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# Article summary:

1. The study investigates the use of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers in the abstract sections of academic research articles written in Turkish and English.

2. The study found statistically significant differences in the use of frame markers, code glosses, hedges, boosters, and self-mentions across the languages.

3. The research article abstracts are crucial tools to convince the audience to read and provide prior knowledge to lead readers to decide if the article is worth reading or not.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article "A Comparative Study of Metadiscourse Markers in the Abstract Sections of Research Articles Written by Turkish and English Researchers" by Dilay Işık Kirişçi and Eda Duruk aims to investigate the use of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers in research articles written in Turkish and English. The authors examine three different types of language use: English articles written by native speakers, English articles written by Turkish speakers, and Turkish articles written by Turkish speakers. The study focuses on two disciplines: Special Education and Preschool Education.

The article provides a comprehensive literature review on the genre approach and metadiscourse in academic writing. It highlights the importance of metadiscourse markers in academic writing as they provide necessary clues for academic writers to have an insight into the academic communities that they belong to. The authors also emphasize the significance of research article abstracts as they are the conveyers of informational and social assumptions of a field.

The methodology employed is quantitative and descriptive research method during the analysis of research article abstracts (RAAs) by focusing on metadiscourse markers in abstract sections. The data for this study comprises 300 published RAAs, 100 each from NST, TSE, and NSE from each discipline.

However, there are some potential biases in this study. Firstly, the sample size is relatively small, with only 100 RAAs per group per discipline. Secondly, there is no mention of how the RAAs were selected or whether they were randomly chosen. Thirdly, there is no discussion on how the researchers ensured inter-rater reliability during coding.

Moreover, while the authors claim that statistically significant differences were found in the use of frame markers, code glosses, hedges, boosters, and self-mentions across languages for interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers; they do not provide any evidence or data to support these claims. Additionally, there is no exploration or discussion on why these differences exist or what factors may contribute to them.

Furthermore, while the authors provide suggestions for academic writers to comply with writing conventions of academic writing; they do not discuss any potential risks or limitations associated with using metadiscourse markers excessively or incorrectly.

In conclusion, while this article provides valuable insights into the use of metadiscourse markers in research article abstracts written by Turkish and English researchers; it has some potential biases and lacks evidence to support its claims fully. Further studies with larger sample sizes are needed to confirm these findings.

# Topics for further research:

* Factors influencing the use of metadiscourse markers in academic writing
* The impact of cultural and linguistic differences on metadiscourse markers in academic writing
* The role of metadiscourse markers in conveying authorial stance and voice in academic writing
* The potential risks and limitations of using metadiscourse markers excessively or incorrectly in academic writing
* The relationship between metadiscourse markers and reader perception in academic writing
* The effectiveness of teaching metadiscourse markers in academic writing instruction.
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