



A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF METADISCOURSE MARKERS IN PAKISTANI AND AMERICAN JOURNALS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE: A CORPUS-BASED STUDY

Sana Tafseer*

Served as CTI intern at Government Graduate Queen Mary College Lahore.

ranaatafseer1234@gmail.com

Mahnoor Ehsan

University of Education, Lahore

mahnoorehsan42@gmail.com

Dr. Jahanzeb Jahan

Lecturer, University of Education, Lahore

Jahanzeb@ue.edu.pk

Radiya Rani

Lecturer, Rashid Latif Khan University

radia.asif1990@gmail.com

Abstract:

The present study is a corpus-based comparative analysis of metadiscourse markers with reference to Pakistani and American Journals on English language, based upon Hyland's (2005) interpersonal model of metadiscourse. Two corpora were constructed, including 464,349 characters from American journals and 469,399 characters from Pakistani journals along with metadata prepared in compliance with ethical conduct of research. The frequency and distribution of interactive and interactional metadiscourse categories, namely transitions, hedges, self-mentions, engagement markers, attitude markers evidential, endophoric markers and frame marker were analyzed using AntConc software.

The findings reveal that metadiscourse is widely used in both corpora to shape reading perceptions and arguments, with some differences between them. American writers exhibited a reader-responsible and dialogic style using many hedging devices (American Journal: 561, Pakistani Journal: 319), engagement markers and corporate self-references, which was indicative of subtle stance-taking and inclusive communication. Pakistani writers showed writer-based and explicit style, with more additive transitions used and individual self-references present; clarity, authority and linear policy orientation. These features indicate culturally determined rhetorical conventions in academic discourse and also highlight the significance of metadiscourse in shaping scholarly identity.

The study has implications for cross-cultural academic discourse, with practical insights for EAP teaching, writing and scholarly pedagogy and editorial practices.

The results indicate that knowledge of metadiscourse can contribute to a pragmatic and intercultural perspective on academic writing.

Keywords: Metadiscourse, Hyland, Corpus-based study, Academic writing, Cross-cultural discourse, Pakistani journals, American journals

1. Introduction:

Academic discourse is not just a vehicle for communication, but also for creating an interpersonal relationship between writers and readers. In this sense of interpersonality, metadiscourse has a central part to play both in the creation of rhetorical structures and in indicating how readers will be expected to interpret them. Metadiscourse, originally conceptualized by Harris (1959), includes “a number of linguistic features which extend beyond propositional meaning in order to organize discourse and express a writer’s or speaker’s involvement with their text and its potential readers or listeners”. This definition has over time been extended to include terms that organise claims, convey attitudes and involve the reader (Hyland, 2005; Ädel, 2006). Thus, metadiscourse also expresses the ways in which writers domesticate with their disciplinary communities and negotiate interaction with their readers.

It has been shown that the amount of metadiscourse used in academic writing differs greatly from one linguistic context to another (Crismore, Markkanen, & Steffensen 1993; Mauranen 1993; Hyland & Tse 2004). Such variation highlights deep rhetorical and communicative norms governing how writers perform authorial identity and address readers. For instance, Anglo-American academia writing generally favours a reader-dependent and dialogic style which favours inclusivity rather than explicit stance-taking. Writers from other English culture and education systems, however, tend to employ a more writer-based and direct form of rhetoric, featuring clarity, authority, and linearity (Chen, 2006; Lee & Casal, 2014).

Within this framework, Pakistani academics -located in an outer expansion English context- share with us how academic language routines come into play reflecting local and global rhetorical traditions. Given the growing emergence of Pakistani research in the international academic community, this study is important to explore how Pakistani English writers (PEWs) use metadiscourse in comparison with American writers (AWs). The investigation of this kind can be organized within robust and reliable methodological bases as corpus-based analysis in particular does, which authorizes the systematic observation of interactive and interactional metadiscourse categories according to Hyland (2005).

Thus, the paper is intended to analyze and contrast both frequency and functional distribution of metadiscourse markers in Pakistani vs. American linguistics RAs. More specifically, the study aims (1) to contrast the use of different metadiscourse markers between PEWs and AWs – on a global level as well as (2) to locate differences in these expressions’ functional distribution. To the extent that it brings to light cross-cultural rhetorical variation, this study adds to our understanding of how academic writers fashion argumentation and reader involvement. Furthermore, the results are pedagogically applicable to EAP teaching and academic writing training, increasing intercultural sensitivity and communicating competence in academic communication.

Research Objectives

1. To compare the overall frequency of metadiscourse markers employed by Pakistani English writers (PEWs) and American writers (AWs) in linguistics research articles.
2. To identify differences in the functional categories of metadiscourse markers used by PEWs and AWs.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Introduction to Metadiscourse

Metadiscourse is defined as the set of linguistic things that writers do in order to help them organize their textual work, express their stance and involve/engage readers with meanings beyond the semantics at propositional level of a text. The type was originally coined by Harris (1959) to denote units of the text that serve as discourse organizers. It was not until later that it was taken beyond strictly text-structural matters by authors such as Vande Kopple (1985), Crismore (1989) and Hyland (2005), who extended the concept to cover both textual and interpersonal functions. It is in this aspect that metadiscourse reaches across the gap separating writers from readers and allows them to orchestrate interpretation, convey credibility, and control information.

Hyland's (2005) interpersonally oriented model of metadiscourse, well-established in academic discourse analysis (Hunston and Sinclair 2000), divides metadiscourse into two major domains: interactive resources and interactional ones. Interactive devices such as transitions, frame markers and endophoric markers contribute to organizing the text for coherence and logical progression. Other linguistic resources such as hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions and engagement markers are used to express the author's opinion and promote it in a positive way within the text by encouraging an active stance adoption. This twofold model offers a broad perspective for a study of how academic writers create argument and interact with their audiences.

2.2 Cross-Cultural Variation in Metadiscourse Use

A considerable amount of research has demonstrated that the use of metadiscourse can be culturally and linguistically bound, since it reflects the rhetorical pattern and academic practice which may concern various cultures. Crismore, Markkanen, and Steffensen (1993) contrasted persuasive writing of American students with that of Finnish counterparts and reported that writers in the U.S. employed more interpersonal markers suggesting a greater degree of reader-orientation. Mauranen (1993) also found that interactive markers like those discussed here were used less frequently by Finnish academic writers than by their Anglo-American colleagues, pointing to cultural preferences in implicit rhetorical organization.

Hyland and Tse (2004) highlighted that metadiscourse is context-bound and discipline-based, shaped by cultural value systems as well as institutional guidelines. For example, Anglo-American academic writing prefers explicit reader engagement and authorial presence, whereas academic writing in non-Western contexts tends to prioritise an authoritative and text-centred approach (Chen, 2006; Lee & Casal, 2014). These two observations suggest that

metadiscourse is to be considered not only a linguistic fact, but also the index of broader epistemological and rhetorical orientations.

2.3 Metadiscourse in Pakistani Academic Writing

It is in recent years that studies on Pakistani academic writing have been initiated, aiming at English usage as a mirror of local education and heritage. It has been researched that the Pakistani writers, even otherwise good in English do show at times different rhetorical patterns because of their nonnative / outer circle background (Shah; Ahmad, 2015; Mehmood, 2018). For instance, Pakistani scholars generally use more additive transitions and self-mentions due to their focus on intelligibility with the color of certainty in argumentation (Mehmood, 2018). This is in sharp contrast with the hedging and reader-focussing strategies often encountered in US scholarly texts.

For example, Khan and Qadir (2012) reported that Pakistani scholars generally tend to place greater importance on the coherence and explicitness of a text rather than the personal or interpersonal connection with potential readers, consistent with traditions of schooling that are characterized by a focus on formality and distance in communication. As a result, their metadiscourse use represents not only linguistic competence, but also cultural identity. These results imply that PALE writing is characterized as a hybrid genre that merges global academic values with local rhetorical expectations.

2.4 Corpus-Based Approaches to Metadiscourse Analysis

Based on corpus data, these methods provide a dominant way forward in research into metadiscourse which can be objectified and replicated between language communities. Applying concordance software, e.g. AntConc or WordSmith, researchers can explore metadiscourse markers' frequency of occurrence and distribution systematically in large text corpora (Hyland, 2005; Ädel, 2006). And, corpus-based investigations also allow us to observe fine degrees of variation in stance-taking; engagement, and cohesion across discourse domains.

For example, Kuhl and Mojood (2014) compared the use of metadiscourse in Iranian and English medical research articles, indicating that non-native writers used more explicit textual markers but less interpersonal ones. Also Hu and Cao (2011) investigated metadiscourse in applied linguistics journals, concluding that English writers employed a wider range of stance markers with an increased emphasis on inclusivity and dialogue. These comparative studies of the rhetorical organization of academic texts constitute important grounds for us to understand cross-cultural academic discourse, and can serve as bases for pedagogical intervention in EAP programs.

2.5 Research Gap

While much research has been conducted on metadiscourse in the diverse cross-linguistic and cross-cultural contexts, there are few comparative studies exploring Pakistani English (PakE) versus American English (AmE) academic writing. Bibliographical research in the area of Pakistani academic writing often focuses on essays written by students or general academic writing, whilst a corpus-based study of published linguistics journal articles is, arguably,

almost non-existent. Furthermore, there is also a need to investigate how PEWs and AWs vary in their use of functional categories of metadiscourse—interactive and interactional resources—to organize arguments and encompass readers.

Filling this void, this study utilizes the model of Hyland (2005) to investigate in general terms the occurrence and distribution of metadiscourse in both Pakistani and American linguistics journals. By the recognition of cross-cultural similarities and differences, this study hopes to contribute to enhanced knowledge of rhetorical variation in global academic literacy instruction, as well as have implications for EAP academic writing pedagogy.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The current study has a comparative corpus based design to investigate about metadiscourse markers in ARA of PEWs and NEWs. The analysis is informed by Hyland's (2005) Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse, which categorises metadiscourse into interactive resources (which help 'orient' the reader in the text and facilitate understanding) and interactional resources (which enable speaker/writer positioning and interaction with readers). We adopted this theoretical framework as it offers a systematic and functionally oriented typology for the study of writer–reader engagement across academic cultures.

3.2 Corpus Compilation

Two specialised corpora were constructed for the current study:

- American Journal Corpus containing about 464,349 characters,
- Pakistani Journal Corpus about 469,399 characters.

Both corpora were drawn from open access, peer-reviewed research articles in the area of English Language and Linguistics and published between 2018-2024. Relevant original research articles was included to help reflect the scholarly discourse. Review articles, editorials and book reviews were excluded to preserve genre concordance. Each text was downloaded in the plain-text format (.txt), and manually cleaned out non-linguistic content, such as reference lists, figures, tables and appendices.

The two data sets were sampled to match pairwise and diversity, considering the text length and publication date. The corpus was constructed following corpus-linguistic criteria of representativeness and balance (Biber et al., 1998).

3.3 Metadata and Ethical Considerations

For each corpus, a rich metadata file was generated containing journal name, article title, authors' affiliation, publication year, DOI and total number of words. No copyright infringement is intended, as all texts were retrieved from open-access sources. Consistent with the practice of ethical corpus-linguistics (Baker, 2006; Sinclair, 2005), no data containing potentially identifiable personal information was collected and only published

publicly available material was examined. The study is consistent with the ethical standards of our institution regarding the use of secondary data and meets the criteria for transparency and academic honesty.

3.4 Analytical Framework

Metadiscourse was analysed in accordance with Hyland's (2005) taxonomy of metadiscourse devices along the following categories:

- Interactive metadiscourse: transitions (radical.empty, radical.begins), frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials and code glosses;
- Interactional metadiscourse: hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mentions.

Every marker was operationalised based on Hyland's definition. (Pre-compiled lists of lexical items for example from subcategories such as these served as the search terms list in corpus analysis.) Contextual verification was then conducted to remove false hits (e.g., instances in which a term such as *see* functioned as a content verb not an endophoric reference).

3.5 Data Processing and Analysis

The analysis was performed with AntConc (version 4.0), a popular corpus tool for concordances and frequency list computing (Anthony, 2019). For each corpus, word lists, keyword frequency counts and concordance lines were compiled. Normalised frequencies for each type of metadiscourse marker were thus compared in order to find cross-cultural differences between Pakistani and American journals.

Analog validation accompanying the automatic counting helped to ensure proper context and filter out noise. The place of each marker was examined in relation to other words within its sentence frame for its metadiscursive role. Quantitative results were subsequently analyzed qualitatively for rhetorical conventions and cultural preferences in each of the corpora.

3.6 Reliability and Validity

To increase the reliability, the search lists were drawn up based on earlier empirical studies that have also used Hyland's model in research writing (for instance, Hyland & Tse, 2004; Adel, 2010). A random sample of articles from both corpora were double coded to ensure reliability and validity of coding. In order to ensure that both corpora were typical of academic discourse within their respective contexts, they also adhered to the principles of representative sampling. Interpretive validity was further enhanced by the cross-checking of automatically extracted data via manual review.

4. Analysis and Discussion

Hyland (2005, 2019) maintains that the interactive metadiscourse resources are linguistic facilities for the texture of discourse and for affecting readers to follow along. They make

information coherent and arguments easy to follow. Among the interactive (also called interaction linking) ones, transition markers have the core role of indicating relation among such units; they can show how two content items are related to each other— e.g., by addition, contrast, consequence and comparison.

Transitions are markers, such as conjunctions and adverbials (i.e., however, therefore, thus, moreover), which denote logical relationships between propositions. Their deployment evidences the author's attention to reader processing, coherence, and rhetorical clarity.

In academic context, their overuse and pattern of coverage can also indicate the extent to which a writer guides the reader (reader-responsible) rather than relying on implicit cohesion (writer-responsible).

Table 1. Transition markers

Transition Marker	Frequency in American Journal	Frequency in Pakistani Journal
However	59	61
Therefore	23	23
Thus	15	24
Hence	13	18
Furthermore	5	13
Consequently	5	6
Moreover	1	44

Total Transitions:

- **American Journal:** 121 occurrences
- **Pakistani Journal:** 189 occurrences

This means Pakistani writers use 56% more transition markers than American writers, signaling important stylistic and rhetorical differences.

a. Overall Frequency

The Pakistani subcorpus includes a much higher number of transitional markers in total (189 vs. 121). This indicates more explicit textual cohesion and use of linking means to move from one idea to another.

In Hyland's model, this means that Pakistani writers value reader comprehension and make the connections between ideas more explicit as encouragement of accessible reading is

characteristic of reader-responsible discourse. In contrast, American writers prefer more implicit coherence through argument structure and shared disciplinary knowledge—writer-responsible discourse.

b. Comparative Distribution by Function

(i) Contrastive Marker: However

- **American:** 59
- **Pakistani:** 61

Both corpora use however at similar rates, showing that contrastive transitions are universally important in academic argumentation.

Interpretation:

Their close frequency says something about the rhetorical appeal of however for American and Pakistani authors, as a marker of turn, counterargument, or qualification. This is one of the most common transitions in both, which supports Hyland's (2005) view that however is a major cohesive device in English academic writing.

(ii) Causal/Resultative Markers: Therefore, Thus, Hence, Consequently

- **Therefore:** equal (23 each)
- **Thus:** more frequent in Pakistani (24 vs 15)
- **Hence:** more frequent in Pakistani (18 vs 13)
- **Consequently:** nearly equal (6 vs 5)

Interpretation:

Pakistani authors use some more resultative connectors (thus, hence) compared to Americans. This is a more explicit cause-effect description. In Hyland's (2001) words, this means that Pakistani writers make logical connections explicit to enhance coherence and to lessen interpretive load on readers—a characteristic of EFL/ESL academic writing.

By contrast American writers may feel that it is enough to believe their readers will deduce causation from the context in which something is argued, and exhibit a more implicit rhetorical sophistication.

(iii) Additive Markers: Furthermore, Moreover

- **Furthermore:** American (5), Pakistani (13)
- **Moreover:** American (1), Pakistani (44)

Interpretation:

Pakistani writers significantly prefer moreover and furthermore as additive markers, apparently preferring them about ten times more than American writers. The fact that there is such a heavy reliance on additive transitions, suggests a limited development of the function of relations in writing (Casanave 2003), since English tends to be a style which leans towards an enumerative and cumulative manner of writing where each point needs to be connected directly with what has gone before.

In Hyland's (2005) language, so much reliance on additive transitions here indicates a didactic or expository mindset – which is well-suited to the focuses of these writers alone. In contrast, the infrequent occurrence of such markers in American journals reflects a more bridged argument structure wherein addition is constructed by means of discourse patterns instead of signaled overtly.

Qualitative Interpretation Based on Hyland's Framework

a. Reader-Responsibility vs. Writer-Responsibility

- Pakistani writers show a reader-responsible approach—they guide readers explicitly through transitions, helping them to follow logical progressions and thematic development.
- American writers exhibit a writer-responsible approach, assuming that readers share the academic conventions and can interpret connections without overt markers.

This supports Hyland's (2005) observation that the cultural and educational background influence how writers manage reader engagement and coherence.

b. Rhetorical Style and Pedagogic Influence

The Pakistani data exhibit a pedagogical writing style that is marked by the textual orientation of instructional practices. Transitions are frequently overused by EFL/ESL writers in order to sound more academic and organized. This is consistent with Hyland (2008) on L2 academic writing, in which non-native writers overuse transitions to compensate for any ambiguity of arguments complexity.

In the United States, however, much scholarly writing is marked by a preference for brevity, economy and implicit coherence (connectives are often omitted) and the straightforward juxtaposition of competing or elaborating points.

c. Disciplinary Convention and Authorial Selfhood

The heavy use of therefore, thus, and hence in Pakistani journals supports the track here toward logical persuasion writer as authority stating something inferentially. American authors, by contrast, develop arguments based on reader interpretation which assumes gentlemanly confidence in shared disciplinary norms and a dialogical academic culture.

d. Lexical Preference Patterns

The heavy reliance on moreover (44) by Pakistani writers is noticeably significant. This may be due to teaching pedagogies that prioritize particular “formal connectors” as features of academic English. Opinion, of course, varies here as well.” But in professional academic writing too much moreover can sound formulaic or repetitious, at the expense of rhetorical nuance (Lynch).

The US writers used moreover the least on all transitions (only 1 in this case), suggesting their preference for less formal and less freezing transition.

Table 2. Summary of Key Findings markers

Aspect	American Journals	Pakistani Journals
Overall frequency	Fewer transitions (121)	More transitions (189)
Most frequent marker	However (59)	However (61)
Additive markers	Rare (Moreover=1, Furthermore=5)	Highly frequent (Moreover=44, Furthermore=13)
Causal/resultative markers	Moderate use	Slightly higher use
Discourse style	Implicit, cohesive	Explicit, connective
Rhetorical orientation	Writer-responsible, inferential coherence	Reader-responsible, overt cohesion

Overall, these findings support Hyland’s claim that metadiscourse is socially and culturally situated. The Pakistani corpus demonstrates a didactic, explanatory approach to academic writing, while the American corpus exemplifies a rhetorically sophisticated, inferential approach consistent with the norms of Anglo-American academic discourse.

Table 3. Interactional metadiscourse (Hedges)

Hedge	American Journal	Pakistani Journal
May	90	49
Might	24	11
Can	219	174
Could	46	20
Would	93	38
Seem	5	2
Appear	23	5
Suggest	12	10

Indicate	13	4
Assume	23	1
Imply	1	0
Perhaps	3	0
Possibly	2	0
Almost	7	5

Total Hedges:

- **American Journal:** 561
- **Pakistani Journal:** 319

American writers therefore use 76% more hedging devices overall than their Pakistani counterparts.

Quantitative Interpretation

a. Frequency Patterns and Distribution

The data show beyond any doubt that American academic writers hedge much more often and in a richer range of lexical forms. Their database involves all listed hedge types, some of which (e.g., imply, perhaps, possibly) do not occur in the Pakistani sample.

This is indicative of a rhetoric that's cautious in its arguments; in American writing there is a willingness to assert new ideas without saying they are definitive.

On the other hand, Pakistani writers use a select pallet of hedges and their preferences are for modal verbs such as can, may and would since they indicate possibility without conveying subtle epistemic distance. This indicates a less varied hedging arsenal and a preference for more assertive or confident claim-making.

Functional and Lexical Analysis

a. Modal Verbs of Possibility and Ability (may, might, can, could, would)

- The most frequent hedge in both corpora is can (American: 219; Pakistani: 174). But in professional jargon, can generally implies general ability or possibility instead of epistemic uncertainty. Its common use might reflect the set phrases of academia rather than deliberately hedged expression.
- Americans use may and might nearly twice as much as Pakistanis (90 versus 49; and 24 vs.11). These modals are epistemic hedges – they attenuate claims and they report probability, not certainty.

- The modal would is also conspicuously more frequent in the American corpus (93 vs 38) as a conditional hedge which denotes hypothetical reasoning or polite conjecture (e.g., “This would suggest that...”).

Interpretation: The pattern indicates that native English writers in America surround themselves with modal construction to place an epistemically finer point on the argument as compared to Pakistani writers who confine modals more to generalized possibility/description and what points out at their less pragmatic sensibility toward hedging as a rhetorical strategy.

b. Lexical Hedges Indicating Tentativeness (Seem, Appear, Assume, Suggest, Indicate)

- US authors display significantly higher usage of “appear” (23 vs 5) and “assume” (23 vs 1)—verbs that moderate commitment and connote inferential reasoning.
- Pakistani writers deploy significantly fewer inferential hedges, relying instead on the direct expression of evidence.

Interpretation: Such a variation underscores a difference in epistemic humility: US writers admit of potential interpretive limits, while Pakistani writers gravitate towards asserting-fashioning presentation style might be related to social norms that link certainty with academic clout.

c. Adverbial Hedges (Perhaps, Possibly, Almost)

- **American corpus:** perhaps (3), possibly (2), almost (7)
- **Pakistani corpus:** perhaps (0), possibly (0), almost (5)

While these markers are infrequent in both, their complete absence of “perhaps” and “possibly” in Pakistani texts indicates a lack of stance softening through adverbs.

American writers, even in small numbers, use these adverbs to modulate claim strength, aligning with Hyland’s assertion that proficient academic writing relies on subtle gradation of certainty.

Table 4. Comparative Interpretation

Aspect	American Journals	Pakistani Journals
Overall frequency	High (561)	Moderate (319)
Range of lexical items	Broad (14 types)	Narrow (10 types)
Dominant hedge type	Modals (can, may, would)	Modals (can, may)
Epistemic verbs	Frequent (appear, assume, indicate)	Minimal (suggest, indicate)
Adverbial hedges	Present but limited	Mostly absent

Tone	Cautious, balanced, negotiative	Assertive, reportive, confident
------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Discourse Implications

a. Negotiation of Knowledge and Certainty

In academic writing, hedging serves as a way for writers to meet claims within the disciplinary community. The widespread use of hedge by American writers shows epistemic negotiation, which is the acknowledgment of opposing views and the provisional status of findings.

Pakistani writers, in contrast, are less comfortable with uncertainty, perhaps reflecting a local academic culture that values explicit assertion and authority over tentative argument. This disparity is indicative of different rhetorical cultures: the American tradition eschews argument as proof, and Pakistani writers may see argument as proof.

b. The Soul-cave: the Identity of Style and Discipline

Hedging works to create an authorial self-presentation. In Hyland's model, good writers "blend authority with modesty," asserting their expertise but also making room for readers to approach critically. The American corpus represents this nuanced personality: writers retain a businesslike voice that is both assertive and careful. Pakistani writers, given meager hedges, might display more authorial confidence while running the risk of dogmatism or less open for discussion in global academic norm.

c. Sociolinguistic and Pedagogical Considerations

It could be that the mere spectrum of hedges used by Pakistani writers, is small because school curricula push more on factual reporting and grammatical perfection opposed to rhetorical subtlety. English for academic purposes courses in EFL settings invariably present the so-called modals (can, may, could) as grammatical resources of assessment rather than stance devices, resulting in the underemployment of somewhat more attenuated hedge forms such as appear or perhaps.

By contrast, American scholars socialized in discourse communities that value argumentative nuance deploy hedges for reasons of disciplinary category.

Summary of Findings

1. Quantitatively, American writers employ significantly more hedges and exhibit greater lexical variety.
2. Qualitatively, American usage shows refined control over degrees of certainty, while Pakistani usage is restricted to a few modals expressing possibility.

3. Rhetorically, the American corpus represents a dialogic, tentative style, whereas the Pakistani corpus reflects a monologic, assertive style.
4. Pedagogically, the results suggest a need for greater awareness of hedging as a strategic rhetorical resource rather than a grammatical convenience in Pakistani academic writing.

Table 5. Self-Mention Markers in American and Pakistani Journals

Word	Frequency in American Journal	Frequency in Pakistani Journal
I	173	228
Me	11	19
My	9	0
We	230	103
Our	81	43

Self-Mentions

Self-mentions reveal how authors create authorial identity and position themselves in the discourse community. In American journals, we (230) and our (81) are present in abundance in global contexts. This pluralist tendency is in line with the expectations of collaborative research in mature academic disciplines. In contrast, Pakistani writers use I (228) as opposed to we (103), suggesting they place greater emphasis on personal authorial voice and independence. The absolute absence of my in Pakistani texts indicates formality and institutional detachment over proprietary reference to research. On the other hand, the American writer addresses the personal and collective identifications without any conflict, showing rhetorical expediency by employing both singular and plural marking. These differences show that American writers tactically use self-mention to sound professional and approachable whereas Pakistani authors adopt a stance which is more personal but with less conventionally dialogic orientation in academic discourse.

Table 6. Engagement Markers in American and Pakistani Journals

Word	Frequency in American Journal	Frequency in Pakistani Journal
See	101	16
Consider	26	1
Remember	0	7

Note	32	4
Finally	23	3

Note. American writers use a broader range of engagement markers, suggesting greater reader involvement.

Engagement Markers

Engagement signals operate command the readers' attention and direct them to activities associated with the argument. The American corpus shows a significantly higher frequency in most engagement markers—compare (101), consider (26), note (32) and finally also(23)—which exposes an authorial style that is engaged/engaging the reader, being interactive. This pattern signals a reader-inclusive mode of discourse, a characteristic style of sophisticated academic prose that encourages participation and recognizes the reader's interpretive function. "Pakistani writers, on the other hand, use these tactics with restraint: consider (1) and note (4) are rare. It is interesting to note that the use of remember (7) is found exclusively in Pakistani texts, indicating perhaps a more pedagogical or instructional character of language—one addressing students and not peers. In this regard, the American affinity for dialogic setup exhibits rhetorical maturity and an acknowledgment of the reader's cognitive presence whereas Pakistani posture betrays a more author-centered mode of monologism that is observed to concentrate on explanation rather than interactivity.

Table 7. Attitude Markers in American and Pakistani Journals

Word	Frequency in American Journal	Frequency in Pakistani Journal
Hopefully	3	0
Crucially	9	0
Significantly	18	18
Importantly	1	4

Note. Both corpora show limited use of attitude markers, though American writers display more evaluative stance.

Attitude Markers

Attitude markers express the writer's attitude, his/her emotions or evaluations of propositions. The data indicate a striking asymmetry of use: American writers draw on more evaluative adverbs like hopefully (3), crucially (9) and importantly,19 conveying subtle assessments of importance or relevance. The instance of these words reveals the expressive assurance in which American writers employ them to lead the readers in value interpretation of their arguments. Pakistani writers, however, remain small-scaled on this account—especially in case of much (18) and important(ly) (4)—indicating no biased presentation stance with an attempt to avoid twist from individual perspective. Although both groups make use of it quite positively, its role in Pakistani writing appears to be more analytical rather than persuasive. Therefore, American writers show nuanced stance-taking and the Pakistani writers adopt a formal distance and prefer the factual neutrality.

Table 8. Evidential Markers in American and Pakistani Journals

Word	Frequency in American Journal	Frequency in Pakistani Journal
Indicated	2	20
Observed	4	18
Argued	12	2
Reported	4	21
Proposed	13	8
Found	64	34
Reveal	3	7

Note. Pakistani writers favor empirically grounded evidentials (indicated, reported), whereas American writers use interpretive verbs (argued, proposed).

Evidentials

Evidentials provide evidence of how writers borrow voices, carrying traces of sources from the outside into their text and inking the dialogic centers that shooters build between their research and existing scholarship. In the United States Of America, verbs such as argued (12), proposed (13) and found(64) are used particularly by American writers; they demonstrate a receptive interaction with previous research other than simply citing. They are deployed as evidence of knowledge, but also as capital for a writer to have in their back pocket. Pakistani writers however lean more towards indicated ((20), observed (18), reported (21) verbs indicating empirical rather than interpretive observation. This preference indicates a bias towards descriptive or reportive language, which emphasizes factual narrative rather than analytical talk. The US pattern indicates critical synthesis and evaluation of sources whereas, Pakistani pattern depicts information transmission. This variation highlights the fact that we have differing rhetorical goals: The first one seeks to make meaning in our discipline, whereas the latter is about showing familiarity with existing literature.

Table 9. Endophoric Markers in American and Pakistani Journals

Word	Frequency in American Journal	Frequency in Pakistani Journal
See	101	16
Above	28	14
Below	20	12
Earlier	5	1
Later	8	7

Note. American writers use more endophoric references, indicating stronger intratextual cohesion.

Endophoric Markers

Anaphoric markers take readers to somewhere else in the text and help connect the endophoric islands with ease and clarity. Stronger endophoric reference in the American corpus as seen with *see* (101), *above* (28) and *below* (20), where a deliberate structuring is performed to enable readers to connect between internal arguments. This extensive self-quotation produces a unified textual network that evinces good editorial and readerly authorial organization. Pakistani writers employ these markers relatively infrequently—*compare* (16), *above* (14), and *below* (12)—implying that intratextual navigation is less central. The lower frequency of *earlier* (1) with Pakistani texts, in contrast to later (7), also suggests relatively little backward referencing and instead a more linear course of thought rather than cyclic re-statement/exercise. American literature, meanwhile has swayed in that style such that it lends itself to the reread that turns *chiasmus* into “that explains everything” connections. This also reveals that Pakistani writers work to develop ideas in linear sequence, while American writers encourage a more cross-referential reading for deeper coherence.

Table 10. Frame Markers in American and Pakistani Journals

Word	Frequency in American Journal	Frequency in Pakistani Journal
Aim	7	10
First	63	50
Second	100	56
Third	8	11
Then	32	37
Next	29	9
Overall	29	13

Frame Markers

Frame markers convey information in the sense of text organization and sequencing, so that readers can track the structure of an argument’s development. Both *first* and *second* are fairly frequent in both corpora, but American language is far more extensive (*first* 63; *second* 100), thus privileging clearly structured argument with several hierarchically related steps. While Pakistani writers also use these same markers, they do so less routinely, a fact that may indicate a more spontaneous and thus also less systematically controlled organization of ideas. American use of *next* (29) and *overall* (29) also reveals a commitment to summarization, and logical transition throughout. Interestingly, Pakistani writers also employ *then* (37) and *third* (11) a little more frequently which may be indicative of a

procedural or chronological text style rather than argumentative development. The comparatively small difference in aim (10 vs. 7) in Pakistani writing might indicate a preference for making research purpose explicit, as is generally typical of instructional traditions in writing. In general, American texts present rhetorical focus and hierarchical texture, while Pakistani text spinning has clear ordering but less integrated framing.

Naveed Rafaqat Ahmad is a researcher focused on public-sector governance, state-owned enterprise reform, and institutional restructuring in developing economies. His work emphasizes evidence-based policy solutions for improving the financial sustainability and operational efficiency of Pakistan's major SOEs. By drawing on comparative international models, he highlights practical reform pathways—such as corporatization, public-private partnerships, and performance-driven management—that can strengthen fiscal discipline and reduce reliance on government subsidies. His scholarship contributes to policy discussions aimed at creating accountable, competitive, and self-sustaining public institutions.

Conclusion

The findings of this study brought to light the notable rhetorical and cultural variations in use of metadiscourse between Pakistani and American academic writers. Although they orientated themselves to similar aims in terms of organizing and responding to readers' needs, their preferences seem to reflect different communicative orientations. Pakistani authors reported a greater number of explicit transitions and evidential markers, leading on to a more direct and informative style designed to convey clarity and authority. American authors, however, were more concerned about implicitness and intended audience, with a characterized by high-frequency hedging engagement markers and collective self-mentions aimed at opening up the dialogue and including readers.

These contrasts illustrate how academic discursive practices are situated within wider cultural and educational norms. Pakistani and American academic literatures show a legible voice choice: while Pakistani academic voices remain loud, assertive and explicit, American voices are quite understated, indirect, negotiated and collaborate.

References

- Ädel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English: Studies in corpus linguistics*. John Benjamins.
- Ahmadi, L. (2022). Interactional metadiscourse markers in scientific texts (based on research articles written by native and non-native speakers). *Science Journal of VolSU. Linguistics*, 21(4), 99–110. <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2022.4.7>
- Ali, M. (2016). The honorific system in Pakistani English: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Journal of English Linguistics and Literature*, 5(3), 221–234.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1989). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. Routledge.

- Asgher, T., Shahzad, A. K., & Hanif, A. (2024). Unveiling Pakistani English: A linguistic and cultural odyssey of features, evolution, and distinctiveness. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(1), 23–36.
- Baig, M. A. (2014). An analysis of hybrids in Pakistani English morphology. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 31(2), 224–229.
- Baumgardner, R. J. (1993). *The English language in Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
- Chen, C. (2006). The use of metadiscourse markers in EFL learners' argumentative essays. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(3), 1–19.
- Crismore, A. (1989). Talking with readers: Metadiscourse as rhetorical act. Peter Lang.
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R., & Steffensen, M. S. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written Communication*, 10(1), 39–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088393010001002>
- Demir, C. (2018). Hedging and academic writing: An analysis of lexical hedges. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(4), 74–92. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n4p376>
- Hayisama, F., Ismail Ahamad Shah, M., & Wan Adnan, W. N. A. (2021). Rhetorical style across cultures: An analysis of metadiscourse markers in academic writing of Thai and Malaysian students. *LSP International Journal*, 6(1), 76–101. <https://doi.org/10.11113/lspi.v6n1.76>
- Harris, Z. S. (1959). The transformational model of language structure. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1(1), 27–29.
- Hu, G., & Cao, F. (2011). Hedging and boosting in abstracts of applied linguistics articles: A comparative study of English- and Chinese-medium journals. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(11), 2795–2809. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.007>
- Hussain, M. (2018). The emergence of Pakistani English and its current status: An overview. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(1), 32–44.
- Hyland, K. (2001). Bringing in the reader: Addressee features in academic writing. *Written Communication*, 18(4), 549–574. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088301018004005>
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156–177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156>
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge University Press.

- Khan, M. A., & Qadir, A. (2012). Rhetorical patterns in Pakistani research articles: A metadiscourse perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Language Studies*, 6(1), 15–30.
- Kuhi, D., & Mojood, M. (2014). Metadiscourse in applied linguistics research articles: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13, 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.10.001>
- Lee, J. J., & Casal, J. E. (2014). Metadiscourse in results and discussion chapters: A cross-linguistic comparison of English and Spanish thesis writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 16, 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2014.08.002>
- Mahboob, A. (2009). English as an Asian language: Perspectives on English language learning and teaching in Pakistan. *World Englishes*, 12(1), 26–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2009.10801277>
- 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)
- Mehmood, A. (2018). The use of metadiscourse in Pakistani research articles: A comparative corpus-based analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(2), 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n2p145>
- Rahman, T. (2010). *Language policy and language conflict in Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
- Ruan, Z. (2020). Metadiscourse use in L2 student essay writing: A longitudinal cross-contextual comparison. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 42(4), 495–519. <https://doi.org/10.1515/CJAL-2019-0028>
- Shafique, H., Shahbaz, M., & Hafeez, M. R. (2016). Metadiscourse in research writing: A study of native English and Pakistani research articles. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(4), 376–393. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n4p376>
- Shah, S., & Ahmad, A. (2015). Exploring metadiscourse in Pakistani academic writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 11(1), 85–98.
- Tariq, R. (2010). The effects of Urdu on the vocabulary of Pakistani English. *Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 2(1), 33–45.
- Xu, X., & Nesi, H. (2019). Differences in the use of stance and engagement features in Chinese and British student writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.12.002>
- Zhao, Y. (2021). Metadiscourse in research article introductions: A cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural perspective. *English for Specific Purposes*, 62, 72–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.01.003>
- Ahmad, N. R. (2025). *From bailouts to balance: Comparative governance and reform strategies for Pakistan's loss-making state-owned enterprises*.

