING:
A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION ON IRAQI EDUCATORS**

Wisam Qasim Al ma'moori
Samfisher879@gmail.com

Ameen Ali Al-Khafajy
Alkhafajameen@gmail.com

Open Educational College

Directorate of Education in Babylon/ Ministry of Education/ Babylon / Iraq

Abstract Iraqi students struggle to write compositions, which negatively impacts their English exam performance. The purpose of this study, which involved five educators from different institutions in Iraq, was to determine whether educators' understanding of the use of metadiscourse markers in writing contributed to the poor writing skills of EFL students in Iraq. It addresses the challenges faced by Iraqi teachers while writing paragraphs such as factual, procedural, and descriptive paragraphs. The goal of the study is to identify these problems and recommend appropriate treatments to overcome them. The researcher believes that it is essential to raise students' understanding of metadiscourse markers because it is a crucial component of their academic development. The research established how significant the distinction is. To evaluate the pupils' performance, the researcher had a group take a pre- and post-test.

Keywords: Metadiscourse markers, writing, Iraq, awareness, educators

1.1 Introduction

Writing skills are one of the skills students must have as English learners. In writing, students need understanding and the ability to use correct and precise grammar and vocabulary (Hajimia et al.,2019, 2022; Ayob et al.,2022). However, Hyland (2003) explains that writing is not only concerned with syntactic units, namely the use of grammar and vocabulary in accordance with the rules of writing in English, but how the language structure reflects meaning. This is because the use of language or language structures shows the communicative function of writing which aims to achieve the goals of writing itself. Hyland & Milton (1997) states that the choice or use of language in writing is one way to convince readers or that writing can be said to be persuasive. This shows that the use of language shows the communicative goals of the writer because writing is not just writing but also as a social and communicative involvement between the writer and the reader (Hajimia et al.,2019a, 2019b; Ayob et al.,2022)

**AWARENESS OF METADISOURSE MARKERS IN WRITING:
A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION ON IRAQI EDUCATORS**

Wisam Qasim Al ma'moori

Ameen Ali Al-Khafajj

There are a number of studies which shows that Iraqi students have problem with writing. Sura Muttlak Nasser (2018) investigated the writing of students from university of Baghdad and her study shows that students face difficulties in writing paragraphs such as descriptive, process, opinion, and factual paragraphs. Jasim Al-Shujairi (2017), investigated the grammatical errors of Iraqi postgraduates and undergraduates in their academic writing and found out that Iraqi high school students have serious problems with the usage of verb tenses, articles, and prepositions with the most frequent types of errors were Omission and Addition due to the interlanguage factor as the main source of errors.

In studying English, one type of text that students should study, in particular, is persuasive text. It helps to improve their cognitive thinking in a naturistic position (Hajimia et al., 2019b). Persuasive text is meant to persuade readers to read a text. In persuasive, students are expected not only to be able to write the correct English language rules but also how they use the language to persuade and convince readers. In this case, metadiscourse can be seen as a linguistic (language) tool or tool in social interaction or communication between text makers and users. Metadiscourse is a term that is widely used in discourse analysis and language education related to the conceptualization of the interaction or communication between text creators and their users. According to Hyland (2005) Metadiscourse is an important linguistic or linguistic aspect and tool that is used to facilitate communication in the text both orally and in writing, support the legibility of a text, and build relationships with text users (listeners or text readers). Previous research related to metadiscourse in text writing is Abdi (2002) who conducted metadiscourse research in scientific and social science articles.

Then, Lon et al (2012) investigated metadiscourse and schematic structures in English abstracts of science students. Mostly, metadiscourse research is in writing scientific articles so that researchers try to do similar research but in a different form of text, namely persuasive text in the media. This is because persuasive text is one of the texts studied by most media students and each text has a communicative purpose (Hajimia, H et al., 2022). Therefore, this study aims to describe what types of metadiscourse educators use in persuading and to explain the metadiscourse functions used by students in writing. This study aims at achieving the following objectives: Investigate whether Iraqi educators are aware of the metadiscourse markers. Investigate whether Iraqi educators possess an adequate awareness in applying the markers into writing

2.1 Metadiscourse Markers

Hyland (2005) defines that metadiscourse is a linguistic feature that not only describes how a person composes a sentence but how to build communication with readers so that it can convince readers. The involvement of readers, for example, readers can classify, interpret, evaluate and respond to what is in the text. Hyland and Tse (2004) state that there are three principles in metadiscourse, namely that metadiscourse is different from propositional content, is related to aspects of the text that bridge the interaction of the writer and reader, and only relates to discourse internally. Hyland (2005, 2013) classifies two types of metadiscourse, namely interactive and interactional metadiscourse. Interactive metadiscourse deals with how the author composes the text. The way of writing in the composition of the text can affect the readability of the reading and the reader can understand the text in a flow (Hajimia et al., 2022). This metadiscourse also shows how the writer guides the reader in understanding the text in order to make the reader interested and responsive in the text. The interactional metadiscourse involves the author's intervention in providing an explanation regarding the information given in a text.

The classification of types and subtypes of metadiscourse can be seen in the following table;

• Category	Functions	Examples
• Interactive	Help to guide the reader through	Resources
•	The text	
• Transitions	express relations between main clauses	in addition to; but; thus
• Frame markers	refer to discourse acts, sequences or stages	finally; to conclude; lastly
• Endophonic markers	refer to information in other parts of the text	noted above; see Fig; in sec 2
• Evidentials	refer to information from other texts	according to X; Z states that
• Code glosses	elaborate propositional meanings	namely; e.g.; such as; like
• Interactional	Involve the reader in the text	Resources
• Hedges	withhold commitment and open dialogue	might; perhaps; possibly; about
• Boosters	emphasize certainty or close dialogue	in fact; definitely; certainly
• Attitude markers	express writer's attitude to proposition	unfortunately; luckily; I agree
• Self-mentions	explicit reference to author (s)	I; we; my; me; our
• Engagement markers	explicitly build relationship with reader	consider; note; you can see that

Ken Hyland's Taxonomy of Metadiscourse

Metadiscourse and is defined by Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen (1993) as “linguistic material in texts, written or spoken, which does not add anything to the propositional content, but that is in-tended to help the listener or reader organize, interpret, and evaluate the information given” (p.40). Vande Kopple (1997), too, defines metadiscourse as “discourse that people use not to expand referential material, but to help the readers connect, organize, interpret, evaluate, and develop attitudes towards that material” (p.2). Likewise, Hyland (2005) believes that “metadiscourse embodies the idea that communication is more than just the exchange of information, goods or services, but also involves the personalities, attitudes and assumptions of those who are communicating”, and, in this way “the writer is not simply presenting information

**AWARENESS OF METADISOURSE MARKERS IN WRITING:
A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION ON IRAQI EDUCATORS**

Wisam Qasim Al ma'moori

Ameen Ali Al-Khafajj

about the suggested route, by just listing changes of direction, but taking the trouble to see the walk from the reader's perspective" (p. 3).

According to Adel (2006), one sort of reflexivity in language—the ability for any natural language to refer to or describe itself—should be viewed as being in metadiscourse. In this way, it might be argued that writers operate on two levels at once. They concentrate on what they are communicating to the readers on the first level, and on how they are interacting with them on the second level. The primary/discourse level is the first level, and the metadiscourse level is the second (Vande Kopple, 1985). The distinction between "what is stated" and a "understanding and judgement of what is said" is also made by Urmson (1952). (p. 231). This comprehension and evaluation, often known as metadiscourse, satisfies Halliday's suggested textual and interpersonal roles of language (1973, 1985). According to Sinclair (1981), referenced in Hyland (2005), metadiscourse serves the "interactive plane" of discourse, which is concerned with the ways in which individuals use language to negotiate with one another and interactively display their writings in order to establish a connection with the reader. He sets off this plane of discourse from what he refers to as the "autonomous plane," which is the plane where a record of experience gradually takes shape through the arrangement of text structure. In a similar vein, Crismore (1989) asserts that writers operate on two levels at once. They do this by communicating information about their subject matter (propositional content) on the one hand, and by demonstrating to their audience how to read, respond to, and assess spoken or written material on the same subject. The first level is referred to as "primary discourse level," while the second level is referred to as "metadiscourse level." Talk about talk, writing about writing, discourse about discourse, or text about text are all terms used to describe this second level. Although some researchers have looked into the metadiscourse markers' presence in academic discourse, other genres, or student writing in recent years, and some of them have also concentrated on the effects of those markers on reading comprehension, almost no study has, to this point, examined the Iraqi EFL learners' awareness of metadiscourse, especially the educators. In order to analyze EFL learners' understanding of metadiscourse markers, the current study will use a close-up test (pretest), observations of a teacher teaching, and finally a posttest.

2.2 Metadiscourse in teaching of writing

Writing goes beyond the fundamental syntactic abilities of grammar and punctuation (Ayob et al., 2022). It is a challenging intellectual endeavor that calls for mental expansion. By studying fundamental conventions and crafting straightforward narratives, elementary school children start to hone their writing abilities. Students should be able to create multi-paragraph writings in a variety of genres by the middle school years that establish a main idea, unfold logically and

sequentially, and include comprehensive facts, examples, and details (Nippold et al., 2008;

Hajimia et al.,2019). When students are conscious of their audience and work to explain themselves more clearly to meet the demands of the reader, their writing demonstrates maturity (Ayob et al.,2022) In order to portray several points of view on a same event, students must develop higher level language skills (Rubins, 1998; Ayob et al.,2022). A quality document is therefore more than just a list of ideas; rather, it is a comprehensive whole that incorporates the author's viewpoint, reader consideration, and information for practical use. The text is deemed coherent when this is accomplished (Hajimia et al.,2019).

Hyland (1997) studied the textual markers in 28 research articles from four academic fields—microbiology, marketing, astrophysics, and applied linguistics—to determine how the proper use of metadiscourse contributes significantly to rhetorical context. One kind of writing where understanding the audience is essential to capturing rhetorical goals is research writing. The reader must be guided toward the desired conclusions by the writer's organization of data and observations into a coherent structure (Hajimia et al.,2022). One out of every fifteen words, or 373 occurrences on average, were metadiscourse indicators, according to the study's findings. The academic fields of marketing and applied linguistics used the most metadiscourse markers. When Hajimia et al. (2019a; 2019b, 2018; 2022) looked the Malaysian Newspaper stories, they found a lot of evidence of markers. The researcher determined that these markers serve a variety of purposes, including conviction, appraisal, elaboration, and reason.

In a different investigation of metadiscourse and rhetoric, Dafouz-Milne (2008) looked at two prestigious newspapers, The Times (British) and El Pais, to see how metadiscourse markers function in the art of persuasion from a cross-cultural perspective (Spanish). The political and rhetorical impact these newspapers have on their different cultures is why Dafouz-Milne (2008) chose them. The researcher wanted to show how metadiscourse functions in texts as a persuasive tool. In particular, Dafouz-Milne (2008) determined which metadiscourse indicators were common to newspaper opinion columns and which markers performed better.

Hyland (2004) used graduate research writing by ESL writers to show how metadiscourse was employed to support effective persuasive engagement in writing. The researcher looked at 240 Masters and Doctoral dissertations produced by ESL students in Hong Kong to see how many metadiscourse indicators were used overall. In order to draw attention to how authors present themselves in their work as a means of communicating their objectives, Hyland updated the metadiscourse model. Through this analysis, the author came to the conclusion that there were

**AWARENESS OF METADISOURSE MARKERS IN WRITING:
A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION ON IRAQI EDUCATORS**

Wisam Qasim Al ma'moori

Ameen Ali Al-Khafajj

differences between the two levels of advanced degree writing. The doctoral students used much more interactive forms, while the master's level students employed marginally more interactional metadiscourse (Hedges, Boosters, Attitude Markers, Self Mention, Engagement Markers) (Transitional, Frame, Endorpic, Evidentials, Code Glosses)

According to several studies, offering students explicit metadiscourse skills improves their ability to communicate. For instance, Jalilfar and Alipour's study from 2007 on the impacts of explicitly teaching metadiscourse markers to pre-intermediate Iranian EFL learners' reading skills demonstrated the beneficial effects of form-focused metadiscourse instruction. Furthermore, Parvaresh and Nemati (2008) looked into how metadiscourse markers affected how well readers understood English texts. The outcomes demonstrated the benefits of teaching metadiscourse, particularly to students with lower skill levels. The findings also demonstrated a strong correlation between the difficulty—as measured by the ability to understand the texts' main ideas—and the presence or absence of metadiscourse. The study conducted by Tavakoli et al. (2010) on the effects of explicit metadiscourse instruction on intermediate students' reading comprehension lends further support to these conclusions. Their research found that: "1) Instruction on metadiscourse effectively changed the subjects' awareness to improve their reading comprehension capacity, which resulted in their considerable performance on the post-test. 2) Although teaching on all metadiscourse indicators had an impact on the respondents' performance, textual awareness stood out in comparison to interpersonal awareness. 3) From the overall results, it can be deduced that metadiscourse awareness teaching had a positive impact on the subjects' reading comprehension scores as well as their performance in all L2 areas that were tested during the trial (Tavakoli et al., 2010:98).

The effectiveness of teaching metadiscourse tactics has also been demonstrated in other research that concentrate on students' writing skills. For instance, Cheng and Steffensen (1996) found that the group that was given guidance on the purposes and use of metadiscourse received higher ratings for their essays. In addition, Shaw and Shaw and Lieu (1998) observed that students' essay writing significantly improved after two months of EAP education that included metadiscourse techniques. Regarding the employment of metadiscourse elements, it was shown that authors used transitions and engagement markers more frequently and less frequently as a result of increasing their understanding of genre expectations and audience participation (Hajimia et al., 2022). The findings of Sengupta (1999) were almost identical. She looked at how students' reading and writing were impacted by rhetorical consciousness raising. The participants were 15 Chinese Year 1 BA students, and regular talks about the characteristics of texts, including metadiscourse markers, helped to improve rhetorical consciousness. The findings

demonstrated that they successfully applied the metadiscourse techniques taught to convey the main ideas of the text and to make their own writing more readable. Martinez (2004) also looked into the correlation between the quantity of metadiscourse markers and the compositional grades of the pupils. The findings revealed a correlation between the amount of metadiscourse markers employed in the essays with good evaluation scores

Ahmad Yaghoubi and Somayeh Ardestani (2014) make an effort to look at the explicit or implicit teaching of metadiscourse markers and the development of writing skills. Iranian female Kish Institute of Science and Technology students made up the study's N = 90 participants. In this work, two experimental groups were established: experimental group "A" received explicit training in metadiscourse markers, whereas experimental group "B" received implicit training based on Hyland's (2005) taxonomy of metadiscourse markers. A pretest and a posttest were the two instruments used in the investigation. In order to elicit the necessary information, participants took a writing proficiency pretest to ascertain whether they were aware of how to properly use metadiscourse markers in their work. A posttest was given after the 8 sessions of therapy to assess how well the participants were using the metadiscourse markers. The results of this study showed that, when metadiscourse markers were applied, there was a substantial change between the pretest and posttest writing scores of the participants. The results showed that the learners' writing improved as a result of the metadiscourse education. In addition, the findings demonstrated that participants' writing skills were greatly enhanced by both the explicit and implicit education of metadiscourse markers.

In this study, Hyland's (2005) interpersonal model of metadiscourse was utilized. This model classifies metadiscourse markers in the following way:

Interactive metadiscourse:

- Transitions (express relations between main clauses)
- Frame markers (refer to discourse acts, sequences or stages)
- Endophoric markers (refer to information in other parts of the text)
- Evidentials (refer to information from other texts)
- Code glosses (elaborate propositional meanings)

Interactional metadiscourse:

- Hedges (withhold commitment and open dialogue)
- Boosters (emphasize certainty or close dialogue)
- Attitude Markers (express writer's attitude to proposition)
- Self mentions (explicit reference to author(s))

**AWARENESS OF METADISCOURSE MARKERS IN WRITING:
A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION ON IRAQI EDUCATORS**

Wisam Qasim Al ma'moori

Ameen Ali Al-Khafajy

-Engagement markers (explicitly build relationship with reader)

3.1 Methodology

This is a quasi-experimental study involving pretest, intervention and posttest on Iraqi EFL learners. First, A pretest is carried out on Iraqi EF learners. A cloze test consisting of 9 sentences totaling to 50 blanks were given to the respondents. The respondents need to underline the metadiscourse markers in the sentences. The results are analysed using Ms excel. Second, is the intervention stage. The researcher explains to the respondents through implicit and explicit teaching instructions of the definitions and the usage of metadiscourse markers. In addition to that, Hyland's metadiscourse markers model was also shared to the respondents to further enhance their understanding. The intervention stage was carried out individually with each respondent. Finally, a post test was conducted on the respondents to test their awareness of the metadiscourse markers. They were asked to write essays. The result from the essay is used as the post-test.

Respondents information are as follows;

R1. Name: Huda Yed. Gender: female.age is 32 years old. She is a lecturer of English language for more than 5 years. She is graduated from university of Babylon-department of English.

R2: Name: Samer yacoub. Gender: Male. Age: 27. He is a lecturer at primary school for 2years. He graduate from university of Babylon department of English language

R3: Name: Ahmed abid. Gender: Male. Age 30 years old. Period of experience is 6 years. He graduated from university of Babylon department of English. He teaches secondary school.

R4: Mohammed yeid. Gender:Male. Age. 27. Years of experience 5. Teaches primary school. Lecturer of English language. Graduated from university of Babylon department of English language.

R5. Ali gender male. Age 25. Years of experience 3. Teaches secondary school. Graduated from university of Babylon department of English language.

4.1 Findings and discussion

A) Section 1: Pre-test

The respondents were asked to underline the metadiscourse marker in the sentences given. The results below show the number of correct answers and the total percentage obtained out of 50 blanks.

Table (1) Results of Respondents and the Total Percentage

Questions	Respondent				
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
Q1	5	8	2	5	6
Q2	1	2	3	2	2
Q3	1	3	4	3	3
Q4	2	4	3	2	4
Q5	3	2	2	3	2
Q6	2	3	5	1	1
Q7	2	1	1	3	1
Q8	2	5	1	2	1
Q9	2	2	1	3	2
Total	20	30	22	24	22
Percentage	40%	60%	44%	48%	44%

Table 1: Pre -test total number of questions, total number of correct marks and percentage

Table 1 above shows that only 1 respondent namely R2 was able to obtain more than 50% of the overall questions equivalent to 60% with 30 correct answers out of 50 blanks. This may be, because the respondent was already been exposed had have the prior knowledge on metadiscourse markers while studying with the researcher. The rest of the respondents obtained lesser than 50% of correct answers ranging from 48% to 40% of marks.

Section 2: Post test Frequency of metadiscourse markers

Table (2) The Differences in Usage of Metadiscourse Markers Among the Respondents

Respondent 1		Respondent 2		Respondent 3		Respondent 4		Respondent 5	
Word List	Types	Word List	Types	Word List	Types	Word List	Types	Word List	Types
Code gloss	2 (1.47%)	Attitude marker	1 (0.81%)			Attitude marker	1 (0.86%)	Code gloss	1 (1.10%)
Endophoric	1 (0.74%)	Code gloss	1 (0.81%)	Emphatic	2 (1.53%)	Emphatic	5 (4.31%)	Emphatic	1 (1.10%)
Hedge	1 (0.74%)	Emphatic	1 (0.81%)	Evidential	2 (1.53%)	Evidential	1 (0.86%)	Logical connective	4 (4.40%)
Logical connective	3 (2.21%)	Endophoric	1 (0.81%)	Hedge	1 (0.76%)	Hedge	1 (0.86%)	Person marker	1 (1.10%)
Person marker	3 (2.21%)	Logical connective	6 (4.84%)	Label stage	1 (0.76%)	Logical connective	8 (6.90%)	Relational marker	1 (1.10%)
Topic shift	1 (0.74%)	Person marker	3 (2.42%)	Logical connective	7 (5.34%)	Relational marker	4 (3.45%)	Sequencing	3 (3.30%)
		Relational marker	2 (1.61%)	Person marker	1 (0.76%)	Sequencing	1 (0.86%)		
		Topic shift	1 (0.81%)	Relational marker	1 (0.76%)				
Total	11 (8.09%)	Total	16 (12.90%)	Total	15 (11.45%)	Total	21 (18.10%)	Total	11 (12.09%)

Table above shows the differences in usage of metadiscourse markers among the respondents.

**AWARENESS OF METADISOURSE MARKERS IN WRITING:
A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION ON IRAQI EDUCATORS**

Wisam Qasim Al ma'moori

Ameen Ali Al-Khafajy

A) Statistics and types of words

Table below shows the types of metadiscourse markers and the words representing the types. In addition the frequency of the words, the percentage of the types and the percentage of the tokens are also provided to strengthen the findings.

Table (3) Statistics and Types of Words

R1	Code gloss 2 types / 2 tokens	Endophoric 1 type / 1 token	Hedge 1 type / 1 token	Logical connective 3 types / 10 tokens	Person marker 3 types / 3 tokens	Topic shift 1 types / 1 tokens		
	1.47% / 1.00%	0.74% / 0.50%	0.74% / 0.50%	2.21% / 4.98%	2.21% / 1.49%	0.74% / 0.50%		
	for example (1)	see (1)	possible (1)	and (6)	my (1)	well (1)		
	such as (1)			hence (1)	our (1)			
			so (3)	we (1)				
R2	Attitude marker 1 types / 1 tokens	Code gloss 1 types / 1 tokens	Emphatic 1 type / 1 token	Endophoric 1 type / 1 token	Logical connective 6 types / 11 tokens	Person marker 3 types / 13 tokens	Relational marker 2 types / 9 tokens	Topic shift 1 types / 1 tokens
	0.81% / 0.47%	0.81% / 0.47%	0.81% / 0.47%	0.81% / 0.47%	4.84% / 5.14%	2.42% / 6.07%	1.61% / 4.21%	0.81% / 0.47%
	important (1)	in other words (1)	definitely (1)	see (1)	also (1)	my (1)	us (7)	well (1)
					and (6)	our (10)	you (2)	
					but (1)	we (2)		
					in addition (1)			
					therefore (1)			
				though (1)				
R3	Emphatic 2 types / 2 tokens	Evidential 2 types / 2 tokens	Hedge 1 types / 2 tokens	Label stage 1 types / 1 tokens	Logical connective 7 types / 16 tokens	Person marker 1 types / 2 tokens	Relational marker 1 types / 1 tokens	
	1.53% / 0.85%	1.53% / 0.85%	0.76% / 0.85%	0.76% / 0.43%	5.34% / 6.84%	0.76% / 0.85%	0.76% / 0.43%	
	never (1)	believe (1)	mostly (2)	overall (1)	and (8)	i (2)	consider (1)	
	should (1)	points to (1)			because (3)			
					consequently (1)			
					in addition (1)			
					moreover (1)			
				therefore (1)				
				thus (1)				
R4	Attitude marker 1 types / 1 tokens	Emphatic 5 types / 9 tokens	Evidential 1 types / 1 tokens	Hedge 1 types / 3 tokens	Logical connective 8 types / 14 tokens	Relational marker 4 types / 10 tokens	Sequencing 1 types / 1 tokens	
	0.86% / 0.41%	4.31% / 3.69%	0.86% / 0.41%	0.86% / 1.23%	6.90% / 5.74%	3.45% / 4.10%	0.86% / 0.41%	
	important (1)	always (1)	believe (1)	would (3)	and (6)	one's (1)	first (1)	
		certainly (2)			because (1)	us (1)		
	definitely (1)			besides (1)	you (6)			

		indeed (1)			furthermore (1)	your (2)		
		true (4)			hence (1)			
					in addition (2)			
					moreover (1)			
					or (1)			
R5	Code gloss	Emphatic	Logical connective	Person marker	Relational marker	Sequencing		
	1 types / 1 tokens	1 types / 1 tokens	4 types / 6 tokens	1 types / 1 tokens	1 types / 1 tokens	3 types / 5 tokens		
	1.10% / 0.65%	1.10% / 0.65%	4.40% / 3.92%	1.10% / 0.65%	1.10% / 0.65%	3.30% / 3.27%		
	that is (1)	know (1)	and (3)	we (1)	you (1)	first (2)		
			because (1)			second (2)		
			but (1)			two (1)		
		or (1)						

Based on the table, percentage of types represents the types of metadiscourse markers and the tokens represents the number of words occurring in each types. For example, R1 showing the result for Logical connectives having 3 types namely ‘and’, ‘hence’, ‘so’ with 10 tokens which is ‘and’ occurring 6 times, ‘hence’ occurring 1 time and ‘so’ occurring 3 times. This result shows that, the respondents were able to understand metadiscourse markers and managed to apply it to their writing. Besides that, they also know how to use varieties of markers.

The excerpts below shows sample sentences with the metadiscourse markers identified by each respondents.

Respondent 1

covid 19 is one of problems that reflects an economical decline in world hence Logical connective
 We Person marker see Endophoric that most of iraqi people have an anxiety which was bigger than
 epidemic covid 19 stops a lot of human affairs such as Code gloss factories schools companies
 and Logical connective airports otherwise covid 19 has a positive effect on world it stops the conflicts
 among countries and Logical connective they enclose together to find a vaccine iraqi families follow a
 special system during covid 19 they realize carefully the risk of epidemic so Logical connective they stay
 at home as possible Hedge to provide the infection of virus on other hand each family chooses a
 certain member to get out house at necessary time as well Topic shift as they feel an upset
 and Logical connective terrible state through this period most of people volunteered to give a healthy
 tips for example Code gloss wearing a mask and Logical connective gloves to keep living peacefully 4 to
 my Person marker eyes nowadays is totally different in compare with old days and Logical connective the
 secret behind this differences is technology that changes a facelifted our Person marker life
 so Logical connective it left a strong impact on new generation so Logical connective that make them knew a
 lot about various cultures around world and Logical connective it fire the spark of knowledge to spread
 quickly

Respondent 2

AWARENESS OF METADISOURSE MARKERS IN WRITING: A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION ON IRAQI EDUCATORS

Wisam Qasim Al ma'moori

Ameen Ali Al-Khafajj

a crucial part of *our Person marker* bodies is memories as all *our Person marker* knowledge and *Logical connective* past experiences are stored there they shape *our Person marker* personality both of *us Relational marker* have memories good as *well Topic shift* as bad *you Relational marker* have memories of a long time ago and *Logical connective* of recent times too in addition *Logical connective* some memories help *us Relational marker* get through difficult days and *Logical connective* make *us Relational marker* smile on good days the small things that help run *our Person marker* lives smoothly are memories in other words *Code gloss* memories are irreplaceable and *Logical connective* very dear to *us Relational marker* they're helping *us Relational marker* learn from *our Person marker* mistakes and *Logical connective* make *us Relational marker* better off in *my Person marker* opinion the memories of one's childhood are the most dear to anyone they're helping to keep the child alive in *you Relational marker* it's also *Logical connective* a reason for *our Person marker* smiles between adult life in *our Person marker* lives childhood memories are very important *Attitude marker* it reminds *us Relational marker* of their best moments of *our Person marker* lives *our Person marker* thought and *Logical connective* future are influenced by them when one has good memories of infancy they grow up to be happy people if one has painful childhood memories though *Logical connective* it gravely affects their adult life *we Person marker* see *Endophoric* therefore *Logical connective* future childhood memories are influencing *our Person marker* future *we Person marker* are not inherently determined by them but *Logical connective* they definitely *Emphatic* play a great role it is not necessary for someone with traumatic memories of childhood to transform

Respondent 3

a highly prevalent problem in today's generation is the imminent innovation in new communication technology most individuals feel that it impacts social interactions *I Person marker* completely agree with this idea and *Logical connective* this statement has few significant points to *Evidential* consider *Relational marker* thus *Logical connective* more people are now fascinated with using these ways of interactions a large number of people are *mostly Hedge* online to review alerts from different apps they use for communication and *Logical connective* they spend more time on their gadgets than socializing with their friends workmates and *Logical connective* families in person consequently *Logical connective* because *Logical connective* of their alienation from the world their relationship with society and *Logical connective* people is destroyed in addition *Logical connective* communication modernization has a major effect on the career of individuals and *Logical connective* their relationship with their colleagues *mostly Hedge* due to inadequate interpersonal communication skills and *Logical connective* poor teamwork the actual contact with office members is declining in today's modern times because *Logical connective* people are busy using different social media to chat on their gadgets moreover *Logical connective* a large number of corporations have radically banned the use of social media in several European nations the use of social media during working hours because *Logical connective* they want their employees to collaborate with their peers promoting teamwork afterwards overall *Label stage* modern technology is easy and *Logical connective* *I Person marker* firmly believe *Evidential* that people should *Emphatic* regulate their use of technology and *Logical connective* never *Emphatic* underestimate the value of personal contact therefore *Logical connective* if they become addicted to it technology is harmful to their relationship with the community

Respondent 4

friend is a person who is very fond of and *Logical connective* who is not part of one's *Relational marker* family a friend in need is a friend *indeed Emphatic* is a term that defines a *true Emphatic* friend's most significant characteristic such a friend is definitely *Emphatic* a valuable asset in the life of a person a friend in need *first Sequencing* of all makes *us Relational marker* feel less lonely in addition *Logical connective* in this day and *Logical connective* age individuals can quickly feel disconnected and *Logical connective* lonely this is because *Logical connective* a friend like this represents life and *Logical connective* all the things that one has in common a friend in need is someone who strengthens and *Logical connective* builds his friend's self confidence most interesting the number one friend of a person is his friend in need in addition *Logical connective* such a friend will say how wonderful he feels about *you Relational marker* a friend in need is someone who provides a reality check for *you Relational marker* such a friend besides *Logical connective* telling positive things is not afraid to explain an individual's shortcomings this *certainly Emphatic* helps an individual in overcoming his weaknesses hence *Logical connective* a *true Emphatic* friend *would Hedge* pull *you Relational marker* back down to earth a friend in need is *certainly Emphatic* a supporter of *your Relational marker* dreams and *Logical connective* aspirations furthermore *Logical connective* a *true Emphatic* friend *would Hedge* always *Emphatic* believe *Evidential* in *you Relational marker* moreover *Logical connective* such a friend does not discourage *you Relational marker* from *your Relational marker* ambitions loyalty is another important *Attitude marker* benefit of a friend in need such a friend is truly an unyielding friend this *true Emphatic* friend *would Hedge* stand by *you Relational marker* in any situation or *Logical connective* circumstance

Respondent 5

the effect of covid 19 on human affairs in iraq as you Relational marker know Emphatic that covid 19 is a wordly disease and Logical connective affect all of the world iraq is one of the countries that are influenced by the virus the influence can be shown on different points first Sequencing on the economic side the curfew that was applied affected the world economy and Logical connective the price of goods second Sequencing it caused a massive distraction in the psychological side of human beings because Logical connective of the media and Logical connective alike the impact of technology on people relations frankly speaking we Person marker can divide the impact into two Sequencing sorts the first Sequencing one is the bright sort in which the people make benefit of that is Code gloss the positive side like using the technology for developing one self or Logical connective for the sake of study ing the second Sequencing but Logical connective the worst side is the dimmed negative side by which the community building has been destroyed

5.1 Discussion and conclusion

From the analysis of the pre-test above, it can be concluded that most of their writings have flunked to present the proper metadiscourse markers. It is clear that they have difficulty to understand those markers and have not used it previously. The educators have encountered real difficulties in identifying and using them at this stage.

The analysis of the data has revealed lack of awareness about the markers. In many cases, the educators have failed to keep the propositional content of these markers because they misunderstand or misuse the marker's function of them which results in miscommunication of the content of the essay. Misuse of markers and the incapacity to render ideas into complete and meaningful sentences. Iraqi EFL educators and students are not sufficiently capable to yield united and coherent writings by their own due to the employment of disconnected ideas and the failure to write coherent paragraphs for the required text. Unfortunately, they are not in the stream of expressing ideas that can flow smoothly from one sentence to the next sentence. This means that they have attempted to write about the main points but they have not been successful in using the proper marker to link details to each main point. They should have understood that unity is a very important characteristic of good paragraph writing.

References

- Al-Shujairi, Y. B. J., & Tan, H. (2017). Grammar errors in the writing of Iraqi English language learners. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 5(4), 122-130.
- Ayob, A., Kiting, R., Sintian, M., Jamaluddin, N., Ramli, Z., & Hajimia, H. (2022). The Measurement of Validity, Stability and Consistency in Essay Writing Structuring Techniques Based on Interactive Multimedia Graphic: A Case-Study in Malaysia. *Journal of Higher Education Theory & Practice*, 22(7).
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R., & Steffensen, M. S. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written communication*, 10(1), 39-71.

**AWARENESS OF METADISOURSE MARKERS IN WRITING:
A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION ON IRAQI EDUCATORS**

Wisam Qasim Al ma'moori

Ameen Ali Al-Khafajy

-
- Crismore, A., & Farnsworth, R. (1989). Mr. Darwin and his readers: Exploring interpersonal metadiscourse as a dimension of ethos. *Rhetoric Review*, 8(1), 91-112.
- Cheng, X., & Steffensen, M. S. (1996). Metadiscourse: A technique for improving student writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 149-181.
- Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008). The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: A cross-linguistic study of newspaper discourse. *Journal of pragmatics*, 40(1), 95-113.
- Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of second language writing*, 12(1), 17-29.
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse studies*, 7(2), 173-192.
- Hajimia, H. (2018). A Corpus-based analysis on the functions of discourse markers used in Malaysian online newspaper articles. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*, 5(1), 19-24.
- Hajimia, H., Singh, M. K. S., Yusoff, M. D. D. N., & Rathakrishnan, M. (2019a). English Grammar Revolution using Corpus-Based Approach: How do the Students React?. *Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow Volume 19: 10 October 2019 ISSN 1930-2940*, 232.
- Hajimia, H., Singh, M. K. S., & Rathakrishnan, M. (2019b). Analyzing frequency and distributional pattern of discourse markers in the Malaysian newspaper. *Opción: Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales*, (35), 2976.
- Hajimia, H., Nordin, N. R. M., Singh, M. K. S., & Golingai, P. (2022). The rhetorical structure of newspaper reports: A synergy between corpus, genre and discourse analysis. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 88-101.
- Hyland, K., & Milton, J. (1997). Qualification and certainty in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of second language writing*, 6(2), 183-205.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177.
- Hallyday, M. (1973). *The functional basics of language. Class, codes and control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 343-366.
- Jalilifar, A., & Alipour, M. (2007). How explicit instruction makes a difference: Metadiscourse markers and EFL learners' reading comprehension skill. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 38(1), 35-52.

- Lon, C. E., Tan, H., & Abdullah, A. N. (2012). Conveying communicative intent: Moves and metadiscourse in abstract writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 1(7), 56-65.
- Martinez Guillem, S. (2009). Argumentation, metadiscourse and social cognition: organizing knowledge in political communication. *Discourse & Society*, 20(6), 727-746.
- Nasser, S. M. (2018). Iraqi EFL students' difficulties in writing composition: An experimental study (University of Baghdad). *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(1), 178-184.
- Nippold, M. A., Mansfield, T. C., Billow, J. L., & Tomblin, J. B. (2008). Expository discourse in adolescents with language impairments: Examining syntactic development.
- Parvaresh, V., & Nemati, M. (2008). Metadiscourse and reading comprehension: The effects of language and proficiency. *Electronic journal of foreign language teaching*, 5(2), 220-239.
- Sengupta, S. (1999). Rhetorical consciousness raising in the L2 reading classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 291-319.
- Tavakoli, M., Dabaghi, A., & Khorvash, Z. (2010). The Effect of Metadiscourse Awareness on L2 Reading Comprehension: A Case of Iranian EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 92-102.
- Urmson, J. O. (1952). Parenthetical verbs. *Mind*, 61(244), 480-496.
- Vande Kopple, W. J. (1997). Refining and Applying Views of Metadiscourse.
- Yaghoubi, A., & Ardestani, S. (2014). Explicit or implicit instruction of metadiscourse markers and writing skill improvement. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(4), 14-22.