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Abstract- This corpus analysis is a quantitative study which intended to investigate the uses of four main interactional metadiscourse devices including fourteen sub-devices in the introduction and the discussion sections of the twenty communication arts research articles taken from Online Journal of Communication and Media technologies by applying ‘AntConc’ software and PASW 18.0. The findings reveal that the three most frequently used devices (X per 1000 words) in the introduction parts are attitudinal marker adjective (10.26), booster verb (5.56), and modal verb hedge (3.96) while the three most frequently found devices in the discussion sections are attitudinal marker adjective (18.88), modal verb hedge (11.51) and booster verb (9.14). There are nine sub-interactional metadiscourse devices among each of which significant difference (P) exist in both introduction and discussion sections. These are attitudinal marker adverb (<0.01), attitudinal marker adjective (<0.01), booster verb (<0.05), booster adverb (<0.05), booster adjectivel (<0.05), modal verb hedge (<0.001), hedge lexical verb (=0.001), hedge adverb (<0.01) , and hedge adjective (<0.05), while another five sub-interactional metadiscourse devices; self-mention, attitudinal marker verb, attitudinal marker noun, hedge noun, and hedge phraseology are found to have no significant difference between the use of each device in the introduction and discussion sections. The results also revealed that low and positive relationships exist among thirteen devices. One device which has no relationship with others is attitudinal marker verbs.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Language is used as a means of communication. Matthew [1] defined language as a means of vocal and written communication among human beings. Communication refers to the process of sending information from one living thing to another. Communication comprises non-verbal and verbal symbols both of which can communicate thoughts or feelings. Newly coined, the term ‘metadiscourse’ is refers to when writers refer to their acts of writing organization or thinking, or their readers’ acts of understanding and reading. We apply the term ‘metadiscourse’ to explain our paper, to indicate our intentions, to guide our reader’s responses, or organize our texts as a whole and improve our writing skills. Metadiscourse guides readers to the way they ought to understand, evaluate, and respond to propositional content. Our study focused on highlighting the concept of interactional metadiscourse devices in communication arts research articles and their functions.

The study will focus on a journal which is reported to have high impact factor and could represent a particular trend in writing a research article, namely the Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies (OJCMT).

As mentioned, the researcher proposes that only two parts of research articles where research article writers could express their own points of view are introduction part as well as discussion part of the article. This is another main reason the researcher particularly emphasizes researching on these two sections.

Currently, when talking about fields of education, sciences, medical sciences, social sciences, business administration, or linguistics would be inevitably mentioned. Another field of education that has been increasingly playing a vital role in nowadays education is communication arts. This could be noticed from an increasing number of research and studies in this field. This is a significant reason why the researcher is interested in studying interactional metadiscourse markers used in research articles in this field.

To the best of my knowledge, there are few research studies investigating the role of interactional metadiscourse devices in communication arts research articles and their functions. Also, few studies were conducted to investigate the use and/or effect of metadiscourse in texts. From a descriptive standpoint, metadiscourse has been shown to be a prominent feature of various types of academic discourse. These include school textbooks and the effects of metadiscourse on reading comprehension [2], university textbooks and doctoral dissertations [3]. Steffensen and Cheng’s study [4] analyze how students write after learning about metadiscourse. By dealing with such a subject, the researcher tries to open the door for other researchers who can deal with the textual function or widen the scope of research by studying use of metadiscourse markers in research articles especially on communication arts.

The main objective of the current study was to study a role of interactional metadiscourse devices in communication arts research articles. By such an exploration there would be much more knowledge...
about how research article writers are able to attract the largest number of people through deploying the metadiscourse elements and how writers can use these devices to make their writing more effective and communicative.

As mentioned above, a research article increasingly plays an important role in nowadays academic setting. Nevertheless, considerable researchers are not informed of appropriate style of language use in a research article. In other words, they are unfamiliar with the linguistic style of this genre.

The major purpose of this study was therefore to examine use of interactional metadiscourse devices in communication arts research articles published in OJCMT so that the use of these devices and their functions could be identified. The second purpose was to study what sub-device is the most frequently used in the introduction and discussion parts of communication arts research articles (RAs). The third purpose was to explore whether there are any differences between use of each of the sub-interactional metadiscourse devices in introduction and discussion parts of communication arts research articles. Furthermore, the last purpose is to probe if there are any correlations between use of each of the fourteen sub-interactional metadiscourse devices in communication arts research articles. All of these four major purposes have been developed to be three main research questions of the study.

Few research studies had been conducted to study interactional metadiscourse devices, which are used as strategies to gain certainty, avoidance of certain responsibility, and acceptance [3]-[6]. Some of them focused on authorial stance features while few emphasized studying boosters and their rhetorical structures. To this end, the authors of this study attempted to explore four specific devices as stance and engagement features as a Hyland’s [7] model. The study sought to answer the following questions and hypotheses empirically: 1) which sub-devices from the fourteen sub-devices are the three most frequently used in communication arts research articles? 2) are there any differences between each of the sub-interactional metadiscourse devices used in introduction and discussion parts of communication arts research articles? and 3) are there any correlations between each of the sub-interactional metadiscourse devices in communication arts research articles?

All of these three questions were answered based on analyzing total amount of the forty introduction and discussion parts of communication arts research articles from Online Journal of Communication and Technology. Regarding the three questions mentioned above, two null hypotheses are created. They are: 1) there is no significant difference between each of the sub-interactional metadiscourse markers in introduction and discussion parts of communication arts research articles and 2) there is no correlation between each of the sub-interactional metadiscourse devices used in communication arts research articles.

The results of this study will not only provide research article writers with use of interactional metadiscourse devices in producing communication arts research articles, the researcher also diagnoses their functions in order to provide an in-depth apprehension of the four interactional metadiscourse devices. In addition, an extended outcome of the research will be that the article writers can be assisted to overcome their article writing proficiency.

In turn, these new understandings will prompt further developments in teaching academic writing strategies used to facilitate learners’ writing academic English to their full potential.

II. DETAILS EXPERIMENTAL

The researcher of this article emphasized exploring the use of interactional metadiscourse devices in both introduction and discussion sections of twenty randomly selected communication arts articles (during 2012-2013 A.D.) of OJCMT.

One reason why the researcher focused on investigating communication arts research articles was that a field of communication arts has been increasingly salient in nowadays education. Numbers of universities around the world has been providing degrees of communication arts. Additionally, considerable studies in this field have been conducted. That would explicitly imply that the field of communication arts becomes more important. Yet, little research about analysis of language use in the research article has been conducted. This main reason causes the researcher of this article interested in studying research articles in the field of communication arts.

Another main reason why OJCMT was selected as an informational resource for studying was that this journal is reported to have credibility among numbers of communication arts scholars. Moreover, the ‘Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies’ has quite high impact factor. It is an international journal that allows freely accessed, rigorously peer-reviewed journal in the field of communication arts and its related fields. OJCMT is published four times a year: in January, April, July and October. Each to-be-published article has to be peer-reviewed by at least two blind internationally recognized reviewers. In other word, all articles published in the OJCMT must reach international standard. This also results in another important reason that researcher choose this journal to investigate.

As mentioned above, the researcher studied only interactional metadiscourse devices used in only two sections of twenty communication art research articles. One significant reason why the researcher focuses especially on these two sections since the
An Analysis Of Interactional Metadiscourse Devices In Communication Arts Research Articles

The study included twenty research articles particularly on communication arts from Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies with a total corpus of about seventy three thousand and seven hundred words. The chosen articles cover the period from 2013 to 2014. The choice of OJCMT in particular is based on its international reputation and on the grounds that the journal represents internationalized standard.

In order to verify the three questions including two hypotheses mentioned in the previous chapter, a quantitative methodology was used correspondingly to each question and hypothesis. Although many researchers hold that interpersonal pronouns are not to be counted as part of the metadiscourse devices. The interpersonal part of the classification system was thus a basis of analysis. It should as well be noted that Hyland and Tse [9] called the interpersonal part of metadiscourse ‘interactional’ resources.

The aim of this analysis was to find out how the interactional metadiscourse devices are deployed by writers in order to give their ideas and message a communicative effect. This was done by a careful statistical analysis of the data, followed by an explanation of the significance of numbers. In order to verify the three questions including the two hypotheses, ‘Ant-Conc’ and ‘PASW 18.0’ were used. The four main interactional metadiscourse markers as well as their fourteen sub-devices are investigated to figure out what kind of device and sub-device are most frequently applied in writing communication art research articles. Then, the significant difference and relationship of the use of all four sub-devices are explored by applying PASW 18.0. Finally, the researcher explains what role these devices play.

The study makes use of Hyland and Tse’s [9] classification of the techniques of interactional metadiscourse. This classification is chosen because it is more relevant to academic writing than others. The reason why the researcher has favored Hyland’s classification to other tools such as these two scholars examine metadiscourse in lecture comprehension which is related to the fact that the latter largely ignored elements almost exclusively found in written discourse because their concern was based on lecture comprehension. Hyland and Tse’s classification suited the purpose of this study since it highlighted how the research article writer interacts with the readers and helps to constitute their awareness. Furthermore, because of the advance of computer technology, collecting, labeling, and analyzing gathered data become easier and more possible. The computer program systematically and scientifically provides us with an insight of language use in research articles. A corpus-based approach, consequently, becomes applied widely and gains more popularity. A corpus-based approach was applied in this paper to investigate the frequency of use and their correlations between the other interactional metadiscourse devices. The first step was collecting materials from the one of the most credible online journals, and a corpus of communication arts research article was then created.

A quantitative analysis is the main method for analyzing data. AntConc 3.2 (Anthony, 2012) came to be used. The reason why AntConc 3.2 was used is that it is free and a user friendly software.

The metadiscursive model set by Hyland [7] was studied. Such a model is mainly interpersonal as it regards the textual markers of metadiscourse as originally interpersonal ones.

If Adel [8] referred to the narrow (non-integrative) approach of metadiscourse as the one that primarily investigates aspects of text organization and largely excluding the interpersonal elements; then, Hyland [7] held the very opposite of such a model, that is, metadiscourse is, in the main, interpersonal.

The model of interaction offered by Hyland [7] is consisted of the two main dimensions (interactive and interactional dimensions):

While the interactive dimension helps guide the reader to go through the text the interactional dimension involves the reader into the text. The researchers employed his analysis by the use of the subcategories of the interactional dimension as our tool. As illustrated by Hyland [7], the interactional devices comprise hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentioning words and engagement markers. Their tentative definitions are as followed:

According Hyland [7], a self-mention refers to the presence of an author in a text. Self-mentioning words are such as first person pronouns and first person possessive adjectives (I, me, my, mine, exclusive we, us, our, ours). According to Hyland [7], self-representation can express through the use of the
first person pronouns. Writers use this device to show how they stand in relations to their argument. According to Hyland and Tse [9], hedges shows the writer’s reluctance to the proposition as an established fact. As stated by Hyland[7], they are devices such as ‘perhaps’, ‘might’ and, ‘possible’ all of which are used to withhold complete commitment to a propositional information. They allow subjectivity as they make information sound an opinion rather than a fact. The matter is then, a writer’s plausible reasoning rather than certain knowledge.

Booster implies certainty and emphasize the force of a proposition. As stated by Hyland [7], words such as ‘obviously’ and ‘clearly’ allow writers to close down alternatives and head off conflicting views. Boosters emphasize certainty by marking involvement with the topic and solidarity with an audience, and by taking a joint position against other voices. Moreover, attitudinal markers express the writer’s appraisal of propositional information, conveying surprise, obligation, agreement, importance, etc. As stated by Hyland [7] words such as “agree”, “prefer”, “unfortunately” and “remarkable” indicate the writer's affective, rather than epistemic attitude to proposition. As lexical items, they are much more powerful in expressing attitude than syntactic devices such as subordination, comparatives, punctuation, etc.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research question I of the study stated that which sub-devices are the three most frequently used in communication arts research articles. To investigate this research question, a descriptive analysis was conducted. The results are summarized in TABLE I. According to TABLE I, it is seen that attitudinal marker (adjective) is the most frequently used interactional metadiscourse devices found in both introduction and discussion sections. The average uses (per a thousand words) of attitudinal marker adjective in these two sections are 10.26 and 8.99 respectively. Interestingly, booster verb, and modal verb hedge are the second and the third most frequently used sub-interactional metadiscourse devices in introduction section. The average uses of these two sub-devices are 5.56, and 3.96 respectively. Oppositely, the second and the third most frequently used sub-interactional metadiscourse devices in discussion section are modal verb hedge and booster verb. The average uses of these 2 sub-devices are 5.56, and 3.96 respectively. The analyzed data is compared and also presented in bar graph format (See TABLE I and Fig1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactional Metadiscourse Device</th>
<th>Introduction Sections (n=20)</th>
<th>Discussion Sections (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-mention</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal marker (adverb)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal marker (adjective)</td>
<td>10.26*</td>
<td>18.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal marker (verb)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal marker (noun)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booster (verb)</td>
<td>5.56*</td>
<td>9.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booster (adverb)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booster (adjective)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge (modal verb)</td>
<td>3.96***</td>
<td>11.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge (lexical verb)</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge (adverb)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge (adjective)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge (phraseological)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: FREQUENCY OF AVERAGE USE OF ALL FOURTEEN SUB-INTERACTIONAL METADISCOURSE DEVICES IN THE INTRODUCTION AND THE DISCUSSION SECTIONS OF THE TWENTY COMMUNICATION ARTS RESEARCH ARTICLES

Research question II of the study stated whether there is no significant difference between use of each sub-interactional metadiscourse devices in the introduction and discussion sections of communication arts research articles. To investigate this research question, an independent samples-test was conducted. The results are summarized in TABLE II.

![Fig 1 Comparison of the average use of all fourteen sub-interactional metadiscourse devices in the introduction and the discussion sections of the twenty communication arts research articles](image-url)
As shown in TABLE II, the average uses of the fourteen sub-interactional metadiscourse devices were compared. As the table indicates, the first null hypothesis was rejected. There are nine sub-interactional metadiscourse devices among each of which significant difference exists in both introduction and discussion sections while another five sub-interactional metadiscourse devices; self-mention, attitudinal marker verb, attitudinal marker noun, noun hedge, and phraseology hedge has no significant difference between the uses of each device in the introduction and discussion sections.

As seen, in terms of attitudinal marker adverb, there is a high significant difference existing between the uses of this device in both introduction and discussion sections (the existing significance value (.007) is less than the significance level (.01). In terms of attitudinal marker adjective, there is a high significant difference existing between the uses of this device in both sections (the existing significance value (.005) is less than the significance level (.01). In terms of booster verb, there is a significant difference existing between the uses of this device in both sections (the existing significance value (.03) is less than the significance level (.05). Also, in terms of booster adverb, there is a significant difference existing between the uses of this device in both sections (the existing significance value (.022) is less than the significance level (.05). In terms of booster adjective, there is a significant difference occurring between the uses of this device in both sections (the existing significance value (.019) is less than the significance level (.05). In terms of modal verb hedge, there is a highly significant difference occurring between the uses of this device in both sections (the existing significance value (.000) is less than the significance level (.001). In terms of lexical verb hedge, there is a highly significant difference occurring between the uses of this device in both sections (the existing significance value (.012) is equal to the significance level (.05). Moreover, in terms of adjective hedge, there is a significant difference existing between the uses of the device in both sections (the existing significance value (.012) is equal to the significance level (.05).

The third research question hypothesized that whether there is no correlation between each of the sub-interactional metadiscourse devices in communication arts research articles. In order to investigate this null hypothesis, a multiple regression was conducted. The results are summarized in TABLE III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devices</th>
<th>Introduction (n=20)</th>
<th>Discussion (n=20)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attn (Adv)</td>
<td>.58 .72</td>
<td>1.67 1.53</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn (Adj)</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>9.88 18.83</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booster (V)</td>
<td>5.56 4.10</td>
<td>5.56 4.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booster (Adv)</td>
<td>.47 .70</td>
<td>1.44 1.66</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booster (Adj)</td>
<td>.69 .79</td>
<td>2.02 2.28</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge (Mod V)</td>
<td>3.97 3.87</td>
<td>11.50 7.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.004***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge (Lex V)</td>
<td>.66 .99</td>
<td>3.48 3.52</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge (Adv)</td>
<td>.295 3.06</td>
<td>6.23 3.50</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge (Adj)</td>
<td>.55 .76</td>
<td>1.50 1.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * P < 0.05 ** P < 0.01 *** P <= 0.001 (only devices with P value < 0.05 are reported)

Attn = Attitudinal marker (V) = Verb (Adv) = Adverb (Mod V) = Modal Verb (Adj) = Adjective (Lex V)= Lexical Verb
In comparing all fourteen sub-interactional metadiscourse devices with each other, product moment correlation coefficient (r) is applied. According to TABLE III, the second null hypothesis is also rejected. It is seen that relationships exist only among thirteen devices. One device which has no relationship with others is attitudinal marker (verb).

As seen from TABLE III, a positive and low relationships exist between self-mention and booster verb (P < 0.05, r = .391), modal verb hedge (P < 0.05, r = .341), and adjective hedge (P < 0.05, r = .337). That means if the use of self-mention is high, the use of booster verb, modal verb hedge, and adjective hedge are high and vice versa.

In addition, positive and low relationships exist between the use of attitudinal marker adverb and attitudinal marker adjective (P < 0.01, r = .499), attitudinal marker noun (P < 0.01, r = .522), booster verb (P < 0.01, r = .364), booster adverb (P < 0.01, r = .410), booster adjective (P < 0.01, r = .396), modal verb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .610), and adjective hedge (P < 0.01, r = .428). That means if the use of attitudinal marker adverb is high, the use of attitudinal marker adjective, attitudinal marker noun, booster verb, booster adverb, booster adjective, modal verb hedge, and adjective hedge are high and vice versa.

Positive and low relationship exists between the use of attitudinal marker adjective and booster verb (P < 0.01, r = .487), modal verb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .396), and lexical verb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .453). That means if the use of attitudinal marker (adjective) is high, the use of booster verb, modal verb hedge, and lexical verb hedge are high and vice versa.

Furthermore, positive and low relationship exists between the use of attitudinal marker noun and modal verb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .435), and adjective hedge (P < 0.01, r = .388). That means if the use of attitudinal marker noun is high, the use of modal verb hedge, and adjective hedge are high and vice versa.

Positive and low relationship exists between the use of booster verb and booster adverb (P < 0.01, r = .496), modal verb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .496), lexical verb hedge (P < 0.05, r = .387), and adverb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .443). That means if the use of booster verb is high, the uses of booster adverb, modal verb hedge, lexical verb hedge, and adverb hedge are high and vice versa.

Positive and low relationships exist between the use of booster adverb and booster adjective (P < 0.01, r = .855), modal verb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .313), lexical verb hedge (P < 0.05, r = .363), adverb hedge (P < 0.05, r = .392), adjective hedge (P < 0.01, r = .475), noun hedge (P < 0.01, r = .409), and phraseology hedge (P < 0.01, r = .436). That means if the use of booster adverb is high, the uses of booster adjective, modal verb hedge, lexical verb hedge, adverb hedge, adjective hedge, noun hedge, and phraseology hedge are high and vice versa.

Positive and low relationships also exist between the use of booster adjective and modal verb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .420), lexical verb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .491), adverb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .428), adjective hedge (P < 0.01, r = .534), noun hedge (P < 0.01, r = .517), and phraseology hedge (P < 0.05, r = .346). That means if the use of booster adjective is high, the uses of modal verb hedge, lexical verb hedge, adverb hedge, adjective hedge, noun hedge, and phraseology hedge are high and vice versa.

Additionally, positive and low relationships also exist between the use of modal verb hedge and lexical verb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .532), adverb hedge (P < 0.01, r = .477), adjective hedge (P < 0.01, r = .607), and noun hedge (P < 0.01, r = .558). That means if the use of modal verb hedge is high, the uses of lexical verb hedge, adverb hedge, adjective hedge, and noun hedge are high and vice versa.

What’s more, positive and low relationships also exist between the use of lexical verb hedge and adjective hedge (P < 0.01, r = .573), and noun hedge (P < 0.05, r = .328). That means if the use of lexical verb hedge is high, the uses of adjective hedge and noun hedge are high and vice versa.

Eventually, positive and low relationship also exist between the use of adverb hedge and adjective hedge (P < 0.01, r = .420). That means if the use of adverb hedge is high, the use of adjective hedge is high and vice versa. Also, positive and low relationship also exist between the use of adverb hedge and noun hedge (P < 0.01, r = .576). That means if the use of adjective hedge is high, the use of noun hedge is high and vice versa.

The interactional metadiscourse devices are necessary markers bonding readers-writers’ interaction, group work, and negotiation of meaning. Significant differences explored in different devices namely self-mention, attitudinal markers boosters, and hedges in the articles. This significance may confuse the novice readers to either embed as hedges and boosters or other features that they could to impress the academia or develop their own style. In other words whether the writers should practice authorial self and power over readers or indicate their modesty and honesty that neither nullifies other
feature’s influence” [10] nor practice over boosterization or over hedgesization. Though the second option may seem convenient, many writers follow the same path of specific pieces of writings as the best stance without substantial instructions. It seems necessary to highlight impressions of these features on construction of rhetorical understandings of the students and to develop an exclusive content providing the article writers with subtle interactional stance necessary in promoting the writers’ discursive persona in academia.

CONCLUSIONS

In this study, it was intended to study the uses of fourteen sub-interactional metadiscourse devices between the introduction and the discussion sections of the twenty communication arts research articles taken from OJCMT. The first question of this study is to find which sub-interactional metadiscourse devices are the three most frequently used devices in the introduction parts are attitudinal marker adjective, booster verb, and modal verb hedge while the three most frequently found devices in the discussion sections are attitudinal marker adjective, modal verb hedge and booster verb. The five most frequently found attitudinal marker adjectives were ‘important’, ‘significant’, ‘high’, ‘knowledge’, ‘still’, and ‘negative’. Moreover, the five most frequently found booster verbs were ‘have’, ‘can’, ‘found’, ‘show’, ‘must’, and ‘cannot’ while the five most frequently found modal verb hedged were ‘can’, ‘may’, ‘will’, ‘would’, and ‘should’. The second question of this study was to unveil whether there was no significant difference between use of each sub-interactional metadiscourse devices in the introduction and discussion sections of communication arts research articles. In order to investigate this research question, an independent samples t-test was conducted. The findings showed that the first null hypothesis was rejected since there were nine sub-interactional metadiscourse devices among each of which significant difference existed in both introduction and discussion sections. These were attitudinal marker adverbs, attitudinal marker adjectives, booster verbs, booster adverbs, booster adjectives, modal verb hedges, lexical verbhedged, adverb-hedges, and adjective hedges, while another five sub-interactional metadiscourse devices; self-mention words, attitudinal marker verbs, attitudinal marker nouns, noun hedges, and phraseology hedges were found to have no significant difference between the uses of each device in the introduction and discussion sections. The third research question was to solve whether there was no correlation between each of the sub-interactional metadiscourse devices in communication arts research articles. In order to investigate this null hypothesis, a multiple regression was conducted. The results revealed that low and positive relationships exist among thirteen devices. One device which had no relationship with others was attitudinal marker verbs. The results revealed that the three most frequently used devices in the introduction parts had significant differences in different features of stance and engagement model as was first frameworked by Hyland [10]. Interestingly, ‘self-mention’ was frequently used by writers to project the indirectness and their cautious style when expressing opinion[11]-[13]
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