

Contents lists available at [JSLP](https://www.sanad.iau.ir/journal/jslp)

Journal of Second Language Pedagogy

Journal homepage: <https://www.sanad.iau.ir/journal/jslp>

Reflexive Metadiscourse Markers in Academic Spoken Seminars: An Across-Sciences Study

Oranoos Rezaei¹, Seyed Foad Ebrahimi^{2*}, Saeed Yazdani³¹ Department of Foreign Languages Teaching, Bu. C., Islamic Azad University, Bushehr, Iran² Department of Foreign Languages Teaching, Shad. C., Islamic Azad University, Shadegan, Iran³ Department of Foreign Languages Teaching, Bu. C., Islamic Azad University, Bushehr, Iran*Corresponding Author's Email: s.f.ebrahimi@iau.ac.ir

KEY TERMS

Functions
Metadiscourse
Reflexive
Sciences
Seminars

ABSTRACT

Metadiscourse is defined as linguistic expressions that help to organize discourse and display the speaker's stance toward the discourse, and it has changed communication as a mere transfer of information to have aspects such as attitudes, personalities, and assumptions of participants in the communication. There are two quite different strands that can be identified concerning the study of metadiscourse; narrow and broad. The narrow model that is mostly adopted by Mauranen and Adel emphasizes the reflexivity in language. This study intends to shed light on the realizations and discourse functions of reflexive metadiscourse markers in academic seminars across sciences. To this end, 39 seminars were selected from four different sciences (Life and Medical Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Physical and Social Sciences). The seminars were selected from the British Academic Spoken English corpus (BASE) corpus. The corpus was analyzed based on Adel's framework and the results were normalized per 1000 words. Findings revealed science variations in reflexive metadiscourse markers. Thus, these differences should be included in the syllabus developed for teaching academic speaking genres across sciences.

ARTICLE TYPE

Original Research Paper

Received:	3 August	2025
Revised:	19 September	2025
Accepted:	20 November	2025
Published Online:	30 December	2025

© The Authors 2025

1. Introduction

Social and cultural trends of human communities are manifested by talk, language, and communication (Van Dijk et al., 1997). Communication is essentially a social interaction (Schiffrin, 1994) as it is not a separate part with one to-one relation, though it is accomplished among different individuals with unique intentions, knowledge, and necessities in a specific society (Aguilar, 2008; Wu, et al., 2022). Transferring some information is the major function in communication between people

for achieving a cohesive and logical construction of this data, a writer/ speaker utilizes different linguistic statements. Certain statements indicate the way of shaping the logical flow of the context by the writer/ speaker, while also presenting their personal attitude toward the content. These particular types of linguistic statements are termed as metadiscourse.

Hyland (2005) states that metadiscourse assumes the communication as something beyond simply exchanging information, services, or products. It also comprises the attitudes, assumptions, and personalities of those involved in communication. It is assumed that metadiscourse serves as the coverage term for self-reflective expressions used for communicating interactional definition in a context, which assists the speaker/writer in declaring an idea and engaging with readers as community members (Fossali & Mancini, 2023; Hyland, 2005; Hyland & Jiang, 2018, 2022).

Due to analytically strong and conceptually rich nature of metadiscourse, scholars encounter indistinctness and difficulties in its description, analysis and grouping (Adel, 2006; Hyland, 2005). In general, there are two definitions shaped in the survey of metadiscourse: one which adopts a wide approach and meaning, observing textual interaction as essential to the category, and one which utilizes a limited approach and definition, observing discussion reflexivity as fundamental to the class (Ädel & Mauranen, 2010; Ädel, 2019). In this study, Adel's (2006) definition of metadiscourse is followed. Based on the reflexive model, Ädel (2006) distinguishes between impersonal and personal metadiscourse. It is rational to accept that academic spoken corpus makes more use of personal modes of metadiscourse, and, in contrast, academic written corpus tends to make higher use of impersonal modes (Boginskaya, 2022). An exhaustive investigation of impersonal and personal modes of metadiscourse can lead to categories being added to Adel's taxonomy. The reasoning behind this is that a unified approach makes it easier to identify similarities and differences between written and spoken metadiscourse (Amiryousefi & Rasekh, 2010). There are a few studies that have dealt with spoken metadiscourse concurrently, and there are even fewer number of works that attempted to draw a cohesive portrait of the types of functions filled by metadiscourse in academic discourse (Abdi & Ahmadi, 2015; Khedri, et al., 2013; Liao, 2020; Lu & Jiang, 2024; Mu, 2025; Pérez-Llantada, 2010; Song, et al., 2024; Qazi, et al., 2025; Yang, 2025). Thus, having above mentioned information, the present work aims to examine the functions and frequencies of reflective metadiscourse in academic English seminars for undergraduate college students across different sciences (Life and Medical Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Physical and Social Sciences).

Some researchers have focused on the realizations and functions of reflexive metadiscourse in academic genres (Zare & Tavakoli, 2016; Zhu, 2018; Ebrahimi & Matrody, 2022;). Zhu (2018) studied the realizations of personal metadiscourse in Chinese and English commencement speeches relying on Adel's reflexive model of metadiscourse and its adoption. He built their studies on 60 commencing speeches. The potential logics behind these differences and similarities are explained. The findings demonstrated that on average there were 23 personal metadiscourse per 10000 words in English speeches and 8 in Chinese speeches. Obviously, personal metadiscourse used in English speeches was more recurrent than in Chinese speeches. Zhu (2018) found that as the focus of personal metadiscourse is on the relation of reader and writers with the world of discourses (or the text), or the way of their relation with each other within that world, so English commencement speeches compared to Chinese speeches are more personal. He added that English appears to use significantly more personal pronouns than Chinese. He added that Chinese language has a less fixed structure with a large number of no-subject sentences. Chinese people are more indirect and implicit when they want to present their thinking and perspectives, while it is opposite concerning English addresser.

Similarly, in his survey of personal metadiscourse with various functions, he stated that metatext was more frequently utilized than audience interaction in both corpora. It is because of genre-related factors "Commencement speech" is considered as a type of monologue, where speakers place great emphasis on structuring their discourse. Hence, metatext was observed in higher frequency in both Chinese and English languages.

Zare and Tavakoli (2016) investigated 16 academic lectures and discussions based on Adel's (2010) taxonomy, the study has examined the roles of personal metadiscourse expressions, the two data (dialogic and monologic) sets were compared concerning the use of personal metadiscourse roles. According to research findings, there were both major and slight differences in the personal metadiscourse use. Dialogues and monologues showed slight differences in the extent to which repairing, clarifying, reformulating, marking asides, introducing, concluding, delimiting, adding to topic, discussing, exemplifying, managing audience discipline, anticipating the audience's response, managing the message, and imagining scenarios were conducted.

Above reviewed literature highlights some gaps that are worth to be considered. One is the lack of focus on Adel's (2006) definition of metadiscourse as most of the current literatures focus on Hyland's (2005) model of metadiscourse. Second, spoken discourse as it is difficult to be collected and analyzed, thus it has received very little attention (Bemani, et al, 2014; Zohoorian, 2015). Among the spoken genres, seminars are little studied for linguistic features such as metadiscourse markers. Thus, this study intends to investigate the realizations of reflexive metadiscourse markers in academic seminars by finding answer to the following research questions:

RQ1. How frequently do reflexive metadiscourse markers occur in academic seminars across four disciplines (Life/Medical Sciences, Arts/Humanities, Physical Sciences, Social Sciences)?

RQ2. What are the functions of reflective metadiscourse markers in academic English seminars across different sciences (Life and Medical Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Physical and Social Sciences)?

2. Methodology

This study is descriptive by qualitatively comparing realizations of reflexive metadiscourse markers in seminars from four sciences. The qualitative analysis explored the discourse functions of different types of reflexive metadiscourse markers and provided possible explanations for their use in seminars.

2.1 Corpus

Forty seminars extracted from the British Academic Spoken English (BASE) corpus (10 seminars per discipline)

2.2 Research Procedure

The following steps were carried out to do this study: First, data collected from the BASE corpus of undergraduate seminar transcripts. Second, the realizations and discourses of second-person pronoun you, first-person pronouns I and we were determined and tabled based on framework suggested by Adel (2010). Third, pronouns were identified as metadiscourse and non-metadiscourse

markers. According to Adel's (2010) framework for metadiscourse analysis, we determined metadiscourse pronouns and their functions in the seminars. Fourth, findings were tabulated and compared with literature. Fifth, as the length of texts (seminars) were different, thus, all frequencies of reflexive metadiscourse were normalized per 1000 words. It is worth mentioning that to decrease the false realizations of metadiscourse markers and their functions, a sample of eight seminars were analyzed by two experts in applied linguistics. This could increase the reliability of findings.

2.3 Study Framework

To analyze the corpus, Adel's (2010) framework were used. This framework contains 23 discourse functions, classified into four major categories: Discourse organization, Metalinguistic comments, References to the audience, and Speech act labels. The category of Metatext known as metalinguistic comments, contain discourse functions of Repairing, Commenting on Linguistic Form/Meaning, Reformulating, Clarifying, and Managing Terminology. Repairing (Example 1) denotes both self- and other- initiated alterations and suggestions for correcting or cancelling a preceding contribution. Reformulating (Example 2) denotes to offer an alternative expression or term, not because the preceding contribution was considered as wrong (as in the case of Repairing), but in order to provide the added value of expansion. Commenting on Linguistic Form/Meaning (Example 3) contains metalinguistic references to word choice, linguistic form, and/or meaning. Clarifying (Example 4) is utilized for spelling out the intentions of addresser so that misinterpretation is avoided. In this context, clarifying does not denote a particular interactive function and therefore is not categorized under Reference to the audience. Instead, it reflects instances where speakers aim to clarify their intent or meaning to stop potential misinterpretations. Managing Terminology (Example 5) generally includes offering definitions and assigning labels or terms to discussed phenomena.

Example 1: I didn't mean to say that out loud

Example 2: Then, if you'll allow me just restate it a little.....

Example 3: now , what do we have going on in the spanish?

Example 4: Again, I do not mean to state that.....

Example 5: when we use the word influence we're talking about...

Discourse organization includes several discourse functions having to do with topic management: Introducing Topic (used to open the topic) (Example 6); Delimiting Topic (used to clearly express how the topic is confined) (Example 7); Adding to Topic (employed for openly remark on adding a topic or subtopic) (Example 8); Concluding Topic (employed for closing the topic) (Example 9); and Marking Aside (employed for opening or closing a "topic sidetrack" or digression) (Example 10). Discourse organization contains some discourse functions related to phonics management: Enumerating (Example 11) is helpful in showing the way of organizing certain sections of the discourse in relation to each other. Endophoric Marking (Example 12) implies a particular location in the discourse, referring to cases in which it is not relevant or clear whether what is referred to happens before or after the current point (in contrast to Reviewing and Previewing). An instance of this is when the speaker directs the audience to refer to a table or locate a particular section in a handout.

Example 6: What we`re gonna do in today`s lecture is.....

Example 7: We`re not gonna address all eight here.....

Example 8: I should add too that.....

Example 9: we`ve now addressed the sediment types.....

Example 10: I like to pass over this section since

Example 11: I`m going to discuss on two mechanisms.

Example 12: ok so if you look at Question 1, uh in your handout

Previewing and Reviewing point forward and backward in the discourse, which are utilized by the addresser for announcing what is going to come, reminding the audience what has already happened in the discourse, and performing contextualization (Example 13-15).

Example 13: and we`ll be coming to that.....

Example 14: uh we closed last time uh with.....

Example 15: Right, well, you`re controlling the act but you can`t manage where you are in this cycle schedule when you do.....

Speech act labels are described as the discourse functions of Arguing (Example 16), employed for stressing the action of arguing for or against an issue; Exemplifying (Example 17), used to clearly present an example; and a general category of Other Speech Act Labelling (Example 18) for the speech acts that are not adequately frequent

Example 16: I argued to you that the different.....

Example 17: that his life should be an example.....

Example 18: recycled cultural entities, okay. I will unpack that for you.....

References to the audience contains 5 discourse functions. Managing comprehension (Example 19) functions when the addresser is going to verify the input perception in participants. Managing audience (Example 20) includes direct addressing of the participants, and punishing or praising them for their conducts. Anticipating the response of audience (Example 21) reflects the cases where the addresser anticipates the participants' potential reactions to the presented information. In Managing the message (Example 22), it is required to emphasize the principal part of the discussion to be recalled by the participants. Imagining scenarios (Example 23) occur when it is expected that participants suppose something in the discourse's shared world.

Example 19: Did I answer your question? ...

Example 20: OK, can I take your attention please?

Example 21: I don`t know if that clarifies it

Example 22: I hope you enjoyed reviewing these materials

Example 23: Assume I say that it is wrong for me to steal some money, by which I mean I ought not....

3. Data Analysis

This research intended to study the realizations and functions of reflexive metadiscourse markers in seminars from four sciences. The results are presented based on research questions presented in introduction section of this study. First research question focused on the frequency of reflective

metadiscourse in academic English seminars across different sciences (Life and Medical Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Physical and Social Sciences). Thus, the corpus was analyzed for the realizations of reflexive metadiscourse pronouns. Results are presented in Table 1. It is worth mentioning that due to not equal corpora, results were normalized per 1000 words.

Table 1

Frequency of Reflexive Pronoun Types (per 1000 words) and Percentage

Reflexive pronouns	I	You	We	Total words
Physical science	1770(21.91)	2713(33.59)	1841(22.79)	80756
percentage	2.19%	3.36%	2.28%	
Life sciences	2389(18.26)	2861(21.87)	1119(8.55)	130781
percentage	1.83%	2.19%	0.86%	
Social sciences	2125(21.68)	2892(29.51)	116(1.18)	97988
percentage	2.17%	2.95%	0.12%	
Humanities	3756(29.69)	4403(34.80)	627(4.95)	126490
Percentage	2.97%	3.48%	0.50%	

According to Table 1, the realizations of reflexive pronouns are among the major linguistic features deserve investigation as they are utilized in academic context such as seminars (Example 1-4).

Example 1: but I think I mean this is again what you're already doing it's just making a couple of notes okay now the portfolio is I think an opportunity.

Example 2: look at our system and I mean you know we're talking about a first world country.

Example 3: yes er yeah I mean, i think i see what you're saying and these are my only references in an any sort of emotional er sense to it er er I-, since I mean of course there are ways for approaching the novel and getting a grip on it.

Example 4: yeah er so but I n-, I think there is some sort of er er okay you've got this strong oxidizing agent when it gets to ruthenium-three okay you so you're talking about the excitation here using first person pronoun and present their attitude on different aspect and issues of their discourse.

The results in Table 1 are similar to those reported in Zare and Tavakoli (2016). They noted that 60-75% of pronouns are not employed for metadiscursive functions. It implies that participants in seminars tend to talk about their experiences in the real world. The similarities between our finding and those reported by Zare and Tavakoli (2016), imply that in seminars speakers care more about the interpretations of audiences and they are more cautious about plainness of their discourse. The data from this research implies that speakers tend to direct the focus of audiences toward the discourse itself, aiming to shape their interpretation. According to Table 1, the pronoun you occurred most frequently among three reflexive pronouns, and we showed the least attention. It can be explained in

this way that speakers desire to draw the attention of listeners to the projected discourse across different sciences especially humanities. In humanities, we have more frequency of *you* compared to life, social and physical sciences. and we have the least frequency of *you* in physical science. Speakers attempt to assist audiences having a better interpretation of information presented about their discourse therefore they use *you* more than other pronouns. After *you*, *I* has received the highest attention and *the* pronoun we occurred least frequently. Several factors may justify this finding: first, speakers often assume ownership of the study, which leads them to tend utilize first-person pronouns to express their position on various issues and aspects within their discourse. In humanities, speakers prefer using *I* after *you* compare to life, social and physical sciences. We have the least number of *I*, in physical science, depending on nature of discourse, speakers have different ideas and present various perspectives about some issues and sometimes every person reaches to a different result. In order to provide more clarification to their discourse, speakers use more *you* in humanities compare to life, social and Natural sciences. The second research question shed the light on the functions of reflexive metadiscourse realized in seminars from different sciences (Life and Medical Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Physical and Social Sciences). Thus the corpus was analyzed and results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Frequency of four Categories of Reflexive Metadiscourse Markers

Discipline	Function	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Per 1000
Physical Science	Metalinguistic comments	440	58.12	5.44
	Discourse organization	0	0.00	0.00
	Reference to audience	314	41.74	3.88
	Speech act labels	1	0.13	0.01
Life Sciences	Metalinguistic comments	518	60.65	6.41
	Discourse organization	0	0.00	0.00
	Reference to audience	336	39.34	2.56
	Speech act labels	0	0.00	0.00
Social Sciences	Metalinguistic comments	657	54.65	6.70
	Discourse organization	0	0.00	0.00
	Reference to audience	545	45.34	5.56
	Speech act labels	0	0.00	0.00
Humanities	Metalinguistic comments	1209	51.60	9.55
	Discourse organization	0	0.00	0.00
	Reference to audience	1134	48.39	8.96
	Speech act labels	0	0.00	0.00

According to Table 2, it is noted that *metalinguistic comments* function received the highest attention among the reflexive metadiscourse functions across sciences. The distribution of

metalinguistic comments in different sciences was somewhat different. It is more frequent in humanities and less frequent in physical science and these results can be discussed in relation to genre of discourse and type of aim that speakers pursue. A detailed examination of the distribution of the functions within *metalinguistic comments* demonstrates that sciences were similar in the absence other functions under *metalinguistic comment* such as *reformulating*, *repairing*, *commenting on linguistic form/meaning* and *managing terminology*. The following are the main functions identified under the category of *Metalinguistic Comments*. These play a critical role in *organizing* and *clarifying* language use in academic discourse: *Repairing*; this function refers to the process of correcting or revising a previous statement or utterance when adjustments or clarifications are needed.

Reformulating; it involves rephrasing a concept or idea in different words to achieve greater clarity or precision. *Commenting on Linguistic Form/Meaning*; this function focuses on evaluating, explaining, or discussing linguistic features or meanings of terms used within the discourse. *Managing Terminology*; it entails introducing, defining, or explaining specialized terms and concepts to eliminate ambiguity and enhance comprehension. The absence of these functions should be considered as genre specific features concerning the use of reflexive metadiscourse.

As reported in Table 2, the *speech act labels* and *discourse organization* categories are not norm in the genre of seminars. This result is in line Rezaei et al, (2022). It appears that speakers tend to focus on the discourse itself. This function involves the actions by speakers for clarifying their communication. They favor using reflexive metadiscourse makers to improve interpretability and comprehensibility of their discourse.

Table 3

Frequencies of Metalinguistics Reflexive Metadiscourse Markers across sciences

Discipline	Sub-function	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Life Sciences	Clarifying	518	100.0
Social Sciences	Clarifying	657	100.0
Humanities (Metalinguistic comments)	Clarifying	1209	100.0
Physical Science (Metalinguistic comments)	Clarifying	440	100.0

Table 3 showed the highest frequency of the *clarifying metadiscursive* function in different sciences (example 5-8), which agrees with those found by Zare and Tavakoli (2016). This finding is a common observation since audience and speaker relate in real context that indicates the necessity for clarification to ensure comprehension of their discourse. This could indicate that the discourse should be as flawless as possible to convince the audience. This function appears to assist speaker to convince both audience and other potential listeners.

Metadiscourse is used to organize discourse and manage interaction between writer/speaker and reader/listener and it is crucial in enhancing communication. Thus, one of the key functions of metadiscourse is *clarification*, which aims to prevent potential misunderstandings and ensure audience comprehension. This function has been explored by numerous scholars, contributing to a rich understanding of its importance in various contexts.

Clarifying strategies stand out as crucial tools for guiding readers through academic texts. Hyland (2005) emphasized how these metadiscourse markers contribute to improved coherence and reader comprehension, facilitating a smoother and more effective communication process. This perspective emphasizes the writer's active role in anticipating and addressing the reader's needs.

Mauranen (1993) added another layer to this understanding by focusing on the function of clarification in cross-cultural academic writing. In contexts where writers and readers may have different cultural backgrounds or academic conventions, clarification strategies become even more essential for preventing misunderstandings and ensuring effective communication. This research highlights the importance of clarifications through metadiscourse in promoting intercultural understanding in academic discourse.

More recently, Zare and Tavakoli (2016) have provided further support for the idea that clarification through metadiscourse markers enhances communication by ensuring audience comprehension. By using clarification markers, speakers and writers acknowledge the presence of their audience and actively work to facilitate their understanding, fostering a stronger connection and a more successful communicative exchange. Examples 5-8 could clearly display the above claims.

Example 5: what do **I think** of this approach well **I think** it's **I think** it's a a w-, a magnificent method er it's inexpensive **I mean** the whole thing other than providing s.

Example 6: sf5397: yes but they are but **I think** still they are travelling **I mean** like inexpensive package tourism initiated during the sixties yeah **I mean** they're sort of drawn into the consumer er pressure.

Example 7: nm5000: yes er yeah **I mean** i i un-, **I think** i understand what you're saying and of course these are my only references in an any sort of emotional er sense to it er er i-, because **I mean** of course there are ways you can approach the novel.

Example 8: nm5033: yeah er so but i n-, **I think** there is some sort of er er okay you've got this strong oxidizing agent when it gets to ruthenium-three okay you so you're talking about the excitation here sm5057: yeah.

As to the reference to *audience reflexive* metadiscourse markers, the corpus was analyzed and results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4*Frequency of References to Audience Reflexive Metadiscourse Markers*

Discipline	Sub-function	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Life Sciences	Managing comprehension	284	84.02
	Anticipating the audience response	52	15.38
	Imagining sceneries	2	0.59
	Total	338	100.00
Other Disciplines	Anticipating the audience response	45	8.18
	Imagining sceneries	5	0.90
	Total	550	100.00

As shown in Table 4, the most frequent subcategory of the references to the audiences' metadiscourse function is *managing the comprehension metadiscourse* function. In spoken discourse, we need to assess the participants' comprehension of the input. In spoken discourse, such a metadiscursive role can considerably help speakers achieve their purpose. The frequent use of managing comprehension in humanities can be more active engagement of the audience. Both the speaker and listener work together in different parts of the discourse to guarantee mutual understanding of the content by realization of their functions. Anticipating the audiences' responses was the sub-category of the references to the audiences' metadiscourse function with the highest frequency after *managing the comprehension metadiscourse* function (example 9-12). It denotes situations where speakers anticipate the audiences' potential reactions or responses. This function is useful in guaranteeing that audiences follow the speakers. Through this function, the speaker can be ensured on the comprehension and understanding of the intended meaning by the listeners. While the managing audience and managing message metadiscourse function were neglected by the speakers.

Example 9: you need to know in some detail so we've just gone over that in er a comprehensive outline and recall **you know** you need to instruct the patient there are drugs there's their actions of daily life there's defending the joints surgical treatment and recall to you know handling the patient er er as far as possible holistically.

Example 10: i mean er we're just having a bit of fun there but i think something like that could direct to some er a productive piece of creative writing **you know** what occurs next write the story yeah er use an **you know** a good piece of er y-, **you know** exercise writing activity something like that.

Example 11: **you think** they might have A-V-N er then er noticeably you don't want to wait until they get progressive er O-A hip you want to try and notice it earlier so you get aching hip in a young individual it's worth examining them.

Example 12: nm5067: i'm going to give that three points i think that's fairly a good one three points for the Jumping Bananas right now here what do **you think** they're doing at the back next yes let's take them at the back.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Metadiscourse is an open category, and when analyzing texts across different registers, it is natural to develop a new version. Moreover, as noted by Adel, the taxonomy is probable to require further amendment. Still, it serves as an effort to create a new model (in shorter form) that is more relevant in various fields.

In the study carried out by Rezaei et al. (2022) just some of functions and subfunctions had been used. In this study, across different sciences also exactly we came to the same results. Some functions and subfunctions based on Adel's classification across different sciences were reported. Adel (2010) proposed a classification system on the basis of materials derived from academic lectures, while in the present work, the data were the seminars. Thus, nature of the corpus could have its own impose on the framework suggested by Adel (2010). In this study, the following functions and subfunctions were reported to be found in the analyzed corpus; metalinguistic comments, clarifying, references to audiences, managing comprehension anticipating the audience response. In other words, the modified model retained four core functional categories: metalinguistic comments (with the subfunction of clarifying), references to audiences (including the subfunctions of managing comprehension and anticipating audience response). This refined categorization reflects the metadiscourse strategies prevalent in the examined written and spoken discourse of seminars and essays, distinguishing it from the broader range of strategies observed in academic lectures (Grigoriev & Sokolova, 2019).

This study was carried out to analyze the use of reflexive metadiscourse in seminars across four academic sciences: social sciences, humanities, physical sciences, and life sciences. The main conclusions are as follows: Reflexive pronouns (you, I, we) are commonly used in seminars. "You" is the most frequent pronoun across all sciences, followed by "I" and then "we." This suggests a focus on audience engagement and speaker responsibility.

In seminars, the noticeable frequency of "I" can mean that the writer is deliberately taking a neutral stand and providing information, by presenting his viewpoints. There are cases in which the focus is on the author's argument, but this is not usually done, in scientific articles for example, where the methods used and the results obtained are presented as facts, with the author as a disinterested party. This impersonal style usually avoids using personal pronouns and other personal metadiscourse markers, which are characteristic of reflexive types of metadiscourse (Yeo & Ting, 2014). However, the word "you" is effective as a mode of address, although its overuse may sound informal or somewhat condescending. In highly scholarly works, the frequency of first-person perspective is expected to be less. In addition, personal writing style also makes an impact on the degree of pronouns used. Humanities: Highest frequency of "you," suggesting a focus on audience interpretation. Physical Sciences: Lowest frequency of "we," reflecting an emphasis on individual research findings. Metadiscourse Functions: Metalinguistic comments (clarifying meaning) are the most frequent category. References to audience (managing comprehension, anticipating responses) are also common. Speech act labels and discourse organization are rarely used.

The distribution of metadiscourse functions differs from Adel's study, likely due to the genre (seminars vs. essays) and data source (spoken vs. written). Some subcategories of

metadiscourse identified by Adel were not found in the current work. Modified Classification: based on the data, the researchers proposed a modified version of Adel's classification focusing on the most relevant metadiscourse functions in seminars and essays: Metalinguistic comments (clarifying); References to audience (managing comprehension, anticipating responses). Overall, the study suggests that speakers in seminars use reflexive metadiscourse to clarify their ideas, engage the audience, and anticipate their understanding.

Our findings have significant implications to develop insight and knowledge of ESL instructors and students on the way of presenting the metadiscourse functions in genres, like seminars, and the way of engaging the audiences in the discourse so that they are encouraged and their attention is drawn to the presentations and ensuring their focus on the content. Besides, our study offers these recommendations for further studies: first, reflexive metadiscourse markers received less attention than the textual and interactive markers proposed by Hyland (2005). Consequently, more studies should be carried out focusing on reflexive metadiscourse markers. Second, functions of personal pronouns are limited to grammatical functions in academic context and their metadiscourse functions are overlooked. Hence, further research with a concentration on metadiscourse functions of personal pronouns are needed.

References

- Abdi, R., & Ahmadi, P. (2015). Signposting propositions: A study of interactive metadiscourse marking in the composition of research articles across sciences. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 5, 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages5020025>
- Ädel, A. (2006). Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sci.24>
- Ädel, A. (2010). Just to give you kind of a map of where we are going:: A Taxonomy of Metadiscourse in Spoken and Written Academic English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9(S2), 69-97. <https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.218>
- Ädel, A. (2019). Variation in metadiscursive “you” across genres: From research articles to teacher feedback. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 19, 949–962. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.4.0037>
- Ädel, A., & Mauranen, A. (2010). Metadiscourse: Diverse and divided perspectives. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9(S2), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.215>
- Aguilar, M. (2008). *Metadiscourse in academic speech: A relevance-theoretic approach* (Vol. 317). Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0351-0403-5>
- Amiryousefi, M., & Rasekh, A. E. (2010). Metadiscourse: Definitions, Issues and Its Implications for English Teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 159-167. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n4p159>
- Bemani, M. N., Zohoorian, Z. & Ambigapathy, P. (2014). *Meeting Learners' Needs: The Effect of Multiple Intelligences-Based Activities on Listening Proficiency*. Language Teaching and Learning: New Dimensions and Interventions. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Boginskaya, O. (2022). Metadiscourse patterns in academic prose by non-native English writers: A cross-disciplinary perspective. *Discourse and Interaction*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2022-2-5>
- Fossali, P. B., & Mancini, R. (2023). Interactions among languages, discourses, social practices and forms of life. *Gragoatá*, 28(62), e60290. <https://doi.org/10.22409/gragoata.v28i62.60290.pt>

- Grigoriev, I., & Sokolova, A. (2019). Corpus based analysis of first-person pronouns in research proposals written by Russian students. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 7(4), 423–430. <https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP1904423G>
- Hyland, K. (2005). Metadiscourse: Exploring writing in interaction. *London: Continuum*, 13-15.
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (2018). Changing patterns of disciplinary metadiscourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, 51, 18–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.02.001>).
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (2022). Metadiscourse across languages and genres: An overview. *Lingua*, 265, 103205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103205>
- Khedri, M., Ebrahimi, S. J., & Chan, S. H. (2013). Interactional metadiscourse markers in academic research article result and discussion sections. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445613480588>
- Liao, J. (2020). Metadiscourse, cohesion, and engagement in L2 written discourse. *Languages*, 5(2), 25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages5020025>
- Lu, S., & Jiang, F. K. (2024). One Journal, Different Practices: A Corpus-Based Study of Interactive Metadiscourse in Applied Linguistics. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 47(2), 219-237. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cjal-2024-0204>
- Matroudy, M., & Ebrahimi, S. F. (2022). Functional analysis of reflexive metadiscourse in dissertation defense sessions. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 7(1), 72-85. <https://doi.org/10.1001/1.25384015.2022.7.1.2.1>
- Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English economics texts. *English for specific Purposes*, 12(1), 3-22. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(93\)90024-I](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(93)90024-I)
- Mu, C. (2025). Academic voice in the rhetorical construction of author identity: An intercultural rhetorical perspective. *Languages in Contrast*, 25(2), 209-236. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.00049.mu>
- Pérez-Llantada, C. (2010). The discourse functions of metadiscourse in published academic writing: Issues of culture and language. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9(S2), 41-68. <https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.217>
- Qazi, S. A., Ullah, Z., & Raqib, H. (2025). Exploring The Use of Metadiscourse Markers in Undergraduate Theses. *Al-Aasar*, 2(2), 1296-1304.
- Rezaei, O., Ebrahimi, S. F., & Yazdani, S. (2022). Reflexive Metadiscourse Markers in Academic Interviews: A Frequency and Functional Study. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 5(43), 87. <https://doi.org/10.30495/jfl.2022.697340>
- Schiffrin, D. (1980). Meta-Talk: Organizational and Evaluate Brackets in Discourse. *Sociological inquiry*, 50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475->
- Song, Z., Bin Hamat, A., Rahman, B. C. A., & Nadiyah, A. (2024). Metadiscourse in English Academic Writing across Disciplines: A Systematic Review. *Pakistan Journal of Life & Social Sciences*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.57239/pjlss-2024-22.2.001482>
- Van Dijk, T. A., Ting-Toomey, S., Smitherman, G., & Troutman, D. (1997). Discourse, ethnicity, culture and racism. *Discourse as social interaction*, 2, 144-180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926599010002001>
- Wu, J., Cheng, L., & Yang, Y. (2022). A corpus-based interpretation of the discourse–cognitive–society triangle on Chinese court judgments. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01491-z>
- Yang, J. (2025). *Exploring cohesive functions of signaling nouns in dissertation writing* (Doctoral dissertation), Iowa State University.

- Yeo, J. Y., & Ting, S. H. (2014). Personal pronouns for student engagement in arts and science lecture introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 34, 26-37.
- Zare, J., & Tavakoli, M. (2017). The use of personal metadiscourse over monologic and dialogic modes of academic speech. *Discourse Processes*, 54(2), 163-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2015.1116342>
- Zohoorian, Z. (2015). A Needs Analysis Approach: An Investigation of Needs in an EAP Context. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5 (1). (1). <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0501.07>
- Zhu, Y. (2018). An Intercultural Analysis of Personal Metadiscourse in English and Chinese Commencement Speeches. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(5), 100-110. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.9n.5p.100>