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ABSTRACT: Metadiscourse features are the rhetorical devices that serve to maintain the writer-reader and speaker-audience interaction. The way metadiscourse features are utilized in spoken and written modes may differ given the nature of these two modes of communication. For this reason, the present study set to unpack the distributional pattern of metadiscourse features as well as investigate the construction and maintenance of writer-reader and speaker-audience interaction in academic written and spoken English. To achieve this goal, two corpora of The British Academic Written English Corpus and British Academic Spoken English Corpus were utilized as the data gathering resources. To categorize the metadiscourse features, Hyland’s taxonomy was selected. The quantitative analysis of the data showcased that the written corpus was more interactive oriented despite the fact that the spoken corpus showed a propensity towards the interactional category of metadiscourse features. On the other hand, the analysis of the concordance lines illustrated that academic conventions differed significantly in spoken and written academic English which resulted in a dynamic interaction between writer-reader as well as speaker-audience. The results of the study at hand may have implications in such lines of research as corpus linguistics, contrastive analysis and genre studies.
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1. Introduction

When communicating, people’s interaction consists of features through which they can organize their texts or speech as well as express their attitudes towards the text, speech or their audience (Hyland, 2005). In this regard, it is argued that texts are usually constructed at two interrelated levels of meaning; that is to say, a propositional content meaning level and a writer-reader interaction level (Herriman, 2014). On one hand, on the propositional content level, writers and speakers supply information necessary for the subject matter and refer to the events and states of matters (Hyland, 2019) as well as making sure that the flow of information has been successfully performed (Vasheghani Farahani, 2020). On the other hand, on the writer-reader level, writers and speakers interact with their intended readers and audience and guide them toward their intended destination. To support the binary nature of the text, Herriman (2014, p. 1) puts forward the claim that “texts may be seen as consisting of different levels of meaning, a propositional content level, which refers to actions, events, states of affairs or objects in the world portrayed by the text, and a writer-reader level, where the writers interact with their readers, explicitly guiding them through its structure and organization, commenting on the writing process itself or
expressing their opinions and beliefs concerning its content.”

These two levels of meaning are constructed, guided and related to each other by the concept of metadiscourse features. The terminology of metadiscourse came into existence by the linguist Zelig Harris in the late 1950s (Hyland, 2004). After a short period of ignorance, it came into the fore commenced by J. M. Williams (1981) and resumed by various researchers such as Vande Koppel (1985) and Crismore (1989). Metadiscourse features refer to “the ways writers refer to the text, the writer and the reader to organize the propositional content of the text, help readers understand the text, and persuade readers to accept their arguments” (M. Williams, 2010, p. 73).

There is accumulated knowledge of written and spoken language research in the literature. Accordingly, as far as the concept of metadiscourse features is concerned, the review of the related literature demonstrated that there were reportedly some studies in this line of research (see for example, Abdollahzadeh, 2011; Aijmer and Stenström, 2004; Alkhatlan, 2019; Alyousef, 2016; Aull and Lancaster, 2014; Bal-Gezegin and Bas, 2020; Basturkmen and von Randow, 2014; Çapar and Turan, 2020; G. Thompson, 2001; González et al., 2017; Kapranov, 2017; Kawase, 2015; Lahuerta Martinez, 2002; Tse and Hyland, 2006a; Yang and Allison, 2003). The results of these studies showed there were statistical differences between the ways metadiscourse features were utilized by writers/speakers. As a case in point, Vasheghani Farahani (2018) analyzed the distributional pattern of metadiscourse features in academic written and spoken English. Being quantitative in nature, the results of this research illustrated that there were stark differences between the ways metadiscourse features were used and distributed in spoken and written English. By the same token, Zhang (2016) launched a study on a multi-dimensional analysis of metadiscourse markers across written registers. Gathering data from Freiburg update of the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English, his study illustrated that there was a direct correlation between the way metadiscourse features were used and the text type. In the same vein, Tadayyon and Vasheghani Farahani (2017) investigated the distributional pattern of discourse markers in academic writing. For this purpose, they compiled a small but fine-grained corpus out of 60 papers written by native and non-native speakers of the English language. Applying Fraser’s (2006) taxonomy of metadiscourse features, they found out that there were significant differences between the distributional pattern of discourse markers between native and nonnative speakers of English in terms of deploying discourse markers.

Regardless of the genre and despite some similarities, writing and speaking modes have a number of differences. As a matter of fact, the syntax, metalinguistic features, level of formality, active and passive voice (Ådel, 2010; Brown and Yule, 1983) as well as the way metadiscourse features are utilized in the written and spoken modes differ (Vasheghani Farahani, 2020). The deployment of metadiscourse features in text or speech will demonstrate the interaction between the speaker and writer and reader and listener (Hyland, 2019). Contemporaneously, the utilization of metadiscourse features will assist the researchers in capturing the potential differences between speech and writing (Ådel, 2010).

Accordingly, this research was an attempt to unveil, quantitatively and qualitatively the potential differences between written and spoken modes in the English academic genre and the way interaction was constructed and directed between writers/speakers and readers/listeners by curtsey of the concept of metadiscourse features. Accordingly, the null hypothesis of this research was that there was no difference between the usage and distribution of metadiscourse features as well as between the way interaction was constructed in written and spoken academic genres.
2. Method

2.1. Metadiscourse features typology

To analyze and categorize metadiscourse features, there are a number of various taxonomies like those of Crismore (1989), Vande Kopple (2002), Ådel (2006) and Abdi et al. (2010), to name a few. However, the taxonomy, which was deployed in this study, was the one, which came into fruition by Hyland (2005). The reason why this taxonomy was preferred was due to the fact that it was the most recent and comprehensive taxonomy of metadiscourse features. In addition, it was found to be an appropriate taxonomy as it took a functional approach to analyzing texts; making it more feasible and practical compared to other existing classifications (Jalilifar et al., 2018). Hyland’s category (as seen in Table 1) is divided into two main categories and ten subcategories. The first main category is interactive and is subdivided into transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, and code glosses. The interactional is divided to hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions, and engagement markers.

Table 1. Taxonomy of metadiscourse features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Help to guide the reader through the text</td>
<td>In addition; but; thus; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>Express relations between main clauses</td>
<td>Finally; to conclude; my purpose is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame markers</td>
<td>Refer to discourse acts, sequences and stages</td>
<td>Noted above; see figure; in section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endophoric markers</td>
<td>Refer to the information in other parts of the text</td>
<td>Texts according to X; Z states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidentials</td>
<td>Refer to information from other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code glosses</td>
<td>Elaborate propositional meaning</td>
<td>Namely; e.g.; such as; in other words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>Involve the reader in the text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>Withhold commitment and open dialogue</td>
<td>Might; perhaps; possible; about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>Emphasize certainty and close dialogue</td>
<td>In fact; definitely; it is clear that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude markers</td>
<td>Express the writer's attitude to the proposition</td>
<td>Unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-mentions</td>
<td>Explicit reference to authors</td>
<td>I; we; my; me; our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement markers</td>
<td>Explicitly build a relationship with the reader</td>
<td>Consider; note; you can see that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Corpus of the study and data gathering regime

Unlike the commonplace method of detecting and quantifying language features manually which is not only time-consuming but also subject to human error (Heng and Tan, 2010), one reliable way is to utilize corpora which are among the most versatile tools for analyzing a large ensemble of texts stored electronically (Anderman and Rogers, 2008; Vasheghani Farahani and Pahlevanzade Fini, 2023; Zanettin et al., 2003). Indeed, corpora make it plausible to look for specific language features in a large number of texts in a systematic way (Candel-Mora and Vargas-Sierra, 2013). For the purpose of the research, this study utilized two corpora: one for the written and another one for the spoken genres. As creating a balanced and representative corpus was inherently time-consuming, nebulous and expensive, this study benefited from two already created, large, balanced and representative corpora: the British Academic Written English Corpus and the British Academic Spoken English Corpus. These two corpora are available in Sketch Engine corpus software as the software for extracting metadiscourse features (P. Thompson and Nesi, 2001).

The British Academic Written English Corpus is compiled out of the essays of BA and MA level students from the 21st century. The range of words equals 500 to 5000 words in length for each essay. It is a representative corpus of 6,506,995 words consisting of a wide range of topics and subtopics; running the gamut of arts, humanities, social sciences, life sciences, and physical sciences. On the other hand, the British Academic Spoken English Corpus, which is compiled at the Universities of Warwick and Reading,
consists of 160 various lectures and oral presentations as well as 39 seminars from 1998 to 2005. This representative corpus consists of a wide range of topics running the gamut from life and medical sciences, arts and humanities, social sciences, and physical sciences to humanities. Table 2 below mirrors the data of the corpora deployed in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British academic written English corpus</th>
<th>British academic spoken English corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of words</td>
<td>Number of tokens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,968,089</td>
<td>8,336,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of lemmas</td>
<td>Number of sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137,598</td>
<td>293,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of words</td>
<td>Number of tokens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,186,290</td>
<td>1,252,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of lemmas</td>
<td>Number of sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,653</td>
<td>29,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3. How were the metadiscourse features detected in the corpora

To detect and designate the instances of metadiscourse features, the word list technique of the Sketch Engine corpus software was utilized. This technique made it possible to detect the most prevalent types (metadiscourse features) of the corpus based on their frequency. It is worth mentioning that a minimum frequency of five tokens was set as the cut-off point in order to designate and categorize the metadiscourse features. Apart from the word list technique, the N-gram technique was also applied as the second method for detecting metadiscourse features. Instead of a word list, the N-gram technique made it possible to detect and categorize combinations of metadiscourse features in the context of usage. Like the word list, a minimum of five frequencies was set to designate N-grams of the corpus. Figure 1 below shows the word list of the British Academic Spoken English Corpus.

![Figure 1](image)

### 3. Data analysis and results

As this research was a qualitative and quantitative study, the raw data were first analysed by curtsey of SPSS software, then they were scrutinized by reading closely the concordance lines.

#### 3.1. British academic spoken English

The combination of the word list technique and N-gram eventuated in the detection of 206 types of metadiscourse features out of which 93 instances belonged to the interactive category of metadiscourse features and 113 to the interactional category.

Table 3 demonstrates the pattern of metadiscourse features distribution in the spoken category of metadiscourse features. As is shown, 45% of the detected metadiscourse features belong to the interactive
category of metadiscourse features.

Table 3. The distributional pattern of metadiscourse features in the spoken corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Interactive</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2** displays the distributional pattern of interactive metadiscourse features in the spoken corpus. As can be seen, frame markers and code glosses were among the most frequent instances of metadiscourse features followed by transitions. However, endophoric markers and evidentials were the least frequent instances of metadiscourse features, respectively.

**Figure 3** showcases the distributional pattern of interactional metadiscourse features in the spoken corpus. As is shown, hedges, boosters and attitude markers were among the most prevailing instances of metadiscourse features in the spoken corpus. On the other hand, engagement markers and self-mentions were among the least frequent metadiscourse features in the spoken corpus.
3.2. The British academic written English

Through analyzing the word list and N-gram, it was found that the written corpus included 309 instances of metadiscourse features out of which 217 ones were interactive metadiscourse features, whereas 184 ones belonged to interactional metadiscourse features.

Table 4 represents the frequency of metadiscourse features in the written corpus. As illustrated, the total frequency of metadiscourse features is inclined towards the interactive category, constituting 59% of all of the detected metadiscourse features. On the other hand, 40% of the detected metadiscourse features belong to the interactional category of metadiscourse features.

Table 4. The distributional pattern of metadiscourse features in the written corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 explicates the distributional pattern of interactive metadiscourse features in the written corpus. As can be inferred, frame markers and code glosses together with transitions were among the most frequent instances of interactive metadiscourse features in the written corpus. On the other hand, endophoric markers and evidential were among the least frequent interactive metadiscourse features in the written corpus.

Figure 4. The distributional pattern of interactive metadiscourse features in the written corpus.

The distributional pattern of interactional metadiscourse features in the written corpus (Figure 5). As is shown, from among the interactional metadiscourse features, hedges, boosters and attitude markers were among the most frequent instances of metadiscourse features. However, self-mentions and engagement markers were among the least frequent instances of interactional metadiscourse features in the written corpus.
To understand whether there was a statistically significant difference between the distributional patterns of metadiscourse features in the two corpora, a chi-square test was conducted. As the results of Table 5 pinpoint, the level of significance was less than 5%, meaning that there was a statistically significant difference between the distributional pattern of metadiscourse features in the two corpora.

Table 5. Results of the chi-square test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson chi-square</td>
<td>87.775</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>100.901</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>25.394</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of valid cases</td>
<td>514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Qualitative study

For the qualitative analysis, the concordance lines were randomly selected, through the technique of concordance lines, and were analysed to investigate writer-reader and speaker-audience interaction in academic English.

4. Interactive metadiscourse features

4.1. Transitions

Academic writing is a skill, which entails a heavy deployment of transitions due to the fact that it must be best capsulated, coherently, on behalf of the receiver. As can be seen in the example below, these elements inherently add to the internal consistency and linkage of the discourse and can be manifested in miscellaneous functions such as comparison, compensation, addition and evaluation. As a matter of fact, this can be justified in terms of the internal consistency of the discourse, which is usually found more in written discourse than that of spoken one. In addition, the written corpus contained more transitions as the writers attempted to produce an unambiguous and fathomable text; something, which is less frequent in spoken discourse.
Example 1. This may due to the fact that even from within the womb, babies are in contact with the outside world via the voices they hear and thus learning may even begin from here.

4.2. Frame markers

Frame markers are those elements, which refer to the sequences and stages of the discourse as well as guiding readers through the complex nature of the written discourse. The reason beyond this consists of the fact that an academic piece of writing entails a well-organized stage structure in such a way that readers can follow the sequence of the discourse more eerily and effortlessly. This can be seen in the following example. The combination of frame markers and transitions adds support to the structure and discourse act of the propositional aspect of the text.

Example 1. The aim of this experiment is to determine the composition of the analgesics and stimulants found in a commercial tablet formulation via the method of HPLC.

4.3. Endophoric markers and evidential

As one salient feature of academic writing, authors refer to information capsulated in other parts of the text as an effort to add support to their argumentation. The reference to other parts of the discourse is delineated through the instances of endophoric markers. In addition, to make their argumentation and proposition more robust and scientifically appealing, they add extra materials and resources, which are manifested through evidential. To put it differently, evidential refers to the “external origin of material in the current text and gives credence to that material by drawing attention to the credibility of its source” (Hyland, 2019, p. 141).

Quite interestingly, the spoken corpus did not include any instances of endophoric markers, nor did it replete with evidential. The paucity of endophoric markers and evidential can be explained and justified by the fact that in the spoken discourse, it is unlikely, for the speakers, to refer to information in other parts of the texts or external materials and resources, as there is little opportunity to do so in a speaking context; mainly due to the fact that in spoken discourse most of the time of the speaker is allocated to personal talks and argumentations. In the same line, in the written discourse, the authors resort to information from others and external materials as so to help “the reader’s interpretation and establish an authorial command of the subject” (Hyland, 2019, p. 60). It is a specification of written discourse, for the authors, to cite others’ works to support their own views and argumentation; a phenomenon, which is quite rare in spoken discourse.

Example 1. These gentlemen were sitting there to be as much on display to the rest of the audience as the actors were.

Example 2. The concentration of the salt was prepared (as shown in the table above) to provide the ionic strength required.

4.4. Code glosses

It is common and acceptable in the domain of academic writing to elaborate the propositional meaning of the discourse in an attempt to assist readers in grasping the intended discourse of the speakers. The process of elaboration in academic writing is, partially, attained by the virtue of code glosses as the elements, which are used to ensure that the receiver of the discourse has fully grasped the essence of the author’s argumentation. The code glosses are manifested through various techniques like paraphrasing, elaborating, rephrasing and elaborating, reflecting the author's prediction of readers’ knowledge and their level of understanding. The reason why the academic corpus contained more instances of code glosses
consists of the fact that in the written discourse it is more plausible for the authors to elaborate on the proposition they have put forward as there seems to be a need to help readers to comprehend it.

Example 1. Michan claimed that “the plague of the fourteenth century was no different to those which preceded or followed it.” In other words, it was not the nature of the Black Death that caused such great changes in Europe, but the “man-made social factors” that were present at the time.

Unlike the written corpus, the spoken corpus had an inclination towards the interactional category of metadiscourse features. The propensity of spoken corpus towards the interactional category of metadiscourse features has a strong correlation with the nature of spoken language, which is, unlike written language, uncorrectable. Therefore, the authors tried, by deploying interactional metadiscourse features to “promote a positive impression of themselves and to negotiate participant roles with the hearer” (Hyland, 2019, p. 9). This is manifested in the usage of such interactional metadiscourse features as hedges, boosters and engagement markers, which are used to show the personal aspects of discourse (Wei and Duan, 2018) and, contemporaneously, involving the readership in the course of the dialogue (Hewings, 2006).

4.5. Hedges

Hedges are the linguistic elements, which are used to show the uncertainty of the author’s speech. To put it differently, hedges withhold the commitment and let the alternative argumentation appear in the proposition. The data analysis demonstrated that in the written corpus, the number of hedges was more than that of the spoken corpus. By utilizing the hedges, the authors reflect the fact that the outcomes of their argumentation are more subjective and opinions than facts. This sort of uncertainty of the discourse is a prevalent phenomenon in academic writing where the researcher will not fully remain robust on the results he gained. The existence of hedges suggests, as can be seen in the following example, that the authors were not cocksure of their propositions nor were they fully confident of their claims, results and outcomes. The following example enunciates how the hedge marker suggests the uncertainty of the author and welcomes the interjection of alternative discourse.

Example 1. There appears to be no hostile relations between the two friends, therefore this should not be a problem.

4.6. Boosters

There are counterbalance rapport hedges and boosters, meaning that the more hedges, the fewer boosters. This can be seen in both the written and spoken corpora. As a matter of fact, the inclusion of boosters in the written and spoken discourse reflects the certainty of the author’s proposition, claims, results and outcomes. In other words, the existence of boosters illustrates the confident and decisive presence of the authors in the discourse. Interestingly, in written and spoken corpora, the number of boosters and hedges shows a counterbalanced relationship. Indeed, in the written corpus there were more instances of hedges than of boosters, whereas in the spoken discourse, the numbers of boosters were more than that of the hedges. This can be justified in the sense that in the spoken mode, where the speaker needs to support his/her argumentation on the spot and defend his findings, boosters prevail; whereas, in the written discourse where there is no need to robustly defend the outcomes of the study, hedges prevail. The following example suggests the way the booster signifies the certainty of the author and closes down the interjection of any alternative discourse.

Example 1. At this junction, it is evident that the only direct threat Islamism poses is the rise of radical Islamist groups.
4.7. Attitude markers

Attitude markers are the elements, which impart solidarity with the readership as well as reveal the feelings of the author about the discourse. These elements are specific to the author’s sense of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the propositions. These features were not frequent in both corpora, which can be justified in relation to the nature of the academic genre. Actually, the academic genre is not a milieu, which permits the interjection of personal and affective feelings; rather academic genre is best described in terms of the logical and epistemological point stance of the authors towards the propositions (Vasheghani Farahani, 2020). As a case in point, as can be seen in the following example, the attitude marker expression has nothing to do with the epistemic and logical nature of the propositional meaning; rather, it is used to show the attitude and feeling of the author towards it.

Example 1. Thus, it is not surprising that we find in certain 1950s SF bomb films moments of divergence from the dominant paradigm.

4.8. Self-mentions

Self-mentions represent and dictate the author’s presence in the discourse. By using self-mentions, the authors establish their identity, personal competence and existence in the discourse as well as receive approval for the claims. Usually, in the spoken academic self-mentions prevail engagement markers due to the fact that there is a direct relationship between the speaker and the audience. As can be seen in the following example, the self-mention phrase “I think” is an explicit reference to the author to show his/her presence in the discourse.

Example 1. I think page five of your printed notes set three and just to bring you back to where we were last week.

4.9. Engagement markers

Engagement markers are on the opposite side of the self-mentions. In other words, there is a counterbalanced relationship between self-mentions and engagement markers. This can be seen in the spoken corpus where there was a counterbalance relationship between these two metadiscourse features—the prevalence of Engagement markers suggests a lackluster deployment of self-mentions. Indeed, engagement markers are the elements, which are used to construct a relationship between writer and reader or speaker and audience and persuade them to engage effectively in the course of the propositional meaning. Authors utilized engagement markers in such a way that they could directly address the prospective reader and audience in their discourse. In the example below, the engagement markers demonstrate how the author/speaker tried to construct a relationship with the potential receiver in an effort to engage them in the propositional-making process.

Example 1. By examining each factor in specific, we will be able to derive the effectiveness of Greenpeace in each separate sphere.

5. Discussion and conclusions

The concept of metadiscourse has intrigued researchers to investigate their different functions in speech and writing modes as well as in various genres such as academic ones. As a matter of fact, metadiscourse features as the linguistic features for shaping the discourse as well as projecting writers and speakers’ stance (Hyland, 2005) have been found to play a salient role in organizing the spoken and written discourse (Lam, 2009; Müller, 2005; Öztürk and Durmuşoğlu Köse, 2021). Taking the significant role of metadiscourse features into consideration, the study at hand set to unpack the way
metadiscourse features were utilized and distributed as well as delving into writer-reader and spoken-audience interaction in academic in written and spoken English. To achieve this goal, two balanced and specialized corpora were scrutinized by curtesy of concordance lines in Sketch Engine corpus software.

As far as the distributional pattern of metadiscourse features was concerned, as the data revealed in Table 3 and Table 5, on the whole, the written corpus contained more metadiscourse features as compared to the spoken corpus. On the other hand, the results of the chi-square test (Table 5) illustrated that there was a statistically significant difference between the distributional patterns of the two corpora. As a result, it can be said that the null hypothesis of the first research question was rejected given the asymmetric distributional pattern of metadiscourse features in the two corpora. This could be explained by the fact that usually in the written language, the authors have the time and chance to revise their writings so as to produce coherent, well-organized and eloquent text (Csomay and Crawford, 2016). On the other hand, the results demonstrated that the written corpus was interactive oriented. Being interactive means that the authors of the texts made their full-fledged effort to produce and arrange their texts in such a way that it could be meet the demands of academic writing as well as assisting the comprehension of the prospective readership (Hyland, 2005). In other words, the deployment of interactive metadiscourse features reveals the overt attempt of the author to organize the discourse (G. Thompson, 2001). The interactive metadiscourse features are used by the authors to create a coherent text in such a way the projected proposition could be perceived as convincing and persuasive. As a matter of fact, producing a coherent, understandable, discursively more complex argumentation and well-organized text as the conventional academic text pattern is necessary in academic writing which can be attained through the deployment of interactive metadiscourse features (Alyousef, 2015).

Symmetrically, the domination of interactive metadiscourse features adds support to the idea that the authors were concerned with creating a text in such a way that it could capture the audience attention as well as projecting the propositional meaning. The inclusion of interactive metadiscourse features in the writings suggests that the authors’ argumentation and proposition conform to the conventionalized writing patterns and directions as they play an organizing role in discourse construction and linking between the arguments as well as facilitating the knowledge from fluently and accurately (Hyland, 2019; Vasheghani Farahani, 2017).

The results of this study had harmony with those of Massaabi (2014), Latawiec (2012) and Vasheghani Farahani and Mohemmed (2018) and Alkhathlan (2019) who demonstrated that the distributional pattern and deployment of metadiscourse features differed in spoken and written language. In the same line, the findings of this research have correlation with this notion that spoken and written language differ significantly in constructing the relationship between the receiver of the message (Ädel, 2010). As a matter of fact, the results of these research explicated that the interaction and interplay between writer-reader and speaker-audience is a dynamic one not a static one. This finding is in line with the claim that the way written and spoken modes are constructed differ significantly as accentuated by Hyland (2000, p. 109) who postulates that the notion of metadiscourse features is to “organize a discourse or writer’s stance towards either its content or the reader”.

6. Concluding remarks

The results of this corpus-based study demonstrated that the concept of interaction between writer-reader and speaker-audience could be a dynamic phenomenon and subject to change in spoken and written academic discourse. Therefore, the null hypothesis of the study at hand was rejected, meaning that the writer-reader and speaker-audience interaction changed and did not remain static in the academic
spoken and English language.

This study could trigger further studies. A potential line of research could be investigating the way interaction is structured in English as a lingua franca and other languages, which entails creating multilingual corpora in different languages. In addition, the genre of academic and nonacademic English is a possible area of research, which deserves further study. There are some other categories of metadiscourse features. It would be an intriguing area of study if similar studies could be run by utilizing other classifications of metadiscourse features.

The results of this study may have some practical and useful implications for various beneficiary groups. To name a few, researchers interested in contrastive analysis may find the results of this study beneficial. In addition, researchers in the domain of corpus linguistics may find the methodology section of this study applicable in order to get an insight into how to run corpus-based studies. Last but not least, implications can be for researchers in register and genre analysis. Researchers will find the results of the current research useful so as to find a way to analyze genre and register.

Despite the findings, the study at hand suffered from some limitations. One limitation was that some of the detected metadiscourse features could be assigned to more than one group. As an example, the phrase “I am confident that” can be either assigned to boosters or self-mention categories. A second limitation was the corpora, which were used in this study. The two corpora, which were deployed in this study, were balanced and representative in nature; however, no corpus could claim to be totally representative and balanced. It would be better if more corpora could be used in this research.
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