University of Leipzig

Faculty of Philology

Department of Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies

Thesenpapier

Writer-reader Interaction in Written Discourse: A Parallel Corpus-based Investigation of English-Persian Translation of Metadiscourse Features in Legal and Political Texts

Mehrdad Vasheghani Farahani

Supervisor:

Professor Dr. Klaus Dieter Baumann

Advisor:

Dr. Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi

Leipzig; Germany

1. **Purpose of The Study:**

This dissertation was an effort to, quantitatively and qualitatively; unveil the distributional pattern of metadiscourse features and to analyze writer-reader interaction in legal and political texts translation in an English-Persian Context.

2. **Significance of the study and Statement of the Problem**

As people communicate, either in spoken or written modes, their interactions include features by which they can organize their texts or speech as well as expressing their own attitudes towards the text and speech or the receiver(s) of it (Hyland, 2001). In this sense, it is argued that texts (as one mode of communication) are records of "dialogue between the writer and the reader in that the writer enacts the roles of both participants in the unfolding dialogue" (Thompson, 2001, p. 60) and are usually produced at two levels of meanings; that is to say, a propositional content meaning level and a writer-reader interaction level (Hyland, 2005; Flowerdew, 2011 & 2015; Herriman, 2014).

On the propositional content level, the author will supply the needed information about the subject matter and refer to the events and states of matters that are all transformed by him in the text (Hyland, 2018). In other words, on this level of texts, meaning refers, mostly, to information in external reality and such aspects of text as actions, events or the intentions which are all depicted in the text and which can be attested, denied, confirmed, argued or even doubted (Halliday, 1994).

However, on the interactional level- which is the second level of meaning- the author does not add anything to the subject matter and / or content; instead, he makes interaction with the prospective receiver(s) of his message. Indeed, on this level of meaning, authors/ speakers represent themselves in the text and facilitate the communication between authors and the prospective readers or audience (Latawiec, 2012).

These two levels of meaning are constructed and related to each other by the notion of metadiscourse features (Hyland, 2005). Indeed, in this context, metadiscourse refers to "the ways writers refer to the text, the writer and the reader to organize the propositional content of the text, help readers understand the text, and persuade readers to accept their arguments "(Williams, 2010, p.73). In other words, the main function of metadiscourse features is to guide and assist the prospective readers or listeners in how to interpret the propositional content (Flowerdew, 2015). To further elaborate the notion of metadiscourse, it is defined as "discourse about discourse and refers to the author's linguistic manifestation in a text to bracket the discourse organization and the expressive implications of what is being said'' (Hyland, 1999, p. 5).

In classifying languages from a writer-reader interaction perspective, some languages are classified as writer-responsible (writer-oriented); whereas, some other languages are classified as reader-responsible (reader-responsible). Indeed, in some languages, it is on the reader to extract the related and expected information in the text; whereas, in other languages, it is the responsibility of the writer to facilitate the understanding of the fellow of information (Hinds, 1983, 1987, 1990). In other words, in such languages writers are required to facilitate the flow of information and understanding of the text (Hinds, 1990; Maddalena & Belmonte, 2011).

In a reader-responsible language, on the other hand, the language does not contain enough rhetorical devices as the reader is expected to understand the connections between the propositions and to unveil the meaning in the text as a whole. In this regard, the reader should himself sort and evaluate the connections on his own and without the assistance of the writer (Wang, 2002).

Considering this classification, English is classified a writer-responsible language and culture (Hind, 1987; Qi & Liu, 2007, Salager-Meyer, 2011) which means that in the course of the communication between the writer and the reader, it is the responsibility of the writer to make the communication as useful and fathomable as possible to the readership (Noor, 2001). In the same line, Persian (Farsi) language is also classified as a writer-oriented language in which the writer makes efforts to effectively make the readership of his message as clear as possible (Hinds, 1987, Mashhady; Fatollahi & Shahraki, 2015).

Considering the writer-reader interaction in translation and the dichotomy of writer-oriented vs. reader-oriented languages, this study was an effort to unveil the distributional pattern of metadiscourse features and to unfold the writer-reader interaction in translation of legal and political texts in an English-Persian context. The null hypothesis of this study was that there was no significant difference between the distributional pattern of metadiscourse features in English and Persian languages and that the writer-reader interaction in English and Persian language remained stable despite translation.

3.Methodology
3.1 Corpus of the Study:
This study privileged two corpora, one English-Persian parallel corpus and one Persian reference corpus. The parallel corpus consisted of two sources; that is to say, one commercially available corpus and one Do It Yourself Corpus. The commercially available corpus called ELRA (European Language Resources Association). The second corpus contained 8 texts in the fields of legal and Political sciences (4 texts in legal and 4 ones in political sciences). The texts were in PDF files creating on aggregation 162 pages in original language. The two sources were merged to create a balanced and representative corpus.

3.2 Reference Corpus:
The Persian monolingual reference corpus was created out of 58 different sources in the fields of legal and political sciences. On aggregation, the corpus contained 419, 237 words. This Persian monolingual corpus was created as a reference corpus against which the translations could be compared and analyzed.

3.3 Metadiscourse Typology
This study was based on the concept of metadiscourse features. As a result, the metadiscourse model of Hyland (2005) was chose as part of the theoretical framework of the study. His taxonomy consists of two main categories as interactive and interactional. In the interactive classification, the writer will try to shape the text in such a way that it could meet the needs of the readership (Hyland, 2005). On the other hand, the interactional category of metadiscourse features is used to make the message of the writer more explicit, which is done by allowing the receiver to respond to the unfolding text.

Table 1

Metadiscourse Category

Category	Function	Example
Interactive	**Help to guide the reader through the text**	**Resources**
Transitions	Express relations between main clauses	In addition; but; thus; and
Frame markers	Refer to discourse acts, sequences and stages	Finally; to conclude; my purpose is
Endophoric markers	Refer to the information in other parts of the text	Noted above; see figure; in section 2
Evidentials	Refer to information from other	texts According to X; Z states
Code glosses	Elaborate propositional meaning	namely; e.g.; such as; in other words,
Interactional	Involve the reader in the text	Resources
Hedges	Withhold commitment and open dialogue	Might; perhaps; possible; about
Boosters	Emphasize certainty and close dialogue	in fact,/definitely/it is clear that
Attitude markers	Express writer's attitude to the proposition	Unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly
Self-mentions	Explicit reference to authors	I; we; my; me; our
Engagement markers	Explicitly build a relationship with the reader	Consider; note; you can see that

4. Procedure

To put this corpus-based study into practice, the following steps were taken carefully to ensure the matter of practicality and feasibility of research. In the first stage, the monolingual referenced Persian corpus was uploaded in the Sketch engine corpus. Then the whole Persian corpus was scrutinized manually, line by line, in order to look for and detect the instances (tokens) of metadiscourse features instances. Once found, metadiscourse features were categorized based on the Hyland's categorization of metadiscourse features. Then by using Sketch engine, the frequency of metadiscourse features was calculated in the whole Persian corpus. This step was taken to get a clear perception of metadiscourse features distributional pattern (s) in Persian language. In addition, the type-token ratio of the Persian monolingual corpus was calculated.

In the second stage, the ELRA corpus together with the second parallel corpus was combined to create a unified, representative, and balanced parallel English-Persian corpus aligned at the sentence level. The corpus was first in Excel files and divided into English and Persian language pairs. It was then uploaded into the Sketch engine corpus software. Then the metadiscourse features were first scrutinized in the English corpus manually and line by line. Then they were categorized based on Hyland's model of metadiscourse features. In the next stage, they were examined by Sketch engine software, one by one, to calculate their frequency in the whole corpus. To be on the safe side, the instances were crossed checked manually to make sure that the instances were categorized correctly. This process was done by applying concordance lines. In the next stage, the Persian translated corpus was analyzed in terms of metadiscourse features to see how they were used and distributed in the Persian translations. They were then categorized

into the categorization of Hyland's model to see how they were used in Persian translation. Then the English and Persian parallel texts were compared in terms of metadiscourse features usage and distributional pattern. Finally, the original English corpus was compared to that of the Persian original referenced corpus. This comparison was made to see how metadiscourse features were used and distributed in English original texts and Persian original (not translated) texts. In the last stage, the Farsi original corpus was compared to that of the Farsi translation corpus to see how translation texts and original ones differ in terms of metadiscourse features distribution.

5. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed in a multi-dimensional way; that is to say, first the Persian monolingual corpus was analyzed, then, the English corpus was analyzed in terms of metadiscourse features. After that, metadiscourse features of the Persian translation corpus were analyzed. In the next step, metadiscourse features in the Persian translation and Persian originals. Finally, metadiscourse features in English, Persian originals and Persian translations were compared.

5.1 Persian Monolingual Corpus:

The Persian monolingual corpus had relatively a high ratio of type-token (77, 15), which means that the Persian monolingual corpus had a high level of linguistic complexity and lexical density and a low number of repetitions. The total number of interactive metadiscourse features was 41064 items. Transitions were the most prevalent instances of metadiscourse feature (26888) followed by frame markers (8891) with 65.5% and 21.6%, respectively. After that code glosses and evidentials were the third and fourth most used instances of metadiscourse features in Persian monolingual corpus with 6.8 and 5.8%; respectively. With only 82 items, were endophoric markers the least used instances of metadiscourse features (.2%).

5.2. Metadiscourse Features of the English Corpus:

The ratio was 89, 19, which means that the English corpus had a rather high level of lexical density and a low number of repetitions. This was like the Persian monolingual corpus. Transitions with 14618 instances (58.7%) were the most frequent instance of metadiscourse features followed by boosters (9.5%) and frame markers (8.7%) as the second and third most frequent metadiscourse features; respectively. With 1838 (7.4%) and 1096 (4.4%) self-mentions and hedges were the fourth and fifth most frequent metadiscourse features. With 870 and 864 items, were code glosses and engagement markers, the next used metadiscourse features (both 3.5 %). Attitude markers with 452 items (1.8%) and Endophoric markers with 362 items (1.5%) were the next applied metadiscourse features. The least used metadiscourse features in English corpus were evidentials with only 299 (1.2%).

5.3. Metadiscourse Features of the Persian Translation Corpus:

The calculated type-token ratio was 91, 12, which is a high level of ratio; reflecting the fact that the Persian translation corpus had a high level of lexical density and a more diverse form of language as well as a low number of repetitions. From the total number of metadiscourse features, transitions were the most frequent metadiscourse features with 13863 items (61.2%) followed by boosters 2046 (9%) and frame markers 1801 (8%). After that were self-mentions with 1318 instances (5.8%) and hedges with 966 items (4.3%). Engagement markers and code glosses with 867 (3.8%), and 788 (3.8%) were the next used metadiscourse features in the Persian Translation Corpus; respectively. Attitude markers with 393 (1.7%), endophoric markers with 310 instances (1.4%) and evidentials 283 (1.3%) were the least used instances of metadiscourse features in the Persian translation corpus.

5.4. Metadiscourse Features of the English Original Corpus and its Persian Translations:

93% of the interactive metadiscourse features were translated from English into Persian, and only 7% were left untranslated. For the interactional metadiscourse features, 84% were translated, and 16% remained untranslated. On aggregation, the English corpus consisted of 24924 metadiscourse features; but the Persian translation corpus consisted of 22635.

5.5. Metadiscourse Features in the Persian Translation and Persian Originals:

From 43054 tokens 41064 counts were dedicated to the interactive category, and 1989 counts were assigned to interactional category; respectively. The significance level is less than 0.05, therefore, there was a statistically significant difference between the two corpora.

5.6. Metadiscourse Features in English, Persian Originals and Persian Translations:

The English corpus contained 24924 metadiscourse features as compared to 22635 counts of Persian translations. The level of significance was .000, which means that there was a statistically significant difference between metadiscourse features distributional pattern in the corpora.

6. Conclusion:

6.1 Quantitative Results

Transitions were the most frequent type of interactive metadiscourse features (79%) followed by frame markers as the second most prevalent type of interactive metadiscourse features (11%). In the third rank were code glosses with (4.8%) followed by endophoric markers (2%) as the fourth used interactive metadiscourse features. The least used metadiscourse feature were evidentials, with only 1.6%. Boosters were the most prevalent instances of interactional metadiscourse features (35.7%). After boosters, self-mentions were the second most applied instances of interactional metadiscourse features (27.8%). On the third rank were hedges (16.6%). Engagement markers (13.1%) were the fourth used interactional metadiscourse features. The least used interactional metadiscourse features in the English corpus was attitude markers (6.8%). As far as the transitions were concerned, 94% of them were transferred/translated, and only 6% were omitted. 83% of the frame markers were transferred/translated and 17% were omitted. 85% of the endophoric markers were transferred, and 15% of them were excluded. 94% of evidentials were translated and transferred into Persian, and only 6% were omitted. For code glosses, 90% were transferred, and 10% were deleted. Overall, 93% of the interactive metadiscourse features were transferred and translated from English into Persian, and only 7% of them were not translated. More than 88% were translated/transferred, and only 12% were omitted. For the boosters and attitude markers, more than 86% of the metadiscourse features were transferred/translated, and 14% were omitted. When it comes to self-mentions, 71% were translated, and 29% were left untranslated. For the engagement markers, 100% were translated.

6.2. Qualitative Results

The qualitative result showed that there were four types of changes in Persian translation of the metadiscourse features in Persian language.

6.2.1. Implicit Change:

The first change was implicit change. As a matter of fact, the inclusion of less metadiscourse features such as transition markers, frame markers and endophoric markers reduced the level of explicitness and increased the level of implicitness. This kind of implicitness in the

target text in the casual relationship was done in situations where translators hindered the transfer of transition markers, endophoric markers and frame markers. The level of explicitly in writer-reader interaction was changed, as there was no one to one and direct translation of transition markers, frame markers, endophoric markers and evidentials.

6.2.2. De-emphasis Change:

The second change, which was detected in the translation, was the (de) emphasis change that is attained through the insertion of boosters and \ or omission of hedges. In this regard, it can be said that the level of emphasis was changed and reduced in the target language as the number of boosters in the target text was found to be fewer than that of the source text. Boosters are used to show the level of certainty in discourse. The inclusion of boosters in the discourse may suggest that the author will not permit the inclusion of other voices as the author think that his proposition is proven. Therefore, the transfer of less boosters into the target language can be seen in situations where translators have toned down the force of proposition as they may have thought that the proposition was not important enough to be worth transferring to Persian; reducing the level of certainty in the target language.

6.2.3. Invisibility Change:

The third change detected in the translation was the invisibility change which was found to take place with the omission of self-mentions and attitude markers. Attitude markers and self-mentions are used to show the personal presence of the author or their own perspective towards the subject matter. As the number of self-mentions and attitude markers were found to be fewer than that of the English corpus, it may be plausible to conclude that the translator decided to tone down the voice of the writer who expressed his opinion regarding the topic and content. Moreover, the omission of attitude markers and self-mentions or their less frequent use by the translator revealed the authors' visibility.

6.2.4. Disinformation Change

The fourth and the last change detected in translation was (dis)information change which was done by the omission of code glosses and evidentials in the Persian language as the target language. Code glosses and evidentials are used to elaborate on the propositional meaning with the objective of making the proposition clearer for the readership. In addition, the inclusion of evidentials metadiscourse features may add support to the proposition of the author which refers to other sources. The fact that the target language depended less upon the code glosses may reveal the assumption of the translator that some pieces of information were irrelevant to the readership of the target language and to their comprehension.

7. Discussion

This research set to delve into the distributional behavior of metadiscourse features in English political and legal texts from English into Persian languages as well as unveiling the writer-reader interaction in translation. For this objective, one parallel uni-directional corpus of English and Persian texts in the fields of law and political sciences was used in order to analyze the translations. In addition, one monolingual Persian corpus was used as the reference corpus against which the Persian translations were compared and analyzed.

Regarding the type-token ratio, the statistics showed that the Persian monolingual corpus had a moderately high level of type-token (77-15) which signifies the fact that the Persian monolingual reference corpus had few repetitive words. The English corpus had the type-token ratio of 89-19, however, the Persian translation corpus had the type-token ratio of 91-12, which is higher than that of the English. This higher ratio suggests that the translations into Persian contained fewer repetitions (in this study fewer metadiscourse features). This is in line with the type-token ratio of the Persian monolingual corpus. It may be concluded that as far as type-token ratio is concerned, the Persian translation (like the Persian monolingual corpus) had fewer repetitions compared to that of the English language. This is in line with the number of metadiscourse features, of both interactive and interactional categories. As far as all the corpora - that is to say, the English corpus, Persian translation corpus and Persian monolingual corpus - were concerned, it was shown that they are all interactively oriented. In comparison to the Persian monolingual reference corpus, the English corpus mostly followed a similar pattern. Comparing the interactional metadiscourse features in the English corpus with that of the Persian monolingual reference corpus it can be suggested that the two corpora followed a different pattern in terms of metadiscourse features usage and distribution.

7.1. Implications of the Study

This research can have several useful implications. It can be suggested that the findings of this research can pave the way for further research in parallel corpora and corpus-based translation studies. Moreover, the findings of this research could be quite useful for researchers in the field of contrastive studies. They can use the results and findings of this research to gain an understanding into how metadiscourse features can be used, distributed, and investigated in translation from the source text to target text.

References

Flowerdew, L. (2011). Action, content and identity in applied genre analysis for ESP.

Language Teaching 44(4): 516-528.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Edward

Arnold.

Herriman, J. (2014). Metadiscourse in English and Swedish non-fiction texts and their

translations. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *3*(1), 1-32.

Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. Text 3 (2), 183196. Hinds, John,

1984. Retention of information using a Japanese style of presentation. *Studies in Linguistics 8*, 45–69.

_____ (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. B.

Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 Text* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

_____ (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: expository writing in Japanese,

Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In: Connor, U., Johns, A. (Eds.), *Coherence in writing*: *Research and Pedagogical Perspectives (*87–109*). TESOL*, Alexandria, VA, pp.

Hyland, K. (2001) 'Bringing in the Reader: Addressee features in academic articles', *Written Communication,* XVIII, 4, 549–74.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.

_____. (2018). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing* (2nd ed.). London, England: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Latawiec, B. (2012). *Metadiscourse in oral discussions and persuasive essays of children exposed to collaborative reasoning* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Maddalena, A., & Alonso Belmonte, I. (2011). Unveiling the writer–reader interaction in Peninsular Spanish and American English newspaper editorials: A cross-linguistic study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(3), 891-903. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.026.

Mashhady, H., Fatollahi, M., & Shahraki, A. (2015). A discourse analysis study of English and Persian newspaper editorials based on Halliday's functional grammar. *IJLI*, *1*(2), 1-16.

Thompson, G., (2001). Interaction in academic writing: learning how to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics 22* (2): 58-78.

Wang, L. (2014). Theme and rhyme in the thematic organization of text: Implications for teaching academic writing. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9*(1), 164-176.

Williams, M. (2010). Translating Metadiscourse: An explanatory analysis of problems in students' work. *Mutatis Mutandis*, *3*(1), 73-90.