

A program based on critical literacy pedagogy to develop secondary school students' metadiscourse analysis

Marwa Abd EL Halim Abd El kayoum Mohamed

Supervisor

Dr. Bahaa El-Deen El-Sayed EL-Naggar

Professor of Curricula and instruction (TEFL), Faculty of Education - Zagazig University, Egypt.

Abstract

This study aimed at improving the secondary school students' metadiscourse analysis through applying a critical literacy pedagogy . A number of 46 first grade secondary school students were randomly chosen from Bani Helal secondary school in the second term in the academic year 2021/ 2022 . They were divided equally into control group and treatment group. The researcher applied a pre-test of metadiscourse analysis on both groups. Their scores were at a low level , and the results showed that they lack the metadiscourse analysis skill as they assumed that they didn't hear this terminology before. The researcher applied a program based on critical literacy pedagogy upon the treatment group for 3 weeks two sessions a week. After ending the program, both groups were submitted to the posttest of metadiscourse analysis. Discussing the results using SPSS program indicated that there were statistically significant differences at 0.01 between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group in the post administration of the metadiscourse analysis test favoring the experimental group. Results showed that using the critical literacy-based program is effective in improving the metadiscourse analysis for the first -year secondary school students.

Keywords: critical literacy pedagogy- metadiscourse analysis

Introduction

Metadiscourse is a relatively new approach to discourse analysis that applies to the manner in which writers or speakers portray themselves in their works to engage with their audiences. It's a notion based on the idea of speaking or writing as a social activity (Hyland, 2005; Dafouz-Milne, 2008). As a result, it's thought to play a key function in structuring the discourse, engaging the listeners, and signaling the writer's or author's attitude (Fuertes-Olivera et al., 2001). As a result, researchers have adopted it and are using it to examine patterns of interaction and discuss various elements of language in usage.

There has been a growing contribution in critical literacy pedagogy in English language learning in recent years (Kubota, 2004; Luke, 2010; Koo, 2012). The English language is viewed as a social and cultural phenomena entangled in power dynamics by critical literacy. This critical approach to literacy considers readers as social practitioners, their communities, and the ways in which they are socialized to read and interact with texts. The readers' roles are influenced by their community's social expectations, ideas, values, and behaviours. Nationality,

religion, age, class, lifestyle, gender, and ideology all have a role in the social membership of the readers. The importance of marginalized roles is highlighted in literacy work. The social view of reading assumes that readers are empowered by their cultural and linguistic abilities, which influence how they interact with texts (Koo, 2001; 2008).

Context of the Problem

The researcher reviewed previous studies in metadiscourse analysis skills and found that the students lacked these skills. A pilot study was conducted on 45 first grade secondary school students .to determine their prior knowledge in metadiscourse analysis . A pilot study included some unstructured interviews and a test on metadiscourse analysis . The results showed that the students didn't hear the term of metadiscourse analysis before and as a result their performance with below the average . As shown in table (1)

Table(1) Results of metadiscourse analysis pilot test

Metadiscourse Analysis Test		N	Percentage
A)	TEXTUAL METADISCOURSE (Help to guide the reader through the text)	46	29%
B)	INTERPERSONAL METADISCOURSE (Involve the reader in the argument)	46	28%

Based on the results of the pilot study, which revealed the weakness of the students' performance at the metadiscourse analysis , the study was an attempt to utilize critical literacy pedagogy-based program to develop secondary school students' metadiscourse analysis.

1.1. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Metadiscourse analysis

Metadiscourse is a type of communication in which the author organizes discourse, expresses his opinions, and interacts with the audience (Hyland, 2000). As a result, metadiscourse can assist us in comprehending the speaker's or author's perspectives regarding the text and audience (Hyland, 2008).

Metadiscourse, according to Hyland, is a set of "linguistic resources employed to arrange a discourse or the writer's attitude toward either its content or the reader" (Hyland, 2000). He also came up with three essential metadiscourse principles after analysing it from the perspective of metadiscourse: "metadiscourse is distinct from propositional aspects of discourse; metadiscourse refers to aspects of the text that embody writer-reader interactions; metadiscourse refers only to relations which are internal to the discourse." (Hyland, 2008).

Different journals published different viewpoints on metadiscourse classification. Textual metadiscourse and interpersonal metadiscourse are the two types of metadiscourse identified by Vande Kopple (1985). Text connectives, validity markers, narrators, code glosses, attitude

markers, comments, and illocution markers were the seven categories of metadiscourse markers used in the two types of metadiscourse.

Later, according to the multifunction of metadiscourse, Crismore et al. (1993) divided and rearranged Vande Kopple's categorisation. Textual metadiscourse was split into textual markers and interpretive markers in Crismore et al.'s taxonomy. Hedges, certainty markers, attributors, attitude markers, and comments were the five subcategories of interpersonal metadiscourse. Metadiscourse was split into interactive metadiscourse and interactional metadiscourse by Hyland (2000).

Interactive meta-discourse was used to "refer to features which set out an argument to explicitly establish the writer's preferred interpretations," according to Hyland's research (2004). "Involve readers in argument by alerting them to the author's perspective towards both propositional information and readers themselves," according to interactional metadiscourse.

2.2. Critical literacy pedagogy

Critical literacy, according to McLaughlin and DeVogd (2004, p. 52) "students can expand their reasoning, deepen their understanding, seek out multiple perspectives and become active thinkers who comprehend from a critical stance".

Rosenblatt (2004) claims that readers are always taking decisions about their cognition and reading from a critical point of view enables readers to use their previous knowledge to identify the connection between their thoughts and the concepts presented by the author of the text in her continuum of reading skills.

According to Anstey and Bull (2006, p. 37) students can be marginalized, discriminated against, or unable to take an active and informed place in life if they are not taught how to read critically.

In sum, the student will not be in control of his or her social future, they write. Critical literacy allows learners to process information with accountability and become critical consumers of the information they receive as they are surrounded by excessive information offered by technology.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Study Design

The recent study adopted the quasi-experimental method. In this study, the researcher administered pre -post test to the sample of the study. The researcher divided them into two groups; treatment group and control group.

3.2. Study Questions:

The problem of the study is stated in the following questions:

1. What are the metadiscourse analysis skills needed for the first-year secondary school?
2. What are the levels of the students' mastery of the metadiscourse analysis?

3. What is the effect of a program based on critical literacy pedagogy on improving metadiscourse analysis among the targeted sample?

3.3. Study Instruments:

1. Metadiscourse analysis checklist.
2. Metadiscourse analysis test.
3. Metadiscourse analysis rubric.

3.4. Study Participants:

The participants in the current study were the first- year secondary school, Bani Helal secondary school ,Mania Al Kamh directorate , Sharqia (2021/2022).The first- year students were selected in order to develop their metadiscourse analysis skill.

The students were randomly divided into two groups: experimental group and control group (n=46 students).

4 . RESULTS

The findings of this study were reached in the light of examining the hypotheses of the study.

4.1. Hypothesis 1:

It was hypothesized that " there would be a statistical significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group in the post test results of metadiscourse analysis skills in favor of the experimental group."

The paired sample t-test was shown in the following table:

Table (2) t-test results

Metadiscourse analysis	Group	n.	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	T value	Sig.
Textual Metadiscourse (Help to guide the reader through the text)	Control post	23	1.253	0.597	1.720	0.184	8.092	0.000**
	Exp. Post	23	2.890	0.490				
Interpersonal Metadiscourse (Involve the reader in the argument)	Control post	23	1.190	0.342	1.380	0.120	7.230	0.000**
	Exp. Post	23	2.620	0.807				

**** significant at (0.01) level.**

This table (2) revealed that the mean scores of the experimental group in the post test is higher than that of the control group. The estimated T- value is high and it was significant at the level of 0.01. These results proved the first hypothesis.

4.2. Hypothesis 2:

It was hypothesized that " there would be a statistical significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group in the pre and posttest favoring the post administration".The following table discusses the results that approve the second hypothesis.

Table (3) t-test results (n=23)

Metadiscourse analysis	Experiment al Group	Mean	Standar d deviatio n	Mean Difference	t-value	Sig.
Textual metadiscourse (Help to guide the reader through the text)	Pre	1.170	0.514	1.280	14.980	0.000**
	Post	2.850	0.480			
Interpersonal Metadiscourse (Involve the reader in the argument)	Pre	1.240	0.453	1.350	12.812	0.000**
	Post	2.750	0.589			

**** significant at (0.01) level.**

Table (3) revealed that the mean scores of the experimental group in the pre-test is lower than that of the same group in the posttest. The estimated T- value is high and it was significant at the level of 0.01. These results proved the second hypothesis.

4.3.Hypothesis 3:

It was hypothesized that " A program based on critical literacy pedagogy would be effective in improving the students' metadiscourse analysis skills" .

Metadiscourse analysis	Group	n.	Mean	Standard deviation	T- value	η^2	Effect Size
Textual metadiscourse (Help to guide the reader through the text)	Experimental pre	23	1.340	0.534	14.210	0.932	Large
	Experimental Post	23	2.870	0.510			
Interpersonal Metadiscourse (Involve the reader in the argument)	Experimental pre	23	1.130	0.427	12.415	0.914	Large
	Experimental Post	23	2.780	0.721			

Table (4) indicated the eta squared of the total value of metadiscourse analysis skills. These values indicate that the effect size of these skills is (large). These results approved the third hypothesis.

V. CONCLUSION

This study adopted Lewison et al., (2002) the four critical literacy pedagogy dimensions model, which incorporates the dimensions of disrupting the commonplace, considering multiple perspectives, focusing on socio-political systems, and taking social actions. It was concluded that applying the critical literacy-based program was effective in enhancing metadiscourse analysis of first grade secondary school student at the Bani Helal secondary school, Mania Al Kamh directorate, Sharqia. This progress could be related to the fact that critical literacy pedagogy involves problematizing popular assumptions and beliefs and examining them through a critical lens.

References

1. Anstey, M., & Bull, G. (2006). *Teaching and learning multiliteracies: changing times, changing literacies*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
2. Crismore, A., Markkanen R., & Steffensen, M. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: a study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written Communication*, 10, 39–71.
3. Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008). The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: Across-linguistic study of newspaper discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 95-113.
4. Fuertes-Olivera, P.A., Velasco-sacristan, M., Arribas-Bano, A. & Samaniego-Fernandez, E. (2001). Persuasion and advertising English: Metadiscourse in slogans and headlines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 1291-1307.
5. Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. London, UK: Longman.
6. Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language writing*, 13, 133-151.
7. Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: exploring interaction in writing* (1st Ed.). New York: Continuum.
8. Hyland, K. (2008). *Metadiscourse*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
9. Koo, Y.L. (2001). Exploring the view of reading as social practice. In M. Maros and Q. C. Kin. *Writing in Applied linguistics in Malaysian Context*, pp.53-64. Malaysia: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
10. Koo, Y.L. (2008). The politics of cultural production and meaning-making in ELT: Exploring a reflexive pedagogy of pluriliteracy in higher education (HE). In Z. Moris, H. Abdul Rahim and S. Abd. Manan. (eds.). *Higher education in the Asia Pacific: Emerging trends in teaching and learning*, pp-234-257.
11. Koo, Y.L. (2012). Critical literacy and diversity in higher education: a case study of a multilingual learner: *Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 20 (1), pp. 205-208.
12. Kubota, R. (2004). The politics cultural difference in second language education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal*, 1 (1), pp. 21-39.
13. Luke, A. (2010). Will the Australian curriculum up the intellectual ante in primary classrooms?. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 5(10).
14. Lewison, M., Flint, A. S., & van Sluys, K. (2002). Taking on critical literacy: The journey of newcomers and novices. *Language Arts*, 79(5), 382–392.
15. McLaughlin, M. & DeVogd, G. (2004). Critical literacy as comprehensions: Expanding reader response. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48, 52-56.
16. Rosenblatt, L.M. (2004). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In R.B. Ruddel & N.J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* 5th ed (pp. 1363-1398). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.