COMPARING INTERPERSONAL METADISCOURSE IN ENGLISH AND PERSIAN ABSTRACTS OF IRANIAN APPLIED LINGUISTICS JOURNALS

ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to analyze interpersonal metadiscursive resources in research article (RA) abstracts written by Iranian applied linguists in English and Persian. For this purpose, 100 abstracts (50 Persian along with their 50 English counterparts) were randomly selected from 4 academic/scientific journals of Applied Linguistics in Iran. Using Hyland’s (2005) typology, we searched for two major types of interpersonal metadiscourse: interactional and interactive, each having their sub-categories. The former includes hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mentions. The latter consists of transitions, frame markers, endophorics markers, evidentials, and code glosses. The two corpora were analyzed for all the instances of the aforementioned categories. Frequency and percentage of occurrence of all the categories were calculated and used to make comparisons between English and Persian abstracts. The overall finding was that the Persian abstracts were in all cases lengthier than their English versions, but in both the interactive metadiscursive resources were more prevalent than the interactional ones. The detailed cases of divergence between abstracts of the two languages are presented and discussed further in the Results.
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1. INTRODUCTION

It has been long since research article abstracts became part of a standard policy in accepting and publishing articles among the discourse community of scholars including applied linguists. As Miller (1984) indicated in her pioneering article on Genre as social action, genres emerge from the requirements of recurrent rhetorical situations, asking for an adequate response. A research article abstract is such a response which is by nature a social one. If we take this point of view, the generic character of an academic abstract is no longer merely defined in terms of particular lexis and syntax, but rather as a case of interaction between individuals, acting in a social, institutional context. Hyland (2005) highlights the interpersonal character of all metadiscursive devices in academic texts, including the abstracts. In this article, his interpersonal model of metadiscourse is adopted which is introduced in the proceedings.

1.1. Hyland’s interpersonal model of metadiscourse

According to Hyland, the interpersonal dimension of language has two elements which can be distinguished for analytical purposes. These can be called interactive and interactional resources. The former are concerned with ways of organizing discourse to anticipate reader’s knowledge and reflect the writer’s assessment of what needs to be made explicit to constrain and guide what can be recovered from the text. The devices are: transition markers, sequencers, code glosses, frame markers, evidentials and endophoric markers. The latter concern the writer’s efforts to control the level of personality in a text and establish a suitable relationship to his or her data, arguments and audience, marking the degree of intimacy, the expression of attitude, the communication of commitments, and the extent of reader involvement. These include such categories as: hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self-mentions (Hyland, 2010).

As reminded by Gillaerts & Van de Velde (2010), the interactive resources are comparable to what Halliday called the textual metafunction. Interactional metadiscourse, on the other hand, deals with the expression of the opinion of the writers, and their relationship and interaction with their readers. Interactional resources are more related to Halliday’s interpersonal metafunction. However, in the present article we analyze both interactive and interactional categories. The subcategories of these resources are better illustrated in Tables 1 and 2.
Hedges mark the writer’s reluctance to present propositional information categorically. Boosters express certainty and emphasize the force of propositions. Attitude markers express the writer’s appraisal of propositional information, conveying surprise, obligation, agreement, importance, and so on. Engagement markers explicitly address readers, either by selectively focusing their attention or by including them as participants in the text through second person pronouns, imperatives, question forms and asides. Self mentions suggest the extent of author presence in terms of first person pronouns and possessives (Hyland, 2010).

Transitions comprise an array of devices, mainly conjunctions, used to mark additive, contrastive, and consequential steps in the discourse, as opposed to the external world. Frame markers are references to text boundaries or elements of schematic text structure, including items used to sequence, to label text stages, to announce discourse goals and to indicate topic shifts. Endophoric markers make additional material salient and available to the reader in recovering the writer’s intentions by referring to other parts of the text. Evidentials indicate the source of textual information which originates outside the current text. Code glosses signal the restatement of ideational information (Hyland, 2010).

1.2. Review of previous research

Metadiscourse has been studied extensively from various perspectives and for various purposes. What we are focusing on here is the importance of metadiscourse used in writing and more specifically on academic writings including essays, articles, theses, etc. An instance of such studies in second language writing (actually one of the initial works in this realm) was carried out by Intaraprawat & Steffensen (1995). These researchers compared the use of metadiscourse in persuasive essays written by professional and novice ESL university students. Differences between the two sets were found in the number of words, number of T-units, and density of metadiscourse features.

In the similar vein, Jones (2011) compared the use of metadiscourse to create coherence in academic writing between a native English-speaking university student and a non-native counterpart. This paper confronted a common and very significant challenge that such students (NNS) faced: difficulty with constructing a coherent argument.

Dahl (2004) investigated writer manifestation in research articles of three languages, English, French and Norwegian, and three disciplines, economics, linguistics and medicine, in order to see whether language or discipline is the most important variable governing the pattern of metatext in academic discourse. Language was found to be the most influential variable.

Gillaerts & Van de Velde (2010) analyzed research article abstracts in terms of interactional metadiscourse in Journal of Pragmatics in the course of the past 30 years. They found interesting increasing and diminishing use of some metadiscursive patterns throughout this period among these abstracts published in the field of applied linguistics. A rather similar study was carried out in the use of hedgings and boostings in the abstracts of applied linguistics between Chinese and English academic articles by Hu & Cao (2011). They found significantly more hedges used in the English-medium abstracts and more boosters in the Chinese counterparts. The reason was attributed to the culturally preferred rhetorical strategies of English and Chinese.

An intercultural analysis of metadiscourse features in research articles was carried out by Mur-Duen˜as (2011). Here the comparison was between Spanish and English articles and based on the interpersonally driven features. The particular linguistic/cultural contexts of publication were found to influence scholars’ rhetorical choices when writing their research articles.

A couple of studies have embarked on contrastive analysis of Persian and English texts (eg. Jalilifar & Alipour, 2007; Marandi, 2003) which have shown differences between Iranian and English writers. The most recent ones are Siami & Abdi’s (2012) along with
The present research does not aim to compare the use of metadiscourse in two or more cultures, but keeps the cultural and national backgrounds constant and looks for the divergences due to the different mediums of writing the research article abstracts, which are English and Persian. It aims to discover and discuss the distribution pattern of metadiscourse markers related to the interactive and interactional resources as classified by Hyland (2005). It is intended to see if there are similarities or differences in the use of metadiscourse by writers from the same cultural and national background writing their academic abstracts in two languages, i.e. English and Persian.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS
The corpus consisted of 100 RA English abstracts (50 English abstracts along with their 50 equivalent Persian abstracts) published in academic/scientific Applied Linguistics journals of Iran. These journals were among the most active and credited academic/scientific journals of applied linguistics in Iran. Another reason for their choice was that the papers which were published in these journals were either required to be submitted in both languages or at least the abstracts needed to be both in English and Persian. These three journals were:

- Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning: University of Tabriz
  (Accessed through: http://language-journal.tabrizu.ac.ir/fa)
- Journal of Research in Linguistics: University of Isfahan
  (Accessed through: http://uijs.ui.ac.ir/jrl/)
- Journal of Linguistic research: University of Tehran
  (Accessed through: http://journals.ut.ac.ir/page/main-page.html)
- The Journal of Applied Linguistics: Islamic Azad University of Tabriz

The articles were published in the past three years (2009-2012) and ranged from 36(minimum)-330(maximum) words in length. Their authors were male and female researchers of the academic society including university professors or students or a mixture of both. The underlying categories of subjects (as described in the scope of these journals) were:

- CALL
- Corpus linguistics
- Discourse and Interlanguage Pragmatics
- ELT Materials Development and Evaluation
- English Language Teacher Education
- English Language Testing and Assessment
- English Literature
- ESP and EAP
- Intercultural Studies and Multiculturalism
- Language and Identity
- Language Planning Policy
- Research on English Language Teaching/Learning
- Second Language Acquisition
- Secondary and Tertiary English Education
Sociocultural Factors and English Education
- Syllabus Design and Curriculum Development
- Translation Studies

The units of analysis were words and phrases (in most cases) or clauses (in fewer cases, mostly serving the function of Frame-markers). In detecting instances of interactional metadiscourse, we stayed close to Hyland’s (2005) classification of the 5 different types of interactional metadiscourse: attitude markers, boosters, engagement markers, hedges and self-mentions, along with the 5 subcategories of interactive type: transitions, evidentials, code glosses, frame-markers and endophorics. For the detection of these 10 categories, the whole corpora were scrutinized word by word, rather than following the procedure by which one selects a number of typical hedges, boosters, etc. from a list to subsequently track them automatically in the corpus. All the instances of each type were located, coded and then counted to check their distribution.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Findings related to the metadiscursive resources are put in two groups. Once, comparison is made based on the distribution of interactional metadiscourse, and once again based on the interactive metadiscourse. On the one side there were English abstracts of 50 research articles, and on the other side 50 Persian abstracts of the same articles written by the same researchers. It becomes interesting to observe how the same writers make different use of metadiscourse when they are writing the same content in different languages. When we initially counted the whole length of the abstracts (in words) once all English and once all in Persian, we came to these numbers: English abstracts: totally 7215 words in length, Persian abstracts: 15332 words. As we can see, the same abstracts when written in Persian become double in size (on average). This is not related to the use of metadiscourse as our main research question. However, we found it worth mentioning to begin with. What proceeds reports on the main findings. Persian extracts are written using English alphabets for the ease of reading.

3.1. Cross-linguistic use of interactional metadiscourse

The first finding in the comparison was that all the English abstracts had at least one interactional metadiscursive resource. However, out of the 50 Persian abstracts, 14 did not have any interactional metadiscourse, that is 28% of these abstracts were without any metadiscursive resources of this type. Table-3 indicates the distribution of interactional metadiscursive resources in English versus Persian abstracts.

In the English abstracts, 2 types of the interactional resources were wholly absent: Attitude markers and Engagement markers. These types were very rare in Persian abstracts too (merely 1 case was observed for each). The low tendency to express the writer’s personal attitude and also addressing the reader directly is, therefore, a similarity between English and Persian abstracts. Self-mentions are the commonest interactional type both in English and Persian abstracts. About 50 percent of the interactional metadiscursive resources in English and Persian abstracts are used to mention the writer directly in the texts. In the English abstracts, the commonest words or phrases to serve this function were:

- ‘I’ as in: “In this paper, I will present different steps for implementing a diphone database”.
- ‘we’ as in: “We recorded the speech signals that contain the diphones”.
- ‘our’ as in: “We use all of them for the accuracy of our database”.
- ‘us’ as in: “Acoustic analysis of our data lead us to conclude that Persian vowel reduction obeys…”.
- ‘author’ as in: “The second section provides experiments conducted by the author to evaluate…”.
In the Persian abstracts, besides the use of particular words or phrases to mention the author, the verb’s SHENASE is also used very commonly to serve this metadiscursive function. This structure is absent in English, i.e. nothing is attached to the verbs in English in order to indicate that they are referring to first person singular or plural subject. This can be a major reason why the number of self-mentions in the Persian abstracts was higher than their English equivalents. Below are examples derived from our data to reveal different forms of author(s)’ self-mentions. These Persian extracts are written in English alphabets followed by their translations in the footnote:

- (Per) “Negarande/Negarandegan” as in: “Dar in maghale negarandegan kushideand ta ba estenad be maghalate motabar…”
- (Per) “first person singular/plural SHENASE” as in: “Dar in maghale say bar in darim ke farayand tekrar …”

Little use was made of the pronouns “MA” or ”MAN” serving the function of Self-mention in the Persian abstracts. As mentioned previously, using SHENASE is more common in Persian to make clear who the subject is.

Boosters were used to a similar extent in both corpora. There was a variety of words or phrases capable of serving this function. Here are examples from the English and Persian corpora:

- (Eng)”The boundary between objectivity and subjectivity is by no means clear-cut in modal verbs”.
- (Eng)”The syllable patterns used in personal names are significantly different in boys’ and girls’ names”.
- (Eng)”Persian Language has had the tendency of becoming more and more analytic”.
- (Per)”Tazahore mozue makan be surate goruhe esmi ha mrah ba RA elzaman be manaye khaneshe kollie mozue makan nist”.
- (Per)”Marze beyne eyniat va zehniat dar afale vajhi kamelan moshakhas nist”.
- (Per)”Dar vaghe in farayand yek amre vajeganist”.

As can be better observed in Figure-1, the use of Hedges is the point of departure between the English and Persian corpora.

In the English abstracts, Hedges were used twice as frequently as in the Persian abstracts. Note that the Persian abstracts, on the whole, were twice as long as their English counterparts. This highlights the low use of hedges in the Persian corpus. Among the English hedges these were the commonest, along with instances for each:

- ‘quite’ as in: “In any standard syntactic analysis, making a distinction between three levels of description is quite necessary”.
- ‘may’ as in: “His process maybe either due to the effect of the addition of one or more affixes”.
- ‘probably’ as in: “…interacting with other factors such as severity of the face-threat, status, specific requirements of the context and, probably, generational differences”.

In the Persian abstracts, different words or phrases were employed to serve as hedges. Here are the clearest instances:
- (Per) “Neshan khahim dad ke zabane farsi haddeaghal dar nezame feli gerayeshes ziaide be tahlili shodan dashte ast”.
- (Per) “Amele ghodrat … sharayete ekhtesasie bafte mogheiatie jalaseye defa va ehtemalan tafavothaye nssli emkane borooz va zohur miyabad”.

3.2. Cross-linguistic use of interactive metadiscourse

First of all, compared to the previous type of metadiscourse (interactional), interactive metadiscursive resources were present in all the abstracts unexceptionally, and were generally more frequent and ubiquitous than the interactional ones. In terms of interactive metadiscourse, the English corpus made a more total use of resources than the Persian one (1.3 times as much as the Persian corpus).
This difference is much greater than in the case of interactional metadiscourse. Considering the greater length of the Persian abstracts, it implies that on the whole authors make significantly fewer use of interactive metadiscourse when they write their article abstracts in Persian than when they do so in English. Compare Table-4:

As it can be observed in the table, the least used category of the interactive type in both corpora has been the Endophoric markers (< 5%). Though very few, here are 2 samples from our data in the two languages:

- (Eng)“Analyses of inferential statistics indicate that, at all the four above-mentioned levels,…”
- (Per)“Dar har chahar sathe basamadie sabeghozekr olguye kamie tabiaate khusheha az mahdudiate tavaliye rasayi baraye farsi …”.

Code Glosses were used nearly to the same extent in both corpora. But on the whole, they are the least common after Endophoric markers still in both corpora. Let’s compare 2 sample sentences from the two languages:

- (Eng)“…for each type of sonority profile, or each combination of sonority classes (e.g. liquid+nasal or nasal+stop)…”
- (Per)“In ghias dar sotuhe mokhtalefe basamadi aam az guneha, nemuneha, tekrar dar payane heja va …”.

Similarly, Evidentials appeared to nearly the same extent in English and Persian abstracts. But yet they were not among the top two prevalent interactive categories. Authors use evidentials to add credit to their claims and basis of their research. Abstracts are very important brief pieces of writing with which authors introduce their work and its value. However, since it is supposed to be succinct, there is often not enough space to make reference to more than 2 or at most 3 works of other researchers. This was confirmed by our findings. Below we can read two such references:

- (Eng)“The first one is a "syntactic theory" introduced by Chomsky as X bar theory”.
- (Per)“Be peiravi az Langaker (1991) elate in masale ra tafsire mozue makan be onvane mozue koneshpazir danesteim”.

The top two prevalent interactive categories were Transitions and Frame markers, the former making links between the stretches of discussion, and the latter designating text boundaries, stages or research goals. As we can see in Figure-2, the point of departure between English and Persian corpora lies in the use of Transitions. In terms of this category, Persian abstracts outscore their English counterparts.

The commonest Transitions in the English abstracts were: and, but, however, therefore and also. Here are some instances extracted from the data:

- (Eng)“It also is one of the fundamental goals of the philosophy of science”.
- (Eng)“Clusters which satisfy the SSC are the most frequent, and the least frequent clusters are those…”
- (Eng)“Although it has a clear meaning in Hebrew, there is no explicit meaning for it in Arabic dictionaries”.

The commonest Transitions in the Persian abstracts were: VA, AMMA, NIZ, HAMCHENIN, etc. The following are a couple of sample sentences containing Transitions in the Persian corpus:

- (Per)“Afzun bar in, barresihaye akhir dale bar in ast ke…”.
- (Per)“Dar payan niz jodasazie dayphoneha va tahiye dadegane morede nazare wert ra paziroft”.
- (Per)“Alaraghme estefadeye besiare in kalame …”.

Frame markers comprised about 50 percent of the whole interactive resources in both English and Persian corpora. All the abstracts, unexceptionally, contained instances of this category in order to highlight boundaries between the moves (as defined by Swales, 1990) of the abstract. Below we can read instances of frame markers used to clarify the goal of research in English or Persian abstracts:
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In this paper, after studying different phone units that can be used for this purpose, I will present different steps for implementing a diphone database.

In the present study, Amen is investigated comparatively in Arabic and Hebrew authoritative books.

dar maghale baraye tahlile sadegi, do negareshe sade raje be zaban ba yekdigar moghayese shodeand.

dar maghalei ke pishe ru darid, negaranegaran kushideand ba … seire tature in vaje ra az ebri be arabi barresi karde va …”.

Frame markers were used to specify the stages of doing the research. Compare the following samples from our data:

At first I have prepared a corpus for Persian language. Then I have designed and implemented a software that extracts…”.

Dar marhaleye baad, signalhaye goftarie vaje ha zabt gardid va …”.

Attention was attracted to conclusions or the main result(s) of the research through the use of Frame markers as well. Here are 2 instances from the two languages:

Finally, with regard to the interactional function of repairs in conversation, the analysis of the data indicates that here are some factors…”.

Dar nahayat, dar in maghale chenin natije ge refte shode ast ke ba deghat va …”.

Frame markers were more ubiquitous in English abstracts than the Persian ones. However, this divergence was not as significant as the use of Transitions in the two corpora.

4. CONCLUSION

This research sought to investigate the use of interpersonal metadiscourse in English and Persian abstracts written by Iranian researchers in the national applied linguistics journals. The model employed was based on Hyland’s (2005) recognition of interactive versus interactional metadiscursive resources in academic writings. The analyses of our data led us to conclude that:

1. In both corpora, interactive categories of metadiscourse were employed significantly more than the interactional ones. That means, Iranian applied linguists show a greater tendency to organize their discourse structurally than to control the level of personality or establish a relationship between themselves and their audience in the abstracts.

2. Iranian applied linguists seem to make little use of Attitude markers and Engagement markers in their abstracts irrespective of the language they write in. That is, they do not incline to make explicit expression of their personal attitudes. Nor do they tend to address their readers directly in their abstracts.

3. Hedges are used significantly lower in Persian abstracts than in the English ones. That implies researchers tend to be less on the safe side when making claims in Persian. Whereas in English, more hedges are used in making the same claims by the same authors. The reasons should be traced down to the exclusive features of Persian, since the other variables including the content and the writer were controlled for.

4. Self mentions were found to be more frequent in the Persian abstracts compared to their counterparts. Two linguistic reasons can be thought of here. Firstly, English has the natural tendency to use passive structures that are by no means as common in Persian. Using passive means refraining from utilizing the Self mention category. Secondly, Persian benefits from using SHENASE that reveals the person of the verb. First person singular and plural were revealed through SHENASEs that were part of the main verbs of the sentences in the Persian abstracts. And in many cases they made direct reference to the author(s). That helped to add to the frequency of occurrence of Self mentions in the Persian corpus.
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5. Transitions and Frame markers were the most prevalent interpersonal metadiscursive resources in the abstracts both in Persian and English. That is, Iranian applied linguists did their best to make clear links in their arguments and also clearly distinguish their goals, methodological stages and finally their conclusions.

6. Though high in amount in both corpora, Transitions were significantly more prevalent in the Persian abstracts. A wide range of words were used in Persian abstracts to make connections among the stretches of argument, especially the conjunctions of addition such as: Va, Niz, Hamchenin.

7. It needs to be reminded, however, that Persian abstracts were on average much longer than their English equivalents (nearly twice as long). We say equivalents since they were not mere translations. Considering this, the more frequent use of Transitions is very well expected.

This research was not meant to be prescriptive from the start. We mainly sought to bring to surface the potential differences of using interpersonal metadiscourse in the same abstracts written in the two languages. Interesting findings were yielded that illuminated these differences. These results, though, were gained under some limitations. We analyzed only 100 RA abstracts. The sample was restricted indeed while covering article abstracts from a variety of files under the scope of Applied Linguistics. It is recommended for further research, to both narrow down on the scope of the articles and also examine a larger sample, so that the generalizability of the findings is better and more precisely possible.
### TABLES AND FIGURES

#### Table-1- A model of metadiscourse in academic texts: interactional resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactional</th>
<th>Involve the reader in the argument</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>withhold writer’s full commitment to proposition</td>
<td>might / perhaps / possible / about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>emphasise force or writer’s certainty in proposition</td>
<td>in fact / definitely / it is clear that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude markers</td>
<td>express writer’s attitude to pro-positon</td>
<td>unfortunately / I agree / surprisingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement markers</td>
<td>explicitly refer to or build relationship with reader</td>
<td>consider / note that / you can see that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self mentions</td>
<td>explicit reference to author(s)</td>
<td>I / we / my / our</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table-2- A model of metadiscourse in academic texts: interactive resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Help to guide reader through text</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>express semantic relation between main clauses</td>
<td>in addition / but / thus / and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame markers</td>
<td>refer to discourse acts, sequences, or text stages</td>
<td>finally / to conclude / my purpose is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endophoric markers</td>
<td>refer to information in other parts of the text</td>
<td>noted above / see Fig / in section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidentials</td>
<td>refer to source of information from other texts</td>
<td>according to X / (Y, 1900) / Z states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code glosses</td>
<td>help readers grasp meanings of ideational material</td>
<td>namely / e.g. / such as / in other words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table-3: Distribution of Interactional Metadiscursive Resources in English and Persian Abstracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English Abstracts</th>
<th>Persian Abstracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw numbers</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Markers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Markers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-mentions</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table-4: Distribution of Interactive Metadiscursive Resources in English and Persian Abstracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English Abstracts</th>
<th>Persian Abstracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw numbers</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame-markers</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endophoric markers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidentials</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Glosses</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure-1: Comparison of English and Persian abstracts in terms of interactional metadiscursive resources

Figure-2: Comparison of English and Persian abstracts in terms of interactive metadiscursive resources
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