# International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

# The Interactional Discourse Markers in Friday Speeches in Jordanian Arabic

**¹ Anas Albawareed, ² Mahmoud Nassar**
1, 2 Jordanian Ministry of Education, Amman, Jordan

Corresponding Author: **Mahmoud Nassar**

## Abstract

The present study aims to investigate the discourse markers in Friday speeches in Jordan.Twenty Friday religious speeches were selected from different speech orators.The collection of these speeches was recorded and transcribed for each speech. The researchers underlined and highlighted the discourse markers employed in these speeches individually. The researchers found that the attitude markers were the most frequent stance feature, with 97 occurrences, followed by engagement markers, which occurred 78 times in 20 religious' speeches. Hedges came third with 23 occurrences followed by boosters with 21 occurrences. The least used stance marker was self-mentions with 20 occurrences.

## 1. Introduction

Religious discourse speakers normally exploit a wide range of linguistic features to impact the audience toward religious intended messages. Researchers have devoted much attention to the use of meta-discourse markers in different genres but very few studies have been turned to religious discourse, particularly orator speeches. Speech orators use interactional discourse markers unintentionally to grab the attention of the audience though they play a pivotal role in grabbing the attention of the listeners. Hyland (2005, p. 37) [12] defined discourse marker as "the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express viewpoint and engage with readers as members of a particular community."It seems interesting to investigate the use of such discourse markers in the speeches of religious orators who purposefully attempt to deliver their religious messages convincingly. To this end, the researchers attempt to figure out the role of discourse markers to help orators affect the audience and constitute some sort of engagement with their listeners.

Researchers have recently pointed out that discourse markers do not only link clauses or sentences but also, they could carry various discourse and communicative functions in different spoken or writtendiscourses. Interestingly, the manipulation of these linguistic devices could unveil the secrets of success behind the use of these markers to leave specific impacts upon receivers. As such, some writers or speakers use such linguistic devices intentionally to build up mutually comprehensible bridges with their readers or listeners. For instance, Hyland (2004) suggested that meta-discourse features play a vital role in assisting writers or speakers to use them effectively to convince the audience.

More recently, Hyland (2015, p. 3) [13] pointed out the difference between interactive and interactional discourse markers:

> The former is concerned with ways of organizing discourse and reflects the writer's assessment of what needs to be made explicit to constrain and guide what should be recovered from the text. The latter concerns the writer's efforts to control the level of personality in a text and establish a suitable relationship to his or her data, arguments, and audience, marking the degree of intimacy, the expression of attitude, the communication of commitments, and the extent of reader involvement.

It is worth noting that both interactional and interactive discourse markers work in parallel to formulate a sort of interrelationship between the writer or speaker and the reader or listener and help to affect the delivered messages to the audience. This paper focuses on the interactional markers to stand on the influences these markers leave on religious audiences particularly. Though these markers spread in the text intentionally or spontaneously, they could reflect specific communicative meanings. Consequently, Arab religious orators are more likely to resort to these markers to address the audience and grab their attention.

In literature, discourse makers show purposefully communicative functions employed in various genres particularly research paper abstracts, to name but a few (Sokolik, 2003, Alotaibi, 2015, Hyland 2015, El-Dakhs, 2018) [16, 5, 13, 7]. The significance of this study arises from the fact that this genre is relatively under research. This study endeavors to find out the stance and engagement markers employed in religious speeches (i.e. orating). Narrowly, the study attempts to figure out the frequencies of interactional discourse markers in Arabic religious orating speeches, a newly discussed genre. The study seeks to find answers to the following research questions:

1. How do Arabic religious orators express their stance and engagement with their audience?
2. To what extent do Arabic religious orators use interactional strategies to address the audience?

## 2. Literature review
### 2.1 Meta-discourse in academic research
Not a long time ago, researchers observed the significance of discourse markers in academic research papers and the rhetorical functions they perform to establish some sort of interaction between writers and readers. About this, Sokolik (2003, p. 88) [16] proposed that academic writers aim to satisfy themselves by addressing their intrinsic desires to express their ideas and to satisfy their readers who are always critical of the way ideas are expressed. This could imply that writers use meta-discourse markers to meet readers' expectations in a particular field.

Akinci (2016) [1] conducted a study on the use of stance-marking devices in the writings of student writers and professional academic writers. The study was corpus-based and hence explored writings in two disciplines, namely Civil Engineering and Applied Linguistics. The results stated that student writers exploited more stance markers than professional academic writers. It also showed that articles in applied linguistics included more stance-marking devices in comparison with those found in Civil Engineering. This means that the professionality of the writer and the audience mostly act on the use of rhetorical features employed in research work. Consequently, the sort of academic community has a pivotal role in affecting the style of the researchers to disseminate research results and recommendations.

Alghazo *et al*. (2021) [3] have paid attention to the genre of research abstracts. They particularly examined the grammatical devices of the stance used in research article abstracts in two fields namely applied linguistics (AL) and literature (L). The findings of the study showed that abstracts in AL employed more hedges than abstracts in L. Instead, writers of L abstracts relied more on boosters since the researchers in this field seem to be subjective and mostly critical to capture the attention of the audience, whereas writers in AL depend on the statistical results to grab the attention of readership influentially. The study also concluded that L abstracts utilized five types of stance adverbials, to mention but a few prepositional phrases, and adverbial clauses; whereas AL corpus used only two types, namely single adverbs and adverb phrases along with hedges.

Dunya and Seena (2021) explored the frequency of both interactive and interactional meta-discourse in literary discourse. The findings demonstrated that the most frequently used interactive marker is transition in critical

essays, which is mainly used to achieve persuasive effects on readers. This device provides the reader with the opportunity to share their attitudes in the exposed arguments. It also revealed that critical essay writers relied more on self-mention markers to highlight their attitudes toward the content of literary works.

Meta-discourse markers potentially reflect an essential role in the semantic core of the overall text. In this regard, Schfrinne (1980) [15] proposed that metalanguage markers are used to express referential and expressive meaning and they could imply expressive or symbolic sense depending on the context they are used. Furthermore, Farghal and Kalakh (2019) [8] investigated the translation of interactional meta-discourse markers in American presidential debates. The researchers pointed out the importance of these markers to engage listeners and grab the attention of the audience in such political discourses. Therefore, the study found that the erroneous translation of these discourse makers negatively changes the intended messages that are delivered to the audience due to the first language interference. This took place as the Arabic language is considered a highly inflective language.

Al-Ghoweri and Al Kayed (2019) [2] conducted a study on the impact of language on the use of hedges and boosters found in Jordanian and English economic newspaper articles. The outcomes proved that language does play a pivotal role in the type of discourse markers used in such articles. For example, English articles employed the boosting device, namely amplifiers the most, whereas the Jordanian ones utilized emphatic as the most boosting device in Arai and Alghad newspapers.

Meta-discourse features are more likely instruments by which writers manipulate them to achieve specific purposes and turn the audience's attention toward them. Hyland (2004) conducted a study on the use of meta-discourse features on 20 MA theses and 20 PhD dissertations. The findings revealed that PhD dissertations used meta-discourse features more frequently than MA theses. This dominance has to do with the fact that the former writers are required to write long elaborate arguments discursively to satisfy a particular academic community. PhD writers relied more on transitions, code glosses, and frame markers to illustrate their arguments comprehensibly.

It is worth mentioning that researchers tackled meta-discourse markers contrastively. The purpose is to acknowledge the linguistic realizations of these markers across languages. For example, Friginal and Mustafa (2017) [9] found out that US-Iraqi researchers have been widely influenced by the country they live in. Consequently, researchers in US-based countries outweigh researchers based in Iraq in the use of verbal features, namely auxiliary verbs, predictive adjectives, and stance-to-complement clauses controlled by adjectives. This could imply that the former researchers more likely tend to imitate the writing techniques of US-based researchers. Similarly, Xu and Nesi (2019) [14] investigated engagement resources employed in 30 research articles, particularly the introduction and conclusion sections. The analysis revealed that Chinese researchers based in the UK utilized denying/countering objections more frequently than the Chinese writers based in China did. However, the latter researchers relied on contract markers more strikingly than the former researchers did. One possible reason for this has been associated with cultural implications in which UK writers tend to open the

space for further debate and discussions.

Some studies attempt to unveil the correspondence between authors and receivers using meta-discourse markers as a means to link the two parties together. Hyland and Tse (2004, p.161) argue that " all meta-discourse is interpersonal in that it takes account of the reader's knowledge, textual experience and processing needs and that it provides writers with an armory of rhetorical appeals to achieve this,". Practically, Zare and Tavakoli (2016) explored the functions of personal meta-discourse expressions in two different modes namely academic monologues and dialogues. The findings proposed that the number of meta-discourse markers in dialogue outweighed those found in monologue due to the properties of the nature of the conditions of this mode in which the presence of the audience invites speakers as well as listeners to exchange the interactions and hence increasing the use of metadiscourse markers. Additionally, the researcher inferred that since the participants were non-native speakers of English, there has been an increase in the use of metalinguistic references (i.e. word choice, word forms…) to ensure comprehension on the behalf of the receivers. Camiciottoli (2004) [6], in this respect, investigated three modes of speech: NS guest, NNS guest, and MITACASE corpus of normal lecturers. The analysis of the study showed that NNS guest speakers resorted to explicative verbs like explain to ensure comprehension. They also relied on particular pronouns; I/we/you and will patterns to reinforce interpersonal relationships with the receivers. Nevertheless, MITACASE lecturers tended to reflect an exceptional preference for phonological reductions like wanna, gonna, and lemme to create a common reciprocal interrelationship toward the audience. In spoken academic discourse, Thompson (2003) [17] scrutinized meta-discourse in academic structure and its role in the organization of the information. The findings concluded that EAP talks have enjoyed more discourse markers than authentic lectures. One possible reason for this is that the former talk puts into consideration the significance of these markers to organize the ideas and hence become more comprehensible to the audience. On the other hand, authentic lecturers used them less frequently as they were aware of the familiarity of the discussed topic.

## 3. Methodology
### 3.1 Data collection
Twenty Friday religious speeches were selected from different speech orators. These weekly religious speeches are chosen because they are worldly religious representative discourse in their respective countries (i.e. Jordan). The collection of these speeches was recorded and transcribed. The researchers underlined and highlighted the discourse markers employed in these speeches individually. The chosen speeches were recorded in different regions of Jordan between 2020 and 2021. A variety of the selected speeches might help to catch a more up-to-date clue about the data and metadiscoursal trends in the recorded religious speeches. These speeches discussed a variety of different religious topics and recent issues related to the latest events. Orators in these speeches shared a similar average length, and they included a very similar number of words. The speeches were written manually by the researchers. After that, each speech was placed in a separate file to prepare for the analysis. The corpora totaled (40129) words.

### 3.2 Data Analysis
The present study adopted a mixed-method approach—using both quantitative and qualitative methods—to analyze the data. This approach could help the researchers work on the numerical outcomes along with the contextual explanations of metadiscourse employed in the text. Interestingly, this way facilitates the process of analysis to connect the percentages with the uses of these markers in lively exemplified situations. On the quantitative part of the analysis, the metadiscoursal items were highlighted and detected in each speech. Frequencies and percentages of the metadiscoursal categories were calculated, and a statistical analysis was conducted to explore the significant uses of these markers in the corpus. In the qualitative part of the analysis, examples were presented, read in context, and interpreted accordingly. The analysis was also functional. Hyland (2019, p. 28) argues that, in the functional approach to metadiscourse, "the emphasis is … on meanings in context, how language is used, not what a dictionary says about it." Putting this in mind, the analysis started by listening to the downloaded speeches, writing them on a sheet of paper, and underlining metadiscoursal elements. Checking each word within its context was necessary to make sure that the word performs a metadiscoursal function in this setting. Each metadiscoursal marker was highlighted manually.

As for the statistical analysis, a list of Arabic words and expressions was collected to represent the metadiscoursal items. The next step was identifying the metadiscoursal items in the speeches and calculating the frequencies of each category. The quantitative analysis of the data was done by running some statistical tests using SPSS. The initial step was obtaining the percentages and frequencies of each interactional metadiscourse resource in the speeches. The next step was to send these words and expressions to an expert in this field who is an associate professor in applied linguistics at the University of Jordan to maximize the reliability of the results. The expert sent some necessary amendments to the assigned metadiscourse markers extracted from the religious speeches. The researchers did them accordingly. The final step was sending the results to an expert in statistical analysis to detect frequencies and percentages.

## 4. Findings and discussion
This section reflects the results and discussions of the way religious orators use discourse markers to engage listeners with the content of their speeches. To answer the research questions of this study, an insightful examination of the employed discourse markers has been conducted. As mentioned in the methodology section, the frequencies and percentages of interactional metadiscourse markers in the speeches were calculated. The quantitative analysis of the data shows the classifications of the interactional metadiscourse markers used thoroughly by speech orators. On the other hand, in the qualitative analysis of the data, some examples and possible interpretations were illustrated and pointed out regarding the category of the interactional metadiscourse marker. In presenting the findings, frequencies are counted per one thousand words which is a convention in metadiscourse studies (see Hyland, 1998, 1999; Noorian and Biria, 2010; Fu and Hyland, 2014; Liu and Zhang, 2021; Wu and Paltridge, 2021).

**Table 1:** Stance and engagement markers in religious speeches

| Religious speeches | Hedges | Boosters | Attitude markers | Self-mentions | Engagement markers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 23 (10%) | 21 (9%) | 97 (41%) | 20 (8%) | 78 (33%) |
| | 39198 | 39198 | 39198 | 39198 | 39198 |
| Per 1000 words | 0.59% | 0.54% | 2.47% | 0.51% | 1.99% |

Table (1) shows the frequencies and percentages of stance and engagement markers employed in Friday religious speeches in Jordanian Arabic (JA). Attitude markers were the most frequent stance feature, with 97 occurrences with 41 % of the markers and 2.47 % per 1000 words. This was followed by engagement markers, which occurred 78 times in 20 religious speeches with 33 % of the markers and 1.99 % per 1000 words. Hedges come in third place with 23 occurrences with 10 % of the markers and 0.59 % per 1000 words. Boosters occurred 21 with 9 % of the markers and 0.54 % per 1000 words. The least used stance marker was self-mentions with 20 occurrences with 8 % of the markers and 0.51 % per 1000 words. These quantitative findings have been accompanied by illustrative examplesunder each category of interactional discourse marker.

## 4.1 Attitude markers
Hyland (2005: 180) [12] proposed that attitude markers express the affective mood of the writer toward the proposition. The use of these makers helps speakers or writers to convey attitude to propositions, conveying surprise, agreement, importance, frustration, and so on, rather than commitment. In other words, these makers embody the intentional highlight of the writer or the speaker toward a particular intended meaning.As noted in Table (1), attitude markers were the most frequently used marker in this particularly religious discourse (i.e. Friday religious speeches). Some examples of attitude markers are translated literally into English as follows:

1. ان من اعظم ما يحبه الله من عباده ان يكرموا عباده

   'One of the greatest worships that Allah loves is to honor his worshipers.'

2. الصدقة من اعجب الاسرار عند الله عزوجل. نحن اليوم احوج ما نحتاج الى هذا العمل الصالح

   'Charity donation is one of the greatest secrets toward Allah. Today we are in great need of this rewarding good work.'

3. الى اتباع سيدنا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم أصحاب القلوب البيضاء تعاونوا على البر و التقوى

   'To the followers of our master Muhammad, peace be upon him, people of white hearts, cooperate on righteousness and piety.'

4. قول هذا كيلو رز لوجه الله انت ما تدري قديش اجرها عند الله

   'Say this is a kilo of rice for the sake of Allah. You don't know how much the price to Allah is.'

5. نحن اذا وقفنا مع التاريخ فانه يقول لنا بان علمائنا يفهمون هذا القانون

   'If we stand with history, it tells us that our scientists

understand this law.'

It is clear that the sense of attitudeis self-evident by using the superlative form 'greatest' and the use of the first plural pronouns such as 'we'. The use of the superlative form gives an emphatic degree to the assigned view. It also maximizes the attention of the listeners toward specific religious thoughts and perspectives. Additionally, the use of the first plural pronoun triggers listeners to the circle of accountability and hence becoming more involved in the commitment of the proposition.

## 4.2 Engagement markers
Hyland (2005) [12] stressed the notion of engagement markers is more likely connected with the bridge of comprehensibility between the writer and the reader to point that they can mutually understand the same thought. He pointed out that writers successfully use these markers when they convince readers to be participants in the argument and guide them to the needed interpretation. These markers come in second place. As such, Friday speech orators rely on engagement markers to shed light on specific religious perspectives (turn the interest of listeners toward intended religious perspectives and thus becoming increasingly aware of the). To put it differently, these markers assist religious speakers tokeep listeners completely aware of the delivered religious messages. This tendency intensifies the role of these markers to monitor the audience to the necessarily appealing religious messages. The following examples illustrate these markers:

6. أتدري الصدقة متى تتضاعف قيمتها

   Do you know when charity doubles in its value?

7. لماذا نذهب الى المحاكم اليوم وكل المشاكل اليوم بسبب الميراث؟

   'Why do we go to court today and all the problems today because of inheritance?'

8. هل نحن اليوم يحب بعضنا البعض؟

   'Do we love each other today?'

9. لماذا يا امام تتوكأ على العصا و انت لست ضعيف؟

   'Why, Imam, (someone who is a model for Muslims) lean on the stick when you're not weak?'

10. ألسنا في هذا الزمن بحاجة الى ان نقوي بعضنا البعض؟

    'Don't we need to strengthen each other?'

It seems obvious that Friday speech orators repeatedly employ questioning strategies (words) to engage listeners with their arguments. This strategy (tendency) acts as a means to bring the view of the speaker and the listeners closer. It also makes the argument conjure in the mind of the listeners and thus start to find solutions (approximate the arguments to the same direction).

## 4.3 Hedges
Hyland (2005) [12] considered hedges as devices in which the writers or speakers stand away from the commitment of the proposition. This sort of uncertainty invites each party to

share the argument differently. In this way (As such), reasoning decides the winning party to persuade the other of the success of its argument. This conflict between the two parties makes rationality the master of the situation and thus helps to disseminate knowledge and the power of persuasion as a means of overcoming controversial issues.As noted in the table above, religious speakers usehedges less frequently than the previous markers as they mostly talk about facts extracted from the holy Qur'an and quoted speeches. The following examples illustrate this feature:

11.  **جيل الإباء في هذا العصر ربما انهم من اكثر الناس ضغوطا .**

'The generation of parents in this age is <u>probably</u> one of the most stressed people.'

12.  **اعمال البعض كما يحسبها البعض ليست قاصرة على اعمال اخروية فقط**

'The actions of <u>some</u>, as <u>some</u> think, are not limited to day after works.'

13.  **ان اجتياح روسيا لأوكرانيا يمكن ان يتحول الى حرب عالم**

'Russia's invasion of Ukraine <u>could</u> turn into a world war.'

14.  **قبل سنوات كان يجي بعض الشباب يتطوع بعد ما شاف المجازر في سوريا.**

'Years ago <u>some</u> young people came to volunteer after seeing the Massacres in Syria.'

15.  **بعض الناس يتلو القران ولا روح له**

'<u>Some</u> people recite the Quran and there is no soul for him.'

## 4.4 Boosters

Hyland (2005: 179) [12] defined boosters as words like, obviously, and demonstrate, which allow writers to express their certainty in what they say and to mark involvement with the topic and solidarity with their audience. These markers turn the attention of the audience toward specific thoughts thus ensuring concern with what the writer or speakers aims to focus on. Consequently, readers or listeners begin to calculate the significance of that view to side with or stand against it. However, boosters were infrequently used feature in religious speeches. The following are illustrative examples of boosters that were employed in Friday religious speeches:

16.  **لابد للإنسان من ساعة يغادر فيها هذه الدنيا**

'A man <u>must</u> leave this world at any time.'

17.  **لابد ان يبنى الصلح على العدل**

'Reconciliation <u>must</u> be built on justice.'

18.  **لابد لنا في هذه الخطبة ان نعي ما لنا و ما علينا**

In this sermon, we <u>must</u> be aware of what we have and what we have to do.

19.  **المشتاق يعلم يقينا ان رمضان امنية الأموات**

'A truly Muslim <u>knows for sure</u> that Ramadan is the wish of the dead.'

20.  **لابد ان تجمعنا علاقة المحبة**

'We <u>have to</u> have a relationship of love.'

In these examples, the religious speakers relied on deontic modality to turn the attention of listeners to deliver religious messages as these models reflect the sense of duty toward societal norms and traditions. In example (16), the speakerutilizedsome obligatory modality forms such as 'must' and 'have to' to emphasize the degree of commitment to abide by the content of the proposition. This feature illuminates some sort of certainty and necessity in which listeners are required to respond accordingly. It also assists speakers to build up canonical relationships with listeners toward obligatory religious issues.

## 4.5 Self-mention

Hyland (2005) [12] suggested that the voice of the author can be manifested to representhis/her attitude or stance on the intended view. This feature mostly hides in science articles as they mainly concentrate on the phenomenon (purely scientific facts).In contrast, in Friday religious speeches, self-mentions were the least used feature as Friday speakers avoid representing their personal perspectives to the audience but they mainly aim at pointing religious perspectives specifically. Below are some examples that show this feature:

21.  **انا ادعو الجميع في شعبان تتبعوا المحاويج**

<u>I</u> invite everyone in Shaaban to search for poor people.

22.  **أريد ان اخذ بأيديكم الى الجنة .**

'<u>I</u> want to take your hands to heaven.'

23.  **في هذه الخطبة علينا ان نعرف هذه المفاهيم**

In this speech, <u>we</u> need to know these concepts.

24.  **انا أقول للشباب لو انك وضعت مصحفك في جيبك زي الموبايل .**

'<u>I</u> say to the young people if you put your Quran in your pocket like a mobile.'

25.  **من رحمة الله بهذه الامة ان جعل لنا مواسم للطاعة .**

'It is Allah's mercy of this nation to offer <u>us</u> seasons of obedience.'

In these examples, Friday speakers used singular and plural first personal pronouns to express sincere advisability on behalf of the addressees. This feature puts the speaker in the same position that the audience experience hence becoming closer to the audience intimately. The scarcity of this feature could imply that Friday orators detach themselves from the delivered verbal discourse and particularly stick to the intended religious messages. This tendency touches the sense of seriousness and sincerity of the delivered points.

This piece of research attempts to fill a gap in the literature to examine the role of interactional discourse markers

employed in the genre of religious discourse mainly weekly Islamic speeches (i.e. Khutba). The findings of the study showed that Islamic weekly orators used all sorts of these discourse markers to engage their listeners when delivering religious messages. This tendency could imply that the use of these markers plays a significant role in raising the attention of the audience toward the delivered speeches. Consequently, the findings ensure that Islamic orators have dominantly turned to attitude markers to leave a great effect on the audience.

In the academic field, Akinci (2016) [1] pointed out that writers in applied linguistics utilized more stance markers than writers in Civil Engineering. The study seems to be congruent with the results of the present study as both Friday orators and researchers in applied linguistics aim at employing stance markers to convince the audience of the validity of the presented arguments whereas researchers in Civil Engineering less frequently employed these markers to address their audience. This means that the use of discourse markers not only plays a major role to grab the attention of the addressees. Instead, they could actively assist speakers to prompt listeners to actively participate in the content of the discourse. Similarly, Alghazo *et al.* (2021) [3] have examined the use of these markers in research abstracts. The results of the study stressed that abstracts in Applied Linguistics employed more hedges than abstracts in literature. This outcome assimilates the present study in that like researcher in Applied Linguistics; Friday orators heavily relied on discourse markers to meet the expectations of their listeners and hence influence their attitudes attentively.

Furthermore, Dunya and Seena (2021) have suggested that critical essay writers tended to use self-mention markers the most to ensure an intimate relationship with their readers. However, the results of the current study showed that self-mention markers were the least used. This means that Friday orators purposefully concentrate on delivering religious perspectives resurfacing impersonally. In this way, Al-Ghoweri and Alkayed (2019) [2] explored the role of language in the use of discourse markers in that English articles used amplifiers the most while Jordanian ones heavily relied on emphatic markers to engage readers toward the content. Similarly, the present study showed that weekly speech orators devoted much attention to attitude markers to raise the level of interest of listeners and made them immersed in the content of the speeches.

Interestingly, researchers have illuminated the influence of discourse markers on the audience. For instance, Farghal and Kalakh (2019) [8] went further to examine the use of interactional markers on presidential discourse. The findings stated that the erroneous translation of these markers has changed the intended meaning thus causing misunderstanding. Similarly, weekly speech orators tend to use interactional markers carefully since the misuse or manipulation of such markers could negatively reveal inappropriate religious messages. Therefore, the use of these markers might cause cultural or religious shock between the sender and receivers. This means that users of interactional markers need constantly to weigh up subtle differences in meaning when utilizing these markers in their speeches.

## 5. Conclusion
The present study has tackled the influence of interactional discourse markers on the audience from a religious discourse perspective. The analysis does emphasize the major role these markers play in the comprehension and attitudes of the listeners. As such, religious orators have employed attitude, engagement, hedges, boosters, and self-mention markers respectively, which mainly represent the significance of these markers to monitor the attention of the receivers toward specific religious messages. It seems plausible to strongly advocate the argument that previous research highlights the effect of interactional markers to build up strong ties between the reader or the speaker and the listeners. In other words, the use of these markers helps to convince listeners of what has been delivered. This could facilitate the process of educationalists to train teachers or journalists to make use of such markers to guide the attention of listeners to important objectives. The study recommends researchers develop more research on interactive discourse markers in religious discourse. They may also compare and contrast religious and political discourse concerning these types of discourse markers.

## 6. References
1. Akinci S. A cross-disciplinary study of stance markers in research articles written by students and experts' Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, 2016.
2. Al Kayed M, Al-Ghoweri H. A sociopragmatic study of the speech act of criticism in Jordanian Arabic. European Journal of Scientific Research. 2019; 153(1):105-117.
3. Alghazo S, Al Salem MN, Alrashdan I. Stance and engagement in English and Arabic research article abstracts. System. 2021; 103. 102681.
4. AlJazrawi D, AlJazrawi Z. Metadiscourse as a Way of Achieving Persuasion in Literary Criticism Texts. GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies. 2021; 21(3).
5. Alotaibi H. Metadiscourse in Arabic and English research article abstracts. World Journal of English Language. 2015; 5(2):1.
6. Camiciottoli BC. Interactive discourse structuring in L2 guest lectures: Some insights from a comparative corpus-based study. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 2004; 3(1):39-54.
7. El-Dakhs DAS. Why are abstracts in PhD theses and research articles different? A genre-specific perspective. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 2018; 36:48-60.
8. Farghal M, Kalakh B. Engagement in translation: Interactional metadiscourse markers in American presidential debates. Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures. 2019; 12(1):103-122.
9. Friginal E, Mustafa SS. A comparison of US-based and Iraqi English research article abstracts using corpora. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 2017; 25:45-57.
10. Hyland K. Disciplinary Interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 Postgraduate Writing. Journal of Second Language Writing. 2004; 13(2):133-151.
11. Hyland K, Tse P. Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. Applied Linguistics. 2004; 25(2):156-177.
12. Hyland K. Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse studies*. 2005; 7(2):173-192.
13. Hyland K. Teaching and researching writing.

Routledge, 2015.

14. Xu X, Nesi H. Differences in engagement: A comparison of the strategies used by British and Chinese research article writers. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 2019; 38:121-134.

15. Schiffrin D. Meta-talk: Organizational and evaluative brackets in discourse. Sociological Inquiry. 1980; 50(3-4):199-236.

16. Sokolik. Writing. In D. Nunan (Ed.), Practical English Language Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003, p87-108.

17. Thompson G. Between hierarchies and markets: The logic and limits of network forms of organization. Oxford University Press on Demand, 2003.

18. Zare J, Tavakoli M. The use of personal metadiscourse over monologic and dialogic modes of academic speech. Discourse Processes. 2017; 54(2):163-175.