Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse in Sociolinguistic Related Undergraduate Research Projects in Nigeria

Oluwatoyin F. Lawal

Department of English
College of Education, P.M.B. 4415, Ilemona, Offa,
Kwara State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT
Nigeria is one of the countries where English language is the *lingua franca* ; yet speaking and writing with this official medium of communication still goes with difficulty in its deployment. The major problem identified is low understanding concerning rules guiding usage of some grammatical properties which make communication in English sound. Among such properties are metadiscourse features. It has been discovered that metadiscourse has various models and this paper focuses on the interpersonal type. The paper has carried out an analysis of ten of the discourse features deployed in two of the sociolinguistic related undergraduate projects in the University of Ilorin, Nigeria. The paper has contributed to the body of knowledge in the field of linguistics with focus on academic writing in English language in Nigeria in particular.
Keywords: Analytical, Interpersonal, Metadiscourse, Sociolingustic, Undergraduate

INTRODUCTION
It has become a reality in the present day Nigeria to make use of English language by the majority of the populace because that is the lingua franca. The use of English language in the day-to-day interaction does not constitute much problem like when the language is to be deployed in academic writing. This is evident in print materials made available for consumption of the public many of which contain errors that weaken the message intended to be communicated by the authors of such materials. Part of such errors has to do with inappropriate use of metadiscourse features. Therefore, this paper analyzes ten discourse features used in two sociolinguistic related undergraduate research projects to exemplify the ideational model of metadiscourse. Hyland's (2005) interpersonal model of metadiscourse is adopted as framework for selecting the linguistic properties examined, which is applied to the textual analysis of the two data. The paper presents a brief review of literature on concept of interpersonal model of metadiscoure before analyzing the two projects chosen for the study.

Concept of Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse
Interpersonal model of metadiscourse has a distant historical antecedent on which a brief review of the contributions to the development of the concept is done here. Abdollahzadeh (2001) embarked on a textual metadiscourse analysis employing text connectives, code glosses and illocution markers while in 2007, he based his analysis on metadiscourse subtypes and used hedges, assertions, attitudinals, person markers, transitions and code glosses as his tools.
According to Hyland & Tse (2004), "all metadiscourse is interpersonal in that it takes account of the reader's knowledge, textual experiences and processing needs and it provides writers with an armory of rhetorical appeals to achieve this". It was on this note that Hyland (2005) came up with his 'interpersonal model of metadiscourse' which he classified in two: interactive and interactional resources. Adel (2006) adopted a non-integrative approach to metadiscourse while in (2008), he embarked on metadiscourse analysis using a taxonomy of text-oriented and participant-oriented functions. The non-integrative approach comprises all textual materials that serve as signposts for the reader through the text while taxonomy of text-oriented and participants-oriented functions include

textual materials the writer uses to interact with the reader (p. 184).Faghih and Rahimpour (2013) carried out an illuminating comparative study. Their work was entitled "Contrastive Rhetoric of English and Persian Written Texts: Metadiscourse in Applied Linguistics Research Articles". They examined a group of 90 discussion sections of applied linguistic research articles with the intention of dissecting various dimensions of academic written discourse. The study analysed English texts written by native speakers of English, English texts written by Iranians who were non-native English, and Persian texts written by Iranians.

To gain insight into cultural differences between Persian and English-speaking researchers, the authors adopted Hyland's (2004) metadiscourse signals as parameters. These included: transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidential, code glosses, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mentions. It was discovered that there were differences in the rhetorical strategies employed by the groups of researchers examined due to their mother tongues. It was also found that all the three groups made use of all the metadiscourse elements. That notwithstanding, there were different ways the Persian and English-speaking researchers deployed the elements. Again, interactive metadiscoursal factors that guide the reader through the text, like transitions and frame markers, were deployed greatly more than interactional ones like hedges, boosters, and the similar ones which involve the reader in the argument.

 A study was carried out by Orta, Millan, Sanz and Duenas (2013) on "How to Explore Academic Writing from Metadiscourse as an Integrated Framework of Interpersonal Meaning . . . ." The authors viewed metadiscourse as:

> linguistic material in texts, whose main function is not to add propositional (or experiential meaning but to help readers organize, interpret and evaluate information. This material does not simply support propositional content; it is the means by which propositional content is made coherent, intelligible, persuasive and convincing to a particular audience. Metadiscourse features are grouped into two macro-categories; interactive and interactional, which were previously referred to as textual and interpersonal, adopting the Hallidayan terms (Orta et al, 2013).

The authors presented the subject from the intercultural, interdisciplinary and intergeneric perspectives.

The model of Hyland (2005) based on his interactive and interactional resources dichotomy will be adopted as the analytical model for this work. He opined that the 'interactive resources' guide the writer to manage the information flow to explicitly establish his preferred interpretation while the 'interactional resources' focus on the participants interaction and seek to display the writer's persona and a tenor consistent with the norms of disciplinary community (pp. 128-129). According to him, the interactive resources are: transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials and code glosses while the interactional resources are: hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self mentions. These tools will be examined one after the other using Hyland's (2005) notion and similar views of other scholars.

Transitions
According to Hyland (2005), transitions are the arrays of devices, mainly conjunctions used to mark additive, contrastive, and consequential steps in the discourse as opposed to the external world. Examples include: in addition, furthermore, but, and, thus, and the likes (p.126). Since transitions are perceived as conjunctions, there will be a need for considering what constitutes conjunctions. Quirk & Greenbaum (1973) stated that some transitions such as 'now', 'as for', 'by the way', 'with reference to', incidentally, among others, introduce new stages in the sequence of thought and introduce related topics (pp. 289-290). Conjunction, according to Halliday (1985) on the one hand, is a range of possible structures within the domain of elaboration, extension and enhancement which is expressed by the choice of conjunctive adjunct (an adverbial group or prepositional phrase) or of the small set of conjunction (and, or, but, yet, so, then) typically, in thematic positions of clauses (pp.302-303).
According to Bloor & Bloor (1995), words such as 'firstly, 'secondly', and the likes are used for achieving external temporal - sequential relationships to introduce the sequence of event referred to, and to indicate the direction of an argument (p.99). To Boroujeni (2012), text connectives otherwise called transitions by Hyland (2005) are used to indicate the relatedness of the parts of the text to each other. This is further classified into three as consequences (e.g. first, next); reminders (e.g. as

mentioned earlier, as it made clear . . .) and topicalizers (e.g. with regard to, in connection with . . .) (p. 360).

Frame Markers

These are references to text boundaries or elements of schematic text structure, including items used to sequence, to label stages, to announce discourse goals and to indicate topic shifts. Examples are firstly, next, finally, to conclude, my purpose is, the aim is. To Boroujeni (2012), Illocution markers are metadiscoursal signals used to explicate the discourse act which a writer is carrying out at certain point. They are used to make readers note that the writer is about rounding off. They are indicated as frame markers by the use of phrasal statements like: 'to conclude,' 'I hypothesize,' 'to sum up . . .'' (p. 361).

Endophoric Markers

Endophoric markers refer to the additional materials that are salient and available to the reader in recovering the writer's intention by referring to information in the other part of the text. Instances of such include: noted above, see fig, in section two, as stated earlier, in the foregoing discussion, among others. Brown & Yule (1983) were of the opinion that endophoric co-reference instructs the hearer or reader to look inside the text to find what is being referred to. For instance, we can have, 'noted above', 'as earlier mentioned', 'consider fig. 2', among others.

Evidentials

These are those markers which indicate the source of textual information which originate outside the current text. They are referential markers referring to the source outside the current text. Burneikaite in his attempt to conceptualize the term 'evidentials' stated that, they are the strategies employed by the writers to point to other texts as sources of additional information which guide the reader through the text and assist them to recover the intention of the writer (Burneikaite citing Hyland & Tse, 2004). He further indicated that evidentials play the role of providing linkage between a writer's statement and those of other authors. Inter-textuality is thereby created as authors establish their academic credentials as they put forward their new discoveries and situate such in the already existing disciplinary knowledge. This is achieved by properly citing or referencing previous works in the field. Examples of evidentials given by Burneikaite include: *furthermore*, *the researchers confirm Myers (1989), Kruse (2002) emphasizes the role of government in….*

Apart from the above, Dehkordi & Allami (2012) in their article entitled, "Evidentiality in Academic Writing" explained that "one of the most important aspects of academic writing is making use of the ideas of other people". This is why any academic text normally contains the idea of others and that of the writer. What is required from the writer is to give evidence for having tapped ideas from others, which is referred to as evidentiality. Thomas and Hawes (1994) have as well been reviewed on the subject of evidentiality. They had considered evidentials as metalinguistic representations of ideas from another source (p. 1896).

Code Glosses

Code glosses are the signal words that help the readers grasp meanings of ideational materials. For example: namely, e.g., such as, in other words, for instance, examples include, etc. According to Mirzapour and Mahand (2012), code glosses are interactive resources which indicate the fact that information is restated. He gave the examples of such words to include: in other words, for example, that means, in another sense. In Boroujeni's (2012) view, code glosses play the role of assisting the audience of a writer or speaker to understand his/her intended meaning. The signals explain, define or clarify as they either appear parenthetically or as examples (p. 360). Faghih and Rahimpour (2013) also explained that code glasses are devices that indicate "restatements of ideational information like: *in other words, e.g.* (p. 7).

Hedges

Hedges mark the writer's reluctance to present propositional information categorically. Hedge is the qualification and toning down of an utterance or statement so common in speech and writing by clauses, adverbials, and the like, in order to make the impact of the utterance less severe (Wales, 1990: 215). It is a form of mitigation used to lessen the impact of a discourse on the reader. Examples include modal auxiliaries: might, could, etc, adverbials such as perhaps, possibly, seems, as if, etc. Yule (1985) referred to hedges as words or phrases used to indicate that we are not really sure that what we are saying is sufficiently correct or complete (p. 130).

Boosters
These are the markers used by writers to express certainty and emphasises the force of propositions like 'in fact,' 'it is clear that,' 'certainly,' and 'definitely.' Hyland (2004:139) stated that boosters are among the interactional resources. While Mirzapour and Mahand (2012) opined that boosters are devices which express certainty. These are illustrated as: 'it is clear that', 'definitely', 'obviously,' and 'of course.' Boosters and hedges are considered as the two major categories of interpersonal metadiscourse. Boosters are considered to be part of communicative styles employed to either reduce or heighten the force of statements. Through boosters, the degree of the writer's confidence in the reality of the statement is not only conveyed but the attitude toward the audience as well. Boosters also known as validity markers are deployed to show commitment of the speaker or writer to the certainty or otherwise of a statement. They are used to show the level of the writer or speaker's commitment to a piece of information. In sum, boosters are lexical devices utilized to present certainty.

Attitude Markers
Attitude markers are used to express the writer's appraisal of propositional information, conveying surprise, obligation, agreements, importance and so on. Examples of attitude markers are: 'unfortunately,' 'I agree,' 'surprisingly,' 'to my uttermost dismay,' just to mention a few. According to Boroujeni (2012), attitude markers express the attitude of a writer to a propositional matter being presented. They indicate the level of interest a writer or speaker has in the materials being presented. Attitude markers are shown by words or phrases like: 'unfortunately,' 'interestingly,'; 'I wish that' . . . (p. 361). These linguistic devices show the way a writer appraises propositional information. These are illustrated with examples like: *I agree, surprisingly* (Faghih and Rahimpour, 2013:7).

Engagement Markers
These 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 aside (Hyland, 2001a). Examples include: 'consider,' 'note that,' 'you can see that,' 'as you can see.' In the opinion of Boroujeni (2012), commentaries are used to involve readers directly by passing comments on the reader's probable mood or possible reaction to the text. Commentaries aid the writer to establish closer relationship with the reading audience. They are referred to as engagement markers by Hyland (2005). Examples include: 'you will certainly agree that,' 'you might want to read that' . . . (p. 361).

Self Mentions
Self mentions are used to indicate the extent of an author's presence in terms of first person pronouns and possessives. Such linguistic elements include: I. we, our, my, etc. Faghih and Rahimpour (2013) referred to self-mentions as the extent of author presence in terms of first person pronouns and possessives like *I, we, our, my* and the likes (p. 7).

Data Presentation Based On The Interpersonal Model Of Metadiscourse
The following methods are adopted for presentation of the data from the two projects selected for analysis.
a)   Two sociolinguistic related undergraduate research projects were selected in two succeeding years, 2009 and 2010. The first one titled " A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Language of Buchi Emecheta's *The Joy of Motherhood"* was written in 2010 by Mary Omotola Lawal whose matriculation number was 06/15CD073. The second data written in 2009 by Adewole Oluwaseun Ololade with matriculation number 05/67QB00 was titled "Code-mixing and Code-switching among the Nigerian Secondary School Students in Osun State."
b)   Word counts for each of the metadiscourse elements in each of the data were carried out based on Hyland (2005)'s classification into transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, code glosses, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self mentions.
c)   A cumulative frequency of each of the elements in both data was also carried out.
The discourse elements in the data are hereby presented in a tabular form to show the frequency of their usage in the two undergraduate research projects. The table shows the results of the frequency of the elements personally carried out by this researcher statistically. The table is followed by categorical examples of the used metadiscourse features in the projects.

Table for Data Presentation showing cumulative frequency of the ten elements in Data One and Two

Tools	Datum One		Datum Two	
	Frequency	Examples	Frequency	Examples
Transitions	427	**Additives**: *and, next, also, and also,* etc. **Adversatives**: *however, or, Although, while*, etc. **Causal**: *therefore, as a result, because,* etc. **Temporal**: *until, afterwards, frequently,* etc.	523	*Similarly, furthermore, but also, in addition,* etc. *However, so as, on the other hand,* etc. *Because, as a result,* etc.
Frame Markers	94	**Title & Subtitle**: *Chapter one, introduction,* etc. **In-text**: *this work aims at, the theory will be applied to*, etc.	116	*Research methods, research design,* etc. *From which we have the following, in the later part of this chapter,* etc.
Endophoric Markers	160	**Elaboration**: social variables *(ethnicity, religion, etc.)* **Reference**: *these differences, according to him, these factors*, etc. **Apposition**: women *who worked to,* factors *which give rise to linguistic variations,* etc	144	It is called *conversation gambit* *The two concepts, as earlier noted,* etc. Words *that are used,* anyone, *who speaks more than one language,* etc.
Evidentials	121	**Personal**: *Yule (1985) states that, Ferguson (1995) quoted by Wardhaugh (2006),* etc. **Non-personal**: *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1999), according to literature in sociolinguistics,* etc.	57	*According to Odebunmi cited from Babatunde (2001: 89),* etc. *Some research work have shown that,* etc.
Code Glosses	51	*Her other works include, for example, in the following,* etc.	57	*Such as, namely, for example,* etc.
Hedges	77	**Nominal**: kind, one, etc, **Verbal:** *could, might, may,* etc. **Adverbial**: *seems, usually,* etc.	51	**Phrasal**: *may however, in his own opinion, are sometimes, he said,* etc **Sentential**: *we would want to believe that,* etc
Boosters	51	*Especially, eventually, can, more, as a field, cannot,* etc.	55	*Obviously, critically, vivid,* etc.
Attitude Markers	10	*Generally, in spite of all odds, in short, simply put,* etc.	14	*Interestingly, it is true, generally speaking, in a way,* etc.
Engagement Markers	96	*We would go on at this point to expatiate on, these variables are related to the data collected,* etc	83	*Note also that, another important thing to be noted, one can deduce that,* etc.
Self Mentions	02	*We* might even find ourselves, *we* expect to find expressions, etc.	09	Finally, *I* will like to, as *we* have seen, etc.
Total	1089		1109	

5

Examples of statements where the metadiscourse elements in each of the undergraduate research projects sampled, referred to as datum one and datum two, are given below as illustrations. Pages where the examples used are taken from each of the research projects under examination are added in brackets at the end of each statement for possible verification.

 1. **Transitions**
Additives

Samples from Datum One:

 "sociolinguistics studies how language varieties differ… *and* how creation *and* adherence to…"

 "*so also*, the slave women who was killed in Agbadi's compound *and* who was later referred to as Nnu Ego's Chi" (p.43).

Samples from Datum Two:

''Furthermore, Osisanwo (2003:3-5) explores Hymes' contribution on the function of language…''(16)

 ''*In addition* to these, code switching may come about…''(p.33)

Adversatives

Samples from Datum One:

"*Although* Fishman (1971) notes that these two areas of emphasis…both are concerned with interpretations…" (p. 8)

''Wardhaugh (2006:13) *on the other hand*…'' (p.11)

Samples from Datum Two:

 '… *so as* to discover the reason and the effects of code – mixing and code – switching among students'' (p.45)

''on the other hand, code - switching and code - mixing is a good quality of bilinguals…'' (p. 65).

Causal

Samples from Datum One:

"these differences can *therefore* be identified in Fishman's definition…" (p.   8).

"*as a result* of these relationship between language and society, an approach to linguistic research has developed" (p. 38).

Samples from Datum Two

''it examines the use of language by considering social parameters *because* a language of expression is essential …'' (p.1)

 ''however, *because* of the limited time and space …'' (p.6).

Temporal

Samples from Datum One

"Dell Hymes, Janet Holmes, Suzanne Romaine, Lakoff and the likes have helped to popularize the field *afterwards until* It gained its present popularity" (p. 9).

"men make use of insults, swear words and obscenities more *frequently* than women" (p. 48).
 In the illustrations above, transitional devices are used for performing the functions of elaboration and extension (additives). In the examples given, 'so also', 'and also' are additives used for achieving emphasis. Apart from elaboration and extension, the various examples have illustrated transitional devices used for achieving contrast (adversatives), result (causal) and sequential ordering (temporal).

 2.   **Frame Markers**

Titles and Sub-titles

Samples from Datum One

CHAPTER ONE
GENERAL INTRODUCTION
1.1 INTRODUCTION
I.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
1.3 JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY… (pp. 1, 2 & 3)
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 INTRODUCTION
2.2 ATTEMPTS AT DEFINING SOCIOLINGUISTICS
2.3 THE SCOPE OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS
2.4 SOCIOLINGUISTICS VARIABLES
2.4.1 SOCIOLINGUISTICS EXPATIATED… (PP. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 & 14)

Samples from Datum Two
Chapter Three
Research Methodology
Research Design
Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques
Population
Target Population… (pp. 43 & 44)
        The frame markers in Datum One are all in upper cases and also in bold print. This is done in order to make it more prominent and distinct from the other parts of the text. This is a way of emphasizing its significance to the text. It guides the readers to what is to be expected in the text. It is a way of summarizing the content of the text and also gives an overview of the text in case the reader does not have the time to read through all the text. However in the Datum Two, the frame markers are written in lower cases, whereas the content words have their initials written in upper cases. This distinction in the two data shows variations in the styles of the two researchers.

In-text Frame Markers

Samples from Datum One

‘'this work therefore aims at examining…'' (p. 2)

"the elements within the theory of sociolinguistics will be picked one
 after the other…" (p. 4)

Samples from Datum Two

"therefore this chapter will deal with the review of relevant literatures on the following headings:

1. Language as a medium of communication
2. Functions of language
3. Challenges of language contact…" (p. 10)
   "…these are issues this research work treats in the latter part of this
   chapter" (p. 23)

The in-text frame markers as used in Datum One are revealing the background of the work and also are providing the details of the work in the other chapters (chapters two, three and four). The in-text frame markers are giving a kind of preview to the entire research work. In Datum Two however, the in-text frame markers are structured in an outlining form using numeratives. This also portrays a distinction in the style of writing adopted by the two researchers.

 3.   Endophoric Markers
Elaboration

Samples from Datum One

"…language varieties differ between groups separated by certain social variables *(ethnicity, religion, status, gender, level of education, age)"*p.1)

 "Ferguson (1959:336), as cited by Wardhaugh says, dialossia is a relatively stable language situation in which in addition to the primary dialects of the language *(which may include a standard or regional standard*)" (p.31)

Samples from Datum Two

"furthermore, Osisanwo (2003: 3-5) explores Hymes' contribution on the function of language *from which we have the following…*" (p. 16)

 " this is often manifested at the lexical level, *that is*, in the word used" (p. 26)

Reference

Samples from Datum One
"Buchi Emechita was born in Nigeria in 1944… *she* has invested fragments
of her personal real life…" (p.4)

"from the example given above, we can infer that the language of an adult is
usually deeply meaningful…" (p.39)

Samples from Datum Two
 "*the two concepts* look alike and are mistaken for each other by some people who have deficient knowledge about this concepts" (p. 2).

 "it should be noticed that code-mixing is an inter-clausal element *as earlier noted*" (p. 27).

Appositive Statement

Samples from Datum One

"her heroines her usually career women, *who work to sustain their families…*" (p.4)

"Yule (1985:240-241) cites the example of a famous study by Labov
(1972) *who combined elements from place 0f occupation and socioeconomic status…* (p.15)

Samples from Datum Two

"the two concepts look alike and are mistaken for each other by some people *who have deficient knowledge about this concepts*" (p. 2).

"to exclude other people *who may eavesdropping within hearing a comment* is intended for only a limited audience" (p. 36).

Endophoric makers in the data which are exemplified above are used as parenthesis to indicate elaboration of ideas for better understanding of the text, reference and apposition. Apart from these significances, endophoric makers are used for achieving clarity of expressions in the data.

4. **Evidentials**
   Personal Evidentials
      Primary:

Samples from Datum One
"*Daramola (1994: 2) defines* education as a process of cultural transmission…" (p. 18) "*Eckert and McConnell—Ginet (2003:10) describes* sex as…" (p. 23)

Samples from Datum Two
"*Osisanwo (2003: 1) in his opinion sees* language as…" (p. 11)
"*Hammer and Blanc (1989: 148) see* code-mixing as…" (p. 26).

Secondary:

Samples from Datum One
"*Halliday et al (1964: 224) cited by Daramola (2004) defines* language…" (p. 7).
"*According to Yygotsyk (1962) quoted by Fishman (1971) focuses* upon…" (P. 8)

Samples from Datum Two
"*according to Odebunmi cited from Babatunde (Eds.) (2001: 89),* attitude are
complex phenomena…" (p. 19).
"*Alabi, T. A. cited from Obafemi (et al) Ed (2007:85)...*" (p. 21).

Non Personal Evidentials

Samples from Datum One
"*According to literature in sociolinguistics...*" (p. 1)
"*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1999)* on the other hand   describe   education as…" (p. 18).

Sample from Datum Two
"*some research work have shown that* students code-mix and code-switch in order to be socially admitted in some situations" (p. 3).

Evidentials are means of acknowledging the persons or materials from which one have borrowed ideas. Evidentials guide the readers through the text and assist them to understand the opinions of the writer towards a proposition.

5. **Code Glosses**

Samples from Datum One

"*Her other works include*, Second Class Citizen, Bride Price, etc" (p.4)

"for *example*, when telling a friend that one likes his or her shirt, *one may say…*"(p.14)

Samples from Datum Two
  " it serves the means of getting things done for functional purposes *such as* for expressing one's emotion, feelings thought and needs" (p.14)
  "Sotiloye (1999) is another scholar that comes up with another types of code switching *namely :…*"(p.32)
  Code glosses are used in the above examples for achieving clarity of ideas, listing and expatiation of ideas as expressed by the researchers. When code glosses are used for listing, they are used for listing of items or a set of ideas. Also when used for expatiations, they describe and explain situations for easy access to the information passed across.

6. **Hedges**
 Lexical Hedges:
Samples from Datum One
    Nominal Hedges
"the *kind* of English spoken by one's grandmother may differ from that which other people around her speak" (p. 1)

 "All these variations make *one* wonder why *one* has to use a different *kind* of English" (p. 2)
    Verbal Hedges
 "we *might* even find ourselves using certain terms depending on which friend we are with…" (p. 2)
"the way we speak to our boss *may* also…" (p. 2)
Adverbial Hedges
 "according to him, it *seems* to be the case that a person who spend a long going through college or university will tend to have spoken language features…"(p. 18)
"there is always a dominant language *(usually* the language of those with more powers)" (p. 36).
Phrasal Hedges
Samples from Datum One

    "there are two major levels of sociolinguistics *as identified by Bell* (1976)…"
    (p. 11)

    "Ekundayo et al (2002) and Adeyanju (2007) agree on the meaning of   semantic   extension *which according to them…*" (p. 35).

Samples from Datum Two

"a community *may however*, have access to use two or more languages *depending on the policy, situation and needs*" (p. 1)

"Osisanwo (2003) *in his own opinion* sees language…" (p. 11)

Sentential Hedges

Sample from Datum Two

"from the assertions of the scholars above, *we would want to belief* that code-mixing is a random…" (p. 26).

    In the examples given so far, hedges have been used to perform the four basic functions of politeness, imprecision, uncertainty and shying away from responsibilities. These hedges are used to paint the picture that the information shared is a mere opinion and not the fact. In the examples cited above, hedges have also been used for showing regard for the views of scholars.

7. Boosters
Samples from Datum One
"however, Nnu Ego and are husband are abandoned by the children, *especially*
the boys" (p. 6)

"those are the top in multilingualism community *usually* have the widest linguistic repertoire and they *certainly* speak the official language." (p. 15)
Samples from Datum Two
"observation method is *obviously* the best method of carrying out research…"
(p. 45).

"it is vivid that speakers started their conversation in Yoruba Language…" (p. 51).

From the examples drawn above, the writers made use of boosters to show the position they maintain in the ideas expressed and this is mostly achieved with the use of adverbials, especially (of manner) and modal verbs for expressing certainty and degree of a writers understanding of a proposition.

8. Attitude Markers
Samples from Datum One
"it would therefore be useful to students of sociolinguistics *generally.*" (p. 3)
"*in spite of odds,* given her state of poverty, she is able to feed her children…" (p. 6)

Samples from Datum Two
"*interestingly* enough, there is a large corpus of literature *which emphasizes* that language serves different functions…" (p. 14)

"Osisanwo (2003:1) in his opinion *sees* language as the human vocal noise…"
(p. 11).

The writers' dispositions are expressed in the examples through the use of adverbial phrases (of manner and concession), verbs, adjectives and also clauses.

9. Engagement Markers
Samples from Datum One
"there are two major levels of sociolinguistics as identified by Bell (1976); micro-linguistics and macro-linguistics." (p. 11).

"these variables are related to the data collected concerning linguistic variables in order to determine variation in language." (p. 13).

Samples from Datum Two
'in Nigeria presently, apart from one basic language of the community, a child is exposed to at least one other language." (p. 1).

"on the side of the students, it would be necessary if all the students can view their indigenous languages with utmost respect…" (p. 69).

The expressions drawn from the data as exemplified in the examples above are means of involving the readers and committing them to activities in the text.

10. Self Mentions
Samples from Datum One
"*we* might even find ourselves using certain terms depending on which…" (p.   2)

"he cites the example of a religious register in which *we* expect to find   expressions   not found elsewhere…" (p. 21).

Samples from Datum Two
"*we* would want to belief that code-mixing is a random insertion of elements of one language into another" (p. 26).

"conclusively, *we* can justifiably say that bilinguals continue to lack in their quest to develop their mother tongue vocabulary." (p. 71)

From the examples given above, it is clear that the type of self mentions used are not to portray the opinions of the writer, rather it suggests their presence and it is used as a kind of suggestion made by the researcher which propelled her to use the first person personal pronoun, 'I'.

CONCLUSION
Attempt has been made in this paper present an analysis of metadiscourse from an interpersonal model perspective. Ten of the metadiscourse features have been described and illustrated, using two undergraduate project within the field of linguistics in the University of Ilorin, Nigeria. The frequency of the usage of the linguistic elements selected for examination from the two data was noted and presented in a table after which examples of the deployment of the elements and brief explanations are given thereafter.
The study shows that the elements examined were largely used in the two data at a satisfactory level. This might be as a result of the fact that the projects sampled were written by students in the department of English language and that the writers were already groomed in the deployment of such linguistic properties. It was further noted that self-mentions occurred more in datum two than in datum one which points to the need for more emphasis and regular assignments on how to write academic papers objectively without using personal pronouns. On the whole, it is believed that this paper will enhance better deployment of metadiscourse properties by academic writers as they will be more conscious of the need to write in a way that readers will be carried along.

REFERENCES
Abdollahzadeh, E. (2001). *Native and non native writers' use of textual metadiscourse in ELT papers*. Unpublished master's thesis University of Tehran Tehran.
Adel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Blakemore, D, (2002). *Relevance and linguistic meaning: the semantics and   pragmatics   of discourse markers*. CUP.

Boroujeni, E. K. (2012). Specifying metadiscoursal signals in the novel *Pride and   Prejudice* and its two Persian translations by Copple's model (1980). In   *Mediterranean journal of social   sciences,   Vol.   3   (2).,357-366.* www.mcser.org/images/stories/2_journal/mjss_may_2012/esmail_kaboli.pdf.   Accessed 25/10/2012.
Bloor, T. & Bloor, M. (1995). *The functional analysis of English*. Britain: Hodder Education.
Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis.* London: Cambridge University Press.
Burneikaite, N. (2012). "Evidentiality in graduate student writing: a study of Lithuanian students' master's thesis in English". Vilnius University, 5 Universiteto Street, Vilnius,Luthuania archive.minfolit.it/arch/4001/4455.pdf. Accessed 26/11/2012.
Crismore, A. (1989). *Talking with readers; matadiscourse as rhetorical acts.* New York: Peter Lang.
Dehkordi, M. E. & Allami, H. (2012). Evidentiality in academic writing in *theory and practice in language   study,*Vol   2,   No.   9,   pp.   1895-1904.   Ojs.academy publisher.com/indexphp/tpls/article/download/…/5399. Accessed 26/11/2012.
Faghih, E. and Rahimpour, S. (2013). "Contrastive Rhetoric of English and Persian   Written Texts: Metadiscourse   in   Applied   Linguistics   Research   Articles."

www.scholarship.rice.edu/bitstream/handle/1991/21850FaghihRahimpour_R___WP.pdf.
Accessed 31/1/2013.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Critical language awareness.* London: Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). Spoken and written language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

------------- (2004). "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate   writing." *journal of second language writing*, 13, 133-151

_____ (2005). *Metadiscourse: exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. & Tse, P. (2004). *Metadiscourse in academic writing: a reappraisal*. London: University of Hong Kong.

Lawal, A. (1997). "Aspects of stylistic theory and the implications for practical   criticism." In Lawal, A. (Ed.). *stylistics in theory and practice.* Ilorin: Haytee Press and Publishing Company.

Lenk, U. (1998). Discourse markers and global coherence in conversations. *journal of   pragmatics, 30,245-257.*

Mirzapour, F. & Mahand, M. R. (2012). "Hedges and boosters in native and non-native library and information and computer science research articles" joournalarticle.ukm.my/5378/1/18-2-12-fatemah.pdf. Accessed 26/11/2012.

Orta, I.V., Millan, E. L., Sanz, R. L., and Duenas, M. M. (2013). "How to Explore   Academic Writing from Metadiscourse as an Integrated Framework of   Interpersonal   Meaning: Three Perspectives of Analysis. www.unizar.esaelfe2006/ALEFE06/1.discoursee/29.pdf. Accessed 30/1/2013.

Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A university grammar of English*. England: Pearson Education Limited.

Thomas, S. & Hawes, T. P. (1994). *Reporting verbs in medical journal articles. Englidh for specific purpose*s, Vol. 13, pp 129-148.

Wales, K. (1990). (Ed.). *A dictionary of stylistics.* London: Longman.