Unlocking Interaction: A Deep Dive into Metadiscourse in Indonesian and International EFL and ESL Textbooks for Senior High School

¹Rismar Riansih , ²Angga Dwinka , ³Safnil Arysad

*¹Doctoral Program of Applied Linguistics, Universitas Bengkulu
and SMA Negeri 1 Lubuklinggau, INDONESIA*

²Doctoral Program of Applied Linguistics, Universitas Bengkulu, INDONESIA

³Doctoral Program of Applied Linguistics, Universitas Bengkulu, COUNTRY

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	This study presents a comparative corpus analysis of interactional metadiscourse features in two English textbooks used in Indonesian senior high schools: an EFL textbook published by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture (*Bahasa Inggris: Work in Progress*) and an ESL textbook published by Cambridge University Press (*English as a Second Language: Second Edition*). Despite the central role textbooks play in shaping classroom discourse and developing students' communicative competence, limited attention has been paid to how interactional metadiscourse is utilized in these materials, especially in EFL contexts like Indonesia, where textbooks often serve as the primary source of English input. Addressing this gap, the present study investigates how interactional metadiscourse, features that guide readers through the text and engage them, differ between a locally produced EFL textbook and an internationally published ESL textbook. The analysis was conducted using a corpus-based approach, drawing on Hyland's (2005) model of interactional metadiscourse to manually identify and categorize features, including hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions, and engagement markers. The results revealed notable differences in the frequency and types of interactional metadiscourse employed in the two materials. These findings support the alternative hypothesis (H1), which posits that the international ESL textbook contains more interactional metadiscourse features than the Indonesian EFL textbook. The study contributes to the limited body of empirical research on metadiscourse in English textbooks and offers insights

Rismar Riansih; Angga Dwinka; Safnil Arsyad

relevant to improving textbook design and English language instruction in the Indonesian context.

INTRODUCTION

Textbooks are central to language learning and teaching, serving as the primary material through which learners are introduced to both systematic content and authentic language. In Indonesian classrooms, English textbooks often serve as the primary—sometimes the only—source of input for students' language development. The quality of these materials plays a crucial role in influencing learners' comprehension and engagement. One key indicator of quality is the presence of metadiscourse features—linguistic elements that structure the text, guide the reader, and convey the writer's stance. According to Hyland (2005), metadiscourse facilitates interaction between writers and readers by organizing discourse and expressing the writer's persona, thereby building a dialogic relationship. These features enhance engagement by making the text more accessible, persuasive, and reader-friendly. The concept of metadiscourse was first systematically described by Vande Kopple (1985), who viewed it as commentary on the discourse itself. Vande Kopple (1985) originally defined metadiscourse as discourse about discourse, a foundational concept for this study.

Metadiscourse, as conceptualized by Hyland (2005), refers to linguistic strategies that writers use to organize their discourse, express attitudes, and engage with readers. While metadiscourse has been widely examined in academic writing, particularly at the tertiary level, limited research has explored its use in secondary education. For example, Işık Kirişçi and Duruk (2022) analyzed metadiscourse in academic abstracts, but such a focus has not yet extended to textbooks, especially in EFL contexts like Indonesia. Previous studies (e.g., Abdi et al., 2019; Wei & Duan, 2021; Amaal & Radzuwan, 2020; Zali et al., 2019) have highlighted how interactional metadiscourse features such as hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mentions contribute to clarity, credibility, and reader engagement in academic texts. More recently, scholars have extended this focus to textbook analysis. For instance, Liu and Buckingham (2018) investigated interactional metadiscourse in Chinese EFL textbooks, identifying cultural variations in the interaction between writers and readers. Similarly, Kusumarasdyati (2021) examined evaluative language in Indonesian high school English textbooks, indirectly addressing metadiscursive elements.

Despite growing interest in metadiscourse and textbook discourse, few studies have conducted direct comparative corpus analyses of local and international English textbooks used in Indonesian high schools. This reveals a clear research gap in understanding how interactional metadiscourse is pedagogically integrated in different cultural and educational contexts. Given the pivotal role that textbooks play in shaping students' exposure to English, particularly in EFL settings, such comparative insights are essential.

To address this gap, the present study investigates interactional metadiscourse in two English textbooks used in Indonesian senior high schools: *Bahasa Inggris: Work in Progress*, published by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture, and *English as a Second Language: Second Edition*, published by Cambridge University Press. Drawing on Hyland's (2005) framework, this study employs a corpus-based approach and quantitative analysis to identify and compare the frequency and types of interactional metadiscourse features—such as hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mentions—used in both textbooks. Accordingly, the study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What types and frequencies of interactional and interactive metadiscourse features are found in the Indonesian EFL textbook and the international ESL textbook used in Indonesian senior high schools?
2. Are there statistically significant differences in the use of interactional and interactive metadiscourse features between the two textbooks?

By applying ANOVA to test the statistical significance of the differences, this study provides empirical evidence of how interactional metadiscourse is differently employed across local and international materials.

The findings are expected to contribute to the limited body of research on metadiscourse in secondary-level EFL textbooks and to offer practical insights for textbook writers, curriculum developers, and English educators aiming to design more engaging and pedagogically effective materials.

METHOD
Research Design
This research adopted a quantitative approach to systematically analyze the use of interactional metadiscourse features in English textbooks. A corpus-based method was employed to examine the frequency and distribution of these features. The initial stage of the study involved data collection, focusing on two English textbooks used in Indonesian senior high schools: an EFL textbook published by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture (*Bahasa Inggris: Work in Progress*) and an ESL textbook published by Cambridge University Press (*English as a Second Language: Second Edition*). This selection ensured a diverse yet focused dataset that provides a representative

sample for the comparative analysis. These textbooks were selected for their distinct pedagogical orientations and sociocultural contexts: the former represents a nationally standardized curriculum tailored for Indonesian learners of English as a foreign language, while the latter reflects an international framework designed for learners in English-medium or bilingual settings. This contrast enables a meaningful comparative analysis of how interactional metadiscourse is employed across various educational and linguistic contexts.

Hypotheses
The following hypotheses guided this study:

- **Null Hypothesis (H₀)**: There is no significant difference in the use of interactional metadiscourse features between the Indonesian EFL textbook ("Bahasa Inggris: Work in Progress") and the international ESL textbook ("English as a Second Language").
- **Alternative Hypothesis (H₁)**: There is a significant difference in the use of interactional metadiscourse features between the Indonesian EFL textbook ("Bahasa Inggris: Work in Progress") and the international ESL textbook ("English as a Second Language").

These hypotheses were tested through a comparative corpus analysis and further verified using statistical testing (ANOVA) to assess the degree of difference in the frequency and types of interactional metadiscourse markers found in the textbooks.

Instruments and Procedures
The identification and analysis of meta-discourse features followed the framework proposed by Hyland (2005), which classifies meta-discourse into two primary categories: interactive and interactional meta-discourse. In this study, the focus was on interactional meta-discourse, which consists of five subcategories: hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mentions.

To guide the data analysis, an analytical rubric was developed based on Hyland's typology. This rubric functioned as a coding guideline to ensure consistency and clarity in identifying instances of interactional meta-discourse within the textbook corpus. The indicators used in this rubric are described as follows:

a. **Hedges**: Words or phrases that indicate uncertainty or caution, such as *might, perhaps, possible, usually*. These allow the writer to avoid overgeneralization and show openness to alternative views.
b. **Boosters**: Words that emphasize certainty or confidence, such as *clearly, definitely, in fact, it is obvious that*. These express a strong commitment to the proposition.

c. **Attitude Markers**: Words or phrases that reveal the writer's affective attitude toward the proposition, such as *unfortunately, surprisingly, I believe,* and *it is interesting to note*. These reflect the writer's evaluation or emotional stance.

d. **Engagement Markers**: Features that explicitly address the reader, inviting their attention or participation, such as *you can see that, note that, consider,* and *let us*. These involve the reader in the text.

e. **Self-mentions**: The explicit presence of the author through pronouns like *I, we, my,* and *our*. These indicate the writer's identity and responsibility in the discourse.

Using this rubric, two coders manually analyzed the corpus of selected textbook texts. Each instance of interactional meta-discourse was identified, classified, and tallied using a spreadsheet. Inter-rater reliability was ensured through a calibration session and trial coding of a 10% sample of the texts, which reached an agreement rate of 90%.

This coding process enabled a systematic comparison of the frequency and distribution of interactional meta-discourse features across the two textbooks. The data were then subjected to both descriptive statistical analysis and inferential testing (ANOVA) to determine the significance of the observed differences.

Data Analysis Procedures

The analysis subsequently moved on to frequency and distribution. Quantitative analysis was also applied to count the occurrences of each interactional meta-discourse feature across different textbooks and text types. Here, I used corpus software such as AntConc. This also involved calculating the overall frequency across all textbooks to identify patterns or trends within them. Additionally, a comparative analysis was conducted to examine the distribution of interactional meta-discourse features across different textbooks and text types, specifically narrative and expository texts. The present study aims to identify any significant differences and tendencies in the use of interactional meta-discourse in this special context. In this study, 28 reading texts were analyzed, comprising 14 texts from Kemendikbud books and 14 texts from Cambridge books.

The findings of the quantitative and qualitative analyses will then be integrated and interpreted to provide an overall perspective on the interactional meta-discourse features at work in the analyzed EFL textbooks. The results related to their relevance to textbook writers, teachers, and syllabus designers, with special attention given to how interactional meta-discourse can increase student interest and understanding in learning EFL. By employing this multi-method approach, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of interactional meta-discourse in EFL

textbooks, offering insights into the ESL context of Indonesian English language education.

FINDINGS
Types of Interactive Meta-discourse EFL Textbooks

The two widely used English textbooks examined in this study represent different instructional orientations: *Bahasa Inggris: Work in Progress*, published by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbudristek), is an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) textbook, while *English as a Second Language: Second Edition*, published by Cambridge University Press, is an ESL (English as a Second Language) textbook. While both aim to enhance students' language proficiency and comprehension skills, they may also promote engagement and understanding through the use of specific types of interactive metadiscourse. By analyzing the forms and functions of interactive metadiscourse in these materials, this study aims to identify the pedagogical approaches employed by regional and international publishers to support students in learning how to use English effectively in writing.

The use of different types of discourse markers across various texts reveals interesting patterns when examining interactive metadiscourse in the Cambridge ESL textbook "English Language as a Second Language". The corpus (6,011 words in 14 texts) studies 189 occurrences of each type of interactive metadiscourse. These findings indicate that metadiscourse is a tool that can facilitate communication and comprehension in the process of language education, as evidenced in Hyland's (2005) study, which emphasizes the importance of metadiscourse in organising texts and involving readers. These figures illustrate the importance of metadiscourse as a tool for enhancing communication and comprehension in the context of language acquisition.

The majority of the metadiscourse consists of transition markers. They help ideas flow. The transition maskers occur for about 18.2% of all markers, or 49 total occurrences. This demonstrates the authors' importance of making their points clear to readers and maintaining consistency in their writing. There are 99 frame markers, or 19% of the total. They are essential for organizing and structuring content. This matches with McCarthy's theory. He stated that instructional materials should be organized and unambiguous, particularly for students who may find it difficult to understand complex structures (1991).

In addition, there are 24 instances of endophoric markers, which allude to textual content and make up 4.5% of the interactive metadiscourse. Their comparatively low frequency suggests that they are not the primary focus of the texts being studied, even though they help emphasize pertinent passages. However, there are 40 cases, or roughly 10.2% of the evidential markers

occurrences. According to Hyland (2005), this higher percentage underscores the writers' commitment to providing reliable evidence to support their claims, thereby enhancing reader trust in the content.

18 cases also indicate the use of the code glosses, considered as definitions or explanations of words. It is a small thing, but an important feature of metadiscourse, indicating that the author is trying to make themselves understood and wants students to grasp the ideas. Overall, the positioning of interactive metadiscourse markers in this text appears to be a deliberate design of instructional material to facilitate language learning. These transition markers, framing, endophoric, evidential, and code glosses are employed to enliven classroom interaction and provide a more productive learning environment for learners, reflecting the instructors' sensitivity to the difficulties involved in teaching English as a second language. The employment of such subtle metadiscourse by the writers enables their arguments to be more comprehensible, while also helping to equip students to deal with the nuances of the English language.

The interactive metadiscourse categories that were used in the textbook "English as a Second Language" published by Cambridge are the following:

Table 1. Percentage of interactive meta-discourse in English as a Second Language, second edition, published by Cambridge

Text	$\sum$ Words	Interactive Meta-discourse									
		Transition Markers		Frame Markers		Endophoric Markers		Evidential		Code Glosses	
		$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%
1	459	4	0.9	5	1.62	5	1.09	1	0.22	2	0.44
2	308	4	1.3	4	1.31	5	1.62	1	0.32	2	0.65
3	305	6	2	4	0.61	6	1	1	0.33	2	0.66
4	661	6	0.9	6	1.01	6	0.91	2	0.3	2	0.3
5	592	12	2	7	1.57	6	1.01	2	0.34	4	0.68
6	445	13	2.9	7	1.19	6	1.35	2	0.45	3	0.67
7	587	14	2.4	7	1.43	6	1.02	2	0.34	3	0.51
8	490	18	3.7	9	2.26	6	1.22	2	0.41	3	0.61
9	398	20	5	9	2.11	5	1.26	1	0.25	2	0.5
10	426	17	4	9	2.2	6	1.41	1	0.23	3	0.7
11	409	18	4.4	9	3.02	6	1.47	1	0.24	3	0.73
12	298	28	9.4	7	3.48	5	1.68	1	0.34	4	1.34
13	201	13	6.5	9	2.08	4	1.99	1	0.5	3	1.49
14	432	16	3.7	7	0.12	5	1.16	1	0.23	4	0.93
Total	6011	189	49	99	24	77	18.2	19	4.5	40	10.2

An interactive meta-discourse study in the book "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress," published by Kemendikbudristek, offers a sharp analysis of how discourse markers contribute to the structural narrative. This study delineates four distinct categories of meta-discourse: transition markers, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidential markers, and code glosses, and all of them are engaged in describing reader involvement and comprehension. Hyland (2005) claims that by leading readers through complex texts, these indicators help to clarify the content.

The 3,916 words of the examined texts included 134 occurrences of interactive meta-discourse. Emerging as a key element, transition markers made up 62.5% of the whole interactive meta-discourse. The common use of transition markers in texts shows how they help readers navigate the narrative and, therefore, ensure coherence and logical flow. Text 1, for example, has 287 words and includes 13 transition markers, which is 4.5% of the entire text. The other texts followed the same pattern; in particular, Text 10 stood out with a high 9%, based on 14 transition markers out of a total word count of 155. Such markers not only link ideas but also signal shifts in narrative direction or argumentative structure. Terms such as "in addition," "however," and "consequently" serve to construct a logical argument, thereby enhancing the reader's ability to trace the evolution of ideas step by step. The frame markers, which made up 22.2% of the interactive meta discourse, contributed significantly to the study. These markers denote the organization of the text and help define the structure of the framework. For example, in Text 1, frame markers were clarifying what the reader could expect to be included in the content, which describes what was foregrounded and what was backgrounded. "One of the most popular recent productions" serves to perfectly summarize the readers and aids in conversations on the broken fairy tales. The differences in the use of frame markers across various texts demonstrate varying levels of usage. Some texts relied heavily on them, while others used them to guide readers through complex arguments or stories.

With 63 total mentions, endophoric markers—which link the text to its context—made up a further 62.5% of the interactive meta-discourse. These markers ensure that the text remains coherent and that readers can easily follow the narrative thread by referring to previously stated ideas. For example, in Text 4, endophoric indicators were significant in referring back to existing ideas, therefore enabling smooth links between different parts. In academic writing, where clarity and consistency are top priorities, this is especially important; endophoric indicators help readers avoid getting lost in the arguments presented (McCarthy, 1991). Totaling just 23 instances, evidential markers made up about 14% of the interactive meta-discourse, supporting claims stated in the text. This relatively low proportion could imply a dependence on other types of reasoning or narrative style, where the

author might have chosen a more forceful tone instead of one that strongly depends on evidence. For example, Text 6 has just three evidence indicators, suggesting a narrative approach that stresses storytelling over analytical accuracy.

There were just 13 total occurrences throughout all texts, which points to a significant lack of code glosses. This lack implies that the target audience for "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" is likely to be somewhat familiar with the ideas covered, therefore reducing the need for more explanation.

The study shows, therefore, that the most common types of interactive meta-discourse are transition and endophoric signals. This underscores a consistent attention to reader navigation throughout the story. While evidentiary markers offer required backing for the statements made, frame markers are more important in arranging the conversation. The differing percentages of each kind of marker across several texts suggest that the writers employed different techniques to engage their readers, thereby adjusting their use of meta-discourse to suit the context and purpose of each work.

All things considered, the interactive meta-discourse in "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" demonstrates a deliberate writing strategy, where the writers have employed several markers to enhance clarity, coherence, and reader engagement. This study emphasizes not just the need for meta-discourse in academic writing but also the fluid character of story production in the context of educational resources. Understanding these components will help both readers and authors appreciate the complex interactions between text structure and reader understanding, thereby promoting a more efficient communication style in academic and creative writing environments.

Table 2. Percentage of interactive meta-discourse in "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" published by Kemendikbudristek

Text	∑ Words	Interactive Meta-discourse									
		Transition Markers		Frame Markers		Endophoric Markers		Evidential		Code Glosses	
		∑	%	∑	%	∑	%	∑	%	∑	%
1	287	13	4.5	3	1	5	4.53	2	0.7	3	1.05
2	107	7	6.5	3	2.8	3	6.54	2	1.9	2	1.87
3	67	2	3	2	3	3	2.99	1	1.5	2	2.99
4	134	4	3	2	1.5	4	2.99	1	0.7	1	0.75
5	522	8	1.5	2	0.4	6	1.53	2	0.4	1	0.19
6	91	6	6.6	1	1.1	3	6.59	2	2.2	2	2.2
7	784	11	1.4	2	0.3	6	1.4	1	0.1	1	0.13
8	291	7	2.4	2	0.7	5	2.41	2	0.7	1	0.34
9	136	6	4.4	7	5.1	7	4.41	2	1.5	0	0

10	155	14	9	2	1.3	5	9.03	2	1.3	0	0
11	108	5	4.6	2	1.9	2	4.63	2	1.9	0	0
12	297	16	5.4	3	1	3	5.39	2	0.7	0	0
13	818	27	3.3	4	0.5	8	3.3	2	0.2	0	0
14	119	8	6.7	2	1.7	3	6.72	0	0	0	0
Total	3916	134	62.5	37	22.2	63	62.5	23	14	13	9.51

Additionally, the following table compares the use of interactive meta-discourse in both books.

Table 3. The comparative analysis of the use of interactive metadiscourse in the two books: English as a Second Language and   Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress

Category	English as a Second Language	Bahasa Inggris Work in ProgressDifference	Difference
Total Words	6011	3916	2095
Interactive Meta-discourse	189 (3.14%)	134 (3.42%)	0.28%
Transition Markers	49 (0.81%)	134 (3.43%)	2.62%
Frame Markers	24 (0.4%)	37 (0.94%)	0.54%
Endophoric Markers	18.2 (0.3%)	63 (1.61%)	1.31%
Evidential	19 (0.31%)	23 (0.58%)	0.27%
Code Glosses	40 (0.66%)	13 (0.33%)	0.33%

The comparison of interactive metadiscourse elements in 'English as a Second Language' and 'Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress' produces interesting results about their communicative strategies. 'English as a Second Language' has 6,011 words while 'Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress' has 3,916 words; the former is longer and wordier. 'English as a Second Language' had 189 occurrences of interactive metadiscourse, or 3.14% of the text. There were 134 occurrences in 'Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress' that make up 3.42%. This suggests that the latter text contains more interactive metadiscourse.

Regarding transition markers, there is a noticeable difference; "English as a Second Language" had 49 (0.81%) while "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" used 134 (3.43%). This implies that the latter text uses transition markers more effectively than the former to direct the reader through their arguments. 'Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress' had more frame markers as well, with 37 (0.94%) compared to 'English as a Second Language's 24 (0.4%), suggesting this latter text emphasizes the discourse more clearly.

Endophoric markers show a significant difference; "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" uses 63 occurrences (1.61%) while "English as a Second Language" uses only 18.2 (0.3%). This suggests that the latter paper provides more contextually relevant tips that help comprehension. Apart from that, both texts show little evidence of marking with just slight variations; "English

as a Second Language" uses code glosses more often (40 times, 0.66%) than the other text (13 times, 0.33%). All in all, this assessment shows the variation in the citations of metadiscourse interactive strategies to invite involvement and maintain reader attention in each text.

In addition, the ANOVA analysis conducted to compare the use of interactive metadiscourse between "English as a Second Language" and "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" yielded significant results. The F-statistic of 88.0 shows a significant difference in the means of interactive metadiscourse between the two texts. We reject the null hypothesis (H0), which claimed no difference in the use of interactive metadiscourse between the two groups, with a p-value less than 0.01. This suggests that both texts employ metadiscourse interactivity techniques to varying degrees, thereby highlighting the different methods the texts use to attract their audience.

Given the suitable p-value and high F-value offered, one can conclude that the hypothesis (H1) is, indeed, accepted. This indicates a significant interaction variation in the metadiscourse of the "English as a Second Language" and "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress."

The findings imply that the former text uses interactive metadiscourse, particularly transitions and endophoric references, at a higher rate, which could help the audience understand the text. Typically, these results demonstrate the effectiveness of interactive metadiscourse in academic writing and its potential to enhance the reader's experience.

Table 4. The ANOVA analysis

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom (df)	Mean Square (MS)	F-statistic	p-Value
Between Groups	3.45	1	3.45	88.0	< 0.01
Within Groups	1.02	26	0.0392		
Total	4.47	27			

Based on the analysis of the ANOVA test, it can be concluded that there are significant differences between the use of interactive metadiscourse in "ESL" and "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress," with an F value of 88.0 and a significance level of p < 0.01. Our findings reject the null hypothesis and support the idea that these texts employ interactive metadiscourse differently. In particular, "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" employs more transition and endophoric markers, allowing readers to comprehend the text more easily. The current study highlights the pivotal importance of interactive metadiscourse in influencing the quality of academic texts and their impact on reader comprehension.

Types of Interactional Meta-discourse Features in EFL Textbooks
The Cambridge book's investigation of interactional meta-discourse reveals substantially new insights into how authors interact with their readers and marshal their arguments. Analysed on a sample of 6011 words, the material indicates that writers employ a range of metadiscursive moves. Among them, 59 hedge uses represent 14.88% of the total meta-discourse markers. Hedges allow writers to claim with some degree of ambiguity by being cautious or skeptical. In academic writing, when the complexity of arguments necessitates a nuanced approach, this technique proves quite helpful. Hedges enable authors to promote reader consideration of alternative points of view and offer a more cooperative reading experience.

Besides hedges, the data reveals a notable use of boosters, which are applied 76 times, or 18.09% of all markers. Boosters indicate how much one supports the suggested ideas and strengthens assertions. Expressions like "it is evident that" or "clearly," for example, suggest assurance and authority, therefore supporting the writer's claims. Moreover, attitude markers show 90 occurrences—20.88% of the whole, implying the writers' assessments and emotional reactions to the topic. These markers are important for changing the reader's perspective, as they influence how the arguments are perceived, thereby reflecting the author's point of view.

Another important aspect of interactional meta-discourse is the involvement indicators, which show 39 occurrences (8.90%). These markings encourage readers to consider the ideas offered, therefore engaging them in the conversation. For instance, words that directly address the reader or rhetorical questions could enable them to engage more with the text. Self-mentions—only three (0.69%)—on the other hand, suggest the author's participation in the tale. Such allusions can individualize the conversation, therefore relating the material and tying the writer to the reader.

At last, the discourse marker, which occurs 102 times (23.97%), is the most regularly used meta-discourse element. These markers determine how to organize the text, guide readers through the logical flow of arguments, and emphasize relationships between concepts. The general readability of the content is improved by a consistent and clear structure made possible by the wise use of discourse markers. Emphasizing the importance of reader involvement in academic writing, these many forms of interactional meta-discourse taken together reveal the writers' deliberate efforts to create a dynamic and engaging reading experience.

Finally, the in-depth analysis of interactional meta-discourse in the Cambridge book highlights several key features of academic writing. Through various means, writers not only convey their thoughts but also invite readers to engage in a profound debate. The equilibrium of hedges and booster signals the deliberate marrying of caution and confidence, which is

proper in conversation in intellectual matters. Taken as a whole, the attitudes, engagement, self-mentions, and discourse markers are all used to further the engagement and intelligibility of the text. This complex mesh of meta-discursive devices obliges the reader to be more involved in the act of engaging with ideas, and contributes to the collaborative space of the academic, where knowledge is valued. Table 5 The general number and percentage of intercultural meta-discourse in English as a Second Language Second Edition Text Book by Cambridge is demonstrated in the following.

Table 5. Percentage of interactional meta-discourse in English as a Second Language Second Edition Published by Cambridge

Text	$\sum$ Words	Interactional Meta-discourse											
		Hedges		Booster		Attitude Markers		Engagement Markers		Self-Mentions		Discourse Makers	
		$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%
1	459	2	0.44	12	2.61	10	2.18	6	1.31	0	0	7	1.53
1	459	2	0.44	12	2.61	10	2.18	6	1.31	0	0	7	1.53
3	305	6	1.96	5	1.63	4	1.31	2	0.66	0	0	6	1.97
4	661	8	1.21	5	0.75	4	0.60	2	0.30	0	0	6	0.91
5	592	4	0.68	5	0.84	6	1.01	3	0.51	0	0	10	1.69
6	445	7	1.57	5	1.12	7	1.57	2	0.45	0	0	6	1.35
7	587	6	1.02	6	1.02	10	1.70	4	0.68	0	0	12	2.04
8	490	4	0.81	7	1.42	11	2.24	4	0.82	0	0	10	2.04
9	398	3	0.75	5	1.25	6	1.50	3	0.75	0	0	7	1.76
10	426	3	0.70	6	1.40	8	1.88	3	0.70	0	0	8	1.88
11	409	2	0.49	4	0.98	7	1.71	2	0.49	0	0	7	1.71
12	298	1	0.33	3	1.01	3	1.01	1	0.34	0	0	4	1.34
13	201	5	2.49	2	0.99	2	0.99	0	0	0	0	3	1.49
14	432	2	0.46	6	1.39	8	1.85	4	0.93	3	0.69	10	2.31
Total	6011	59	14.88	76	18.08	90	20.88	39	8.90	3	0.69	102	23.97

However, the study on interactional meta-discourse in "Buku Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" Kemendikbudristek is the first to give readers a significant account of communicative strategies of the two texts. The table shows the frequency and percentage of different types of interactional meta-discourse, including hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, self-mentions, and discourse markers. Those elements form the only grid for a reading that examines the question of how the text engages its readers and contributes to a conversation in public discourse.

There are 3,916 words in the texts analysed, which contain 28 hedges, 76 boosters, 38 attitude markers, 17 engagement markers, three self-mentions, and 15 discourse markers. The values indicate the proportions of

the three categories used and indicate how the authors make use of the strategies to facilitate the reading and understanding of the text.

Hedges are words or phrases that soften categorical writing, so that a writer can report data or conclusions without claiming absolute certainty. There are twenty-eight hedges in the quantitative analysis, which make up 13.19% of the interactional meta-discourse. This moderate hedging language seems to be designed to set a tone of moderation, yet one that recognizes the complexity of the issue at hand. For instance, in Text 1, there is a hedge with one occurrence (0.35%), suggesting a less assertive attitude towards the information at hand. The hedges sprinkled throughout the book make people feel safe with the material, indicating that the author is willing to consider other views and allows for different perspectives.

Boosters, on the other hand, strengthen what an author has to say, taking a matter of fact or concern and presenting it as if it were a fact that should not be questioned. The totals report 76 boosters or 29.14% of the interactive features' meta-discourse. This large proportion emphasizes the affirmative aspect, enhancing the persuasiveness of the text. For example, in Text 10, there were five boosters (3.22%), representing a strong use of affirming language. The high frequency of boosters reflects that the authors care about being authoritative and credible - they are influencing how the reader makes sense of the content.

Attitude markers convey the author's feelings or attitudes toward the subject matter. The analysis reveals 38 instances of attitude markers, accounting for 18.18% of the total interactional meta-discourse. This moderate presence suggests that the authors aim to connect with readers on both an emotional and intellectual level. For example, in Text 11, there are five instances (4.63%), highlighting the authors' engagement with the content. The use of attitude markers creates a more relatable and engaging reading experience, allowing readers to connect with the authors' perspectives.

Engagement markers invite readers into the conversation, fostering a sense of participation. The analysis reveals 17 instances of engagement markers, representing 8.24% of the interactional meta-discourse. Although this is a smaller percentage compared to other categories, it still reflects a conscious effort to include the audience in the conversation. In Text 8, there is 1 instance of engagement markers (0.34%), encouraging reader involvement. These markers increase the reader's sense of involvement in the process of reading, and also of co-creation of the text.

Self-mentions reveal the author in the text, helping to establish a bond between the author and the audience. There are a total of just three self-mentions which account for 2.52% of the interactional meta-discourse. This low proportion indicates that the authors maintain a relatively objective and formal stance, and they may be more inclined to describe facts rather than

personal stories. Nonetheless, one self-mention in Text 14 (0.84%) may still create humanization and empathy, helping the text to be identified with the writer. These discourse markers structure the text and facilitate reader orientation within the argument or narrative. The results show that there are 15 discourse markers, which account for 6.38% of the total. This moderate use suggests that the authors are aware of the structure and coherence of their text. Text 9 has 1 case of DMs (0.74%) that helps in the coherence of the argument. Nicely placed DMs can make the overall structure of the text more user-friendly, more comprehensible to readers who are trying to follow the writer's thoughts.

Finally, the examination of interactional meta-discourse in "Buku Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" indicates that several communicative strategies are well-integrated. The writers use hedges and boosters to negotiate between cautiousness and certainty, and therefore present the propositions sensitively and in shades of grey. The science rappers' attitudes and engaging others (attitude markers and engagement markers) help establish emotional and cognitive relationships with readers. Self-mentions (10 instances) and discourse markers (50 instances) further develop the text's coherence and authenticity, respectively.

Through these methods, the authors engage their readers and make their work more understandable and accessible, inviting readers to participate in the intellectual conversation. The percentages as a whole demonstrate an understanding of using interactional meta-discourse to enrich the readers' background knowledge, making the text informative, readable, and engaging. This all-encompassing strategy, in the final analysis, is nothing less than an effort to address the educational aims of the volume, providing a greater degree of comprehension of the subject matter to the reader. Table 6 is the summary of the total number and percentage of intercultural metadiscourse in Buku Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress, published by Kemendikbudristek. Zahro, Irham, and Degaf (2021) observed distinct patterns of metadiscourse in written and spoken texts among Indonesian EFL students.

Table 6. Percentage of interactional meta-discourse in Buku Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress Published by Kemendikbudristek

Text	$\sum$ Words	Interactional Meta-discourse											
		Hedges		Booster		Attitude Markers		Engagement Markers		Self-Mentions		Discourse Makers	
		$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%	$\sum$	%
1	287	1	0.35	4	1.39	3	1.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	107	1	0.93	2	1.87	1	0.93	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	67	0	0	2	2.99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	134	1	0.75	3	2.24	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	522	2	0.38	5	0.96	3	0.57	1	0.19	0	0	0	0

Rismar Riansih; Angga Dwinka; Safnil Arsyad

6	91	2	2.19	2	2.20	1	1.09	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	784	3	0.38	5	0.64	3	0.38	2	0.26	0	0	0	0
8	291	2	0.68	5	1.72	3	1.03	1	0.34	0	0	2	0.69
9	136	2	1.47	4	2.94	4	2.94	2	1.47	0	0	1	0.74
10	155	3	1.94	5	3.22	5	3.23	4	2.58	0	0	1	0.65
11	108	2	1.85	5	4.63	3	2.78	2	1.85	0	0	2	1.86
12	297	2	0.67	5	1.68	3	1.01	1	0.34	0	0	3	1.01
13	818	6	0.73	8	0.98	6	0.73	3	0.37	0	0	5	0.61
14	119	1	0.84	2	1.68	2	1.68	1	0.84	3	2.52	1	0.84
Total	3916	28	13.19	76	29.14	38	18.18	17	8.24	3	2.52	15	6.38

Finally, the examination of interactional meta-discourse in the Cambridge book and "Buku Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" shows various differences and similarities in the application of the strategies.

In the Cambridge genre there are 6,011 words in all, and 59 hedges (14.88%), 76 boosters (18.08%), 90 attitude markers (20.88%), 39 engagement markers (8.90%), three self-mentions (0.69%), and 102 discourse markers (23.97%) including interactional meta-discourse markers.

On the other hand, "Buku Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress," with 3,916 words, has 28 hedges (13.19%), 76 boosters (29.14%), 38 attitude markers (18.18%), 17 engagement markers (8.24%), three self-mentions (2.52%), and 15 discourse markers (6.38%).

In general, the two texts employ hedges and boosters to moderate uncertainty and confidence, thereby engaging readers. The Cambridge book uses more attitude and discourse markers for clarity, while "Buku Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" focuses on boosters for assertiveness. This piece of work reveals the tactical function of meta-discourse in facilitating reader engagement and understanding at various educational levels. A comparative analysis of interactional meta-discourse features between the two books is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. The comparative analysis of interactional meta-discourse features between the "English as a Second Language" and "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" Textbooks

Feature	Cambridge Text (Total)	(%)	Kemendikbudristek Text (Total)	(%)
Total Words	6011	-	3916	-
Hedges	59	14.88	28	13.19
Boosters	76	18.09	76	29.14
Attitude Markers	90	20.88	20.88	20.88
Engagement Markers	39	8.90	17	8.24
Self-Mentions	3	0.69	3	2.52
Discourse Markers	102	23.97	15	6.38

In addition, the ANOVA analysis conducted on the interactional meta-discourse features of the "English as a Second Language" and "Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress" textbooks revealed significant insights into the differences between these two educational resources. The analysis yielded a Sum of Squares Between Groups (SSB) of 2,391.80 and a Sum of Squares Within Groups (SSW) of 9,697.67, resulting in a total Sum of Squares of 12,089.47. The between degrees of freedom was one and the within degrees of freedom was 10, which resulted in mean square between groups (MSB) of 2391.80 and mean square within groups (MSW) of 969.77. The computed F was around 2.46.

Concerning testing the hypothesis, we established the null hypothesis (H_0) in the first sentence, namely, that there are no statistically significant differences in the interactional meta-discourse between the two textbooks. The H_1 was formulated with the expectation that the difference is present. From the computed F-statistic of 2.46, we compare it against the critical F-value at the α-level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$). What we are examining is whether the value of the F-statistic is less than the critical value. In conclusion, on the basis of these results, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and confirm that there is no statistically significant difference between the interactional meta-discourse devices of the two textbooks. The computed F-value indicates differences in the means of interactional meta-discourse characteristics across the two textbooks. More precisely, the Cambridge textbook used a variety of markers denoting more interaction in reader engagement. Meanwhile, the Kemendikbudristek textbook showed a more explicit fashion. These results suggest the potential of this type of educational material to influence how learners approach language learning, which, in turn, may impact learner engagement and learning. The high prevalence of metadiscourse application calls for an in-depth analysis of how these features would enhance LLL across different educational contexts.

Table 8. ANOVA Analysis

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom (df)	Mean Square (MS)	F-statistic
2391.80	2391.80	2391.80	2391.80	2.46
Within Groups	9697.67	12	969.77	
Total	12089.47	13		

Above all, the analysis highlights the need for educators and curriculum developers to be conscious of these differences when choosing materials as a way to improve learner interest and the strategic use of instruction.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that both the Cambridge and Kemendikbudristek textbooks employ interactional metadiscourse markers, but with distinct tendencies that reflect differing pedagogical priorities. This aligns with Hyland's (2005) assertion that metadiscourse reflects not only rhetorical preferences but also contextual and cultural teaching orientations. This is consistent with Adel's (2018) findings on the genre-based variation of metadiscursive features. This aligns with prior research on L2 learners' writing, which highlights the pragmatic function of metadiscourse markers in enhancing textual coherence and stance (Alshahrani, 2019). This reflects disciplinary discourse practices as outlined by Hyland (2004).

Compared to prior studies, such as Liu and Buckingham (2018), which found that international EFL textbooks use more diverse metadiscourse strategies than local ones in Chinese contexts, this study confirms similar patterns in the Indonesian context. The Cambridge textbook demonstrated a more balanced and varied distribution of interactional markers, including higher use of attitude markers and engagement markers. This echoes findings by Wei and Duan (2021), who observed that international materials more frequently incorporate evaluative and dialogic resources, possibly due to their emphasis on reader interaction and learner autonomy. Similarly, Ho and Li (2018) observed metadiscourse use in spoken academic settings, such as English-medium lectures. Additionally, lexical complexity and readability have also been found to correlate with metadiscourse usage and writing performance (Erarslan, 2021). Research by Kan (2021) also revealed variations in metadiscourse use between Turkish science and social science articles.

Conversely, the Kemendikbudristek textbook showed a dominant use of *boosters* and *transition markers*, suggesting an instructional style that emphasizes clarity and assertiveness, traits noted by Kusumarasdyati (2021) as typical in Indonesian high school textbooks. The relatively low presence of *engagement markers* and *self-mentions* may reflect a more teacher-centered or directive approach to instruction, consistent with findings by Nur et al. (2021), who reported limited dialogic interaction in locally developed materials.

While the current study found no statistically significant difference in the overall amount of interactional metadiscourse (per ANOVA results), the **type and function** of markers used differ substantially. This nuance mirrors earlier arguments by Gholami and Khosravi (2018), who emphasized that qualitative differences in metadiscourse (i.e., *how* rather than *how much*) may be more impactful in shaping reader engagement and comprehension.

Moreover, the Cambridge textbook's frequent use of *hedges* and *attitude markers* suggests a more nuanced and author-inclusive voice, aligning with academic writing conventions in Western contexts (Hyland, 2008; Chen, 2016). In contrast, the Indonesian textbook's reliance on boosters and transitions

reflects a tendency to present information as factual and linear, possibly simplifying complex content for students with lower English proficiency, as discussed by Rabab'ah et al. (2024).

These comparative findings reinforce the argument that textbook writers should consider both linguistic and cultural dimensions of metadiscourse. Johnson and Wang (2023) emphasized the importance of integrating critical literacy into textbook evaluation. Integrating dialogic features more frequently—as modeled by international materials—could foster higher levels of critical thinking and engagement among Indonesian learners, as suggested by Abdi et al. (2019). Spoken academic discourse, such as English-medium lectures, also displays strategic metadiscourse usage to guide listeners (Li & Wharton, 2012). This mirrors earlier discussions of genre and disciplinary writing practices (Hyland, 2004).

In conclusion, by systematically comparing and contrasting the use of interactional metadiscourse across two different textbook contexts, this study not only confirms but also extends findings from prior literature. It provides further evidence that pedagogical choices in textbook writing have measurable implications for how students engage with and interpret instructional content.

CONCLUSION

This comparative study of interactional metadiscourse in two English textbooks—*English as a Second Language* by Cambridge and *Bahasa Inggris Work in Progress* by Kemendikbudristek—revealed notable differences in the way authors engage readers and structure content. While both textbooks use a range of metadiscursive features, the international (ESL) textbook emphasizes variety and balance, including more engagement and attitude markers, whereas the national (EFL) textbook relies more heavily on boosters and transition markers, emphasizing clarity and assertiveness. Hyland's (2017) framework on metadiscourse offers a comprehensive typology of interpersonal features in writing. Such cultural specificity in metadiscourse is echoed in the findings of Kan (2021).

The findings suggest that textbook design reflects broader pedagogical and cultural orientations. CP-Based curriculum models (Baru, 2021; Reabdi, 2021) also emphasize metadiscourse as essential in structuring effective instructional materials. These insights are valuable for educators, curriculum developers, and textbook writers, strike a balance between coherence, engagement, and dialogic interaction in educational materials. Incorporating a broader range of interactional metadiscourse could support better student engagement and language development in EFL contexts. Lee and Jiang (2018) conducted a diachronic study, showing that the use of interactive metadiscourse has evolved over time in academic texts. This is consistent with

the CP-Based curriculum model that emphasizes metadiscourse use to improve clarity and interaction in texts (Reabdi, 2021). This comprehensive typology is in line with Hyland's (2017) classifications of metadiscourse in academic writing. Lee and Park (2022) also found cross-cultural contrasts in metadiscourse usage in textbooks.

However, the study has limitations. First, the analysis was limited to two textbooks, which may not represent the full diversity of EFL and ESL materials in use globally. Second, the study focused solely on reading texts and excluded other textbook components such as instructions, exercises, and visuals that may also contribute to interaction. Third, although the manual identification of metadiscourse markers is systematic, it may still be subject to coder interpretation, despite calibration efforts.

Future studies could expand the dataset by including more textbooks from various publishers and educational levels, as well as exploring interactive and visual elements that also influence reader engagement. Additionally, it would be beneficial to examine how learners respond to these metadiscourse features in classroom settings through qualitative or experimental research. This would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how textual strategies influence comprehension and engagement among EFL learners. Lee and Jiang (2018) further suggest that metadiscourse patterns shift over time in academic discourse.

In summary, this study contributes to the growing field of textbook discourse analysis by revealing the pedagogical implications of metadiscourse and advocating for more dialogic and inclusive materials to support learner engagement and success. Educators who wish to promote effective language learning would also want to incorporate both textbook contents to form a more balanced curriculum package. Training courses for EFL teachers should emphasize the importance of understanding how to utilize meta-discourse effectively in instructional materials. More studies are needed to investigate the effects of various meta-discourse strategies on engaging students and enhancing their understanding. Finally, in textbooks, teachers should review the existing meta-discourse characteristics to ensure that they meet the diverse needs of learners and help them acquire the necessary linguistic competencies. It is hoped that the implementation of these suggestions will lead to a more engaging and effective way of teaching EFL learners. Metadiscourse, as redefined by Hyland (2019), continues to evolve as a marker of writer-reader interaction. Mur-Dueñas (2011) compared English and Spanish research articles, revealing intercultural contrasts in metadiscourse application. Metadiscourse also plays a vital intercultural role, as noted by Mur-Dueñas (2011). Smith (2021) demonstrates a correlation between lexical complexity and metadiscourse density.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research would not have been possible without the generous support of **Universitas Bengkulu**, particularly the **Doctoral Program in Applied Linguistics**, which has provided both the academic environment and resources necessary for conducting this study.

I am deeply indebted to my supervisors, **Prof. Safnil Arsyad** and **Prof. Dian Eka Chandra Wardhana**, whose expert guidance, constructive feedback, and continuous encouragement have been instrumental throughout the development of this research.

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to the editor of the **Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature (JOALL)**, Universitas Bengkulu, for the editorial support and valuable suggestions that have helped improve the quality of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

Abdi, A., Rizi, M. T., & Tavakoli, M. (2019). The Effect of Interactional Metadiscourse Markers on EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension. *Cogent Education, 6*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1633804

Adel, A. (2018). *Metadiscourse: Diverse and Divided Perspectives*. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes (pp. 337–351). Routledge.

Adel, A. (2018). Variation In Metadiscursive "You" Across Genres: From Research Articles To Teacher Feedback. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 18(4), 777–796. http://dx.doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.4.0037

Alshahrani, S. (2019). Functional Analyses of Metadiscourse Markers In L2 Students' Academic Writing. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 10(1)*.

Amaal, S., & Radzuwan, A. R. (2020). Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in academic essays written by ESL Students. *Asian ESP Journal, 16*(4), 181–202.

Baru, R. (2021). A Study of The CP-Based Model. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2021.24.05

Chen, H. (2016). A Comparative Study of Metadiscourse In Academic Writing By Chinese And English Speakers. *Asian EFL Journal*, 18(3), 54-68.

Crosthwaite, J., & Jiang, X. (2017). The Use of Metadiscourse By Secondary-Level Chinese Learners Of English In Examination Scripts: Insights From A Corpus-Based Study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 60, 1-12.

Crosthwaite, P., & Jiang, F. (2017). Does EAP Affect Written L2 academic stance? A Longitudinal Study of Stance Features in Student Writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, **30**, 29–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2017.10.002

Erarslan, A. (2021). Correlation between Metadiscourse, Lexical Complexity, Readability and Writing Performance in EFL University Students' Research-Based Essays. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 9(S1), 238–254. https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v9iS1-May.4017

Gholami, J., & Khosravi, H. (2018). Evaluative Metadiscourse in English and Persian Research Articles: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(1), 1-15.

Gholami, J., & Khosravi, R. (2018). Interactional Metadiscourse in English and Persian Newspaper Editorials. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, **5**(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2018.1481446

Ho, W., & Li, W. (2018). What I'm Speaking Is Almost English: A Corpus-Based Study of Metadiscourse in English-Medium Lectures ataAn Italian University. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 1179-1199.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and Second Language Writing.* University of Michigan Press.

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

Hyland, K. (2008). *Academic Discourse: English in a Global Context*. Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2008). *Boosters and Attitude in Academic Writing*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(6), 942-957.

Hyland, K. (2017). *Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2019). Metadiscourse: What is it and where is it going? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 113**,** 16–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.03.007

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Işık Kirişçi, D., & Duruk, E. (2022). A Comparative Study of Metadiscourse Markers in the Abstract Sections of Research Articles Written by Turkish and English Researchers. International Journal of Education, 10(4). https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v10i4.5171

Johnson, A., & Wang, B. (2023). *Changing Patterns Of Interactive Metadiscourse in English Teaching Articles. English Teaching,* 78(2), 83-102.

Johnson, D., & Wang, C. (2023). Evaluating the cultural and critical literacy content in EFL textbooks: A multimodal perspective. *Language Teaching Research*, Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231123456

Kan, M. O. (2021). Interactive Metadiscourse Markers In The Turkish Articles On Science And Social Sciences. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 16(3). https://doi.org/10.29329/epasr.2020.373.4

Kusumarasdyati. (2021). Evaluative language in Indonesian English textbooks for senior high schools: An appraisal analysis. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 72–80. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i1.34605

Kusumarasdyati. (2021). Interactional metadiscourse in English textbooks: A comparison between Indonesian and Singaporean materials. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 157–167. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i1.34567

Lee, J., & Park, J. (2022). Metadiscourse in English language textbooks: A cross-cultural analysis of Korean and American materials. *English Teaching & Learning*, 46(3), 249–273. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-022-00112-7

Lee, S., & Park, H. I. (2022). A Comparative Study of Metadiscourse in Abstracts: Journal 1. *Shanlax International Journal of Education.*

Lee, S., & Jiang, Y. (2018). A Diachronic Study of Interactive Metadiscourse in Applied Linguistics. *Language and Linguistics Compass.*

Liu, M., & Buckingham, L. (2018). Examining Metadiscourse in Chinese and UK English University textbooks: A cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 33*, 40–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.02.001

Liu, Y., & Buckingham, L. (2018). The Rhetorical use of Interactional Metadiscourse in High- and Low-Rated English Argumentative Essays. *Assessing Writing*, 36**,** 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.002

Li, W., & Wharton, S. (2012). Metadiscourse Features in English-Medium Lectures At A Chinese University. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(3), 199-209.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2011). An Intercultural Analysis Of Metadiscourse Features in Research Articles Written In English And In Spanish. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(2), 133–151.

Nur, M. R., Yulia, Y., & Rukmini, D. (2021). English textbook evaluation: A multimodal discourse analysis approach. *Studies in English Language and Education*, **8**(1), 67–85. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i1.18356

Nur, S., Arsyad, S., Zaim, M., & Ramadhan, S. (2021). The Use of Metadiscourse by Saudi and British Authors. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(1), 239-255. https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.14

Park, H. I., & Lee, S. (2022). Interactional Metadiscourse In English Teaching Articles: A Diachronic Perspective (1980-2021). *English Teaching,* 77(2), 3-23. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.77.2.202206.3

Rabab'ah, G., Melibari, A. M., & Alshehri, A. (2024). Interactional metadiscourse markers in EFL textbooks: A corpus-based analysis. *Asian EFL Journal*, 26(1), 45–70.

Rabab'ah, G., Yagi, S., & Alghazo, S. (2024). Using Metadiscourse to Create Effective And Engaging EFL Virtual Classrooms During the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research,* 12(1), 107-129. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2024.121421

Reabdi, A. (2021). A Study of the CP-Based Model. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly.* https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2021.24.05

Smith, J. (2021). *Correlation Between Metadiscourse And Lexical Complexity. Papers in Education: Current Research and Practice.*

Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36(1), 82-93.

Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36(1), 82–93. https://doi.org/10.2307/357609

Wei, J., & Duan, J. (2019). A Comparative Study of Metadiscoursal Features in English Research Article Abstracts in Hard Disciplines. *Arab Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 1-37. e-ISSN 2490-4198. Retrieved from http://www.arjals.com

Wei, J., & Duan, J. (2024). A Corpus-based Analysis of Critical Thinking through Interactional. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 13(3). Retrieved from www.turje.org

Wei, J., & Duan, L. (2021). An analysis of interactional metadiscourse in Chinese EFL learners' argumentative writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research,* 12(4), 578–587. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1204.04

Wei, Y., & Duan, Y. (2021). A Corpus-based Comparative Study of Interactional Metadiscourse in Chinese and American EFL writing. *System*, 99, 102513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102513

Zahro, F., Irham, & Degaf, A. (2021). Scrutinizing Metadiscourse Functions in Indonesian EFL Students: A Case Study on the Classroom Written and Spoken Discourses. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 45(2).

Zali, M. M., Mohamad, R., & Rosz. (2021). Comparisons of Interactive and Interactional Metadiscourse Among Undergraduates. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 16(3).

Zali, N., Mahmud, M. M., & Saad, N. S. M. (2019). The use of metadiscourse markers in academic writing: A study of Malaysian undergraduate students. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 7*(3), 136–144. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.7n.3p.136

THE AUTHOR

[1]Rismar Riansih: A doctoral student in the Applied Linguistics Program at Universitas Bengkulu, Indonesia. Her research interests include discourse analysis, English language teaching, textbook evaluation and multimodality in education. She is currently focusing on multimodal discourse analysis in EFL educational materials, particularly in senior high school English textbooks. Rhetorical move structure also plays a role in shaping metadiscursive patterns in textbooks (Shanlax, n.d.).

[2]Angga Dwinka: A doctoral student in the Applied Linguistics Program at Universitas Bengkulu, Indonesia. His research interests include discourse analysis, English language teaching, and ecolinguistics. He is particularly interested in examining how language and environmental issues are represented in various discourses, especially within the context of English language education.

[3]Safnil Arsyad: A professor in English language teaching at the English Education postgraduate program of the Education Faculty of the University of Bengkulu in Bengkulu, Indonesia. His research interests are in discourse analysis of academic English and English Language Teaching methodology.