

Exploring Gender Differences in Cross-disciplinary Discourse: Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in the Discussion Section of Research Articles

Behrang Mohammad Salehi, Ph.D. Candidate in TEFL
Islamic Azad University, Izeh Branch

Reza Biria, Ph.D.
Islamic Azad University, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch

=====

Abstract

The present comparative study sought to explore the gender differences in the use of interactional metadiscourse markers in the discussion section of Research Articles (RAs) in the two disciplines of microbiology and applied linguistics. Using Hyland's (2005a) metadiscourse model, the research study investigated the use of five subcategories of interactional metadiscourse in a corpus of 64 research articles written by all-male, all-female, and male-female authors in the respected fields. Based on quantitative analysis, it was found that there was a significant difference between male and female writers and male-female ones in using attitude markers as one of the interactional metadiscourse elements. Besides, the results showed that there was a cross-disciplinary variation in using interactional metadiscourse. These findings acknowledge the fact that different disciplines use various rhetorical thought patterns in their writings.

Keywords: Gender Differences; Interactional Metadiscourse; Research Article

1. Introduction

Academic discourse has gained centrality during the past thirty years. In this regard, there is a close relationship between academic discourse and the way a writer's identity is shaped. One of the ways through which the writer's identity is constructed and practiced, is writing (Richardson, 2000). In fact, as Bazerman (1988) and Hyland (2000) indicated writing tends to

construct disciplines and its practitioners' identity. One part of a writer's identity is the expression of the writer's gender in written academic discourse. Writing like other tools of communication is a rich resource for gender representation. Tse and Hyland (2008) have noted the significance of gender studies in academic discourse. This is to say that there might be variations between males and females in terms of their use of language in communication. Taken this fact into account, Tardy (2006) posits that one of the influential factors in interactions is the gender of the text's writer. That is, men and women writers might not approach interaction through writing in the same way and with the same resources at hand.

The role of metadiscourse in academic communication has been the focus of many research studies during the past decades (Hyland, 1998; 2005b; Mauranen, 1993; Vande Kopple, 1985), and many other researches have investigated the use of metadiscursive elements in different types of academic writing especially RAs. (Abdi, 2002; Abdi & Ahmadi, 2015; Abdi, Tavangar Rizi, & Tavakoli, 2010; Cao & Hu, 2014; Hyland, 1998, 2005b; McGrath & Kuteeva, 2012; Mur Duenas, 2011). Moreover, gender-based studies on metadiscourse in written discourse have received increasing academic attention (Holmes, 2009; Rezaei Zadeh, Baharlooei, & Simin, 2015; Salek & Yazdanimoghaddam, 2014; Tafaroji Yeganeh & Ghoreyshi, 2015; Zareifard & Alinezhad, 2014). Metadiscourse elements enhance the text organization; help the reader through the text; help the writer to establish his/her identity (Hyland & Tse, 2004). Since metadiscourse is used to express persuasion and author's participation in written academic discourse, some of the studies have focused on comparative and contrastive analyses of these elements by discipline (Cao & Hu, 2014; Estaji & Vafaeimehr, 2015; Rashidi & Alihosseini, 2012; Tse & Hyland, 2008).

There have been few studies (Crismore, Markkanen, & Steffensen, 1993; Francis, Robsen, & Read, 2001; Ghafoori & Oghbatalab, 2012; Herbert, 1990; Johnson & Roen, 1992; Tse & Hyland, 2008) which have investigated the effect of gender on employing metadiscourse elements by writers and speakers. These studies have emphasized the importance of gender in language use and confirmed that male and female writers used specific features of language

differently but none of them examined cross-disciplinary variations in terms of using interactional metadiscourse features in discussion section of research articles (RAs).

There are various conceptualizations and taxonomies of metadiscourse (Ädel & Mauranen, 2010). A key taxonomy that has been widely used in diverse research studies in the field is Hyland's (2005a) model of metadiscourse. Hyland's taxonomy is an extension of earlier models by Crismore et al., (1993) and Vande Kopple (1985). His model takes into account the contextual situatedness of metadiscursive elements and considers social factors which encircle and affect the use of language by writers. The rationale behind choosing Hyland's (2005a) interpersonal metadiscourse model was its widespread utilization in previous studies of metadiscourse; thus, its adoption in current study would allow the findings to be compared with those from the existing bulk of research.

Hyland describes metadiscourse as “reflective language used by the writer/speaker to interact with the reader/hearer in a specific context of communication and draws a distinction between interactive and interactional metadiscourse” (as cited in Cao & Hu, 2014, p. 16). Interactive and interactional metadiscourse were introduced by Thompson (2001) each with five other subsections, which supplanted textual and interpersonal markers respectively. In academic discourse, in one hand, interactive metadiscourse is used to “help readers understand a text by explaining, orienting and guiding them through the information” (Hyland, 2005a, p. 75). On the other hand, interactional metadiscourse is applied to indicate the writer's knowledge-oriented position on propositional information and his/her attitude toward readers in order to engage them in construction of the text in a joint effort (Hyland, 2005b). Although both categories of metadiscourse are important in academic communication, few studies, if any, examined cross-disciplinary variations in using interactional metadiscourse in the discussion section of research articles (RAs).

There is a growing body of research that recognizes the importance of metadiscourse in dealing with text and talk in academic genre of research article. What follows is a synopsis of literature found on the topic under investigation.

Crismore, et al., (1993) in a comparative study examined the use of metadiscourse elements in persuasive essays by American male and female student writers. They recommended that rhetorical use of metadiscourse markers depended on the writers' gender and culture. They came to the conclusion that in spite of using interpersonal metadiscourse more than textual by both genders, female writers used interpersonal metadiscourse more than male writers.

In another study by Tse and Hyland (2008) using a corpus of book reviews which were written by male and female writers and interviews with experts in biology and philosophy, they found that both male and female book reviewers used twice as many interactional markers as interactive ones. The more frequent use of interactional elements by male writers indicated the presence of the writer and demonstrated the evaluative nature of book review genre. According to them, the more frequent uses of 'engagement markers', 'hedges', and 'self-mention', by males originated from the engaging factor which was connected with female style of writing (Holmes, 1989).

Tse and Hyland (2008) defended the results of their analysis by relating them to dominant position and higher status of males in academic settings. The examination of interactive elements demonstrated that 'transition markers' were the most frequent features in females' texts and the second most frequent elements in male's texts. This showed that writers of both genders attempted to help their readers with clear interpretation of their arguments. Females made heavy use of 'evidentials', but variations between males and females in their uses of 'code glosses' were not significant. In the same vein, the interviews with members of academic disciplines exhibited the same results as 'hedges' and 'boosters' were frequently used by male interviewees. However, the analysis of 'evidentials' and 'code glosses' showed that they were more frequent among female interviewees.

Holmes (2009) analyzed 78 conference articles written for a conference in Australia as the main corpus of the study in order to explore gender differences in the use of hedges and boosters in academic discourse. The results of the study indicated that male authors had more inclination to use boosters even though difference in the frequency of hedges was not significant.

Nevertheless, it was suggested that men were more likely to use the less common hedges compared to women writers. The effect of collaboration and the first author was also taken into account.

Ghafoori and Oghbatalab (2012) did a comparative study of metadiscourse in academic writing using a corpus of 20 applied linguistics RAs which were written by native male and female English writers. Drawing on Hyland's (2005a) taxonomy, they wanted to see whether there were differences in the use of metadiscourse by the writers or not. The results of the study showed that writers of both genders were not different in their use of metadiscourse elements but significant differences were found in categorical distribution of these elements.

Salek and Yazdanimoghaddam (2014) analyzed three groups of research articles consisting of native English (NE), native Persian (NP), and non-native English (NNE) articles based on Hyland and Tse's (2004) taxonomy plus two metadiscourse strategies by Abdi et al., (2010). The cultural differences between English and Persian present in texts was also examined in terms of the effect of English as L2 on the non-native English research articles written by Iranian researchers. Chi-square statistical technique was used to find the differences among the three corpora. The results of analyzing about 9000 lines of 26 published research articles on ELT and theoretical linguistics revealed that native Persian writers used interactive metadiscourse markers in their L1 writings more than the native English and non-native English academic writers (Iranian) whereas they used the fewest number of interactional metadiscourse with self-mentions as an exception. Interestingly, Persian academic writers used interactional metadiscourse markers the most when they wrote in L2 (English). The findings indicated no relationship between gender and metadiscourse markers utilized by the native English and native Persian academic writers. It was further demonstrated that NP research articles were the clearest and the most comprehensible articles because they comprised the majority of interactive markers in contrast to NE and NNE research articles.

Zareifard and Alinezhad (2014) examined the relationship interactional metadiscourse and gender in theses of Persian speakers. Quantitative analyses of the metadiscourse markers

used by eighteen male and female candidates' theses in humanities and social sciences showed a statistically significant difference in the use of interactional metadiscourse markers by the candidates. It was noted, however, that qualitative analysis demonstrated the existence of some similarities among male and female candidates in using the types of metadiscourse markers in the defense seminars of Persian speakers. In a comparative study of paradigmatic and disciplinary influences on interactive metadiscourse in research articles by Cao and Hu (2014), they scrutinized the use of five types and subtypes of interactive metadiscourse in 120 research articles. The results revealed marked cross-disciplinary differences in the use of exemplifiers, comparative transitions, linear references, and integral citations.

In a more recent attempt, Tafaraji Yeganeh and Ghoreyshi (2015) investigated gender differences in abstract and discussion sections of 40 English articles written by native speakers of Persian using Hyland's (2005a) metadiscourse classification scheme. Using the scheme, the occurrences of hedge and booster in these two sections were analyzed. The results of quantitative and qualitative study demonstrated that gender differences played a crucial role in making use of these devices in the corpus. Besides, the study also showed that Iranian males were more oriented to use boosters in their academic writing while Iranian females preferred to use more hedges to express the information they supplied.

In short, the present study aims at exploring gender differences in the discussion section of research articles in the field of microbiology and applied linguistics using interactional metadiscourse features. More precisely, the research attempts to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: Are there any differences between the two disciplines in terms of using interactional metadiscourse?

RQ2: Are there any gender differences between the two disciplines in terms of using interactional metadiscourse?

2. Framework for Analysis

In order to find answers to the research questions, Hyland's (2005a) model of interactional metadiscourse was adopted as the analytical framework. This classification scheme recognizes five major types of interactional metadiscourse markers (Table1). These interactional resources engage readers in the text and provide opportunities to them to have contributions to the discourse by making them aware of the author's perspective towards both propositional meaning and readers themselves. According to Hyland (2005a, pp. 51-52), these resources are as follows:

1. Hedges: hedging system is used to 'withhold commitment' and avoid certainty.
2. Boosters: these resources on the other hand emphasize certainty by showing evidence and facts.
3. Attitude markers: these elements express writer's attitude towards what is going to be stated or implied in the text.
4. Self-mentions: they refer to the extent of the author's presence and involvement in the text.
5. Engagement markers: these markers are used to create relationship with reader throughout the text.

Table 1 *An Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse* (Hyland, 2005a, p. 49)

Category	Function	Examples
Interactional	Involve the reader in the text	Resources
Hedges	withhold commitment and open dialogue	might; perhaps; possible; about
Boosters	emphasize certainty or close dialogue	in fact; definitely; it is clear that
Attitude markers	express writer's attitude to proposition	unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly
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

3. Methodology

3.1. Corpus

The corpus created for the purpose of this study comprised Research Articles (RAs) from the two disciplines, one from microbiology and the other one from applied linguistics. The

rationale behind constructing the corpus based on these two disciplines derived from Becher and Trowler's (2001) classification of the disciplines. They divide the academic disciplines into soft and hard sciences. In Becher and Trowler's idea, soft disciplines refer to the humanities and social sciences and hard disciplines refer to natural sciences. Soft and hard disciplines are further divided into pure and applied subcategories. In the current study, it was decided to select two disciplines from soft and hard sciences which are applied in nature, namely microbiology and applied linguistics. Besides, the corpus was confined to the *Discussion* section of RAs in that the *Discussion* part of any RA relates the reported study to the previous work mentioned in the introduction. Moreover, the *Discussion* section is the part of research study in which the scholars attempt to persuade their audience.

Time is another significant consideration in choosing the corpus of the study (Bazerman, 1988). In order to cater for the time factor, all the articles were selected from the time interval of 2011 to 2016.

A total of 64 research articles were randomly chosen from among several scholarly and refereed journals in microbiology and applied linguistics. All the articles were retrieved from the electronic versions of journal websites. From each discipline, it was determined that 10 articles were written by male authors; 10 were written by female authors and the rest of 12 articles were written by both male and female authors. Most of the articles in microbiology had more than one author except for one. 13 articles in applied linguistics were authored by single male and female writers. In most of articles, the gender of the author(s) was easily identified from their names. In some other samples in which there were some doubts regarding the gender of the authors, required information was obtained from the Internet websites of universities where they worked. Table 2 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the corpus under investigation by discipline and gender.

Table 2 *Descriptive Statistics for the Corpus*

Discipline	RA	Gender			No. of words	Mean
		M	F	M-F		
Microbiology	32	10	10	12	31473	983
Applied Linguistics	32	10	10	12	37611	1175
Total	64	20	20	24	69084	2158

3.2. Procedure

The texts in the corpora were converted into Microsoft word documents. Some of the items were removed from the texts including tables, figures, references, and reference numbers. Basic data such as number of words, paragraphs, and words per sentence were taken from the corpus using Microsoft word tools. Microsoft Word Find feature was then applied to identify the interactional metadiscourse subtypes, namely Attitude Markers, Boosters, Self-Mention, Engagement Markers, and Hedges. Every instance of these subcategories was studied in its sentential co-text so as to avoid potential ambiguities and diverse functions each one of them may have had. In order to arrive at valid end result, the data were manually checked to see whether the instances were compatible with the obtained results of the word-processing software. In the meantime, some ironic uses of the metadiscourse items were accounted for.

3.3. Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis was conducted on the interactional metadiscourse identified in the corpus, which were used by male, female, or male-female authors. An independent samples t-test (using IBM SPSS Statistics V. 23), was run to examine cross-disciplinary variation (microbiology vs. applied linguistics) in using interactional metadiscourse subsections. In the meantime, to examine the differences between male, female, and male-female writers in employing interactional metadiscourse subtypes, A one-way ANOVA test and Post Hoc ANOVA (Tukey test) were utilized to show whether there are differences or not.

4. Results and Discussion

In this section, the results of the quantitative analysis are presented. The results presentation is organized according to the main types of interactional metadiscourse under examination. As table 3 exhibits, the descriptive statistics by discipline and all five subcategories of interactional metadiscourse in the corpus are provided. On the whole, hedges, engagement

markers, boosters, self-mention, and attitude markers had the most number of occurrences respectively.

Table 3 *Descriptive Statistics for Interactional Metadiscourse by Discipline*

	Discipline	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Attitude	microbiology	32	1.94	1.848	.327
	applied linguistics	32	4.25	1.951	.345
Boosters	microbiology	32	8.22	4.542	.803
	applied linguistics	32	10.41	3.999	.707
Self Mention	microbiology	32	3.81	3.217	.569
	applied linguistics	32	2.78	2.181	.386
Engagement	microbiology	32	7.34	4.194	.741
	applied linguistics	32	11.59	2.551	.451
Hedges	microbiology	32	13.66	7.298	1.290
	applied linguistics	32	24.34	4.783	.846
Total	microbiology	32	34.9688	14.33805	2.53463
	applied linguistics	32	53.3750	7.86889	1.39104

In order to answer the first research question regarding the differences between microbiology and applied linguistics in terms of interactional metadiscourse use, an independent samples t-test was run to answer the question. According to table 4 and based on the results of the independent samples t-test, it can be stated that there is a significant difference between microbiology and applied linguistics in terms of using attitude markers, ($t = -4.868$, $p = .000$), boosters ($t = -2.045$, $p = .045$), engagement markers ($t = -4.898$, $p = .000$), and hedges ($t = -6.928$, $p = .000$), by the authors. The significance level was set at $p \leq .05$, but there was no significant difference found regarding Self Mention between the two disciplines.

Table 4 *Independent Samples T Test for Discipline and Interactional Metadiscourse*

	t	df	t-test for Equality of Means		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
Attitude	-4.868	62	.000	-2.313	-3.262	-1.363
	-4.868	61.8	.000	-2.313	-3.262	-1.363
		19				
Boosters	-2.045	62	.045	-2.188	-4.326	-.049
	-2.045	61.0	.045	-2.188	-4.327	-.048
		21				
Self Mention	1.501	62	.138	1.031	-.342	2.405
	1.501	54.5	.139	1.031	-.346	2.409
		25				
Engagement	-4.898	62	.000	-4.250	-5.985	-2.515
	-4.898	51.1	.000	-4.250	-5.992	-2.508
		77				
Hedges	-6.928	62	.000	-10.688	-13.771	-7.604
	-6.928	53.4	.000	-10.688	-13.781	-7.594
		82				

Total		-6.366	62	.000	-18.40625	-24.18578	-12.62672
		-6.366	48.1	.000	-18.40625	-24.21913	-12.59337
			21				

In order to answer the second research question regarding the gender differences among the authors of the articles in the two disciplines, A One-way ANOVA was run to see whether there are any differences between the two variables. As table 5 indicates, there were significant differences between the male and female authors, and male-female authors in using attitude markers, ($F=7.297$, $df = (2, 61)$ and $p = .001$). The significance level was set at $p \leq .05$.

Table 5 One-way ANOVA for Gender and Interactional Metadiscourse

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Attitude	Between Groups	59.741	2	29.870	7.297	.001
	Within Groups	249.697	61	4.093		
	Total	309.438	63			
Boosters	Between Groups	12.533	2	6.266	.319	.728
	Within Groups	1199.217	61	19.659		
	Total	1211.750	63			
Self Mention	Between Groups	1.487	2	.744	.094	.911
	Within Groups	483.872	61	7.932		
	Total	485.359	63			
Engagement	Between Groups	22.591	2	11.296	.680	.510
	Within Groups	1013.346	61	16.612		
	Total	1035.938	63			
Hedges	Between Groups	12.911	2	6.456	.094	.910
	Within Groups	4175.089	61	68.444		
	Total	4188.000	63			
Total	Between Groups	198.995	2	99.498	.449	.640
	Within Groups	13514.114	61	221.543		
	Total	13713.109	63			

In the same vein, Post Hoc ANOVA using Tukey test (table 6) shows that the difference between male and female, and male-female authors in using attitude markers with the level of significance of .001 was established clearly, but this difference was not significant among other interactional metadiscourse elements.

Table 6 Post Hoc ANOVA (Tukey Test) for Gender and Interactional Metadiscourse

Dependent Variable	(I) Gender	(J) Gender	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound

Attitude	male	female	-1.395	.665	.099	-2.99	.20
		male-female	.957	.606	.262	-.50	2.41
	female	male	1.395	.665	.099	-.20	2.99
		male-female	2.352*	.616	.001	.87	3.83
	male-female	male	-.957	.606	.262	-2.41	.50
		female	-2.352*	.616	.001	-3.83	-.87

Based on the results of one-way ANOVA and the independent samples t-test, there was a significant difference between disciplines and the gender of authors in attitude markers.

The results of the present study are in line with Abdi's (2002) study which examined the use of interpersonal metadiscourse markers in Social Sciences (SS) and Natural Sciences (NS) to illustrate the writers' identity and their choices on the use of attitude markers, emphatics, and hedges. Moreover, such results support other findings by Hyland's (2005b) comprehensive study, which demonstrated statistically significant difference in use of metadiscourse markers in eight disciplines based on analyzing 240 published RAs and interviews. In the meantime, the current results are in agreement with those obtained from Atai and Sadr (2008) who demonstrated a significant difference in the use of hedging devices in the academic writing of English native and non-native speakers in applied linguistics research studies. As reported in the preceding part, the two disciplines investigated in this research study were found to vary considerably in the use of some interactional metadiscourse resources including attitude markers, boosters, engagement markers, and hedges but not in self mention feature. This is in line with Tse and Hyland (2008). Attitude markers are used to make participants and writer's feelings visible. They are valuable rhetorical means whereby different academic identities can be presented (Abdi, 2002). These findings approve of the fact that different disciplines use different rhetorical thought patterns in their writings.

This gender-based cross-disciplinary research between all-male and all-female and male-female authors can be attributed to some other studies done in this respect such as Ghafoori and Oghbatalab (2012); Holmes (2009); Tafaroji Yeganeh and Ghoreyshi (2015) whose findings are similar to the ones found in this study.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed at exploring cross-disciplinary and gender differences on the use of interactional metadiscourse markers in the discussion section of research articles. Through the analysis of subcategories of interactional metadiscourse in a corpus of 64 RAs, it was found out that there was a clear difference between microbiology and applied linguistics disciplines in terms of making use of attitude markers, boosters, engagement markers, and hedges. Meanwhile, statistically significant differences were found in male and female, male-female writers in employing attitude markers in their pieces of writing in their respected academic fields.

Due to some limitations in the process of the study, the results cannot be indicative of the whole picture. First of all, the research articles used in the study to construct the corpus were gathered from a limited number of journals in the related fields. This can affect the external validity of the study to some extent. To do a more comprehensive and full-fledged study, it is suggested that more disciplines be included in the research to replicate the results of this study. Second, as this study focused on interactional metadiscourse in the discussion section of RAs, other studies are needed to take into account other rhetorical sections of RAs in some different fields of study to create a better picture of research in metadiscourse area. Finally yet importantly, research can be carried out to include other genres of academic discourse such as book reviews, book blurbs, theses, and dissertations, and technical reports with a focus on gender differences in these areas.

References

- Abdi, R. (2002). Interpersonal metadiscourse: an indicator of interaction and identity. *Discourse Studies*, 4, 139-145.
- Abdi, R., & Ahmadi, P. (2015). Signposting propositions: a study of interactive metadiscourse marking in the composition of RAs across sciences. *RALs*, 6, 5-17.
- Abdi, R., TavangarRizi, M., Tavakoli, M. (2010). The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: a framework for the use of metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 1669-1679.

- Ädel, A., & Mauranen, A. (2010). Metadiscourse: diverse and divided perspectives. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9(2), 1-11.
- Atai, M. R., & Sadr, L. (2008). A cross-cultural study of hedging devices in discussion section of applied linguistics research articles. *Teaching English Language and Literature Society of Iran (TELLSI)*, 2(7), 1-2.
- Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: the genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Becher, T., Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Cao, F., & Hu, G. (2014). Interactive metadiscourse in research articles: A comparative study of paradigmatic and disciplinary influences. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 66, 15-31.
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R., & Steffensen, M. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written Communication*, 10(1), 39-71.
- Estaji, M., & Vafaeimehr, R. (2015). A comparative analysis of interactional metadiscourse markers in the Introduction and Conclusion sections of mechanical and electrical engineering research papers. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 3(1), 37-56.
- Francis, B., Robsen, J., & Read, B. (2001). An analyses of undergraduate writing styles in the context of gender and achievement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(3), 313- 326.
- Ghafoori, N., & Oghbatalab, R. (2012). A Comparative Study of Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: Male vs. Female Authors of Research Articles in Applied Linguistics. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 87-113.
- Herbert, R. K. (1990). Sex-based differences in compliment behavior. *Language in Society*, 19, 201-224.
- Holmes, A. (2009) Gender and Written Academic Discourse: Hedges and Boosters in Education Conference Papers. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 1-14.
- Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 437-455.

- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourse: Social interaction in academic writing*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2005a). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2005b). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7, 173-192.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: a reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 156-177.
- Johnson, D., & Roen, D. (1992). Complimenting and involvement in peer reviews: Gender variation. *Language in Society*, 21, 27-57.
- Mauranen, A. (1993). *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric: A textlinguistic study*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- McGrath, L., & Kuteeva, M. (2012). Stance and engagement in pure mathematics research articles: linking discourse features to disciplinary practices. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31, 161-173.
- Mur Duenas, P. (2011). An intercultural analysis of metadiscourse features in research articles written in English and in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 3068-3079.
- Rezaei Zadeh, Z., Baharlooei, R., & Simin, S. (2015). Gender-based Study of Interactive and Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in Conclusion Sections of English Master Theses. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 47, 195-208.
- Rashidi, N., & Alihosseini, F. (2012). A contrastive study of metadiscourse markers in research article abstracts across disciplines. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov*, 5(4), 17-23.
- Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 923-948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Salek, M., & Yazdanimoghaddam, M. (2014) A Cross-cultural Analysis of Metadiscourse in ELT and Theoretical Linguistics Research Articles by Native English vs. Iranian Academic Writers. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 2(1), 29-39.
- Tafaraji Yeganeh, M., & Ghoreyshi, S. M. (2015). Gender differences in the Use of Discourse Markers in Iranian Academic Research Articles. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 684-689.

- Tardy, C. M. (2006). Researching first and second language genre learning: A comparative review and look ahead. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 79-101.
- Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in academic writing: Learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), 58-78.
- Tse, P., & Hyland, K. (2008). 'Robot Kung Fu': Gender and professional identity in biology and philosophy reviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 1232-1248.
- Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 82-93.
- Zareifard, R., & Alinezhad, B. (2014) A Study of Interactional Metadiscourse Markers and Gender in the Defense Seminars of Persian Speakers. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(1), 231-238.

Appendix A

Resources of Interactional Metadiscourse

Attitude markers

!, admittedly, agree, agrees, agreed, amazed, amazing, amazingly, appropriate, appropriately, astonished, astonishing, astonishingly, correctly, curious, curiously, desirable, desirably, disappointed, disappointing, disappointingly, disagree, disagreed, disagrees, dramatic, dramatically, essential, essentially, even x, expected, expectedly, fortunate, fortunately, hopeful, hopefully, important, importantly, inappropriate, inappropriately, interesting, interestingly, prefer, preferable, preferably, preferred, remarkable, remarkably, shocked, shocking, shockingly, striking, strikingly, surprised, surprising, surprisingly, unbelievable, unbelievably, understandable, understandably, unexpected, unexpectedly, unfortunate, unfortunately, unusual, unusually, usual

Boosters

actually, always, believe, believed, believes, beyond doubt, certain, certainly, clear, clearly, conclusively, decidedly, definite, definitely, demonstrate, demonstrated, demonstrates, doubtless,

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 **16:12 December 2016**

Behrang Mohammad Salehi, Ph.D. Candidate in TEFL and Reza Biria, Ph.D.

Exploring Gender Differences in Cross-disciplinary Discourse: Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in the Discussion Section of Research Articles

establish, established, evident, evidently, find, finds, found, in fact, incontestable, incontestably, incontrovertible, incontrovertibly, indeed, indisputable, indisputably, know, known, must (possibility), never, no doubt, obvious, obviously, of course, prove, proved, proves, realize, realized, realizes, really, show, showed, shown, shows, sure, surely, think, thinks, thought, truly, true, undeniable, undeniably, undisputedly, undoubtedly, without doubt

Self Mention

I, we, me, my, our, mine, us, the author, the author's, the writer, the writer's

Engagement Markers

(the) reader's, add, allow, analyse, apply, arrange, assess, assume, by the way, calculate, choose, classify, compare, connect, consider, consult, contrast, define, demonstrate, determine, do not, develop, employ, ensure, estimate, evaluate, find, follow, go, have to, imagine, incidentally, increase, input, insert, integrate, key, let $x = y$, let us, let's, look at, mark, measure, mount, must, need to, note, notice, observe, one's, order, ought, our (inclusive), pay, picture, prepare, recall, recover, refer, regard, remember, remove, review, see, select, set, should, show, suppose, state, take (a look/as example), think about, think of, turn, us (inclusive), use, we (inclusive), you, your

Hedges

about, almost, apparent, apparently, appear, appeared, appears, approximately, argue, argued, argues, around, assume, assumed, broadly, certain amount, certain extent, certain level, claim, claimed, claims, could, couldn't, doubt, doubtful, essentially, estimate, estimated, fairly, feel, feels, felt, frequently, from my perspective, from our perspective, from this perspective, generally, guess, indicate, indicated, indicates, in general, in most cases, in most instances, in my opinion, in my view, in this view, in our opinion, in our view, largely, likely, mainly, may, maybe, might, mostly, often, on the whole, ought, perhaps, plausible, plausibly, possible, possibly, postulate, postulated, postulates, presumable, presumably, probable, probably, quite, rather x, relatively, roughly, seems, should, sometimes, somewhat, suggest, suggested, suggests, suppose, supposed, supposes, suspect, suspects, tend to, tended to, tends to, to my knowledge, typical, typically, uncertain, uncertainly, unclear, unclearly, unlikely, usually, would

Behrang Mohammad Salehi, Ph.D. Candidate in TEFL (Corresponding Author)
Islamic Azad University, Izeh Branch, Khuzestan, Iran
behrangsalehi@gmail.com

Reza Biria, Ph.D.
Islamic Azad University, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Isfahan, Iran