

**Jelena M. Marković\***

University of East Sarajevo, Faculty of Philosophy  
Bosnia and Herzegovina

## ENGAGEMENT MARKERS IN INTRODUCTORY TEXTBOOKS

Originalan naučni rad  
UDC 81'42

This article is meant to contribute to the increasingly prominent research on academic discourse and metadiscourse. The framework used in the article is based on Hyland (2005a, 2005b), who distinguishes between interactional and interactive metadiscourse features. Among interactional ones, which are used to build the writer-reader interaction, Hyland identifies engagement markers - means of 'engaging' the reader more explicitly in the process of weaving academic discourse. Engagement markers are further classified and divided into the five basic types: reader pronouns, directives, questions, appeals to shared knowledge and personal asides.

The research question in the article is exploring engagement markers in academic discourse, or more precisely, in introductory textbooks. Using functional analysis, we have identified and interpreted the five types of engagement markers in the corpus, which is an introductory textbook we consider suitable and interesting for the proposed goal. The results of the analysis show that the most frequent engagement markers in the corpus are reader pronouns, directives and appeals to shared knowledge. Questions and personal asides are used infrequently. The pragmatic contribution of using engagement markers in the corpus is building interaction in a dominantly informal way.

Generally speaking we may conclude that introductory textbooks seem to be losing the essentially unobjectionable tone - the writer, though preparing an introductory textbook, may intentionally engage the reader much more than he used to do some time ago. In this way the paper is a contribution to explaining more global changes in the overall tone in academic discourse of linguistic literature nowadays.

**Key words:** academic discourse, metadiscourse, interaction, engagement, reader pronouns, directive, question, knowledge reference, personal aside.

### 1. Academic discourse and metadiscourse

Categorizing genres, as an applied linguistics issue, is nowadays predominantly seen as "a matter of extensive text-in-context inquiry", which does not rely upon some rigid "straightforward textual or transcriptal scrutiny" (Askehave and Swales 2001: 209). What is meant by 'text-in-context inquiry' definitely includes not only identification of relevant features, but also interpreting them in the context, which reflects the communicative purpose of the discourse.

Though different sources may use slightly different ways of categorizing genres, they consider academic discourse to be a specific genre, since it is defined by its communicative purpose: communicating academic knowledge and novelties to the readers in the field. Academic discourse is often seen as relatively flawless, or in

---

\* University of East Sarajevo, Alekse Šantića 1, 71420 Pale, Bosnia and Herzegovina; e-mail: jelenam52@gmail.com

Hyland's word, it is seen as "an objective, faceless and impersonal form of discourse" (2005a: 65).

In actual fact, under the superficial flawlessness of academic discourse there is a constantly ongoing interaction between the author and the putative reader. In other words, it is "a persuasive endeavour involving interaction between writer and reader" (Hyland 2005a: 65):

Interaction in academic writing essentially involves 'positioning', or adopting a point of view in relation to both the issues discussed in the text and to others who hold points of view on those issues. In claiming a right to be heard, and to have their work taken seriously, writers must display a competence as disciplinary insiders. This competence is, at least in part, achieved through a writer-reader dialogue which situates both their research and themselves, establishing relationships between people, and between people and ideas. [...]

The motivation for these writer-reader interactions lies in the fact that readers can always refute claims and this gives them an active and constitutive role in how writers construct their arguments. Any successfully published research paper anticipates a reader's response and itself responds to a larger discourse already in progress. This locates the writer intertextually within a larger web of options (Bakhtin 1986), and within a community whose members are likely to recognize only certain forms of argument as valid and effective. (Hyland 2005b: 175- 176)

Thus, though being academic and professional, academic discourse necessarily includes interpersonal features. Exploring interpersonal features has been the topic of numerous research articles and monographs focusing on academic discourse from a specific point of view: not identifying its propositional values, but trying to discover the ways in which metadiscourse works.

Metadiscourse is briefly defined as discourse about discourse. There is a common understanding that it refers to non-propositional features of discourse (Swales 1990, Hyland 2005a), but there are also considerable differences in ways in which its relation to other related concepts should be seen. Thus Vande Kopple clearly distinguishes the level of propositional content and the level of discourse, which does not add anything to the propositional meaning (1985: 83). Crismore et al. (1993) also state that metadiscourse should be seen as linguistic material which does not affect the propositional meaning, but "is intended to help the listener or reader organize, interpret and evaluate the information given" (1993: 40). These are clear examples of looking at metadiscourse as an essentially non-truth and non-propositional concept. This view, of separating metadiscourse from the propositional meaning, is a commonplace in linguistics today.

Trying to explain the essence of metadiscourse and its relation to the meaning of the text, Hyland (2005a, 2005b) takes a more insightful view. He emphasizes that the meaning of the text is not its propositional meaning only, since the process of re-

textualization of a text given (e.g. for a wider audience) will affect its overall meaning:

[T]he meaning of a text is not the propositional material or what the text could be said to be about. It is the complete package, the result of an interactive process between the producer and receiver of a text in which the writer chooses forms and expressions which will best convey his or her material, stance and attitudes. (Hyland 2005a: 22)

Therefore, metadiscourse should be seen as "an essential part of any text", and not as "a separate and separable set of stylistic devices" (2005a: 23), or in other words:

[M]etadiscourse is not a subjective question of style, but a central pragmatic feature: the means by which writers portray a disciplinary awareness of how best to represent themselves and their research. (Hyland 1998: 453)

Furthermore, analyzing metadiscourse features does reveal "a great deal about the norms and epistemology of those who use them" (ibid), which is the cornerstone of the currently very popular interdisciplinary field of contrastive rhetoric (see Blagojević 2012).

This attitude, that metadiscourse does not only embellish the text and its propositional meaning, but actively takes a part in expressing the overall meaning of the text, is supported in the article. In the same manner metadiscourse is seen as an essentially important part of any discourse, including academic texts.

### **1.1 Academic metadiscourse in introductory textbooks**

Academic discourse may be varied. Therefore it is further classified into different types of academic texts, the division being primarily based on their different communicative purposes. The 'primary' or 'default' type of academic discourse is certainly research article, which has attracted most attention in linguistic research on metadiscourse. Its target readers are other researchers or specialists in academic fields, unlike the target readers of the so called popular research articles, which may be intended for both specialists and lay readers. The last but not the least type of academic discourse appears in introductory textbooks, seen as "the major pedagogic genre of the academy" (Hyland 2005a: 104). The importance of introductory textbooks is unquestionable, since they are certainly properly defined as follows:

[O]ne of the primary means by which the concepts and analytical methods of a discipline are acquired, playing a central role in learner's experiences and understandings of a subject" (ibid 101).

It is generally thought and stated that introductory textbooks mostly present accepted theories and uncontested facts, which was proposed by Bakhtin (1981: 427 in Hyland 2005a: 104) in his using the term 'undialogized' discourse. If academic discourse in general is frequently seen as relatively objective and flawless, introductory textbooks are certainly seen as even more objective and unquestionable.

In academic circles introductory textbooks are frequently rather underestimated as academic endeavours. Generally speaking, they are seen as addressing students or novices, and subsequently offering contents which are not challenging enough for experts in the field. However, Swales emphasizes that introductory textbooks do not just represent accepted truths, but also communicate a kind of view of the discipline to both novices and scholars (Swales 1995 in Hyland 2005: 101). Thus introductory textbooks must exert a considerable level of expertise and authority, not becoming overwhelmingly superior or didactic. In other words introductory textbook discourse has to answer rather different demands successfully. Subsequently introductory textbook discourse should show interesting and specific qualities when addressed as the topic of linguistic research

## **1.2 The theoretical framework**

Looking for a theoretical framework for the study, we have consulted the three models classifying metadiscourse features, which we find to be very influential. The first model is Vande Kopple's classification system of metadiscourse (1985: 82-92). He says that metadiscourse conveys interpersonal and textual meanings, and thus he distinguishes between textual and interpersonal metadiscourse. The writer uses textual metadiscourse, as the term suggests, to produce the text which will make sense in the particular context. Textual metadiscourse is further classified into text connectives (e.g. *first, next, in connection with*), code glosses (e.g. clarifying a point, reformulating in parenthesis etc.), validity markers (e.g. *perhaps, may, clearly, undoubtedly*), and narrators (e.g. *according to Smith*). Interpersonal metadiscourse, on the other side, helps writers express their personalities and attitudes towards the propositional meaning of the text. Subsequently interpersonal markers are divided into illocution markers (e.g. *to conclude, we predict*), attitude markers (e.g. *interestingly*), and commentaries (addressing readers directly).

Crismore et al. (1993) use the term metadiscourse to refer to linguistic items that explicitly serve the interpersonal and textual functions of language. They offer a

slightly adapted subcategorization: metadiscourse is divided into textual and interpersonal metadiscourse, and textual metadiscourse is further classified into textual markers and interpretive markers. Interpretive markers include code glosses, illocution markers and announcements. Here interpretive markers and interpersonal markers are seen as distinct categories, though they functionally considerably overlap.

Hyland (2005a, 2005b) re-organizes ideas presented in Vande Kopple's classification, primarily adopting a clear functional approach, and avoiding the term 'textual' metadiscourse. Namely, he focuses on Thompson, who noted that there are the two basic aspects of interaction, the interactive and the interactional, being "essentially the two sides of the same coin" (Thompson 2001 in Hyland 2005a: 44). The interactive aspect includes markers which the writer discreetly uses to build up the interaction with the reader, whereas the interactional aspect more overtly exhibits the writer's performance in the text. The writer constantly goes to and fro, employing interactive and interactional means to build the desirable metadiscourse:

Rather than simply moulding the text interactively to fit the readers, writers may chose at any point to bring their management of the unfolding of the text to the surface and to engage themselves and their readers explicitly in the process. [...] The reasons why this option might be selected are very varied but typically reflect an attempt to involve the reader in some way. (Thompson 2001: 61 in Hyland 2005a: 44-45).

Hyland carried out intensive research on the frequency of interactive and interpersonal aspects of interaction, further divided into their subtypes.<sup>1</sup> Summarizing the results, Hyland noticed that there was a rough balance between interactive and interactional forms in research articles, whereas in introductory textbooks used as the corpus there appeared more interactive forms. This may seem logical, since textbooks are seen as offering transparent guidance in the text, whereas research articles are seen as the text where different means of persuading will be taking place. In the second, more detailed study, Hyland (2005a)<sup>2</sup> reported that the overall frequency of forms was similar to the earlier study. The novelty was that hedges and engagement markers were ranked next to the most frequent (interactive) metadiscourse markers.<sup>3</sup> The table presenting his results is given in the appendix.

---

<sup>1</sup> Interactional markers are further divided into stance and engagement markers, whereas interactive markers are further divided into transitions, code glosses, endophoric, frame markers, and evidentials.

<sup>2</sup> In this study Hyland used a corpus of 500,000 words.

<sup>3</sup> The most frequent markers were transitions.

In his framework, Hyland (2005b) divided interactional features into stance and engagement markers first of all. Stance markers are seen as primarily attitudinal, including features used by writers when they aim to communicate their judgments, opinions, or commitments (2005b: 176), and therefore are writer-oriented. On the other side, a number of forms may be used when the writer wants to 'engage' his readers, or when they recognize "their presence" (ibid). However, the two groups of forms are strongly interrelated, and certainly there are overlaps. In the following figure, we present Hyland's framework of interactional markers:

Interactional markers								
Stance				Engagement				
Hedges	Boosters	Attitude markers	Self-mention	Reader pronouns	Directives	Questions	Shared knowledge	Personal asides

Figure 1. Key resources of academic interaction  
 (based on Hyland 2005a and 2005b: 177).

### 1.3. The scope of the research

The research question in this article, as mentioned above, is describing and interpreting engagement markers in the introductory textbook corpus. What made us interested in this research question are Hyland's findings (2000, 2005a, 2005b), where he states that interactional markers are less frequent in introductory textbooks than in research articles. Nevertheless he also states that engagement markers, though belonging to interactional features, are among the most frequent discourse features in general.

Our aim is thus describing and interpreting engagement markers in a grammar textbook of contemporary English, *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*, by Huddleston and Pullum (2005). The textbook consists of 16 chapters, covering about three hundred pages. The academic text used as the corpus includes the body text in each chapter and the text of prescriptive grammar notes. However, it excludes the text in exercises given at the end of each chapter, since exercise instructions necessarily and typically include direct ways of addressing the reader, whereas our primary aim in the article is to identify the means of engaging the reader in academic text in introductory textbooks which need not include explicit ways of doing it.

This textbook was chosen as the research corpus for several reasons. It is widely used nowadays as a standard grammar book. Its metadiscourse features are neither standard nor typical: the authors themselves state they have written the book in an engagingly interesting informal style.<sup>4</sup> The overall informal style of the textbook is also connected with our expectations of more overtly expressed presence of the reader in the discourse. Subsequently we expected engagement markers to be prominent and varied in the corpus.

This study, focused on engaging the reader in introductory textbooks, certainly possesses some limitations. Generally speaking, we could say that the writer and the reader are incessantly engaged in interaction in the discourse, or as Hyland puts it, "that all metadiscourse refers to interactions between the writer and the reader" (2005a: 45). Not denying it, we want to focus on explicit signs of engaging the reader in the interaction, called engagement markers. Another restriction in the study is that although engagement markers take very different syntactic forms (e.g. words, phrases, clauses, sentences), their syntactic diversity is not our aim. Most researchers use functional analysis in discourse studies, which also seems to be the best means towards the aim of this article. Finally, we found classifying markers to be difficult at times, since sometimes their pragmatic values considerably overlap, or are not clear enough. All these factors make the process of analysis more demanding.

## **2. A closer look at engagement markers in the corpus and the results**

In Figure 1 above, we can see that Hyland (2005a, 2005b) divides interactional forms into the two groups: expressing stance and expressing engagement. The first group, of stance, includes various means positioning the writer himself in the discourse. Different forms of stance have been frequently investigated in linguistic literature. On the other side, expressing engagement, or positioning the reader in the discourse, has not been very popular among research questions in discourse analysis. Hyland notes that there are two main purposes in using engagement markers:

Acknowledgement of the need to adequately meet readers' expectations of inclusion and disciplinary solidarity. Here we find readers addressed as participants in an argument with reader pronouns and interjections.

---

<sup>4</sup> Formality of academic discourse was the topic of our presentation ("Is academic English necessarily formal?") at the international conference *Going against the Grain*, which was held in Banja Luka in June 2013.

To rhetorically position the audience. Here the writer pulls readers into the discourse at critical points, predicting possible objections and guiding them to particular interpretations with questions, directives and references to shared knowledge. (Hyland 2005b: 182)

The two purposes do overlap considerably, but they are also frequently distinguishable. The basic types of markers performing the two purposes which we explore in the corpus are the ones identified by Hyland (2005b): reader pronouns, directives, questions, shared knowledge, and personal asides. They are rather different according to the level of explicitness and the typical forms realizing them.

### 2.1. Reader pronouns

Using reader pronouns is generally very explicit: using the pronoun *you* directly engages the reader in the discourse. However, most academics, for stylistic reasons, prefer to use inclusive *we*. This pronoun seems to be the most frequently exploited means of engaging the reader. Generally speaking, reader pronouns are used when the writer anticipates readers' concerns, expectations, or objections:

- (1) Which of these **you** can do with a given sentence depends to a large extent on its syntactic form. (EG 159)<sup>5</sup>
- (2) So in general, if **you** take a PP that can be the complement of **be**, **you** will find it cannot be the complement of **become**, but with AdjPs there is no such restriction [...] (EG 135).

What may be easily noted after the empirical research is that *you* (and subsequently the possessive determiner *your*), being the commonest reader pronoun, appears surprisingly frequently in the corpus. There is hardly a page in the text where it is not used.

Apart from *you*, the pronoun *we* is also a frequent means of engaging the reader in the discourse in the same way:

- (3) In [iia] **we** see an example of the present perfect as used to report hot news. (EG 49).
- (4) In *Sue hurt her*, by contrast, *Sue* cannot be the antecedent, and hence **we** understand that Sue hurt some other female. (EG 106).

However, the pronoun *we* in the corpus is frequently used to denote the two authors only, performing a different aim: unlike *we* as an engagement marker, the first person plural personal pronoun *we* is now used to propose some convention or the necessary methodological or terminological issue in the corpus. Thus it is used while introducing topics and linguistic theories underlying them:

---

<sup>5</sup> The abbreviation EG is used in the article to denote the introductory textbook used as the corpus, *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*. Since bold, italic and underlined letters are frequently used in the corpus, we have chosen to use **underlined bold** letters to denote engagement markers in the examples.

- (5) The purpose of this chapter is to introduce most of those (or at least the most important ones). We do it by taking a high-speed reconnaissance flight over the whole terrain covered in the book. (EG 11)

Apart from *you* and *we*, there are rare instances where the pronoun *I* is also used impersonally, thus again engaging the reader:

- (6) I use a definite NP when I assume you will be able to identify the referent. I say 'Where's the dog?', for example, only if I'm assuming you know which dog I'm referring to. (EG 19)

In the previous examples containing reader pronouns we can easily see why syntactic analysis in discourse studies will not fulfill the aim, and at the same time why any metadiscourse markers, including engagement markers, may be realized as discourse markers only in actual instances of realization.

## 2.2. Personal asides

Personal asides are seen as a reader-oriented strategy because they express short 'dialogues' between the writer and the reader. They are not focused on the basic propositional values of the discourse: they are focused on establishing the relationship between the writer and the reader. The part of the corpus containing most personal asides in the corpus are prescriptive notes given mostly at the end of the chapter, since their contribution in the overall contents is providing further but digressive insights on the topics covered:

- (7) Among the most famous cases are sentences that everyone will recall hearing, such as 'Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's (the King James Bible, 1611), and a date which will live in infamy (Franklin D. Roosevelt's often misquoted remark about the day of the 1941 Pearl Harbour attack). (EG 191)
- (8)
- (9) [...] to some speakers a non-subject NP in the matrix clause seems just as good as a basis for figuring out what the understood subject in the adjunct should be (though speakers often don't agree on which ones) [...] (EG 207)
- (10)
- (11) [...] they are generally understood by everyone. The few that have disruptive or hilarious unintended meanings are actually rather rare (though they tend to be cherished and much quoted by usage writers). (EG 209)

Generally speaking, the pragmatic value of personal asides may be also performed by footnotes. However, if they are found in the body of the introductory textbook discourse, personal asides are felt as building the writer-reader interaction in an almost informal way mostly owing to their digressive, almost friendly essence.

In the corpus we found several examples of personal asides, each adding to the overall 'informal' tone of the textbook.

### 2.3. Appeals to shared knowledge

Appeals to shared knowledge should function as means of making the reader recognize something as familiar or shared knowledge. In this way, writers frequently propose that what they are saying is true by using these helping strategies of appeals of shared knowledge. The forms in which they appear in the corpus are rather typical: in the form of adverbials (*certainly, obviously, clearly*), or using the introductory or the closing remarks ('as we have seen'):

- (12) **As we have seen**, all canonical clauses contain a subject and a predicator [...]. (EG 77)
- (13) In clause structure **we have recognized** a unit intermediate between the clause and the verb, namely the verb phrase. In the same way we recognize a unit [...]. (EG 83)
- (14) **We have said** that prototypical adjectives have comparative and superlative forms [...]. (EG 118)

An unusual way of referring to shared knowledge in academic discourse is using 'of course', which was also found in the corpus:

- (15) But **of course** I don't assume that you can name the language, since the whole point of the rest of the sentence is to tell you its name. (EG 91)
- (16) It's only a preference, **of course**: there's no question of a ban on subjects being new [...]. (EG 242)

Appeals to shared knowledge, being very frequent in the corpus, in most cases rely on using reader pronoun *we*.

### 2.4. Directives

Directives usually appear in the imperative mood: they are used to make the reader do what the writer wants: perform some cognitive acts. Here our analysis will not follow Hyland's (2005b: 185). Namely Hyland divided acts into textual, physical or cognitive acts, where he takes textual acts to "metadiscoursally guide readers through the discussion, steering them to another part of the text or to another text" (ibid). However, since the purpose of steering the reader throughout the discourse is finally cognitive, we used the term directives as the cover term for all cognitive acts that the reader is supposed to perform.<sup>6</sup>

In the corpus we found a number of lexical verbs used in directives:

- (17) **Notice that** in [ii] we have again chosen a construction where the preterite does not indicate past time. (EG 34)
- (18) **Compare** these two examples: [...]. (EG 44)

---

<sup>6</sup> Needless to say, physical acts are rather infrequent in social sciences, in linguistic discourse being almost nonexistent.

- (19) The preterite and the perfect are different kinds of past tense: **note that** both *She went home* and *She has gone home* locate her going home in past time. (EG 43)
- (20) **Consider** the following data: [...]. (EG 141)
- (21) **Consider** these cases and **think about** which of them (if any) could possibly be said to have something to do with possessing: [...]. (EG 109)
- (22) **Note that** the exhaustive element of meaning applies equally in an example like *He'll complain, whether we meet on Saturday or Sunday*. (SG 179)

Directives typically occur initially, though they sometimes appear medially. The most frequent verbs used in directives in the corpus are *note* and *compare*, followed by *notice* and *consider*. The verbs *take*, *think about* and *contrast* appear sporadically in the corpus.

However, we have to note that the overall extremely high frequency of directives in the body of the discourse surprised us. Thus, almost every set of examples is preceded by a directive, which explicitly raises the reader's awareness of the cognitive load in the examples. Thus the corpus used in the article, the chosen introductory textbook, uses directives abundantly in its now almost recognizable predominantly informal tone.

## 2.5. Questions

Questions are used to involve the reader into dialogue with the writer. They are supposed to arouse the reader's interest. In Hyland's corpus, over 80% of questions were rhetorical. This is obvious in that the writer asks the question and responds to the question immediately, as is the case in all the instances we have found in the corpus:

- (23) Focus on the four we've underlined. The second and fourth are obviously instances of the same word, but **what about the first and the third? Are these instances of the same word, or of different words?** The answer depends on which sense of 'word' is intended. (EG 15)
- (24) **Why would this exhaustive conditional meaning be expressed by an interrogative form?** Because the interrogative expresses a question whose answers define an exhaustive set of conditions. (EG 179)
- (25) But it makes the sentence ungrammatical. **Why is that?** Because needed has already got a direct object [...]. (SG 185)
- (26) **Can you imagine any situation in which Sara wanted to convince Ed while Ed didn't want to be convinced?** Obviously, yes. (EG 217)
- (27) **Now, can you imagine circumstances in which Sara seemed to convince Ed but Ed didn't seem to be convinced?** This time the answer must be no [...]. (EG 217)

Though using questions as engagement markers in the corpus was as frequent as using other engagement markers, several examples which have been found in the corpus are used as effective means of catching the reader's attention and engaging him in the discourse.

## **2.6. Final remarks on the results**

Instances of all the five types of engagement markers have been found in the corpus, some of them being very prominent. Namely, the extremely frequent use of reader pronouns, directives and appeals to shared knowledge was accompanied by sporadic uses of personal asides and questions. As expected, some means may be seen as realizations or combinations of different engagement markers, whereas few types are rather specific: personal asides and questions.

The overall extensive use of engagement markers, however, is justified in the textbook used as the corpus, since it acquires the primarily informal tone of accidentally but rather constantly engaging the reader into the discourse.

## **3. Conclusion**

The question we have tried to answer in the article refers to exploring academic discourse in introductory textbook in one of its most frequent metadiscourse features: engagement markers. Therefore we have analysed the relation between metadiscourse and academic discourse, presented the theoretical framework of classifying metadiscourse markers (Hyland 2005a, 2005b) used in the research, and finally interpreted the results.

The corpus, considered to be a standard English grammar introductory textbook nowadays, but also an unconventional sample of academic discourse, proved to be suitable for the purpose. Namely, instances of all the five types of engagement markers have been identified in the corpus, their frequencies being rather varied. Reader pronouns, directives and appeals to shared knowledge are simply indispensable in the corpus, whereas personal asides and questions are rare. While reader pronouns and appeals to shared knowledge are markers we expect to find in introductory textbooks, what surprised us was a large number of directives used almost on the regular basis whenever it was possible. The 'texture' of the discourse becomes intensively reader-friendly for a number of reasons, but at least partially owing to the pragmatic function of the engagement markers. Namely, the overall interaction acquires a considerable degree of the predominantly informal tone, which

is sometimes perceived as becoming even personal. Personal asides, though infrequent, also add to this informal tone.

The corpus textbook is praised by its reviewers, presumably for its propositional meaning, as a 'modern and innovative grammatical framework' (from the blurb reviews). However we cannot resist concluding it is the 'complete package' of the textbook (including all the metadiscourse features, and subsequently the engagement markers) that exhibits 'an innovative academic framework'. In the same style we may support what has been stated earlier in the text: all metadiscourse will 'reveal' the writer and his epistemology. Thus even though there has been a rise in the interest in academic metadiscourse, it still seems insufficient to satisfy the needs.

## References

- Askehave, I. and J. M. Swales (2001). Genre Identification and Communicative Purpose: A Problem and a Possible Solution. *Applied Linguistics*, 22/2, 195-212.
- Blagojević, S. (2012). *O engleskom i srpskom akademskom diskursu*. Niš: Filozofski fakultet.
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R. and Sreffensen, M. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: a study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written Communication*, 10, 39-71.
- Huddleston, R. and G. Pullum (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, R. and G. Pullum (2005). *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: the pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 437-55.
- Hyland, K. (2005a). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2005b). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192.
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 148-164.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). Some explanatory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 82-93.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Metadiscourse in 56 coursebooks in 8 disciplines (Hyland 2005a: 103)

Categories	No. per 1000 words	%	Categories	No. per 1000 words	%
Transitions	24.9	37.0	Hedges	8.1	12.2
Code glosses	5.5	8.0	Engagement markers	7.0	11.3
Endophoric	4.8	6.7	Boosters	5.3	7.9
Frame markers	3.4	4.9	Attitude markers	4.4	6.6
Evidential	1.7	2.7	Self mention	1.6	2.5
Interactive	40.3	59.3	Interactional	26.4	40.5

### Apstrakt

#### MARKERI PRISUSTVA ČITAOCA U UNIVERZITETSKIM UDŽBENICIMA

Ovaj rad je nastao kao plod interesovanja autora za neke aspekte akademskog metadiskursa. Teorijski okvir preuzet je od Hajlenda, jednog od najznačajnijih autora u ovoj oblasti. Klasifikujući metadiskursne markere, Hajlend ih deli najpre na interaktivne i interkacione. Iako su i jedni i drugi od suštinske važnosti za ostvarivanje komunikacije između autora i čitaoca, razlikuju se po svojoj eksplicitnosti. Naime, interaktivni markeri uglavnom implicitno ostvaruju komunikaciju autor-čitalac, dok interkacioni markeri eksplicitno učestvuju u ostvarivanju komunikacije. Iako su Hajlendova istraživanja pokazala da su interkacioni markeri znatno zastupljeniji u naučnim radovima nego u univerzitetskim udžbenicima, jedan tip ovih markera izdvaja se po svojoj učestalosti, a to su markeri prisustva čitaoca.

Markeri prisustva čitaoca dele se na nekoliko tipova: zamenice, direktivi, pitanja, upućivanje na već poznato i lične napomene. Iako se navedeni tipovi nekada preklapaju ili kombinuju formirajući zajedničke eksponente, često su i specifični po svojoj pragmatičkoj ulozi, ali i formi.

Istraživanje u ovom radu obavljeno je na korpusu jednog danas veoma zastupljenog, gotovo standardnog univerzitetskog udžbenika gramatike engleskog jezika, autora Hadlston i Pulam (2005). Udžbenik je odabran kao nekonvencionalan upravo po svojim metadiskursnim osobenostima. U korpusu su pronađeni primeri upotrebe svih tipova markera prisustva čitaoca, a najzastupljeniji su izvesno zamenički oblici, direktivi, i upućivanje na već poznato. Dok je zastupljenost zameničkih oblika i upućivanja na već poznato bila očekivana, iznenadila nas je izuzetna učestalost direktiva, koji su bili gotovo nezaobilazni elementi izlaganja praćenog primerima u korpusu.

Na osnovu rezultata rada, može se zaključiti da se univerzitetski udžbenici ne moraju odlikovati jedino autoritativnim metadiskursom. Naime, ukoliko autor proceni da je direktno uključivanje čitaoca jedna od mogućnosti ostvarivanja uspešne interakcije između autora i čitaoca, markeri prisustva predstavljaju nezaobilazan element u izgrađivanju metadiskursa.

Sagledavajući pragmatičku ulogu markera prisustva čitaoca na korpusu univerzitetskog udžbenika, možemo zaključiti da se njihova zastupljenost odražava na sveukupnu ulogu akademskog metadiskursa, ne samo kao pratećeg propoziciji u tekstu, već kao komplemetarnog propoziciji u formiranju sveukupnog značenja diskursa.

**Ključne reči:** akademski diskurs, metadiskurs, interakcija, uključivanje, markeri prisustva čitaoca, zamenice, direktivi, pitanja, upućivanje na već poznato, lične napomene.