



INVESTIGATING METADISOURSE MARKERS IN UK AND PAKISTAN'S POLITICAL LEADERS SPEECHES: A CORPUS-BASED MD ANALYSIS APPROACH

¹Faiqa Ahmad, ²Menall Qaiser, ³Faizullah

¹MS English scholar, Department of English Language and Literature, Superior University Lahore.

Email: ahmadfaiqa6@gmail.com

²MS English scholar, Department of English Language and Literature, Superior University Lahore.

Email: menallqaiser4@gmail.com

³M.Phil. Scholar, Department of English Graduate Studies, National University of Modern Languages Islamabad.

Email: faizp057@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the use of metadiscourse markers in political speeches by leaders from Pakistan and the United Kingdom, utilizing a corpus-based Multidimensional Analysis (MD) approach grounded in Biber's Five-Dimensional Model (1988) of Register Variation. Given that English serves as an official language and a critical medium for international discourse in Pakistan, this research addresses the linguistic and rhetorical strategies that Pakistani leaders, speaking in English, employ to communicate on international platforms compared to native English-speaking UK leaders. Specifically, this study examines how Pakistani political figures adapt their rhetorical style to align with or diverge from the stylistic conventions employed by UK political leaders, focusing on the degree to which these markers support persuasive and culturally resonant communication. The study involves a comparative analysis of eight speeches, with four delivered by Imran Khan and four by Theresa May at international forums. The research questions explore the degree to which these leaders align with Biber's five dimensions of register variation and differ in their use of interactional metadiscourse features. Using MAT Tagger and AntConc 4.3.1, metadiscourse markers are categorized into dimensions of involvement, narration, explicitness, persuasion, and concreteness, providing insights into each leader's communicative approach and cultural framing. The findings reveal both shared and divergent metadiscourse patterns, with Imran Khan emphasizing unity, emotional appeal, and inclusivity, while Theresa May utilizes a more directive, policy-oriented stance, subtly shaping narratives to support her political agenda. This comparative analysis underscores the impact of metadiscourse markers in shaping political messages and their reception in cross-cultural contexts, suggesting that these linguistic tools play a critical role in political persuasion. The study's corpus-based methodology highlights systematic differences in political discourse strategies and recommends extending such analyses to other cultural settings to better understand the role of language in political communication and leadership.

KEYWORDS: Metadiscourse markers, political speeches, corpus-based analysis, cross-cultural rhetoric, Multidimensional analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

Political speeches are powerful tools for influencing public opinion and achieving specific communicative goals, especially on international platforms where language and cultural nuances are critical. Metadiscourse markers, which are linguistic elements that help shape the relationship



between the speaker, the content, and the audience, play a central role in political communication. These markers enable political figures to structure their discourse in a way that engages, persuades, and aligns with the expectations of diverse audiences (Hyland, 2005). For non-native English-speaking leaders like those from Pakistan, understanding and employing these markers effectively can enhance rhetorical impact and ensure the message resonates with an international audience (Ali & Kazemian, 2015).

English serves as a second language in Pakistan and is used in official and diplomatic contexts. Pakistani leaders often rely on English when addressing global audiences to convey their perspectives and policies internationally. However, since English in Pakistan has unique linguistic and stylistic characteristics, it is pertinent to explore how Pakistani political leaders' use of metadiscourse markers compares with that of native English-speaking counterparts, such as UK leaders (Mahboob, 2009). This study's focus on metadiscourse markers provides a lens through which to examine the potential influence of cultural and linguistic factors on political rhetoric.

Metadiscourse in political speeches can be divided into two primary categories: interactive and interactional markers. Interactive markers organize the discourse, guiding the audience through the argument, while interactional markers reveal the speaker's stance, directly engaging the audience on an interpersonal level (Hyland, 2005). Studies have shown that interactional markers, such as hedges, boosters, and attitude markers, are especially effective in political contexts where leaders seek to express conviction, solidarity, or empathy (Fuentes-Rodríguez & Álvarez-Pérez, 2019). By comparing Pakistani and UK leaders, this study aims to uncover differences in the use of these markers, thus shedding light on cultural variations in political communication.

To conduct this analysis, this study employs Biber's (1988) Multidimensional Model of Register Variation, which categorizes language features across five dimensions, including involvement, narrative structure, explicitness, persuasion, and concreteness. Previous research has used this model effectively to analyze the linguistic patterns in political speeches and other formal registers, demonstrating how dimensions like persuasion and explicitness contribute to the perceived authority and effectiveness of the speech (Conrad & Biber, 2001). In this context, the model provides a systematic framework for examining metadiscourse markers in the speeches of UK and Pakistani leaders, facilitating a nuanced comparison across cultural and linguistic boundaries.

Given the importance of effective communication on international platforms, this study holds practical significance. By exploring the alignment and divergence in the use of metadiscourse markers between Pakistani and UK leaders, the research highlights how rhetorical and stylistic choices reflect broader cultural contexts and political priorities. Ultimately, understanding these patterns can contribute to improved cross-cultural political communication, providing insights into how leaders from different backgrounds might optimize their linguistic strategies for global audiences (Ali, Kazemian, & Mahar, 2015).

1.1. Problem statement

English is used as a second language in Pakistan and gained official status at state level. Usually, Pakistani political leaders speak in the English language on international platforms to express their perception at an international level. That's why, it is important to question whether the spoken metadiscourse markers used by Pakistani leaders in such settings are similar to that



employed by native-speaking English leaders specifically of UK. Awareness of this comparison is crucial in order to identify differences or similarities in cross cultural stylistic and rhetorical appeals and also to assess the degree of appropriateness and persuasion, Pakistan leaders employ English metadiscourse for the targeted international audience purposes. This research explores spoken metadiscourse markers in speeches delivered by leaders of UK and Pakistani political leaders with a Corpus-based Multidimensional Analysis (MD) method to examine cultural similarities or differences in speeches.

1.2.Purpose of study

The study aims to provide a comparative analysis of metadiscourse markers in speeches by UK and Pakistani political leaders, focusing on their alignment and effectiveness in achieving communicative goals at International forums.

1.3.Research Questions

2. How do Pakistani and UK political leaders utilize Biber's five dimensions of register variation in their speeches delivered at International forums?
3. In what ways do Pakistani and UK political leaders differ in their use of Interactional metadiscourse features to achieve communicative purposes at International forums?

1.4.Research Objectives

2. To assess the applicability of Biber's five dimensions of register variation in the speeches made by Pakistani and UK political leaders delivered at the International level.
3. To identify and compare the interactional metadiscourse features used by Pakistani and UK political leaders while delivering speeches specifically in international fora with regard to particular meaningful objectives.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1.Metadiscourse Markers

Metadiscourse markers are different elements that embrace the structure of discourse and express the author's attitude to the material and the audience. As this paper has highlighted already, they are instrumental in political speeches in relation to how they help the audience interpret, articulate arguments, and perhaps more importantly create a connection between a speaker and the audience. These markers can be categorized into two main types: The specific features of academic discourse include textual means, which are used for construction of the discourse and interpersonal means, which involve the audience and reflect the position of the speaker (Hyland, 2005). Metadiscourse used in political speeches is a topic that cannot be overemphasised since it provides the leadership of any country with the means of making their speeches clear, persuasive as well as engaging the public. Therefore, metadiscourse has a threefold function in a political context. First, a speechclue helps to facilitate an audience's understanding by offering prompts to elucidate the speaker's purpose and the construction of her or his points. For instance, the transition marker demonstrates changes in topics or ideas in a text, whereas the frame marker show how the information should be viewed (Hyland & Tse, 2004). Second, metadiscourse is also important in organising ideas and helping the speakers commit their ideas in a persuasive manner. Last but not the least, politeness is a virtue in any political speech; use of hedges creates a rapport with the targeted group and therefore makes the speech credible (Biber et al., 1999). Political language analysis involves evaluating how certain language is particular employed in political settings in an effort to have a specific impact. The use of metadiscourse markers makes a considerable input to



a speaker's appeals because it influences the persuasiveness of the total communication. For instance, they can emphasize the candidate or politician's adherence to some level/propose some policies while at the same time responding to likely objections (Ali et al., 2020). The relationship between language and persuasion supports the significance of defining its metadiscourse in the political oratory.

There are many theoretical approaches which underpin the study of metadiscourse. One of the most prominent is Hyland's metadiscourse model, which categorizes metadiscourse into two main dimensions: The comparable switch is between the text interactive, which assists in order and subordination of conversations, and the interactional, which involve the audience (Hyland, 2005). This model focuses on the role of metadiscourse as more than a way of organizing the text and also as a way of addressing an audience. Of the metadiscourse models available, Biber's framework is most useful to determine linguistic features viewed across genres such as the political. Biber categorizes metadiscourse into distinct functional dimensions: textual (such as transition signal), interpersonal (for example, generalizations) & evidential (like references) (Biber, Johnnes & Mets, 1999). Altogether, this approach enables the researchers to determine how various types of metadiscourse are used in the particular contexts and in the range of the given genre.

Undoubtedly, Biber's corpus-based analysis have certain merits that cannot be attained by means of the qualitative analysis, namely the identification of patterns that might be unnoticed. The frequency of metadiscourse in political speeches helps the researchers solve the third research question about the predicting the systematic distribution of the metadiscourse for certain strategies and expectation in the audience. Such research method contributes to improved understanding of the role played by metadiscourse in political communication.

2.2.Types of Metadiscourse Features in Political Discourse

Metadiscourse markers are a sub-genre of metadiscourse and can be used in political speeches. As the textual markers, we find transitions and frame markers that define the argument structure and direct audiences, as well as interpersonal markers such as hedges, boosters and engagement markers that create credibility and involvement. Research has pointed out that the selection of these markers is often related to their intended persuasive force for example, use of markers considered authoritative through markers such as betterment (to persuade towards a certain conclusion), solidarity markers which emphasize agreement with others or softening statement with blessers and depreciation (Hyland & Tse, 2004). Debras (2021), for instance, demonstrates that multimodal features (such as gestures) align with speech to enhance communicative effectiveness and relevance in political speeches. In Zhang et al. The monologue was the most structured (2017), and there was a clear difference between dialogic discourse as those whereby used more engagement markers, This indicates that markers used in political speeches may differ in type, depending on the manner of speech: interactive or monologic.

2.3.Comparison of Political Metadiscourse Features

Different cultures and countries seem to exhibit different tendencies in the employment of metadiscursive markers. Consider, for example, how UK and Pakistani political speeches are compared to each other, and how psychosocial cultures affect metadiscourse. In the UK, political debaters are often restrained in expressing their opinion. Thus, they employ hedges in their statements. However, in speeches, Pakistani politician's speakers may prefer booster stimulators

as a sign of command or confidence (Ali et al., 2020). Cultural context also determines the metadiscourse politicians use to respond to the audience. In Pakistan, where culture is prominent in politics, speakers may resort to metaphor and culture-oriented allusions as metadiscourse strategies (Rashid & Abbas, 2020). This suggests that appreciating the momentousness of local cultural contexts is key in rendering how metadiscourse functions in different political settings. Additionally, political beliefs of the participants also determine the manner of metadiscourse used. While analysing UK and Pakistani circumstances it becomes clear that not only the selection of the markers for metadiscourse is determined by the ideology, but even the functions of the metadiscourse markers in the speeches. For example, leftists may utilize interpersonal markers to achieve solidarity building, while their opponents who are rightists may aim inter alia at employing authority strategy (Ismail & Al-Mahdi, 2022).

2.4. Corpus-based MD analysis and Political Speeches

The field of studies has recently witnessed a shift whereby, metadiscursive approaches are being enriched by corpus linguistics, an approach that allows for the analysis of political speeches, among other works. In utilizing corpus-based approaches, scholars are able to retrieve and classify the systematized patterns of metadiscourse components present in the bulk of political data. This method has been touted for such merits as increased reliability and replicability of the research outcomes (Biber et al., 1999).

Comparison of participants' and interactional metadiscourse components structural relationships obtained using corpus-based analyses incorporating Biber's framework, has led to the understanding of actors' strategic behavior in political communication. For instance, within this particular context, some researchers have found out that in the case of election campaigns, certain types of metadiscourse performed certain discursive functions and thus contributed to the persuasion effect of the speaker (Ali et al., 2020). These findings, in turn, highlight the need to pair corpus linguistics with political discourse analysis in order to reveal a more sophisticated and complex picture of language use. Furthermore, metadiscursive analysis also has the advantage of enabling a cross-cultural perspective. They note that by looking at the linguistic data of speech from different nations or cultural areas from a particular point of view, one can see both commonalities and distinctions in how various cultures engage in metadiscursive activities (Rashid & Abbas, 2020). This comparative angle extends our comprehension of language in political discourse to blue ocean zones.

This study is essential to understanding the nature of political discourse but there are currently no cross-cultural comparative studies of metadiscourse in UK and Pakistani political speeches even though this genre has been shown in previous research to have different cultural and ideological backgrounds. Each study considers individual parts of the whole (such as general keys of sentiment in intonation Peres, 2014 and formality in tweets Rashid et al., 2024) but little is analysed within one view across these geographical areas. To address this gap, this study uses corpus-based analysis to identify linguistic dimensions in two political contexts—UK and Pakistan—and derive insights about the cultural implications of metadiscourse working on the spectrum of culture and politics.



3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Model

Biber's Five-Dimensional Model of Register Variation:

1. Involved vs. Informational Production
2. Narrative vs. Non-Narrative Concerns
3. Explicit vs. Situation-Dependent Reference
4. Overt Expression of Persuasion
5. Abstract vs. Concrete Information

Data Size: 8 speeches in total (4 speeches by a UK leader and 4 speeches by a Pakistani leader).

Nature of data: Political speeches

Distribution of data

Pakistani Leader: 4 speeches by Imran Khan

UK Leader: 4 speeches by Theresa May.

3.2. Procedure of Data Collection

Speech Selection: Recordings of speeches by UK and Pakistani political leaders at international forums are sourced from YouTube, ensuring they are delivered in English to maintain comparability.

Transcription: Each speech's transcripts are downloaded from YouTube without timestamps to just focus on textual content.

Tagging and Analysis of Metadiscourse Markers: Transcripts are processed using the MAT Tagger, which identified metadiscourse markers. Then, the Frequencies of interactional metadiscourse features are assessed using Antconc 4.3.1. These markers are categorized based on Biber's five-dimensional model, addressing the dimensions of involvement, narration, explicitness, persuasion, and concreteness.

Comparative Analysis: Using the coded data, a comparative analysis is conducted to assess the alignment and divergence in the use of metadiscourse markers between UK and Pakistani political leaders.

4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The MDA model by Douglas Biber developed in 1988 has emerged as a critical account for analysis of language variation in the various registers of English. This model reveals five major categories which summarize systematic features of languages attested in actual contexts, facilitating systematic comparisons of linguistic structures and processes. The description of dimensions is follow as:

Dimension	Description
D1 Involved vs. Informational Discourse	A high result indicates affective and interactional discourse (informal conversations, many verbs and pronouns). A low result indicates informationally complex discourse (academic language, many nouns, adjectives, and long words).
D2 Narrative vs. Non-Narrative Concerns	A high score indicates a narrative text (e.g., a novel, many past tenses, third-person pronouns). A low score indicates a non-narrative text.



D3 Context-Independent vs. Context-Dependent Discourse	A high score indicates context-independent discourse (e.g., academic language, many nominalizations). A low score indicates context-dependent discourse (e.g., sports broadcasts, many adverbs).
D4 Overt Expression of Persuasion	A high score indicates explicit marking of the author’s point of view and assessment of probability/certainty (e.g., business letters, many modal verbs). A low score indicates informationally dense texts (e.g., academic prose, many nouns and long words).
D5 Abstract vs. Non-Abstract Information	A high score indicates technical, formal discourse (e.g., scientific language, many passive clauses and conjuncts). A low score indicates non-abstract, more concrete information.

MAT is a tool that the framework ‘Biber’s model’ of text classification categorizes texts along such dimensions as providing linguistic variation z-scores and statistical data. MAT enhances genre analysis by producing genred texts with annotations as well as displaying them in the context of the Biber’s dimensional system, which in turn helps the analyst to get an idea about the genre-unique use of linguistic features. In the present research, Biber’s MDA model is used to analyze interactional metadiscourse- hedges, boosters; engagement, attitude and self mention. The lists of these features were adopted from Ken Hyland’s Metadiscourse (2005), and relating to how such markers contribute to the engagement and the authorial position in various communicative settings. This approach helps to explain how interlocutionary language differs across specific uses and therefore enhances the body of knowledge on language use across personal and informative contexts.

In the present study, the research drawn a comparison between Pakistani Political Leader Imran Khan and British Political Leader Theresa May to find out the differences in the use of Interactional metadiscourse features which seve an important role in communicative purposes.

Political Speeches	Pakistan	UK
No. of texts	4	4
No. of word tokens	13595	15534

Using MAT, texts of both Political leaders are tagged and analysed. The mean value and closest genre to each dimension is mentioned in the table below for both Imran Khan Speeches and Theresa May Speeches;

Imran Khan	Dimension1	Dimension2	Dimension3	Dimension4	Dimension5	Closest text type
Imran Khan speeches	3.43	-2.2	2.93	0.97	-0.48	Involved persuasion



Theresa May	Dimension1	Dimension2	Dimension3	Dimension4	Dimension5	Closest Text Type
Speeches	-5.41	-3.78	5.00	4.24	-0.62	General narrative exposition

List of Interactional metadiscourse features is taken from book's Index of Hyland, 2005.

Some interactional metadiscourse features with subcategories and their roles are listed below;

Subcategory	Feature	Role
Hedges	around	Softens the claim, indicating approximation or uncertainty
	could	Suggests possibility rather than certainty
	assume	Implies a tentative stance or hypothesis
	would	Expresses conditional or hypothetical situations
	about	Indicates generalization, preventing overstatements
	Boosters	Must
know		Asserts certainty, emphasizing the speaker's confidence
Think		Shows a belief or personal stance with a confident tone
always		Amplifies the frequency or generality, adding certainty to the statement



	indeed	Reinforces or emphasizes a point, giving an assertive tone
Engagement Markers	ensure	Directs readers' attention to the necessity of action or consideration
	need to	Implies a requirement, engaging the reader with advice or direction
	show	Demonstrates or emphasizes transparency in information
	do not	Offers a directive or caution, engaging the reader actively
	go	Engages the reader by suggesting an action or approach
Attitude Markers	agree	Expresses alignment or shared opinion, revealing stance
	essential	Shows the importance, indicating a valued stance
	important	Highlights significance, indicating a positive evaluative stance
	prefer	Demonstrates a choice or preference, indicating a subjective stance
	interesting	Engages readers by showing intrigue or fascination
Self Mention	we	Establishes a personal connection, showing involvement of the author
	my	Indicates personal responsibility or ownership of ideas
	us	Creates inclusivity, bringing the audience into the discussion
	our	Expresses shared perspective, strengthening engagement
	I	Directly establishes the author's presence in the discourse

4.1.METADISCOURSE FEATURES ANALYSIS THROUGH MD

4.1.1. Imran Khan Speeches

D 1

Slightly more notably, favourites of Imran Khan’s speech are characterized by using an ‘involved’ communication strategy, characterized by 269 ‘we’, 115 ‘you’ and 25 ‘us’ mentions, to involve and maintain the audience’s attention. Promotional reinforcement words like ‘must,’ (23) and ‘should’ (11) help the Section to convince the reader/ user, and in comparison to rhetoric elements, informational elements play the role of backup, not key to the message. It underlines such an interaction-oriented paradigm over the informational one which is more characteristic for communication with objects.

Engagement Markers	Frequency
We	269
Must	23
Go	18

Textual Examples

1. "...it will finish and then it has unintended consequences so **we** have seen in front of our eyes Pakistan joining the..."
2. "...world community that they **must** take notice of this what is going to happen.”
3. "I wanted Pakistan to **go** up and as I said, I saw..."

D 2

Imran Khan’s speeches do not have typical narrative structures, but there is a strong emphasis on the texture, intent on delivering the facts and entreaty. Such boosters as ‘must,’ ‘believe,’ ‘think’ can also be identified and correlate to the confident, clear and assertive type of rhetoric based on persuasion. Appeal enhancers like ‘important’ and ‘unfortunately’ placed words have the function of topic and point mutating into evaluative segments. Thus, even though first-person pronouns and questions are employed here, they are employed for keeping the audience involved, rather than for telling the story, so that the major technique for audience involvement remains non-narrative.

Boosters	Frequency
Must	23
Think	22
Sure	3

Textual Examples

1. "...a businessman **must** make money you see what happened in Pakistan was..."
2. "of Pakistan is a huge opportunity how important do you **think** education is in this context and who do you..."
3. " I would make **sure** that we preserve this god-given beauty..."

D 3

The third dimension of the study is directed at the differentiation of referential activity into referential, where the speaker actually refers to the object discussed, and situational, where the



referent is the situation or context of the conversation. This is because reactivation includes use of boosters like, know, think, must and presents an assertive message as shown by attitude markers like, important and interesting. The most conspicuous of these type are references based on situational context, such as exclusion markers such as ‘we,’ ‘you,’ ‘our’ and conversational placebo such ‘look at,’ ‘find’. These markers are useful to create a link with the end consumers as well as to make the discourse more grounded.

Attitude and Conversational markers	Frequency
Know	29
Important	11
Find	4

Textual Examples

1. "We **know** what we go through as a Prime Minister."
2. "Most **important** thing I want to say, to explain this Islamophobia."
3. "Any minority that is persecuted can **find** citizenship in India."

D 4

Metadiscourse feature uses are also rendered more frequently in Imran Khan’s speech, particularly self-promoting references such as “we”, “I”, “our”. Sociable boosters including “know”, “think” and “must” are his positive emphasizing affirmations. Articles like ‘important’ and ‘essential’ bear an urge, that helps direct the audience attention to important issues authoritatively.

Self mention and attitude markers	Frequency
I	199
Our	66
Essential	1

Textual Examples

1. “start a reform program reforms are painful but it is **essential** if we have to get out of current problems”
2. "Our growth rate and provide jobs to young people and **I** think you can also rely on the Davos community..."
3. "Supposed to be a welfare state the founding fathers of **our** country wanted Pakistan to be what was called an..."

D 5

Depending on whether the information processed in discourse corresponds to abstract or non-abstract concepts, Dimension 5 is distinguished. Mainly, they include judgment markers or boosters such as believe, know, and must, as well as attitude markers including important mainly for expressing principles or values. On the other hand, the non-abstract information makes use of references to a situation ‘we’ ‘our,’ ‘you,’ and exigent terms like ‘must’.



Boosters, attitude and self-mentioning Frequency markers

Must	23
Important	11
We	269

1. "...they **must** take notice of this what is going to happen..."
2. "...world leaders really realizing the urgency of the situation. **We** have a lot of ideas; but as **they** say, other hardly..."

4.1.2. Theresa May Speeches

D 1

The “Involved vs. Informational Production” dimension is particularly relevant to discuss discourse that is Osborn’s category of ‘engagement/stance’. Some of the qualified metadiscourse features include the use of pronouns such as “I” “we” or any form of the first person pronoun, which indicate a special engagement, and the use of “must,” “indeed,” which signal high degree of force. All these features are present in the speeches of Theresa May as she uses the link to the audience provided by self-mentions and strengthens it by boosters expressing her commitment.

Self mention and boosters	Frequency
We	341
I	67
Indeed	9

Textual Examples

1. “Across this country because **We** will not have truly left the European Union if...”
2. "**I** want Britain to be what we have the potential..."
3. "attempts to secure peace and stability in Syria. And **indeed**, we must continue to call on all those with"

D 2

In Theresa May’s speeches, there is a reflection of Dimension 2, Narrative vs. Non-narrative Concerns. Even in this aspect, her discourse seldom has many complexities of storying; however, there are some instances of past-tense booster including believed and found in an effort to explain the background information or previous events. However, she spends less time on the telling of narrative and spends most of the time discussing policies of the present and future, with her direct, policy-style orientation.

Boosters	Frequency
Clear	20
Found	4
Believed	2



Textual Examples

1. "My answer is **clear**: I want this United Kingdom to emerge from this..."
2. "Equality, freedom of thought, opinion, religion, and conscience, all **found** in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights..."

D 3

In dimension 3 “Explicit vs. situation dependent reference”, Theresa May’s speeches contain guidance to engage through engagement markers as well as the attitude through attitude markers. The audience is directed using term such as ‘define’, ‘apply’ and ‘follow’, while the use of ‘attitude markers’ such as the ‘important’ reveals key issues. This language adds to intentionality in terms of stance and guides the audience to certain aspects when presenting her policy positions.

Engagement and attitude markers	Frequency
Important	17
See	14
Follow	2

Textual Examples

1. "Britain will continue to cooperate with its European partners in **important** areas such as crime, terrorism, and foreign affairs..."
2. "They will **see** that we shaped them a brighter future..."

D 4

In Dimension 4, “Overt Expression of Persuasion”, Theresa May’s speeches employs modals of necessity and “must” and “need to” is used as boosters and engagement markers. These features she employs to signal for certainty and to boost her persuading tone to call for the audience to support her policies. Such metadiscourse markers correspond to the ‘Boosters’ subcategory: stating the author’s confidence with the argument and ‘Engagement Markers’, assuring the readers’ active participation in discourse.

Boosters and Engagement markers	Frequency
Must	55
Need to	14

Textual Examples

1. "We **must** be far more robust in identifying these ideologies and..."
2. "With the changing nature of Trade and Technology, we **need to** give the World Trade Organization a broad, ambitious..."

D 5

In Dimension 5 “Abstract vs Non Abstract Information,” The Theresa May’s speeches show that there are many hedges such as ‘may’, ‘perhaps’ that is non-abstract thus giving the flexibility in complex issues. Also, she employs religious boosters with implied general references, like “beyond, doubt”, for re-assertion in more generalized discourses relating to principles or theories. These features correspond to the “Hedges” subcategory for dealing with a cautious approach to the uncertainty of the finding and “Boosters” for emphasizing confidence in terms of the idea.



Hedges and Boosters	Frequency
Would	27
Beyond	8
May	6

Textual Examples

1. "It **would** mean accepting a role for the European Court of..."
2. "Many people behind the fear that our children and grandchildren **may** lack the education and skills to secure the jobs..."

Comparison of Interactional metadiscourse features between Imran Khan and Theresa May Speeches

Metadiscourse in the speech of Imran Khan is evident in the use of metadiscourse markers that subscribe to an inclusive, involved and persuasive communication style which appeals to the audience's shared values of a listening and speaking partner. Theresa May is clearer and more confident in her speeches and she balances between clear and precise instructions and implicit freedom. Both leaders strategically use metadiscourse to shape their political messages, though with differing focuses: On inclusivity and persuasion, there is Khan; on balance and clear authority, there is May.

Dimension	Imran Khan	Theresa May
1. Involved vs. Informational Production	<p>Engagement Markers: High frequency of pronouns like "we" (269), "you" (115), "us" (25) to build rapport and inclusivity.</p> <p>Boosters: Words like "must" (23) and "should" (11) emphasize urgency, adding to the interactive style.</p>	<p>Self-Mention and Boosters: Uses pronouns like "I," "we," "our" and boosters like "must," "know," "clear" to express strong certainty and commitment, creating an authoritative tone.</p>
2. Narrative vs. Non-Narrative	<p>Non-Narrative Structure: Minimal storytelling elements; focuses on factual and persuasive language with attitude markers (e.g., "important") and boosters like "must," "know."</p>	<p>Limited Narrative Elements: Mainly non-narrative with some past-tense verbs ("believed," "found"), reinforcing confidence while avoiding storytelling.</p>

3. Explicit vs. Situation-Dependent Reference	<p>Explicitness: Frequent use of "know," "think," "must," "sure" to reduce ambiguity, making points clear.</p> <p>Situation-Dependence: Engages audience directly with phrases like "look at" and "pay attention," which require active audience involvement.</p>	<p>Explicit Guidance: Uses engagement markers like "define," "follow" and attitude markers like "important," "prefer" for explicit evaluations, keeping the message straightforward and clear.</p>
4. Overt Expression of Persuasion	<p>Persuasive Techniques: Pronouns ("we," "I") and boosters ("know," "must") foster inclusivity and strengthen credibility, aiming to rally the audience for collective action.</p>	<p>Directive and Persuasive: Uses boosters ("must," "prove") and engagement markers ("allow," "need to") with a formal tone, subtly guiding audience actions while reinforcing authority.</p>
5. Abstract vs. Non-Abstract Information	<p>Abstract Appeals: Boosters like "believe," "know" appeal to universal values, while engagement markers ("we," "our") make these principles relatable.</p>	<p>Balanced Abstract and Non-Abstract: Uses hedges ("may," "perhaps") with abstract boosters ("beyond doubt") to balance assertiveness and nuanced flexibility in complex topics.</p>

5. DISCUSSION

The occurrence of metadiscourse markers in the speeches of Imran Khan and Theresa May also show specific and more general uses of language strategies for the core target of political politics, and more broadly, regional and contextual impacts. The analysis carried out here using two leaders shows that there are key differences in how they deal with audiences, the approach both use in convincing the target group, and the way the leaders structure arguments using the comparative method from a corpus.

Firstly, speaking about the dimension of Involved vs. Informational Production, Imran Khan uses more appeals to turn-taking: inclusive pronouns 'we,' 'us,' 'you' entailing collective action. Engagement markers foster the establishment of a relationship between the speaker and the listeners which makes his speeches relationship and participation oriented. In Theresa May speeches self-mention is much higher and boosters ("must," "know") tone her writings fully authoritative, assertive. This corresponds with her political image of the leader and the capability of making definite decisions, the desire with the help of which she intends to attract attention.



Consequently, the of Narrative vs. Non-Narrative Concerns supports the fact that Imran Khan's speeches contain limited narrative elements; he mainly uses techniques of factual language avoiding characterization and personal attitude when using the boosters. He never tells any stories as they way of appealing to audiences' values; he makes direct appeals to their values and to the need to act right now. Theresa May, like most of the information given, does not emphasize the narratives very much but the use of past simple helps her to sound rather rigid in her believes and to maintain the existence of the policies for quite a long time. It is for this reason that this paper will seek to compare and contrast how the two leaders use speech to address their political situation focusing on Khan's speeches as embodying immediacy and collective endeavor as opposed to May's speeches which signify consistency and authoritative leadership.

In the Explicit vs. Situation-Dependent Reference dimension, the tendencies of both leaders are oriented to explicit reference. The subject of text is Imran Khan and one can witness that he uses relatively simple and direct phrases such as "know," "think", and "must" to avoid misunderstanding of the message. Theresa May employs direct cues like 'define,' 'follow' and 'important' while using more of situation embedded cues that'll need the viewers' intervention. This shows her reliance on leading the audience towards envisaged clear steps while at the same a encouraging them to appraise the roles they have to play in social matters.

Analyzing the Overt Expression of Persuasion, both leaders possesses robust persuasive tendency yet, in the different ways. In his speeches, Imran Khan employs encouraging pronouns and promoters to create an atmosphere and call to people, to unite them for common action and to make them participate directly in political life. However, persuasion in Theresa May's speech is considerably stronger and more authoritative, as she incorporates formal boosters and the engagement markers, which tell the audience what exactly they should do in this or that situation, but at the same time, the tone remains rather authoritative. This distinction reflects their differing leadership styles: Khan works at the level of the community, whereas May tries to manage discourse and events at every turn.

In the last one namely the Abstract vs. Non Abstract Information dimension, Imran Khan refers to belief and right. The speech is then inspired using boosters and engagement markers. Theresa May does the same, while using hedges and abstract boosters to show that she is fairly flexible, though at the same time providing concrete information robustly. This gives her certain freedom because when she needs to approach a more complicated issue she is able to do so with a certain measure of flexibility, she is appealing to the audience that is more thoughtful and probably less impulsive.

This analysis draws out how both leaders protect and achieve culturally and ideologically sensitive metadiscourse markers Appeals as part of their oratory and speeches to the cultural, ideological, and political contexts of countries. Imran Khan's speeches contain a comparative or at least a different approach with frequent use of emotional appeals in order to motivate people to take action while Theresa May's words are more commanding and precise, intended to provide her audience with the solution pointing at the correct path.

6. CONCLUSION

The analysis of metadiscourse markers conducted in the present study based on the corpus methodology and the Multidimensional model has shed light on the specific linguistic mechanisms which may be used by political speeches and, in particular, those delivered by Imran Khan and



Theresa May as the leaders of two major political parties of Great Britain. As it can be seen, cultural and contextual considerations may be vastly distinct between the UK and Pakistan, metadiscourse is used by both leaders to good effect to accomplish their aims and goals of persuasion. While addressing the people, Imran vows to include, unite, and emotionally mobilize; Theresa May addresses her subjects, ordering and subtly bending the reality to fit her policy.

This paper demonstrates that it is crucial to understand the characters of metadiscourse to underscore how political communication evolved and establish how the use of such markers can have an impact on intended perception of the message. The corpus analysis indeed has been found helpful for the identification of patterns and strategies in politically informed texts as compared to the previous qualitative method which is quite unreliable in terms of the identification of metadiscourse in politically informed texts. It will be thus valuable for future research to expand this analysis in other cultures to understand how language influences political stance and leadership. The implications of the findings are that there is more to learn about metadiscourse and it is necessary for political persuasion and other communication contexts in multicultural environment.

REFERENCES

1. Ali, A., Rashid, A., & Abbas, S. (2020). Metadiscourse Markers in Political Discourse: A Corpus-Assisted.
2. Ali, A.R., Rashid, A., & Abbas, S. (2020). Metadiscourse Markers in Political Discourse: A Corpus-Assisted Study of Hedges and Boosters in Benazir Bhutto's Speeches.
3. Biber, D. (1988). *Variation Across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Bibi, H., Ishaq, S., & Anwaar, Z. (2024). A Comparative Analysis of Metadiscourse Markers in Pakistani and Native English Travel Blogs. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 8(2), 29-44.
6. Cheng, T. (2021). A multidimensional analysis: speaking style of learner speech across proficiency levels. *Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*.
7. Debras, C. (2021). How to prepare the video component of the Diachronic Corpus of Political Speeches for multimodal analysis. *Research in Corpus Linguistics*, 9(1), 132-151. <https://doi.org/10.32714/ricl.09.01.08>
8. Farahani, M. V., & Kazemian, R. (2021). Speaker-audience interaction in spoken political discourse: a contrastive parallel corpus-based study of English-Persian translation of metadiscourse features in ted talks. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 5(2), 271-298.
9. Gifu, Daniela & Cristea, Dan. (2012). Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Political Language. *Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering*. 164. 10.1007/978-94-007-4516-2_21.
10. <https://corpus.bfsu.edu.cn/MATv1.3Manual.pdf>
11. [https://jan.ucc.nau.edu/biber/Biber/Biber%20\(1995\).pdf](https://jan.ucc.nau.edu/biber/Biber/Biber%20(1995).pdf)
12. https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/corpus/ZJU/xpapers/Xiao_enhanced_MDA
13. Hyland K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Continuum.



14. Ismail, A. I. H. M. (2012). Discourse markers in political speeches: Forms and functions. *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, 23(4).
15. Kashiha, H. (2022). On persuasive strategies: Metadiscourse practices in political speeches. *Discourse and Interaction*, 15(1), 77-100.
16. Nazeer, I., Yousaf, S., & Anwar, N. (2023). Analyzing Linguistic Shifts in Political Discourse: A Corpus-Based Study of Political Rhetoric in the Digital Age. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(4), 3924–3933. <https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2023.1104.0661>
17. Nini, A. (2019). *The Multidimensional Analysis Tagger: A User's Manual*. University of Birmingham.
18. Peres, D. O. (2014). Perception of emotional speech in Brazilian Portuguese: an intonational and multidimensional approach. *Nouveaux cahiers de linguistique française*, 31, 153-196.
19. Rashid, S., Mahmood, B., & Sarfraz, Z. (2024). Register Variation in Pakistani English Political Discourse: An Instigation of Twitter Analytics Using Biber's Multidimensional Analysis. *International "Journal of Academic Research for Humanities"*, 4(2), 210–230. Retrieved from <https://jar.bwo-researches.com/index.php/jarh/article/view/485>
20. Shabestari, S. S., & Abdi, R. An ESP Approach to a Metadiscursive Analysis of Political Science's Corpus.
21. Sheng, D., Li, X. A multi-dimensional analysis of interpreted and non-interpreted English discourses at Chinese and American government press conferences. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 11, 472 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02968-9>
22. Sheng, Dandan & Li, Xin. (2024). A multi-dimensional analysis of interpreted and non-interpreted English discourses at Chinese and American government press conferences. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*. 11. 10.1057/s41599-024-02968-9.
23. Signorello, R., D'Errico, F., Poggi, I., & Demolin, D. (2012). How Charisma Is Perceived from Speech: A Multidimensional Approach. *2012 International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 2012 International Confernece on Social Computing*, 435-440.
24. Syed Ali Bilal, Muhammad usman safdar Butt, Bisma Aftab, & Amir Maqsood (Corresponding author). (2024). A Corpus-Based Meta-Discourse Analysis of Political Speeches by Maryam Nawaz and Shahbaz Sharif. *Al-Mahdi Research Journal (MRJ)*, 5(5), 197–205. Retrieved from <https://ojs.mrj.com.pk/index.php/MRJ/article/view/447>
25. Zhang, M. (2016). A multidimensional analysis of metadiscourse markers across written registers. *Discourse Studies*, 18(2), 204–222. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24815288>
26. Zhuang, G., & Li, Y. (2022). A Study of Xi Jinping's Speech Discourse in the Context of Metadiscourse. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 148, p. 02024). EDP Sciences.