Metadiscourse Analysis of Arabic Debate Argumentation at ISDC (International School Debating Championship)

Ahmad Zaimul Umam[a*], Mohamad Zaka Al Farisi [b], Rinaldi Supriadi[c]

[abc]Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

A B S T R A C T

Arabic debate is an argumentative discourse with exceptional skills in conveying it; therefore, debaters are required not only to be proficient in the material but must also be able to use extraordinary rhetoric to satisfy the audience. This research analyzes the types and functions of Hyland metadiscourse markers used by debaters from the Indonesian team and the Singapore team in international inter-school debate events (ISDC) in Doha, Qatar. This research method uses descriptive qualitative research and a content analysis research design. Data collection techniques include listening and note-taking. At the data analysis stage, researchers carry out steps: collecting, reducing, presenting, and drawing conclusions. The results showed that both teams used a variety of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers, with an emphasis on the use of engagement markers and self-mentioning. The findings indicated that transition and frame markers were the most frequently used, which contributed to the structure and clarity of the arguments. This study emphasizes the role of metadiscourse in enhancing communication skills and critical thinking in debate contexts, and encourages further exploration of metadiscourse in Arabic given the unique challenges faced by the language rules.

1. Introduction

Language plays a vital role in human life because language is a tool for human thinking. With language, humans can express their thoughts both in writing and orally. The ability of language in humans can express all feelings, ideas, information, and human thoughts (Al Farisi et al., 2023, p. 1093). Humans can express this through language or what can be called discourse. Discourse can be written or spoken. Discourse in writing can take the form of free articles, scientific articles, stories, books, novels, news, etc. Oral discourse can be free expression, conversation, speech, debate, etc. One means of expressing a discourse can be through munaazarah ilmiah, also known as Arabic debate.

According to Freeley and Steinberg (2013), debate is an argumentative activity in which speakers organize their arguments in a structured way to convince listeners to believe what they say (Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023, p. 218). In presenting his argument, a debater must pay attention to several things, such as the argument's theme, purpose and content. In a debate, a person is also necessary to think critically, so a debater needs to consider and choose the right words to express an argument that the listener can understand (Istiani & Puspita, 2020, p. 13). Therefore, debate is considered one of the most appropriate forums for developing critical thinking and language skills. It is also a forum where someone can show their passion for communicating by using vocabulary and broad insight to defend and strengthen their arguments with their opponents (Wati & Maula, 2021, p. 233).

Debates in the Arabic language world are known as Munaazarah Ilmiah. Munaazarah Ilmiah is the art of dialogue between two sides to show something true. It can also be said to be a type of dialogue where two or more people are participating and have a particular position, which they defend with specific evidence, try to support and

---

* ahmadzaimul07@upi.edu (Umam)

protect their opinion, and cancel and refute other claims or opinions with their arguments. Another opinion, according to Najjar, munaazarah is a dialogue exchanging arguments about a particular problem or issue carried out by two sides or two people who have different opinions. The side that supports is called the mullah or pro team, and the side that refuses is called the mu'aradhah or contra team (Al Hajuri, 2019, p. 116).

In debate, argumentative discourse is something that a debater must master. For a debater to be competent in forming an argumentative discourse, awareness and ability in rhetoric are needed. The study of metadiscourse markers can help debaters build more persuasive arguments, attract listeners' interest, be understood correctly by listeners, and create appropriate judgments (Dichoso, 2022, p. 303). Building arguments in a debate is not easy; apart from having good communication skills, debaters must also be able to convey arguments in a structured and coherent manner to attract the listener's attention. Van Ginkel (2015) revealed that debaters not only have to have the ability to communicate but also have to be able to connect with the argument (Xu et al., 2021).

Debates in linguistic studies can be analyzed from a metadiscourse perspective. Ilie revealed that debate in metadiscourse studies is a set of communicative and interactional strategies arranged rhetorically and used by debaters to signal, reduce, highlight and cancel parts of discourse and their varying relevance to different listeners (Ilie, 2003). Therefore, this study will examine the types and functions of metadiscourse markers used by debaters in Arabic debate events. This research provides an overview of the markers that are generally often used in debate discourse, especially in Arabic language debates

Metadiscourse is a language feature used by writers or speakers to organize and structure the text, establish a relationship with the reader, control the flow of information, convey intent and purpose, and establish a relationship with the reader. Metadiscourse is therefore a very important concept in language analysis, by understanding metadiscourse, we can analyze texts in more depth and understand how language is used to achieve different communication goals (Hyland, 2005, pp. 16–17). Another definition states that metadiscourse is a concept of discourse analysis that focuses on how the author guides the reader's insight into the text (Koutchadé, 2021, p. 77). Metadiscourse is widely used in discourse analysis and language education to conceptualize interaction or communication between writers or speakers and readers or listeners (Aini & Ekawati, 2022, p. 56). Thus, it can be concluded that metadiscourse is a means for writers or speakers to express their ideas more easily so that readers or listeners can understand them.

Two main types of metadiscourse markers are classified by Hyland (2005): interactive and interactional. Interactive metadiscourse markers relate to the writer's or speaker's awareness of the reader or listener and the writer's way of accommodating his or her knowledge, interests, rhetorical expectations, and processing abilities. Qin & Uccelli (2019) state that interactive markers aim to guide readers or listeners through the discourse structure of text or speech explicitly by providing relationships between ideas, clauses and paragraphs based on what the author expresses (Kuswoyo & Siregar, 2019, p. 297). The interactional metadiscourse markers relate to the way the writer or speaker connects himself to the discourse as a form of a voice in a discourse (Zaki, 2022a, p. 115). According to Hyland (2005), this type of interactional metadiscourse focuses on how the writer or speaker presents the interaction by interrupting and commenting on their opinions (Rahimi Rad, 2020, p. 1357). There are five subcategories regarding the types of interactive metadiscourse markers: transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidential markers, and code glosses (Hyland, 2005).

Table 1. Interactive Metadiscourse Markers

Main Category	Sub-Category	Function	Example
Interactive Resources	Transition	Linking between main clauses	But, besides, thus, etc
	Frame markers	Indicates discourse actions, sequences or stages	My goal is, finally, in conclusion, etc
	Endhoporic markers	Shows information in other parts of a text	As stated above, see pictures, sections, etc
	Evidentials	Shows other information outside the text	According to opinion X stated, etc
	Code glosses	Helps understand difficult meanings	For example, like, namely, etc

Meanwhile, according to Hyland (2005), there are five subcategories consisting of hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mentions (Zali et al., 2020, p. 122).

Table 2. Interactional Metadiscourse Markers

Main Category	Sub-Category	Function	Example
Interactional Resources	Hedges	Holding the author's total commitment to proportion	Maybe, about, etc
	Boosters	Expresses certainty and emphasizes the power of proportion	Of course, it is clear that, in fact, etc
	Attitude markers	Represents the author's attitude and assessment of the content of proportion	I agree, unfortunately, etc.
	Engagement markers	Explicitly build relationships with readers	You can see it, consider it, note it, our mood, etc
	Self mentions	Indicates the author's presence explicitly	I, we, us, etc

To analyze the types and functions of metadiscourse markers used in Arabic language debates by debaters, this research chose Arabic language debates which were practiced in student-level international Arabic language debate events known as ISDC (International School Debating Championship), which Qatar Debate in Doha, Qatar organized. Arabic debates using the Qatar Debate method were chosen to study metadiscourse marker analysis because they are relevant and exciting compared to other types of debates. In Arabic debates using the Qatar Debate method, some elements must be fulfilled to express an argument that can be understood and satisfy the listener. Therefore, the researcher chose the Arabic language debate at the ISDC as the research object at this time.

Indonesia and Singapore are two countries with different cultural and educational backgrounds, so there are potential differences in language use, including the use of metadiscourse. Metadiscourse which is a language feature used to manage the flow of information in a text and build relationships with readers. In the context of Arabic debates, it is interesting how language is used strategically to convince debate opponents and audiences.

In connection with research on metadiscourse markers, several previous studies examined similar things, including research by Farghal and Kalakh titled "Engagement in Translation: Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in American Presidential Debates." This research explains that negligence and misinterpretation of engagement markers expressed to the audience can disrupt the metadiscourse marker relationship. It can divert focus and misconvey the message phatically and persuasively. Unlike English, Arabic is a highly inflectional language, and there is still a lack of research on metadiscourse markers in translation between English and Arabic in this field (Farghal & Kalakh, 2020). Furthermore, research by Alkhodar and Habil, titled "Metadiscourse Markers in Dr. Zakir Naik's Persuasive Discourse," explains, in general, that Zakir Naik has effectively developed and promoted his arguments through various metadiscourse markers and built a perfect relationship with the audience to achieve a sustainable relationship. The research also reveals that a valuable approach to exploring interpersonal and textual definitions of a language is Dafouz Milne's categorization of metadiscourse markers as a powerful methodological tool in discourse analysis (Al Khodari & Habil, 2021).

Furthermore, research by Zal and Moini, entitled "The Use of Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in English Book Reviews Across Disciplines," explains significant differences in stance markers between various book reviews. The findings highlight the differences in rhetorical strategies used in book reviews across different academic fields and the importance of genre-based teaching in university writing courses. In addition, there are significant differences in the use of stance markers in the introduction, description, and highlights. However, using engagement markers, the only significant difference is in highlighting (Zal & Moini, 2021). Next, research by Nugrahani and Bram entitled "Meta-discourse Markers in Scientific Journal Articles." This research explains that the eight journal articles "LTT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching" that were analyzed contained 708 metadiscourse markers, with interactive metadiscourse markers appearing more frequently 529 times, compared to interactional metadiscourse markers 179 times. Transitions, such as the words "but" and "thus," have

249 occurrences and are the most frequently used markers, and boosters, such as the words "actually" and "definitely," have 24 occurrences and are the least used markers (Nugrahani & Bram, 2020). Furthermore, research by AlJazrawi and AlJazrawi, entitled "The Use of Metadiscourse: An Analysis of Interactive and Interactional Markers in English Short Stories as a Type of Literary Genre," shows that short stories are considered persuasive texts because of non-linguistic factors, such as transportation and linguistic factors, such as the use of metadiscourse markers. This finding is the most significant and refutes the idea that short stories are persuasive texts because of transportation and other similar factors (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019).

Furthermore, research by Dichoso et al. titled "Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in Computer-Mediated British Parliamentary Debate: A Discourse Analysis." This research shows that interactional metadiscourse markers are significant in forming argumentative discourse. The subcategory of interaction markers often used in these debates is engagement markers, followed by self-mentions, hedges, attitude markers, and boosters. Engagement markers such as "we" and "our" draw the listener's attention to the argument. The use of self-mentions in facts or statements shows the debater's self-confidence. The use of hedges shows the debater's doubts about his argument. The use of attitude markers shows the debater's interesting attitude and establishes the truth of the claim (Dichoso, 2022). Efendi and Wahyudi's research is titled "The Exploration of Metadiscourse Markers in The National University Debating Championship (NUDC) and Its Pedagogical Implications." This research shows that debaters use all types of Ilie's (2003) and Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse models to represent their position as team members who must convey arguments logically and critically (Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023).

Furthermore, research by Zaki titled "The Metadiscourse of Arabic Academic Abstracts: A Corpus-based study". Penelitian tersebut menunjukkan bahwa abstrak akademik Bahasa Arab memiliki kedua jenis metawacana Hyland. Penanda Transition dan frame markers memiliki frekuensi yang tertinggi pada domain tekstual, Adapun penanda boosters dan self-mentions sering muncul di domain interpersonal. Sedangkan penanda endoforik dan hedges merupakan penanda yang jarang digunakan, dan engagement markers merupakan penanda yang sering digunakan (Zaki, 2022b). Kemudian penelitian oleh Mahfouz dengan judul "The Metadiscursive Construction of Computer-mediated Discourse in Arabic Newspaper Articles". Penelitian tersebut menunjukkan bahwa sejumlah tema yang menonjol terutama yang menggambarkan Computer-mediated Discourse (CMD) sebagai ancaman terhadap Bahasa Arab dan penurunan kemahiran linguistic dikalangan pemuda serta hilangnya identitas mereka. Penelitian tersebut juga menunjukkan sejumlah suara kontra yang mengakui keuntungan CMD sebagai bentuk komunikasi yang inovatif. Oleh karena itu, representasi metadiskursif CMD menunjukkan hubungan antara wacana dengan beberapa ideologi yang bertentangan menunjukkan perubahasa sosial budaya yang signifikan di dunia Arab (Mahfouz, 2024). Kemudian penelitian oleh Alzarieni, dkk dengan judul "Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in the Abstract Sections of Arabic Patents". Penelitian tersebut menunjukkan bahwa penanda boosters, hedges, attitude markers merupakan penanda yang sering digunakan, Adapun penanda lainnya menunjukkan penggunaan yang rendah. Penelitian tersebut juga menunjukkan bahwa interactional metadiscourse markers memenuhi fungsi berbeda, seperti menyediakan data secara jujur, menghindari komitmen terhadap angka yang tepat dan persuasi diantara yang lain (Alzarieni et al., 2019).

Several previous studies mentioned above show similarities and differences between each other. Some similarities are in the focus of metadiscourse studies and the research objects used. Three studies only focus on studying Hyland's interactional metadiscourse markers (Dichoso, 2022; Farghal & Kalakh, 2020; Zal & Moini, 2021). Three studies examine Hyland's interactive and interactional types of metadiscourse markers (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019; Alzarieni et al., 2019; Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023; Mahfouz, 2024; Nugrahani & Bram, 2020; Zaki, 2022b). Three studies use English language debate objects as metadiscourse marker research study objects (Dichoso, 2022; Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023; Farghal & Kalakh, 2020). Three studies use Arabic language as object of research (Alzarieni et al., 2019; Mahfouz, 2024; Zaki, 2022b). Several differences exist between the metadiscourse theory used and the research object. The research uses Dafouz-Milne's interpersonal and textual metadiscourse theory (Al Khodari & Habil, 2021) and Ilie's metadiscourse theory (Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023). Some studies use different research objects, such as persuasive discourse (Al Khodari & Habil, 2021) English book reviews (Zal & Moini,

2021), scientific journal articles (Nugrahani & Bram, 2020), short stories in English (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019), Arabic academic abstract (Alzarieni et al., 2019; Zaki, 2022b), and Arabic newspapers (Mahfouz, 2024).

Looking at some of the similarities and differences in previous research on metadiscourse markers which focused on the objects of academic articles and written discourse, the researcher sees that the study of metadiscourse using Arabic language objects is still rarely used, especially in the study of Arabic debate discourse which is an oral discourse. Where oral discourse contained in Arabic debates has a special rhetorical strategy. Thus, this research focuses on the study of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers using Arabic debate objects. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the types and functions of metadiscourse markers used by debaters from the Indonesian team and the Singapore team in the ISDC event in Doha, Qatar.

2. Methods

This study aims to analyze the types and roles of Hyland's metadiscourse markers used by debaters from the Indonesian and Singaporean teams in the ISDC event in Doha, Qatar. The method applied in this study is qualitative with a case study design. The population in this study includes all utterances expressed by debaters from the Indonesian and Singaporean teams in the Arabic debate video of the 6th ISDC in 2023 held in Doha, Qatar. The research sample was taken through purposive sampling, namely all utterances related to the use of metadiscourse according to Hyland's (2005) theory which consists of two types of categories, namely: First, the interactive category which includes subcategories of transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, and code glosses. Second, the interactional category includes subcategories of hedges, boosters, attitude markers, involvement markers, and self-mentions. The number of data samples obtained can be seen through the following table:

Table 3. Metadiscourse Markers from Indonesia and Singapore team

No	Debate Team	Interactive's Cetgory	Interctional's Category	Total	Subcategories used
1	Indonesia	154	158	312	Interactive : transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, dan code glosses Interactional : hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mentions
2	Singapore	136	139	275	Interactive : transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, dan code glosses Interactional : hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mentions
	Total			587	

The research instruments used is the video of the 6th ISDC Arabic debate in 2023 uploaded on the Qatar Debate YouTube channel with a length of 46 minutes (*Qatar Debate*, 2023). Information collection was carried out using observation and note-taking methods. The researcher watched all the debate videos repeatedly and recorded every expression related to the use of metadiscourse. The scripts of the debate videos were then used as the main data in the analysis.

Data analysis was conducted using the Miles and Huberman model which includes four stages: 1) data collection: data in the form of debate transcripts were collected thoroughly from the beginning to the end of the video; 2) data reduction: data that had been collected were then reduced by selecting and focusing on data relevant to the use of metadiscourse according to Hyland's (2005) theory; 3) data presentation: The data that have been reduced are presented in the form of tables or narratives, then, the data are analyzed based on the interactional and interpersonal metadiscourse categories proposed by Hyland (2005); 4) conclusion drawing: based on the results of

the analysis, the researcher draws conclusions regarding the types and functions of metadiscourse that are most dominantly used by the debaters from both teams, as well as the differences and similarities in their use.

3. Results and Discussion

The findings of this research discuss the types and functions of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers used by debaters from the Indonesian and Singaporean teams at Arabic language debate events based on Hyland's (2005) perspective metadiscourse theory. This research focuses on two categories of metadiscourse markers: interactive and interactional. The findings prove that all the Indonesian and Singapore team debaters used all categories of metadiscourse markers.

Table 4. Interactive and Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in the Indonesian Team (Pro).

Category/Sub-category	Speakers				Frequency	Percentage
Interactive	*First Speaker*	*Second Speaker*	*Third Speaker*	*Summarize*		
Transition	28	33	13	10	84	55%
Frame markers	10	7	2	6	25	16%
Endophoric markers	3	3	7	6	19	12%
Evidential	4	5	4	1	14	9%
Code glosses	7	-	2	3	12	8%
Total					154	100%
Interactional						
Hedges	2	-	-	-	2	1%
Boosters	3	17	14	5	39	25%
Attitude markers	2	4	1	3	10	6%
Engagement markers	8	7	8	7	30	19%
Self mentions	20	19	22	16	77	49%
Total					158	100%

Table 5. Interactive and Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in Singapore Teams (Contra).

Category/Sub-category	Speakers				Frequency	Percentage
Interactive	*First Speaker*	*Second Speaker*	*Third Speaker*	*Summarize*		
Transition	21	13	9	7	50	37%
Frame markers	6	8	8	6	28	21%
Endophoric markers	5	10	7	7	29	21%
Evidential	3	7	1	-	11	8%
Code glosses	1	3	6	8	18	13%
Total					136	100%
Interactional						
Hedges	-	-	-	-	-	-
Boosters	7	4	11	2	24	17%
Attitude markers	4	1	4	3	12	9%
Engagement markers	20	9	17	8	54	39%
Self mentions	16	11	15	7	49	35%
Total					139	100%

To see the forms of interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers used by the debaters from the Indonesian and Singapore teams in the debate, the researcher will analyze several forms used by the debaters in the Arabic language debate.

3.1 Interactive

According to Hyland and Tse (2004), interactive metadiscourse markers are markers related to the way of organizing or composing a discourse, not part of the experience of the writer or speaker, and markers that aim to help the reader or listener understand the purpose conveyed explicitly by the speaker so that they can easily listeners understand (Nugrahani & Bram, 2020, p. 6). Using interactive markers certainly makes the speakers' speech or utterances easily captured and understood by the listeners so that the important points conveyed by the debaters can be conveyed well to the listeners. The forms of interactive metadiscourse markers found in the debate are as follows:

3.2.1 Transition

According to Hyland (2005), the transition is a marker for connecting clauses (Koutchadé, 2021, p. 78). He revealed that there are three types of transitions: addition, comparison, and consequence. Addition functions as an addition to an argument or to an event. Meanwhile, comparison functions as comparing two things and contrasts an event, object, quality, evidence and argument. Consequences function as explanations of why and how an event can occur, as well as drawing conclusions or adding to arguments (Nugrahani & Bram, 2020, p. 6). The forms of metadiscourse markers in the transition subcategory in Arabic language debates are as follows:

Table 6. Transition Markers for the Indonesian and Singapore teams.

Teams	Sentence
Indonesia (Pro)	لاينظرون إلى الجوانب السلبيات **ولكن** المجتمع ينظرون إلى الجوانب الإجابيات
	*They do not look at the negative aspects, **but** society looks at the positive aspects*
Singapore (Contra)	الرابع الاستدامة البيئية. **فإذا كانت** الدول ليس لديها هذه أربعة معايير معايير النجاح
	*Fourth, environmental sustainability. **If** countries do not have these four success criteria*

In the transition marker used by the speaker from the Indonesian team, it is in the context of the discussion that many people glorify leaders in successful state governments; they actually do not see the negative side of these leaders but only focus on the positive side that they have. or they already do. In the context of the conversation, the speaker uses a marker with the word ولكن 'but' to connect two points of events. First, there is an incident in which society does not see the negative side of leaders. Second, incidents in society only focus on leaders' positive side.

These markers can be categorized as interactive transition markers because they link two different clauses. The transition marker is a comparison type because its function is to compare two things or events that are almost the same but are different. As stated by Hyland (2005), the function of comparative transition markers is to compare and contrast events, objects, arguments, qualities and evidence (Hyland, 2005).

Then, there were transition markers used by speakers from the Singapore team who discussed the standardization of a successful government regime, including point four, environmental sustainability. Then he explained that if a country does not have these four points, then that country cannot be said to be a country with a successful government regime. In this conversation, the speaker uses a transition marker with the words فإذا كان 'if something' to connect two different points. The first point is the mention of the fourth standardization in the form of environmental sustainability. The second point is in the form of a different statement about how a country cannot be said to be successful if it does not meet these four standards.

This marker is an interactive marker in the transition subcategory. Because this marker functions to connect two different clauses. The type of transition used is a consequence transition because the marker functions as a conclusion from the previously presented information. As found in Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse theory which states that consequence transitions function as arguments or conclusions from information that has been previously conveyed (Aini & Ekawati, 2022, p. 57).

The type of interactive metadiscourse marker in the transition subcategory is the marker most widely used in debates, both from the Indonesian and Singaporean teams. The Indonesian team used a total of 84 markers from the three speakers, while the Singapore team used a total of 50 markers from the three speakers. The many uses of transition markers in this debate cannot be separated from the many information, ideas, and essential ideas conveyed by all the speakers, so transition markers have become widely used. As in research (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019;

Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023; Farghal & Kalakh, 2020; Nugrahani & Bram, 2020). Transition markers are frequently used because the writer or speaker wants the text to be coherent and the reader or listener to understand the relationship between ideas.

3.2.2 Frame Markers

In Hyland's metadiscourse marker theory (2005), frame markers sequence, provide stages, show information, and provide information on the purpose of discourse (Hyland, 2005). The forms of frame markers found in Arabic language debates are as follows:

Table 7. Frame Markers for the Indonesian and Singapore teams.

Teams	Sentence
Indonesia (Pro)	وأنا كالمتلم الأول **سأتكلم** من محور سياسي، وزميلي أنا
	*As the first recipient, **I will speak** from a political axis, and my colleague is me*
Singapore (Contra)	فأنا كالمتحدثة الأولى **سأشرح** لكم حجتنا الأولى
	*I, as the first speaker, **I will explain** our first argument to you*

The frame markers used by the speakers from the Indonesian team were found in the discussion regarding the mention of the speaker's position as the first speaker and signaling the information that will be conveyed in conveying arguments from the political field. The form of interactive frame markers used by Indonesian team speakers is the word سأتكلم 'I will speak', where this word is a signal that provides information to listeners regarding the argumentative information in the political field that they will convey.

The markers used in the discourse can be categorized as frame markers because they signal the information to be conveyed. This is in line with what is stated in Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse theory in the interactive category in the frame markers subcategory, which states that frame markers help readers or listeners understand the flow of writing or reading by providing a sequence of information, providing signals of information that will be conveyed, predicted, and shifted information or arguments (Balog, 2022, p. 223).

The frame markers used by the speaker from the Singapore team discuss the expression of the speaker's statement as the first speaker of the counter team and the expression that signals information about the first argument that will be conveyed. The form of frame markers used in this discourse is the word سأشرح لكم 'I will explain', where this word is a signal that provides information to the audience regarding the information in the first argument that they will explain.

The forms of markers contained in the discourse can be categorized into frame markers because these markers function as signals for the information that the speaker will convey. This is in line with what Hyland (2005) stated in his metadiscourse theory, which states that frame markers are markers for giving signals, labeling stages of information, providing information on the purpose of discourse, and indicating shifts in a particular topic (Azijah & Gulö, 2020, p. 71).

From the discourse of the Arabic language debate between the Indonesian and Singaporean teams, frame markers are widely used among other interactive markers. In the Indonesian team, frame markers were the second most common marker after transition markers, which were widely used by all speakers and had 25 uses. As for the Singapore team, frame markers were the third most common marker after transition and endophytic markers, with the number of uses reaching 28 times. This is similar to previous research, which made frame markers the most widely used markers after transition markers, namely in research by (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019).

3.2.3 Endophoric Markers

According to Hyland (2005), endophoric markers function as indicators of relationships with other information mentioned in a text or discourse (Hyland, 2005). The forms of exophoric markers contained in the debate are as follows:

Table 8. Endophoric Markers in the Indonesian and Singaporean teams.

Teams	Sentence
Indonesia (Pro)	**كما قد قال متكلمنا** الأول إن المراد من التمجيد هو الخضوع بشكل المبالغة

	***As our first speaker said**, what is meant by glorification is submission in an exaggerated way*
Singapore (Contra)	**فبناءً على ما قد قدمنا** من الحجج والبراهين، نطالب منكم
	***Based on the arguments and evidence we have presented**, we demand that you*

The endophoric markers used by the Indonesian team speaker discussed the statement made by the third speaker, which showed the information that the first speaker had conveyed to the pro team regarding the meaning of التمجيد 'glorification', which means excessive submission. The endophoric markers used are in the form of the word كما قد قال متكلمنا الأول 'like what our first speaker said', where the word is a marker that functions as a reference or pointer to the expression that has been conveyed in a discourse.

The markers used in the discourse can be said to be endophoric markers because they function as a link between information and the information conveyed by the first speaker. This is in accordance with Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse theory, which states that endophoric markers are markers that refer readers or listeners to other parts of the text or discourse (Asadi et al., 2023, p. 133).

The endophoric markers used by the Singapore team speakers were found at the end of the discussion regarding several arguments conveyed by the first speaker so that the listeners or judges could use them as a basis that the Singapore team had the right to win the match. The form used in this conversation is the word فبناء على ما قد قدمنا 'based on what we have said', where this word becomes a link and refers to information in the form of arguments in other parts of the text or speech.

The markers contained in the discourse are included as endophoric markers because they connect and indicate information that is still contained in the same discourse. According to Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse theory, endophoric markers are markers that allude to or connect other information in a text or discourse (Mat Zali et al., 2021, p. 22).

From the discourse of the Arabic debate between the Indonesian and Singapore teams, endophoric markers appear a lot in the Singapore team. They are markers used less often and less in the Indonesian team. There are 19 endophoric markers used by the Indonesian team, making this marker the third most used interactive marker after transition and frame markers. As for the Singapore team, 29 endophoric markers were used, making this marker the second most widely used interactive marker after transition markers. This is similar to several previous studies that used endophoric markers as markers, but not as much or as little as in research (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019; Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023; Nugrahani & Bram, 2020).

3.2.4 Evidential

Evidential in Hyland's metadiscourse theory (2005) is evidence outside the text that strengthens the writer or speaker's opinion in his discourse (Hyland, 2005). In this case, using evidence in a piece of writing or speech can strengthen the speaker's opinion in presenting his argument. The evidential forms contained in the Arabic language debate between the Indonesian and Singaporean teams are as follows:

Table 9. Evidential on the Indonesian and Singapore teams.

Teams	Sentence
Indonesia (Pro)	**على سبيل المثال** مهاتر محمد حيث إن الحكومة خضعت له فيما صدر منه من القرارات لمدة طويلة أربع وعشرين سنة
	***For example**, Mahathir Muhammad, as the government submitted to him the decisions he issued for a long period of twenty-four years*
Singapore (Contra)	**على سبيل المثال** في سعغافورة هناك أعمال الشغف العنصرية
	***For example**, in Singapore, there are acts of racist passion*

The evidence contained in the Indonesian team's speakers discussed mentioned examples or evidence for the arguments he had explained, where the example mentioned was Mahatir Muhammd's leadership as a Malaysian government politician who received glorification from his people so that he was able to serve for an extended period of around 24 years. The evidential form in this statement uses the word على سبيل المثال 'for example', where the

evidence or example strengthens the opinion that has been conveyed by the speaker discussing the glorification that occurs in successful government regimes.

The form of marker used in the statement is classified as an evidential marker because its function is to serve as evidence and to strengthen the argumentative opinion conveyed by the speaker. This is stated in Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse theory, which states that evidential markers refer to information outside the text and function as reinforcement or justification for the arguments or opinions conveyed by the author or speaker (Akoto, 2020, p. 475).

Meanwhile, the evidence contained in the speakers from the Singapore team discussed leaders who received glorification from their people but who were capable and successful in managing their country, including eradicating crimes that occurred. This statement is strengthened by examples or evidence in the form of racist cases that occurred in Singapore, which were able to be resolved by Lee Kuan Yew, who served as prime minister of Singapore. The evidential form for indicating evidence is the word على سبيل المثال 'for example', where this word is a marker for mentioning evidence that functions as a reinforcement of the opinion that has been previously expressed.

This word form is categorized as an evidential marker because it functions as a reinforcing marker for evidence or examples that refer to information outside the text and as reinforcement for the speaker's opinion. This is in line with what is contained in metadiscourse theory, which states that evidential is a marker that functions as evidence to strengthen the opinion that has been conveyed. This evidence refers to information outside the text or discourse (Geng & Wei, 2023, p. 34).

Evidential content in the Arabic language debate between the Indonesian and Singapore teams is a little-used marker. On the Indonesian team, all speakers used 14 evidential markers. Meanwhile, on the Singapore team, all speakers used 11 evidential markers. This is similar to previous studies that revealed that evidential markers appear least often or are not found in certain discourses (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019; Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023).

3.2.5 Code Glosses

Hyland (2005) stated that Code Glosses are markers that function as explanations, rearranging, re-deciphering and providing additional information to what has been expressed so that the reader or listener can understand the meaning intended by the author or speaker (Hyland, 2005). The code glosses used in the Arabic language debate between the Indonesian and Singaporean teams are as follows:

Table 10. Code Glosses on the Indonesian and Singapore teams.

Teams	Sentence
Indonesia (Pro)	"يندم" **فالمراد** من هذه الكلمة هي عدم إعادته
	*"Regret." **What is meant** by this word is not to repeat it*
Singapore (Contra)	هم يقولون بأنّ من الناحية السياسية أي وجود حرية التعبير
	They say that from a political standpoint, there is freedom of expression

The code glosses marker found in the speaker from the Indonesian team was in the discussion regarding the meaning of the word يندم 'regret', which was clarified by the appearance of the code glosses marker as an explanation of the meaning of the word, which means not repeating it. The form used to explain the meaning of the word is the word المراد 'meaning', where the word is a marker that clarifies the previous statement.

This form of the word can be classified as a code gloss marker because it clarifies the statement or discourse previously conveyed so that the listener can have a correct understanding and match what the speaker wants. This is in line with Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse theory, which states that code glosses are markers that have several functions, namely as markers to provide additional information, explain or elaborate on what has been conveyed, and rephrase statements, this is to ensure that the reader or listener can obtain the meaning or understanding intended by the author or speaker (Koutchadé, 2021, p. 78).

The gloss marker on the speaker from the Singapore team was contained in the rebuttal statement delivered by the third speaker. The rebuttal stated that it was related to the claim of the pro team (Indonesia) in one of the

points of the pro team's argument, namely in the political field of argumentation, where the code glosses marker became the explanation of the meaning of argumentative claims in the political field conveyed by the pro team. The form of code glosses used in this discourse is the word أي, where this word is an explanation of the statement made previously.

The words in the statement can be categorized as code glosses because they explain the previous statement so the listener understands the meaning the speaker wants to convey. Hyland (2005) stated this in his theory: code glosses are markers that function as explanations to help readers understand the author's meaning (Anuarsham et al., 2020, p. 20).

Based on the findings from the Arabic language debate discourse between the Indonesian and Singapore teams, 12 code gloss markers appeared in the discourse from the Indonesian team. Meanwhile, 18 code glosses appeared in the discourse of the Indonesian Team. So, it can be said that the use of code gloss markers from the two teams is relatively tiny. This is similar to several previous studies which stated that the use of code glosses included markers that were rarely used, namely in research by (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019; Nugrahani & Bram, 2020).

3.2 Interactional

According to Hyland (2005), interactional markers involve readers in an argument by reminding them of the author's perspective on proportional information and the reader himself. In their use, interactional markers can be studied through the interaction between the writer or speaker and the reader or listener (Hyland, 2005). The forms of interactional metadiscourse markers contained in the debate are as follows:

3.2.1 Hedges

Hedges express the author's intention not to imply a total commitment to a proposition (Istiani & Puspita, 2020, p. 15). Using hedges allows writers to express something based on their perspective and present a claim carefully when speaking to their audience. The forms of hedges found in the Arabic language debate between the Indonesian team and the Singapore team are as follows:

Table 11. Hedges on the Indonesian and Singapore teams.

Teams	Sentence
Indonesia (Pro)	**كأن** هذا التمجيد يجعل أن يكتم الرؤساء السلطويين من الجوانب السلبية
	*It is as if this glorification makes it **possible** for authoritarian leaders to conceal their negative aspects*
Singapore (Contra)	-

The form of hedges found by the speakers from the Indonesian team was placed in the context of a conversation discussing glorification, which was illustrated as if the negative side of authoritarian leaders was covered up because of glorification. The form of hedge used in this statement is the word كأنّ 'as if', where the presence of this word indicates that the speaker's expression of the opinion is conveyed carefully or that the speaker is not entirely sure of his statement.

The words used in the statement above can be categorized as hedges because these markers illustrate the speaker's caution in stating something with the person he is speaking to and indicating the speaker's lack of total commitment to what he is expressing. This is in line with what Hyland (2005) expressed in his theory, which states that hedges are markers that involve the reader or listener which function to withhold the author's total commitment to a particular proposition or statement; this shows the author's or speaker's caution in dialogue with the interlocutor (Hu Xue-chen & Liu Ying-liang, 2022, p. 270).

In the Arabic language debate between the Indonesian and Singaporean teams, hedges were the markers that were used the least or not at all. This is proven by the Indonesian team having only two markers, while the Singapore team did not use hedges. In the context of a debate, the speaker tends to avoid statements that show a lack of full commitment because the speaker in the debate tends to believe in the arguments he has presented.

3.2.2 Boosters

According to Hyland (2005), Boosters are markers writers use to strengthen claims and show the writer's commitment to the truth of a proposition (Hyland, 2005). The forms of boosters found in the Arabic language debate between the Indonesian and Singaporean teams are as follows:

Table 12. Boosters on the Indonesian and Singapore teams.

Teams	Sentence
Indonesia (Pro)	فلذلك نحن من الموالاة، **طبعا** نندم هذا التمجيد *Therefore, we are loyalists, and **of course,** we regret this glorification*
Singapore (Contra)	جئناكم **معارضين** بقضية المجلس *We came to you in opposition to the **Council** issue* (strong affirmation)

The Heges contained in the Indonesian team speaker's statement are in the discussion, which discusses the confidence of the speaker's claims regarding the arguments he has conveyed regarding regret for the glorification that occurs among authoritarian leaders. The form of marker used in this statement is the word طبعا 'definitely/certainly', where this word is an affirmation or proof of the speaker's full commitment to the truth that he is conveying.

The word forms in the statement above can be categorized as booster markers because they confirm or reinforce the speaker's total commitment to his claims or arguments. This aligns with Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse theory, which states that a booster is a marker to express certainty, reinforcement, affirmation, the author's complete confidence or a particular opinion or proposition (Park & Lee, 2022, p. 6).

Meanwhile, the hedges of the Singapore team speaker is found in the statement that emphasizes the speaker's position as a team that rejects the debate motion. The form used in this statement is the word معارضين 'rejection' or can be interpreted as "strongly reject", where this word functions as an amplifier or in Arabic linguistics terms called "*Taukiid*" which functions as an affirmation of a statement (Hidayat & Fatimatul Djamilah, 2022), where in the context the word emphasizes the speaker's position by rejecting the debate motion clearly.

The words expressed by the Singapore team can be categorized as boosters because they affirm and explain to the interlocutor his position as a team member who firmly rejects the debate motion. This is according to Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse theory, which states that boosters are markers that show certainty, confirmation and strengthening of a proposition (Çapar & Turan, 2020, p. 338).

The findings above show 39 uses of boosters out of the total number of Indonesian team speakers, making boosters the second most frequently used marker after self-mentions. Meanwhile, boosters were used 24 times out of all speakers in the Singapore team, making boosters the third most frequently used marker after engagement markers and self-mentions. In line with these findings, several previous studies reveal that boosters are among the markers that are widely used, namely in research by (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019; Zal & Moini, 2021).

3.2.3 Attitude Markers

According to Hyland (2005), attitude markers are markers used to show the writer's attitude towards a proposition, such as conveying surprise, obligation, agreement, and interest (Hyland, 2005). The forms of attitude markers used in the Arabic language debate between the Indonesian and Singaporean teams are as follows:

Table 13. Attitude Markers pada tim Indonesia dan Singapura.

Teams	Sentence
Indonesia (Pro)	لذلك ننحن **نندم** على تمجيد الرؤساء السلطويين حيث إن هذا التمجيد سؤدّي إلى السلبيات الكثيرة *Therefore, **we regret** glorifying authoritarian presidents, as this glorification will lead to many negatives*

Singapore (Contra)	ولذلك نحن **لاندم** على الرؤساء السلطويين
	*Therefore, **we do not regret** authoritarian presidents*

In one of the discourses contained in the Indonesian team speaker above, attitude markers are found in the context of the conversation where the first speaker expresses his attitude assessment of the arguments that have been presented. He considered that his team regretted the glorification because this could have had many negative impacts. The form of attitude marker used in this statement is by using the word نندم 'we regret', where this word shows the assessment of the speaker's attitude towards the statement he has conveyed.

The word forms above are included in attitude markers because they express the speaker's attitude assessment of certain propositions. This is in line with what Hyland (2005) stated: attitude markers are markers that function to show the writer's or speaker's affective attitude towards a particular proposition, such as in conveying surprise, frustration, agreement, obligation, etc (Bal GezegiN & Bas, 2020, p. 52).

Meanwhile, the form of attitude markers found in the Singapore team above discusses the attitude of not regretting authoritarian leaders who receive glorification from their people as long as they are successful in leading a country. The form of attitude marker used is the word لاندم 'we do not regret', where this word shows the speaker's attitude towards the proposition expressed previously.

These word forms can be categorized into attitude markers because they refer to the speaker's attitude toward his previous statement. In line with what is contained in Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse theory, which states that attitude markers are markers to express the writer's or speaker's attitude towards the proposition he or she has conveyed (Anuarsham et al., 2020, p. 20).

Based on the findings above, attitude markers are rarely used in the Arabic language debate between the Indonesian and Singaporean teams. There were ten uses of attitude markers from the Indonesian team and 12 times from the Singapore team. This is in line with several previous studies which found little use of attitude markers, such as in research by (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019; Dichoso, 2022; Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023; Nugrahani & Bram, 2020).

3.2.4 Engagement Markers

Hyland's (2005) engagement markers are markers explicitly addressed to readers, either to focus on or include them as participants in discourse through pronouns, imperatives, questions, or greetings (Hyland, 2005). The forms of engagement markers found in the Arabic debate between the Indonesian and Singaporean teams are as follows:

Table 14. Engagement Markers for the Indonesian and Singapore teams.

Teams	Sentence
Indonesia (Pro)	**ندعوكم للجميع** ليقف معنا في مبدئنا اليوم
	We invite everyone to *stand with us in our principle today*
Singapore (Contra)	فبناء على ما قد قدمنا **نطالب منكم يا سيدي الرئيس** أن ترفض هذه القضية
	*Based on what we have presented, **we ask you, Mr. President**, to reject this case*

The engagement markers that emerged from the Indonesian team were found in a statement discussing the invitation expressed by the second speaker to the audience to support their position as a team that supported the debate motion. The word form used in this statement is in the form of the word ندعوكم للجميع 'we invite you all', where this word is a marker aimed at the audience to invite them to be part of the debate discourse that supports the speaker's position.

The word forms used above are classified as engagement markers because the function of these markers is to ensure that the audience is in the part of the discourse that supports the speaker's position as a team that supports the debate motion. This is in line with what is contained in Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse theory, which states that engagement markers are markers that build an explicit relationship

with the reader through word forms directed at the reader to participate in a part of a discourse (Aszeli et al., 2021, p. 91).

Meanwhile, the engagement markers from the Singapore team were in a statement discussing the third speaker's invitation to the audience, especially the jury, to reject the motion and support the opposing team (Singapore) in the debate. The word form used in this statement is the word نطالب منكم يا سيدي الرئيس 'We ask, to the jury', where this word is a marker that functions to invite the audience, especially the jury, to be part of the speaker's discourse in rejecting the debate motion.

These word forms can be categorized as engagement markers because they function as markers to invite the audience to participate in the part of the discourse being conveyed. Hyland (2005) expressed this in his theory: Engagement markers aim to build relationships with readers or audiences explicitly to become part of the discourse being conveyed (Zali et al., 2020, p. 122).

The data on engagement markers in the Indonesian team and Singapore debate shows that these markers are widely used. In the Indonesian team, engagement markers were used 30 times out of all speakers, making it the third most frequently used marker. Meanwhile, from the Singapore team, there were 49 uses of engagement markers, making them the most frequently used markers among other interactional markers. Several previous studies reveal similar things regarding the large number of uses of engagement markers in discourse, such as in research by (Dichoso, 2022; Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023; Farghal & Kalakh, 2020).

3.2.5 Self Mentions

According to Hyland (2005), self-mentions refer to the explicit presence of a writer or speaker in a text or speech expressed through first-person pronouns or possessive adjectives (Hyland, 2005). One form of use of self-mentions in the debate between the Indonesian and Singaporean teams is as follows:

Table 15. Self Mentions on the Indonesian and Singapore teams.

Teams	Sentence
Indonesia (Pro)	إننا **نحن** لاننكر على محاسن الرؤساء ولكنها تكون في بعض النواحى
	***We** do not deny the virtues of presidents, but they are in some ways*
Singapore (Contra)	**فأنا** كالمتكلمة الثالثة دعوني أن أكشف لكم الأخطاء والمغلطات
	*As the third speaker, let **me** reveal to you the mistakes and inaccuracies*

The self-mentions contained in the Indonesian team discuss the author's assertion that they believe that glorification has several positive impacts on authoritarian leaders. However, the visible positive impacts are only partially visible. The form of self-mention used in this statement is in the form of the word إننا نحن 'indeed we', where this word is a marker that shows the presence of the speaker explicitly by using the first person pronoun.

The word forms expressed above can be categorized as self-mentions because the function of the marker refers to the speaker's presence in a proposition where the marker is a first-person pronoun. This is what Hyland (2005) expressed in his metadiscourse theory, which states that self-mentions refer to the use of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives where the aim is to present the author's presence in a text (Park & Lee, 2022, p. 6).

Meanwhile, the self-mentions used in the Singapore team are in statements that reveal the speaker's position, where he states that he is the third speaker who will convey the mistakes of the opposing party. The form of self-mention contained in this statement is in the form of a first-person pronoun, namely أنا 'me' and a possessive adjective combined in the word دعوني 'let me', where these two words are markers that refer to the speaker's presence in a discourse or utterance.

The form of words from the Singapore team above is in the self-mentioning marker category because the marker is an explicit reveal of the speaker's presence, expressed by using first-person pronouns and possessive

adjectives. This aligns with Hyland's (2005) statement that self-mentions aim to show the speaker's presence by using first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives (Mat Zali et al., 2021, p. 22).

Based on the findings of self-mentions in the debate between the Indonesian and Singaporean teams show that these markers are among the most frequently used markers between the two teams. There were 77 markers used by the Indonesian team, making it the first marker most used among all speakers. Meanwhile, in the Singapore team, there were 49 self-mention markers, making it the second most used marker out of all speakers. The findings, which state the extensive use of self-mentions in discourse, are in line with several previous studies that stated the same results, including research by (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019; Dichoso, 2022; Effendi & Wahyudi, 2023; Zal & Moini, 2021).

4. Conclusion

This study aims to analyze the types and functions of metadiscourse markers used by debaters from the Indonesian team and the Singapore team in the international inter-school debate event (ISDC) in Doha, Qatar. The results showed that all debaters used interactive and interactional types of markers. From the discourse delivered by all Indonesian team debaters, they used all subcategories of interactive metadiscourse marker types with the highest frequency of use being on transitions 84 times (55%) and markers with the least frequency being code glosses 12 times 8%). Meanwhile, in the Singaporean team, the interactive markers with the highest frequency of use were on transition 50 times (37%) and the least marker was evidential 11 times (8%). In interactional metadiscourse markers, the highest frequency of use is in engagement markers 54 times (39%) and the lowest is in attitude markers 12 times (9%). Interactional markers became the most used type of marker 139 times compared to interactive markers which were used 136 times.

This research provides an overview of the markers that are generally often used in debate discourse, especially in Arabic language debates. This, of course, impacts conveying the ideas and arguments that the debaters want to convey. Considering the rarity of metadiscourse research focusing on Arabic language studies, especially on Arabic language debates, the author considers this study very interesting. Researchers found several difficulties in this research, such as differences in Arabic language rules with other languages, making the finding of markers less accurate because in Arabic language rules, several markers do not appear clearly in an Arabic text, and it is difficult for researchers to understand the context of vocabulary use. Arabic is used as a metadiscourse marker. Therefore, the researcher suggests that the use of markers contained in Arabic discourse, both written and spoken, be studied further in future research.

This study has theoretical implications in expanding the study of metadiscourse in Arabic, especially in debate discourse, by revealing the role of metadiscourse in argumentation and persuasion strategies. Practically, the research findings can help debaters and debate coaches in crafting more cohesive and persuasive arguments, as well as contribute to the teaching of speaking skills in Arabic. In addition, this study can be used by debate competition organizers to develop more linguistically-based scoring guidelines. From a social and cultural perspective, this study also provides insights into how Arabic debate reflects cultural norms and evolving ideologies, while playing a role in shaping critical thinking and communication skills among Arabic speakers.

References

Aini, N., & Ekawati, R. (2022). Metadiscourse Markers in CNN Health News Articles. *SUAR BETANG*, *17*(1), 55–67. https://doi.org/10.26499/surbet.v17i1.329

Akoto, O. Y. (2020). Metadiscourse within a discipline: A study of introduction and literature review chapters of sociology masters' theses. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 471–480. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i2.28588

Al Farisi, M. Z., Tantowi, Y. A., & Nurmala, M. (2023). Language, Culture, and Translation. *Prosiding Pertemuan Ilmiah Internasional Bahasa Arab*, *14*(1), 1093–1102.

Al Hajuri, S. B. I. (2019). The use of debate in teaching Arabic to non-native speakers: A descriptive and analytical study. *Al-Tajdid Is a Biannual Peer-Reviewed Intellectual Journal Published by the International Islamic University Malaysia*, *23*(46), 99–147.

Al Khodari, F. T., & Habil, H. (2021). Metadiscourse Markers in Dr. Zakir Naik's Persuasive Discourse. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, *21*(4), 342–363. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2021-2104-18

AlJazrawi, D. A., & AlJazrawi, Z. A. (2019). The Use of Meta-discourse An Analysis of Interactive and Interactional Markers in English Short Stories as a Type of Literary Genre. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *8*(3), 66–77. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.8n.3p.66

Alzarieni, M., Safinaz Zainudin, I., Mat Awal, N., & Zain Sulaiman, M. (2019). Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in the Abstract Sections of Arabic Patents. *Arab World English Journal*, *10*(2), 379–393. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.29

Anuarsham, A. H., Rahmat, N. H., & Khamsah, M. A. N. (2020). Metadiscourse Analysis of An Online Entertainment Article. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, *3*(1), 17–29. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejals.v3i1.187

Asadi, J., Aliasin, S. H., & MoradJoz, R. (2023). A Study of the Research Article Discussion Section Written by Native Authors: Hyland's 2005) Metadiscourse Model in Focus. *Research in English Language Pedagogy*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.30486/relp.2023.1976435.1428

Aszeli, N. A., Jamil, D. A., & Rahmat, N. H. (2021). A Study of Interactional Metadiscourse On News Article On The Impact of Covid-19 On Education. *European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies*, *4*(4). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejlll.v4i4.238

Azijah, D. P., & Gulö, I. (2020). Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers In Jacinda Ardern Speech at Christchurch Memorial. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *1*(2), 70–77. https://doi.org/10.33365/llj.v1i2.594

Bal GezegiN, B., & Bas, M. (2020). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A comparison of research articles and book reviews. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *6*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.710204

Balog, P. (2022). Analysis of Queen Elizabeth II's Coronavirus Speech Using Hyland's Metadiscourse Theory. *International Journal of Arts, Sciences and Education*, *3*(1).

Çapar, M., & Turan, Ü. D. (2020). Interactional Metadiscourse in Research Articles Written by Turkish and Native Speakers. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, *10*(1), 324–358. https://doi.org/10.18039/ajesi.682042

Dichoso, D. B. (2022). Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in Computer- Mediated British Parliamentary Debate: A Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of Advanced Multidiciplinary Studies*, *2*(7), 302–3014.

Effendi, I. S., & Wahyudi, R. (2023). The Exploration of Metadiscourse Markers in The National University Debating Championship (NUDC) and Its Pedagogical Implications. *Journal of Creative Practices in Language Learning and Teaching (CPLT)*, *11*(2), 217–237.

Farghal, M., & Kalakh. (2020). Engagement in Translation: Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in American Presidential Debates. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures*, *12*(1), 103–122. https://doi.org/10.47012/jjmll.12.1.7

Geng, H., & Wei, H. (2023). Metadiscourse Markers in Abstracts of Linguistics and Literature Research Articles from Scopus-Indexed Journals. *Journal of Modern Languages*, *33*(1), 29–49. https://doi.org/10.22452/jml.vol33no1.2

Hidayat, R., & Fatimatul Djamilah, W. I. (2022). At-Taukid wa al-Mubalaghah fi al-Qishah al-Qasirah Athfal al-Ghabah (Dirosah Nahwiyah). *Kitabina: Jurnal Bahasa & Sastra Arab*, *3*(02), 51–66. https://doi.org/10.19109/kitabina.v3i02.16087

Hu Xue-chen & Liu Ying-liang. (2022). A Corpus-based Study of Interactional Metadiscourse in Dissertation Abstracts. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, *12*(3). https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5836/2022.03.009

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Continuum.

Ilie, C. (2003). Discourse and metadiscourse in parliamentary debates. *Journal of Language and Politics*, *2*(1), 71–95.

Istiani, R., & Puspita, D. (2020). Interactional Metadiscourse used in Bloomberg International Debate. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *1*(1), 13–20. https://doi.org/10.33365/llj.v1i1.160

Koutchadé, I. S. (2021). Analysing Metadiscourse Markers in Two Online Newspapers' Editorials on Covid-19. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, *8*(4), 76–88.

Kuswoyo, H., & Siregar, R. A. (2019). Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers as Persuasive Strategies in Oral Business Presentation. *Lingua Cultura*, *13*(4), 297. https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i4.5882

Mahfouz, I. M. (2024). The Metadiscursive Construction of Computer-mediated Discourse in Arabic Newspaper Articles. مجلة البحث العلمي في الآداب, *25*(3), 74–102. https://doi.org/10.21608/jssa.2024.247201.1571

Mat Zali, M., Mohamad, R., Setia, R., Raja Baniamin, R. M., & Mohd Razlan, R. (2021). Comparisons of Interactive and Interactional Metadiscourse among Undergraduates. *Asian Journal of University Education*, *16*(4), 21. https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v16i4.11946

Nugrahani, V. E., & Bram, B. (2020). Metadiscourse Markers in Scientific Journal Articles. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, *6*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v6i1.1528

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

Qatar Debate. (2023, September 2). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gA6qbW-yxQs&list=WL&index=1

Rahimi Rad, M. (2020). Iranian EFL Learners` Use of Metadiscourse Markers in Argumentative Writing. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, *3*(3), 1353–1362. https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v3i3.1184

Wati, A. T., & Maula, N. D. (2021). Correlation Between Vocabulary Mastery and Arabic Debate Ability: *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Sustainable Innovation 2020–Social, Humanity, and Education (ICoSIHESS 2020)*, *518*, 233–238. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210120.129

Xu, Q., Chen, S., Wang, J., & Suhadolc, S. (2021). Characteristics and Effectiveness of Teacher Feedback on Online Business English Oral Presentations. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *30*(6), 631–641. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00595-5

Zaki, M. (2022a). The metadiscourse of Arabic academic abstracts: A corpus-based study. *Research in Corpus Linguistics*, *10*(2), 113–146. https://doi.org/10.32714/ricl.10.02.06

Zaki, M. (2022b). The metadiscourse of Arabic academic abstracts: A corpus-based study. *Research in Corpus Linguistics*, *10*(2), 113–146. https://doi.org/10.32714/ricl.10.02.06

Zal, N., & Moini, M. R. (2021). The Use of Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in English Book Reviews Across Disciplines. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *12*(3), 477–488. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1203.18

Zali, M. M., Mohamad, R., Setia, R., Baniamin, R. M. R., & Razlan, R. M. (2020). Interactional Metadiscourse Analysis of Evaluative Essays. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *5*, 120–129.