



ISSN: 2376-760X

# Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research

Volume 8

Number 4

2021



## EDITORIAL TEAM

### Editor-in-Chief

Dr Mohammad R. Farvardin

### Editorial Board

1. Professor Bernd Spillner, University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany
2. Professor Leena Furtado, California State University, United States
3. Professor Klaus-Dieter Baumann, University of Leipzig, Germany
4. Professor Howard Giles, University of California, United States
5. Professor Shi- xu, Zhejiang University, China
6. Professor Firooz Sadighi, Shiraz University, Iran, Islamic Republic of
7. Professor Behzad Ghonsooly, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran, Islamic Republic of
8. Assoc. Prof. Dr A. Tamilselvi, Thiagarajar College of Engineering, India
9. Assoc. Prof. Dr Ali Göçer, Ecyes University, Turkey
10. Assoc. Prof. Dr Sanjay Kumar Jha, Haramaya University, Ethiopia
11. Assoc. Prof. Dr Mansoor Tavakoli, University of Isfahan, Iran, Islamic Republic of
12. Assoc. Prof. Dr Abbass Eslami Rasekh, University of Isfahan, Iran, Islamic Republic of
13. Dr Seyed Jalal Abdolmanafi Rokni, Golestan University, Iran, Islamic Republic of
14. Dr Amir Sadeghi, University of Canterbury, New Zealand
15. Dr Amin Marzban, Islamic Azad University, Iran, Islamic Republic of
16. Dr Anwar Mourssi, Higher College of Technology, Muscat, Oman
17. Dr Ali Derakhshan, Golestan University, Iran, Islamic Republic of
18. Dr Salva Shirinbakhsh, University of Isfahan, Iran, Islamic Republic of
19. Dr Mohammad Saleh Sanatifar, Tabaran Institute of Higher Education, Mashhad, Iran, Islamic Republic of
20. Dr Zari Sadat Seyyedrezaie, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran, Islamic Republic of

## Focus and Scope

Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research (JALLR) is a double-blind peer-reviewed international journal published bimonthly. It is dedicated to promoting scholarly exchange among teachers and researchers in the field. Although articles are written in English, the journal welcomes studies dealing with the teaching of languages other than English as well. The journal is a venue for studies that demonstrate sound research methods and theoretical base with a visible practical application which can be generalized. The scope of JALLR includes the following fields: teaching English as a second or foreign language, English language teachers' training and education, Language teaching methodologies, Pedagogical techniques, Classroom-centered research, Cross-cultural studies, Translation, Testing and evaluation, Applied linguistics, Language and culture.

ISSN: 2376-760X

Authors can submit their papers via online system or email ([jallreditor@gmail.com](mailto:jallreditor@gmail.com)).

## Google Scholar Metrics

Citations: 3093

h-index: 21

hi10-index: 83

## Abstracting/Indexing

1. [Scientific Indexing Services \(SIS\)](#)
2. [Publons](#)
3. [ISSN](#)
4. [Electronic Journals Library](#)
5. [Eduindex - Index of Education](#)
6. [International Institute of Organized Research](#)
7. [InfoBase Index](#)
8. [Open Academic Journals Index \(OAII\)](#)
9. [Linse](#)
10. [International Impact Factor Services \(IIFS\)](#)
11. [Directory of Research Journal Indexing \(DRJI\)](#)
12. [Linguistics Abstracts Online](#)
13. [Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin](#)
14. [ZB MED](#)
15. [IPN Library](#)
16. [Journal TOCs](#)
17. [CfpList](#)
18. [ResearchBib](#)
19. [Journal Index](#)
20. [General Impact Factor \(GIF\)](#)
21. [ResearchGate](#)
22. [LINGUIST List](#)

23. [The Library of Congress](#)
24. [Academia.edu](#)
25. [WorldCat](#)
26. [Karlsruhe Virtual Catalog \(KVK\)](#)
27. [Leipzig University Library](#)
28. [Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin](#)
29. [CrossRef](#)
30. [Scribd](#)
31. [Google Scholar](#)
32. [Microsoft Academic Search](#)
33. [Open Archives Initiatives](#)
34. [Open J-Gate](#)
35. [Open Journal System](#)
36. [PKP Open Archives Harvester](#)

## **Publisher**

Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research is published by **Lulu Press** in USA.

## Vol 8, No 4 (2021)

### Table of Contents

#### Articles

A Comparative Study of Two EFL Books: Prospect 1 and American English File 1 <i>Melika Saghebi Ghale Joughi</i>	1-17
The Impact of Discourse Analysis-based Instruction on Iranian Extroverted vs. Introverted EFL Learners' Speaking <i>Hossein Siahpoosh, Taher Hosseinzadeh</i>	18-31
EFL Learners and Teachers' Satisfaction Degree towards Online Learning and Teaching through COVID-19 Pandemic <i>Abeer Al-Ghazo, Issam Mostafa Ta'amneh</i>	32-45
Investigating the Effectiveness of Social Media Platforms (SMPs) in English Language Teaching and Learning from EFL Students' Perspectives <i>Iman Al-Khalidi, Ouarda Khouni</i>	46-64
Students' Problems in Learning Speaking by Using Zoom During Covid-19 Pandemic <i>Ernati, Lely Refnita, Putri Nurhasanah M.</i>	65-75
Analysing Metadiscourse Markers in Two Online Newspapers' Editorials on Covid-19 <i>Innocent Sourou Koutchadé</i>	76-88



## Analysing Metadiscourse Markers in Two Online Newspapers' Editorials on Covid-19

**Innocent Sourou Koutchadé\***

Département d'Anglais, Université d'Abomey-Calavi, République du Bénin

### Abstract

One important way of analysing discourse is to find out how the writer uses specific linguistic features to interact with readers. This is carried out through the study of metadiscourse. The aim of this paper is to analyse metadiscourse markers in selected online articles. Specifically, the study focuses on two online newspapers' editorials in Nigeria, *PUNCH* and *THE NATION*. Hyland's (2005) approach is adopted in the study. Through a descriptive research design and mixed method perspective, the results reveal that apart from code glosses and self-mentions which are non-existent in the first text, the other types of interactive and interactional metadiscourse occur in the two texts. The distribution of interactive metadiscourse shows that transitions, evidentials and frame markers are mostly utilised in the first text whereas transitions, endophoric and frame markers are most dominant in the second text. Regarding interactional metadiscourse, hedges and engagement markers are dominant in *PUNCH* editorial while hedges and attitudes makers are mostly used in *THE NATION*. The paper concludes that these linguistic markers are all the more important as they facilitate the construction and negotiation of social relations.

**Keywords:** metadiscourse, Covid-19, transitions, hedges, social relations

### INTRODUCTION

Language is a medium through which human beings communicate their thoughts and intentions and it is mainly realised in written or oral form. In written texts, language is used as a means of providing information, persuading, entertaining and engaging the audience regarding the subject matter being dealt with. According to Ozdemir & Longo (2014), there are two levels at which people write. The first one contains propositional content that is the subject of the text, while the second level is metadiscourse that helps readers organise, understand and interpret the writing. Hyland (2005) contends that metadiscourse considers writing as a social engagement as it represents writers' awareness of the unfolding text as discourse: they locate themselves and their readers in a text to create convincing, coherent prose in particular social contexts. The social interaction is created through the organisation of the writer's ideas in accordance with the reader's opinions, the transfer of the writer's real personality, and the interaction with the reader in a relevant manner.

This study focuses on the analysis of metadiscourse markers in two newspapers' editorials. The articles chosen are from *PUNCH* and *THE NATION*, two online Nigerian newspapers. The objective of this study is to find out how the authors of these editorials have used interactive and interactional metadiscourse to express their attitudes and beliefs and enable readers to understand their messages. For that purpose, the following questions are to be answered

- What are the interactive metadiscourse markers used in the two texts?
- How are interactional markers organised in the two texts?
- How do these linguistic features highlight the message delivered by these two authors?

In order to meet some specific criteria related to this study, the paper provides the theoretical foundations, overviews some past studies, accounts for the materials and methods, analyses the two texts with the framework provided and discusses the main findings that have made it easy to answer the above research questions.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **The meaning of Metadiscourse**

Coined by Harris (1959), metadiscourse is a concept of discourse analysis which focuses on the way the reader or audience's insight into the text is guided by the writer or speaker. As Hyland (2005) puts it, apart from the exchange of goods and services, communication also focuses on the personalities, attitudes and assumptions of those who are communicating. Metadiscourse markers, thus, make it easy for authors to share their feelings and experiences with their readers. Hyland (2005) describes metadiscourse as a "discourse about discourse" and a "text about text". He also adds that it has to do with meaning rather prepositional ones. Jalilifar & Alipour (2007) quoted by Mohamed and Rashid (2017) observe that metadiscourse markers organise contents of a text and messages by using connectives and form an interaction between the writers and readers to become more reader-friendly texts. Therefore, one of the best strategies to communicate, interact and getting reader's attention when one produces a written passage is to use these markers. Their role is, therefore, important in both internal and external organisation of texts. Metadiscourse markers have been classified differently by various scholars. In this paper, Hyland's (2005) model is adopted. This approach, known as interpersonal model, provides comprehensive categories or sub-categories of metadiscourse. It includes two models of interaction which are the interactive and interactional models.

### **The interactive dimension**

In this dimension, the writer knows that an audience is taking part in a communication event through his or her interests, knowledge adaptation, "interests, rhetorical expectations and processing abilities (Hyland, 2005, p. 49)" Paltridge (2012) contends that interactive metadiscourse features are used to direct readers via the structure of the text, the ties between clauses, information drawn from other parts of the texts or

elements drawn from other texts which are used to elaborate on the meanings in the text. There are five sub-types of interactive resources. These include:

-transition markers; they focus on the link between clauses. They outline additive, causative and contrastive relations in the writer's thinking and express relationships between stretches of discourse. Some of these resources include such items as *moreover, similarly, nevertheless, etc.*

-frame markers; they signal sequences and clarify discourse acts to the readers. They include items such as *first, next, the purpose is, etc.* Hyland (2005) argues that they function to sequence, label, predict and shift arguments, making the discourse clear to readers or listeners.

-endophoric markers: they refer to other parts of the text. They facilitate comprehension and supporting arguments by referring to earlier material or anticipating something yet to come (Hyland, 2005). Categories of them include: *refer to the next section, as noted above.*

-evidentials; these are elements which refer to information from other sources. They guide the reader's interpretation and establish an authorial command of the subject (Hyland, 2005)

-Code glosses supply additional information, by rephrasing, explaining or elaborating what has been said, to ensure the reader is able to recover the writer's intended meaning. Examples are: *that is, this can be defined as, for example, etc.*

### **The Interactional Dimension**

It focuses on how the writer organises interaction through various comments on the message conveyed. The writer's point of view is clarified so as to open opportunities for readers to contribute to the discourse by alerting them to the author's perspective towards both propositional information and readers themselves (Hyland, 2005, p. 52). Paltridge (2012) explains that interactional metadiscourse resources include the ways in which writers express their stance towards what they are saying as well as how they explicitly engage with or address their readers in their texts (Hyland, 2005). Five categories of interactional metadiscourse are identified below:

-Hedges: they withhold commitment and open dialogue. Hyland (2005) contends that "Hedges emphasize the subjectivity of a position by allowing information to be presented as an opinion rather than a fact and therefore open that position to negotiation" (p.52). Examples of hedges are the following: *might, perhaps, possibly, etc.*

-Boosters: they suggest that the writer recognizes potentially diverse positions but has chosen to narrow this diversity rather than enlarge it, confronting alternatives with a single, confident voice.

-Attitude markers indicate the writer's affective, rather than epistemic, attitude to propositions. Instead of commenting on the status of information, its probable relevance, reliability or truth, attitude markers convey surprise, agreement, importance, obligation, frustration, and so on.

-Self-mention refers to the degree of explicit author presence in the text measured by the frequency of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives like *I, me, mine, exclusive we, our, ours*).

-Engagement markers are devices that explicitly address readers, either to focus their attention or include them as discourse participants.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Many scholars have applied metadiscourse methods to analyse texts of various genres. Their objective is to find out how writers interact with their readers and audience. In fact, Wang & Zhan (2016) have carried out a study of the abstract of English academic paper through the lens of metadiscourse. They study small abstracts corpora which comprise 30 mathematical and 30 linguistic abstracts of academic papers from Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and Science Citation Index (SCI) journals. Their analysis indicates that metadiscourse features predominate in the abstracts of linguistic academic papers more than mathematical academic papers. The abstracts of the two areas of study display more instances of interactive markers. In addition, interactive markers are almost equally distributed in the two disciplines whereas in the analysis of interactional markers, linguistic academic papers display a high frequency of hedges while self-mentions are dominant in mathematics.

Basing on Hyland and Lakoff's interactional metadiscourse models, Anuarsham; Rahmati & Khamsah (2020) have analysed an online entertainment article. The study reveals that although all the features of interactional metadiscourse including intensifiers, hedges, boosters, and engagement markers are used in the article, engagement markers are mostly employed by the writer and, according to these scholars, they prove to be relevant tools used for the definition of relationship existing between the writer and the readers.

In the same vein, Farahani (2018) has analysed some applied linguistics research articles with the framework of metadiscourse features. Using Hyland's (2005) model, he has selected 30 research articles and processed his data through Sketch engine software. The findings reveal that interactive metadiscourse features are more predominant than interactional ones and both transitions and frame markers have a higher percentage. Regarding the interactional metadiscourse features, writers have mostly used hedges and self-mentions. It has been concluded that such a research is important in contrastive analysis, corpus linguistics and text analysis

Abdullah, Rahmat, and Fatin Zafirah Zawawi's (2020) paper aims highlight the interactional metadiscourse markers using Hyland's (2005) approach in online newspaper articles written by a Malaysian and a South Korean author. The results of their analysis show that although self-mentions features are non-existent in the two articles, other interactional resources such as hedges, boosters, engagement makers and attitude makers are employed in the two articles to show how the authors intend to inform readers on the situation of the topic. The analysis also points out that more interactional resources are identified in the South Korean author's article than that of the Malaysian author.

Etemadfar (2020) has analysed interpersonal metadiscourse markers used by Donald Trump's campaign speeches to convince his audience. He has utilised Dafouz (2008)'s classification of metadiscourse markers and adopted a qualitative approach. The analysis reveals that all the interpersonal metadiscourse features including hedges, certainty markers, attributors, attitude markers, and commentaries, are used by Trump in his speeches. In addition, in order to convince the audience to vote for him through an emotional link, he has used a high number of attitude markers and commentaries.

Ozdemira & Longob (2014) have studied metadiscourse markers in Turkish and USA postgraduate students' abstracts in MA thesis written in English, with a focus on cultural variations. Drawing on Hyland (2005)'s approach, the mixed method analysis reveals that some cultural differences are noticed in the number and categories of metadiscourse. In addition, makers such as evidentials, endophorics, code glosses, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions are more predominant in Turkish students' Master thesis abstracts than USA students, but Turkish students used metadiscourse of transitions, frame markers and hedges more than USA students.

Mohamed and Rashid (2017) have attempted to analyse metadiscourse markers employed in a corpus of good undergraduate writers' essays (GUWE corpus). Through concordance software, the frequency of the metadiscourse markers utilised in good essays produced by 269 Malaysian undergraduate writers are presented. The researchers have concluded that the results presented in this paper prove to be of great importance for further studies in the same area of investigation. This brief review shows that texts analysis through metadiscourse markers is not a new area. Nevertheless, it is almost difficult to find research that has focused on newspapers' editorials. The present study attempts to fill in the gap.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This paper is based on the study of metadiscourse markers in newspapers' editorials. More particularly, the study focuses on *PUNCH* and *THE NATION*, two Nigerian newspapers which publish daily both in print and online. Two editorial archives have been selected: one from *PUNCH* and the other from *THE NATION*. This choice has been motivated by the fact that they both focus on the same subject matter: the COVID 19 vaccine.

They have been downloaded from websites. To meet certain criteria related to the research objectives, the mixed method approach is adopted. In this regard, the two texts have been thoroughly studied and categories of interactive and interactional metadiscourse, as suggested by Hyland (2005) have been identified manually. The quantitative analysis as has made it easy to count and disclose the frequency and percentage of each metadiscourse marker as distributed in each text. Then, the different elements that fall within each dimension of Hyland model have been identified and analysed therein. Finally, a comparative analysis of metadiscourse frequencies and percentages make it easy to appraise the way these linguistic elements are used in both *PUNCH* and *THE NATION*'s editorials.

## RESULTS

In this section, linguistic markers are identified and classified according to Hyland's (2005) framework; the frequency and percentage of each marker are recapitulated and summarized in table 1 below:

**Table 1.** Statistics of interactive metadiscourse in the two texts

Interactive	Text1(PUNCH)		Text2 (THE NATION)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Transitions	14	38.89%	19	45.24%
Frame markers	07	19.44%	06	14.29%
Endophoric markers	04	11.11%	09	21.43%
Evidentials	11	30.56%	04	9.52%
Code gloss	0	0%	04	9.52%
Total	36	100%	42	100%

The above table shows that transitions are mostly dominant and come in the first position. This implies that items that make it easy for the reader to explain the connections between ideas of the text are predominantly used in the two texts. However, the frequency of these interactive markers in text 1 is higher than that of text 2. They are 14 in number and correspond to 38.89% in text 1 whereas in text 2, they are 19 in number and represent 45.24%. Evidentials rank second in text1 with a rate of 30.56%, showing the way the writer intends to convince the reader of the truth of the message conveyed through information drawn from other texts. In text 2, endophoric markers rank second, which suggests that the writer aims to help readers grasp particular meanings conveyed through clarifications provided with elements drawn from other parts of the text. As regards frame markers, they rank third in text 1 and in text 2 although their rate is higher in text 2 (21.43%) than in text1 (11.11%). Their use is evidence that arguments are organised and sequenced to enhance readers' understanding of the discourse. Moreover, code glosses are non-existent in text 1 (0%) but 4 (9.25%) categories of them are identified in the second text. The use of interactive elements shows how readers of the article are guided in order to provide their own interpretation and understand some aspects of the text.

Likewise, in order to have further appraisal of the writer's beliefs and judgments regarding the message given, the analysis of interactional metadiscourse is also carried out in this section. Instances of these markers are identified, recapitulated and summarized in table 2 below:

**Table 2.** Statistics of markers

Interactional	Text1		Text2	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Hedges	14	38.89%	19	45.24%
Boosters	07	19.44%	06	14.29%
Attitude markers	04	11.11%	09	21.43%
Engagement markers	11	30.56%	04	9.52%
Self-mentions	0	0%	04	9.52%

Regarding the interactional markers, the table shows that hedges are the most dominant ones. They bear the highest percentages in text 1 (38.89%) and in text 2 (45.24%). This implies that the information shared take the form of opinion in which the writers tend to express their beliefs and attitudes towards the propositions they have made. Engagement markers occupy the second position in text 1 (30.56%), whereas attitudes markers come in the second position in text 2 (21.43%). This shows how the writer has attempted to highlight the presence of the reader in text 1, as well as how the writer's thoughts and feelings are expressed in the second text. Boosters come in the third position in text1 (19.44%) and text 2 (14.29%), meaning that certainty or close dialogue are expressed in the texts. Put another way, the writer intends to strengthen their arguments by focusing on the readers' view so as to create solidarity through feelings and opinion conveyed. Finally, self-mentions are non-existent in text1 whereas a few of them are identified in text 2. Their use infers that the author is present in text 2 as he has used items that refer to him.

## DISCUSSION

The previous section has provided a picture of metadiscourse distribution in the two editorials. The subject matter of the two texts has to do with Covid 19 vaccines. Actually, due to the outbreak of this pandemic and given the way it has shaken the whole world, scientists have been struggling to find out relevant ways to counter-attack the disease. One of the reliable solutions to remedy this situation is the discovery of vaccine which has been assessed and allowed to be administered to the people who meet certain criteria. This accounts for the fact that newspapers are more interested in this issue of vaccine and dedicate specific leading articles for it. As the analyses have revealed it, the linguistic features of metadiscourse markers are identified in the two covid 19 articles. In text1, the categories of transition markers are: *as, despite, but, hence, thus, notwithstanding that, and, additionally*.

Here are examples of passages in which they occur.

The first case of transition marker is "and" which is used in the first text:

- (1) ....*and now*, only six months later, it is being made in multiple places from India to the US, as well as Britain.....
- (2) ....*and* it is being used around the world.
- (3) ....*and* monitoring the exercise, including forcefully frustrating the antics of shady persons keen on profiting from the vaccine rollout.
- (4) ...*and* ensure the safety of the vaccine.

As can be noticed from the excerpts, this transition marker is used to express the relationship of addition. It is utilised in (1) and (2) to give details regarding Boris Johnson's statement about the efficiency of the vaccine and its presence in many areas of the world. Likewise, *and* is employed in (3) and (4) to provide additional information on the management of the vaccine. Other transition markers include *but* which occurs in the following clauses:

- (5) *But* Boris Johnson, the United Kingdom's prime minister, says ...
- (6) *But* states must take further measures in actively coordinating and monitoring the exercise,
- (7) ...*but* they were promptly arrested

This transition marker used in the sequences above accounts for contentions that are different from those mentioned previously. In fact, *but* in (5) introduces Boris Johnson's point of view which contradicts that of other heads of states who doubt the efficiency of the vaccine. In addition, the good management of the vaccine distribution, as commonly agreed upon, required a serious action as suggested contrary to simply measure as stated in (6), whereas this transition markers aims to introduce a clause that contradicts the idea of people who intend to reap from the pandemic to the detriment of the people by distributing counterfeiting Covid-19 vaccines. Other transition markers are "*despite*" and "*notwithstanding that*". Whereas the former introduces the argument which contradicts the efficiency of AstraZeneca Covid-19 vaccine, the latter marks an argument which contradicts the health workers' assurance about the vaccine. Likewise, "*hence*" and "*thus*" introduce a direct consequence of what has been said earlier. So, *hence* is meant to state the first beneficiaries of the first jabs of vaccine and *thus* confirms the claim that there is no discriminatory measure regarding the vaccine jab administration.

Regarding the second text, the types of transition markers identified are the following: *although, neither, while, but, since, therefore, despite, because, and therefore, as, to the extent that, however, otherwise, in addition, nor, therefore*. The transition marker *but* is mostly used as can be noticed in the following clauses:

- (8) *But* now that the vaccines are here, the next challenge is distribution
- (9) *But* others were lucky to be cured of the disease
- (10) *But* even that should not be taken too far.

In these sequences the marker *but* shows a contrastive relation between other elements of the text. In (8), it reveals the new challenge related to the distribution of the vaccine in a context where only the most influenced people are well-taken good care of, whereas in (9) it is used to specify that not all care workers died of the disease. In addition, *but* is employed in (10) to express the argument against the new strategy of vaccine distribution. Then, the transition marker *however*, is utilised twice in the text to introduce the statement which brings assurance to the citizenry of the arrival and good distribution management of the vaccine on the one hand, and the attitude to be adopted by categories of officials to get the vaccine. In addition, *therefore* is utilised to express the consequence of the writer's arguments as shown in the following passages:

- (11) *Therefore*, being accorded preference, in receiving the vaccine, should encourage the health workers to work more assiduously and courageously in fighting the pestilence.
- (12) and *therefore* can't avail their natives and residents COVID-19 vaccine protection

(13) *therefore*, a new template should quickly be devised, especially to accommodate the vulnerable population assailed by other ailments.

The passages (11, 12, 13) are used by the writer to comment on the management of the anti Covid vaccines available. Similarly, other elements emphasize relation of addition like *in addition*, to express comparison, *while* (contrast), *although*, *despite* (correlative relation), etc.

Moreover, as the statistics reveals, frame markers are also utilised in the two texts to indicate topic shift. Categories of them are the following: *Now, only six months later, moreover, let alone, even, the first, immediately* in text 1 and *Before then, first, on day one, beyond, Soon, also* in text 2. For example, *only six months later* in text 1 introduces the information related to the use of the Oxford-AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccine in various countries as its safety has been confirmed by many specialists. In the same text, *moreover* provides explicit additive relation in terms of how the vaccine distribution in the different states should be managed. The other frame markers such as *let alone, even, the first, immediately* are used to organise arguments in the text. In the same vein, the metadiscourse marker *before then* is meant to account for the doubting situation that is prevailing before the arrival of AstraZeneca vaccines. Similarly, the other types of markers are employed to stress the sequences related to the distribution of vaccines to the selected target groups.

Likewise, the endophoric markers applied in text 1 include: *this (2 times) doing such, the country* whereas those applied in text2 are the following: *this (4 times) the implications, its administration, they, even that, the present online pre-registration*. They are all used to refer to various pieces of information that have to do with vaccine administration in the text. As far as evidentials are concerned, they make it easy for the writers to strengthen their contentions so as to persuade their readers. The two texts under study display this type of interaction metadiscourse although the statistics reveal that they are more predominant in text 1 than in text 2. In text 1, some of them are illustrated as follows:

(14) *As The Times newspaper reported, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, the Netherlands, Cyprus and Portugal announced temporary pauses.....*

(15) *But Boris Johnson, the United Kingdom's prime minister, says after exhaustive tests, it has proved that the "vaccine is safe and works extremely well.....*

(16) *As Bill & Melinda Gates .... Solomon Zewdu, noted.....*

(17) *It noted that herd immunity – the level at which a population **can** be sheltered.....*

The first marker in (14) introduces a statement that the author is sharing with the reader about some European country's decisions to stop administering AstraZeneca vaccine until further investigations are carried out. Nevertheless, the writer has used two evidentials in (15) to show how the same decision has quickly been rejected as medical experts has provided the assurance in favour of the vaccine's safety. While the marker in (16) introduces a statement reported by the writer regarding the struggle to get the vaccine, that of (17) shows an expert's statement about mass's protection

condition. The other types of evidentials in the text are: *the organisation had abundantly noted, WHO also recommends, it has been established by health experts, experts have recommended.*

In the second text, the four evidential markers are illustrated below:

(18) *Boss Mustapha, chairman of the PTF, and Dr. Osagie Ehanire, the minister of Health, have assured that the process would be transparent.....*

(19) *... it has been announced, have registered on the web site.*

(20) *Mr. Mustapha said states without necessary facilities should not expect to be part of this consignment....*

(21) *When noted that the first 100,000 doses of the Pfizer vaccine had to be turned down.....*

In arguing about the way vaccines would be managed and handled, the author of this text has reported the PFT chairman's statement to assure the way it would be distributed as revealed in (18). Similarly, the evidential marker *it has been announced* aims to relay the information about the number of people who express their desire to be vaccinated by registering online, while that of (19) shows the condition under which people should welcome the availability of the medicine. Finally, the writer has related to the information of the turning down of the Pfizer vaccine to urge each state to get the relevant facilities to keep the vaccine safe as illustrated in (20, 21).

Moreover, basing on the statistics above, we can notice that interactional metadiscourse are used in the two text. According to Hyland (2004, p. 52),

these resources are not only the means by which writers express their views, but are also how they engage with the socially determined positions of others. They therefore act to anticipate, acknowledge, challenge or suppress alternative, potentially divergent positions and so work to expand or restrict opportunities for such views

In fact, hedges are the most predominant interactional metadiscourse markers in the two texts. In text 1, those identified are *should, appears, must, would, has to, cannot, could, can, will*, as can be noticed in the passages below:

(22) transparency *should be* the guiding principle

(23) ... the Nigeria Centre for Disease Control *should* collaborate with the states...

(24) It is cheering that the country *appears* equipped for the vaccine exercise

(25) Nigeria *cannot* afford to be left behind as the rest of the world puts in enough work to inoculate their citizens against the dreaded pandemic

(26) ...the job *would not* be done until the vaccine got into people's arms

(27) The country *has to* purposely build on the gains achieved with the lockdowns

(28) ... and the job *could* be exponentially harder in countries with far fewer doses and public health resources ...

Similarly, in text 2, categories of hedges identified are the following: *would, will, may not, should not, had to, can't, would be, could, should*. Some of them can be identified in the passages below:

(29) No one knew exactly when the vaccines *would* be arriving.

(30) We, however, hope that the Federal Government *will* keep faith in with this plan, beyond the first day

(31) It is worrisome that some of the 36 states of the Federation *may not* be in position

(32) ... Pfizer vaccine *had to* be turned down....

(33) The President and the Vice President; governors and their deputies, *could* lead the charge

(34) Its administration *should* be left to the states who *should* receive them

Most of the hedges are verbal operators. They play the role of either modalisers by expressing probability or modulators by expressing obligation and inclination (Eggins, 2004). In this regard, *would, will, could* and *appears* in the example selected in the texts are meant not only to express the writers' attitudes and judgments towards the events dealt with but also the writer's probability and certainty towards the truth of the statements. Likewise, *had to, should* and *must* are utilised in the texts to display feelings of obligations and inclination regarding the management of vaccine distribution. More importantly, the use of *should, had to* and *must* is mostly predominant in the two texts to emphasize not only the ways the two writers display people's commitment, obligation and inclination but also to show the authors' personal opinion regarding the subject matter being discussed.

As far as boosters are concerned they are used differently in the two texts. In a high proportion, categories that are utilised in text1 are the following: *It is cheerful that, extremely, actively, forcefully, effectively, exponentially, continually, scientifically, scientifically, strictly, properly*, whereas in text 2 those identified are *exactly, to ensure, are not expected, shortly, enough*. In fact, boosters display in the two texts the writers' assurance regarding his opinions on the use of vaccine. They also reinforce a claim through the emphasis of shared experiences needed to draw the same conclusions as the writer. Regarding the attitude markers, the writers display some instances to show surprise, agreement, importance, obligation, frustration, etc. In text1, *likely, promptly, purposely, resolutely, jointly, ethically, it is essential, globally, largely, intentionally, fully* are the types identified whereas in text 2, *finally, openly, assiduously, courageously, globally* are the categories used by the writer.

Another interactional metadiscourse that stresses the presence of the reader in a piece of writing is the engagement marker. Although they are in very low proportion, their presence in the two texts signals the writer's engagement with the reader given that he or she is considered as a participant in the discourse. In the first text, the phrases: *given the country's irksome history of sleaze, Civil society groups, it will be catastrophic for*

*Nigeria* are types of engagement markers whereas in text 2, the only one used is the phrase *asking the state health ministries*. Finally, it can be noticed that self-mentions are non-existent in text1 whereas in text2, they are illustrated in the following passages:

(35) *We*, however, hope that the Federal Government will keep faith in with this plan, beyond the first day

(36) *We* call on the PTF to make public the states that fall in this category, as it is the right of all citizens to be vaccinated

These self-mentions are applied to explicit reference to authors and help authors to make relations with the readers

## CONCLUSION

This paper has focused on the study of metadiscourse markers in two texts drawn from two newspapers' editorials. The concept of metadiscourse has been clarified in the theoretical framework of the study. In addition, the two articles reviewed in the literature review proved that the area is not that new as many studies have been carried out by various scholars. From the analyses, it has been revealed that interactive metadiscourse are most frequently used as they are meant to express logical relations in the clauses and implicitly realise cohesion and coherence in the two texts. The different stages of the two texts have been highlighted through the use of frame markers. To reinforce their contentions, the author of the first text has relied on information from other texts in order to persuade the readers. As for information from other parts of the texts, there are dominant in the second text than in the first one. The use of these elements tallies with Hyland's (2005, p. 49) claim when he says that "*the use of resources in this category therefore addresses ways of organizing discourse, rather than experience, and reveals the extent to which the text is constructed with the readers' needs in mind*"

As regards interactional markers, they are utilised in the two editorials. To express their judgements and viewpoints, they use high percentages of hedges and give their personal interpretation of the information provided. Certainty is expressed through the use of boosters and the texts are less impersonal thanks to the use of attitude markers. Finally, the avenue to build solidarity with readers has been shown in the two texts through the use of engagement markers. The very few instances of self-mentions are used in the second text to refer to both the readers and the author. All in all, this study shows that interactive markers are meant to help and guide readers of the editorials whereas interactional markers are employed to involve the reader of the editorials.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, N. A. A.; Rahmat, N. H. & Fatin Zafirah Zawawi, F. Z. (2020). Interactional Discourse Analysis of Malaysian and South Korean Newspaper Articles on Online Learning during Covid-19. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, 3(1), 1-16
- Anuarsham, A. H.; Rahmati, N. H. & Khamsah, M. A.N. (2020). Metadiscourse Analysis of an Online Entertainment Article. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, 3(1), 17-29.

- Farahani, M. V. (2018). The Usage and Distributional Pattern of Metadiscourse Features in Research Articles in Applied Linguistics Based on Hyland's Classification. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 2(1), 35-51
- Etemadfar, P. (2020). An Investigation of Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers as Persuasive strategies in Donald Trump's 2016 Campaign Speeches. *Critical Literary Studies*, 2(2), 117-130.
- Harris, Z. (1952). Discourse Analysis. *Language*, 28, 1-30.
- 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.
- Mohamed, A. F. B., & Rashid, R. B. A. (2017). The Metadiscourse Markers in Good Writers' Essays Corpus. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(6), 213-220.
- Ozdemira, N. O. & Longob, B. (2014). Metadiscourse Use in Thesis Abstracts: A Cross-cultural Study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 59- 63.
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- PUNCH editorial Board (2021, March 17<sup>th</sup>). Effective administration of COVID-19 vaccine. Effective administration of COVID-19 vaccine - PUNCH Newspapers (PUNCHng.com)
- The Nation (2021, March 7<sup>th</sup>). Covid-19 Vaccines are here. COVID-19 vaccines are here - The Nation News Nigeria (thenationonlineng.net)
- Wang, L. & Zhang, Y. (2016). An Analysis of Metadiscourse in the Abstracts of English Academic Papers. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science: G Linguistics & Education*, 16 (9), 8-15.