

METADISCOURSE MARKERS IN INTERVIEWS: A CORPUS ANALYSIS STUDY OF ELON MUSK'S SPEECHES

CHAU NGUYEN LAM VAN*

ABSTRACT: This research examined how Elon Musk uses metadiscourse markers to convey certainty, commitment, and persuasion in his speeches. A mixed-method approach, including detailed corpus analysis of Musk's interviews, was employed to identify patterns in his metadiscourse usage. The findings reveal that Musk's communication style is marked by frequent self-mentions, such as "I" and "my," which emphasize his personal involvement and authority, positioning him as a pioneering leader. His direct and confident tone, combined with a humble demeanor, enhances his credibility and earns respect. In contrast, Musk uses few boosters and engagement markers, such as "definitely" and "in fact," favoring precision and directness over emotional appeal. His limited use of attitude markers like "unfortunately" and "hopefully" further underscores his commitment to transparency and factual accuracy, rather than personal sentiment. This approach aligns with Musk's objective of providing clear information about the status and challenges of his ventures. Additionally, his natural, less structured communication style contributes to his distinctive image in the tech and business world. These findings offer insights into how strategic metadiscourse can improve the effectiveness of public communication, especially in fields that require technical accuracy and long-term vision.

KEY WORDS: Metadiscourse markers; Communication style; Self-mentions; Precision; Transparency; Leadership; Public communication; Elon Musk.

RECEIVED: December, 19th, 2024.

EDITED: June, 19th, 2025

1. Introduction

Language lies at the heart of human interaction, serving as the primary medium for expressing ideas, emotions, and intentions. It is both a tool for connection and a lens through which individuals construct and interpret reality. Dialogue, as Irigaray (2008) suggests, is not only a vehicle for co-creating meaning but also a repository for cultural knowledge. Within this dynamic, interviews occupy a unique position, offering a structured yet flexible format for exploring complex ideas, experiences, and phenomena. Scholars such as Kvale (1996) have underscored the richness of interviews as tools for uncovering nuanced layers of meaning, transcending mere data collection to foster deeper understanding. By analyzing the interplay between interviewers and interviewees, discourse analysis provides valuable insights into the linguistic strategies that shape these interactions.

In the modern era of digital influence, figures like Elon Musk emerge as prominent communicators whose words significantly shape public opinion and discourse. Musk's interviews, characterized by their strategic and engaging nature, offer a fertile ground for examining the linguistic elements underpinning effective communication. A critical aspect of this communication lies in the use of metadiscourse markers - linguistic devices such as hedges, boosters, and engagement markers that structure discourse, clarify intent, and facilitate connection with audiences. Understanding how Musk employs these markers not only enriches linguistic scholarship but also provides a window into the rhetorical strategies of influential public figures.

This paper, entitled *"Metadiscourse Markers in Interviews: A Corpus Analysis Study of Elon Musk's Speeches,"* aims to systematically investigate the deployment of metadiscourse markers in Musk's interviews. Drawing on the theoretical frameworks of Hyland (2005, 2010) and Lakoff (1973), it explores how Musk uses these markers to convey certainty, manage interpersonal relationships, and enhance the persuasive power of his discourse. Specifically, the paper addresses two research questions: 1/What types

*Dalat University; Email: lamvan512@gmail.com

of metadiscourse markers are found in Elon Musk's speeches?; 2/How are metadiscourse markers used in his speeches to improve the effectiveness of his communication?

The significance of this research extends beyond the linguistic realm. By examining Musk's use of metadiscourse markers, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of persuasive communication in public discourse. It sheds light on the techniques that enable Musk to build rapport, establish authority, and influence audiences, offering valuable insights for fields such as marketing, public relations, and media studies. Moreover, by employing corpus-assisted discourse analysis, this research provides a systematic and replicable methodology for analyzing linguistic patterns, bridging the gap between linguistic theory and practical applications.

2. Literature review

2.1. Discourse analysis

Discourse analysis (DA) is a fundamental approach in linguistics that examines language beyond the sentence level, delving into how it functions within social, cultural, and situational contexts. This methodology is pivotal not only for analyzing general language use but also for understanding specialized forms of communication, such as interviews. Within the broader framework of linguistics, discourse analysis serves as a tool for unpacking the ways in which language constructs and reflects social realities, a concept significantly advanced by theorists like Foucault (1972) and Goffman (1959). These scholars highlight the profound role of language in shaping societal norms and power relations, underscoring its influence on knowledge dissemination and regulation.

When applied to interview contexts, discourse analysis becomes instrumental in exploring how language mediates communication between participants. The interactive dynamics of interviews often reveal deeper insights into social hierarchies, identity construction, and power imbalances. By examining the linguistic choices of both interviewers and interviewees, researchers can uncover implicit strategies used to assert authority, negotiate meaning, or build rapport. For example, turn-taking strategies, question framing, and the use of hedging devices can all serve as indicators of underlying power dynamics or attempts to manage face-threatening acts.

Moreover, discourse analysis allows researchers to identify recurring patterns in conversational exchanges, such as the use of markers to signal transitions or the adoption of specific interactional strategies to maintain coherence. These elements are crucial for understanding how interview language is not merely a vehicle for information exchange but also a medium for enacting social roles and identities. In essence, discourse analysis provides a versatile framework for examining the intricacies of language use across diverse communicative settings, including interviews.

2.2. An overview of metadiscourse

Metadiscourse, a concept extensively studied within the field of pragmatics, offers significant insights into the interactive dimensions of written and spoken communication. As Hyland (2005:37) defines it, metadiscourse refers to "[t]he cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers as members of a particular community."

This definition highlights the dual purpose of metadiscourse: guiding the audience through a text and facilitating a connection between the author and the audience. Early contributions to the study of metadiscourse include Crismore (1989), who described it as "authorial commentary on the process of writing or reading." Crismore emphasized its potential to enrich comprehension and engagement but also warned against its overuse, which could distract readers or dilute focus. Similarly, Vande Kopple (1985) conceptualized metadiscourse as text segments that help readers interpret, process, or understand the content. However, like Crismore, Kopple cautioned against excessive reliance on specific linguistic features, noting that such an approach might obscure broader contextual interactions.

Hyland (1998a, 2005, 2010) further refined the study of metadiscourse, proposing that it is a strategic tool for managing the relationship between the text and its audience. His work explored its application in academic writing, particularly in enhancing coherence, establishing authorial credibility, and fostering

reader involvement. Hyland's 2005 model classified metadiscourse into two broad categories: interactive and interactional. This dual framework captures the ways in which authors organize information and interact with their audience, addressing both textual coherence and reader engagement.

Other scholars have expanded on Hyland's foundational work. Martín and Pérez (2014) explored metadiscourse's role in persuasive writing, analyzing features such as hedges, boosters, and self-mentions. Ho (2018) examined how these elements contribute to the persuasiveness of arguments, while Skorczynska (2020) focused on first-person references in corporate press releases to uncover their persuasive impact. Collectively, these studies underscore the versatility of metadiscourse as a linguistic tool across genres and contexts.

2.3. Hyland's framework for metadiscourse

Hyland's metadiscourse framework, particularly as articulated in his 2005 and 2010 models, represents a significant advancement in the field. His 2010 model systematically categorizes metadiscourse features, providing a robust theoretical foundation for analyzing their role in constructing meaning and facilitating audience interaction. This framework addresses several limitations identified by earlier scholars. For instance, while Crismore (1989) highlighted the risk of distraction caused by excessive metadiscourse, Hyland's model offers strategies for its effective integration. Similarly, Kopple's (1985) concern about overly narrow linguistic focus is mitigated by Hyland's emphasis on contextual factors, such as audience expectations and authorial intent.

Central to Hyland's approach is the recognition of disciplinary conventions and the concept of discourse communities. These communities, comprising individuals with shared goals and communication norms, significantly influence language use. Understanding these conventions is crucial for authors, as it guides their rhetorical choices and ensures alignment with audience expectations. For example, the strategic use of transitions or hedges may vary depending on whether the discourse is situated within a scientific, literary, or corporate context.

Hyland's model is particularly relevant for analyzing public figures like Elon Musk, whose speeches and documents exemplify the strategic use of metadiscourse. By applying this framework, researchers can explore how Musk constructs his persona, engages his audience, and achieves his communicative objectives.

2.4. Interactive metadiscourse

Interactive metadiscourse focuses on organizing content to enhance readability and guide the audience through a text. It reflects the author's awareness of the reader's needs, considering factors such as background knowledge and processing capacity. Hyland (2005, 2010) identified five key subcategories of interactive metadiscourse:

- Transitions: These linguistic devices connect ideas, signaling relationships such as addition ("and," "in addition"), contrast ("but," "however"), or causality ("therefore"). For instance, "In addition, this method offers robust analytical capabilities."
- Frame markers: These markers indicate text boundaries and organizational structure, using terms like "first," "to conclude," or "let's turn to." They help readers navigate the logical flow of the text.
- Endophoric markers: These elements reference other parts of the text, such as "noted above" or "see Figure 3," fostering cohesion and guiding readers to related content.
- Evidentials: Evidentials attribute information to external sources, enhancing credibility. For example, "According to Smith (2020), this approach yields significant results."
- Code glosses: These markers restate or elaborate on information, using phrases like "in other words" or "namely" to ensure clarity and comprehension.

2.5. Interactional metadiscourse

Interactional metadiscourse emphasizes the relationship between the author and the audience, allowing the former to convey stance and foster engagement. Hyland (2005, 2010) identified the following subcategories:

- Hedges: These expressions, such as "might," "perhaps," or "it appears that," convey uncertainty or caution, as in "This suggests a possible link between the variables."
- Boosters: In contrast, boosters like "definitely" or "it is clear that" assert confidence, reinforcing the author's claims. For instance, "The findings definitively support this hypothesis."
- Attitude markers: These markers reflect the author's affective stance, using terms like "surprisingly" or "fortunately" to express opinions.
- Engagement markers: Engagement markers directly address the reader, using commands ("consider"), questions, or inclusive pronouns ("we," "our") to build rapport.
- Self-mentions: Self-mentions, such as "I" or "we," explicitly signal the author's presence, shaping the tone and fostering a personal connection.

2.6. Relevance of Hyland's model to the current study

Hyland's framework is particularly suited for analyzing the language of influential figures like Elon Musk. By examining Musk's use of interactive and interactional metadiscourse, researchers can gain insights into his rhetorical strategies, audience engagement, and persona construction. For instance, his frequent use of boosters may underscore his confidence in innovative ideas, while hedges could reflect strategic caution in speculative claims. Additionally, engagement markers in his speeches might reveal efforts to build rapport with diverse audiences, from investors to technology enthusiasts.

In conclusion, the study of metadiscourse offers a powerful lens for understanding how language functions as both a communicative tool and a medium for social interaction. Hyland's comprehensive framework provides valuable methodologies for exploring these dynamics, making it an indispensable resource for analyzing complex linguistic phenomena.

2.7. Previous studies on metadiscourse markers

Research on metadiscourse has spanned diverse languages and discourse types, focusing on its role in communication. Hyland (2004) analyzed metadiscourse in Hong Kong students' dissertations, identifying interactive and interactional elements as central to academic persuasion. Similarly, Mur-Dueñas (2011) explored cross-cultural differences in metadiscourse in English and Spanish research articles, revealing the prominence of interactional markers in English. Crismore and Farnsworth (1990) highlighted metadiscourse's role in establishing ethos, as seen in Darwin's writings, while Ho (2016) examined its strategic use by the Hong Kong government to influence public opinion on education policies. Studies of media discourse, such as Dafouz-Milne's (2008) analysis of British and Spanish newspapers, and public speeches, including Nan and Liu's (2013) study of Steve Jobs' rhetoric, demonstrate metadiscourse's versatility in enhancing persuasion and audience engagement.

Despite these contributions, existing research often focuses on academic, political, or scripted discourse, leaving gaps in understanding its application in spontaneous, specialized contexts. To address this, the present study investigates metadiscourse markers in Elon Musk's interviews, combining Hyland's framework with corpus analysis. By examining Musk's real-time communication in diverse settings, this research extends metadiscourse theory into technology and business domains, offering fresh insights into its role in dynamic and influential discourse.

3. Methodology

The methodology for this paper adopts Hyland's framework (2005, 2010), offering a systematic lens for analyzing metadiscourse markers in Elon Musk's interviews. By categorizing markers into interactive and interactional dimensions, this approach explores their role in organizing discourse and establishing rapport. Such a framework ensures a nuanced, credible analysis aligned with discourse analysis principles.

To investigate Musk's rhetorical strategies, a multi-method approach integrates qualitative insights, quantitative measurements, and corpus-based techniques. Using AntConc software, transcriptions of eight interviews (2013–2023) were analyzed to identify metadiscourse patterns. This comprehensive design highlights shifts in Musk's communication, providing a robust dataset to understand his evolving use of persuasive language in high-profile discourse.

4. Findings and discussion

4.1. Metadiscourse markers in Elon Musk's interviews

An analysis of Elon Musk's interviews reveals a total of 6,872 metadiscourse markers, divided into interactive and interactional resources. Table 3 provides a detailed count, highlighting Musk's strategic use of these markers to facilitate communication and enhance audience engagement.

Interactive resources are represented by 2,641 instances, with transitions being the most frequent (2,484 occurrences). These markers, including "but" (516), "and" (1,906), and "therefore" (8), guide the flow of conversation and signal shifts in topics. Frame markers (70 instances), such as "first" (50) and "second" (16), structure discourse, while code glosses (87 occurrences) clarify meanings, aiding comprehension. Interestingly, endophoric markers and evidentials are absent, suggesting a focus on direct and immediate discourse rather than referencing external materials.

Interactional resources dominate with 4,231 markers, emphasizing Musk's engagement with his audience. Self-mentions account for the largest share (2,896 instances), using pronouns like "I" (1,889) and "we" (795) to personalize discourse and assert authority. Hedges (1,197), such as "might" (41) and "I think" (412), demonstrate cautious expression, while boosters (102 instances), including "in fact" (42) and "definitely" (41), convey certainty and confidence. Attitude markers (25) reflect Musk's opinions and emotional stance, whereas engagement markers (11) encourage audience involvement.

Table 1. *Counts and Percentages of Metadiscourse Markers in Elon Musk's Interviews*

	Category	Number of metadiscourse markers	Percentage of metadiscourse per 6872 markers
Interactive resources	Transitions	2484	36.15
	Frame markers	70	1.02
	Code glosses	87	1.27
Interactional resources	Hedges	1197	17.42
	Boosters	102	1.48
	Attitude markers	25	0.36
	Engagement markers	11	0.16
	Self mentions	2896	42.12
Total		6872	100

The Table and Figure above illustrate the distribution of these markers. Self-mentions comprise the largest percentage (42.12%), followed by transitions (36.15%) and hedges (17.42%). This pattern aligns with findings by Nan and Liu (2013), highlighting the absence of endophoric markers in spoken discourse. Musk's reliance on interactional resources underscores his focus on clarity, audience connection, and message delivery. These findings reveal Musk's strategic approach, prioritizing engagement and fostering understanding in his interviews. The following sections will elaborate the findings in more details.

4.1.1. Interactive resources

(1) *Transitions: Establishing semantic relations:* Transitions are the most prevalent interactive markers in Elon Musk's interviews, with 2,484 instances accounting for 36.15% of all metadiscourse markers. This high frequency underscores Musk's emphasis on coherence and clarity. Common markers like "and" (1,906 instances) ensure smooth narrative flow, while "but" (516 instances) introduces contrasts and new perspectives. Less frequent markers such as "in addition," "therefore," and "still" expand on ideas or emphasize relevance. Notably, Musk often uses the cluster "and then you" to transition between thoughts, enhancing audience comprehension. These deliberate choices reflect Musk's strategic use of transitions to structure his arguments and maintain logical consistency.

(2) *Frame markers: Structuring discourse:* Frame markers are sparse in Musk's discourse, appearing only 70 times (1.02%). Words like "first" (50 instances), "second" (16 instances), and "finally" (4

instances) indicate a structured progression but are used minimally. The absence of explicit phrases such as "to conclude" or "let's turn to" suggests Musk relies on a conversational style, trusting his audience to follow the natural flow of his arguments. This informal approach enhances relatability and allows technical content to remain accessible.

(3) *Code glosses: Clarifying information:* Code glosses appear 87 times (1.27%), with "that is" used predominantly (85 instances). This reflects Musk's focus on clarifying complex ideas for his audience. However, markers like "such as" and "in other words" are rare, and others like "namely" are absent. This selective use highlights Musk's preference for straightforward elaboration, reinforcing the precision and clarity of his discourse.

4.1.2. Interactional Resources

(i) *Hedges: Indicating uncertainty:* Elon Musk employs hedges frequently, with 1,197 instances (17.42% of interactional markers), reflecting his preference for cautious and flexible communication. This strategy conveys humility and avoids overly assertive statements. The most common hedges are "I think" (412 occurrences) and "about" (253 times), often used to qualify ideas and guide discussions. Clusters such as "I think we should" and "about the future" underscore Musk's forward-looking and inclusive approach. Other nuanced hedges like "might," "perhaps," and "could" further indicate his deliberate communication style. Unlike academic norms, phrases such as "it appears that" are absent, showcasing Musk's distinct rhetorical strategies.

(ii) *Boosters: Expressing certainty:* Musk sparingly uses boosters, comprising only 1.48% of interactional markers. Key examples include "in fact" (42 times) and "definitely" (41 times), employed to underscore factuality or confidence. Less frequent markers like "of course" (8 times) and "obvious" (6 times) highlight Musk's cautious approach, prioritizing balance over emphasis. Compared to other leaders, such as Steve Jobs, Musk's restrained use of boosters reflects a measured, analytical style.

(iii) *Attitude markers: Conveying emotion and opinion:* Attitude markers are minimal, appearing 25 times (0.36%). Words like "hopefully" (9 times) and "unfortunately" (6 times) reveal rare moments of emotional engagement. This sparing use suggests Musk's focus on objectivity, avoiding overt emotional expressions to maintain professionalism and clarity.

(iv) *Engagement markers: Building interaction:* Engagement markers are rare (11 instances, 0.16%), with phrases like "consider" (7 times) prompting reflection. Musk's limited use contrasts with other leaders who employ engagement markers more actively, suggesting a preference for delivering information authoritatively rather than interactively.

(v) *Self-mentions: Establishing presence:* Self-mentions dominate Musk's discourse, totaling 2,896 instances (42.12%). "I" appears 1,889 times, often clustered with phrases like "I think" or "I mean", reflecting Musk's assertive and personal communication style. "We" (795 times) highlights collective action and teamwork. This emphasis on self-mentions portrays Musk as a confident and pioneering leader, balancing personal authority with inclusivity.

Overall, Musk's use of interactional resources reveals a strategic blend of caution, confidence, and objectivity, emphasizing clarity and relatability over rhetorical flourish. This distinctive approach enhances his credibility and solidifies his leadership persona.

4.2. Metadiscourse markers in Elon Musk's speeches: Enhancing conversational effectiveness

Table 3 analyzes Elon Musk's strategic use of 2,641 interactive and 4,231 interactional resources in interviews. Interactive resources foster audience engagement through direct address and prompting, while interactional resources build rapport, convey viewpoints, and provide evidence. This dual approach enhances audience participation, reinforces arguments with credibility, and highlights Musk's skill as a persuasive and engaging communicator.

4.2.1. Interactive resources in Elon Musk's communication

a) *Transitions: Enhancing clarity and flow:* Elon Musk frequently employs transitions like *and* (1,906 times) and *but* (516 times) to organize his discourse effectively. For instance, in a 2021 interview with Lex Fridman, *and* appeared 492 times, linking ideas sequentially and fostering coherence. Common

clusters like "and I" or "and then" highlight Musk's focus on narrative flow and personal involvement, making his points accessible and engaging. Similarly, *but* often introduces contrast, as seen in phrases like "but I think," used to balance optimism and caution. For example, Musk contrasts Bitcoin's inflation mechanisms with traditional currency, using *but* to juxtapose drawbacks and advantages, thereby structuring arguments with precision.

b) Frame markers: Structuring discourse: Musk employs frame markers sparingly, avoiding explicit phrases like "to conclude" or "now, let's turn to." Instead, he relies on logical progression to connect ideas naturally, encouraging the audience to follow his reasoning. This approach reflects his preference for transparency, aligning with his role in advancing scientific and technological discourse. In contrast, Steve Jobs extensively used frame markers to emphasize innovation and compelling presentations, showcasing distinct organizational strategies between the two leaders.

c) Code glosses: Clarifying complex ideas: Musk frequently uses *that is* (85 times) to clarify intricate concepts, particularly on topics like AI, cryptocurrency, and governance. For example, he explains cryptocurrency as a "database that is called money," breaking down abstract ideas into relatable terms. This technique enhances audience understanding and reinforces his ability to communicate complex ideas with precision.

4.2.2. Interactional resources

1) Hedges - Balancing certainty and openness in Musk's statements: Elon Musk extensively uses hedge words like "might," "perhaps," "possible," "about," "would," "could," and "I think" to temper the certainty of his statements, allowing for nuanced expression. Phrases like "I think" reflect his open-minded approach, while terms like "about the answer" and "about the future" suggest his curiosity and forward-thinking mindset. Musk frequently uses "would be" and "could be" to discuss hypothetical scenarios, softening his statements and presenting them as possibilities rather than certainties. For example, in discussing humanity's need to become a multi-planet species, he uses "I think" to emphasize subjectivity. Musk's use of hedges, which constitutes 17.42% of his speech, contrasts with the styles of other leaders like Steve Jobs (2.5%) and Jacinda Ardern (5.93%), highlighting his cautious, open-minded communication style.

2) Booster - reinforcing confidence and persuasion in arguments: Elon Musk uses boosters sparingly in his discourse, with "in fact" appearing 42 times and "definitely" 41 times. These boosters emphasize certainty, particularly when discussing topics like technology's impact, AI risks, and climate change. Musk's use of boosters constitutes just 1.48% of his speech, reflecting his cautious approach to avoid unrealistic expectations. This contrasts with leaders like Bhutan's Prime Minister, who used more boosters, balancing confidence with openness. Musk's restrained use of boosters helps maintain transparency and manage expectations, particularly for ongoing projects like Mars exploration.

3) Attitude markers - Conveying Musk's perspective and emotions: Attitude markers, which convey emotional or subjective viewpoints, are used sparingly in Elon Musk's discourse. Markers like "unfortunately" (6 times), "I agree" (5 times), and "hopefully" (9 times) appear infrequently, while others are absent. This suggests Musk's deliberate communication style, which prioritizes neutrality and objectivity. He avoids emotional emphasis, focusing instead on clear, factual information. This approach aligns with studies by Kuswoyo and Siregar (2019) and Azijah and Gulö (2020), reflecting Musk's commitment to honesty, clarity, and credibility.

4) Engagement markers - Directly involving the audience in conversations: Elon Musk uses engagement markers minimally, making up only 0.16% of his speech. This aligns with his factual communication style, focusing on providing clear information rather than fostering audience interaction. In contrast, other figures like Steve Jobs (20.5%) and Jacinda Ardern (Azijah & Gulö, 2020) use engagement markers more extensively to create emotional connections and emphasize key points.

5) Self mentions - Establishing a personal connection with the audience: Elon Musk's frequent use of self-mentions in interviews is notable, with "I" appearing 1889 times, making up 42.12% of all metadiscourse markers. This indicates a strong focus on individual self-reference, positioning Musk as the

central figure in discussions. He also uses "we" (795 times) and "my" (107 times), but these are less prominent. Musk's self-referential language emphasizes his authority, accountability, and involvement in the topics he discusses, including space exploration, AI, and sustainable energy.

This pattern is similar to the findings of Albalat-Mascarell and Carrió-Pastor (2019), who noted that political figures often prioritize self-mentions to assert leadership. Musk's use of phrases like "I think," "I mean," and "I am" emphasizes his personal viewpoints and approaches. For example, when discussing AI or space exploration, he often frames his statements as personal opinions, inviting consideration rather than asserting absolute truths.

Musk's frequent use of "we" conveys collaboration and shared responsibility, as seen when discussing the development of Tesla's autonomous vehicles or sustainable energy efforts. His self-mention rate, much higher than figures like Steve Jobs (20.5%) or Jacinda Ardern (11.11%), reflects his strong focus on personal leadership and his active role in driving technological advancements. This style fosters a direct connection with his audience, highlighting his leadership in shaping innovative futures.

5. Conclusion and implications

This paper aimed to examine how Elon Musk uses metadiscourse markers to convey certainty, commitment, and persuasion in his communication. By employing corpus analysis, the study identified patterns in Musk's interviews, revealing his strategies for managing communication complexities. The goal was to better understand the use of metadiscourse in the speech of influential figures like Musk, highlighting his rhetorical choices and implicit messages.

The findings revealed key aspects of Musk's communication style. His frequent self-mentions, using "I" and "my," underscored his leadership role and personal involvement in his ventures. Additionally, Musk's minimal use of boosters and engagement markers suggested a preference for precision and directness, rather than emotional appeal. His restrained use of attitude markers also reflected his commitment to transparency, prioritizing factual accuracy over personal sentiment.

These insights emphasized the importance of aligning communication strategies with the specific needs of a field, highlighting how metadiscourse can enhance public communication, particularly in technical domains.

Speakers can improve communication by balancing personal and collective pronouns, using "we" and "us" to promote unity and collaboration. While Elon Musk emphasizes his personal role through self-mention markers, speakers should focus on collective efforts to foster team spirit. Increasing engagement markers can strengthen rapport with the audience, encouraging interaction and feedback - something Musk's sparse use of markers may lack. Boosters and attitude markers, when used thoughtfully, can enhance persuasiveness and emotional impact while maintaining accuracy. Musk's transparency is a key strength that leaders should emulate, ensuring clarity and avoiding unrealistic expectations. Lastly, adapting communication styles for different audiences can enhance effectiveness. By implementing these strategies, speakers can optimize their communication, improve efficiency, and contribute to organizational success.

REFERENCES

1. Crismore, A. (1989), *Talking with readers: Metadiscourse as a rhetorical act*. New York: Peter Lang.
2. Crismore, A., & Farnsworth, R. (1990), Metadiscourse in popular and professional science discourse. In W. Nash (Ed.), *The writing scholar: Studies in academic discourse*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
3. Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008), The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: A cross-linguistic study of newspaper discourse. *Journal of pragmatics*, 40(1), 95-113.
4. Foucault, M. (1972), *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Vintage.
5. Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Anchor Books.

6. Ho V. (2018), Using metadiscourse in making persuasive attempts through workplace request emails. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 134, 70-81.
7. Ho, V. (2016), Discourse of persuasion: a preliminary study of the use of metadiscourse in policy documents. *Text & Talk*, 36(1), 1-21.
8. Hyland, K. (1998a), Persuasion and Context: The Pragmatics of Academic Metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(4), 437-455.
9. Hyland, K. (2005), *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Continuum.
10. Hyland, K. L. (2010), Metadiscourse: Mapping interactions in academic writing. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*.
11. Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004), Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177.
12. Irigaray, L. (2008), *Conversations*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
13. Kopple, W. J. V. (1985), Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College composition and communication*, 82-93.
14. Kvale, S. (1996), *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
15. Lakoff, R. T. (1973), Hedges: A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 183-228.
16. Martín P., Pérez I. K. L. (2014), Convincing peers of the value of one's research: A genre analysis of rhetorical promotion in academic texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 34, 1-13.
17. Mur-Dueñas, P. (2011), An intercultural analysis of metadiscourse features in research articles written in English and in Spanish. *Journal of pragmatics*, 43(12), 3068-3079.
18. Nan, Y., & Liu, L. (2013), Investigating the interpersonal and textual meaning of Steve Jobs' Stanford speech in terms of Hyland's metadiscourse theory. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 1(4), 90-96.
19. Skorczynska H. (2020), "We are prepared to play our part . . .": A case study of the use of first-person references in e-releases from two oil companies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 155, 1-14.

Các dấu hiệu siêu ngôn ngữ trong các bài phỏng vấn:

Một nghiên cứu về các bài phát biểu của Elon Musk

Tóm tắt: Bài báo này nghiên cứu cách Elon Musk sử dụng các dấu hiệu siêu ngôn ngữ để truyền đạt sự đảm bảo, cam kết và thuyết phục trong các bài phát biểu của ông. Phương pháp nghiên cứu hỗn hợp, bao gồm phân tích dữ liệu từ các cuộc phỏng vấn của Musk, đã được áp dụng để xác định các mô hình trong việc sử dụng siêu ngôn ngữ của ông. Kết quả nghiên cứu cho thấy phong cách giao tiếp của Musk được đánh dấu bởi việc sử dụng thường xuyên các tự xưng, chẳng hạn như "tôi" và "của tôi", nhấn mạnh sự tham gia và quyền lực cá nhân của ông, giúp ông khẳng định vai trò là một nhà lãnh đạo tiên phong. Tông giọng trực tiếp và tự tin của Musk, kết hợp với phong thái khiêm tốn, nâng cao độ tin cậy và nhận được sự tôn trọng. Ngược lại, Musk ít sử dụng các từ ngữ tăng cường và các dấu hiệu kết nối như "chắc chắn" và "thực tế", ưu tiên sự chính xác và trực tiếp thay vì sự kêu gọi cảm xúc. Việc ông hạn chế sử dụng các dấu hiệu thái độ như "thật không may" và "hy vọng" càng làm nổi bật cam kết của ông đối với tính minh bạch và độ chính xác, thay vì cảm xúc cá nhân. Phương pháp này phù hợp với mục tiêu của Musk là cung cấp thông tin rõ ràng về tình hình và thách thức trong các dự án của ông. Thêm vào đó, phong cách giao tiếp tự nhiên, ít cấu trúc của Musk góp phần tạo nên hình ảnh đặc trưng của ông trong thế giới công nghệ và kinh doanh. Những kết quả này mang đến cái nhìn về cách sử dụng siêu ngôn ngữ chiến lược có thể cải thiện hiệu quả giao tiếp công chúng, đặc biệt trong các lĩnh vực đòi hỏi độ chính xác kỹ thuật và tầm nhìn dài hạn.

Từ khóa: Các dấu hiệu siêu ngôn ngữ; phong cách giao tiếp; tự xưng; sự chính xác; tính minh bạch; lãnh đạo; giao tiếp công chúng; Elon Musk.