

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Mohamed Seddik BenYahia. Jijel
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English



The Use of Metadiscourse in the General Introductions of Algerian Master EFL Dissertations

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillments of the requirements for the degree of Master in didactics of foreign languages

Submitted by

Chaima CHABBI

Supervised by

Dr Mohammed BOUKEZOULA

Board of Examiners

- **Chairperson:** Loubna KOUIRA, University of Mohamed Seddik BenYahia. Jijel
- **Supervisor:** Mohammed BOUKAZOULA , University of Mohamed Seddik BenYahia. Jijel
- **Examiner:** Asma BENALILECHE, University of Mohamed Seddik BenYahia. Jijel

2020-2021I

Declaration

I hereby declare that the dissertation entitled “ The use of metadiscourse in the general introductions of Algerian master EFL dissertations” is my own work and all the sources I have used have been acknowledged by means of references. I also certify that I have not copied or plagiarized the work of other students or researchers partially or fully. In case any material is not documented, I shall be responsible for the consequences.

Signature

Date

Dedication

To those who have always believed in me

To those who have always been there for me through thick and thin

I dedicate this work to all my loved one:

To my parents without whom I would have never become the woman I am today

To my teachers without whom I would have never become the student I am today

To friends and siblings by whom I have been fully supported and genuinely loved

To the dreamy child I was once upon a time.

To the darkest days

To the sleepless nights

To all the struggles and obstacles I have stumbled upon and I am to stumble upon

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Mohammed Boukezzoula, without whose judicious guidance this work would have never seen the light.

Second, words are certainly not enough to express my deep gratitude to Mr. Bounar, Mr. Naili, Mr. Boukhentache, and Miss Azieb.

Third, special thanks should also go to Mr. Fanit, and Ms. Arzim for kindly accepting to participate in the present study.

Finally, I am sincerely grateful to the members of the jury, Mrs. Loubna Kouira and Mrs. Asma Benalilèche, for their much appreciated efforts and the precious time they have spent in evaluating this dissertation.

Abstract

The present dissertation aimed at investigating master two students' of English problems in the use metadiscourse markers in the general introductions of their dissertations and gauging the potential causes of those problems. To achieve the first aim, a corpus analysis of fifteen master dissertation randomly chosen on the basis of convenience have been identified, codified, and analysed following Hyland's (2005) model, which assigns metadiscourse features to two metadiscourse functions ,interactive and interactional. To achieve the second aim, a teachers' interview was designed and implemented to five supervisors randomly chosen among those who supervised the dissertations in question. The corpus analysis was based on Hyland's (2005) model which assigns discourse markers to two major metafunctions: interactional and interactive revealed significant results. As far as interactive metadiscourse markers are concerned, the corpus analysis has revealed that master students have demonstrated an adequate use of transitions, frame markers and endophoric markers, but failed to demonstrate the required level with regard to two markers, namely evidentials and code glosses. As for the interactional metadiscourse metafunction, the analysis of the corpus under study has revealed that master two students have failed in demonstrating an adequate level with regard to all the defining features of this metafunction,namelyhedges,boosters,attitudemarkers,engagementmarkers,and self-mention. It is worth noting here that engagement markers have been totally absent in the data. As far as the interview is concerned, the analysis of the results has shown that the adequate use of discourse markers does not constitute a focal point of the feedback they offer to their supervisees due, at least partly, to lack of time and students' fragility at the level of grammar and writing. The most interesting finding generated by the analysis of the interview is the supervisors 'admittance that they are responsible for inhibiting supervisees from using hedges, boosters, attitude markers and self-mentions. This finding suggests that the supervisors in question do not

adhere to a constructivist view of academic writing which totally rejects the principle suggesting that discourse is but a mere linguistic representation of a set of impersonal and universal truths.

List of Abbreviations, Acronyms and Symbols

- 1- EFL: English as a foreign language
- 2- e.g.: *exempli gratia*
- 3- GI: general introduction
- 4- GIs: general introductions
- 5- GI1: general introduction number one
- 6- GI2: general introduction number two
- 7- GI3: general introduction number three
- 8- GI4: general introduction number four
- 9- GI5: general introduction number five
- 10- GI6: general introduction number six
- 11- GI7: general introduction number seven
- 12- GI8: general introduction number eight
- 13- GI9: general introduction number nine
- 14- GI10: general introduction number ten
- 15- GI11: general introduction number eleven
- 16- GI12: general introduction number twelve
- 17- GI13: general introduction number thirteen
- 18- GI14: general introduction number fourteen
- 19- GI15: general introduction number fifteen
- 20- i.e: *id est* (that is to say)
- 21- L2: second language
- 22- MD: metadiscourse
- 23- Mr: mister

24- PhD: doctor of philosophy

25- TEFL: teaching English as a foreign language

26- % percent

Listof Tables

1- Table01: Kopple’s Model of Metadiscourse.....	21
2- Table02: Crismore et al’s Model of Metadiscourse.....	23
3- Table03: Hyland’s Model of Metadiscourse.....	25
4- Table04: The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Metadiscourse in the GIs of of Master Dissertations.....	34
5- Table 05 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Interactive MD in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	31
7- Table 06 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Transitions in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	33
8- Table 07 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Frame Markers in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	35
9- Table 08 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Endophoric Markers in the GIs of Master Dissertations	37
10- Table 09 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Evidentials in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	38
11- Table 10 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Code Glosses in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	39
12- Table 11 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Interactional MD in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	40
13- Table 12 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Hedges in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	41

14- Table 13 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Boosters in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	42
15- Table 14 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Attitude Markers in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	43
16- Table 15 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Engagement Markers in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	44
17- Table 16 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Self-Mentions in the GIs of Master Dissertations.....	45

Dedication.....II

Acknowledgements.....III

Abstract.....VI

ListofAbbreviations,Acronyms,andSymbols.....V

ListofTables.....VII

Contents.....VIII

General Introduction.....1

1. Background of the Study.....1

2. Statement of the Problem..... 3

3. Aim of the Study..... 4

4. Research Question.....4

5. Means of Research.....4

6. Structure of the Dissertation.....4

Chapter One: Academic Writing: the Need for a Genre-based

Instruction

1.1.....Academic Writing

Introduction.....7

1.1.1Definition of Academic Writing.....7

1.1.2. The significance of Writing in English in Foreign Language Classes.....8

1.1.3. Approaches to Academic Writing.....8

1.2. The Genre-based Approach to writing.....	9
1.2.1. The Genre-based Approach to Teaching writing.....	9
1.2.1.1. The Merits of the Genre-based Approach to writing.....	10
Conclusion.....	10

Chapter two: The Role of Metadiscourse in Academic Writing

Introduction.....	13
1.1. Definition of Metadiscourse.....	13
1.1.2. Identification of Metadiscourse Markers.....	13
1.1.3. Principles of Metadiscourse.....	14
1.1.4. Taxonomies of Metadiscourse.....	15
1.1.4.1. Vande Kopple’s Mode.....	16
1.1.4.2. Crismore et al’s model	17
1.1.4.3. Hyland’s model.....	19
1.2. Metadiscourse and Writing.....	21
1.2.1. The Role of Metadiscourse.....	21
1.2.2. The Structure of a Well-written General Introduction.....	23
Conclusion.....	24

Chapter Three: Field Work

Introduction	27
1.1 The Corpus Analysis.....	27
1.1.1 The Sample.....	27
1.1.2. Description of the Corpora Analysis	27
1.1.3. Corpus Codification.....	28
1.2. Description of the Teachers’ Interview.....	28

2.1 Data Discussion and Analysis.....	29
2.1.1. Analysis of the Results of the Corpora Analysis.....	29
2.1.1.1. The Use of Interactive MD in the Corpus.....	31
2.1.1.2. The Use of Transitions in the Corpus.....	33
2.1.1.3. The Use of Frame Markers in the Corpus.....	35
2.1.1.4. The Use of Endophoric Markers in the Corpus.....	37
2.1.1.5. The Use of Evidentials in the Corpus.....	38
2.1.1.6. The Use of Code Glosses in the Corpus	39
2.1.1.7. The Use of Interactional MD in the Corpus.....	40
2.1.1.8. The Use of Hedges in the Corpus.....	41
2.1.1.9. The Use of Boosters in the Corpus.....	42
2.1.1.10. The Use of Attitude Markers in the 2.2.1. Corpus.....	43
2.1.1.11. The Use of Engagement Markers in the Corpus.....	44
2.1.1.12. The Use of Self-Mentions in the Corpus.....	45
2.1.2. Overall Analysis of the Results generated by the Corpus Analysis.....	46
2.1.3. Analysis of the Results of the Teachers' Interview.....	48
3.1. Limitations of the Study.....	67
Conclusion.....	68
General Conclusion.....	71
References.....	73
Résumé.....	76
ملخص.....	77

General Introduction

General Introduction.....	1
1. Background of the Study.....	1
2. Statement of the Problem	3
3. Aim of the Study.....	4
4. Research Question.....	4
5. Means of Research.....	4
6. Structure of the Dissertation.....	4

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study

In the last three recent decades or so, academic writing theory, research, and pedagogy have witnessed an interesting shift in perspective: academic writing which has long been considered to be a cognitive act is now being regarded rather as a primarily social/interactive act, thus leading to the emergence of social-interactive theories of discourse. As a result of this shift, academic discourse is no longer been regarded as reflective of absolute and universal scientific truth, but, instead, it is viewed as a social construction of a possible interpretation of a scientific reality by members of a disciplinary community. Following this view, each disciplinary community develops its proper set of conventions and constraints upon the type of discourse that should be produced and accepted by its members. Hence, in order to write persuasively to a given disciplinary academic community, writers should abide by the core principles of academic writing which are deeply rooted in the epistemology of their domain ,show awareness about the expectations of their readers, and, equally important, demonstrate the required level of caution about advancing potentially controversial stances, findings, and conclusions. To achieve this challenging aim especially to non-native English users, academic writers are required to deploy adequate metadiscursive tools. Metadiscourse, then, refers to ‘textual communication within an academic community’ (Lo, Othman, & Lim, 2020, p. 272).Hence, an emphasis on the interpersonal function of metadiscourse markers in academic texts was brought to light. That is, research on writing in academic contexts began to focus on the interactional metadiscourse features that academic writers use to voice their opinions and ideas in their texts.

In 1970s, Lautamatti (cited in Al-Rubaye, 2015, p. 22) pointed out that text’s features are of two categories: topical (propositional) and non-topical (metalinguistic).In this regard,

Schiffrin's (.....)study, which appears to be the first empirical research conducted in the field, suggests that language is not used only to inform, but also to create social interactions. This contribution to metadiscourse is of high significance, for Schiffrin was almost the only voice in the early 1980s who called attention to the importance of interactional features in language. An ever-growing number of theory and research on academic discourse including the above-mentioned researchers support the view that interactivity in academic texts is achieved through the use of metadiscourse. Consequently, academic writing is now viewed as an act of identity, communicating not solely propositional content, but also mirroring the epistemological convictions of the writer as well as his/her identity (Hyland, 2002). In other words, academic writing is an interactive act aimed at establishing a rational dialogue with readers belonging to an established disciplinary community through the deployment of appropriate metadiscourse tools.

In recent years, a number of scholars has focused on the study of the use of metadiscourse in both PhD theses and master dissertations. Interest in the study of metadiscourse in these two types of high stake academic texts has been motivated by the fact that these texts require graduate and postgraduate students to demonstrate an adequate content knowledge coupled with an acceptable level of awareness to metadiscourse elements. Academic writing that is performed with poor knowledge and awareness of metadiscourse elements is problematic (Lo et al, 2020).

As far as the significance of master dissertations is concerned, Hyland (2004) points out that "The dissertation is a formidable task of intimidating length and exacting expectations which represents what is potentially achievable by individuals writing in a language that is not their own".(p. 134) Therefore, master dissertations are considered to be significantly important for the postgraduates.

However, despite the great importance allotted to the study metadiscourse in dissertations in applied linguistics literature, few studies have investigated the use of metadiscourse markers in master dissertations in the Algerian EFL context and the problems that the use of these important yet challenging features Algerian master students.

2.Statement of the Problem

The dissertation is the most demanding piece of writing that students of Applied Linguistics are required to write by the end of their training course. It presents a long argument aimed at persuading an academic audience of the relevance of a solution to a research problem. In this regard, the general introduction plays a key role in introducing the reader to the topic being researched, persuade him about the need to embark on the study in question, and informs him about the methodology being used. The strength of this argument depends primarily on an adequate and crafty use of metadiscourse markers. The definition of the aforementioned term has been manifested in the light of different perspectives since the term was first introduced by Harris in 1959. Harris (1991) suggested that metadiscourse is a technique of understanding language in use, representing a writer's or speaker's attempts to guide audience's perception of texts (as cited in Hyland, 2005).

As far as the use of metadiscourse in master dissertations is concerned, Algerian master students of Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching encounter enormous difficulties in deploying the right discourse markers to craft their argument. In the light of this, the present study attempts to explore the following question:

what are the problems encountered by Algerian students in writing general introductions to master dissertations in Applied Linguistics?

3.Aim of the Study

In the light of what has been mentioned above , the present study aims at exploring the type and sources of students' problems in the use of metadiscourse in writing general introductions of master dissertations. The findings of this study will ,hopefully, provide some insights for a more effective articulation of the teaching of metadiscourse features in academic writing especially at the master's level.

4.Methodologyand Means of Research

To achieve the aim of the present study, a corpus consisting of 15 randomly selected general introductions of master dissertations pertaining to the field of TEFL written by Algerian non-native postgraduates at University of Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia . The metadiscourse items used in the general introductions collected are identified, classified and analyzed .It is worth noting that the present study uses Hyland's taxonomy of metadiscourse.To shed light on the causes of the problems encountered by Algerian master students of TEFL in the use of metadiscourse features, an interview was designed and implemented to the supervisors of the dissertations selected for the study.

5.The Structure of the Study

The present dissertation comprises three chapters. Chapter one addresses the issue of academic writing with a specific focus on the genre-based approach. This approach is a textual top-down approach to academic writing which deemed suitable to articulating the teaching/learning of metadiscourse features in the writing course across the English curriculum. As for chapter two, it deals specifically with the concept of metadiscourse through reviewing its definitions, role, taxonomies and different classifications as well as the significance of its use in dissertations. Finally, Chapter three presents the practical part of this study and focuses on data collection techniques used , the sampling procedure, an account of the methodology of analysis

adopted , the discussion of the findings generated bythe two research tools used to achieve the aims of the present study, namely corpus analysis and the interview.

Chapter One: Academic Writing: the Need for a Genre-based

Instruction

1.2. Academic Writing

Introduction

1.1.1 Definition of Academic Writing.....	7
1.1.2. The significance of Writing in English in Foreign Language Classes.....	8
1.1.3. Approaches to Academic Writing.....	8
1.2. The Genre-based Approach to writing.....	9
1.2.1. The Genre-based Approach to Teaching writing.....	9
1.2.1.1. The Merits of the Genre-based Approach to writing.....	10

Conclusion

ChapterOne
Academic Writing: the Need for a Genre-based
Instruction

Introduction

As a result of the coming of age of the field of English for academic purposes (EAP), academic writing has been increasingly attracting the attention and interest of an ever-growing number of researchers and teachers around the globe. The present chapter will review the major approaches to academic writing with a specific focus on the genre-based approach. This review aims at showcasing need for textual approach susceptible to raise learners' awareness to academic writing as a disciplinary interactive practice governed by a set of socially constructed principles and constraints, one major element of which is without doubt metadiscourse.

1.1.1.1 Definition of Academic Writing

Given that students' grasp of content in most subjects across the university English curriculum in general and the master course in particular is assessed on the basis of written examinations, writing, thus, should be considered the most important skill that should be mastered by university students of English especially at the master's level, where they are required to produce a dissertation. Interestingly, Byrne (1993) claims that writing is "essentially a solitary activity and the fact that we required to write on our own, without the possibility of interaction or the benefit of feedback, in itself makes the act of writing difficult" (p.4). However, Byrne's (1993) definition wrongly confounds synchronous feedback and asynchronous interaction in the act of writing.

Hyland (2011), on the other hand, has questioned this widely held view, arguing that "modern conceptions of learning to write see writing as a social practice" (p. 31). In this respect,

he rightly advances that “while every act of writing is in a sense both personal and individual, it is also interactional and social, expressing a culturally recognized purpose, reflecting a particular kind of relationship and acknowledging an engagement in a given community. (Hyland, 2011, p. 31). This social constructivist view to writing marks an important shift from considering it to be a merely solitary interaction-free act to the more accurate view which is considered to be a social interactional one, that is, primarily interactive.

1.1.2. The Significance of Writing in English as a Foreign Language Classes

Writing is a significantly needed skill in all fields for both professional and personal purposes. According to Bowker (2007), “writing is a skill that is required in many contexts throughout life. For instance, you can write an email to a friend or reflect on what happened during the day in your personal diary” (p. 2). In other words, he who possesses the skill of writing, can fulfil his social needs. In fact, as Chris Tribble argued “to be deprived of the opportunity to learn to write is ... to be excluded from a wide range of social roles” (as cited in Harmer, 2004, p. 3). In other words, writing is quite important to perform certain social roles and, therefore, to function in a given society. In the context of education, however, according to Harmer (2004), most exams, regardless of the abilities they measure, often rely on the student’s writing ability to measure their *savoir-faire* (p. 3).

1.1.3. Approaches to Academic Writing

In modern literature of academic writing, three key approaches to teaching writing can be identified: a product approach, a process approach, and a genre-based approach. The name attributed to each approach indicates the aspect of writing that the approach in question takes as its focal element.

The product approach represents, according to Elashri and Ibrahim (2013), a traditional view of teaching writing in which instructor, typically, provide their learners with a model

text and encourages them to mimic it in order to produce a similar product (p. 4). In other words, as its name suggests, this approach focuses on the final product of writing. Hence, according to Elashri and Ibrahim (2013), this approach has been criticized for neglecting the cognitive dimension of the writing act: writers generally go through a set of stages before producing the final draft which they present to the readers (p. 6).

As a result of discontent with the weaknesses of the product approach, writing theorists and researchers proposed an alternative approach based on insights gained from the study of writing processes among professional writers, namely the process approach. This approach, according to Elashri and Ibrahim (2013), focuses more on using techniques such as brainstorming, exploring ideas, peer editing, and rewriting. That is to say, this approach focuses on the process of writing itself (p. 4).

Finally, the genre based approach, which, according to Elashri and Ibrahim (2013), is a top-down textual approach to teaching explicitly and comprehensively all the necessary features of the text types that students are to write. That is, it is geared towards raising awareness to and training in the production of the different types of texts and their specific corresponding features based on a thorough discourse analysis of the target texts. (p. 8) A genre based approach should focus not only on the form of communication but also on the social action it is used to accomplish (Miller, 1984, as cited in Elashri & Ibrahim, 2013, p. 10). In addition to providing learners with an explicit and comprehensive description of all the features constituting the target text type, this approach also provides sample information about the relevant set of principles and constraints established by the discourse community as rules for achieving the communicative goals of the texts in question (p. 13).

1.2. The Genre-based Approach to Writing

1.2.1. The Genre-based Approach to Teaching Writing

Recurring communicative practices result into the establishment of a set of generic features that define the text types that mediate the textual communication during those events. This leads to the emergence of relatively stable text types which are easily recognized by the members of a given academic community precisely because they contain the tacitly or explicitly agreed upon discursive features. The essay, the research article, the dissertation, and the thesis are examples of genres that mediate communication within disciplinary communities and for which each academic discipline has established a set of defining discursive features. According to Badger and White (2000), genre-based approaches view writing as “essentially concerned with knowledge of language, and as being tied closely to a social purpose” (Badger & White, 2000, p. 156). That is, writing differs as the social context differs whereas the development of writing is seen as the analysis and mimicking of models presented by the teacher to their students. This seems similar to the product approach, but they are different in the fact that the genre based approach stresses the social nature of writing.

1.2.1.1. Merits of the Genre-based Approach to Teaching Writing

The genre-based approach has manifestly a number of advantages. This approach takes into consideration the text as a meaningful whole and does not limit itself to the description and presentation confined to the sentence level. Moreover, this top-down approach is geared towards the explicit presentation of the generic features of the genres pertaining to a given discipline and hence this approach enables learners to grasp more easily the generic structure of established academic genres. Moreover, as far as the focus of the present study is concerned, since the Genre-based approach to writing highlights the social nature of writing, it highlights the role of metadiscourse in academic writing. As far as the social dimension is concerned, Amirusefi and Rasekh (2010), point out that writing is more than just the communication of ideas; Rather, it is a social act which allows both writers and readers to interact with each other (p. 159) through

the manipulation of conventional discursive tools through which ideas and intended meanings are presented and understood (p. 161).When crafting an academic text,the author does not only communicate a factual content,but also manifests his identity,his evaluation,and his reaction to the anticipated expectations of his audience;in other words,he uses metadiscourse.

Conclusion

While subsuming the advantages of the product and process approaches, the genre-based approach showcase the fact that writing is a social act.When engaging in this act, the writer does not only expresses a content,but equally important he asserts a stance vis-à-vis that content,manifests a persona,and negotiate the potentially controversial views against the backdrop of the anticipated expectations of his disciplinary audience.

Chapter two: The Role of Metadiscourse in Academic Writing

Introduction

1.1. Definition of Metadiscourse.....	13
1.1.2. Identification of Metadiscourse Markers.....	13
1.1.3. Principles of Metadiscourse.....	14
1.1.4. Taxonomies of Metadiscourse.....	15
1.1.4.1. Vande Kopple’s Mode.....	16
1.1.4.2. Crismore et al’s model	17
1.1.4.3. Hyland’s model.....	19
1.2. Metadiscourse and Writing.....	21
1.2.1. The Role of Metadiscourse.....	21
1.2.2. The Structure of a Well-written General Introduction	23

Conclusion

Chapter two

The Role of Metadiscourse in Academic Writing

Introduction

The present chapter deals with the definitions of the key concepts related to metadiscourse and reviews its principles, taxonomies and relation to the academic act of writing. This review aims at showcasing the primordial role played by metadiscourse in the writing, in general, and academic writing, in particular.

1.1. Definition of Metadiscourse

Since the term was first coined by Harris in 1959, an ever-growing number of definitions of metadiscourse have been proposed. First, Williams (1981) defines metadiscourse as “writing about writing” (as cited in Wei et al., 2016, p. 194). This definition suggests that metadiscourse is at a different level from the subject matter being addressed in the text in which both are used. In the same vein, VandeKopple (1985) suggests that metadiscourse goes far beyond propositional level of writing ; it enables the readers of the text in question to “organize, classify, interpret, evaluate, and react to such material” (Kopple 1985, as cited in Amirousetfi&Rasekh,2010, p. 160). On the other hand, and in a clear departure from this traditional view, Hyland (2005) argues that “metadiscourse embodies the idea that communication is more than just the exchange of information, goods or services, but also involves the personalities, attitudes and assumptions of those who are communicating” (Hyland,2005, as cited in Amirousetfi& Rasekh,2010, p. 159). In other words, metadiscourse encompasses both the propositional level of writing , that is the factual data being communicated as well as the manifestation of the author’s presence in the text.

1.1.2. Identification of Metadiscourse Markers

Hyland (2015) argues that no simple form-function correspondences exist to identify metadiscourse markers. He further explains that it is not a close category but rather an open one to which brand new items can be added depending on the writer's needs (p. 4). Hyland (2015) bestowed a list of steps one can follow to identify metadiscourse markers (p. 4). The list is as follows:

1/ The analyst starts searching for linguistic forms, under the condition that he/ she regards these forms as expressions with specific functions that are discourse-oriented.

2/ The analyst in question extracts all the occurrences of linguistic forms which possibly signal metadiscoursal functions, this is done "either from a pre-defined list or those from within a target text itself (e.g. Hyland, 2005)". (Hyland, 2015, p. 4)

3/ The retrieved items are not particularly exclusively metadiscursive ones, for they are still open to the possibility of performing other functions withal, even in the very same stretched piece of discourse. Resultantly, the items in question are put under scrutiny to examine the role they are actually playing in the analysed text. Are they used to contribute in the development of information in the text or to the organization of these information or the writer's attitude to them?

4/ The analyst in question attempts to examine the functions performed by the larger unit in the text by examining lexico-grammatical co-occurrence patterns, or what items occur with. Irrelevant linguistic forms are eliminated.

According to Hyland (2015), an analysis that follows the above mentioned steps can obtain an overview of the occurrence and distribution of metadiscourse markers in a particular text. This authorises comparisons across contexts of use (p. 4).

1.1.3 Principles of Metadiscourse

According to Hyland's (2005) conceptualization of the term metadiscourse, it is manifested in a set of linguistic forms that serve metadiscorsal functions as opposed to non-metadiscorsal ones (p. 138). To make distinction between both categories, he sets three principles which are as follows :

1. Metadiscourse is Distinct from the Propositional Aspects of Discourse (Amiryousefi&Barati 2011, p. 5246). That is to say, in a given text, there is a clear dissimilarity between metadiscourse and propositional material. The latter is, as defined by Halliday (1994, p. 70) "... something that can be argued about, affirmed, denied, doubted, insisted upon, qualified, tempered, regretted and so on" (as cited in Sadeghi&Esmaili, 2012, p. 649). On the other hand, according to Hyland (2005), the role of metadiscourse is "to signal the writer's communicative intent in presenting propositional matter" (Hyland, 2005 as cited in Sadeghi&Esmaili, 2012, p. 649). Briefly, The two are quite dissimilar.

2. The term metadiscourse refers to those aspects of the text that embody reader-writer interactions (Amiryousefi&Barati 2011, p. 5246). This hereby rejects the strict duality of textual and interpersonal functions found in the early literature of metadiscourse. This suggests the idea that all metadiscourse is interpersonal since its features, according to Hyland and Tse (2004), take into account the "the reader's knowledge, textual experience, and processing needs and that it provides writers with an armory of rhetorical appeals to achieve this (as cited in Sadeghi&Esmaili , 2012, p. 649).

3. Metadiscourse distinguishes relations which are external to the text from those that are internal (Amiryousefi&Barati 2011, p. 5246). That is, metadiscourse refers only to the relations that are internal to the text. According to Hyland and Tse (2004) "an internal relation thus connects the situations described by the propositions and is solely communicative, while an

external relation refers to those situations themselves “(as cited in Sadeghi&Esmaili, 2012, p. 649)

1.1.4 Taxonomies of Metadiscourse

According to Ebrahimi, (2018);Harris (1952), Williams (1981), Crismore (1982), Goffman (1981) and VandeKopple (1985) were pioneers as far as working on metadiscourse is concerned, starting with general definitions of the term. Notwithstanding the fact that their definitions had a few functions, no precise classifications were presented. Of the pioneers in question, each presented some clarifications, justifications and classifications to deliver the picture so informative and clear that future researchers could take it further and finalise the picture such as Hyland who could present the final and most complete model of metadiscourse in writing in 2005 after successive modifications.(p. 91)

1.1.4.1VandeKopple’s Model

According toAmiryousefi&Barati (2011), of all models, VandeKopple’s is especially significant not only because it was the first systematic attempt to introduce a taxonomy that triggered lots of practical studies but also it gave rise to a number of new taxonomies (p. 5246).

According to Aguilar (2008), in 1980 VandeKopple argued that metadiscourse could be processed and recalled at another level that is not primary discourse (p. 68). The writer in question pointed that VandeKopple was a precursor of different studies (Meyer et al 1980; Chaudron& Richards 1986) which resultedin somewhat similar conclusions suggesting that some metadiscursive items have an unexpected minor facilitating role (p. 68). Aguilar (2008) also suggested that ,in 1985, VandeKopple put forward a definition of metadiscourse along the lines of Crismore's early studies in 1985 , for he followed Crismore's approach at the time (p. 68). Let alone, the author added, VandeKopple was the first to introduce Halliday's functions in 1985 in the study of metadiscourse; he assigned the ideational function to primary discourse and

the textual and interpersonal functions to metadiscourse (p. 67). Moreover, he identified the multifunctionality of some items and introduces a seventh type, which was labeled Commentary, which is the metadiscourse that the writer uses to directly address the reader and invite him or her to implicit dialogue. Vandekopple's classification (1985) of metadiscourse is of seven categories (p. 68).

Table 01: Kopple's Model of Metadiscourse (1985) (Amiryousefi&Barati 2011, p. 5250)

Table1. Vandekopple's Classification System for Metadiscourse (1985,pp.82-92)

Category	Function
Textual metadiscourse	
Text connectives	Used to help show how parts of a text are connected to one another. Includes sequencers (first, next, in the second place), reminders (as I mentioned in chapter 2), and topicalizers, which focus attention on the topic of a text segment (with regard to, in connection with).
Code glosses	Used to help readers to grasp the writer's intended meaning. Based on the writer's assessment of the reader's knowledge, these devices reward, explain, define, or clarify the sense of a usage
Validity markers	Used to express the writer's commitment to the probability of or truth of a statement. These include hedges (perhaps, might, may), emphatics (clearly, undoubtedly), and attributers which enhance a position by claiming the support of a credible other (according to Einstein)
Narrators	Used to inform readers of the source of the information presented- who said or wrote something (according to smith, the Prime minister announced that).
Interpersonal metadiscourse	
Illocution markers	Used to make explicit the discourse acts the writer is performing at certain points (to conclude, I hypothesize, to sum up, we predict)
Attitude markers	Used to express the writer's attitudes to the propositional material he or she presents (unfortunately, interestingly, I wish that, how awful that).
commentaries	Used to address readers directly, drawing them into an implicit dialogue by commenting on the reader's probable mood or possible reaction to the text (you will certainly agree that, you might want the third chapter first).

Vandekopple's classification of metadiscourse seem to be manifested in two major categories. The first two are textual; they includes: text connectives (e.g. first) and code glosses (e.g. that is). The second category, notwithstanding, is that of interpersonal metadiscourse . It includes illocution Markers (e.g. to sum up), narrators (Mr Jones said), validity markers (clearly), attitude markers (e.g. luckily), and commentaries (e.g. most of you will oppose the idea that).

Amiryousefi and Barati (2011) pointed that the categories of Kopple’s model are vague and functionally overlap (p. 5246). They gave the example of Citation that “ can be used to enhance a position by claiming the support of a credible other (validity markers).They can also be used to show the source of the information” (Amiryousefi&Barati 2011, p. 5246).

1.1.4.2 Crismore et al’s Model

Pioneering work on metadiscourse can be traced back to the eighties. Crismore (1982, 1983,1984a/b, 1989c, 1990a/b) and VandeKopple (1985a/b 1990) are benchmark researchers mainly because their work was the first in a series of related research where other names and collaborations appear(Aguilar, 2008, p. 66).

Table02: Crismore et al’s Model of Metadiscourse(1993) (Amiryousefi&Barati 2011, p. 5250)

Table 2. Metadiscourse Categorization by Crismore et al. (1993, pp.47-54)

Category	Function	Examples
Textual metadiscourse		
1. Textual markers		
Logical connectives	Show connection between ideas	Therefore; so; in addition; and
Sequencers	Indicate sequence /ordering of material	First; next; finally; 1,2,3
Reminders	Refer to earlier text material	As we saw in chapter one
Topicalizers	Indicate a shift in topic	Well, now we discuss ...
2. Interpretive markers		
Code glosses	Explain text material	For example; that is
Illocution markers	Name the act performed	To conclude; in sum; I predict
Announcements	Announce upcoming material	In the next section
Interpersonal metadiscourse		
Hedges	Show uncertainty to the truth of assertion	Might; possible; likely
Certainty markers	Express full commitment to assertion	Certainly; know; shows
Attributers	Give source/support of information	Smith claims that ...
Attitude markers	Display writer’s affective values	I hope/agree; surprisingly
Commentary	Build relationship with reader	You may not agree that

According to Amiryousefi&Barati (2011), This revised model (Table.2) was introduced by Crismore et al. (1993) (p. 5246). The two major categories of textual and interpersonal were

kept; however, the subcategories were collapsed, separated, and reorganized. As you can see textual metadiscourse was further sundered into two subdivisions, “textual” and “interpretive” markers. Textual markers consist of those features that help organize the discourse, and interpretive markers are those features used to help readers to better interpret and understand the writer’s meaning and writing strategies (Crismore et al., 1993 as cited in Amiryousefi&Barati, 2011, p. 5246).

Notwithstanding Crismore (1993) et al.'s efforts to better Vande Koppel’s model, this revised model is still problematic, it is quite confusing. If we take reminders, for example, which refer to earlier text material, they are presented as textual; however, announcements, which announce upcoming material, are presented as interpretive. It seems ,to me, quite illogical that referring to earlier text material helps organize the discourse,but announcing upcoming material helps readers to better interpret and understand the writer’s meaning and writing strategies.

1.1.4.3. Hyland’s Model

According to Amiryousefi&Barati (2011), the model introduced by Hyland (2005), however, consists of two major categories, “interactive” and “interactional. The former concerns the writer’s awareness of the target reader, and his or her attempts to accommodate his or her interests and needs, and to render the argument persuasive of him or her. Interactional metadiscourse, however, refers to the writer’s attempts to render his or her stance explicit, and to engage the target reader by anticipating his reactions to the text (see Table.3) (p. 5246). The two categories are further divided into subcategories and, according to Hyland (2015), they are as follows:

“*Interactive resources* allow the writer to manage the information flow to explicitly establish his or her preferred interpretations. They include the following:

- ◆ **Transitions** comprise an array of devices, mainly conjunctions, used to mark additive, contrastive, and consequential steps in the discourse, as opposed to the external world.
- ◆ **Frame markers** are references to text boundaries or elements of schematic text structure, including items used to sequence, to label text stages, to announce discourse goals and to indicate topic shifts.
- ◆ **Endophoric markers** make additional material salient and available to the reader in recovering the writer's intentions by referring to other parts of the text.
- ◆ **Evidentials** indicate the source of textual information which originates outside the current text.
- ◆ **Code glosses** signal the restatement of ideational information.

Interactional resources focus on the participants of the interaction and display the writer's persona and a tenor consistent with community norms. They include these subcategories:

- ◆ **Hedges** mark the writer's reluctance to present propositional information categorically.
- ◆ **Boosters** express certainty and emphasise the force of propositions.
- ◆ **Attitude markers** express the writer's appraisal of propositional information, conveying surprise, obligation, agreement, importance, and so on.
- ◆ **Engagement markers** explicitly address readers, either by selectively focusing their attention or by including them as participants in the text through second person pronouns, imperatives, question forms and asides.

Self mentions suggest the extent of author presence in terms of first person pronouns and possessives.”(pp. 3-4)

Table03: Hyland's Model of Metadiscourse(2005) (Amiryousefi&Barati 2011, p. 5250)

Table 3. An Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005, p.49)

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

In short, of the above-mentioned models, all are based on one rationale suggesting a strict duality of functions.

1.2. Metadiscourse and Writing

Knowledge and awareness of grammar are quite significant in the act of writing, but they are not sufficient. Effective academic writing requires also the deployment of metadiscourse so as to promote the writers' ideas and make them acceptable to the intended audience.

1.2.1 The Role of Metadiscourse

According to Aguilar, Cheng and Steffensen (2008) pointed out that writing is a meaning-making process in which both the writer and the reader negotiate and interact (p. 76). In this respect, they argued that metadiscourse can assist writers in producing more accessible and friendly texts that live up to the expectations and appeal to the epistemological convictions of their audience (p. 76). In other words, interacting with the audience is crucial for writers in many different aspects and metadiscourse provides writers with the linguistic tools that are amenable to creating a dialogue (Thompson and Thetela 1995; Hyland 2000, 2001a; Thompson

2001; Le 2004, as cited in Aguilar, 2008, p. 98). Metadiscourse, then, is the set of linguistic tools that allow writers to sound respectable, credible and persuasive among their intended audience (Aguilar, 2008), p. 98). That is to say, to achieve their subtle communicative aims, writers need to create a credible textual persona or ethos and develop an appropriate attitude towards their readers and the claims they assert. In the construction of this textual persona, metadiscourse plays a vital role (Dafouz-Milne, 2008, p. 96).

Furthermore, the use of metadiscourse markers as one of the factors leading to reader-friendly texts has been increasingly attracting the attention of researchers of academic writing (Crismore, 1993, as cited in Ebrahimi, 2018, p. 90). In this respect, Cheng and Steffensen discussed the extent to which metadiscourse can help improve student writing. Taking audience as a conceptualised dynamic force (community), they define the place where discourse occurs as the forum and metadiscourse as a means to create a forum and evoke a sense of audience in student writers. (Aguilar,2008, p. 96). In fact, according to Aguilar (2008), of the research findings, some such as that of Cheng and Steffensen (1996) revealed that students' writing skills are susceptible to improve as a result of exposure to instruction dealing with the different metadiscourse features (p. 76).

In addition, according to Ebrahimi (2018), Crismore (1982) argues that in order for a writer to signal a shift in the subject or arriving at a conclusion, that what is added is more or less reliable, or to assure the significance of their ideas, they use some metadiscourse markers in most texts. No definition of terms , acknowledgement of difficult lines of thought or even reference to the existence of an audience can occur without the deployment of the right metadiscourse features (p. 91). Furthermore, according to Ebrahimi (2018), Crismore (1982) stated that the responsibility of providing appropriate transition statement to move from one idea to the next and to place signals in the text regularly, so the reader/ listener can see how the text is

intended together, falls on the writer/ speaker. These signals are called metadiscourse markers (p. 91). The receiver of the message will better understand the author's text plan if he knows metadiscourse awareness and strategies of using it (Crismore& Farnsworth, 1990, as cited in Ebrahimi, 2018, p. 91).

Additionally, metadiscourse can fulfill a set of purposes as far as readers' comprehension is concerned, be they native or non-native. For instance, metadiscourse can play a facilitative role in the processing of the information presented in the texts, showcase the stance of the writer towards the texts and the information included, and mediate the negotiation of the stance and engagement with the text (Hyland, 2005, as cited in Ebrahimi, 2018, p. 90). Having said that, the readers expect to find their texts signalled with metadiscourse markers in a way that suffices them to understand the intended meaning from the texts easily and explicitly (Hyland, 2005, as cited in Ebrahimi, 2018, p. 90). According to Ebrahimi (2018), non-native speakers, however, seem to have more interest in the existence or non-existence of metadiscourse features since it is more significant for them to facilitate reading comprehension (p. 90). In other words, they search for these markers to help them to decode the meaning intended by the writer.

Metadiscourse has a significant role in facilitating a reader-writer interaction in texts and persuading the readers, developing student's writing skill, providing a smooth move between text sentences, clauses, and paragraphs, hence making it easier for the reader to follow and understand the writer's line of thought.

1.2.2 The Structure of a Well-written General Introduction

According to Boubekeur (2021), general introduction writing is extremely fundamental, for it is the second part that is read by target reader right after the abstract (p, 3). Resultantly, he

suggested a number of steps to consider for a well-written general introduction. According to Boubekour (2021), They are as follows:

1. General description of the areas of concern, around (2 paragraphs).
2. Significance of the study (why this research is important).
 - Include explicit statement of significance specific to the research.
 - Why is it important to conduct the study?
 - This section will probably not be very long but it should be very powerful.
3. State the aim of the research
4. Problem Statement;
 - Identify the purpose of the research explicitly.
 - The introduction should lead up to and provide support for the problem statement.
5. Research questions and hypotheses.
6. Research Methodology (how did the researcher conduct the study).
 - Research tools (surveys, observation, etc.)
 - Participants and setting (case study).
7. Dissertation division (how many chapters does the memoir have?)
 - Brief description of each chapter
8. Summarize the major results
9. Conclusions. (p. 3)

To conclude, the general introduction of a master dissertation is of a significant status . that is, the value and function attached by writers to their general introductions are quite crucial in addressing their research to scholars and readers who are from the same research community – and those who are not ,yet are interested in the topic. Resultantly, it should be well written by follow a number of steps.

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed definitions of the concept metadiscourse its principles, classifications and its relation to the academic activity of writing. Furthermore, this review has attempted to showcase the primordial role played by metadiscourse in enabling the writer to assume an identity, to craft a stance, and to negotiate potentially controversial claims in response to the hypothetical expectations of a disciplinary audience. Moreover, metadiscourse enables readers especially non-native speakers to understand the subtle messages encoded in the

text,decipher the writer's stance regarding the issue being discussed,and notice his epistemological positioning.

Chapter Three: Field Work

Introduction

1.1 The Corpus Analysis	27
1.1.1 The Sample.....	27
1.1.2. Description of the Corpora Analysis	27
1.1.3. Corpus Codification.....	28
1.2. Description of the Teachers' Interview.....	28
2.1 Data Discussion and Analysis.....	29
2.1.1. Analysis of the Results of the Corpora Analysis.....	29
2.1.1.1. The Use of Interactive MD in the Corpus.....	31
2.1.1.2. The Use of Transitions in the Corpus.....	33
2.1.1.3. The Use of Frame Markers in the Corpus.....	35
2.1.1.4. The Use of Endophoric Markers in the Corpus.....	37
2.1.1.5. The Use of Evidentials in the Corpus.....	38
2.1.1.6. The Use of Code Glosses in the Corpus	39
2.1.1.7. The Use of Interactional MD in the Corpus.....	40
2.1.1.8. The Use of Hedges in the Corpus.....	41
2.1.1.9. The Use of Boosters in the Corpus.....	42
2.1.1.10. The Use of Attitude Markers in the 2.2.1. Corpus.....	43
2.1.1.11. The Use of Engagement Markers in the Corpus.....	44
2.1.1.12. The Use of Engagement Markers in the Corpus.....	45
2.1.2. Overall Analysis of the Results generated by the Corpus Analysis.....	46
2.1.3. Analysis of the Results of the Teachers' Interview.....	48

3.1. Limitations of the Study	67
Conclusion	
GeneralConclusion.....	71
References.....	73
Résumé.....	76
ملخص.....	77

ChapterTwo

Fieldwork

Introduction

In the light of the review of the literature related to the role played by MD in academic texts, the practical part of the present study investigates the type and sources of students' problems in the use of MD in writing GIs of master dissertations. In this regard, the first part provides a quantitative and qualitative description of the use of MD markers in the GIs of a sample of dissertations selected on the basis of convenience. The dissertations in question have been written by non-native students of English specializing in the didactics of foreign languages at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University in Jijel. It is worth noting that Hyland's model of MD (2005) has been adopted as a framework for conducting this analysis. As for the second part of the study, it is devoted to gauging the causes of master students' problems in using MD features revealed in the first part. To achieve this aim, an interview has been designed and administered to a sample of five supervisors selected at random among those who supervised the dissertations selected for the afore-mentioned analysis.

1.1. The Corpora Analysis

1.1.1. The Sample

In my attempt to seek a relevant and reliable answer to the aforementioned research question, a sample of fifteen (15) master dissertations produced by master two students specialising in the didactics of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia university in Jijel. It should be noted that the sample has been randomly selected on the basis of convenience.

1.1.2. Description of the Corpora Analysis

In order to investigate the use of the MD markers used by the different writers of master dissertations' GIs, this study was conducted. The

corpus selected for this study consists of 15 master dissertations' GIs collected from a non-native English speaking university, Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University in Jijel. The analysis of this corpus was based on the concept of obligatory context defined by Brown, as "Each obligatory context can be regarded as a kind of test item which the [subject] passes by supplying the required morpheme or fails by supplying none or one that is incorrect" (as cited in Disbrow-Chen 2004, p. 11). Accordingly, each instance of the obligatory context is counted when there is a correct, erroneous or no use of a metadiscourse marker in the analysed corpus. Moreover, To ensure the validity and reliability of the results of the analysis in hand, I have used three raters including myself to analyse the samples. To ensure further validity and reliability , the analysis have been revised by the raters after a week period of the analysis in question. To conduct the analysis, Hyland's (2005) model of MD has been used ; for ,according to Abdi, Tavangar&Tavakkoli (2010), it is simple, clear and comprehensible(as cited in Duruk , 2017,p. 4)

1.1.3. Corpus Codification

In order to preserve complete anonymity of the writers of the analysed samples, codification of the analysed corpus has been adopted. That is, to keep the identity of the writers of the samples confidential, texts constituting the analysed corpus were codified in the form of a two-letter acronym and a number. The two letters denote the phrase "general introduction" (GI); the latter is followed by a number (from 1 to 15) for further illustrative and statistical purposes. An example of this would be GI1.

1.2. Description of the Teachers' Interview:

In order to support the data generated from the corpus analysis, a teachers' interview was conducted. Five (05) supervisors of the analysed master dissertations were interviewed. Two of them were interviewed online. As for these two, no direct quotes were included in this chapter since it was impossible to record them. For it is an important aspect of conducting quality research is to make sure that the values included in one's research are but a real accurate reflection of the person's thoughts when they answered the questions in the interview, after the transcription of the interviews, I have resorted to data cleaning to resolve any type of inconsistencies. I have been going through the data, going back to the recorded interview or the notes for those participants who were interviewed online and checking them multiple times to ensure that each response of each participant included in this chapter corresponds 100 % to the responses bestowed by participants.

2.1. Data Discussion and Analysis:

2.1.1. Analysis of the Results of the Corpora Analysis

Table 04 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Metadiscourse in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Interactive MD	759	84.57	The following questions	08.74	first	00.95	further
Transitions	255	90.37	In addition, moreover	07.19	Therefore, moreover	02.43	And, then
Frame Markers	182	72.49	Next	25.19	First, second	00.00	

Endophoric Markers	123	100	The following, the following research questions	00.00		00.00	
Evidentials	148	86.67	According to Deborah Tannen (1986), (Holmes 1991, p. 210)	00.00		00.00	
Code Glosses	51	73.33	Such as	11.33	In other words	00.00	
Interactional MD	156	53.07	We	10.27	We	00.66	In fact
Hedges	59	86.67	Can, may	00.00		00.00	
Boosters	12	50.00	Actually	06.67	In fact	03.33	In fact
Attitude Markers	41	58.67	Most importantly	14.67	Interestingly	00.00	
Engagement Markers	02	00.00		10.00	Note that	00.00	
Self-Mentions	42	66.67	We, us	00.00		00.00	

The table above shows that master two students of applied linguistics, TEFL, of the non-native English speaking university Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University, in Jijel, use all types of metadiscourse, yet this use is manifested in three main categories for each type. First of all, the first category is correct use which , as you can see, is of the highest frequency amongst the rest two categories for each type of metadiscourse but that of the engagement markers type (00%). Then, the second category is that of no use of metadiscourse. The latter is of a low frequency to a no frequency at all. Finally, the last category is that of Erroneous use.

The frequency of the latter is very significantly low to none. Frame markers represent the highest frequency in this category with a percentage of 02.32, followed by transitions that are of 01.48 per cent. The rest of types are of no frequency.

The table above also shows that in the category of correct use, the use of Interactive MD (84.75%) is significantly more frequent than that of Interactional MD (53.73%) while in the second category, no use, it is the no use of Interactional MD (10.27%) that is more frequent. Interestingly, you can see that in the last category, erroneous Use, Interactive MD (00.76%) is of a so significantly low frequency whilst Interactional MD is of a zero.

The analysis of the frequency of each category mentioned above is provided separately below.

2.1.1.1. The Use of Interactive MD in the Corpus

Table 05 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Interactive MD in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Interactive MD	759	84.57	The following questions	08.74	First	00.95	Further

As the table above demonstrates, the use of interactive MD was divided into three categories. The table, also, shows that the correct use of the former is of a high frequency (84.57%) compared to its frequency of no use (08.74%) and that of erroneous use (00.95%). Given that this type of MD assists the researcher, in managing the data flow to explicitly establish their favoured interpretations and arguments; the fully correct use of such type is required to craft a genuinely adequate piece of writing, including the general

introductions of master dissertations that are per se a long argument crafted for the sole purpose of conveying the audience of the relevant field of study to believe in a certain hypothesis. Having said that, the frequency of the no use along with that of the erroneous use should be way less than what have been found in this analysis which is quite problematic. An example of correct use can be seen in GI1 in which the writers have used an interactive MD, an endophoric marker, to refer to information that are mentioned in another part of the same dissertation. They have used “the above research questions” in the part that is devoted to research hypothesis to refer to the research questions that were mentioned in the part that is devoted to research questions: “**From the above research questions**, we hypothesize...”

It seems that the writers have successfully supplied the right MD marker in the right place. On the other hand, there seem to be instances in which a given MD marker should be used, according to the principles of obligatory context. Nevertheless, the MD marker in question has not been supplied at all. For instance, the interactive MD marker “first”, which is a frame marker, has not been used in GI1 in the following text : “as a rich field of study, text anxiety has been investigated by several researchers.**[First]** A study conducted in Pakistan...In addition, Alam (2013) investigated...”. The writers have stated a number of studies conducted in their field of interest, yet they have not used an interactive MD, specifically a frame marker, to organise the different sequences of this text. In other words, they failed by supply none of interactive MD. Along with correct use and no use of interactive MD markers, there are, also, manifestations of erroneous use of the former. An example of this would be when the writers of the GI1 used “further”, which is a transition, instead of a frame marker, “finally”, in the following sentence “The test is consisted of four sections, each one aims to investigate particular area, **further** the students must answer using specific statements mentioned in the test paper.”. The writers have used this sentence as a concluding sentence to a paragraph

entitled “Means of Research”, having said that, and according to the raters who conducted the analysis, the frame marker “finally” would be the proper discourse marker to use.

2.1.1.2. The Use of Transitions in the Corpus

Table 06 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Transitions in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Transitions	255	90.37	In addition, moreover	07.19	Therefore, moreover	02.43	And, then

The correct use of transitions have occupied the second rank in the analysed samples (see the table above). It has exceeded 90% of obligatory context which indicates that the students in question have succeeded in demonstrating an adequate use of this MD feature which is quite significant, it may affect the crafting of an adequate general introduction, due to the fact that the latter is a long argument which needs to be logical and cohesive. This is only realised through a fully correct use of transitions. An example of correct use of this particular discourse marker can be seen in GI2 in which the writers have used a transition to express semantic relations between clauses. They have used “therefore” to mark consequential steps in the discourse. “Modern approaches to teaching shifted the attention to students and argued that student-centered classes might be more effective than their teacher-centered counterparts. **Therefore**, students' involvement in the learning process has become their major concern. Drama.” As you can see the writers have successfully supply the right MD marker in the right place. But, there seem to be incidents in which a certain transition should be supplied, according to the principles of obligatory context, yet the MD marker in question has not been

used at all. For example, the transition “consequently” has not been used in GI2 in the following example : “The impact of this notion on language acquisition theory has been extraordinary due to the fact that Intercultural Communicative Competence enlarges learners’ knowledge and raises their awareness about the similarities and differences between the native and the target culture.”

“**[Consequently]** Modern approaches to teaching shifted the attention to students and argued that student-centered classes might be more effective than their teacher-centered counterparts.”. The writers have inserted an independent clause which is a result clause, nonetheless they have not used a transition to mark the transition from the cause to the effect. That is to say, they failed by supply no transition in this example. A side from the correct use and no use of transitions, note that there is, also, erroneous use of the former. an example of this would be in GI2 when the writers stated “Researchers...have proved that it is not enough to know the target language, to master its grammatical rules, and to memorize its vocabulary. **However**, besides being able to use the language correctly, one must also be able to use it appropriately”. According to the raters who analysed the GIs, although the relation between the first clause and the second one is a cause and effect relationship, the writers have used “however” which is a transition marking contrastive steps in the discourse. This by far is an erroneous use of the transition.

Overall, as far as the obligatory context is concerned and given that a subject is acquired by the learner when he or she correctly uses the former in 90 % of its obligatory context (Paul, 2007, p. 353), master two students seem to have a mastery over the use of transitions, this could be because these students have received proper training with regard to the use of such type of metadiscourse markers in the course of Academic Writing in their first

and second year at the university level. The latter made them familiar with how and when to use this particular type of metadiscourse.

2.1.1.3. The Use of Frame Markers in the Corpus

Table 07 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Frame Markers in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Frame Markers	182	72.49	Next	25.19	First, second	00.00	

The frequency of correct use of frame markers was not as high compared to the rest types (72.49%) (see the table above). Moreover, it indicates that the writers of the samples do not have a full mastery over the use of this feature. On the other hand, the frequency of the erroneous use of the former is of a zero; furthermore, the no use category of this type is of a fairly high frequency (25.19%). This indicates that the writers of the samples are more familiar with the correct use of frame markers but still ignorant of when to use them. This is problematic for the former is crucial to organise the text boundaries or elements of a schematic text structure, including an argumentative essay such as a general introduction. An example of correct use can be seen in GI2 in which the writers have used frame markers to refer to discourse sequences. They have used “first” and “second” to sequence their discourse and render it more comprehensible and logical for the reader “The researcher, nevertheless, recommended two things: **first**, teachers must take... interests; **second**, teachers must be provided with...” Note that the writers have successfully supplied the right MD marker in the right place. However, there seem to be incidents in which a given frame marker should be

supplied, according to the principles of obligatory context; nonetheless, the MD marker in question has not been used at all. For example, the frame marker “firstly” has not been used in IG2 in the following text : “Some studies which were carried in this respect are cited below.

[**Firstly**] Barreto (2014) studied language acquisition...”. The writers have listed a number of studies, nonetheless they have not use frame markers, to put them in order so to organise the different sequences of their discourse. In other words, they failed by supplying none of the frame markers in this case. A side from the correct use and no use of frame markers, you can see that there is no erroneous use of the former. The latter indicates that master two students are more familiar with how to use this particular type of metadiscourse then when to use it. This should not be the case for the students in question have studied the use of frame markers in middle school. This leads to hypothesise that students in middle school have been taught properly the use of frame markers, yet they have been taught more on how to use frame markers but not when to use them when they should.

2.1.1.4. The Use of Endophoric Markers in the Corpus

Table 08 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Endophoric Markers in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Endophoric Markers	123	100	the following research questions	00.00		00.00	

The correct use of endophoric markers have occupied the first rank in the analysed samples (100%) (see the table above). Both the no use and the erroneous use of the former are

of a zero frequency which indicates that the writers of the samples are quite familiar with the correct use of this type. An example of correct use for this type of MD would be in GI11 “In order to reach the aim of the current research **the following questions** will be asked:...”.

In this example the writers have used the endophoric marker “ the following questions” to refer to information that are in another part of the text, in this example the information are yet to come in the next two sentences. In other words, the writers have successfully supplied the right MD, the right endophoric marker, in the right place. This shows that these students have a complete mastery over the use of endophoric markers perhaps this could be due to the fact that they are implicitly taught how to use them through constant exposure to this discourse feature in handouts at the level of university.

2.1.1.5. The Use of Evidentials in the Corpus

Table 09 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Evidentials in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Evidentials	148	86.67	According to Deborah Tannen (1986)	00.00		00.00	

The frequency of the correct use of evidentials is quite high in the analysed samples; nonetheless, it is not high enough to claim that the writers of the samples have a mastery over the use of this type of MD (86.67%) (see the table above). This is problematic, for these students have receive training as far as the use of evidential is concerned in the course of Research Methodology in their second and third year of license. This leads me to hypothesise

that maybe this training was not enough for them to master the use of evidential which suggests an issue, for they can violate the rules of academia through plagiarism. An example of correct use of such type of MD marker can be seen in GI5 in which the writers state: “**According to Barnett (1988)**, reading strategies refer to ...”. The writers of this example have correctly used an evidential to refer to the source of information they have mentioned right after the use of this MD marker in order to avoid plagiarism, which indicates that these two students in particular are aware of the shortcomings of plagiarism.

Interestingly, just like the case of endophoric markers, both of the no use and the erroneous use of the former are of a zero frequency.

2.1.1.6. The Use of Code Glosses in the Corpus

Table 10 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Code Glosses in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Code Glosses	51	73.33	Such as	11.33	In otherwords	00.00	

The use of code glosses in the corpus, as can be seen in the table above, is manifested in two categories, correct use (73.33%) and no use (11.33%). The frequency of the correct use is high, yet not high enough to reach the standard of 90% . This indicates that master students have no mastery over the use of code glosses; this could be due to the fact that they have not been taught what they are or how to use them. An example of correct use of such type of MD marker can be seen in GI5 in which the writers state: “In addition to the printed sources, another major concern arises due to the technological development which is the

online sources **such as** internet-articles ...”. In this example, the writers have used a MD marker, a code gloss, to give examples of online sources for further clarifications. These writers seem to have supplied the right MD marker in the right place.

On the other hand, the frequency of the no use of the MD marker in question, although little, may affect the crafting of an adequate argumenive text, such as general introductions of master dissertations, for it helps signaling the restatement of Information. An example of no use of such type of MD marker can be seen in GI5 in which the writers state: “The use of the internet has become an important part of the learning process in and out of the class. [Namely] The internet provides a vast range of materials...”. The writers have given a factual statement followed by an explanatory statement to assist the reader to grasp the intended meaning. This requires the use of the code gloss “namely”, which they failed in supplying it by not using it.

2.1.1.7.The Use of Interactional MD in the Corpus

Table 11 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Interactional MD in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscour se markers	Obli gato ory Cont ext	Correct Use (frequen cy) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneo us Use (%)	Example(s)
Interactional MD	156	53.07	We	10.27	We	00.66	In fact

As you can see in the table above, the frequency of the correct use of Interactional MD in the analysed samples of the general introductions of master dissertations is quite low compared to the use of interactive MD, but both of their frequencies are not high enough to exceed 90% so to claim that the aforementioned students master the use of such type of MD. An example of correct use of interactional MD can be seen in GI15 in which the writers state:

“Wehypothesise ...”. The writers of this example have correctly used an interactional MD marker, a self mention, ”we” to make an explicit refer to them (the authors) to mark their presence.

Note that the no use of such type of MD, although little, may significantly impact the crafting of an adequate general introduction. An example of no use of interactional MD can be detected in GI15 in which the writers state: “Reading is considered as a complex process that requires many factors which may affect reader’s reading ability. [**In fact**] Some of the factors that cause difficulties are ...”. The writers have given a factual statement followed by a more specific detailed statement. This requires the use of the booster “in fact”, which they failed in supplying it by not using it.

The erroneous use, however, has a quite low frequency. An example of it can be seen in GI8 in which the writers state: “**Infact**, the main aim of studying English is to master the language and communicate with it fluently however....”. It is important to mention that the writers have introduced their general introduction with this statement; that is to say, they have started their general introduction with the booster “in fact” which is incorrect in this case, for the writers have not given a more general factual statement so it can be followed by this more specific detailed one. This requires the use of the booster “in fact”, which they failed in supplying it by not supplying a given clause before it.

All of this suggests that the writers of the analysed samples are unfamiliar with when to use of such type, and this indicates an issue; for , according to Hyland (2008) “those in the humanities and social sciences taking far more explicitly involved and personal positions than those in the science and engineering fields”(pp. 12-13). In other words, in the field of applied linguistics it is expected of the writer in the latter to correctly use such type of MD more than those writers who belong to the field of hard sciences.

2.1.1.8. The Use of Hedges in the Corpus

Table 12 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Hedges in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Hedges	59	86.67	Can, may	00.00		00.00	

The frequency of the correct use of hedges is, as you can see in the table above, relatively high in the samples analysed (86.67%). Nevertheless, this frequency is not high enough to exceed 90% so to claim that master two students who wrote the analysed samples have a mastery over the use of such type of MD, hedges. This is problematic because, in the field of applied linguistics, it is expect of the writer to correctly use such type of MD more than the writers in other fields. This is an issue, especially after all of the training these students have received, they have been taught how to use this specific MD marker at the level of middle school; secondary school and university, the grammar course. They should have a full mastery over the use of hedges, but surprisingly they do not. This leads me to suggest that there must be a problem with the approach (es) used to teach these students the use of hedges.

An example of correct use of interactional MD can be seen in GI8 in which the writers state: “The more students of third year have the feeling of fear of making errors the less they **could** perform effectively”. The writers have used the hedge “could” to mark their reluctance to present their full commitment to the proposition.

Moreover, just like in the case of endophoric markers and evidentials both of the no use and the erroneous use of this type of MD are of a zero frequency

2.1.1.9. The Use of Boosters in the Corpus

Table 13 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Boosters in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Boosters	12	50.00	Actually	06.67	In fact	03.33	In fact

as you can see in the table above, the frequency of the correct use of booster (50%) has not reached 90% which indicates that the writes of the samples have issues with regard to using boosters. The latter is problematic because in the field of applied linguistics the writer in the latter is supposed to correctly use such type of MD more than the writers in the field of hard sciences. An example of correct use of boosters can be seen in GI15 in which the writers state: “**Actually**, many EFL learners feel that ...”. In this particular example, the writers have used the booster “actually” to emphasise their certainty with regard to the propositional information they have stated right before the clause mentioned in the example above. This means they have successfully supplied the right booster in the right place. Examples of no use and erroneous use , not a lot but still, (see page and page) can be found in the corpus which can be detrimental to arguments granted in the former, for in the field of applied linguistics the use of such type of MD is crucial according to Hyland (2008,p. 14)

the no mastery over the use of boosters can be attributed to the fact that students in Algeria at all levels have received little to no training as far as the use of boosters is concerned, for the latter is not included in any curriculum of any level.

2.1.1.10. The Use of Attitude Markers in the Corpus

Table 14 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Attitude Markers in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Attitude Markers	41	58.67	Most importantly	14.67	Interestingly	00.00	

The use of attitude markers in the corpus, as can be seen in the table above, is manifested in two categories, correct use(58.67%) and no use (14.67%). The frequency of the correct use is fairly low compared to the rest types, and it does not reach 90 % which means that the writers of the samples analysed have no mastery over the use of this type of MD markers, attitude markers. This could be due to the fact that students are unfamiliar with such MD feature because it has not been taught to them. I have arrived at such hypothesis for, after scanning through the curriculums of middle school, secondary school and university, grammar and writing modules curriculum taught in Jijel university.

An example of correct use of boosters can be seen in G11 in which the writers state: “Test anxiety may also be related to classroom anxiety... **Most importantly**, if teachers use scaffolding as a guiding and supportive strategy... this will be considered helpful by students in reducing the debilitating effects and levels of test anxiety.” The writers have used an attitude marker to express their attitude towards the aforementioned propositional information, which means they have successfully supplied the right MD marker, the attitude marker “most importantly” in the right place.

On the other hand, the frequency of the no use of the MD marker in question is fairly significant. This means that the writers of the analysed samples are still not fully familiar with when to properly use it. This suggests an issue, for the writer in the field of applied linguistics is supposed to correctly use this type of MD more than the writers in the field of hard sciences

An example of no use of boosters can be seen in GI2 in which the writers state: “However, the achievement of the Intercultural Competence (IC), which is the main concern of this dissertation, requires the acquisition of non-linguistic skills”.

“**[Interestingly]** Two researchers attempted to investigate the impact of drama on developing intercultural communication.” The writers have not used an attitude marker to move smoothly from the first clause mentioned to the second expressing their attitude towards the aforementioned propositional information , which means they have failed in supplying the right MD marker, the attitude marker “interestingly” by not supplying it in the right place.

2.1.1.11. The Use of Engagement Markers in the Corpus

Table 15 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Engagement Markers in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Engagement Markers	02	00.00		10.00	Note that	00.00	

This particular type of MD has the lowest frequency of correct use (00%) and a fairly low frequency of no use (10.00%). The frequency of erroneous use of such type is of a zero. Having said that, this suggests that the writers of the analysed samples are ignorant of the correct use of such type. This also suggests that they are unfamiliar with when to use such type of MD. The latter is problematic because in the field of applied linguistics it is expect of the writer in the latter to correctly use such type of MD more than the writers in other fields.

This issue can be a result of lack to no training as far as the use of such type of MD marker is concerned. I have arrived at such hypothesis since after scanning through the

curriculum of middle school, secondary school and university, grammar and writing modules curricula taught in Jijel university; I have found no lesson tackling the use of this MD feature or even what it is.

An example of no use of such type of MD markers, engagement markers is in GI13 when the writers stated: “Teaching and learning a foreign language is not easy. [**Consider that**] Studies of foreign language use have shown kinds of problems and difficulties foreign language learners face...”. The writers failed in supplying an engagement marker to explicitly address the reader by selectively focusing his/her attention through the use of imperative. According to the raters there was no smooth transition from the first clause to the second until an engagement marker was successfully supplied in this example.

2.1.1.12. The Use of Self-Mentions in the Corpus

Table 16 : The Frequency of the Correct, Erroneous and No Use of Self-Mentions in the GIs of Master Dissertations

Metadiscourse markers	Obligatory Context	Correct Use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	No Use (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous Use (%)	Example(s)
Self-Mentions	42	66.67	We, us	00.00		00.00	

As shown by the table above, the frequency of the correct use of self-mentions is quite low compared to the rest types of MD (66.67%), and yet did not reach 90% so to claim that those students have a mastery over the use of such type of MD, whereas the frequencies of both categories of no use and erroneous use for this MD feature are of zero frequencies. All of this indicates that the writers of the analysed dissertations are unfamiliar with how to use such type of MD which is problematic, for writers in humanities and social sciences, such as the

field of applied linguistics, are expected to correctly use such type of MD more than those writers who belong to the field of hard sciences.

This issue could be due to the fact that master two students were not properly taught that the use of first personal pronoun in academic writing including academic essays and research papers is considered academic and professional.

An example of correct use of self-mentions can be seen in GI13 when the writers state: “We hypothesize that...”. The writers have marked their presence in the text by using “we”.

2.1.2. Overall Analysis of the Results generated by the Corpus Analysis

Based on Hyland’s (2005) model, the corpus selected for the present study has been codified and analysed with reference to the use of MD features in terms of correct use, no use and erroneous use. This analysis has generated the following results for each of the metafunctions of MD markers stipulated by the model in question, namely interactive and interactional MD markers.

-As far as interactive metadiscourse markers are concerned, the corpus analysis has revealed that master students have demonstrated an adequate use of transitions, framemarkers, and endophoric markers, but failed to demonstrate the required level with regard to two markers, namely evidential and code glosses.

As far as the interactional metadiscourse metafunction, the analysis of the corpus under study has revealed that master two students have failed in demonstrating an adequate level with regard to all the defining features of this metafunction, namely hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mention. It is worth noting here that engagement markers have been totally absent in the data.

2.1.3. Analysis of the Results of the Teachers’ Interview

Q1: When have you started supervising master dissertations?

When asked about when they have embarked on their supervising journey of master dissertations, the participants have bestowed different answers: participant 01 reported that they have started this journey 6 years ago; however, participant 02 have stated that their journey have started since 4 or 5 years ago. One more participant, participant 03, have reported that they have started supervising master dissertations in 2013. The rest two participants have reported that they have started supervising master dissertations 7 years ago.

2/Do you think that supervising master dissertations in applied linguistics requires specific skills and savoir-faire (knowledge)?

All of the participants have answered with a yes when they were asked whether they think that a supervisor should have a set of specific skills and savoir-faire.

3/Have you ever received any specific training aimed at equipping you with the necessary skills to coach master students production of their dissertations?

Of the teachers interviewed, all have answered in the negative, as they were asked whether they have received any specific training as far as equipping them with the essential specific skills and savoir-faire to supervise master students dissertations is concerned.

4/Are you satisfied with students' level in reasoning and writing dissertations in AL?

When asked about their attitude with regard to the level demonstrated by the students they have supervised, all of the participants argued that most of the students fail to demonstrate an adequate level in writing. Moreover, participant05 added that there is a need for introducing the module of Academic Writing in the master programme. The latter, as reported by them, was a subject of discussion with their colleagues.

5/ Do you think that there should be a logical order of text sequences and clauses ?

The sole reason behind asking about the logical order of text sequences and clauses is to establish the supervisors' attitudes towards the use of frame markers, transitions and endophoric markers. All of the teachers have answered with a "yes". Participant04 further added "...you need to know a thing or two about stylistics...critical thinking, logical thinking, principles of argumentation, these, erm the students are lacking in all of these departments".

6/How is that manifested in writing by the students? / What type of expressions are used by them ?

The rationale for catechizing about the manifestation of logical order of text sequences and clauses is to gain more knowledge with regard to the use of frame markers, transitions, boosters and endophoric markers by the supervised students from the supervisors' perspective. Firstly, participant 01 referred to the use of frame markers as linking words to manifest logical order in texts and called them endophoric and exophoric references and metadiscourse markers." Participant04; however, referred to the use of transitions to manifest logical order in texts: "certain words! It depends actually... sometimes you want to contrast sometimes you want to compare sometimes you want to express consequence...". Participant 05, incongruously, argued that there should be a structure that one has to follow which hereby compels students to use certain words, namely frame markers and transitions. Like participant05, participant03 emphasised the use of frame markers and transitions to betoken the existence of logical order of text sequences and clauses; nonetheless, they added that this is but a direct manifestation of the latter; an indirect one would be stating the topic sentence.

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing of their master dissertations?

When asked about whether the students supervised by the interviewees succeeded in manifesting logical order of text sequences and clauses in writing their master dissertations, the participants established two categories of students. Four out of five teachers reported that most of the students failed in such manifestation. In this regard, participant 03 have exemplified by stating that sometimes there is contrast and the students use moreover, something that signals addition. This indicates that the students mix up transitions. This betokens that they have a lack to no awareness and savoir faire with regard to the functions of different transitions. Participant02; however, argued that although there are two categories in this regard, both tend to have diverse issues as far as the use of linking words to manifest logical order in texts is concerned. They stated: “[clears throat] I said two categories of students. High achievers... they use them excessively, so I try to eliminate them, but even if they don’t use them excessively ...they fall, sometimes, into inappropriateness... As for the others, sometimes they don’t use them... Don’t use the links between paragraphs between sentences, erm, they have problems with sentences because they write run-on sentences ...”.

Which strategy/strategies do you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

When asked about the strategy/strategies they embrace to overcome mistakes and/or errors with regard to the proper use of linking words to establish a logical order of text sequences and clauses, the interviewees’ answers seem to vary among them. Four out of five supervisors reported that they use one strategy. Each strategy adopted by each supervisor is different from

the rest. Firstly, Participant01: “Of course you always ask the students to use linking words to say first second next then consequently ... to link the paragraphs, to link the ideas within the – or the sentences within a paragraph, err, some of them would use some others would not because, err, ... maybe they don’t know all of those linking words or they don’t know how to use them. Secondly, participant04: “The only strategy I use is, err, ask them to read a book that I like so much I give them books to read [with regard to academic writing]... I’ve never coached the students, right? face-to-face coaching, on how to write properly ... we haven’t got much time”. This indicates that no correction of the students’ mistakes and/or errors is provided by this supervisor. Thirdly, participant 02: “I discuss with the students what they should do, it means, the meaning of each sentence”. Finally, Participant03 stated that they, to use their words, “start yelling” at the students and retorts with asking for the reason why they do not reflect on their writing, asks them to read it again, examine it closely, and rendering them questioning the erroneous use of linking words. However, one participant, participant 05, reported a no use of any strategy to overcome the aforementioned matter. They stated that they do not use any strategy per say; nonetheless, they attempt to raise the awareness of the students they supervise with regard to their mistakes and/or errors in writing their dissertations. Yet the participant in question does not do that all the time, for this is solely dependent on the teacher’s mood. They explained this by saying that the teacher is a human being, at times the latter can be in the mood for correcting, other times he / she is not. They further added that they used to pay more attention to the matter; however, the former seems to diminish overtime. Similarly, participant03 added at the end of the interview that as far as correcting the mistakes and errors is concerned , when the students are more academically able ones, the participant in question attempts to perfect and refine their work in order to come up with a very adequate dissertation; however, when the students are less able ones they produce

too many mistakes and errors to the point that the supervisor neglects such problem and focuses on bigger ones such as that of the research methodology.

These answers are significant, for they explain why we still find mistakes and/or errors in the end product even though the latter have been supposedly revised by the student(s) multiple times, and so by their supervisors. In other words, given that 3 out of 5 supervisors reported that they do not provide correction for MD markers, this signifies that those mistakes and/or errors cannot be proved to be just errors from the part of the students and the supervisors as expected by the researcher; they are still open to the possibility that they can be but mistakes from the part of the student(s) that were not corrected by the supervisor, for the latter focuses on bigger issues such as that of methodology neglecting grammar and syntax related problems due to the fact that he/she is overwhelmed with what to correct.

7/What is the purpose behind academic writing, including dissertation writing ? so what you are saying is that there is an interaction between the writer and reader ?

When asked about the purpose behind academic writing and dissertation writing, of the teachers, all responded that it is to communicate ideas and information by the author to the targeted reader. The participants in question were queried about whether they think there is an interaction between the writer and reader to which the supervisors in question responded positively.

8/How is it manifested in texts?/ Can you tell whether the students you supervise involve a writer-reader interaction in writing their master dissertations ? How

Of the purposes behind asking this question, the main one was to get an insight about supervisors' attitude towards the use of MD in general. All of the interviewees have associated the existence of a reader-writer interaction with the use of certain lexical items, which is MD.

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing Of their master dissertations? Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

When indirectly queried whether their students use MD markers correctly 3 out of 5 participants responded that most students fail in doing so. In this respect, both participants, participant 05 and participant 03 added that at times the students' production fails to achieve intelligibility by the supervisors in question, that is when they read what the supervisees have written, they ask them about their intended meaning to which they usually respond in a way which suggests that the uttered meaning and the intended one are not in likeness. On the other hand, participant04 responded positively arguing that overall they succeed in using them but sometimes mistakes and errors occur. Moreover, as for the response of participant 02 there are two categories of students and some of them tend to succeed in use of MD features.

When asked which strategy/strategies they tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with this regard, 3out of 5 participants actually reported that they use a particular strategy. they stated that they ask them to reflect on their writing and to repeatedly and tirelessly read what they have written. However, participant 05 stated that no strategies are used by them to overcome the problem in question. Which, again, explains why mistakes and/or errors are still found in the submitted version of the dissertation. The results of the analysis above proved that the strategies adopted by the participants are of low effectiveness.

9/What are the most difficult aspects of writing a dissertation?

When asked about the most difficult aspects of dissertation writing, Both Participants, participant03 and Participant05, argued that there is a great number of aspects like language and added that the students lack on a great number of departments like grammar, punctuation and so many others. In contrast, the rest of the teachers had completely different answers to this question. First, Participant04 argued for the introduction and the conclusion to be the most difficult aspects. Secondly, Participant01 argued for the general introduction and the practical part to be the most difficult aspects, referring to the use of evidentials in the theoretical part. They suggested: “The general introduction and the practical part because it is there where the students use their own words, their own language, ok ?it is not like the theoretical part just copy X says this and that, Y says this and that, etc, and they finish ”. Finally, and contrastingly, participant02 views identifying the problem and the variables as well as the theoretical part the most difficult aspect about writing a dissertation.

10/Do you consider trying not to fall in the trap of plagiarism a difficult aspect of writing a dissertation?

When queried about whether the participants consider attempting to avoid plagiarism a difficult aspect of dissertation writing, all responded positively. Interestingly, participant02 also points out that not all students plagiarise: “there are two categories”. Participant03 added that, of the students, most if not all attempt to plagiarise.

11/How do students, namely the students you have supervised, avoid plagiarism?

When asked about the ways adopted by the supervised students to avoid plagiarism, participant 05, participant 02 and participant 01, stated that they refer to the

source. participant03 added that there are rules of the APA style that one has to follow to avoid plagiarism. However, participant 04 puts that in our context, students never avoid plagiarism.

In case they fall in the trap of plagiarism, which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

It is all the same for Participant03 , participant01 and Participant05; they simply tell their students that this is plagiarism and they should change it while participant02 gives the first time a dead eye then warns the second time. In contrast to the previous responses, participant 04 argued that no strategy is use by them in this regard. The participant in question stated: “[giggles] I give them advice I don’t think there is any strategy”.

12/Do you choose for your students or grant them liberty to choose the topic they desire?

The rationale for asking this question and the soon-to-come questions is to gain more knowledge about the use of self-mentions, attitude markers by master two students from the perspective of their supervisors. When queried whether they choose the topics of research to their students or they leave them the freedom to choose their desired one, four (04) out of five (05) participants assured that they have been in both situations. That is, at times they have chosen for their students, other times they gave them the opportunity to conduct a research on whatever they wish. In contrast, Participant02 mentioned the fact that law entrusts the supervisor with selecting the topics for their supervised students.

13/Do you think that master students demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic they choose , in other words do you see their voice in writing?

The sole reason behind inquiring the interviewees about the supervisees' voice in writing is to gain more insight about the use of self-mentions, attitude markers, hedges and boosters. Two out of five participants answered in the negative. In this regard, participant01 stated : “ No!... They are not really aware of voice in writing... [sighs]...personally, I ask them not to use the we or I, just use... the researcher or the the study is this and that”. Likewise, Participant03 argued that even if the students are engaged, they are still not demonstrating an adequate level when it comes to writing a dissertation quite yet, for the interviewee thinks that they are not ready enough; resultantly, Academic Writing should be taught at the level of master. The interviewee in question added that as for the use of first person pronouns such as I and we, they recommend the students to avoid using them. The supervisor also said that there are so many alternatives to this one in order to keep it professional. Then they presented the example of the passive voice or just referring to themselves as the researcher(s). In contrast, two other participants answered positively. Participant02: “of course! they use, in my opinion[giggles], err, we don't advise them to write this, in my opinion, or I have found...when it comes to practice you just collect the findings, ok? Analyse them and report them ...”. In this regard, participant04 added: “... yes! They say we,I, sometimes I, but then again I ask them to change that to use the passive voice which is an impersonal style”. The participant further added: “I was in viva two days ago when they advised the students to avoid talking about something in absolutist terms, like, it was essentially , it was absolutely , the best method...but then again, they fall in to the trap of subjectivity”. They added: “ ...here in Algeria, we, err, based on my experience, teachers and supervisors, members of the jury as well, examiners, they always ask the students to use impersonal style”.Diversely,participant05 suggested that of the students he has supervised, some not all demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic they choose. They

further added that they ask them not to use personal pronouns such as I and we because in their opinion this is not academic. Interestingly, the participant in question added that they ask them not to use any type of words that are emotionally charged. That is,, no attitude markers, no self-mentions and, no hedges and no boosters are allowed.

Note that of the interviewees, all reported that they do not allow their students to use self-mentions. Most do not allow the use of attitude markers, , hedges and boosters ; for they believe that they are subjective, unprofessional, not academic or the students are not really aware of voice in writing. This is significant to this research for it indicates that it is not the students who have no mastery over the use of attitude markers, hedges, boosters and self-mentions but they are simply not given the green light to produce them

14/What about when the superior chooses for them? Do you think they would demonstrate an decent level of engagement with the topic, in terms of voice in writing?

When queried whether the supervised students demonstrate an adequate level of engagement when the topic is chosen for them in terms of their voice in writing, the answers of the interviewees were quite different. Two out of three participants answered in the negative. However, participant02 answered positively. Diversely, participant03 suggested that either ways, engaged or not , no adequate level is demonstrated by them when it comes to dissertation writing, for they are not ready for this process. Differently, participant05 stated that they have not noticed any difference therein, for they have never paid attention to this.

15/Would it be the same if they chose it themselves?

When queried whether it would be the same if they chose for themselves as opposed to when the supervisor chooses for them, both participants, participant01 and participant03 answered positively. However, participant 04 responded in the negative. Diversely, Participant05 and participant02 suggested that they think that both cases occur in both situations in likeness. in this respect, Participant02: “ Sometimes yes the students are not very much motivated by the topics selected by someone else, but...given the circumstances of last year, students begged for topics”

Note that one last question, which strategy/strategies do you tend to use to overcome their lack or absence of engagement in writing their master dissertations?, was intended to be asked before the interview took place. However, during the interview I figured that no need for this, for the supervisors admitted as they were answering the previous questions that the use of self-mentions and attitude markers is not allowed by them

3.1. Limitations of the Study

During the period of conducting this research, a number of issues has raised which was challenging for me as a researcher. The issues are the following:

- 1)Attempting to find a fairly good number of raters to conduct the analysis for the purpose of ensuring the validity and reliability of the analysis then attempting to convince them to re-conduct the analysis after a period of doing it for further insurance of reliability and validity.
- 2)The fact that, of the interviews, some took place online which rendered recording them impossible; resultantly, no direct quotations of some interviewees were available.

The analysis of the results of the interview, however, has demonstrated that the supervisors do not consider the adequate use of MD a vital point in their feedback for a number of reasons, namely time limitation and students' lacking abilities in grammar and

writing. Be that as it may, the interview has revealed that the supervisors forbid their students from using hedges, boosters, attitude markers and self-mentions. This betokens that those supervisors adhere to a positivist view of academic writing promoting language of statistics and prescribed truths.

Conclusion

The present chapter presented a corpus analysis of GIs of master dissertations with regard to the use of MD markers following Hyland's (2005) model (interactional and interactive). Regarding the latter, the corpus analysis has revealed that master students have demonstrated an adequate use of transitions, framemarkers, and endophoric markers, but failed to demonstrate the required level with regard to evidentials and code glosses. As for the second metafunction, the analysis revealed that master two students have an inadequate level with regard to the defining features of this metafunction, namely hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mention and engagement markers. The latter have been absent in the data. The analysis of the results of the interview, however, revealed that supervisors' feedback does not consider MD use due to lack of time and students' low level in grammar and writing. The most interesting finding is that the supervisors are responsible for inhibiting supervisees from using hedges, boosters, attitude markers and self-mentions. This suggests that those supervisors adhere to a positivist view of academic writing viewing language as a set of impersonal, statistic, prescribed and universal procedures.

General Conclusion

The study in hand aimed at investigating master two students' of English problems in the use of metadiscourse markers in the general introductions of their dissertations and investigating the reasons behind those problems. In order to perform this, fifteen (15) general introductions of master two dissertations in the major of TEFL, randomly selected on the basis of convenience, have been identified, codified, and analysed following Hyland's (2005) taxonomy which classifies metadiscourse features to two major metadiscourse functions, namely interactive and interactional. To achieve the second aim, a teachers' interview was designed and implemented to Five (5) participants, who are the same ones who supervised the analysed general introduction; a data cleaning technique, namely logical checks technique, was deployed to ensure the validity and reliability of the results. The corpus analysis which is based on Hyland's (2005) dual classification of metadiscourse, interactive and interactional. Revealed a number of results. First, master two students have demonstrated an adequate use of transitions, frame markers, and endophoric markers, but failed to demonstrate the required level with regard to the rest two interactive metadiscourse features, evidentials and code glosses. Second, master two students have demonstrated an inadequate level with regard to the use of all the defining interactional features of metadiscourse, namely hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mention. Be that as it may, the absence of engagement markers in the data has been detected. The analysis of the results of the interview has revealed that supervisors seem to regard the adequate use of metadiscourse markers of a minor significance in their feedback, for the time allocated is never efficient and students' fragility at the level of grammar and writing seem to overlap. The most significant finding generated by the analysis of the interview is the supervisors' 'admittance of not granting the supervisees the permission to use hedges, boosters, attitude markers and self-

mentions. This finding betokens that the supervisors in question do not adhere to a constructivist view of academic writing rather they believe that discourse is only manifested in a mere linguistic representation of a set of universal truths that are impersonal.

References

Aguilar, M. (2008). *Metadiscourse in academic speech: A relevance-theoretic approach*. Peter Lang.

Al-Rubaye, M. H. K. (2015). Metadiscourse in the academic writing of EFL and ESL Arabic-speaking Iraqi graduate students. Retrieved from

<https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1017&context=theses>

Amiryousefi, M., & Rasekh, A. E. (2010). Metadiscourse: Definitions, Issues and Its Implications for English Teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 159-167. Retrieved from

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1081977.pdf>

Amiryousefi, M., & Barati, H. (2011). Metadiscourse: exploring interaction in writing, Ken Hyland. *Continuum, London. Elixir Literature*, 40, 5245-5250.

Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT journal*, 54(2), 153-160. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED539137.pdf>

Boubekeur, S. (2021). How to Write a Master Dissertation: From Abstract to General Conclusion.

Bowker, N. (2007). Academic writing: A guide to tertiary level writing. Retrieved from https://www.kau.se/files/2016-11/academic_writing_guide_masseyuniversity.pdf

Byrne, D. (1993). Longman handbooks for language teachers: Teaching writing skills. *Essex: Longman Group UK Limited*. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/5542884/49860749-Byrne-Teaching-Writing-Skills>

Crismore, A. (1983). Metadiscourse: What it is and how it is used in school and non-school social science texts. *Center for the Study of Reading Technical Report; no. 273*.

Crismore, A., Markkanen R., & Steffensen, M. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: a study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written Communication*, 10, 39–71. Cited in Hyland, K. (2005).

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*, 40(1), 95-113. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/223217480_The_pragmatic_role_of_textual_and_interpersonal_metadiscourse_markers_in_the_construction_and_attainment_of_persuasion_A_cross-linguistic_study_of_newspaper_discourse

Ebrahimi, S. J. (2018). The role of metadiscourse markers in comprehending texts of reading comprehension books published in Iran and oxford university press. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(3), 90-96. Retrieved from <https://www.journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/IJALEL/article/view/4275/3353>

Elashri, I. I. E. A. E., & Ibrahim, I. (2013). *The effect of the genre-based approach to teaching writing on the EFL Al-Azhr secondary students' writing skills and their attitudes*

towards writing (pp. 1-58). ERIC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED539137.pdf>

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Edinburgh Gate. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/41442986/Jeremy_Harmer_How_to_Teach_Writing_Longman_2004

Hyland, K. (2002). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of pragmatics*, 34(8), 1091-1112. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/22895075/Authority_and_invisibility_authorial_identity_in_academic_writing

Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of second language writing*, 13(2), 133-151.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Continuum. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404508080111>

Hyland, K. (2011). Learning to write: Issues in theory, research and pedagogy. *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language*, 31, 17-35. Retrieved from

https://www.academia.edu/40422513/Learning_to_write_Issues_in_theory_research_and_pedagogy

Hyland, K. (2015). Metadiscourse. In Tracy, K. (ed.) International Encyclopaedia of Language and Social Interaction. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell

Lo, Y. Y., Othman, J., & Lim, J. W. (2020). The use of metadiscourse in academic writing by Malaysian first-year ESL doctoral students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 271-282. Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341823313_The_use_of_metadiscourse_in_academic_writing_by_Malaysian_first-year_ESL_doctoral_students/link/5f0f574992851c1eff123ea8/download

Sadeghi, K., & Esmaili, S. (2012). Frequency of textual metadiscourse resources (MTRs) in two original and simplified novels. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(4), 647. Retrieved from <http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/jltr/vol03/04/08.pdf>

Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). Some explanatory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication* 36, 82–93. Cited in Hyland, K. (2005).

Wei, J., Li, Y., Zhou, T., & Gong, Z. (2016). Studies on Metadiscourse Since the 3rd Millennium. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(9), 194-204. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1095757.pdf>

Disbrow-Chen, R. L. (2004). *Morpheme acquisition in relation to task variation: A case study of a beginning-level ESL learner* (Doctoral dissertation, Portland State University). Retrieved from <http://www.labschool.pdx.edu/research/current/Disbrow-Chen%20thesis.pdf>

Paul, R. (2007). *Language disorders from infancy through adolescence: Assessment & intervention* (Vol. 324). Elsevier Health Sciences. Retrieved from <https://books.google.dz/books?id=QxLfgByBvToC&pg=PA353&dq=brown+1973+obligatory+context&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj9xaSS3LXxAhXBmFwKHZ1VBFsQ6AEwAXoECAkQA#v=onepage&q=90&f=false>

Duruk, E. (2017). Analysis of metadiscourse markers in academic written discourse produced by Turkish researchers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(1), 1-9. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1140601.pdf>

Hyland, K. (2008). Persuasion, interaction and the construction of knowledge: Representing self and others in research writing. *International Journal of English Studies*, 8(2), 1-23.

Appendices

Appendix A

GI1

SCAFFOLDING STRATEGIES AND TEST ANXIETY

1

1. Review of Previous Research

Several problems and obstacles affect negatively the students' learning progress and academic performance; problems such as test anxiety require teachers to look for reliable techniques to reduce its negative effects.

As far as scaffolding is concerned, it is considered as one of those reliable techniques that is increasingly adopted by teachers to move students towards stronger understanding, help them to reach higher levels of comprehension as well as skill acquisition. Scaffolding refers to the temporary support or strategies that the teacher provides for the aim of facilitating the learning process and helping learners to organize course materials. When the learners become able to perform the task at hand alone, this assistance should be removed.

The construct scaffolding has lately become an interesting theme for study. Sidek (2011) carried out a study to investigate the role which scaffolding plays through informal interaction in second language (L2) development, particularly in terms of syntax development of a young L2 learner. This study is based on Vygotsky's theory of scaffolding within the zone of proximal development. To investigate this subject, a set of pictures were selected as a data collection instrument, to be described before and after the treatment using scaffolding techniques. The results obtained pointed out that such scaffolding has positive impacts on the learning of syntax. Samana (2013), in his turn, conducted a study to shed light on the scaffolding provided from a teacher and from classmates when students engaged in solving a task in the classroom. The results obtained showed that scaffolding can also be provided by peers, not only teachers. Sabet, Tahriri and Pasand (2013) investigated the impact of peer scaffolding through a process approach on writing fluency of English as a foreign language (EFL) learners. A proficiency test administered to 49 learners proved that organizing EFL learners to write in pairs where each one of them scaffolds the other one, does not help in improving their writing fluency, as a whole. In addition, because of the great

General Introduction

Over the past decades the process of learning a foreign language has undergone dramatic changes. Researchers like Dell Hymes (1972) and Canale and Swain (1980) have proved that it is not enough to know the target language, to master its grammatical rules, and to memorize its vocabulary. However, besides being able to use the language correctly, one must also be able to use it appropriately. Communicative competence is a term coined to refer to the skills and knowledge that are needed for the occurrence of a successful communication. Moreover, the inclusion of intercultural competence as part of communicative competence by Legutke and Thomas (1991) has received wide approval and acceptance. The impact of this notion on language acquisition theory has been extraordinary due to the fact that Intercultural Communicative Competence enlarges learners' knowledge and raises their awareness about the similarities and differences between the native and the target culture.

Modern approaches to teaching shifted the attention to students and argued that student-centered classes might be more effective than their teacher-centered counterparts. Therefore, students' involvement in the learning process has become their major concern. Drama is one of several methods that provide much more involvement for both teachers and students in the learning process. Benjamin Franklin said "Tell me and I forget. Teach me and I remember. Involve me and I learn". Drama allows the teacher to present the target language in an active, communicative and contextualized way and helps the teacher address the four skills. More importantly, it develops the awareness towards the intercultural aspect embedded in the language we use and offers sufficient opportunities to explore the foreign culture through the creation of atmosphere that was often absent in the traditional classroom.

General Introduction

1. Background of the study

Teaching history to learners of English as a foreign language can be really challenging given that they have to deal with difficult historical concepts, complex sentences and lack of prior knowledge in history (Haynes, 2016). Most students do not put much efforts when studying history for it is boring and -is going to be all names and dates! (Straus, 2017, para. 4). In 1993, a project called -the EACHI was launched with an aim of fostering the skills of English and history through the use of historical fiction. -Its intention was for teachers of English and history to explore together, and in depth, ways in which the skills of each discipline might overlap through the shared use of historical fiction! martin & brooke, n.d. para. 1). Teaching history through historical fiction is highly recommended by many scholars and instructors due to the fact that it brings history back into life and it raises the students' engagement inside the classroom. Rudyard Kipling stated that -If history were taught in the form of stories, it would never be forgotten! (as cited in Evelind, 2015, para. 1)

The study in hand sheds light on how historical fiction may contribute to improve the students' understanding of the civilization course at Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University, Jijel.

2. Statement of the Problem

Despite the use of different materials and tools in teaching civilization, it has been noticed base on personal experience that the students of the English department at Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University, Jijel have troubles in understanding the civilization course, for they consider it as a burden to them. Trying to solve this problem, a method

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study

Communicative competence (CC) is an essential element in learning the English language. It emerged, first, with Chomsky who coined the term “competence and performance”. Then, Hymes further developed Chomsky’s idea and laid the four parameters needed for successful communication. But, the first real model of CC was introduced by Canal and Swain (1980). After that, different researchers developed their models of CC. Hence, the representation of CC in the textbook is so important and many studies were conducted concerning this interest.

Wafa Ibrahim (2013) conducted a study aimed at evaluating the different components of communicative competence among fourth level English major students at three universities in Gaza (The Islamic, Al-Azhar, and Al-Aqsa) and discovering to what extent students’ components marches their performance. It also aimed to identifying the areas of weaknesses in learning communicative competence. The result of the questionnaire showed the following

1. They were moderately well prepared to acquire the different components of linguistic competence and socio-linguistic, strategic, and discourse competence.

2. They were somewhat well prepared to acquire the pragmatic competence.

And the results of the diagnostic test show the following conclusion:

3. Students at the three universities had some areas of weaknesses in learning the communicative competence especially strategic competence.

4. They have the competences, but they have poor performance i.e. the students’ components did not match their performance.

Japar Sidik (2018) conducted a study about the representation of communicative competence in three (3) English language textbooks in Indonesia. The textbook analysis was carried out using the model of communicative competence proposed by Celce-Murcia (2007). The findings suggest that the textbooks have not provided sufficient dialogues that give useful

1. Introduction

Nowadays, English is considered as a lingua franca used throughout the world by the majority of people in most countries. To communicate in English successfully, English foreign language learners (EFL) are in need to master the four basic language skills. These skills are divided into two sub skills. Receptive skills are concerned with listening and reading, whereas productive skills refer to speaking and writing. Thus, in order to acquire language, the learner should first receive comprehensible input through listening and reading before using it (Lightbown and Spanda, 2006, p.42). EFL learners can have two main sources for gathering information that can be presented in the form of printed or online texts. The latter is more available for learners rather than the printed texts because of the wider spread of technological tools such as the internet, cellphones, and tablets. This is why EFL learners need to develop reading skills to benefit from the available information found in both materials (printed and electronic).

2. Background of the Problem

In order to be able to read, they have to use various abilities and strategies they already possess from their reading experiences in their native language. They will need their prior knowledge and strategies they have so far developed to help orienting themselves in the many dimensions of language implicated in any text. Actually, many EFL learners feel that they cannot effectively comprehend what they read due to their unawareness of the effectiveness of reading strategies in both the native and the target language. One major reason accounting for this phenomenon is that learners have not yet mastered and applied effective reading strategies (Jiang, 2011, p. 180).

In addition to the printed sources, another major concern arises due to the technological development which is the online sources such as internet-articles, e-book, e-journals sources. These represent authentic materials for EFL learners in online as well as

General Introduction

The importance of English as a global language is increasing day by day as the number of its speakers is equally increasing. As this happens, EFL learners realise the need to sound intelligible when they speak English. In the past, linguists, teachers, and scholars favoured teaching grammar and vocabulary over teaching speaking in general and pronunciation in particular. The latter was given many labels including the “Cinderella” area of foreign language teaching by Kelly (1969, as cited in Celce Murcia, Brinton & Goodwin, 1996, p.2).

It was about time that practitioners in the field recognized the significant role of pronunciation in a language, particularly English. Nonetheless, pronunciation was not treated as it should be for a long time, and not surprisingly, it is still overlooked in many EFL/ESL classes. Many methods and strategies tried to be equitable in this matter, yet the results seem to show no apparent change in the status of pronunciation in ELT.

Moreover, the teaching of pronunciation in many academic institutions is about Phonetics in which learners are introduced to the sounds of language with so many details, yet little practice in sound drills and minimal pairs is needed as much as they are for authentic practice of pronunciation by applying phonetic rules and regularities in real contexts similar to everyday life situations.

In the Algerian context, English pronunciation teaching is conducted in much the same way. For these reasons the current study has been conducted as an attempt to show how speaking activities may have a positive effect on the learners’ pronunciation in EFL classrooms.

Introduction

Correct pronunciation in of second and foreign languages is regarded as essential to communication. In order to communicate successfully, the message should be transmitted appropriately from the speaker to the hearer especially in terms of the intelligibility and conformity of speech sounds to those of the target language standards, as spoken by native speakers. Failure to adhere to those norms would result in foreign accent, or speech that is devious from the native norms, and that may cause communication breakdown or, at least, to judgement of speakers as incompetent as far as mastery of the target language is concerned. The deviations that are observed in non-native speakers' speech can occur at various levels, including the segmental level, concerning the production of the speech sounds and phonemes, and supra-segmental level, dealing with such features as stress, pitch and intonation.

Vowel mispronunciation in learning English constitutes one area that creates a foreign-accented speech. It can be traced back to the native language or languages of the speakers who may wrongly think that their native language has equivalent sounds for the mispronounced vowels or when they do not master the sound pattern of English in terms of the quality of its production.

1. Review of Previous Research

Accented pronunciation is identified as one of the problematic aspects for English as a foreign language (EFL) learners, and which has been investigated by many researchers to determine its nature. Close relationships have been found between the characteristics of native languages (L1s) of speakers and their mispronunciations of EFL. In addition, researchers have suggested strategies for getting students rid of their accents.

Cross-linguistic influences of mother tongue on foreign language were studied by Odlum (1989) (as cited in Bettach & Boulfous, 2015, p. 2). He highlighted the powerful influence of

General Introduction

In fact, the main aim of studying English is to master the language and communicate with it fluently however, learners' oral production is one of the most challenging aspects that face them during the process of learning and acquiring a foreign language. Basically, fear of making errors affects their oral performance negatively. There are many factors related to the notion of fear which hinder students from speaking in the classroom such as anxiety, shyness, lack of self confidence, lack of vocabulary, fear of making errors and fear of negative evaluation. These factors prevent English foreign language learners from standing in front of their classmates and speak without hesitation and lead to a state in which a student is always keeping in mind the idea of (how if I make an error, no need, it is better to keep silent) this will make the student habituate avoiding speaking and of course this will affect the student skill negatively and decrease his or her communicative competence. Teachers and students are both responsible to find strategies to overcome the problem of avoiding speaking because of fear of making errors.

1. Statement of the problem

Learning foreign language require from learners to practice speaking in order to become proficient in the FL. Fluency is a requirement in foreign language learning which needs from learners to give a great importance to practicing speaking but most of foreign language learners are always avoiding practicing speaking and especially in front of public because they have an internal feeling of fear of making errors during speaking as a result of some psychological problems such as: anxiety, lack of self-confidence, fear of negative evaluation, shyness or external reasons like: lack of vocabulary, communication apprehension which

INTERNET SOURCES TO DEVELOP READING SKILLS

General Introduction

The use of the internet in the educational environment has enabled easy access to many resources; therefore, information sharing has increased and the prevalence of this sharing has brought additional benefits in that these resources can be used in any location and any time. It is obvious that education is one of the areas significantly influenced by technology. The development of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) has had a great impact on education. ICT tools help teachers and students' access beneficial information on various subjects quickly as it helps them exchange their thoughts and experiences with people from all over the world. Moreover, the worldwide web and the internet allow teachers to use this information to motivate their students to use English daily and provide functional communication experience.

The use of the internet has become an important part of the learning process in and out of the class. The internet provides a vast range of materials, be them in typed texts, in audio format, or in audio-visual format. Thus, in order to acquire the language, the learner should first receive comprehensible input through listening and reading before using it. Technology has proved an effective tool for learners, who are often urged by their teachers to use it in order to facilitate the learning process. Teachers integrate the use of technology to support the curriculum so that learners can increase the effectiveness of developing their language skills through the use of technology (Costley,2014; Murphy, De Pasquale, & McNamara, 2003).

1. Background of the Study

The most effective communication resources, computers and the internet have become a part of our daily lives and have become one of the important tools in education. The internet helps transfer the information between different points. Therefore, this makes it a very powerful information system. People of different ages, students and academics prefer using

Introduction

Task-based language teaching (TBLT), also called Task based language learning (TBLL) or Task based instruction (TBI), stresses the use of communicative tasks in order to develop students' inter-language through providing a task, which is meaningful to students, and then asking them perform or solve it using language. The approach is based on communicative views on language teaching, and therefore, differs enormously from traditional ones in that instead of teaching and practising language structures and functions, it uses tasks as a means of learning (Harmer, 2007).

An important aspect of TBLT is that of task repetition, which aims essentially at improving learners' language production. Bygate and Samuda (2005) defined task repetition as "repetition of the same or slightly altered tasks—whether whole task or parts of the task." (p.43). Bygate (2001) further identifies real task repetition as "the kind experienced by learners when they find themselves repeatedly in a highly communicative situation and with the opportunity to build on their previous attempt at completing a task (p.29)

In order to improve learning, TBLT uses different types of communicative tasks, the repetition of which in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, is believed to assist the learners to enhance their performance and, particularly, develop their language production. This is because, as its proponents argue, when a task is performed for once only, the learners may not have enough time or opportunities to pay attention to several aspects of the target language such as fluency, complexity, and accuracy of their language production, unlike when the task is performed for the second time.

1. Review of Previous Research

Task Repetition (TR) is now considered as an important Task-Based implementation variable in that it could be used as pedagogical tool to direct the attention of Second Language (L2) learners toward the form of the language being practised (Hawkes, 2011).

General Initiation

Introduction

One of the important traits that affects individual's communicative competence in virtually every language; particularly English, and one that has drawn increasing attention recently, is the effect of one's sex (gender) on production and performance of language. Differences between men and women talk have been noted for some time now (Tannen 1986, 1990; Holmes 1987, 1991; Lakoff 1975). Among English speakers, it has reported that males use assertive, strong expletives showing freedom and deference; therefore, women are not expected to use such language. On the other hand, females use forms that sound polite, indirect, soft and less assertive showing solidarity and cooperation.

According to Deborah Tannen (1986), linguistics professor, females use language that expresses more uncertainty than men, say hedges, suggesting less confidence on what they say. Additionally, she believes that men and women differ in the focus behind their communication. Men converse with a focus on achieving social status and conversational interaction, while women focus on achieving personal connection, fulfilling their role as more elaborative and facilitative participants in an interaction; men want to report, women want to rapport.

As stated above, the use of hedges and the focus-genre on communication strongly indicate femininity and masculinity; they are often used to illustrate stereotypical women and men. These different patterns are found in disparate scripted conversations. In those written conversations, women are consistently enforcing their femininity and men their masculinity. However, according to some researchers, gender-related languages are not used as frequently in real conversations as they are in written ones, and some are even disappearing. Moreover, both rapport/report talk and hedge are subtleties drawn from

General Introduction

1. Introduction

Teaching languages in general is an art and science. It is a process that involves collaboration of both the teacher and the learner. It encompasses the integration of all four language skills which are listening, speaking, reading and writing. Speaking in particular is probably the most difficult aspect in all languages since it is constrained by many factors and English is no exception. Accordingly, Alonso (2011) states that "speaking is often considered as one of the most difficult skills to be developed and for most language learners, acquiring a native-like competence in speaking seems almost unattainable" (p.120). Learners' oral performance is affected by some psychological factors that develop or inhibit their oral communicative skills.

Learners have different important characteristics in the learning environment. One of these characteristics is the view learners have on themselves, technically referred to as self-esteem. Dembo et al. (1994) define self-esteem as "the value or judgment individual place on their behavior" (P.456). Noticeably, students with high self-esteem find it enjoyable to learn how to speak, whereas students with low self-esteem are not motivated and prefer to keep silent, they do not believe in their capacities, they will probably be less effective and creative in their learning environment. Considering the relative significance of learners' beliefs about themselves and their capabilities to achieve desirable outcomes, this work will attempt to investigate this crucial affective factor, self-esteem, and its relation with learners' oral performance i.e. (speaking skill). Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving and processing information (Burns & Joyce, 1997)

General Introduction

Statement of the problem

Teaching and learning a foreign language is not easy. Studies of foreign language use have shown kinds of problems and difficulties foreign language learners face and skills they need to communicate either in secondary schools or in higher institution. In learning English language as a foreign language, most students have knowledge in English Grammar and Vocabulary, but they are not able to use it in speaking the English language. This problem occurs for several factors. Among the factors, students have no confidence in speaking English, the weakness of pedagogy in teaching English for communication, the influence of the first language and so forth.

Therefore, this study highlights the implementation of group work activities as one of student-centered learning approach towards enhancing, speaking proficiency in English. In addition, this study tries to find out whether performing group work activities assists the students' confidence and motivation to communicate in English as well as other basic foreign language skills. Besides that, this study also discusses the role of teachers in doing group work activities among students.

Aims of the Study

The aim of the study will focus on the role of group learning in developing learners' speaking skills. In this research, we are going to investigate how interaction among learners provides knowledge that is responsible for developing their oral proficiency as well as their communicative competence. During their learning process, learners are required to achieve their goal in mastering the foreign language. Involving learners in group work through interaction is the best way to reach such an aim. In addition, our aim in this research is to show

1. Background

Listening plays a significant role in the lives of people. Of the four major areas of communication skills and language development--listening, speaking, reading, and writing--the one that is the most basic is listening. Lynch (2002) put: "listening involves making sense of spoken language, normally accompanied by other sounds and visual input, with help of our relevant prior knowledge and the context in which we are listening" (p. 193). As it is clear from the above-mentioned quotation, it is not a plain phenomenon, but bundles of related process which remained unnoticed for first language acquisition due to its natural and effortless nature. Krashen (1987) stated in his input hypothesis, that the role of listening for acquisition is undeniable. However, unlike its importance role, it is a so-called "Cinderella skill" (Nunan, 1997, p.47) in EFL situation, receiving only slight emphasis in instruction. Traditionally listening was considered as a "passive process, in which our ears were receivers into which information was poured..." (Richard, 2002, p. 193). Having been demystified those unjustly-neglected simplistic views, (myths) nowadays; it is regarded, as Richard (2002) aptly argued, an " active, interpretive process".

It is often assumed that listening could be acquired through exposure rather than teaching. That's why; we believe that films are a rich source of authentic materials that help developing listening skills. Consequently, films should not be regarded as merely a peripheral 'extra' in a listening class; on the contrary, they can function as the core content and become an integral part of the curriculum (Sommer, 2001). Appropriate, creative exploitation of films can reveal their potentials in fostering the acquisition of listening skills (Eken, 2003); therefore, their use as instructional media in listening lessons should be encouraged due to at least four pedagogical reasons. Films provide exposures to the real language uttered in authentic settings and the culture in which the foreign language is spoken (Stempleski, 1992).

1. Statement of the Problem

Fostering learners' autonomy constitutes a shared over-arching goal among most, if not all, modern language teaching approaches. Due to the central role that writing plays in communication in today's globalised world, in general, and in the academic domain, in particular, the development of an adequate level of autonomy in writing should be one of the main goals of the English university curriculum. Learner autonomy in writing is defined by Abdullah (2015:xiii) as '...the learners' abilities to reflect and evaluate their written essays in planning and deciding the best arguments to revise their essays. In other words, learners' development of a satisfactory level in autonomy in writing depends entirely on these learners' abilities to judge the texts they produce against the standard set of objective criteria adopted and used by their academic and/or social community. Therefore, students' acculturation to and internalization of these standard criteria, being the sole guarantee for the development of autonomy in writing depend, in turn, on the degree of transparency with which the community in question utilizes those criteria in assessing students' writings. As far as writing assessment is concerned, Hyland (2004) points to the existence of two types of scoring procedures: holistic and analytic scoring procedures. The former refers to 'a single, integrated score of writing behaviour', while the latter refers to 'a set of criteria important to good writing' and 'give [s] a score for each category' (Hyland, 2004: 162). Hence, analytic scoring procedures are more transparent and more conducive to fostering learners' autonomy in writing.

As far as assessing English as a foreign language students' writing performances across the English university curriculum is concerned, over-crowded classes most often than not constrain teachers to resort to holistic scoring procedures which consist of assigning one mark to the whole student's writing performance. We assume that this rampant practice constitutes a major hindrance to the development of learners' autonomy

Appendix B

Supervisor 01:

Q1: When have you started supervising master dissertations?

I have started supervising master dissertations in 2015, so it's been 6 years now, yes

2/Do you think that supervising master dissertations in applied linguistics requires specific skills and savoir-faire (knowledge)?

Erm I would say yes, any supervisor should be aware of research methodology, ok ?education research he should be aware ,erm, of or what academic writing is. We may say yes it requires [stutters] certain skills, certain knowledge to supervise.

3/Have you ever received any specific training aimed at equipping you with the necessary skills to coach master students production of their dissertations?

Erm training ? Well speaking for myself, I have never had training in supervision [giggles]

4/Are you satisfied with students level in reasoning and writing dissertations in applied linguistics?

Erm, not really! not really! Except for , we have very few students who manage to write, erm, a dissertation with a certain quality

5/ Do you think that there should be a logical order of text sequences and clauses ?

there must be a certain logical order erm in terms of ideas, erm, texts

6/How is that manifested in writing by the students ? / which types of expressions are used by the students ?

you have to use linking words , here, to organize the ideas, it's not for logic it's just for the order of the ideas there.

we can say that the study aims to investigate this and that, this is the general aim, ok? "Then" , erm, we can use "then" these linking words are generally found in introductions, erm, of the dissertations they are mostly there when defining when moving from one idea to another; when moving from part, erm, to the other. From one element , a title, to another one, the next , from a section to another, from a chapter to another they are called endophoric and exophoric references, they are also called metadiscourse markers

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing of their master dissertations?

It's very rare to find students who are able to have that case, that smoothness, fluency we call it, erm, fluency in writing, erm, when the writer was fluent in his writing then you can read fluently, you can read smoothly. But if there is no logic no discourse markers, ok? then you can just read the sentence and the other one and you feel these are independent, ok ? there is no connection between them. So very few students have this ability to write fluently

Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

Of course you always ask the students to use linking words to say first second next then consequently to use all these terms to link the paragraphs, to link the ideas within the –or the sentences within a paragraph, err, some of them, I would say, would use some others would not because, err, ...maybe they don't know all of those linking words or they don't know how to use them".

The participant in question was requested to provide further clarifications for the rationale for them to assume that the supervised students demonstrate a lack of knowledge with regard to the appropriate usual ways of using linking words the participant responded: “[sighs] that’s a difficult question [giggles] well [stutters] maybe they don’t give them importance, they don’t think they have an impact on their writing. They just write for the sake of writing, for finishing their work”.

7/What is the purpose behind academic writing, including dissertation writing ? so what you are saying is that there is an interaction between the writer and reader ?

The purpose behind writing a general introduction of err a dissertation or book or any other thing, erm, is to give the reader the opportunity to read a short version of your book”; The participant in question was asked whether they agree on the proposition suggesting that the writer communicates his ideas to the reader through his writings. The interviewee answered “[nodding] yes, erm, basically”

8/How is it manifested in texts?/ Can you tell whether the students you supervise involve a writer-reader interaction in writing their master dissertations ? How

They use certain words

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing Of their master dissertations? Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

most of them fail in doing so.

Strategy?you always ask the students to use linking words

9/What are the most difficult aspects of writing a dissertation?

the general introduction and the practical part because it is there where the students use their own words, their own language, ok ? it is not like the theoretical part just copy X says this and that, Y says this and that, etc, and they finish, no! But when you compare the theoretical part to the general introduction and the practical part it's there where you discover the student language and style

10/Do you consider trying not to fall in the trap of plagiarism a difficult aspect of writing a dissertation?

Of course! Yes, it is difficult

11/How do students, namely the students you have supervised, avoid plagiarism?

Just use the reference

In case they fall in the trap of plagiarism,which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

Well! If you use the reference then you avoid plagiarism. Just use the reference; avoid plagiarism.

12/Do you choose for your students or leave them at liberty to choose the topic they desire to choose?

It depends, I always suggest, I suggest titles and it's up to them to choose

13/Do you think that master students demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic they choose , in other words do you see their voice in writing?

No, no ,no! Not at all! They are not really aware of voice in writing... maybe , err, because they were not made aware of it in teaching. I mean, in learning during, err, their course, err, or they are not interested in knowing that, simply [sighs]There's still a debate concerning this. We have others who said 'you have to avoid using personal pronouns , the I and we, [stutters] and use the passive instead, the passive form. Personally, I ask them not to use the we or I, just use, erm, the researcher or the the study is this and that.

14/What about when the superior decided to choose for them? Do you think they would demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic chosen for them, again in terms of their voice in writing?

No they wouldn't! they would take it for granted[giggles].

15/Would it be the same if they chose it themselves?

They are not aware of voice in writing. So, erm, yes

Supervisor 02

Q1: When have you started supervising master dissertations?

I have started since 4 or 5 years.

2/Do you think that supervising master dissertations in applied linguistics requires specific skills and savoir-faire (knowledge)?

of course ! But even if the supervisor is not equipped with such skills consciously, it means he didn't already receive training in doing so, there are too many ways to do it, having been in the process of supervision, it means supervised by someone else, erm, he or she has gain some of those skills, it means implicitly, and there are some things which are learned through experience, erm, so these skills are learned in the process of supervising and there are some things which fall in the category of adaptation, it means you don't have to stick to a fixed and rigid way of framework of supervision, you have to be open to the modifications, it means you have to be flexible. Yeah! it would help. It will help. It is not going to ensure quality of work or to ensure success of the teacher or the supervisor on its own"

3/Have you ever received any specific training aimed at equipping you with the necessary skills to coach master students production of their dissertations?

"no, erm, we learn through experience"

4/Are you satisfied with students level in reasoning and writing dissertations in applied linguistics?

I have two categories of students, high achievers and low achievers, the high achievers do that naturally, even if they don't, we advise them to do so. Each time they provide , for example,

a statement they have to be prepared to, erm, give examples; if they give a quote they need to analyse it ; they need to state its addition to the ideas expressed before.

5/ Do you think that there should be a logical order of text sequences and clauses ?

Yes! In our context, and you can go and check the students I supervised, I tell them when you review previous studies you have to analyse , criticise, criticise what they have done and try to apply it to our context; so establishing the link between studies which are done in practice and theory, practices in other places and practice in Algeria, the link is called for.

6/How is that manifested in writing by the students ? / which types of expressions are used by the students ?

I'm not pretty sure 100 percent because with each study there is something specific to it. But you can say in comparison to... on one hand, on the other hand it means two people said different things here and we are comparing. If we want to build up a case, ok, it means we are going to make our argument strong we are going to add or to include any study that is in line with our work. Sometimes people say, erm, the jury, erm, tell you well ,your research is meaningless just because they are not familiar with the specialty, but if you come and tell them look how many studies have been done this one, in addition, moreover, add to this, to list just a few, etc so you are going to include these words.

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing of their master dissertations?

[clears throat] I said two categories of students. High achievers... generally they use them excessively, so I try to eliminate them, but even if they don't use them excessively there is

the problem of appropriateness or appropriacy. So [stutters] they fall, sometimes, into inappropriateness, ok? As for the others, sometimes they don't use them, ok? Don't use the links between paragraphs between sentences, erm, they have problems with sentences because they write run-on sentences , ok? Erm .When one idea is expressed, when one idea is being expressed, they can go on talking about it in several paragraph; whereas, what is needed is just one paragraph.

Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

I discuss with the students what they should do, it means, the meaning of each sentence.

7/What is the purpose behind academic writing, including dissertation writing ? so what you are saying is that there is an interaction between the writer and reader ?

people try to make a name for themselves that's why they write; they try to be known, to be visible, the same thing for writing a dissertation; they try say I'm here I'm good enough I can be special. For dissertations, you have to show your ability to use or to mobilise all the skills you've learned in order to write a piece of writing that meets the standards of academia which are the master degree specifications, erm, of course! ideas are there. One of the aims of dissertation writing is to bring about some change, something new, etc. Contribution to solve problems ok, this is one of the aims of dissertation writing.

The interviewee in question was asked whether they believe that ideas are attempted to be communicated through writing a dissertation, to this they responded

of course! It's communication, it's everywhere, communication is omnipresent in any piece of writing".

They were asked to whom the writer of a dissertation is communicating their ideas; the answer was

[stutters] the audience, first, you are addressing your fellow students...second, there is the community of teachers...there is also the context of ESP, for students learning in other fields of study... there is also the, erm, wider community of research in [stutters] Algeria, there's also the international community.

8/How is it manifested in texts?/ Can you tell whether the students you supervise involve a writer-reader interaction in writing their master dissertations ? How

I can tell, of course, but I'm not gonna tell you all students do this; but for the students who do they use words such as view this, this author viewed and another viewed it differently, or another author added the following, or in saying this the author means or wanted to point out to, he opted for, he argued for an idea or even summarising a comment by an author, the studies done by, err, an author points out to the necessity of.

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing Of their master dissertations? Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

as for the response of participant 02 it was but a missing value, for I have forgotten to ask them this question because simply whenever humans get involved mistakes and errors occur; therefore, I have run a logical check by looking at the data and see whether it by looking at the

data and see whether it makes sense; resultantly, I have checked the participant's responses to the rest of the questions, one of which, the previous question, provided the answer to this one. The answer is there are two categories of students and some of them tend to succeed in use of metadiscourse features.

When asked which strategy/strategies they tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect participant02 answered

I make them [giggles] they need to be pushed to use them.

9/What are the most difficult aspects of writing a dissertation?

First in, erm, in doing research... you need to identify your problem, the problem you want to solve, to specify your variables this is the toughest part. The second most difficult part is choosing the appropriate, err, literature to be included. When there is too much written about the topic the problem is making the right choice. When there's too little written about the topic the problem is to find it.

10/Do you consider trying not to fall in the trap of plagiarism a difficult aspect of writing a dissertation?

There are two categories!

11/How do students, namely the students you have supervised, avoid plagiarism?

They refer to the source.

In case they fall in the trap of plagiarism, which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

The first time I allow the practice but I warn. I select and say we are here we know everything.

12/Do you choose for your students or leave them at liberty to choose the topic they desire to choose?

This year , I didn't choose for them, they chose for themselves, but the law says we should do so, and I did last year".

13/Do you think that master students demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic they choose , in other words do you see their voice in writing?

of course! they use, in my opinion[giggles], err, we don't advise them to write this, in my opinion, or I have found these are the markers of engagement, erm, you advocate, you, maybe you believe in the importance of something, but when it comes to practice you just collect the findings,ok? analyse them and report them; don't try to say that [stutters]my way is the perfect way.

14/What about when the superior decided to choose for them? Do you think they would demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic chosen for them, again in terms of their voice in writing?

I did last year, and it was one of the most successful experiences, the students knew in the beginning what they are going to work on, erm, they were actively engaged.

15/Would it be the same if they chose it themselves?

This is an idea that is a stereotype. Sometimes yes the students are not very much motivated by the topics selected by someone else, but, err, sometimes given the circumstances of last year, students begged for topics.

Supervisor 03:

Q1: When have you started supervising master dissertations?

I have started supervising master dissertations in 2013. I have started a bit late compared to other teachers.

2/Do you think that supervising master dissertations in applied linguistics requires specific skills and savoir-faire (knowledge)?

Yes, it does!

3/Have you ever received any specific training aimed at equipping you with the necessary skills to coach master students production of their dissertations?

The supervisor answered in the negative, as they were asked whether they have received any specific training as far as equipping them with the essential specific skills and savoir-faire to supervise master students dissertations is concerned.

4/Are you satisfied with students level in reasoning and writing dissertations in applied linguistics?

When asked about their attitude with regard to the level demonstrated by the students they have supervised, the participant reported that most of the students fail to demonstrate an adequate level of writing.

5/ Do you think that there should be a logical order of text sequences and clauses ?

the teacher has answered with a “yes”.

6/How is that manifested in writing by the students ? / which types of expressions are used by the students ?

participant03 emphasised the use of frame markers and transitions to betoken the existence of logical orderof text sequences and clausesuch as first , second, moreover and the

like; nonetheless, they added that this is but a direct manifestation of the latter; an indirect one would bestating the topic sentencebecause it is the one that sets the scene for what is coming next.

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing of their master dissertations?

The participant 03, who answered in the negative, argued that most of them fail in doing so. They have exemplified by stating that sometimes there is contrast and the students use moreover, something that signals addition.

Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

Participant03 gigglingly stated that they, to use their words, “start yelling” at the students and retorts with asking for the reason why they do not reflect on their writing, asks them to read it again, examine it closely, and rendering them questioning the erroneous use of linking words. They exemplified by saying that they ask “read it again! Look at it! Do you really think that it’s addition and not contrast”

7/What is the purpose behind academic writing, including dissertation writing ? so what you are saying is that there is an interaction between the writer and reader ?

Participant03 argued that of the many purposes of academic writing one that is communicating ideas to the reader by the writer, for between the latter and the former there is a sort of an interaction.

8/How is it manifested in texts?/ Can you tell whether the students you supervise involve a writer-reader interaction in writing their master dissertations ? How

participant03 suggested that as one reads a given text, one can tell whether the writer establishes an interaction with the reader in question through the latter's use of certain lexical items . the use of the latter by the former, the participant added, does not only create this communication between the target reader and the writer but also creates intelligibility. If the latter is not established this does not necessarily allude that the blame can be solely put on one of the two parties, for in the end of the day it is but a joint effort. Furthermore, who writes should ask themselves multiple times whether the words they have written communicate the meaning that they intended to communicate.

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing Of their master dissertations? Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

participant03, who also argued that most of the students failed in such manifestation of a writer-reader interaction in writing their master dissertations, added that at times when they read what the supervised students have written they ask them about their intended meaning to which they usually respond in a way which suggests that the uttered meaning and the intended one are not in likeness.

When asked which strategy/strategies they tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect, the participant in question actually reported that they use a particular strategy. they stated that they ask them to reflect on their writing and to repeatedly and tirelessly read what they have written.

9/What are the most difficult aspects of writing a dissertation?

participant03 argued that there is a great number of aspects like language and added that the students lack on a great number of departments like grammar, punctuation and so many others.

10/Do you consider trying not to fall in the trap of plagiarism a difficult aspect of writing a dissertation?

Participant03 argued that attempting not to fall into the trap of plagiarism is quite difficult, and of the students are most if not all who attempt to plagiarise. Some do it in an intelligent way some do it in a stupid way. The former tend to preserve the original structure , yet they tend to replace the lexical items, words, by their synonyms. This is still plagiarism, the participant in question added, alluding to the fact that when one writes down an idea ,it is almost impossible for another writer to express the same idea exactly the like thereof. The second category of students who plagiarise tend to write it as it with no modification on any level, so a feeling of a difference in style is bestowed to the supervisor as they read the it.

11/How do students, namely the students you have supervised, avoid plagiarism?

participant 03 stated that there are the different rules of the APA style; furthermore, one only has to follow these rules in order to avoid plagiarism.

In case they fall in the trap of plagiarism,which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

Participant03 simply tells their students that this is plagiarism and they should change it.

12/Do you choose for your students or leave them at liberty to choose the topic they desire to choose?

A for participant03, although reported that they have experienced both situations; stated that students usually choose their topic; however, usually, it is not the optimal option, for they come up with topics that are unprofessional ;that are not related to the field of study, TEFL; that they are not able to provide operational definition for the related variables; therefore, the superior in question ends up suggesting topics for them or just gives them the topic, directly.

13/Do you think that master students demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic they choose , in other words do you see their voice in writing?

Participant03 argued that even if the students are engaged, they are still not demonstrating an adequate level when it comes to writing a dissertation quite yet, for the interviewee thinks that they are not ready enough; resultantly, Academic writing should be taught at the level of master. The interviewee in question added that as far as the use of first person pronouns such as I and we, they recommend the students not use such type of personal pronouns. The supervisor also said that there are so many alternatives to this one in order to keep it professional. Then they presented the example of the passive voice or just referring to themselves as the researcher(s).

14/What about when the superior decided to choose for them? Do you think they would demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic chosen for them, again in terms of their voice in writing?

participant03 suggested that either ways, engaged or not , no adequate level demonstrated by them when it comes to dissertation writing because they are not ready enough for this process.

15/Would it be the same if they chose it themselves?

Participant03 answered this question positively.

Supervisor 04:

Q1: When have you started supervising master dissertations?

Erm, [stutters] I have started supervising master dissertations probably 7 years ago.

2/Do you think that supervising master dissertations in applied linguistics requires specific skills and savoir-faire (knowledge)?

Personally, I'd love to[undergo a training].

3/Have you ever received any specific training aimed at equipping you with the necessary skills to coach master students production of their dissertations?

[stutters] what I know is the teachers here have never undergone any form of formal training even those who are specialised in Didactics.

4/Are you satisfied with students level in reasoning and writing dissertations in applied linguistics?

Depends on the students, actually!

5/ Do you think that there should be a logical order of text sequences and clauses ?

Of course there is a logic to follow, but in our department, unfortunately, we don't teach our students the principals of logical thinking and the principles of critical thinking lots of skills coming to [stutters] play when it comes to writing a dissertation ,and the most of people think that knowing about the mechanics of writing, the basic mechanics of writing, will help you writing a dissertation which is false actually. You need to know a thing or two about stylistics, you need to know a thing or two about critical thinking, logical thinking, principles of argumentation , these ,erm, the students are lacking in all of these departments

6/How is that manifested in writing by the students ? / which types of expressions are used by the students ?

Certain words! It depends actually... sometimes you want to contrast sometimes you want to compare sometimes you want to express consequence, it depends.

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing of their master dissertations?

Most of the students failed in doing so.

Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

The only strategy I use is, err, ask them to read a book that I like so much I give them books to read [with regard to academic writing], err, but, frankly speaking, I've never coached the students, right? face-to-face coaching, on how to write properly, I don't do that, probably, we haven't got much time

7/What is the purpose behind academic writing, including dissertation writing ? so what you are saying is that there is an interaction between the writer and reader ?

the purpose behind writing is to convey a message, right? Basically it's a form of interaction between who do we write to because [giggles] from a rhetorical point of view, err, we write to an audience, right? We write to a reader, and then again, since we are writing to a reader, erm, we want to get our message across, that's probably the primary purpose behind writing.

8/How is it manifested in texts?/ Can you tell whether the students you supervise involve a writer-reader interaction in writing their master dissertations ? How

Well , actually, probably through the use of metalanguage. Right? Because you want to direct the reader to probably the certain argument that you are about to make, right? Erm how is it manifested ? Err, I don't know, err, something that is based on a gut feeling.

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing Of their master dissertations? Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

Yes, sometimes as I said it is base on gut feeling, the other day I was supervising master two students and [stutters]I gave them this advice, I said think about your reader first, err, I don't know how to explain it in practical terms sometimes you feel something is not working properly you feel something messing

9/What are the most difficult aspects of writing a dissertation?

probably, the most difficult ones are the introduction and the conclusion. They may be. Probably the introduction because it is the most important part. If you fail to introduce the topic in the introduction, if your reader fails to get what you're trying to say I don't think he'll be willing to read on.

10/Do you consider trying not to fall in the trap of plagiarism a difficult aspect of writing a dissertation?

Yeah, I always ask the students to avoid plaigirism

11/How do students, namely the students you have supervised, avoid plagiarism?

In Algeria you can't prevent it because the students will plagiarise in one way or another. Sometimes they do plagiarise because unknowingly , probably unknowingly.

In case they fall in the trap of plagiarism,which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

[giggles] I give them advice I don't think there is any strategy.

12/Do you choose for your students or leave them at liberty to choose the topic they desire to choose?

I don't, err, I just give them freedom to work on whatever they want.

13/Do you think that master students demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic they choose , in other words do you see their voice in writing?

Well ,err, this has to do with the analysis of diction, err, yes! They say we, I, sometimes I, but then again I ask them to change that to use the passive voice which is an impersonal style. I was in viva two days ago when they advised the students to avoid talking about something in absolutist terms , like, it was essentially ,it was absolutely , the best method, the most important skill. And I always say that how would you know that. How do you know that it's the most , you know, err, most essential skill . [stutters] It's probably an indicator that the student is fully engaged with the topic. He wants to say what I'm working on is very important and this is what I want to believe as well, but then again, they fall in to the trap of subjectivity. Although in [stutters] the states, err, they use personal pronouns they have no problem with that; they have no objection against personal pronouns. It's I and we, but it's usually I , but here in Algeria, we, err, based on my experience, teachers and supervisors, members of the jury as well, examiners, they

always ask the students to use impersonal style, use the passive voice, I don't know, use probably 'the researcher'.

14/What about when the superior decided to choose for them? Do you think they would demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic chosen for them, again in terms of their voice in writing?

If somebody wants to work on something they would be more engaged with it

15/Would it be the same if they chose it themselves?

No! Not really

Supervisor 05

Q1: When have you started supervising master dissertations?

When asked about when they have embarked on their supervising journey of master dissertations, the participant in question has reported that they have started supervising master dissertations 7 years ago.

2/Do you think that supervising master dissertations in applied linguistics requires specific skills and savoir-faire (knowledge)?

The participant has answered with a yes when they were asked whether they think that a supervisor should have a set of specific skills and savoir-faire.

3/Have you ever received any specific training aimed at equipping you with the necessary skills to coach master students production of their dissertations?

The teacher answered in the negative, as they were asked whether they have received any specific training as far as equipping them with the essential specific skills and savoir-faire to supervise master students dissertations is concerned. Interestingly, the participant whose major is not that of TEFL, which is the only major found in the university of Mohamed SadikBenyahia as far as the majors of English are concerned, stated that supervising TEFL students is not an easy task for them to perform, for it is not their specialty.

4/Are you satisfied with students level in reasoning and writing dissertations in applied linguistics?

Participant05 who also answered in the negative reported that there is a need for introducing the module of Academic Writing in the master programme. The latter, as reported by them, was a subject of discussion with their colleagues.

5/ Do you think that there should be a logical order of text sequences and clauses ?

The teacher has answered with a “yes”.

6/How is that manifested in writing by the students ? / which types of expressions are used by the students ?

Participant 05, incongruously, argued that there should be a structure that one has to follow which hereby compels students to use certain words, namely frame markers and transitions. When asked to provide examples, the participant in question presented: first, second, finally, on the contrary and moreover as examples.

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing of their master dissertations?

When asked about whether the students supervised by the interviewee in question succeeded in manifesting logical order of text sequences and clauses in their writing of their master dissertations, the participant established two categories of students and reported that most of the students failed in such manifestation.

Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

participant 05, reported a no use of any strategy to overcome the aforementioned matter. They stated that they do not use any strategy per say; nonetheless, they attempt to raise the awareness of the students they supervise with regard to their mistakes and/or errors in writing their dissertations. Nevertheless, the participant in question does not do that all the time, for this is solely dependent on the teacher's mood. They explained this by saying that the teacher is a human being, at times the latter can be in the mood for correcting the mistakes and/or errors , other times he / she is not. They further added that they used to pay more attention to the matter; however, the former seems to diminish overtime.

7/What is the purpose behind academic writing, including dissertation writing ? so what you are saying is that there is an interaction between the writer and reader ?

When asked about the purpose behind academic writing and dissertation writing , the teacher in question responded that it is to communicate ideas and information by the author to the targeted reader. The participant in question was queried about whether they think there is an interaction between the writer and reader to which the supervisors in question responded positively.

8/How is it manifested in texts?/ Can you tell whether the students you supervise involve a writer-reader interaction in writing their master dissertations ? How

The interviewee has associated the existence of a reader-writer interaction with the use of certain lexical items, that is metadiscourse. The participant in question argued that it is more about the lexical items as well as the ideas and the information that are communicated by the write so the reader can relate to the former.

Do you think that the students that you have supervised succeeded in such manifestation in their writing Of their master dissertations? Which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

participant 05 stated that of the students they have supervised, most fail in establishing a proper writer-reader interaction in writing their master dissertations. The interviewee mentined that at times the students' production fails to achieve intelligibility by the supervisor in question.

participant 05 stated that no strategies are used by them to overcome the aforestated problem.

9/What are the most difficult aspects of writing a dissertation?

Participant05 argued that there is a great number of aspects like language and added that the students lack on a great number of departments such as grammar, punctuation and so many others.

10/Do you consider trying not to fall in the trap of plagiarism a difficult aspect of writing a dissertation?

The participant responded positively.

11/How do students, namely the students you have supervised, avoid plagiarism?

When asked about the ways adopted by the supervised students avoid plagiarism, participant05 mentioned that they refer to the source.

In case they fall in the trap of plagiarism, which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome any mistake or error with regard to this aspect?

Participant05 simply tells their students that this is plagiarism and they should change it.

12/Do you choose for your students or leave them at liberty to choose the topic they desire to choose?

Participant05 added that they usually allow the students the liberty to choose, for forcing them with this regard is unethical. Moreover, they added that at times they choose for them.

13/Do you think that master students demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic they choose , in other words do you see their voice in writing?

Participant05 suggested that of the students he has supervised, some not all demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic they choose. they further added that they ask them not to use personal pronouns such as I and we because in their opinion this is not academic. Interestingly, the participant in question added that they ask them not to use any type of words that are emotionally charged.

14/What about when the superior decided to choose for them? Do you think they would demonstrate an adequate level of engagement with the topic chosen for them, again in terms of their voice in writing?

Participant05 mentioned that they have not noticed any difference therein mainly because they have never paid attention to this.

15/Would it be the same if they chose it themselves?

Participant05 suggested that they think that both cases occur in both situations in likeness.

Note that one last question, which strategy/strategies you tend to use to overcome their lack or absence of engagement in writing their master dissertations?, was intended to be asked before the interview took place. However, during the interview I figured that no need for this question, for the supervisors themselves admitted as they were answering the previous questions that the use of self-mentions and attitude markers is not allowed by them.

Resumé

La présente thèse vise à étudier les problèmes d'anglais des étudiants de master 2 dans l'utilisation des marqueurs de métadiscours dans les introductions générales de leurs thèses et à évaluer les causes potentielles de ces problèmes. Pour atteindre le premier objectif, une analyse de corpus de quinze mémoires de master choisis au hasard sur la base de la commodité a été identifiée, codifiée et analysée selon le modèle de Hyland (2005), qui attribue des caractéristiques de métadiscours à deux fonctions, interactive et interactionnelle. Pour atteindre le deuxième objectif, un entretien d'enseignants a été conçu et mis en œuvre auprès de cinq encadrants ayant dirigé les thèses en question. L'analyse du corpus a été basée sur le modèle de Hyland (2005) qui attribue des marqueurs de discours à deux métafonctions majeures : interactionnelle et interactive a révélé des résultats significatifs. En ce qui concerne les marqueurs de métadiscours interactifs, l'analyse du corpus a révélé que les étudiants en master ont démontré une utilisation adéquate des transitions, des marqueurs de cadre et des marqueurs endophoriques, mais n'ont pas réussi à démontrer le niveau requis en ce qui concerne deux marqueurs, à savoir les évidences et les gloses de code. Quant à la métafonction interactionnelle métadiscours, l'analyse du corpus à l'étude a révélé que les étudiants de master 2 n'ont pas réussi à démontrer un niveau adéquat au regard de toutes les caractéristiques définissant cette métafonction, à savoir les haies, les boosters, les marqueurs d'attitude, les marqueurs d'engagement et l'auto-mention. . Il est à noter ici que les marqueurs d'engagement ont été totalement absents des données. En ce qui concerne l'entretien, l'analyse des résultats a montré que l'utilisation adéquate des marqueurs de discours ne constitue pas un point central du retour d'expérience qu'ils offrent à leurs supervisés en raison, au moins en partie, du manque de temps et de la fragilité des étudiants. au niveau de la grammaire et de l'écriture. Le résultat le plus intéressant généré par l'analyse de l'entretien est le fait que les superviseurs admettent qu'ils sont

responsables d'empêcher les supervisés d'utiliser des haies, des boosters, des marqueurs d'attitude et des auto-mentions. Ce constat suggère que les superviseurs en question n'adhèrent pas à une vision constructiviste de l'écriture académique qui rejette totalement le principe suggérant que le discours n'est qu'une simple représentation linguistique d'un ensemble de vérités impersonnelles et universelles.

ملخص

تهدف الأطروحة الحالية إلى التحقيق في مشاكل اللغة الإنجليزية لدى طلاب الماجستير في استخدام علامات الميثا خطاب في المقدمات العامة لأطروحاتهم وقياس الأسباب المحتملة لهذه المشاكل. لتحقيق الهدف الأول ، تم تحديد وتحليل مجموعة من خمسة عشر رسالة رئيسية تم اختيارها عشوائيًا على أساس الملائمة ، وفقًا لنموذج الباحث الشهير هايلاند (2005)). ولتحقيق الهدف الثاني ، تم تصميم و إجراء مقابلة مع خمسة مشرفين و الذين هم أنفسهم من أشرفوا على الأطروحات التي تم تحليلها. أظهرت النتائج أن طلاب الماجستير قد أظهروا يجيدون استخدام الانتقالات وعلامات الإطار و العلامات الداخلية ، لكنهم فشلوا في استخدام الأدلة و مسارد الكود. بالنسبة إلى ادوات التحوط ، والمعززات ، وعلامات السلوك ، وعلامات المشاركة ، والإشارة الذاتية ، أظهرت الدراسة أن الطلاب لا يجيدون استخدامها . وتجدر الإشارة هنا إلى أن علامات المشاركة كانت غائبة تمامًا في البيانات. اما بالنسبة الى المقابلة ، أظهر تحليل نتائجها أن الاستخدام الملائم لعلامات الخطاب لا يشكل نقطة محورية في الملاحظات التي يقدمها المشرفون إلى طلابهم بسبب ضيق الوقت وضعف مستوى الطلاب ، جزئيًا على الأقل. في النحو والكتابة. النتيجة الأهم و التي أسفر عنها تحليل المقابلة هي إقرار المشرفين بأنهم مسؤولون عن منع المشرفين من استخدام أدوات التحوط والمعززات وعلامات السلوك والإشارة إلى الذات. تشير هذه النتيجة إلى أن المشرفين المعنيين لا يلتزمون بوجهة نظر بنائية للكتابة الأكاديمية و التي ترفض تمامًا المبدأ الذي يشير إلى أن الخطاب ليس سوى تمثيل لغوي لمجموعة من الحقائق غير الشخصية والعالمية.