The Impact of Explicit Instruction of Metadiscourse Markers on EFL Learners' Writing Performance

Dr. H. Vahid Dastjerdi*

Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics

University of Isfahan, Isfahan

email: h_vahid@yahoo.com

M. Shirzad

M. A. Student

University of Isfahan, Isfahan

email: maryam.shirzad86@yahoo.com

Abstract

The current study is an attempt to investigate the impact of explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers on advanced, intermediate, and elementary EFL learners' writing performance. The participants of the study were 94 undergraduate students majoring in English Literature at the University of Isfahan. To elicit the relevant data, participants were given a pretest of writing ability to check their initial knowledge and unprompted use of metadiscourse markers. All the three groups were then exposed to explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers for six successive sessions. Finally, a post test measuring their writing ability with metadiscourse markers in focus was administered. The findings indicated generally that explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers significantly improves EFL learners' writing ability. It was however unpredictably revealed that learners at the intermediate level improved significantly greater than those at the advanced and elementary levels. These findings firstly call practitioners to pay more serious attention to metadiscourse markers in making EFL curricula. Secondly, they ask for the reinforcement of metadiscourse markers through explicit instruction in EFL courses for the improvement of the learners' writing ability.

_____

1. Introduction

1.1 Writing and metadiscourse

Within the communicative framework of language teaching, the skill of writing enjoys a special status. It is via writing that a person communicates a variety of messages to his/her readers. Writing as a communicative activity needs to be encouraged during the language learners' course of study. The writing process, in comparison to spoken interaction, imposes greater demands on the text, since written interaction lacks immediate feedback as a guide. The writer has to anticipate the readers' reaction and produce a text which will follow Grice's (1975) Cooperative Maxims. According to these maxims, the writer has to try to write a clear, relevant, truthful, informative, interesting and memorable text.

While the technique of getting students to turn a set of propositions or simple sentences into coherent discourse is a relatively straightforward one, the processes that the writer must go through are extremely complex. To produce coherent discourse writers must exploit what they already know about the subject at hand and integrate it with information from other sources; they must draw on the way that grammar and discourse function together and they are required to use cohesion appropriately. One of the most important functions for metadiscourse is to serve as textual relevance cues. Relevance is relative and varies according to the context: relevance for a certain author or reader, relevance with respect to a certain problem or task. Metadiscourse actually helps put into writers' focal awareness what is important according to text structure (Crismore, 1982).

As Hyland (2005) states in his book on metadiscourse, "the term metadiscourse was coined by Zellig Harris in 1959 to offer a way of understanding language in use, representing a writer's or speaker's attempts to guide a receiver's perception of a text" (3). The concept has

been further developed by writers such as Williams (1981), Vande Kopple (1985) and Crismore (1989). Hyland (1998) states that "based on a view of writing as a social and communicative engagement between writer and reader, metadiscourse focuses our attention on the ways writers project themselves into their work to signal their communicative intentions. It is a central pragmatic construct which allows us to see how writers seek to influence readers' understandings of both the text and their attitude towards its content and the audience" (437). Using metadiscourse means that the writer has foreseen the audiences' interactive frames and knowledge schemas (Tannen and Wallat, 1999) and that s/he made the necessary amendments and additions to the information flow. If as members of the same discourse community, both authors and readers use similar mappings, effective comprehension will cope with the readers' expectations in terms of contents, contextual resources and disciplinary knowledge and as Sperber and Wilson (1998) state, will therefore "search for maximal relevance"(9). As a result, using metadiscourse allows readers to understand discourse texture and intertextuality, to share pragmatic presuppositions, to infer intended meanings, and to interpret the institutional and ideological ties underlying the text (Pérez-Llantada, 2003).

Many writers experience difficulty in adapting their prose for readers (Redd-Boyd and Slater, 1989). This is generally because of the different conventions writers are familiar with from their home community and cultures. Because of this we cannot expect either L1 or L2 students to just 'pick up' suitable metadiscourse usage from their assigned readings or other course materials, for these often provide inappropriate models. Textbook authors' effort to both construct a disciplinary image and mediate unfamiliar material for novices involves rhetorical practices very different to other academic genres (Hyland, 2005). EFL and EAP writing textbooks are often equally unhelpful, either treating metadiscourse features in a rather piecemeal way or ignoring them altogether. The importance of hedges and

boosters, for example, is rarely reflected in textbooks (Holmes, 1988; Hyland, 2004), and even transitions can be misinterpreted (Milton, 1999). In addition, this neglect of metadiscourse in EFL textbooks may be duplicated by teachers who rely on such texts as sources for their own in-house materials.

As a result it is rare for metadiscourse to be either explicitly taught or adequately covered in writing materials in a way which either shows the systematic effect of particular options or reveals the important interactive nature of discourse. It seems vital, then, that students should receive appropriate instruction in metadiscourse using models of argument which allow them to practice writing within the socio-rhetorical framework of their target communities (Hyland, 2005). Metadiscourse markers, although akin to cohesive devices, deserve to be treated separately, as they do not lead to a search for a referent or meaning. In this research, the term 'metadiscourse markers' will be used instead of cohesive devices because scholars use it more frequently.

Research on the impact of metadiscourse on writing has revealed different results. The role of metadiscourse has actually been acknowledged: "metadiscourse is known to be an effective technique for improving writing and a means to render textbooks more considerate and reader friendly." (Cheng and Steffensen 1996, Crismore 1984, Hyland 1998 & 1999). Xu (2001) found interesting findings in a study of metadiscourse use by 200 students across four years of an undergraduate course in English at a Chinese university. He found that students in the final two years employed more formally complex and precise interactive metadiscourse (*consequently, therefore, as a result*) than those in the first two years, who preferred forms such as *but, then* and *and.* In addition, they used fewer attitude markers, less self mention and fewer 'validity markers' (hedges and boosters). The reason for these changes are complex but Hu attributes them to the weakening intrusion of Chinese criteria of good writing as the students gained grater awareness of English academic norms.

Martinez (2004) investigated the use of discourse markers in expository composition of Spanish undergraduates. The main findings were that students employed a variety of discourse markers with some types used more frequently than others. Elaborative markers were the most frequently used, followed by contrastive markers. There was a significant relationship between the number of discourse markers and the students' scores. There was also a significant relationship between highly rated essays and poorly rated ones in the frequency use of elaborative, contrastive and topic relating discourse markers. Those essays with larger number of elaborative, contrastive and topic relating discourse markers obtained a higher score. Elaborative markers were the most closely related to the compositions' quality.

A study by Jalilifar and Alipour (2007) attempted to determine the effect of explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers on pre-intermediate Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension skill. Ninety students were selected and given three versions of the same test, original, modified and unmodified metadiscourse-free texts. Results revealed that the group receiving the original version outperformed the group with the unmodified version, but their performance was about equal with the group receiving the modified version. In addition, two of the groups answered a questionnaire on how they judged the texts. Next, one of the groups received instruction on metadiscourse. Finally, a posttest was administered. Results revealed the positive influence of form-focused instruction of metadiscourse. It also revealed that metadiscourse markers are primarily responsible for cohesion rather than coherence. (1)

Following what was mentioned above, the present research aimed at investigating the impact of explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers on EFL learners' writing performance, since learning appropriate use of metadiscourse markers seems to be of considerable importance for becoming proficient writers in academic English and, more broadly speaking, for becoming effective communicators when

addressing the intended readership. Thus, efforts were made to address the following questions and test the two null hypotheses:

1.2 Research questions and hypotheses

Q1. Does explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers have any significant impact on EFL learners' writing achievement?

Q2. Is there any significant relationship between explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers and EFL learners' level of language proficiency?

H01. Explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers doesn't have any significant impact on EFL learners' writing achievement.

H02. There is no significant relationship between explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers and EFL learners' level of language proficiency.

2. Method

As was stated above, the current research aimed mainly at investigating the impact of explicit instruction of metadiscourse on EFL learners' writing ability. In this section, therefore, a brief profile of the participants, the materials used, the procedures and measures applied for eliciting the necessary data as well as the scoring method will be presented.

2.1 Participants

The participants in this study were 94 EFL students, both male and female, and aged between 20 to 23 years, of whom 32 were elementary, 32 intermediate, and 30 advanced students. They were majoring in English literature at the University of Isfahan. They were divided into three levels of language competence through the administration of a Michigan proficiency test. The mean score of the test was calculated. Those whose scores were two standard deviations above the mean were assigned the label 'advanced'. In the same fashion, the 'intermediate' students were those whose scores were either one standard deviation

below the mean or one standard deviation above the mean, and those whose scores were two standard deviations below the mean were considered the 'elementary' group.

2.2 Materials

The materials used in this study comprised a) a Michigan proficiency test (MELAB 1992), with 100 multiple-choice items on vocabulary, various grammatical points as well as reading comprehension texts, intended to divide the participants into three levels of language proficiency, b) a pretest to assess their initial knowledge and use of metadiscourse markers, and c) a post test to measure the participants writing performance after explicit instruction.

2.3 Procedures

As to the procedures applied in this study, the Michigan test was first administered and the population was divided into three groups of language proficiency based on the distance from the mean. Then, a pre-test on writing performance was given to all participants. In this test, the three groups were given three different topics to write about. Each participant was actually required to write a paragraph of no less than ten lines on each topic in order to determine the extent of his/her initial knowledge and unprompted use of metadiscourse markers.

All three groups were then exposed to the same explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers in six successive sessions. They were initially provided and familiarized with a list of definitions and examples of the two categories of the taxonomy (i.e. textual and interpersonal metadiscourse) proposed by Vande Kopple (1985)- Appendix 1. They were then repeatedly, and under the instructor's guidance, given opportunity during the instruction sessions to give synonyms for different types of metadiscourse and generate sentences using them. Participants were also frequently given sentences with deleted metadiscourse markers and were asked to supply the markers. They were given passages with metadisourse markers time and again and were required to first identify

them and then write down the function of each marker on a sheet of paper (some of the tests are included in Appendix II). They were also required to use each type of metadiscourse in various types of sentences (simple, compound, complex, declarative, imperative, question, etc.) and in larger units as well. The reinforcement of all such activities formed the 'explicit instruction' meant in this study.

Finally, the writing ability post-test (i.e. writing a 250 word informative essay) was administered to check the participants' achievement in terms of metadisourse markers after having been exposed to explicit instruction. The participants' scores on the pre-test and post-test were then compared to find the degree of improvement of each group. The analysis and comparison of the test results are presented in section three below.

2.4 Scoring method

The scoring of writing tests were basically subjective, because there is more than one correct way of writing each paragraph, so inter-rater scoring procedure was used. Two raters scored the participant's writings based on the degree of their cohesiveness and the correct use of metadiscourse markers. In order to reduce the mentioned subjectivity, they were asked to base their judgments on such general assessment criteria as the clarity of the purpose, the clarity of the main ideas, the close relations between ideas, the correctness of the segmentation of paragraphs, the clear connections between ideas, etc.). The obtained scores were statistically analyzed, using Paired Sample T-Test in order to identify the changes that had taken place as an outcome of instruction given to the groups as well as differences in achievement among the three groups.

3. Data Analysis and Results

This section presents the results from the analysis of the obtained data. However, to bridge the results and the hypotheses of the research, below is a restatement of the two null hypotheses mentioned earlier:

H01. There is no significant relationship between explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers and EFL learners' writing achievement.

H02. There is no significant relationship between explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers and EFL learners' level of language proficiency.

3.1 The first null hypothesis

The first null hypothesis states that explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers doesn't have any impact on EFL learners' writing achievement. Regarding this hypothesis, a Paired Sample T-Test was conducted to compare the means of the two sub-test results.

Each group in the study took a pretest and posttest on writing ability. The post-test was taken after the participants went through the necessary explicit instructions. Each student wrote a 250 word informative essay. Two different raters scored the essays and the mean score for each essay was calculated to see how each learner performed on his/her pretests and after the explicit instructions on the posttest. The results of the participants' pre-test and posttest were compared through Paired Sample T-Test. Paired Sample T-Test is used to see a group's performance on two different tests. Table 1 below presents the mean score of the pretest and posttest of the elementary group.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the elementary group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test	8.5625	32	2.47487	.43750
	Post-test	10.515	32	2.7193	.48072

Looking at table 1, one can clearly see that the mean score on the pretest (8.56) has improved to (10.51). This clearly shows that explicit instruction has affected the writing ability of elementary learners.

Having scanned the statistics of the paired samples T Test, we need to determine if the difference across the variables is considerable. Table 2 below clearly illustrates the significance of the resulting difference.

Table 2: Paired samples t-test elementary groups' performance

		Paired Differences							
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviatio	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	
Pair 1	Pre-test Post-test	-1.95313	.58695	.10376	-2.16474	-1.74151	-18.824	31	.000

We can set out now to interpret the resulting table above. As was mentioned before, this test was performed to discover the possible impact of explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers on writing ability of the learners. However, the mean difference between the two tests (equal to – 1.95) has come out to be almost noticeably different, not adequate of course to show a high significance of the difference. To get information about significance of difference, confidence interval of difference and significance value of the test have been provided. Generally, provided that confidence interval of difference does not contain zero and significance value is less than the alpha level of test, it can be concluded that the difference between two tests is significant (Table 2). Accepting that and taking a second look at the paired samples T Test table, one can undoubtedly observe that the above mentioned conditions are both met in this test, that is, confidence interval of difference does not contain zero (upper=-1.74, lower=-2.16) and significance value of the test is much less than the alpha level of the test (0.00<0.05).

Table 3 presents the result of intermediate group's level of achievement in their posttest. As indicated in the table below, the mean score of the learners' on their pre-test was 12.19. The mean score on their post test indicates that the participants' writing achievement has improved to 15.05 which shows a higher achievement compared to the elementary level students.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the intermediate group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test	12.1875	32	2.44207	.43170
	Post-test	15.0469	32	2.03343	.35946

As was mentioned before, this test was performed to discover the possible effect of explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers on writing ability of the learners. The mean difference between the two tests for the intermediate group was equal to –2.86. To see if explicit instruction had a considerable impact on writing ability of the intermediate group learners, confidence interval of difference and significance value of the test have been provided. Confidence interval of difference does not contain zero (upper=2.63, lower=-3.09) and significance value of the test is much less than the alpha level of the test (0.00<0.05). This is shown in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Paired Samples T Test- Intermediate group's performance

		Paired Differences							
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviatio	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	
Pair 1	Pre-test Post-test	-2.85938	.63797	.11278	-3.08939	-2.62936	-25.354	31	.000

Table 5 below demonstrates the result of pre-test and post-test for advanced level participants. The number of students participating in this group was 30. The mean score of the pre-test for this group was 16. The mean score after explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers improved to 17.5, which demonstrates the least improvement among the three groups.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics of the advanced group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test	16.0000	30	1.33907	.24448
	Post-test	17.5500	30	1.24810	.22787

The mean difference between the two tests for the advanced group was equal to –1.55(Table 6 below). To see if explicit instruction had a considerable effect of explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers on writing ability of the advanced group learners, confidence interval of difference and significance value of the test have been provided. Confidence interval of difference does not contain zero (upper=-1.32, lower=-1.78) and significance value of the test is much less than the alpha level of the test (0.00<0.05).

Table 6: Paired sample t test advanced group's performance

		Paired Differences							
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Mean	Std. Deviatio	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-test Post-test	-1.55000	.62076	.11334	-1.78180	-1.31820	-13.676	29	.000

All together, explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers does have an effect on the EFL learners' writing ability. In other words, the writing ability of the EFL learners was significantly related to the explicit instruction they received on metadiscourse markers; thereby the first null hypothesis of the research was rejected.

3.2 The second null hypothesis

The difference between the participants' performance on the pre-test and post-test was calculated. A one-way ANOVA was actually conducted to explore the differences among the three groups' achievement in writing after explicit instruction.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics of three groups

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1.00	32	1.9531	.58695	.10376	1.7415	2.1647	1.00	3.00
2.00	32	2.8594	.63797	.11278	2.6294	3.0894	1.50	4.00
3.00	30	1.5500	.62076	.11334	1.3182	1.7818	-.50	3.00
Total	94	2.1330	.82036	.08461	1.9650	2.3010	-.50	4.00

Table 8: One-way ANOVA between groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	28.116	2	14.058	37.111	.000
Within Groups	34.472	91	.379		
Total	62.588	93			

Table 8 gives both between-group sum of squares, degrees of freedom etc. In the last column we can see the significant value. This value being less than .05, we can conclude that there is a significant difference somewhere among the mean scores on the dependent variable for the three groups, although it does not tell us which group is different from which other group. The statistical significance of the differences between each pair of group is provided in the next table which provides the result of the post-hoc tests.

Table 9: Multiple comparisons of all groups

(I) GROUP	(J) GROUP	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1.00	2.00	-.9063(*)	.15387	.000	-1.2729	-.5396
	3.00	.4031(*)	.15641	.031	.0304	.7758
2.00	1.00	.9063(*)	.15387	.000	.5396	1.2729
	3.00	1.3094(*)	.15641	.000	.9367	1.6821
3.00	1.00	-.4031(*)	.15641	.031	-.7758	-.0304
	2.00	-1.3094(*)	.15641	.000	-1.6821	-.9367

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

The significant value in the ANOVA table above is equal to (.000), so there is a difference between groups' achievement in their post-test. This table shows exactly where the differences among the groups occur. The asterisks(*) next to the values listed in column labeled Mean Difference means that the two groups being compared are significantly different from one another at the $p<.05$ level. The exact significance value is given in the column labeled sig. In the results presented above, all groups are significantly different from one another. But the significant value for the second group compared to the first and third group is smaller (.000), so we can conclude that the second group showed a more significant improvement after explicit instruction.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

With regard to the analysis of the data in the previous section and the results thereof, the following significant conclusions can be drawn and discussed:

  - Elementary learners improved significantly after explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers.

  - Intermediate learners had the highest improvement. In other words, explicit instruction showed to be most effective for this group of learners.

  - Advanced learners showed the least improvement after explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers.

The above conclusions for the three groups in the study confirm the major claim of this research that explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers in Iranian EFL courses is quite successful for improving learners' writing ability. This strongly corresponds to Crismore's (1985) point of view that metadiscourse awareness has been very effective in foreign/ second language teaching classrooms and with various parts of language skills and components.

 As it was also observed in the preceding section, the participants in the second group (i.e. intermediate learners) did significantly better than the first and third group on their post test- an unpredictable finding. This is in contrast to Simin and Tavangar's (2009) finding that" the more

proficient learners are in a second language, the more they use metadiscourse markers"(p. 230). It can thus be concluded that for intermediate learners the reinforcement of metadiscourse markers through explicit instruction in their writing courses seems to be indispensible, and that explicit instruction is not as helpful for elementary and specially for advanced learners, although they too showed comparatively less significant improvements on their post-test. The reason for this might be that advanced learners already know enough language, and are familiar with metadiscourse markers; therefore they unconsciously use such markers in their writing. As to the elementary group, less improvement seems to be natural due to their inadequate language competence. The outperformance of intermediate learners in the present study and the possible reasons for it should however be investigated in future researches and different contexts.

The findings of this research reveal the fact that metadiscourse awareness affects the learners' language performance. This is in line with studies of Cheng and Steffensen (1996) and Intraprawat and Steffensen (1995) who have come to the point that students' writing is improved when they write with an awareness of textual metadiscourse--one of the two types of metadiscourse markers taught explicitly in this research. The findings also support Simin and Tavangar's (2009) statement that, "metadiscourse instruction has a positive effect on the correct use of metadiscourse markers" (230), although there is no report in their study of explicit teaching of metadiscourse markers to their participants. The findings are also in line with Perez- L1antada (2003), who conducted research on the effect of metadiscourse techniques on learners' communication skills in university courses of English for Academic Purposes (EAP), and observed that students became successful communicators with regards to metadiscourse strategies.

A final word is that, first of all, this research can be a call to teachers, practitioners and researchers in language teaching and learning to pay more attention to metadiscourse as an important aspect of language. Secondly, it provides a suggestion to material designers, i.e. by making

texts more coherent both textually and interpersonally they can enhance EFL learners' ability to understand and remember information. This research also clarifies the fact that learners with different levels of language proficiency go separate ways in writing a text. Therefore, they should not be treated alike, and more attention is needed in respect to homogeneity of language classes.

5. Limitations of the Study

This study like other studies might have many inherent limitations. Among these limitations, some of them are explained as follows:

- Given the fact that the study examined only 94 students' writings, they may not have been a true representation of the larger population of EFL Persian learners.

- The researchers could have used the Michigan proficiency test handbook to specify the level of proficiency of the participants, but this handbook being inaccessible, they were forced to resort to the mean scores and standard deviations.

- There was no objective way to score the writings of the participants. The writings were therefore subjectively scored by two raters as mentioned in 2.4.

Appendix I
A classification of metadiscourse elements (Vande Kopple 1985)

Category Textual	Function	Examples
Logical connectives	Express semantic relationship between main clauses/sentences	And, therefore, however, still
Frame markers	Mark main transition between different stages (e.g. sequence material, indicate topic shift)	First, second; now let's turn to … before delving in to…
Illocutionary markers	Naming the act the speaker performs or announcing the speaker's intention	I am allowing myself to make sweeping generalization; I'd like to discuss; I shall highlight; I have attempted to compare;
Reminders	Refer back to other sections of the lecture	As I mentioned before; as I think back over what I have said thus for … throughout this lecture

Category Textual	Function	Examples
Attributors	Provides support for the speaker's arguments, including quotes	Because of increasing evidence
Code glosses	Clarify, explain, rephrase, or exemplify propositional meaning	For example, that is such as in other words

Category Interpersonal	Function	Examples
Hedges	Without full commitment to the statement	Normally, perhaps for the most part may, might, in many cases, give or take… it appears that… I think
Certainly	Express full commitment to the statement	Normally, perhaps for the most part may, might, in many cases, give or take… it appears that … I think
Emphatics	To highlight aspects of propositional content or mark salience	Do in fact … most importantly fronting
Attitude	To express the speaker's attitude towards propositional content	X might knock you out of your seat, the more interesting topic of … it is my opinion that…
Relational markers	To establish and maintain rapport with the audience (including rhetorical questions, direct appeals to the audience, etc)	You might be wondering what… to a European student … [refer to a characteristic of the audience can we learn from …? De buen rollo, discotecas[code switching] you," including – We"
Person markers	To explicitly refer to the speaker	" I "

Appendix II
Metadiscourse Tests

Test 1

Use a suitable connection word to join each two sentences into one compound sentence. The connection should show how the ideas in the two sentences are related.

1. The road between Pollock pines and Omo Ranch was quite rough.____ we found it more comfortable to travel slower than usual.

2. The girl appears to be at least three sizes too large for her bikini. _____ every eye was fixed upon her as the men waited for the fabric fail.

3. The wreckers towed his car away, _____ he could no longer drive it.

4. Students are showing greater interest in baseball as a school sport. _____ students are showing a greater interest in dramatics.

5. She caused trouble wherever she went. _____ she was the kind of woman who could turn a peaceful exchange of views in the weather into a war of nerves.

6. Kent seldom bothers to attend class or reach his assignments. _____ he has never even taken the first test.

7. San Francisco is visited by every foreign visitor who comes to the west. _____ its charms are know the world over.

8. The dog and the cat always fight, _____ it is obvious they hate each other.

9. Far too much emphasis has been placed on psychology and too little on personal responsibility. _____ knowledge of psychology can be very valuable.

10. The next morning she was glad that she had not yielded to a scar, _____ he was most strangely and obviously better.

11. Recently Ralph Nader has criticized the auto industry far producing unsafe automobiles. _____ he condemned the Volkswagen as being the most dangerous car on the road.

12. All the figures were correct and had been checked, _____the total came out wrong. (From Writer's Workshop, Frew, Gunches, Mehoffy 1976).

Test 2

Write down a connecting word that would be suitable for the blank at the beginning of each sentence.

Thank you very much for lending me this book. I'm afraid I didn't understand much of it. 1_____, I read less than half of it! 2_____, it's a subject that interested me. 3_____, it's first one that I need to know

more about for my work. This isn't the first time that I've tried to find out something about it, as you may remember. You can see I'm not giving up! I haven't got a lot of time to spend on it. 4_____ perhaps you'd be good enough to send me that simple book you mentioned. (From A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English, Riversand 1978)

References

Cheng, X and Steffensen, M. (1996). *Metadiscourse: A technique in improving students writing*. Research in the teaching of English.

Crismore, A. (1982). *The metadiscourse component: understanding writing about reading directives*. Avon.

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

Crismore, A. (1985). Metadiscourse in social studies texts. *Technical Report*, No. 366.

Crismore, A. (1989). *Talking with readers: Metadiscourse as rhetorical act*. New York: Peter Lang.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation, In Cole and Morgan (Eds.), *Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, 45-58.

Holmes, J. (1988). Doubt and certainty in ESL textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, 91, 20-44.

Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 437.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Longman/Pearson.

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

Hyland, K. K. (1999). Talking to students: Metadiscourse in introductory course books. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18* (1), 3-26.

Intraprawat, P. and Steffensen, M. S. (1995). The Use of metadiscourse in good and poor ESL essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *4* (3), 253-272.

Jalilifar, A. and Alipour, M. (2007). How explicit instruction makes a diffference: Metadiscourse markers and EFL learners' reading comprehension skill. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, *38,* 1.

Martinez, A. C. L. (2004). Discourse markers in the expository writing of Spanish university students. *IBERICA*, 8, 63-80.

Milton, J. (1999). Lexical thickets and electronic gateways: Making text accessible by novice writers. In C.N. Candlin and Hyland (Eds.), *Writing: Texts, processes and practices*. London: Longman, 221-243.

Pérez-Llantada, C. (2003). Communication skills in academic monologic discourse. Empirical and applied perspectives. *Circulo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 3, 15.

Redd-Boyd, T. and Slater, W. (1989). The effect of audience specification on undergraduates: attitude, strategies, and writing. *Research in the Teaching of English,* 23, 77-103.

Simin, S. and Tavangar, M. (2009). Metadiscourse knowledge and use in Iranian EFL writing. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11, 230-255.

Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1998). Irony and relevance: A reply to Seto, Hamamoto and Yamanashi. In Robyn Carston & Seiji Uchida (Eds.), *Relevance theory: Applications and implications*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 283-93.

Tannen, D. and Wallat, C. (1999). Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/ interview. In A. Jaworski and N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader*. London: Routledge, 248-263.

Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition Communication*, *1* (36), 1.

Williams, J. (1981). Style: *Ten lessons in clarity and grace*. Boston: Scott Foresman.

Xu Haiming. (2001). *Metadiscourse: A cross-cultural perspective*. Nanjing: Southeast University Press.