International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT), 2010, Vol. 6, Issue 3, pp. 124-146.

Extracting and comparing the intricacies of metadiscourse of two written persuasive corpora

Chan Swee Heng and Helen Tan
Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Previous studies (Wu 2007; Hyland, 2004; Hyland & Tse 2004; Intaraprawat & Steffensen 1995; Crismore et al 1993; Vande Kopple 1985) have established the use of Metadiscourse (MD) as an essential element in writing as it allows the writer to create a dialogic space with his readers. In recent years, attempts have been made to analyse MD through the use of text corpus with the help of computer technology especially when the corpus is large. In this investigation, data have been obtained through an electronic means to illustrate the use of MD in writing samples of a group of Malaysian undergraduates. In order to investigate the use of MD by these students, their writing was benched against an established standard, the open access BAWE corpus, available online. The MD features were analysed through the concordancing software, monoConc Pro 2.2, for this research. The paper demonstrates how the software manages the data to reveal patterns of use between writers of the two corpora. The paper concludes on initial insights obtained from the comparison to show the nature and manner of MD between standard proficient writing (extract from BAWE corpus) and evolving student writing at the tertiary level that would have implications for writing improvement in educational institutions.

Keywords*: student writing; concordancing software; MD; text analysis; BAWE corpus*

WHAT IS METADISCOURSE?

Metadiscourse (MD) has been defined in a number of ways by different researchers. Williams (2007, p. 65), defines it as "the language that writers use to refer not to the substance of their ideas but to themselves, their readers, or their writings". Similarly, Vande Kopple (1985, p.83) classifies MD into a number of features stating that MD is the:

> *linguistic material that does not add prepositional meaning to the content but signals the presence of the writer.*

This notion is also held by Crismore et al (1993). They further added that MD helps both readers and listeners to "organize, interpret and evaluate the information given" (p.40). This functional interpretation to the definition of MD is supported by Hyland and Tse (2004) who elaborate that it is a useful linguistic resource that writers can use to communicate to their readers their stance and attitude towards the given proposition, thus emphasising the interactive perspective.

Its importance in writing cannot be disputed and over the past decades, the study of MD has garnered much attention from researchers of Second Language (L2) writings. This is evidenced by the number of studies that ranged from classification to cross-cultural studies on MD. Researchers such as Vande Kopple (1985), Crismore et al (1993) and Hyland (2005) have classified MD into different functional categories to explain the workings of MD. Vande Kopple (1985) categorised MD into two main domains – textual and interpersonal. The 'textual domain' helps writers link their propositions in a cohesive manner and the 'interpersonal' provides writers the avenue to convey their feelings towards the given propositions. The textual MD is exemplified through the use of 'text connectives' and 'code glosses' while the 'interpersonal MD' is realised

through the use of 'illocutionary markers', 'validity markers', 'narrator's, 'attitude markers' and 'commentary'. Based on Vande Kopple's (1985) categorisation, Crismore et al (1993) further modified, collapsed and created new categories of MD. Although they retained the terminology of the two main domains of MD, they further sub-divided 'textual MD' into 'textual markers and interpretative markers'. Under 'textual markers', they added 'logical connectives', 'sequencers', 'reminders' and 'topicalisers'. They then removed temporal connectives and narrators and created the code glosses, illocution markers and announcement as interpretative markers. Other than these frameworks, Hyland (2005) promotes the interpersonal model of MD. His model is not only an update on the taxonomies used by Vande Kopple (1985) and Crismore et al (1993), it also gives greater comprehensibility and distinction to the varieties of MD features. As a result, his framework is adopted in this study, though keeping in mind that it is still open for further refinement. Hyland (2005), in the same manner of Vande Kopple (1985) and Crismore et al (1993), distinguishes MD into two main domains. However, he identifies them as 'Interactive' and 'Interactional MD'. He explains that the function of the 'interactive MD' is to help guide readers through the text while that of the 'interactional MD' is to involve the reader in the argument. Interaction with the reader is firmly anchored in his framework and he further details the categories of the interactive and interactional MD, providing comprehensive examples for each sub-category. The sub-categories of the 'interactive' MD are manifested as 'transitions', 'frame markers', 'evidentials', 'endophoric markers' and 'code glosses'. For the 'interactional' MD categories, they are realised as 'hedges', 'boosters', 'engagement marker', 'attitude markers' and 'self-mention' (the framework is presented in Table 1).

With the advent of information and computer technology (ICT), the study on MD took on a new dimension. ICT made possible the investigation of large corpora through the use of concordance software. A case in point is the comparative study carried out by Hyland (1999) where he compared the use of MD in textbooks and research articles. The results showed that research articles have more interpersonal MD. Another corpus study on MD is Hyland's (2004) investigation on the use of MD in postgraduate writings. The study revealed that doctoral theses have more interactive MD than masters' theses. Interestingly, 'evidentials' were seen as appearing four times more in doctoral theses indicating the value placed on the greater use of citation as central to the argumentative or persuasive force of the text. Comparison of MD use between good and poor ESL undergraduate writers is evident in Intaraprawat and Steffensen's (1995) work which found that good essays have more MD features than poor essays.

Apart from the various studies that explore the use of different categories of MD others have been done to explore specific MD features. Wu (2007) concentrated on the use of engagement resources in high and low rated undergraduates' geography essays, while Hyland (2001a) studies the importance of audience engagement in academic arguments. Harwood (2005) concentrates on the use of self-mention, especially the use of inclusive and exclusive pronouns, and Hyland (2001b) focuses on the use of self-citation and the exclusive pronouns.

The investigation of cross cultural perspectives added another dimension to the studies on MD, as seen in the work by Crismore et al (1993) where they compared the use of MD in argumentative essays written by American and Finnish students. Both Dafouz-Milne (2008) and Aertselaer (2008) compared the use of MD between Spanish and English writers. While Dafouz-Milne (2008) focuses on the construction and attainment of persuasion in newspaper writings: The Times (British) and El Pais (Spanish), Aertselaer (2008) concentrated on the use of MD in the English-Spanish Contrastive Corpus (ESCC) argumentative texts. Culture is an important variable that impinges on the understanding of written language use and cultural differences are reflected through different thought processes in dealing with reader-writer interaction which could be captured in the use of MD.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Previous studies on MD have one striking similarity in their choice of writing samples - writing taken from experienced writers. This study intends to build on the existing knowledge on MD by investigating the use of MD through the use of technology – that of a concordancing tool, of a group of first year Malaysian undergraduates (MU) enrolled in a writing skills course. Through the application of the computer software, the undergraduate writing is compared to a group of acclaimed proficient writers in terms of MD use. The writings of these acclaimed proficient writers were drawn from an electronic source of open access text corpora compiled by academics from Great Britain known as the BAWE (British Academic Written Essays) corpus. One of the intentions behind the compilation of the corpus was to have an international benchmark for student academic writing and also to provide a corpus for research studies on writing. The lack of borders in this global world has pushed many countries especially where English is used as an L2 to seek indicative markers that could be used to gauge local performances as against those that are external and seen as desirable. Every writing teacher strives for improvement in their student work and a corpus of good writing could serve as a yardstick for performance which L2 learners could aspire to. To understand the operations of exemplary writing, specific elements could be isolated for meaningful exploration so that data obtained could give learning pointers for the writing classroom to enhance writing. Essentially, the study undertaken is to examine the specificities in the use of MD of local student writing with a view of its approximation to an international standard.

Research Questions

The questions that guided the research are:

1. What are the frequency and forms of MD use in the persuasive writing of L2 Malaysian undergraduate (MU) writers compared to the BAWE writers?

2. Are there any differences or similarities in the MU writers' use of MD when compared with the BAWE writers?

METHODOLOGY

Sampling was both purposive and stratified. In the selection of the MU corpus, writing samples were drawn from first year university students enrolled in a writing course - General Writing Skills. They had obtained grades A1 and A2 for English in the Sijil Peperiksaan Malaysia (SPM) which is equivalent to the British O'Level on leaving secondary school. . They represented the undergraduate writers with high proficiency in English and the sample size amounted to 294 texts with a total word count of 145,425 words. A1 in SPM is a Malaysian national indicator for a large portion of school-leavers who have reached the prescribed standards. Our interest in this study focuses on students who have exited the national evaluation assessment system and are given a recognition –to show a particular level of competence. It is a general criticism that students entering university are not able to write well in spite of attaining anA1 proficiency. This has actually given the researchers a concern about the discrepancy between the Malaysian A1 students and an acclaimed good writer. The BAWE corpus, as the benchmark, was identified through a survey of possible written text corpora available on the Internet. The BAWE corpus claimed that their corpus is the standard for student academic writing and it was constructed as a research reference for researchers to use. From the outset, it must be made known that this study is not a comparison of Malaysian English versus British English. Contact was established with the sites and after weighing the choices in terms of accessibility, and verification about the

corpus through personal communication, including the writing genres involved, the researchers decided on the use of the BAWE corpus. In the selection of the BAWE corpus, reference was made to the Oxford Text Archives-Resource Number 2539 which was an online resource. From the BAWE spreadsheet, a total text number of 2761 (from Humanities, Social Studies and Science) was found. Text types include essays, research report, literature survey, critique, methodology recount, empathy writing, problem question, explanation and design specification. The writers were from Years 1, 2, 3 of their undergraduate studies and masters programmes. To ensure the relevant use of the BAWE essays, the researchers established direct contact with the Director of the BAWE corpus project to identify the text-type and level of study of the writers. Together with the help of the BAWE spreadsheet, the choice was narrowed to essay type (argumentative texts) and year 1 category of undergraduate writing. Since the essays in the BAWE corpus were obtained from students from varied disciplines, the titles of their essays were also varied (Nesi et al 2004, p.441). Therefore, the comparison of MD used between the BAWE corpus and the MU corpus was not based on similarity of essay titles but rather on the similarity of text rhetoric which is that of the argumentative type. In total, there were 400 texts selected with a total running number of 808,642 words.

The Writing Task

To elicit the writing evidence, students were asked to write an argumentative essay based on the topic of smoking, A persuasive task was chosen as it is deemed to be a rhetorical form that is most likely to exhibit the varieties of MD (see Appendix for the essay prompt). The task was timed for the writing of the final essay and the duration given for completion was 1 hour 15 minutes. Prior to the administration of the writing task to the participants, a pilot study was conducted on a group of 126 undergraduates. Based on the feedback, the writing task was further revised to enable all categories of MD to be captured in the participants' writing (which included the evidentials and endophoric markers which were found to be lacking in the pilot analysis).

The first draft of the essay was written in the second week of the semester. After that, input on MD (12 hours) was given to the undergraduate students. The instructional input of MD focused on samples of text that had MD features. They were taken from varied sources such as textbooks, articles in the Internet and newspapers. Probing questions were created after the introduction of each text sample to direct the subjects' attention to the use of MD. One of the exercises in the instructional input included the drafting and redrafting process of written work. After acquiring the knowledge on the use of MD, the subjects were required to improve a given text using appropriate MD. This mirrored the need for redrafting of the essay they had written earlier which was to be done at the end of the intervention period. Thus, the first drafts of the students were returned and the students were told to improve on their writings in their second drafts. The second drafts were then collected and analysed to obtain the data for the study.

Instrument

To analyse the MD used, Hyland's (2005) Interpersonal Model of MD provided the initial guidelines. Hyland's framework has been chosen over others, such as Crismore et al's (1993) and Vande Kopple's (1985) after a detailed comparison has been carried out. Hyland's (2005) framework is seen as the most comprehensive. This framework however is seen as evolving and open in the sense that studies into MD could still contribute to the building up of the MD categories. As such, MD features that are considered to be not fitted in the model will definitely be extricated as building upon the model adopted. The details of Hyland's (2005) model are as follows.

***Table 1**: An interpersonal model of MD (Hyland 2005, p. 49)*

Category	Function	Example
Interactive	***Help to guide reader through the text***	
Transitions	express semantic relation between main clauses	in addition/but/thus/and
Frame markers	refer to discourse acts, sequences, or text stages	finally/to conclude/my purpose here is to
Endophoric markers	refer to information in other parts of the text	noted above/see Fig/in section 2
Evidentials	refer to source of information from other texts	according to X/(Y 1990)Z states
Code glosses	help readers grasp functions of ideational material	namely/e.g./such as/in other words
Interactional	***Involve the reader in the argument***	
Hedges	withhold writer's full commitment to proposition	might/perhaps/possible/about
Boosters	emphasise force or writer's certainty in proposition	in fact/definitely/it is clear that
Attitude markers	express writer's attitude to proposition	unfortunately/I agree/surprisingly
Engagement markers	explicitly refer to or build relationship with reader	consider/note that/you can see that
Self-mentions	explicit reference to author(s)	I/we/my/our

The instrument used to analyse the texts was the monoConc Pro version 2.2, a word concordancing software developed by Barlow (2003). The use of the electronic tool is adopted to facilitate text analysis, in particular that of MD use.

IDENTIFICATION OF MD

To run the programme, there are some preliminary procedures. First, only words or expressions that have metadiscoursal values are classified as MD. For example, transition 'and' is counted as an MD token only when it is used to link two clauses. If it is used as a linker in listing such as in "heart attack, strokes and cancer", it is discounted as an MD feature.

In the MU corpus, some metadiscoure features were found to be lifted directly from the essay prompt. This was another constraint in the tagging of MD. They were again ignored as a token of MD use by the writer.

For words having 200 hits/matches or more (and in BAWE corpus has 23,707 hits), the list was randomised and the first 200 concordance lines were analysed for MD use. The number of MD features identified will be extrapolated as a percentage of the total number of MD features analysed. It is then normed to an occurrence of 10,000 words so that the MD used can be compared between two corpora of unequal size (MU corpus: 145,425 words and BAWE corpus: 808,642 words).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To begin with, a frequency count was made in the use of MD. It was found that the total number of words of the BAWE corpus is 808,642 words while that of the MU corpus is 145,425 words. The corpus size of MU is much smaller as it consists of L2 written texts with an average length of 500 words while the text length of the BAWE corpus is between 1000 - 5000 words (Nesi et al 2004, p.441). The frequency count is displayed below according to the two major categories of MD use.

***Table 2**: Frequency of use of interactive and interactional MD*

	BAWE Corpus (Total words: 808,642 words)		**MU Corpus (Total words: 145, 425 words)**	
MD Category	**Total Hits**	**Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**Total Hits**	**Occurrence per 10,000 words**
Interactive	30,646	**379.0**	4644	**319.3**
Interactional	19,571	**242.0**	5151	**354.2**

It is found that the BAWE corpus has a higher frequency of use in interactive MD (379.0 occurrences per 10,000 words compared to 242.0 occurrences per 10,000 words in interactional discourse). This result is similar to other MD studies (Hyland 2004, Hyland & Tse, 2004, Intaraprawat & Steffenson 1995) whereby the frequency of use of the interactive MD is more dominant compared to the interactional MD. Interactive MD encompasses linguistic resources that writers use to organize and to structure their propositions so that the text would be more coherent to the readers. The use of transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials and code glosses are examples of interactive MD.

In direct contrast to the findings on the BAWE corpus, the MU corpus exhibited a higher frequency of interactional MD when compared with the interactive MD (354.2 occurrences per 10000 words compared to 319.3 occurrences per 10,000 words for interactive MD). Interactional MD focuses on linguistic signals that attempt primarily to connect to the audience, such as, in the use of hedges, boosters, engagement markers, attitude markers and self-mention.

It could be said that interactive signals engages the reader on a level that relates more to formal grammar while the interactional use relates more to the socio-affective level where audience engagement from that perspective is prioritised in discourse. The MU writers seem to reveal a lack of sensitivity and ability in achieving coherence in writing from the interactive perspective. This is not surprising as the MU corpus consists of texts written by L2 undergraduate writers. Although these L2 undergraduate writers are deemed to have high general English proficiency (obtaining A1 and A2 in English in the secondary school leaving examination), they may not have attained a writing proficiency level that could mobilise all the linguistic resources of the target language to craft a coherent piece of academic writing in English compared to the BAWE writers.

While interactional MD provides writers the opportunity to engage with their readers with linguistic resources that 'gives life' to the piece of writing, the writers have yet to meet the demands of academic writing conventions which appear to juggle a sensitive 'balanced' use of both types of MD. The MU writers may have built solidarity with their readers but are still strategising to align

their writings according to the expectations of experienced readers linguistically on a more formal level.

The next aspect was to examine the frequency of use according to the specific sub categories of interactive and interactional use. The table below shows the analysis as generated by electronic means for interactive MD.

***Table 3**: Number of occurrences of the categories of interactive MD in the BAWE and MU corpus*

	BAWE (Total words: 808,642 words)			**MU Corpus (Total words: 145. 425 words)**		
MD Category	**Total Hits**	**Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**% of Total**	**Total Hits**	**Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**% of Total**
1. Interactive						
Transitions	19,564	241.9	63.8	3579	246.1	77.1
Frame Markers	939	11.6	3.1	363	25.0	7.8
Endophoric Markers	1257	15.5	4.1	148	10.2	3.2
Evidentials	5415	67.0	17.7	117	8.0	2.5
Code Glosses	3471	42.9	11.3	437	30.0	9.4
Total	**30,646**	**379.0**	**100.0**	**4644**	**319.3**	**100.0**

Among the five categories of interactive MD in the BAWE and MU corpus, transitions has the highest frequency of use with more than half of the total percentage of overall interactive MD (BAWE Corpus: 241.9 occurrences per 10,000 words; MU Corpus: 246.1 occurrences per 10,000 words). However, between the BAWE and MU corpus, the frequency of use of transitions in the MU corpus is marginally higher. The next highest frequency of use in the BAWE corpus is evidentials (67.0 occurrences per 10,000 words) while for the MU corpus, it is the use of code glosses (30.0 occurrences per 10,000 words). In comparison, the use of evidentials in the MU corpus is the lowest with only 8.0 occurrences per 10,000 words. With the use of evidentials in the BAWE corpus registering eight times more than their use in the MU corpus, the BAWE writers seem to exhibit a greater awareness of the need to establish writers' credibility. Using evidentials as Hyland (2005, p.67) puts it is "*the perceived credibility that readers grant to writers*".

In the BAWE corpus, the third highest frequency of use is the use of code glosses (42.9 occurrences per 10,000 words) and its use is also significantly higher than that in the MU corpus (30.0 occurrences per 10,000 words). The other two categories, frame markers and the endophoric markers have very low frequency of use. Each of these two categories registers less than 10% of the total interactive MD with the frame markers noted as only 3.1% of the total interactive MD (11.6 occurrences per 10,000 words). The endophoric markers account for only 4.1% of the total interactive MD (15.5 occurrences per 10,000 words). In the MU corpus, the use of frame markers is the third highest (25.0 occurrences per 10,000 words) and it is marginally higher than those recorded in the BAWE corpus, while the use of endophoric markers accounts for only 3.2 % of the overall use of interactive MD (10.2 occurrences per 10,000 words).

***Table 4**: Number of occurrences of the categories of interactional MD in the BAWE and MU corpus*

	BAWE (Total words: 808,642 words)			**MU Corpus (Total words: 145. 425 words)**		
MD Category	**Total Hits**	**Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**% of Total**	**Total Hits**	**Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**% of Total**
2. Interactional						
Hedges	9331	115.4	47.7	819	56.3	15.9
Boosters	3966	49.0	20.3	966	66.4	18.8
Engagement Markers	3704	45.8	18.9	2918	200.7	56.6
Attitude Markers	1521	18.8	7.8	166	11.4	3.2
Self Mention	1049	13.0	5.4	282	19.4	5.5
Total	**19571**	**242.0**	**100.0**	**5151**	**354.2**	**100.0**

Table 4 displays the frequency observed in the use of interactional MD. Of the five categories, hedges has the most number of occurrences (115.4 occurrences per 10,000 words) followed by boosters (49.0 occurrences per 10,000 words) and engagement markers (45.8 occurrences per 10,000 words) in the BAWE corpus. In contrast, the MU corpus exhibited an extremely high occurrence of engagement markers when compared with the other interactional categories. It accounts for 200.7 occurrences per 10,000 words while boosters which is the next highest frequency of use only accounts for 66.4 occurrences per 10,000 words and hedges has a frequency of use of 56.3 occurrences per 10,000 words.

The function of both hedges and boosters are in a way diametrical. If the function of the hedges is to tone down assertions, the function of boosters is to increase the force of the assertion. In an academic discourse, the careful balance of the use of both hedges and boosters is important as they reflect the writers' ability to balance a show of their confidence with caution. Essentially, the balance reveals the writers' readiness to accept alternative views while at the same time there is evidence of their own confidence of their own propositions.

In the MU corpus, the dominant use of engagement markers, particularly the use of the inclusive pronoun 'we' indicates writers' sensitivity to include the readers into their arguments. The use of such engagement markers at strategic points in the text enhances writer-reader solidarity, facilitating the readers to accept the argument. However, the high use of boosters compared with the use of hedges seems to indicate the writer's over-confidence of their argument to the exclusion of being modest when presenting one's viewpoint. Perhaps in this area, undergraduate writers need to be taught to write with greater caution by using more hedges than boosters. As claimed by Williams (2007), confident writers use more hedges than boosters because they do not want to appear too assertive. In short, a persuasive piece of writing with an adequate balanced use of hedges and boosters would aid readers to accept the argument more readily.

The lowest use of the interactional MD in the BAWE corpus is self mention with only 13.0 occurrences per 10,000 words, while attitude markers account for 18.8 occurrences per 10,000 words. Similarly, in the MU corpus, both the attitude markers and the self mention showed the lowest frequency of use. However, in the MU corpus, the lowest frequency of use was seen in attitude markers (11.4 occurrences per 10,000 words) followed by self mention (19.4 occurrences

per 10,000 words). Although their use is significantly lower compared to other categories of interactional MD, it does indicate that the writers have the repertoire of MD skills.

FORMS OF MD

Hyland (2005) has categorised ten different types of MD, with each category realised through a variety of forms. As one of the universal properties of human language is creativity (Fromkin et al 2007), it is to be expected that writers have a wide mental list of lexicons to express their thoughts. In other words, each category of MD can be realised linguistically through a variety of forms. It is also this very characteristic of human language that the analysis of any MD features needs to be done in context as any linguistic realisation can be interpreted as having either propositional or metadiscoursal meaning. Below are some discussions on the linguistic expressions of the different categories on MD used by the writers of both the BAWE and MU corpus obtained from the concordancing display made possible by the electronic programme.

Transitions

In the use of *transition*s, the five most common linguistic realisations in the BAWE and MU corpus are the use of co-ordinating and sub-ordinating conjunctions. In the BAWE corpus, the co-ordinating conjunctions are realised through the use of 'and', 'but' and 'also'. In the MU Corpus, the co-ordinating conjunctions are realised mainly through the use of 'also', 'and', 'but' and 'so'. As for the use of subjunctive conjunctions, the BAWE writers preferred 'however' and 'because' while the MU writers tend to use the word 'because'.

***Table 5**: The first five preferred forms of transitions in BAWE corpus and MU corpus*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	Forms of Transitions	Total Hits	Total Occurrence per 10,000 words	Forms of Transitions	Total Hits	Total Occurrence per 10,000 words
1	And	7112	87.9	Also	707	48.6
2	But	2108	26.1	Because	665	45.7
3	Also	1760	21.8	And	453	31.2
4	However	1638	20.3	But	406	27.9
5	Because	917	11.3	So	396	27.2

Overall, the BAWE corpus showed more variety of linguistic expressions used as transitions. Of the total of 47 forms of transitions analysed, the BAWE corpus recorded 46 varieties of linguistic forms while the MU corpus recorded only 31 varieties of linguistic forms. This leads us to conclude that although the MU writers attempted to use transitions in their writings, their varieties of forms used are more restricted compared to the BAWE writers.

Frame Markers

In both the BAWE and MU corpus (Table 6), the five most preferred frame markers are mostly those that signal the sequence of the text structure. For the BAWE corpus, the five most preferred forms (in order of the most to least preferred forms) are 'firstly', 'in conclusion', 'then', 'finally' and 'first'. In the MU corpus, the preferred forms are 'first', 'in conclusion', 'finally', 'last' and 'firstly'. To

mark the beginning of a sequence of ideas, the BAWE writers prefer the form 'firstly' as compared with the writers of the MU corpus who preferred the form 'first'.

***Table 6**: The first five preferred forms of frame markers in BAWE corpus and MU corpus*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	**Forms of Frame Markers**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**Forms of Frame Markers**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**
1	Firstly	124	1.533435	First	72	5.0
2	In conclusion	96	1.187176	In conclusion	60	4.1
3	Then	95	1.174809	Finally	44	3.0
4	Finally	80	0.989313	Last	27	1.9
5	First	74	0.915114	Firstly	26	1.8

The function of 'last' can be expressed in a variety of manner and the concordance lines in the MU corpus reveal that the form 'last but not least' occurred no less than 20 times. Such a form is not present in the BAWE corpus but it seems to be the preferred frame markers among the MU writers. This expression, however, is generally considered to be a cliché and inappropriate for academic writing. The MU writers will have to 'unlearn' the expression to be more discerning.

Similar to the use of transitions, the BAWE corpus also reveals a wider variety of forms in the use of frame markers compared to the MU corpus. While the MU corpus exhibited 20 forms, the BAWE corpus has a total of 43 forms of frame markers. The BAWE writers were able to use sequencing such as 'firstly', 'to begin', 'in this chapter', 'in this part', 'in this section'. One possible reason that the last three forms are absent could be that MU writing was only in the form of an essay. Therefore, it may not have been necessary for the writers to resort to the use of these frame markers. However, there was a marked absence in the MU corpus the following expressions: '*to conclude', 'thus far', 'to summarise', 'in sum', 'in summary', 'to sum up', 'at this point', 'on the whole', 'at this stage', 'to sum up', 'for the moment'*. Besides, frame markers that announce goals such *as '*objective', 'intend to', 'aim', 'purpose', 'wish to' and those that denote a shift in topic, such as, 'back to', 'with regard to', 'move on', 'return to', 'turn to' were also not found in the MU corpus. We may conclude that the BAWE writers had a wider and richer repertoire of frame markers compared to the MU writers.

Endophoric Markers

Endophoric markers are a form of MD that refers readers to information in other parts that are within or outside the text. This intratextual feature is used to provide support to the argument with the purpose of convincing readers of the validity of the argument. In the BAWE corpus, the following linguistic expressions 'p.X', 'X above', 'page X', 'X earlier', 'in section X'/'the X section', 'Table X', 'X below', 'X later', 'in chapter X'/'the X chapter', 'X before', 'in part X'/'the X part', 'see X', and 'Fig. X' (see Table 7 below). In the MU corpus, however, only five different linguistic variations of endophoric markers were used. They were 'Table X', 'X above', 'X earlier', 'X before' and 'X below'. One possible reason for the limited linguistic choices could be the length of the MU essays (500 to 600 words). Below are examples of the linguistic realisations as revealed by the concordance lines.

***Table 7**: The first five preferred forms of endophoric markers in BAWE corpus and MU corpus*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	**Forms of Endophoric Markers**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**Forms of Endophoric Markers**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**
1	p. X	687	8.5	Table X	114	7.8
2	X above	118	1.5	X above	20	1.4
3	page X	94	1.2	X earlier	6	0.4
4	X earlier	84	1.0	X before	4	0.3
5	(in) section X/ the X section	57	0.7	X below	4	0.3

The use of the form p. X/p X in the BAWE corpus could be closely linked to the use of citation as a persuasive strategy in the crafting of academic writing. Reference to the page number complements the citation process and it reinforces the validity and reliability of the writers' arguments.

Evidentials

***Table 8**: The first eight forms of evidentials in BAWE corpus and MU corpus*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	**Forms of Evidentials**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**Forms of Evidentials**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**
1	name/date	4926	60.9	According to X	96	6.6
2	cited in	190	2.3	X states/ state that	13	0.9
3	According to X	131	1.6	Said	7	0.5
4	X states/ state that	79	1.0	quoted in/as quoted	1	0.1
5	quoted in/as quoted	48	0.6	name/date	0	0.0
6	Said	35	0.4	(to) cite X	0	0.0
7	(to) cite X	3	0.0	(to) quote X	0	0.0
8	(to) quote X	3	0.0	cited in	0	0.0

As seen in the Table 8, evidentials can also be realised through various forms. It is clear that the BAWE corpus utilizes more varieties of evidentials than the MU corpus. At the top of the list is the use of the common citation convention techniques where the names of the author, followed by the year of publication and the page number, are cited. The forms of evidentials that are least used in the BAWE corpus are: '(to) cite X…' and 'to quote…'.

In the MU corpus, the form 'as quoted' is the least preferred form. There was only one such instance in the whole corpus. The other four forms such as name/date, (to) cite X, (to) quote X, and cited in were also not present in the MU corpus.

Code Glosses

Table 9*: The first five preferred forms of code glosses in BAWE corpus and MU corpus*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	**Forms of Code Glosses**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**Forms of Evidentials**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**
1	such as	976	12.1	such as	207	14.2
2	( )	454	5.6	for example	95	6.5
3	or X	366	4.5	in fact	21	1.4
4	_	338	4.2	or X	21	1.4
5	Indeed	231	2.9	( )	17	1.2

Based on the figures in the table above, it is observed that the most preferred form of code glosses in both the corpora is the use of 'such as'. A parallel form to 'such as' is 'for example' which is a preferred form in the MU corpus.

The use of the bracket and dash indicates that MD, particularly in the use of code glosses, is not realised by words alone. Punctuation marks also have metadiscoursal meaning which allow writers to elaborate further on what they have conveyed in writing. The conjunction 'or' is also used as code glosses in both the BAWE and MU corpus. Forms such as *'as a matter of fact'* and 'put another way' found in the MU corpus were not found at all in the BAWE corpus. However, the dash '(-)', 'e.g.',' i.e.', 'indeed', 'namely', 'that is to say', and 'viz' were not found in the MU corpus.

Hedges

***Table 10**: The first five preferred forms of hedges in BAWE corpus and MU corpus*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	Forms of Hedges	Total Hits	Total Occurrence per 10,000 words	Forms of Hedges	Total Hits	Total Occurrence per 10,000 words
1	Would	1840	22.8	May	177	12.2
2	May	1234	15.3	Would	98	6.7
3	Could	981	12.1	About	96	6.6
4	Perhaps	433	5.4	Might	72	5.0
5	Seems	387	4.8	Could	63	4.3

In examining the use of *hedges*, the concordancing outcomes revealed that the prevalent form is the use of the auxiliary verb. The first three preferred forms in the BAWE corpus are 'would', 'may' and 'could'. Similarly, the MU corpus also exhibited the use of auxiliary verbs where the first, second, fourth and fifth preferred forms are 'may', 'would', 'might' and 'could' respectively. The third preferred form is the adverbial 'about'. The fourth preferred form in the BAWE corpus is the adverbial 'perhaps' with the fifth, a linking verb, 'seems'.

In the MU corpus, the adverbial used is the form 'about'. Almost all instances of the use of 'about' in the MU corpus were found before the presentation of statistical information. This indicated that the MU writers were cautious not to demonstrate that they have absolute knowledge on the proposition. (Please see the concordance output below).

1. ... 06 , the smokers among women increasing [[about]] 0.3 % from the year before and for t
2. ... cigarette smoking . Whereas , there is [[about]] 0.9 % of men deaths caused by cigarette
3 ... creasing from year 2006 to year 2007 at [[about]] 1.3 % because most of them came from
4. ... e age of 18 start smoking and currently [[about]] 1 in 5 teenagers smoke . Many steps h ..
(Essays of MU participants)

Hedges can be linked to the expression of uncertainty or a lack of commitment to the truth of the propositions. In choosing to use the auxiliaries, the writers are conveying the message that they may not possess the absolute knowledge on the subject. In a persuasive discourse, this strategy is necessary to win the acceptance of the readers towards the arguments. Although the MU corpus also uses the linking verb 'seems', it is not dominant compared to the BAWE corpus. Just like the use of adverbials, the use of the linking verb, 'seems' indicates uncertainty. It allows writers to convey the message that the meaning of the proposition is only 'somewhat' and not absolutely the case.

Apart from the above forms, other forms of hedges are also detected, such as 'suggests', 'claim', 'possible', etc. Their distributions in the two corpora were quite varied. The BAWE corpus had a total of 343 hits for 'suggests' while in the MU corpus, it only recorded a total of three hits. In another instance, the word 'possible' garnered a total of 280 hits while there was none found in the MU corpus. It is apparent then that the use of hedges in the MU corpus is not only less frequent but is also less varied. The analysis points to the likelihood of the need of a greater awareness of the role of hedges in L2 writing. Successful writers usually are able to hedge more. This fact has been highlighted in Williams' (2007) writing manual and has also been proven in

Intaraprawat and Steffenson's (1995) study. Thus, L2 writers would need more training to enhance their use of this aspect of metadiscourse.

Boosters

***Table 11**: The first five preferred forms of boosters in BAWE corpus and MU corpus*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	**Forms of Boosters**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**Forms of Boosters**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**
1	Must	741	9.2	Very	215	14.8
2	Very	705	8.7	Must	181	12.4
3	Indeed	266	3.3	Always	115	7.9
4	Never	264	3.3	Actually	109	7.5
5	Always	253	3.1	Really	97	6.7

Three of the common forms that appear in both the BAWE and MU corpus are 'must', 'very' and 'always' (table 11). These expressions in the form of modal verbs, modifiers or adverbs, play a similar role, that is, they accentuate the certainty of the propositions. Similarly, the other forms found in the table above – 'indeed', and 'never' in the BAWE corpus and 'actually' and 'really' in the MU corpus also increase the certainty of the proposition.

Akin to the other categories of MD discussed earlier, it is again found that boosters used in the BAWE corpus were more varied. In the BAWE corpus, a total of 38 different linguistic expressions were recorded while the MU corpus only had 24 different linguistic expressions of this category. The BAWE corpus also recorded more forms, having over 100 hits (12 in total) while the MU has only four forms (see Table 12).

***Table 12**: Forms of boosters in BAWE corpus and MU corpus with more than 100 hits*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	**Forms of Boosters**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**Forms of Boosters**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**
1	Must	741	9.2	Very	215	14.8
2	Very	705	8.7	Must	181	12.4
3	Indeed	266	3.3	Always	115	7.9
4	Never	264	3.3	Actually	109	7.5
5	Always	253	3.1			
6	Clearly	215	2.7			
7	In fact	209	2.6			
8	Actually	184	2.3			
9	Certainly	110	1.4			
10	Obvious	106	1.3			
11	True	105	1.3			
12	Really	102	1.3			

Engagement Markers

***Table 13**: The first five preferred forms of engagement markers in BAWE corpus and MU corpus*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	**Forms of Engagement Markers**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**	**Forms of Engagement Markers**	**Total Hits**	**Total Occurrence per 10,000 words**
1	We (inclusive)	1601	19.8	We (inclusive)	974	67.0
2	Our	568	7.0	Our	811	55.8
3	Us (inclusive)	476	5.9	You	383	26.3
4	?	441	5.5	?	259	17.8
5	You	243	3.0	Your	197	13.5

'Engagement markers' provide the avenue for writers to build solidarity with their readers. The inclusive 'we' topped the list of the five most preferred forms of engagement markers. Other forms of engagement markers in the above list were the use of the pronoun 'you', possessive pronoun 'our' and 'your' and the object form of the plural 'we' and 'us'.

It is interesting to note that the writers from both corpora also made the effort to engage their readers by using questions. This is a useful strategy as posing a rhetorical question in the text draws the readers to participate actively in the process of the argument. From the concordance lines, it is seen that although the MU writers made attempts to use questions to engage their readers, there were, however, instances where the questions were not constructed correctly, or the writers had used awkward sentence structures. This inability to use standard sentence construction is a common problem among L2 writers. As evolving writers attempt to write in the target language, there is bound to be some confusion because of their first language interference or inability to acquire the structures is yet in the developmental stage.

Just as there are dominant linguistic expressions of engagement markers in the corpora, there are also linguistic realisations of engagement markers that have very low frequency of use. The forms of engagement markers that only account for between one to ten hits in the BAWE corpus are the following: 'imagine', 'notice', 'assume', 'look at', 'let's', 'observe', 'suppose', 'by the way', and 'think abou't'. As for the MU corpus, the forms of engagement markers that have ten hits or less are 'think about', 'let us', 'note', 'notice', 'by the way' and 'suppose'. Why this is so merits further investigation.

Attitude Markers

***Table 14**: The first five preferred forms of attitude markers in BAWE corpus and MU corpus*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	Forms of Attitude Markers	Total Hits	Total Occurrence per 10,000 words	Forms of Attitude Markers	Total Hits	Total Occurrence per 10,000 words
1	Important	686	8.5	!	74	5.1
2	Essential	137	1.7	Unfortunately	25	1.7
3	Interesting	78	1.0	Important	19	1.3
4	Essentially	71	0.9	Agree	12	0.8
5	Dramatic	55	0.7	Disagree	6	0.4

In comparing the use of attitude markers, it is observed that they are realised through the use of adjectives, adverbs, attitude verbs and punctuation (table 14). In the BAWE corpus, the first five preferred forms of attitude markers were mostly the use of adjectives ('important', 'essential', 'interesting' and 'dramatic') and one adverb ('essentially'). In the MU corpus, however, there were more varieties. Besides the use of adjectives ('important'), the writers also used punctuation ('!') as well as adverbs ('unfortunately') and attitude verbs ('agree' and 'disagree'). The use of these different linguistic realisations allows readers to understand not just the propositional content but also the stance of the writers towards the propositions. The use of attitude markers is essential in a persuasive written text as a text devoid of attitude markers would be too arid and impersonal.

Apart from the five most preferred forms of attitude markers, there are other forms of attitude markers used in the two corpora. In the MU corpus, however, their use is not that significant with a total of less than five hits. The BAWE corpus on the other hand, exhibited a total of 23 different linguistic realisations. This difference again speaks of a wider repertoire of linguistic realisations that are used by the BAWE writers.

Self Mention

***Table 15**: The five preferred forms of self mention in BAWE corpus and the three preferred forms of MU corpus*

	BAWE Corpus			MU Corpus		
NO	Forms of Self Mention	Total Hits	Total Occurrence per 10,000 words	Forms of Self Mention	Total Hits	Total Occurrence per 10,000 words
1	I	758	9.4	I	223	15.3
2	My	175	2.2	My	39	2.7
3	Me	62	0.8	Me	20	1.4
4	The author	24	0.3			
5	The writer	13	0.2			

Table 15 shows, the first five preferred forms of self mention in the BAWE corpus (out of a total of nine different forms). In the MU corpus, however, there were only three preferred forms. Linguistic forms such as 'mine', 'the author', 'the author's', 'this author', 'the writer' and 'the writer's' were

uncommon in the MU corpus. Alluding themselves as 'the writer' or 'the author' in an expository essay may sound too formal as the topic of the essay is about persuading young people not to smoke. On the contrary, in the BAWE corpus, the topic for the academic assignment is formal and longer covering three broad disciplines: humanities, social sciences and science (Nesi et al, p.443). Therefore, their use may be deemed necessary.

It was also found that the three most preferred forms for both corpora were the same and these occur in the same order of frequency (highest to lowest). They are the first person pronoun, 'I', possessive pronoun, 'my', and the normative case of 'I' and 'me'. All these three forms allow writers to intrude into the text and signal their presence. Of the three forms, the first person pronoun, 'I', allows writers to invariably state their stand in relation to their arguments.

As found in the data display generated, the first person pronoun allows writers to categorically state their stand such as 'I strongly believe', 'I strongly discourage' or 'I absolutely agree'. In addition, the use of the first person pronoun also demonstrates the writers' personal feelings towards the proposition as in the expressions 'I hope', 'I admit', or 'I'm sure'.

In the BAWE corpus, the first person pronoun is also used for the same effect. Furthermore, writers also use the first person pronoun to inform the writers of their intention such as 'I will look at', 'I will then explore' and 'I will limit'. This can also be said for the use of linguistic expression 'me'. Similar to the use of the first person pronoun, the use of 'me' also indicates the writer's presence. As highlighted by Hyland (2005, p.53), the signaling of the writer's presence or absence in the text is a matter of the writer's conscious choice. In stating their stance, writers have the liberty to project their presence or distance themselves from their proposition depending on how they would like to relate their argument to their readers or their community's expectation.

The possessive pronoun is used to signal that the proposition given is entirely the writers' and not anyone else. They are expressed in linguistic choices such as 'in my opinion', 'in my essay', 'for my decision', 'in my view', etc.

CONCLUSION

There is much evidence in the use of MD in both the BAWE corpus and the MU, evidence made possible for easy display by the concordancing tool. While there were similarities in use, the results showed a major difference in the frequency of occurrence and distribution and variety of forms in both the corpora. The data supports the conclusion that the BAWE corpus exhibited a greater use of MD. The BAWE also showed more use of the interactive MD while the MU corpus exhibited more interactional MD. This phenomenon reflects that the BAWE writers could be more concerned with and were more aware of the internal structuring of their argument, while the writers of MU corpus were more inclined towards building readers' relationship in forwarding their arguments. The MU writers likely need to improve on the internal structuring of their text to show more sophistication in their writing.

Among the different categories of interactive MD, transitions seem to enjoy the highest frequency of use. This is not surprising as transitions consist of conjunctions that allow writers to link their ideas in the text and they are generally much emphasised in the teaching of writing. As for the least frequently used, frame markers dominate for the BAWE corpus and the endophoric markers for the MU corpus. The reason is likely that the essays in both the corpora are not exceptionally long thus they do not enable the writers to exhibit a greater use of frame markers or endophoric markers.

For interactional MD, the use of hedges was more dominant in the BAWE corpus while in the MU corpus, engagement markers were most frequently used. This indicates that the BAWE writers are more conscious of the need to hedge while the MU writers appear to focus more on the building of solidarity with their readers to engage them in their arguments. It could also be construed that the more proficient BAWE writers were more aware of the demands of academic writing whereby hedging invites readers to accept the propositions made by the writer in a subtle way. The L2 MU writers, on the other hand, showed a preeminence of the use of the engagement marker 'we' as a solidarity marker. This marker if overused could sound overbearing. Again relative effects of MD need to be explained and greater use of hedges deserves more highlight in teaching L2 writing.

Apart from the frequency of use, the forms of MD between the two corpora are also markedly different. One common thread that runs through the BAWE corpora was the consistent use of a greater variety of forms among the BAWE writers. In addition, the forms in the BAWE corpus also had a higher number of electronic hits. Therefore, we can conclude that the BAWE writers as better writers were more conscious of the features of formal academic writing and were also able to use more appropriate and varied MD forms in the writings to convey their thoughts. In addition, it was also generally noted that the greater number of hits in the context of occurrences per 10,000 words seem to indicate that many of the MD features are spaced out. It could lead to the conclusion that MU writers use much shorter sentence construction for idea connection. A study into the connection between MD features and sentence length or idea units is potentially invigorating.

Although the MU writers had obtained a distinction (A1 and A2) in their English subject for their higher secondary school leaving certificate, their proficiency level of the English language still needs to be improved. As developing writers in the English language, they not only have to grapple with the syntactic and morphological rules of the language but also the writing genre conventions of a discourse community. This problem or difficulty was also voiced by Intaraprawat and Steffensen (1995). The lack of vocabulary and knowledge on syntactic rules of the language hamper the effort of some of the MU writers to construct meaningful sentences that would aid the readers' understanding of the texts. For these reasons, attempts to use metadiscoursal features were sometimes found in non-standard sentence construction. Therefore, from the results obtained, we can conclude that MU writers are still at the evolving writer's stage and have not approximated closely to the writing ability of the BAWE writers.

Writing is also culture bound and therefore may be characterised by idiosyncratic use. The same can be said of MD as a feature of writing (cf. Crismore et al1993; Dafouz-Milne 2008; Aertselaer 2008). However, in the case of undergraduate academic writing, the norm that instructors would aspire is one that is generally seen to be acceptable as good writing which can exist regardless of situation and place, though criterion features undoubtedly are influenced by L1 writing development from the west. In understanding emerging L2 writers using the English language, there is certainly a place for cross-cultural investigation to establish the 'norms' that characterise their writing and this would certainly include the use of MD. The explication of these particularised 'norms' would serve as a comparison between cultural perspectives to achieve an understanding of underlying influences in L2 writing, and thence could move to the next stage of showing a conscious adapting perhaps of prevalent expectations of a broader and more influential discourse community.

To conclude, some relevant points can be reiterated about technology and writing. First the electronic concordancing tool can be seen as a powerful facilitator in revealing textual differences between groups. Patterns of use and frequency of use of particular features of MD could not be so readily accessible had it not been for this facilitation. The electronic tool enabled the human eye to survey a comprehensive display of the forms of MD. Such a display would have been too

complicated for the human hand to manage without technological aid. Using the tool has also given the researchers a means of analysis that is objective and fast once the parameters are set. The Internet has also helped pull together resources that are managed online such as the BAWE corpus, enabling open access that transcends borders.

In the age of the Internet, electronic texts captured in large corpora are now more amenable for comparative analysis. In this manner, standards are made available for researchers and in this case, to benchmark developmental writing. The learners could benefit as they can be made to be more consciously aware of the importance of writing conventions in the crafting of successful writing. The teacher, on the other hand, could use the output of the concordance lines as authentic teaching resources to raise students' awareness on the construction of linguistic realisations of appropriate MD accompanied by appropriate syntax and morphology of English language use. Exposing students to real life writing examples of how more experienced writers manage their writing will serve as an eye opener to the world of a wide array of rich discourse possibilities, and to the cultures of writing. New writing goals in education could evolve to guide undergraduate writers to greater writing maturity aided by technological use.

REFERENCES

Aertselaer, J.N.V. 2008, "Arguing in English and Spanish: A corpus study of stance", *Cambridge ESOL: Research Notes*, no. 33, pp. 28-33 Retrieved 10 May 2009: http://www.cambridgeesol.org/rs_notes/rs_nts33.pdf

Barlow, M. 2003, *Concordancing and corpus analysis using MP 2.2*, Athelstan, Houston.

Crismore, A., Markkanen, R. & Steffensen, M.S. 1993, "Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finnish university students", *Written Communication,* vol. 10, no.1, pp. 39-71.

Dafouz-Milne, E. 2008, "The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: A cross-linguistic study of newspaper discourse", *Journal of Pragmatics,* vol. *40*, no. 1, 95-113.

Fromkin, V., Rodman, R. & Hyams, N. 2007, *An Introduction to Language*, 8th edn. Thomson Wadsworth, Boston.

Harwood, N. 2005, "We do not seem to have a theory ...The theory I present here attempts to fill this gap: Inclusive and exclusive pronouns in academic writing:, *Applied Linguistics,* vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 343-375.

Hyland, K. 2001a, "Bringing in the reader: Addressee features in academic articles", *Written communication*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 549-574.

Hyland, K. 2001b, "Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles", *English for Specific Purposes,* vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 207-226.

Hyland, K. 2004. Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. Retrieved 26 June 2007 at http://www.sciencedirect.com.

Hyland, K. 2005, *Metadiscourse,* Continuum, New York.

Hyland, K. & Tse, P. 2004, "MD in academic writing: A reappraisal", *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 156-177.

Intaraprawat, P. & Steffensen, M.S. 1995, "The use of MD in good and poor ESL essays", *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 4, no.3, pp. 253-272.

Nesi, H., Sharpling, G. & Ganobesik-Williams, L. 2004, "Student papers across the curriculum: Designing and developing a corpus of British student-writing", *Computer and Composition*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 439-450.

Vande Kopple W. J. 1985, "Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse", *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 36, no.1, pp. 82-93.

Williams, J. 2007, *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace,* 9th edn., Pearson-Longman, New York.

Wu, S. M. 2007, "The use of engagement resources in high and low rated undergraduate geography essays", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol.6, no.3, pp.254-271.

APPENDIX

WRITING TASK

Duration: 1 hour 15 minutes

Situation:

You are concerned that despite efforts by the government to discourage young people from smoking, the number of smokers particularly among teenagers is on the rise. You are also unhappy about how cigarette companies have exploited young children in marketing their products. You have read several articles about the problem and extracts from three articles are shown below.

Extract A

Tobacco's Influence on Asian Youth
By: Simone Provence
http://bang-ishotyou.livejournal./2003/com/

As teenage girls are included in the group of young, and often underage, smokers, many tobacco advertisements in Asia are geared towards female's self-esteem to encourage them to smoke for a variety of reasons. In a mall in the Philippines during 1992 there was an advertisement of a beautiful, young Asian woman wearing a Marlboro jacket and hat surrounded by giant Marlboro signs and posters that caught the eyes of every shopper in the mall[5]. Similar events using highly attractive, young Asian women in Cambodia during 2001 and Vietnam in 1996 for cigarette ads lead young girls to believe that smoking makes them more attractive, and therefore they pick up the deadly, addicting habit[6]. Tobacco, specifically cigarettes, has been used as an appetite suppressant for years now, and young women world-wide still think that smoking will help prevent them from gaining weight. Movie advertisements in Asia reflect beautiful young women smoking cigarettes, which in turn leads to an increase in smoking among female teenagers who desire the beauty of the actress they see holding the cigarette.

Similar to the toy and video game advertisements, and aside from movie ads and rock stars that imply to young children and teens that smoking is cool, other children are also partly responsible for the increase in popularity of cigarette smoking. Lower class youth view fellow friends and classmates from higher income families as role models and look up to them. Those higher class youth are the ones who can afford to, and often do, smoke, which makes smoking look cool and desirable[10].

Extract B

Tobacco Control 2004;**13**:ii37-ii42

Industry sponsored youth smoking prevention programme in Malaysia: a case study in duplicity

M Assunta, **S Chapman**
School of Public Health, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

"We strongly believe that children should not smoke and that smoking should only be for adults who understand the risks associated with it". This statement was made by British American Tobacco (BAT) Malaysia in its first social report released in June 2002.1 Tobacco companies in Malaysia have been collaborating on youth smoking prevention programmes since 1994.2 The top three tobacco transnationals, BAT, Philip Morris (PM), and the former RJ Reynolds (RJR), have conducted three joint anti-smoking campaigns directed at youth: "Youth Should Not Smoke" (1997); "No Sale to Under 18s" (1998); "On top of the World-Without Smoking" (2001).

The Control of Tobacco Products Regulation 1993 banned direct tobacco advertisements, the sale of cigarettes to under 18 year olds, and prohibited this group from purchasing cigarettes or smoking. However, brand stretching activities and sponsorship of sports and entertainment events remained legal and extremely widespread.3 On average, every day about 50 teenagers below the age of 18 years start smoking in Malaysia and currently about one in five teenagers smoke.4 Smoking prevalence among teenage boys aged 12–18 years is 30% while smoking among girls has doubled from 4.8% in 1996 to 8% in 1999.4 The second national health and morbidity survey in 1996 reported the public health sector has not acted in a timely manner to curb the marketing tactics of the transnational tobacco companies and this "failure to act aggressively from the 1970s has made action in the 1990s more difficult".5 Between 1986 and 1996 there was a 67% increase in the number of teenage smokers.6 Ninety eight per cent of the tobacco market in Malaysia is controlled by transnational tobacco companies.7

In 1997 the Malaysian government fully endorsed the industry sponsored youth smoking prevention (YSP) programme. This endorsement put the tobacco industry in a favourable position to influence the government in its tobacco control efforts. While the influence of industry sponsored YSP programmes in preventing effective tobacco control legislation has already been documented,8–10 this paper provides further insight to a developing country's situation where, in the absence of a government anti-smoking campaign, the industry successfully used the YSP programme to counter legislation restricting tobacco marketing and continued to promote tobacco to youth.

Extract C

Table 1.1 Estimated death caused by cigarette smoking in Malaysia: 2005, 2006, 2007

	Estimated number of deaths caused by cigarette smoking	
Year	**Women**	**Men**
2005	8.5 %	21.4%
2006	8.8%	21.6%
2007	10.1%	22.3%

Source: *Health Digest*, January 2008

Task:

As a responsible journalist in a newspaper agency, write a 5 paragraph persuasive essay (which includes **an introductory paragraph, three developmental paragraphs and a concluding paragraph)** that discourages smoking among teenagers. Give at least **three** convincing reasons to explain your stand on the issue. To support your stand on the issue, you **have to do** the following:

i) **Quote some of the information in extracts A and B in your essay.**
ii) **Insert Table 1.1 of Extract C in your essay and comment on the information provided in the table.**

You are allowed to add more points of your own.

The length of your essay should not be less than **500 words.** Before you begin writing, take 5-10 minutes to read the question and plan your essay. Then, in about 60 minutes, write your 5 paragraph essay. Use the last 5 minutes to revise or edit your essay.