**Educational Administration: Theory and Practice**
2024, 30(11), 2732-2739
ISSN: 2148-2403
https://kuey.net/

**Research Article**

# Metadiscourse in Motion: Tracing Diachronic Variations in Pakistani Academic Writing Across Disciplines

Sana Nawaz[1], Dr Lubna Ali[2*], Dr Mussarat Azher[3], Mamoona Shahzad[4], Anayat ullah[5]

[1]PhD Scholar, Lincoln college University Malaysia, snawaz@lincoln.edu.my
[2*,3,4,5]Co-Supervisor, Lincoln college University Malaysia, Mussarat.Azher@gmail.com
mamoonashahzad604@gmail.com, anayatullah739@gmail.com

***Corresponding Author:** Dr Lubna Ali
*Co-Supervisor, Lincoln college University Malaysia, Mussarat.Azher@gmail.com

**Citation:** Sana Nawaz, et.al (2024). Metadiscourse in Motion: Tracing Diachronic Variations in Pakistani Academic Writing Across Disciplines, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(11) 2732-2739
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i11.10905

**ARTICLE INFO**

**ABSTRACT**

Metadiscourse analysis holds great significance as it provides a way to discover the rhetorical patterns of the text. It is the way in which the language is used by a speaker or writer to regulate the flow of communication, enhance their message, and involve the audience. It is categorized into two main types. Interactive metadiscourse refers to the interaction between the speaker and listener and writer and the reader. Interactive metadiscourse involves devices like, engagement markers (e.g., "you," "as we can see"), hedges (e.g., "perhaps," "maybe") and transitions (e.g., "however," "in addition") that help organize ideas and connect concepts. While, interactional metadiscourse show the speaker's or writer's stance toward the topic or situation in the content. Hyland has divided interactional metadiscourse into five major categories. They are hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mentions. According to Hyland, metadiscourse is used in language analysis and language education in order to relate the communication of writer with the readers or the speaker with the audience (Hyland, 2005). Hence metadiscourse is a way of understanding the intended communication of the speaker or writer with the listener or reader. According to Hyland, transition markers are mainly conjunctions and adverbs that facilitate the reader in building and understanding the semantic context and meaning of the content. Therefore, the current study employs the metadiscourse framework of Hyland (2005) to investigate the language variation in the academic writing particularly in the three disciplines. This study aims to explore the diachronic variation across doctoral dissertation writing of Pakistani university students in terms of interactional meta-discourse over the last three decades, i.e. from 1990-2020 by examining the prominent textual features and the patterns of change involved in the meta-discourse in question. For this reason, 180 PhD research dissertations were collected from three major disciplines: humanities, social sciences and sciences which finally generated 10 million word corpora. All the metadiscursive devices are analyzed by applying corpus-based approach and then analyzed qualitatively. The results of study show that Pakistani research writers use interactional reach markers to make their writing more persuasive and unified.

**Keywords:** Metadiscourse, Pakistani academic writing, language variation, interactional markers, interactive markers, transition markers

## INTRODUCTION:

Meta-discourse may be defined as a thoughtful linguistic expression, the speakers and writers use to engage their audience socially and communicatively. Meta-discourse has been widely discussed and studied in academic discourse, especially with reference to how writers engage their imagined readers through certain linguistic expressions. It is based on a view of writing as a social engagement and, in academic contexts, exposes the ways writers project themselves into their discourse to signal their attitudes and commitments. Hyland

(2004) considers meta-discourse as "self-reflective linguistic expressions referring to the evolving text, to the writer, and to the imagined readers of that text" (p. 133). He believes academic writing as a social and communicative activity that not only helps the writer project his/her academic stance and signal their interactive intension, but also engages the readers to convince and persuade them in terms of the argument presented in the academic discourse. The notion of meta-discourse has been defined by a number of scholars. Williams (1981) elaborates it as "writing about writing, whatever does not refer to the subject matter being addressed" (p. 212). On the other hand, Vande Kopple (1985) defines, meta-discourse in these words "the linguistic structure that provide an evidence of presence of writer in the text" (p. 83). Furthermore, Mauranen (1993, p. 8) and Crismore et al. (1993, p. 40) have the same notions on meta-discourse as they define it the source of guidance and navigation for the readers and listeners.

It is evident that the unique cultural and linguistic aspects have given rise to unique varieties of English around the world. In this context, Pakistani English has emerged as a non-native variety which shows variation at various levels of language. Scholars have developed growing and surging interest in its unique and exclusive features in the past twenty years. The majority of the research has been undertaken on lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactic features of Pakistani English (PE) wherein linguistic units from various texts have been the targets (e.g. Talaat, 1993, 2002; Baumgardener, 1987, 1993, 1998; Mehboob, 2004; Rehman, 2010; Mehmood, 2009; and Mehmood 2009). These studies have lent their support to the process of codification and the legitimation of Pakistani English as a variant. Following the idea of language variation, there has been topmost need to examine linguistic structures in terms of register. A register is considered to be defined language variety that depends on situation.

It is marked by specific situation, topic and aim. Ferguson (1983), states that "register variation in which language structure varies in accordance with the occasions of use is all-pervasive in human language" (p. 154). Pakistani English needs to be examined at the level of register to further explore its distinctive aspects and to establish its unique linguistic identity. There is a necessity to explore other registers of Pakistani English for reinforcing its existence as a different variety. Biber et al. (1999), Biber (2006), and Biber & Conrad (2009) define academic prose as "a very general register, described as written language which has been produced and edited carefully, aimed at a great many readers who are distant in time and space from the writer, and with the main communicative function of providing information about some topic" (Biber & Conrad 2009: 32). Scholarly writing in the current scenario can be characterized as a kind of writing which serves the educational purpose or the kind of writing done in compliance with academic assignment for the completion of degree or it can also be characterized as a discourse of community within a particular discipline. Academic writing language has been researched from various viewpoints.

These studies can be categorized into two wider categories: studies on the frequency of occurrence of individual linguistic items (e.g. Crompton, 1997; Grabe & Kaplan, 1997; Holmes, 1988; Hyland, 1994, 1996a, 1996b; Kuo, 1999; and Marco, 2000) and the studies on the sets of co-occurring linguistic features ( e.g. Conrad, 1996, Biber, 1988, Moran, 2011, Gray, 2011, Egbert, 2015). These researchers have found characteristic linguistic features and textual dimensions of academic writing as a register. Academic writing similar to other registers in Pakistan is a field that continues to look for the researchers' and linguists' attention. In the case of the learners, academic writing is the most crucial register on which their academic life hangs. This target register must be thoroughly explained in terms of linguistic features to prepare proper teaching materials and procedures.

## Aim of the Study:

The present corpus –based study aims to work on the language variation in Pakistani academic writing by applying the model of metadiscourse. Metadiscourse analysis holds great significance as it provides a way to discover the rhetorical patterns of the text. Therefore, the current study employs the metadiscourse framework of Hyland (2005) to investigate the language variation in the academic writing particularly in the three disciplines.

## Questions of the Study:

Therefore, the following research questions are put forward in the current corpus-based study:

1. How far is the language of Pakistani academic writing diachronically changed in terms of interactional meta-discourse markers across various disciplines?
2. How far is the language of Pakistani academic writing transformed in terms of interactional meta-discourse markers (Hyland, 2005)?

## Literature Review:

Sahragard, R. & Yazdanpanahi, S. (2017), studied the interactional discourse markers in a comparative study where they searched into the language used in research articles of Science and Humanities. They (ibid) employed Hyland's Model of Metadiscourse for the interpretation of interactional discourse markers in four disciplines of Humanities i-e Law, Economics, Psychology, and Sociology) and four disciplines of Sciences

(Physics, Biology, Mathematics, and Geology). They developed a contrastive corpus of four disciplines from Humanities and four from Sciences and then randomly selected sixteen articles from each discipline. The data was scrutinized according to the purpose of the study and the results indicate that Humanities use more interactional markers as compared to the articles of Sciences. Hence, this study applied a corpus -based methodology and used Hyland's model of metadiscourse as its framework of research.

Hyland's (2005) model of metadiscourse is popularly employed in researches to uncover the interactional and interactive discourse markers in the text or the research data. Hyland's (2005) model of metadiscourse focuses on unity and coherence in a text which enables a better and comprehensive interaction between the text and the readers. Hina Gul, & Naveed-Ur-Rehman Khattak. (2021), presented a study which uncovered the use of language and its linguistic features in the Vice-chancellors' Messages posted on the websites of the private and public sector universities of Pakistan. The researchers from University of Mardan made a corpus containing Vice-Chancellor's messages from universities all over the Pakistan by using a corpus tool Antconc. (2014). They (ibid), then applied Hyland's (2005) model on it to know the specific features like hedges, commands, directives, verbs, etc. The result depicted that data was repleted with specific language that makes those messages as a sign of successful communication.

Taki, S. & Jafarpour, F. (2012), analyzed 120 English and Persian research articles in two disciplines of Chemistry and Sociology were analyzed for the purposes of cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary comparison. The comparative study enables the researchers to know the engagement markers used by academic writers of both disciplines. The results portrayed that the writers of both disciplines employ engagement markers in their writing but in articles centered on Sociology the use of such markers is enhanced.

Abdollazadeh (2003) has studied the interactive markers in the selected articles of Iranian native writes. He selected sixty-five articles and studied their last two parts i-e discussion and conclusion respectively. The study by Abdollazadeh (2003) analyzed the research articles published from 2000-2002 in the domain of linguistics and applied linguistics. The study found out that native writers have high tendency of using interaction markers as compared to the Iranian writers. Additionally, the interactive markers, boosters and attitude markers, are found in the academic articles of Anglo-American writers.

In the context of metadiscourse, another significant study is done by Salek and Yazdanimoghaddam (2014). They analyzed three set of corpora consisting of published research papers. The three corpora were labelled as native English writers (NE), native Persian writers (NP) and non-native English writers (NNE). The primary goal of the study was to study interactive markers in the corpora.

## Research Methodology and Framework:

The current research is centered on the Corpus of Pakistani Academic Writing which is developed by adding academic writings of Ph.D. students form different universities. In order to develop Corpus of Pakistani Academic Writing (COPAW), the researcher has selected disciplines to depict the features of Pakistani Academic Writing. . For this step, three disciplines are selected by the researcher i-e Humanities, Sciences, and Social Sciences on the basis of the vital academic work done in each of them.

This research focuses on diachronic interpretation of 180 dissertations of post graduate students (PhD.) The 180 thesis are from three main disciplines i-e Social Sciences, Humanities, and Sciences. The understudy dissertations encompass the features of academic writing and are recognized as separate academic register on the basis of their formal construction, sophisticated language, and symmetric organization. For the convenience and better analysis of metadiscourse features, the academic dissertations are further divided into three disciplines i-e Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities. Furthermore, the data is divided into research section of the included thesis. Thus, the division of corpus data is done twice, once on the basis of the discipline and secondly on the basis of the research sections. The corpus represents three disciplines in academic writing, i.e., Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities.

Hyland's *metadiscourse model* (2005b) is adopted for analysis of selected corpus, both interactive and interactional markers (such as hedges, self-mentions, engagement markers, attitude markers, and boosters) will be analyzed in the anticipation of offering implications for better understanding and constructing academic writing across disciplines. Hyland (2005b) defines metadiscourse as "*the cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interpersonal meanings in a text, assisting the writer (speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers as members of a particular community*" (p. 37). In other words they are resources used by writers to fulfill their organizational objectives, engage their readers, and voice their viewpoint to both their content and readers.

## Research Data/Disciplines:

This study aims to explore the three disciplines in terms of Hyland's metadiscourse model.

### 1. Sciences:

The discipline of science deals with the empirical study of data by following particular steps in order to get a logically correct theory which later becomes a law. In addition to these sciences deals with the development of scientific data through a scientific method. The scientific discipline is further divided into branches on the basis of nature of scientific approach and explored knowledge. Sciences hold a significant position in pedagogical process as well as in academic writing because it is ever-expanding and growing since its inception due to the vital and essential knowledge it is providing. Furthermore, the discipline of sciences is not restricted to its scientific division and disciplinary branches rather it has developed into multiple inter-disciplinary branches, multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary branches. Today, the research articles being written on the discipline of science are focusing on spread of global pandemics and their aftermath. Furthermore, researchers are also inclined towards the exploration of global ecological hazards and are interested in exploring the unexplored zones in their respective domain of science. The major notion of scientific academic papers is to bring scientific advancements and discoveries into the light.

### 2. Social Sciences:

The current study also focuses on the discipline of social sciences to uncover its metadiscourse. The discipline of social sciences is an academic field concerned with the examination of how society works and interacts in a culturally coordinated and organized way to ensure prosperity and economic growth. As this discipline is primarily concerned with the working and development of society that is why it is divided into multiple domains each concerning one pillar of society. The major sub-branches or fields of social sciences include, demography, economics, education, geography, anthropology and many others. Social sciences are a highly vital area of research and exploration in academic studies as they people and interaction of people in a society. The dissertation regarding social sciences studies the "science of the society" and explore different dimensions of society. Within the domain of Social Sciences, different cultural and societal aspects are explored so that the ways and lifestyle of a particular group of people can be read and understood.

### 3. Humanities:

In addition to the analysis of Social Sciences and Sciences, this study also explores the diachronic dissertation of another discipline known as Humanities. Humanities majorly deals with the study of core subjects that are part of human civilization from its beginning. It also focuses on the new and innovative domains of knowledge that are being introduced because of the information explosion and influence of other domains. Humanities encompasses all essential subjects that humans have developed, studied and explored from their early settlements to the latest developments. Therefore, it includes variety of subjects like English, Urdu, Fine Arts, History, Religion, Media, etc. The basic distinction between humanities and other disciplines lies in the fact that humanities focus on descriptive knowledge with is mostly subjective in nature while other disciplines like sciences focuses on objective and empirical knowledge. The researches in humanities focus on the describing of a subject and outlining the key notions that build it. It is true to say that humanities throw light on the culture and language of a society and studies the major pillars of a society critically.

## Analysis of the Language used across disciplines in Pakistani Dissertations

### 1.1 Results of the chi square test on diachronic variation of interactional markers across disciplines:

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1745.981[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1826.975 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1554.866 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 19567 | | |
| Phi | .299 | | .000 |
| Cramer's V | .211 | | .000 |

*Table .1.1 Chi-Square for Hedges across Disciplines*

The Chi-Square tests presented in the table assess the relationship between hedge usage across different academic disciplines (Social Sciences, Sciences, and Humanities) over time. The Pearson Chi-Square value is 1745.981 with 4 degrees of freedom (df) and a significance level (Asymp. Sig.) of .000, indicating that there is a statistically significant relationship between hedge usage and the disciplines across decades. The Likelihood Ratio (1826.975) further supports this conclusion with the same level of significance. The Linear-by-Linear Association test, with a value of 1554.866 and a significance level of .000, suggests a strong linear relationship

between hedge usage and the variables analyzed (disciplines and time). The Phi coefficient (.299) and Cramer's V (.211) measure the strength of association between the variables. Both are statistically significant (p = .000), with Cramer's V indicating a moderate association between disciplines and hedge usage over time.
Overall, these results confirm a significant and moderately strong relationship between the use of hedges and the academic disciplines over the decades, highlighting that hedge usage varies systematically across Social Sciences, Sciences, and Humanities during the periods analyzed.

**Table 1.2: Chi-Square Tests for Boosters Across Disciplines**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 210.907[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 213.636 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 62.892 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 3780 | | |
| Phi | .236 | | .000 |
| Cramer's V | .167 | | .000 |

*Table 1. 2 Chi-Square for Boosters across Disciplines*

The Chi-Square tests conducted across various disciplines revealed a statistically significant association between the variables examined. The Pearson Chi-Square statistic was 210.907 with 4 degrees of freedom, yielding an asymptotic significance (p-value) of .000, indicating strong evidence against the null hypothesis of independence. Similarly, the Likelihood Ratio also supported this finding, with a value of 213.636 and a p-value of .000. The Linear-by-Linear Association further confirmed the trend with a statistic of 62.892, again with a significance level of .000. The effect size measures also indicated a moderate association between the variables, with a Phi coefficient of .236 and Cramer's V of .167, both with p-values of .000. The total number of valid cases analyzed in this study was 3,780. Overall, these results suggest a significant relationship between the examined factors across the disciplines studied.

**Table 1.3: Chi-Square Tests for Engagement Markers Across Disciplines**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1407.604[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1398.895 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1216.386 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 28748 | | |
| Phi | .221 | | .000 |
| Cramer's V | .156 | | .000 |

*Table 1.3 Chi-Square for Engagement Markers across Disciplines*

The results of the Chi-Square tests for engagement markers across disciplines indicate a statistically significant association among the observed frequencies of engagement markers in Social Sciences, Sciences, and Humanities. The Pearson Chi-Square value is 1407.604, with 4 degrees of freedom and a p-value of .000, suggesting that the likelihood of observing such a distribution by chance is virtually nonexistent. This indicates a strong relationship between the academic disciplines and their engagement markers. The likelihood ratio also confirms this finding, with a value of 1398.895 and the same p-value of .000, reinforcing the conclusion of a significant association. The linear-by-linear association statistic (1216.386, p = .000) further highlights a consistent trend across the decades in how engagement markers are distributed among the disciplines. The effect size measures, Phi (.221) and Cramer's V (.156), indicate a moderate association between the disciplines and engagement markers. Cramer's V, in particular, provides a useful measure for understanding the strength of this relationship, suggesting that while the association is significant, there is still room for exploration of additional factors influencing engagement across these disciplines. Overall, these findings highlight the importance of analyzing engagement markers in educational research and their varying distributions across different academic fields.

**Table 1..2: Chi-Square Tests for Self-Mentions Across Disciplines**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 287.477[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 292.636 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 20.865 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 28302 | | |
| Phi | .101 | | .000 |
| Cramer's V | .071 | | .000 |

*Table 1. 4 Chi-Square for Self-Mentions across Disciplines*

The Chi-Square tests for self-mentions across disciplines indicate a statistically significant association between the frequencies of self-mentions in Social Sciences, Sciences, and Humanities. The Pearson Chi-Square value is 287.477, with 4 degrees of freedom and a p-value of .000. This result suggests that the distribution of self-mentions across these academic fields is not due to random chance, but rather reflects meaningful differences in how self-references are utilized within each discipline. The likelihood ratio, which is 292.636 with the same p-value of .000, supports this conclusion, indicating a consistent trend across disciplines. The linear-by-linear association statistic of 20.865 (p = .000) further emphasizes that there is a systematic relationship between the decades and the discipline-specific frequencies of self-mentions, suggesting an evolving pattern over time. In terms of effect size, the Phi coefficient is .101, and Cramer's V is .071. These values indicate a small to moderate association between self-mentions and the disciplines, suggesting that while there is a statistically significant relationship, the practical significance may be limited. Cramer's V, which is often used to assess the strength of association in categorical data, indicates that the relationship is weak.

Overall, the findings suggest that self-mentions are significantly associated with the disciplines studied, reflecting disciplinary norms and practices. The results could guide further research into how self-referential language varies among disciplines and over time, providing insights into academic writing styles and self-presentation in scholarly work. This analysis could also contribute to understanding the evolving landscape of academic communication and how different fields adopt and adapt self-referential practices.

**Table 1..2: Chi-Square Tests for Attitude Markers Across Disciplines**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 37.004[a] | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 37.332 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.455 | 1 | .228 |
| N of Valid Cases | 3348 | | |
| Phi | .105 | | .000 |
| Cramer's V | .074 | | .000 |

*Table 1. 5 Chi-Square for Attitude Markers across Disciplines*

The Chi-Square tests for attitude markers across disciplines indicate a statistically significant relationship between the frequencies of engagement markers in Social Sciences, Sciences, and Humanities. The Pearson Chi-Square value is 37.004 with 4 degrees of freedom and a p-value of .000. This result suggests that the observed distribution of engagement markers across these academic disciplines is unlikely to have occurred by chance, indicating a meaningful association. The likelihood ratio, which is 37.332, also confirms this finding with the same p-value of .000, reinforcing the conclusion that there is a significant relationship between the disciplines and their respective engagement markers. However, the linear-by-linear association statistic is 1.455 with a p-value of .228, indicating that there is no significant trend over the decades. This suggests that while there is an overall association among the disciplines, the changes in engagement markers do not follow a consistent linear trend across the time periods analyzed.

In terms of effect size, the Phi coefficient is .105, and Cramer's V is .074. Both values suggest a small effect size, indicating a weak association between engagement markers and academic disciplines. Cramer's V, specifically, suggests that the relationship is not strong, and while statistically significant, it may not have substantial practical implications.

Overall, these results indicate that engagement markers are distributed differently across the three academic disciplines, but the relationship is weak and does not follow a clear trend over time. This finding could encourage further exploration into the factors influencing engagement markers in different fields of study and the implications for academic writing practices.

The results of Chi-square indicate that interactional markers—such as hedges, boosters, engagement markers, self-mentions, and attitude markers—vary significantly across disciplines, , revealing distinct academic conventions and evolving communicative practices.

## Discussion of the findings:

The analysis of the interactional markers in various dissertations across three discipline reveal the usage of different kinds of discourse markers.

### 1. Hedges across Discipline, Social Sciences, 1991-2000

***Example 1***

*"This is* may be *due to the reason that experienced educational administrators at a certain stage of their professional life start using their personal experience and intuition." (Text, 2(5))*

**Example 2**
*"Decision making describes the process through which a course of action is selected as the solution to a specific problem. Home makers are sometimes sensitive to certain types of problems and opportunities can sometimes be an advantage as they* may be *aware of possibilities that others in the family ignore." (text 4(2))*

**2. Boosters Across Discipline, Social Sciences, 1991-2000**
**Example 1**
*"Table 13 clearly exhibits the data that the result due to lack of planning organization and taking decisions instantly was that 63% of the respondents reports' that they had no control over their expenditure, where as those respondents who were budgeting (18.75%), out of which 17% had full control over their budget an expenditure and 1.75% (who were budgeting) and plus 20% of respondents have medium control." (text, 3(4))*

**Example 2**
*"To know what to do is not the same thing as knowing how to do it. It is, of course, important----indeed indispensable--that a faculty, especially its leadership, know clearly the changes they desire to make in the educational programme. Unless the changes are clearly understood in terms of the practical operations they require and in terms of the direction in which they lead, a faculty need not be surprised if its effort go astray." (text, 6(3))*

**3. Engagement Markers Across Discipline, Social Sciences, 1991-2000**
**Example 1**
*"There should be a separate IT cell in the proposed Libraries, documentation centers, clearing houses, referral centers, information centers, information analysis centers, and data centers are also the key organizational units of a national information system in education." (text, 4(2))*
**Example 2**
*"For adopting to the process of budgeting it is very important that it should be planned on the basis of MBO (Management By Objectives). All the fixed and flexible expenditures should be written and a detailed account keeping is followed." (text, 4(5))*
**Example 3**
*"From this concept, they proposed two important hypotheses:*
*1. When a person who has migrated moves again, he or she should favor some former place of residence as the destination because the person has location-specific capital there.*
*2. The longer the absence, however, the weaker should be the propensity to return, because most location-specific capital depreciates in value, (p.8)." (text, 8(2))*

**4. Self-Mentions Across Discipline, Social Sciences, 1991-2000**
**Example 1**
*"He wanted to paint bones of nature, the robust structure hidden beneath the shallow surface.* We *all know about the value of his art. He enjoys the same position among artists that Goethe enjoys among the poets." (text, 12(1))*
**Example 2**
*"Compare Cezanne with Klee or Mondrian.* We *find that the eternal shining gaze of sun god Apollo is more vivid in Cezanne's creation. On the other hand Apollo is completely missing in Klee and Mondrian." (text, 12(1))*

**5. Attitude Markers Across Discipline, Sciences, 1991-2000**
**Example 1**
*"One of the major arguments against START II put forward by Russian critics is that the agreement would require Russia to eliminate the principal component of its deterrent force— MIRVed ICBMs—while it would allow the United States to retain the key element of its deterrent force: SLBMs. As a result, Russia would* have to *go through the costly and difficult process of restructuring its strategic triad; while the United States could keep its triad intact, including the forces in which it enjoyed technological superiority over Russia.." (text, 11(2))*
**Example 2**
*"This is followed by the arrival of rainy season during which the vegetation grows in abundance and the animal is in a position to take large amounts of food to increase its body food reserves partly in the form of glycogen but mostly in the form of huge fat deposits.' It is further suggested that abundance of vegetation restricts the animal's movement in the field as it does not* have to *move for long distances in search of food." (text, 15(3))*
**Example 3**
*"For Pakistan the entire system of public personnel management needed fundamental changes. A system would* have to *be designed to attract, retain, reward and motivate professionally competent, dedicated responsible and creative public servants. New methods of criteria would* have to *be devised for recruitment*

*and selection, training and development, performance appraisal, promotion and salary administration." (text, 4(1))*

## Results and Findings of the study:

In this study, the data is studied and concluded across disciplines i-e art and humanities, sciences, and social sciences. Hyland's model (2005b) is applied by the researcher see the variations that have taken place in Pakistani English academic writing over time and to examine the data diachronically. The diachronic analysis across the disciplines shows an amalgam of traditional academic writing trends and global writing patterns. The decline in engagement markers and self-mentions suggests a unique period where Pakistani academic writing favored objectivity and detachment, which diverges from the steady increase in reader-inclusive practices observed internationally. Furthermore, the significant increase in booster use in Sciences in the final decade contrasts with previous trends and may reflect a shift towards a more assertive presentation of empirical research, influenced by international standards that emphasize strong argumentation. The changes indicate Pakistani academia is progressively adopting global trends, while adhering with the traditional formality. In conclusion, the analysis across disciplines reveals the progressive evolution of Pakistani academic writing in line with Hyland's (2005) model. They also uncover the unique diachronic adaptations present in Pakistani academic writing along with the presence of global trends. To conclude, the findings, reveal that Pakistani academic writing is growing with an addition of cautious, assertive, and engaging language features across disciplines.

## References:

1. Hyland (2002b). Directives: argument and engagement in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics* 23 (2): 215–239.
2. Hyland (2002c). What do they mean? Questions in academic writing. *Text* 22 (4): 529–557.
3. Hyland, K (2004). Graduates‟ gratitude: the generic structure of dissertation acknowledgements. *English for Specific Purposes* 23: 303–324
4. Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 30,437-455.
5. Hyland, K. (1994). Hedging in academic writing and EAP textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes, 13,* 239-256.
6. Hyland, K. (1994). Hedging in academic writing and EAP textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes, 13,* 239-256.
7. Sahragard, R. & Yazdanpanahi, S. (2017), English Engagement Markers: A Comparison of Humanities and Science Journal Articles. *Language Art*,2(1): pp. 111-130.http://doi: 10.22046/LA.2017.06