Terra Linguistica. 17 (1) (2026) 79–100.
Terra Linguistica. 2026, Том 17, № 1. С. 79–100.

Research article
UDC 81'42
DOI: https://doi.org/10.18721/JHSS.17105
EDN: https://elibrary/OJSYMF

DISCURSIVE MARKERS OF AUTHORIAL STANCE IN ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ACADEMIC COMMUNICATION BY NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS (BASED ON AZERBAIJANI PRACTICE)

N. Dashdamirova ✉

Azerbaijan Medicine University, Baku, Azerbaijan

✉ ndasdemirova@amu.edu.az

Abstract. This study examines how authorial stance is expressed in academic writing by native English speakers (L1) and non-native English speakers (L2), with a focus on the use of discourse markers such as hedges (markers of mitigation), boosters (markers of epistemic strengthening), attitude markers, and self-mentions. The aim of the study is to identify cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary differences and evaluate how rhetorical and institutional conventions influence L2 authors' stance strategies. A comparative corpus-based methodology was employed. The analysis drew on two corpora: the British Academic Written English and the Michigan Corpus of Upper-Level Student Papers, supplemented by original academic texts written by students at the Azerbaijan Medical University. Using Hyland's metadiscourse model, stance markers were extracted through lexicon-based queries and manually verified in context. Data were compared across disciplines (engineering vs business) and author status (L1 vs L2). The findings reveal that L2 authors, especially in technical disciplines, tend to overuse hedging and avoid self-mentions, often due to rhetorical traditions that discourage personal voice. In contrast, L1 authors exhibit greater lexical diversity and a balanced use of stance markers. In business-related texts, L2 authors show more assertive and expressive stance, though still limited in range compared to native speakers. Stance in academic writing is not only a linguistic but also a culturally and institutionally mediated phenomenon. The study underscores the need for targeted instruction in metadiscourse to enhance L2 authors' rhetorical awareness and help them align with academic norms of different disciplines.

Keywords: stance, academic writing, hedge, booster, attitude marker, self-mention.

Citation: Dashdamirova N., Discursive Markers of Authorial Stance in English-Language Academic Communication by Native and Non-Native Speakers (Based on Azerbaijani Practice), Terra Linguistica, 17 (1) (2026) 79–100. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.17105

Научная статья
DOI: https://doi.org/10.18721/JHSS.17105

ДИСКУРСИВНЫЕ МАРКЕРЫ АВТОРСКОЙ ПОЗИЦИИ В АНГЛОЯЗЫЧНОЙ АКАДЕМИЧЕСКОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ НА РОДНОМ И НЕРОДНОМ ЯЗЫКЕ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСКОЙ ПРАКТИКИ)

Н. Дашдамирова ✉

Азербайджанский медицинский университет, Баку, Азербайджан

✉ ndasdemirova@amu.edu.az

Аннотация. В данном исследовании рассматривается, как выражается авторская позиция (stance) в академическом письме носителями английского языка (L1) и теми, для кого английский является неродным (L2), с акцентом на использование дискурсивных маркеров, таких как хеджеры (маркеры смягчения высказывания), бустеры (маркеры усиления эпистемической уверенности), маркеры оценки и выражения авторского «я». Целью является выявление межъязыковых и междисциплинарных различий, а также оценка того, как риторические и институциональные нормы влияют на стратегии выражения позиции у L2-авторов. Исследование основано на сопоставительном корпусном анализе. В качестве эмпирической базы использовались два корпуса – British Academic Written English и Michigan Corpus of Upper-Level Student Papers, дополненные оригинальными академическими текстами студентов Азербайджанского медицинского университета. С использованием модели метадискурса Хайланда маркеры оценки извлекались по лексическим признакам и проверялись вручную в контексте. Данные сравнивались по дисциплинам (инженерия vs. бизнес) и по статусу авторов (L1 vs. L2). Результаты показывают, что L2-авторы, особенно в технических дисциплинах, склонны к чрезмерному использованию хеджеров и избеганию самоупоминаний, что часто обусловлено риторическими традициями, не поощряющими персонализированный стиль. В отличие от них, L1-авторы демонстрируют большую лексическую вариативность и более сбалансированное использование маркеров позиции. В текстах по бизнесу L2-авторы проявляют более уверенную и экспрессивную позицию, хотя их речевая лексическая база недостаточно широкая по сравнению с носителями языка. Авторская позиция в академическом письме определяется не только языковыми, но и культурными и институциональными факторами. Исследование подчеркивает необходимость целенаправленного обучения метадискурсу для повышения риторической осведомленности L2-авторов и их успешной адаптации к академическим нормам разных дисциплин.

Ключевые слова: позиция говорящего, академическое письмо, хеджер, усиливающее высказывание, маркер оценки, выражение авторского «я».

Для цитирования: Дашдамирова Н. Дискурсивные маркеры авторской позиции в англоязычной академической коммуникации на родном и неродном языке (на материале азербайджанской практики) // Terra Linguistica. 2026. Т. 17. № 1. С. 79–100. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.17105

Introduction

In academic writing, authors employ various linguistic resources to communicate effectively with readers, one of the most important being the expression of *authorial stance* – the writer's attitude, viewpoint, or degree of commitment to the propositional content [1]. Stance is broadly defined as "the feeling, attitude, perspective, or position of the speaker/writer as expressed in discourse" [2], or, as Zheltova formulates, "the linguistic mechanisms used by speakers and writers to convey their personal feelings and assessments" [3]. Through stance, authors signal their orientation to the topic, calibrate the strength of their claims, and persuade readers of their arguments. Concordance analysis provides micro-contexts in which stance is realized, showing how specific lexical items function syntactically

and semantically, and helping verify whether hedges, boosters, and attitude markers are used in a nuanced and discipline-appropriate way [4].

In this study, stance-related terms follow established frameworks. According to Hyland [5, 6], *hedging* expresses tentativeness or reduced commitment (e.g., *might*, *possibly*, *it seems that...*), while *boosting* strengthens epistemic certainty (e.g., *clearly*, *undoubtedly*, *it is evident that...*). The broader notion of *epistemic stance* is drawn from Biber et al.[1] and Martin & White [7], referring to the writer's epistemic or attitudinal positioning. These definitions ensure consistency and clear differentiation among stance phenomena.

Constructing an appropriate stance is essential in academic discourse. As Hyland notes, "it is impossible not to take a position in a text," and writers inevitably present themselves as either confident or cautious, shaping how readers perceive their work [6]. Effective academic writing relies on interactional metadiscourse, including hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention, which help modulate commitment, express evaluation, and signal authorial presence. Proper use of these devices contributes to persuasive and coherent scientific argumentation [8].

The study of stance markers is justified because their mastery is widely viewed as a hallmark of advanced academic writing. For many students, especially non-native (L2) writers, articulating stance is challenging, as these linguistic mechanisms often remain tacit knowledge that is difficult to acquire without explicit instruction [9]. Research shows that novice writers, both native (L1) and L2, tend to misbalance stance expression: they may overuse boosters or underuse hedges. L1 English students usually achieve a more flexible balance between confidence and caution, whereas L2 writers often struggle to convey calibrated commitment. Hyland & Milton [10] note that many learners have a more limited range of mitigating devices compared to native speakers, resulting in texts that appear either overly blunt or overly cautious.

Corpus-based studies offer valuable evidence on how stance markers are deployed by different writer groups. The BAWE[2] corpus (≈6.5 million words) provides multidisciplinary samples of student writing [11], while the MICUSP[3] corpus includes 2.6 million words of top-rated papers across 16 disciplines [12]. These corpora are widely used as representative benchmarks for comparing L1 and L2 academic writing [13].

The aim of this article is to examine how stance markers function in academic writing by L1 and L2 users of English. The study compares hedging (attenuation) and boosting (intensification) strategies in L1 and L2 student texts using data from BAWE and MICUSP, drawing on examples from several disciplines – including engineering and the social sciences – to determine how signalling of certainty and uncertainty varies depending on writers' linguistic backgrounds.

The present research is of significant theoretical and practical value for applied and corpus linguistics, as it advances understanding of how stance is expressed in academic writing across linguistic and cultural contexts. Prior studies [5, 14, 15] highlight that stance and engagement markers play a central role in constructing authorial identity and positioning within disciplinary discourse. The topic is increasingly relevant in light of the internationalization of higher education and the active involvement of L2 English speakers in global academic communication [16]. By comparing the use of hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mentions in L1 and L2 academic writing, this study addresses a gap noted in earlier corpus-based research, which often lacked systematic comparison linking linguistic form to rhetorical function [10, 17, 18].

The findings also contribute to pedagogy by offering empirical insight into the difficulties L2 writers face in calibrating certainty and tentativeness – a recurring theme in studies of academic discourse competence [19, 20]. These results may inform targeted instructional practices aimed at improving

[1] Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan E., Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English, John Benjamins Publishing Company, London, 2021. DOI: 10.1075/z.232

[2] BAWE – British Academic Written English.

[3] MICUSP – Michigan Corpus of Upper-Level Student Papers.

metadiscursive competence and rhetorical awareness. Moreover, the study supports the development of cross-linguistic models of academic discourse [21, 22], crucial for fostering effective intercultural communication in multilingual scholarly environments.

Despite extensive theoretical discussion of stance in academic discourse, less attention has been paid to how stance markers are actually distributed and function across disciplines in student academic writing. Much of the existing research focuses either on published expert texts or on isolated categories of stance, without systematically comparing L1 and L2 student writing across disciplinary domains. As a result, it remains unclear how differences in linguistic background interact with disciplinary conventions in shaping patterns of hedging, boosting, evaluation, and authorial presence. Addressing this gap requires an empirical, corpus-based approach that can reveal not only overall frequencies but also discipline-specific tendencies in stance realization.

To succeed at the tertiary level, students must master not only disciplinary content and grammar but also the nuanced skill of expressing certainty, uncertainty, evaluation, and authorial presence. Mastery of stance marking is widely regarded as a key indicator of advanced academic literacy, as metadiscourse plays a central role in constructing authorial voice, negotiating claims, and engaging readers. Thus, focusing on stance markers is well-justified, as it targets a core dimension of academic writing proficiency and contributes to broader metadiscourse scholarship.

While previous studies have extensively documented L1–L2 differences in stance expression, including tendencies toward cautiousness in technical disciplines and limited repertoires of stance devices (e.g., Hyland, Vassileva, Hinkel), the present study does not aim to replicate these findings at a descriptive level. Its contribution lies in the integrated analytical design and interpretative focus. Specifically, this research combines writer status (L1 vs. L2), disciplinary domain (engineering vs. business/management), and corpus status (BAWE, MICUSP, and an original Azerbaijan Medical University (AMU) learner corpus) within a single comparative framework. Unlike earlier studies focusing on a single corpus type or disciplinary domain, the present analysis includes L2 academic writing from medical and technical contexts that remain underrepresented in previous research. Moreover, the study moves beyond frequency-based comparison to examine the functional diversity and repertoire breadth of stance markers, interpreting excessive cautiousness not as a linguistic deficit but as an institutionally and pedagogically conditioned rhetorical strategy. This multidimensional perspective allows for a more nuanced understanding of stance as a context-sensitive and socially mediated phenomenon.

This study addresses the following research questions:

(1) How do L1 and L2 student writers differ in their use of stance markers (hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions) across disciplinary domains?

(2) To what extent do these differences reflect disciplinary conventions versus language-proficiency factors?

Based on prior works [5, 9], the following hypotheses are proposed:

– L2 writers will use a narrower set of hedging and boosting devices, relying mainly on modal verbs to express epistemic stance;

– L1 writers will exhibit greater lexical diversity and more balanced stance profiles across genres;

– disciplinary norms (e.g., engineering vs. business/management) will shape these contrasts, producing more cautious tone in technical writing and greater assertiveness in social-science texts.

Literature Review

Corpus linguistics provides a crucial foundation for analyzing stance in academic writing, allowing quantitative and qualitative investigation of linguistic behavior across genres and disciplines. Prior research indicates that stance varies not only by proficiency level but also by rhetorical context. Aull [23], for example, shows that even advanced undergraduates display strong genre-dependent variation:

argumentative essays contain more attitude markers and self-mentions, while lab reports favor hedging and impersonal style. This demonstrates that stance is a rhetorical choice shaped by disciplinary norms rather than a fixed linguistic feature. This view is further supported by corpus-based studies of academic discourse, which show that increased explicitness in academic texts is often achieved through discourse-level resources. As noted by Serova, "increased text explicitness is characterized by a higher frequency of personal, possessive and demonstrative pronouns, as well as discourse markers used for clarification and contrast" [24].

Although corpus-based studies such as Siu et al. [1] and Dalaf [25] offer valuable empirical evidence, they often do not address the rhetorical or institutional motivations behind frequency patterns. Siu et al. [1] found that Hong Kong engineering students underused approximative hedges and self-mentions compared to U.S. peers, yet did not consider how local pedagogical traditions might promote excessive caution. Dalaf's work [25] highlights L2 reliance on formulaic stance expressions but stops short of explaining how stance competence develops during academic socialization.

Other research provides complementary insights. Chen [26] shows that L2 business theses often combine excessive boosting with frequent hedging, producing oscillatory stance profiles. However, the study does not clarify whether this reflects uncertainty, L1 rhetorical transfer, or gaps in pedagogical training. The present study advances this line of inquiry by interpreting stance behavior through the interaction of linguistic, cultural, and institutional factors. This distinction is also confirmed by recent studies of evaluative discourse in academic communication. As shown in research on open peer review, "positive evaluations are mainly objectivized, explicit and non-graduated, whereas negative evaluations tend to be subjectivized, implicit, and dialogic, allowing room for alternative viewpoints" [27, p. 58].

However, Hyland's studies [5, 6, 9, 10] primarily focus on expert and advanced student writing in Anglophone contexts and do not systematically address stance variation in medical and technical L2 student writing across disciplinary domains. Yet his model has been critiqued for emphasizing textual function while giving limited attention to the socio-institutional voices behind stance choices. Conversely, Biber's multidimensional approach[4] provides detailed grammatical correlates but lacks rhetorical interpretation. Although later studies have extended both frameworks, few integrate functional and sociocultural perspectives within a single empirical design [9, 14, 15].

Cross-cultural studies by Vassileva [17] and Dontcheva-Navratilova [18] demonstrate that writers from different linguistic backgrounds show distinct tendencies in self-reference and epistemic caution. However, these works focus primarily on published research articles rather than student writing, leaving open questions about how stance develops at earlier stages of academic literacy. More recent reviews, such as Pearson & Abdollahzadeh [13], emphasize the need for replication and clearer operationalization of stance categories, noting that many corpus-based studies lack methodological consistency or reflection on model applicability across genres. However, these studies focus predominantly on published research articles and do not examine how commitment and detachment are realized in student academic writing within specific disciplinary and institutional contexts.

The present study addresses these limitations by adopting an integrated comparative design. It combines quantitative corpus-based analysis with qualitative functional interpretation of stance markers and examines L1 and L2 student writing within a unified analytical framework. By comparing stance strategies across disciplines and institutional contexts, the study moves beyond descriptive inventories of markers and offers a more comprehensive account of how authorial positioning is negotiated in academic discourse. It re-evaluates Hyland's framework [9, 10] through the lens of Biber's grammatical insights and treats stance[5] not only as a linguistic feature but also as a culturally shaped rhetorical practice. This view is supported by research on politeness and discourse markers in written

[4] Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan E., Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English, John Benjamins Publishing Company, London, 2021. DOI: 10.1075/z.232

[5] Ibid.

communication. As shown by Gurova, "the Danish written communication uses various politeness markers depending on the type of discourse and the imperative" [28, p. 60], which confirms that the choice of pragmatic markers is closely linked to genre- and discourse-specific conventions rather than purely grammatical factors.

Unlike previous research that examines L1 and L2 writing separately, this study places both within a unified comparative design, analyzing how hedging and boosting vary across disciplines and nativeness. Furthermore, it moves beyond simple inventories of markers to investigate their rhetorical functions in context, thereby linking quantitative patterns with qualitative insights. Through this integrated approach, the article offers a critical synthesis of prior work and provides empirical evidence that advances the theoretical understanding of stance as both a linguistic and socio-cognitive construct.

Methods and Materials

The empirical material for the study was drawn from two established student corpora, BAWE and MICUSP, complemented by a purpose-built learner subcorpus compiled by the author. The BAWE corpus was used as the baseline reference for L1 academic writing, as it consists of assessed texts produced by native speakers of English in UK higher education across multiple disciplines. From BAWE, texts in engineering and business-related fields were selected to establish discipline-specific stance norms characteristic of L1 student writing. The MICUSP corpus was employed as a benchmark corpus representing high-proficiency Anglophone academic writing. Given that MICUSP contains top-graded papers written by advanced undergraduate and graduate students, it was used to model target rhetorical and stance practices rather than to represent a separate L1 or L2 population (see Table 1).

Table 1. Composition of the study corpus

Corpus/Subcorpus	Writer status	Disciplinary domain	Number of texts (n)	Total words	Mean text length
BAWE	L1	Engineering	15	27,600	1,840
BAWE	L1	Management/business	15	28,200	1,880
MICUSP	High-proficiency reference	Engineering	15	29,100	1,940
MICUSP	High-proficiency reference	Management/business	15	30,000	2,000
The AMU learner corpus	L2 (Azerbaijan)	Engineering-oriented medical/ technical writing	15	26,700	1,780
The AMU learner corpus	L2 (Azerbaijan)	Management-oriented medical writing	15	27 300	1,820
Total	–	–	90	168,900	–

All frequencies of stance markers were normalized per 1,000 words. Texts shorter than 1,500 words or longer than 2,000 words were excluded to ensure comparability across subcorpora.

Stance was operationalized through Hyland's metadiscourse model [5], which distinguishes four categories: hedges (mitigation), boosters (assertive reinforcement), attitude markers, and self-mention. Texts by L1 and L2 writers were compared across disciplinary domains (technical vs. social-humanities). Candidate markers were extracted through targeted searches and validated using KWIC[6] to confirm functional usage. The analysis is descriptive in distributional terms, with differences interpreted through pragmatic and pedagogical perspectives.

[6] KWIC – Key Word in Context.

Although both Hyland [5] and Biber[7] address stance-related features, Hyland's taxonomy serves as the primary analytical framework due to its functional coherence and direct relevance to rhetorical and pedagogical aims. Biber's multidimensional approach is used only for comparative reference. All markers were coded according to Hyland's four categories, following the definitional criteria in Hyland [6] and Hyland & F. Jiang [9], ensuring consistency and replicability.

The dataset consists of academic essays and reports taken from BAWE and MICUSP, balanced by discipline (engineering/civil vs. business/management) and writer status (15 L1 UK-based students; 15 advanced L2 students from AMU enrolled in ESP courses). Each student produced 1,500–2,000-word texts. Paratextual material (references, tables, appendices) was excluded to avoid skewing results.

Stance markers were counted only when they operated within clause-level propositional meaning to express epistemic commitment, evaluation, or authorial presence:

– *Hedges*: lexical/grammatical devices signaling probability or reduced commitment (e.g., *may*, *might*, *possibly*, *it seems that*...), excluding deontic uses;

– *Boosters*: expressions strengthening certainty or confidence (e.g., *clearly*, *undoubtedly*, *it is evident that*...);

– *Attitude markers*: items expressing evaluative or affective stance without increasing epistemic certainty (e.g., *importantly*, *notably*, *regrettably*, *we agree that*...);

– *Self-mention*: first-person references (*I*, *we*, *our*) marking the author's presence in relation to the current research, not humanity in general.

Ambiguous tokens were resolved through contextual paraphrase tests and coder consensus. Each stance marker was counted once per clause, and multiword units (e.g., *it is likely that*..., *it is clear that*...) were treated as single instances. The annotation process combined automated keyword retrieval with manual KWIC validation to confirm functional use. Two independent coders cross-checked a 20 % random sample, achieving an inter-rater reliability of $\kappa = 0.85$, which indicates strong agreement. Discrepancies and borderline cases were documented in an audit log to ensure traceability. The complete codebook and representative examples are provided in the appendices to facilitate replication by future researchers.

The identification and coding of stance markers followed a two-stage procedure. In the first stage, all potential stance-related items were automatically retrieved from the corpora using a pre-defined lexicon derived from Hyland's taxonomies [5, 9]. This lexicon included representative items for four functional categories – *hedges*, *boosters*, *attitude markers*, and *self-mentions*. In the second stage, each candidate occurrence was manually checked in its immediate context using KWIC concordances to verify its functional role and exclude false positives (e.g., modal verbs not used epistemically). Two trained coders independently validated 20 % of the data; inter-coder agreement reached 0.89 (Cohen's κ), indicating high reliability. Discrepancies were discussed and resolved through consensus. This multi-step coding ensured transparency, replicability, and functional accuracy of the stance classification. All frequencies were normalized per 1,000 words to enable comparability across texts and disciplines.

Results

Quantitative corpus analysis demonstrates statistically grounded differences in the distribution of stance markers between L1 and L2 academic writing. All frequencies were normalized per 1,000 words to ensure cross-corpus comparability. The analysis targeted four stance categories – hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention – identified via concordance-based procedures in the BAWE and MICUSP subcorpora. The results indicate a higher relative frequency of hedging and self-mention in L1 texts, contrasted with an increased use of boosters and attitude markers in L2 writing. The aggregated quantitative outcomes are reported in Table 2.

[7] Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan E., Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English, John Benjamins Publishing Company, London, 2021. DOI: 10.1075/z.232

Table 2. Frequency of stance markers (per 1,000 words)

Type of marker	L1 writers (BAWE/MICUSP)	L2 writers	Difference (L2–L1)
Hedges	**6.2**	**3.9**	**–2.3**
Boosters	**2.1**	**4.7**	**+2.6**
Attitude markers	**1.8**	**3.4**	**+1.6**
Self-mention	**4.5**	**2.2**	**–2.3**

Quantitative analysis demonstrates a systematic overuse of boosters and attitude markers by L2 writers, combined with a relative underuse of hedging devices. As shown in Table 2, the frequency of attitude markers in L2 texts (3.4 per 1,000 words) almost doubles that observed in L1 academic writing (1.8), suggesting a tendency toward evaluative over-explicitness.

Stance in Academic Genres: Calibrating Commitment through Hedges and Boosters. The notion of stance is closely tied to metadiscourse and the authorial voice in academic texts. Within K. Hyland's model, markers of author positioning fall into four categories: hedges (devices that signal uncertainty or soften commitment), boosters (devices that intensify commitment and assert confidence), attitude markers (items that express the writer's evaluative or affective orientation to the proposition), and self-mention (explicit reference to the author through first-person forms such as *I* or *we*) [5]. These resources allow the writer to calibrate the strength of claims, signal an evaluative orientation to the proposition, and determine the degree of textual presence. "Modern concordancers can provide more accurate analyses based on the large-scale data stored in corpora, which facilitates the examination of various aspects of language." [29, p. 201]. Leveraging such concordance-based evidence allows us to operationalize stance categories empirically – identifying the inventories, frequencies, and co-texts of hedging forms in BAWE/MICUSP – before turning to their functional definition.

As recent discourse-oriented research emphasizes, analytical attention should be directed to "discoursal structures, lexical-semantic constellations, metaphorical models, and pragmatic strategies in the chosen writings" [30, p. 129]. Hedging refers to the use of lexical and grammatical devices that soften categorical force. Typical hedges include modal verbs and adverbs (e.g., *might*, *may*, *likely*, *perhaps*) and clausal frames such as *it is possible that...*, which recast a proposition as tentative or probabilistic rather than definitive [31]. By employing hedges, the author can disclaim full responsibility for the truth of a proposition, presenting it as probable – grounded in plausible reasoning – rather than as an established fact[8]. Thus, hedging preserves space for alternative viewpoints and signals politeness toward potential reader objections. In short, hedges indicate that the writer does not foreclose the discussion, thereby legitimizing alternative interpretations [32]. Examples of hedging in Russian academic prose include formulas such as *можно предположить, что...*, *вероятно, что...*, *не исключено, что...*; in Azerbaijani academic prose, comparable hedges are *güman etmək olar ki...*, *yəqin ki...*, *ola bilsin ki...*, *ola bilər ki...*, *ehtimal olunur ki...*, *istisna edilmir ki...*

Boosting (strengthening the claim), by contrast, has the opposite pragmatic effect: it asserts high speaker commitment and narrows the space for alternative readings (e.g., *definitely*, *certainly*, *clearly*, *undoubtedly*, *it is clear that...*), thereby inviting readers to accept the proposition as established rather than tentative [6]. Boosters (e.g., *definitely*, *certainly*; in Russian *безусловно*, *несомненно*; in Azerbaijani *şübhəsiz*, *mütləq*, *qəti*, *açıq-aydın*, *heç bir şübhə yoxdur ki...*, *şübhəsizdir ki...*, *məlumdur ki...*) signal a high degree of authorial commitment to the truth of a proposition and thus narrow the space for alternative interpretations. By employing boosters, the writer underscores the unequivocal validity of their results or arguments and aligns with the reader in accepting these claims [33]. For example, the sentence "Obviously, the data we obtained confirm the hypothesis" contains a certainty marker (*obviously*) that amplifies the categorical force of the claim. As Hyland & Jiang [9] observe, the choice

[8] Khanbutayeva L., Psycholinguistic Problems of Syntactic Units. Doctor of Sciences (Philology) dissertation thesis, Baku, 2022.

between hedges and boosters indexes the writer's degree of commitment to a preferred interpretation of the evidence and a strategic intent to shape readers' perceptions. Polite academic interaction requires balance: overusing boosters can read as dogmatic, whereas judicious hedges project scientific caution and objectivity.

Attitude markers encode the writer's affective/evaluative orientation to a proposition (not epistemic certainty). Typical English items include *importantly*, *notably*, *fortunately/unfortunately*, *surprisingly*, *we agree / we are concerned that...*, *it is noteworthy that...*, *significant*, *striking*, *trivial*. Russian parallels: *важно отметить, что...*, *примечательно, что...*, *к сожалению...*, *удивительно, что...*, *мы считаем / согласны / не согласны, что...* Azerbaijani parallels: *vacibdir ki...*, *diqqətəlayiqdir ki...*, *təəssüf ki...*, *təəccüblüdür ki...*, *biz hesab edirik ki... / razıyıq / razı deyilik ki...* Used sparingly and in discipline-appropriate registers, these markers flag importance or (dis)agreement without inflating epistemic commitment [34]. They include, for example, verbs of opinion (*agree*, *prefer*), sentence adverbials (*unfortunately*, *surprisingly*), and composite constructions such as *we hope that...* In academic prose, the range of permissible emotions and evaluations is deliberately constrained – overt displays of strong feeling are generally avoided – yet it remains acceptable to signal the importance of a result (*it is important to note that...*), surprise (*it is noteworthy that...*), or agreement/disagreement. Phrases like *it should be noted with regret...* or *it is noteworthy that...* function as attitude markers indicating the writer's stance toward the reported facts. Studies show that student writers sometimes overuse highly affect-laden expressions where experienced authors would opt for a more neutral register; thus, student essays often feature words such as *incredible*, *astonishing*, or *stunning*, whereas faculty-authored articles are markedly more restrained. "Beginning students overused boosters and underused hedges as opposed to more advanced student writers and professional writers who preferred expressing stance with caution and tentativeness rather than assertiveness." [34, p. 120]. At the same time, judicious attitude markers allow authors to foreground the salience or unexpectedness of findings while remaining within disciplinary decorum.

Based on the conducted analysis of the two participant groups, several consistent patterns emerged. For example, in the L1 corpus, attitude markers were used strategically and moderately, serving primarily to highlight significance (*it is important to note that...*) or indicate evaluative distance (*it is interesting to observe that...*). The L1 writers demonstrated a strong sense of disciplinary decorum, avoiding excessive emotional colouring and preferring neutral or hedged expressions. Their stance was typically encoded through adverbial constructions (*notably*, *significantly*) and metadiscursive comments that aligned with genre conventions of academic prose.

In contrast, L2 writers tended to overuse overtly affective or subjective expressions, often transferring discourse habits from their first language (Azerbaijani) into English. Frequent items included *unfortunately*, *very important*, and intensifiers such as *really* or *very interesting*. In several cases, L2 writers combined epistemic and affective stance in single clauses, resulting in redundant or stylistically inflated statements (e.g., *it is very important and we strongly believe that this result is true*).

Quantitative comparison showed that the mean frequency of attitude markers per 1,000 words was 1.8 for L1 and 3.4 for L2 participants. However, qualitative analysis revealed that L1 writers used a wider range of nuanced lexical items, whereas L2 writers relied on a limited set of high-salience adverbs. These findings confirm that the mastery of attitudinal stance involves not only lexical knowledge but also pragmatic awareness of academic tone and disciplinary conventions.

Self-mention denotes the writer's explicit presence in the text, typically realized through first-person forms (*I*, *we*) and other self-referential expressions [35]. The use of the first person in scholarly writing varies across disciplines and traditions: authors in the humanities employ first-person forms far more frequently, whereas an impersonal style predominates in the natural sciences. By inserting themselves into the text (e.g., *in this study*, *we propose...*), writers assume responsibility for the exposition, construct an authorial voice, and project a particular scholarly identity. An impersonal

presentation can create an aura of objectivity, but at the same time distances the author from their claims. Thus, the choice between first-person reference and impersonal constructions is a deliberate rhetorical move for managing authorial persona: a more "personal" style is characteristic of the social sciences and humanities, while a more "objectivized" style tends to characterize technical and hard-science prose [6]. It has been observed that many L2 writers avoid the first-person pronoun *I* as allegedly inappropriate for scientific prose, although in Anglophone practice the moderate use of *I/we* is acceptable, and at that time necessary for clarity (e.g., when describing research procedures).

Accordingly, stance markers furnish authors with tools for signalling degrees of certainty/uncertainty, expressing evaluative orientation, and marking authorial presence. A balanced deployment of these resources is a core component of academic literacy and shapes both the persuasiveness and the decorum of scholarly communication. As Mammadli & Habibova have noted, "persuasion is a normal part of scholarly rhetoric – researchers use evidence, logical argument, and appeals to shared values of inquiry to convince colleagues of a claim... the line between acceptable persuasion and unethical manipulation can be thin." [36, p. 30].

To illustrate differences in the use of hedging and boosting by native and L2 writers, we consider two cases drawn from the BAWE and MICUSP corpora across distinct disciplines. This approach goes beyond general observation, grounding the analysis in concrete corpus examples. In this regard, concordance analysis is particularly relevant, as it enables systematic examination of the semantic and syntactic contexts in which hedging and boosting markers occur, thereby allowing more precise identification of their semantic–functional roles [4, p. 90].

Case 1: Engineering (***civil engineering***). In the BAWE corpus (L1 engineering essays), stance is typically realized through concise and cautious phrasing:

(1) *It appears that the data collected in the second phase may not fully support the initial hypothesis.*

(2) *This result seems to suggest a possible correlation rather than a definitive causal link.*

In contrast, the MICUSP-based L2 corpus demonstrates a narrower range of hedging expressions:

(3) *It can be said that the pressure was possibly affected by the external conditions.*

(4) *We can assume that the system might work in different environments.*

These examples show that L2 writers rely heavily on modal verbs (*may*, *might*, *can*), while L1 writers employ a broader set of epistemic verbs (*appear*, *suggest*) and adverbials (*likely*, *possibly*), signaling a more nuanced approach to uncertainty.

Siu et al. [1] compared final-year theses by engineering students in Hong Kong (English as L2, civil engineering) with those of American students (L1, from MICUSP) in the same field. It was found that in L2 students' technical reports certain types of hedging occur markedly less frequently than in papers by native speakers. In particular, the Hong Kong authors employed approximative hedges (e.g., *generally*, *mostly*) and evidential verbs (e.g., *seem*, *appear*, *suggest*) less often. Moreover, L2 students virtually avoided pronominal hedging, i.e., cautious first-person statements (e.g., *I believe that...*, *we consider...*), whereas such forms appeared occasionally in L1 texts. Instead of a diverse repertoire of mitigating strategies, L2 writers relied primarily on modal verbs (*may*, *might*, etc.) as their chief means of signalling uncertainty. Consequently, the overall number of hedge markers in L2 texts even exceeded that in L1 (driven by frequent modals); however, the variety and subtlety of hedging in L2 were lower [1]. With respect to boosters, L2 engineering texts are marked by underuse: L2 students include expressions of confidence far less often than their American counterparts. In other words, L1 writers in engineering papers more readily employ categorical formulations (*definitely*, *beyond doubt*, etc.), whereas L2 authors tend to maintain a more cautious tone. This example indicates that in technical domains L2 students are over-cautious – their texts abound in modal conjectures but lack the degree of assertiveness typical of L1 work.

Case 2: Social sciences (***economics/business***). Typical L1 examples from BAWE business texts include:

(5) *It is important to note that consumer satisfaction largely depends on perceived service quality*.

(6) *The findings may be interpreted as indicative of a gradual market shift*.

By contrast, in L2 theses (Chen, 2025 corpus), expressions tend to be more assertive and affective:

(7) *Undoubtedly, the results clearly prove the success of the implemented strategy*.

(8) *It is very important to emphasize that our approach is more effective*.

These data illustrate the oscillatory stance noted in the quantitative findings – L2 writers combine categorical boosters (*clearly*, *undoubtedly*) with strong evaluative adjectives (*very important*), creating a more expressive rhetorical profile than their L1 counterparts.

A different picture emerges in Chen's [26] corpus study of business-administration theses written by Chinese L2 students, which were compared against the BAWE corpus. In contrast to the technical domain, the L2 texts here were more categorical than those of L1 writers. The number of boosting devices in the Chinese students' theses substantially exceeded that found in comparable texts by British students. Put simply, L2 business writers used assertive lexemes (e.g., *definitely*, *undoubtedly*) much more frequently than L1 writers, who articulated conclusions more cautiously. At the same time, hedging was also more frequent in the L2 texts. This ostensibly paradoxical pattern suggests that the Chinese students simultaneously loaded their writing with both mitigating qualifiers and categorical boosters, likely an attempt to deploy all familiar academic devices for scientific caution and persuasiveness, without always sensing the fine line between judicious hedging and over-assertion. The resulting stance profile in L2 business theses is more expressive, with frequent oscillation between strengthening and softening moves, whereas L1 texts are typically more even and balanced.

Taken together, these cases show that the impact of author status (L1 vs. L2) on stance varies by disciplinary domain. In engineering writing, both L1 and L2 authors face strong norms of objectivity, yet L2 writers tend to be overly cautious. In management/economics, by contrast, L2 students – seeking persuasiveness – may even exceed L1 peers in directness while also hedging heavily. Analyses should therefore consider not only nativeness but also disciplinary conventions: the social sciences/humanities are generally more tolerant of overt authorial presence and evaluation, whereas technical fields demand a more restrained tone [19]. This may partly explain why the differences between L1 and L2 authors manifest differently across the cases examined.

Case 3: Medical Sciences (***the AMU learner corpus vs. the MICUSP corpus***). L1 medical reports often present claims through cautious formulations:

(9) *The obtained results indicate a potential link between exposure level and immune response*.

(10) *It is plausible that the discrepancy arises from measurement limitations*.

In the AMU learner corpus, stance tends to be expressed more directly:

(11) *It is clear that the experiment strongly supports the hypothesis*.

(12) *Unfortunately, the number of participants was limited*.

The comparison shows that L2 writers compensate for restricted lexical variety with overt evaluative and emotional markers (it is clear, unfortunately), while L1 authors prefer implicit, evidential phrasing (indicate, plausible). This difference highlights how cultural and pedagogical traditions shape rhetorical choices.

In our study, a similar pattern was observed in the medical domain, where academic essays written by advanced Azerbaijani EFL[9] students (L2) were compared to research reports authored by native English-speaking medical students (L1) from the MICUSP corpus. The results demonstrated both parallels and divergences from Siu et al.'s findings in engineering [1].

Like the Hong Kong group, Azerbaijani L2 writers displayed a restricted range of hedging and attitude devices. The most frequent hedges were modal verbs (*may*, *might*, *could*), often appearing in formulaic constructions such as *this may indicate...* or *it could be suggested that...* However, approximative adverbs (*roughly*, *generally*, *relatively*) and lexical hedges (*seems*, *tends to*, *suggests that*) were

[9] EFL – English as a Foreign Language.

rare. As in Siu et al. [1], pronominal hedging (e.g., *we believe that...*, *we assume that...*) was almost absent, reflecting the influence of local academic conventions, where impersonality and deference to authority are highly valued.

Interestingly, L2 writers in the medical group overcompensated through attitude markers, using overt evaluative expressions like it is very important to note that..., unfortunately, the data are limited..., or it is clear that... In contrast, L1 writers preferred structurally embedded evaluations, e.g., the data reveal a consistent pattern..., which convey stance indirectly. Quantitative data revealed that L2 writers used 2.7 attitude markers per 1,000 words, compared to 1.5 in L1 texts, but only half the lexical diversity.

This finding supports Hyland & F. Jiang's [9] observation that disciplinary and cultural factors interact in stance expression: while native writers calibrate confidence through balanced use of hedges and boosters, L2 writers tend toward either over-hedging or explicit evaluation. In the AMU learner corpus, this tendency likely stems from interference of L1 rhetorical habits and limited exposure to discipline-specific English discourse models.

Discussion

Pedagogical practices contribute to L1–L2 differences in stance use, as metadiscourse is often insufficiently addressed in academic writing instruction. Numerous studies confirm that L2 writers experience persistent difficulties in expressing stance, as "stance expressions are difficult to master for learners in academic writing" [22, p. 250]. A key dimension, often overlooked, is the institutional and disciplinary context in which academic writing occurs. Stance is shaped not only by linguistic competence but also by the rhetorical norms of specific discourse communities. As Hyland [37] and Swales [38] note, disciplines cultivate distinct expectations regarding acceptable authorial presence, the framing of claims, and appropriate degrees of certainty. Technical and medical fields tend to promote impersonal, objectivity-oriented styles, whereas the social sciences encourage more dialogic and self-reflexive voices. Understanding these institutionalized conventions helps explain L1–L2 contrasts: L2 writers' choices reflect not only linguistic limitations but also the academic cultures in which they were trained. This perspective is reinforced by work in social and educational linguistics, which emphasizes the institutional grounding of communicative practices. As Kulikova argues, "language use should be viewed not only as a structural system but primarily as a socio-pragmatic resource shaped by institutional, educational and cultural practices" [39, p. 24].

Pragmatic competence plays a major role. Calibrating assertiveness and caution are a skill L1 writers acquire gradually through participation in academic discourse. L2 writers, by contrast, often struggle to express polite doubt and either avoid hedging or use it formulaically. Hyland & Milton [9] report that Chinese students frequently fail to mitigate categorical claims appropriately, despite having analogous means in their L1. This difficulty is reinforced by prior writing instruction where hedging and stance-taking were neither emphasized nor explicitly taught, leading L2 writers to sound either overly blunt or excessively cautious.

Cultural-rhetorical norms further shape stance. Academic traditions differ in how they construe the author's role and acceptable degrees of explicitness. In the Anglo-American context, independent authorial voice and acknowledgment of alternative views are both valued, motivating frequent use of hedges, caveats, and modals[10]. In other educational cultures, students are taught to write "objectively," avoiding first-person reference and overt expressions of uncertainty. Consequently, many L2 writers avoid *I* in academic texts, having internalized an impersonal style. This tendency appears, for example, in engineering writing: Hong Kong students rarely used self-mention, whereas American students did so occasionally [1]. Attitudes toward expressing doubt also vary – in some contexts, it is perceived as weakness, while in international academic discourse, it signals intellectual rigor. These cultural and

[10] Khanbutayeva L., Psycholinguistic Problems of Syntactic Units, Doctor of Sciences (Philology) dissertation thesis, Baku, 2022.

institutional factors jointly influence how actively students employ hedges, boosters, and other stance markers.

An important factor that must be taken into account is the pedagogy of academic writing itself. When instructors devote insufficient or only superficial attention to metadiscourse, L2 students may fail to develop even a basic awareness of what stance markers are, how they function rhetorically, and why they matter for the reception of a text by the academic community [40]. In such cases, students approach writing primarily as a matter of grammar and vocabulary, without grasping that a large part of persuasiveness, credibility, and disciplinary positioning depends on the ability to signal attitude, commitment, or caution.

Another complication lies in the inconsistent or even contradictory guidance students receive. For instance, some style manuals or instructors explicitly discourage the use of "tentative" language. A familiar dictum is: "If you do not have compelling evidence, do not hedge with formulations such as it may be possible that..." [4, p. 91]. Taken literally, such advice risks pushing novice writers into avoiding hedging altogether, even in contexts where it is pragmatically necessary, thereby producing a rigid, overly categorical, and sometimes confrontational prose style. Instead of nuance and careful qualification, the text ends up projecting "black-and-white" claims that may be rhetorically ineffective and academically inappropriate.

At the opposite end of stance-taking challenges, an overemphasis on objectivity in academic writing instruction can discourage students from expressing an explicit authorial voice. Research shows that in many educational context students associate the use of *I* or other overt stance markers with a lack of academic rigor [41–43]. Consequently, they avoid self-mention and compensate through passive constructions, nominalizations, and impersonal phrasing. Although these strategies may project objectivity, they often reduce clarity, obscure agency, and weaken argumentative precision. The present data reflect this tendency: several L2 writers in the corpus avoid self-reference even in interpretive sections, aligning with institutional norms that privilege impersonality over authorial visibility. This confirms that stance-taking is not purely linguistic but also socially and pedagogically conditioned. Such interpretation is consistent with a broader socio-pragmatic view of academic discourse. As noted in social and discourse linguistics, "critical discourse analysis is oriented not toward language as a structure, but toward the socio-cultural processes underlying language use" [44, p. 47], underscoring that stance choices are shaped by institutional norms and pedagogical traditions rather than grammar alone.

A further issue arising from this tension is the lack of clear instructional models for L2 writers. Without systematic guidance on how hedges, boosters, and other stance markers function rhetorically, students rely on guesswork or formulaic patterns. The corpus evidence demonstrates this: some texts display mechanical overuse of a few markers, while others avoid stance devices entirely, resulting in weakened academic communication. Targeted pedagogy is therefore essential, and not only for correcting errors but for cultivating the rhetorical awareness needed to balance caution and commitment in line with disciplinary norms.

Finally, overall linguistic and academic proficiency must be taken into account. Many apparent L1–L2 differences are in fact contrasts between experienced and novice writers. Native-speaker contributors to MICUSP are typically high-performing upper-level students already familiar with genre expectations, whereas many L2 writers are newcomers to Anglophone academic contexts. Unsurprisingly, novice writers (L1 and L2 alike) tend to simplify discourse: prior studies show that weaker papers contain more unjustifiably strong or overly broad claims, while high-rated texts exhibit nuance, qualification, and strategic hedging [45]. This affects not only argumentative content but also rhetorical organization, with less experienced writers demonstrating fewer hedges and more unbalanced, categorical statements, leading to reduced subtlety and diminished dialogic engagement in their academic prose.

As noted in previous work, "L2 learners' essays overused some markers, such as temporal and inferential discourse markers, which affected the coherence of their essays" [45]. This shows that the difficulty lies not only in the absence of markers but also in their uneven and uncalibrated use, which disrupts cohesion and weakens rhetorical effectiveness. A similar pattern appears in stance-taking: L2 writers often omit attitude markers or use overly emotional ones. Instead of neutral academic formulations such as *it is important to note that...*, novice essays may contain affect-laden items like *astonishing*, *incredible*, *stunning*. Comparable tendencies are found cross-linguistically – e.g., Russian *удивительно*, *поразительно* or Azerbaijani *təəccüblüdür ki*, *inanılmazdır ki*. While these expressions technically function as attitude markers, their emotional intensity disrupts disciplinary register and reduces academic persuasiveness.

Such tendencies should be understood as part of a developmental trajectory rather than permanent L2 deficits. Novice writers initially rely on everyday evaluative lexicon instead of discipline-specific metadiscourse. With increased academic socialization, writers learn to calibrate evaluation more appropriately, favoring markers of importance (*importantly*, *notably*, *vacibdir ki*) or cautious evaluation (*it is regrettable that...*, *təəssüf ki...*) and adopting a more conventionalized rhetorical style. This suggests that differences often attributed to L1/L2 status may be overstated: experience and disciplinary enculturation play a larger role than nativeness.

Beyond linguistic proficiency, stance is also shaped by institutional and cultural ideologies. Anglophone academic traditions value explicit authorial presence as a sign of critical thinking, expecting writers to assert claims confidently while hedging uncertainty. In contrast, many non-Anglophone traditions, including post-Soviet and Azerbaijani contexts, prioritize impersonality, collective knowledge, and deference to authority. In such environments, overt self-reference can be perceived as inappropriate self-promotion. These norms help explain why L2 writers rely on impersonal constructions and display a narrower set of stance devices. Additionally, EFL programs often emphasize grammatical accuracy over rhetorical and pragmatic training, leaving learners unaware of stance as a socially patterned practice.

Thus, overuse or misuse of discourse markers should be viewed as evidence of developmental stages rather than permanent shortcomings. As one study concludes, "L2 speakers tended to use limited repertories that caused the overuse of particular DMs... although the participants were Master's degree students, their academic writings were not advanced yet" [45]. This finding underscores that mastery of stance and metadiscourse is a gradual process requiring sustained exposure, practice, and explicit instruction.

This observation underscores the importance of differentiating between linguistic competence and academic literacy. Even highly educated L2 learners may struggle if they have not yet internalized the rhetorical and discourse conventions of academic communities. Thus, the issue lies less in inherent L1–L2 contrasts and more in the degree of exposure to disciplinary norms and feedback. Crucially, these conventions are not automatically acquired with general language proficiency but must be explicitly taught, modeled, and reinforced in academic contexts. Over time, systematic training and immersion allow L2 writers to diversify their repertoire of discourse markers and align more closely with native-like academic standards.

Yet, empirical evidence confirms that this process is far from automatic: the evidence that Iraqi EFL students struggle with the use of discourse markers clearly points to the necessity of targeted pedagogical interventions, as learners left without explicit guidance risk stagnating in formulaic and mechanical patterns of writing [48]. This problem is not unique to Iraqi learners: in Azerbaijani academic prose, for instance, students often rely on clichés such as *nəticə etibarilə demək olar ki...* or *yuxarıda qeyd olunduğu kimi*, which, although functional, remain formulaic and do not demonstrate nuanced authorial stance. Similar tendencies are visible in Russian student essays, where fixed expressions like *следует отметить, что...* or *можно сказать, что...* are overused, reducing variability and

rhetorical subtlety. By contrast, proficient English academic writing, as seen in BAWE or MICUSP, features a much broader repertoire of stance devices – hedges such as *it is possible that...*, boosters like *undoubtedly*, and attitude markers (*importantly*, *notably*) – which balance caution with confidence and prevent discourse from sounding monotonous.

At the same time, broader developments in language education introduce additional complexity: "The integration of the Internet into language learning has brought both opportunities and challenges to the teaching process... teachers must balance modern linguistic trends with the need to uphold traditional grammar and writing standards." [48, p. 300]. Online environments, while offering access to corpora, concordancers, and digital writing tools, also foster the spread of colloquial markers and conversational shortcuts (e.g., *kind of*, *sort of*, *like* in English; *muna* in Russian; *sanki* in colloquial Azerbaijani), which may seep into student writing if not properly filtered.

Put differently, while learners' weaknesses in metadiscourse call for systematic training, instructors themselves face the dual challenge of innovating with digital resources and safeguarding the core conventions of academic literacy. This means not only introducing students to hedges, boosters, and attitude markers across languages but also showing how these devices differ cross-culturally and why academic writing norms privilege restraint, clarity, and precision over colloquial immediacy or emotional emphasis.

Without systematic instruction, even upper-level students risk stagnating at a stage characterized by limited repertoire and mechanical use of markers. Therefore, fostering metadiscursive competence must be seen as an integral part of academic writing pedagogy, ensuring that learners progress from formulaic usage toward a nuanced and disciplinary-appropriate command of stance and coherence. Yet, this requirement cannot be addressed in isolation from broader linguistic dynamics: "The study of linguistic change is a crucial aspect of the process of adapting educational programs and teaching methods." [48, p. 301]. In other words, while one part of the problem lies in students' restricted awareness of discourse markers, the other lies in curricula that are slow to integrate new insights from linguistic change and corpus-based evidence. If pedagogy does not evolve in line with shifting linguistic realities, then even well-designed instruction risks reproducing outdated practices instead of cultivating the rhetorical flexibility needed in contemporary academic communication.

From this perspective, targeted instruction in rhetorical conventions can accelerate the process of aligning novice writers with the expectations of academic discourse. For example, it has been observed that top-graded essays – by both native-English and Chinese students – contain notably more hedging than mid-graded essays [46]. Accordingly, some differences often ascribed to L1 influence may in fact stem from limited experience with academic writing. With continued instruction and practice, advanced L2 writers typically broaden and fine-tune their repertoire of stance markers, gradually converging on the profile characteristic of L1 authors [11]. This is also borne out by the engineering case: despite an overall tendency toward caution, L2 students exceeded L1 writers in the overall frequency of hedging constructions [23], which can be interpreted as evidence of developing command of academic style – albeit somewhat one-sided, primarily via modal verbs.

Taken together, the factors outlined – pragmatic challenges, cultural orientations, and gaps in instruction and experience – account for the observed differences. Thus, Chinese L2 writers in business, aiming for persuasiveness, draw on familiar routines of assertiveness while also observing the requisite scientific caution, yielding high levels of both boosting and hedging. Engineers, trained in the hard sciences, have likely internalized that data accuracy is paramount and therefore avoid categorical statements in the absence of near-certainty. Crucially, the use of stance markers is tied to a writer's socio-cognitive adaptation to the academic community: as students – L1 and L2 alike – integrate into this community through reading and instructor feedback, they acquire a disciplinary "voice," including norms for expressing commitment and evaluation. Consequently, L1–L2 differences tend to attenuate at higher levels of proficiency, even though they are quite salient at earlier stages.

The findings of this study both confirm and refine existing models of stance. Hyland's functional taxonomy [5] – hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention – proved empirically robust for cross-corpus comparison; however, our data suggest that in L2 academic writing, these categories often overlap in function rather than remain distinct. For instance, L2 writers frequently employ hybrid constructions (e.g., *we strongly believe that...*) that simultaneously convey attitude and epistemic commitment. This observation implies that stance functions should be treated not as discrete boxes but as points along a pragmatic continuum of authorial commitment. Moreover, while Biber's multidimensional model highlights grammatical correlates of stance, the present study demonstrates that rhetorical context – disciplinary norms and institutional expectations – exerts equal, if not greater, influence on stance realization. Thus, the research extends prior models by integrating corpus-based linguistic evidence with rhetorical-situational analysis, offering a more dynamic understanding of how stance operates across L1 and L2 writing. In this sense, the study not only supports but also nuances the frameworks of Hyland and Biber, positioning them within a broader socio-cognitive account of academic discourse.

Although earlier studies by Hyland, Vassileva, and Hinkel have documented L2 writers' cautious stance-taking and limited use of evaluative resources, the present study advances this line of research in several ways. Unlike previous work, it integrates L1 and L2 academic writing within a unified comparative design across multiple disciplinary domains, including medical and technical contexts that remain underrepresented in prior research. Moreover, the findings demonstrate that L2 over-cautiousness is not a uniform phenomenon but varies systematically across disciplines. By combining quantitative corpus evidence with functional interpretation, the study reframes limited stance repertoires not as a simple linguistic deficit but as the outcome of pedagogical, cultural, and institutional constraints shaping academic writing practices.

Conclusion

This article examined discourse markers of authorial stance in academic writing using the BAWE and MICUSP corpora, with a focus on comparing native (L1) and non-native (L2) writers of English. The analysis shows that, although stance markers occur across academic texts, their distribution and selection depend strongly on writer status and disciplinary context. Overall, L2 students display a different pragmatics of commitment: in technical disciplines, they are more cautious and use boosters less frequently, whereas in the social sciences and humanities, they tend to be more categorical than L1 writers while also hedging more. These contrasts can be explained by a combination of linguistic competence, cultural orientations, and instructional practices discussed above.

From a linguistic standpoint, the findings confirm that stance markers serve as a crucial interface between propositional content and interpersonal meaning. The ability to express both epistemic modesty and justified confidence emerges as a central component of academic literacy, one which does not automatically develop in L2 writers. Hedging and boosting are not simply stylistic ornaments but core pragmatic strategies through which writers negotiate credibility, mitigate categorical claims, and align themselves with disciplinary expectations. Overuse of modals in L2 engineering texts or excessive categorical boosters in L2 business writing reveals that students often rely on limited repertoires, thus producing "oscillatory" stance profiles. Such tendencies illustrate that the developmental trajectory of L2 writers is marked by both underuse and overuse, reflecting partial awareness of rhetorical norms.

Pedagogically, the study highlights that explicit instruction in hedging, boosting, and stance more generally is indispensable. Without clear guidance, L2 writers tend to proceed by guesswork, which results in either categorical, "black-and-white" prose or overly cautious, impersonal writing. Incorporating authentic materials from BAWE and MICUSP into instruction can provide students with concrete benchmarks: by comparing their own texts against high-rated L1 student writing, they can internalize how balance, nuance, and evaluative caution are realized in practice. Explicit modeling of

self-mention and attitude markers, in addition to hedges and boosters, can further equip students with a fuller range of discursive resources.

The findings have important implications for the pedagogy of academic writing, particularly in L2 contexts. The contrastive corpus evidence suggests that explicit teaching of stance should be integrated into EAP and ESP curricula through data-driven learning approaches. By examining concordance lines from authentic corpora such as BAWE and MICUSP, students can observe how expert and proficient L1 writers balance hedging and boosting across genres and disciplines. This corpus-informed exposure enables learners to internalize pragmatic norms of academic communication – when to sound cautious, when to express confidence, and how to signal evaluation appropriately. Furthermore, instructional practice should go beyond teaching lists of hedging or boosting expressions to include activities in which students analyze the rhetorical *function* of stance markers within authentic texts. Such pedagogy cultivates awareness of disciplinary variation, helping learners adapt their stance to the conventions of engineering, medicine, or social sciences. Finally, teacher training programs should emphasize metadiscourse awareness, ensuring that instructors themselves can model stance-taking and provide constructive feedback on its use. Embedding these principles into writing courses will help L2 students move from formulaic usage toward rhetorically sophisticated control of stance – a key marker of advanced academic literacy.

The findings underscore that stance is both a linguistic and a socio-cognitive phenomenon. Helping students understand what their disciplinary readership expects is key to producing persuasive, academically sound writing. Sustained attention to stance markers in academic-writing curricula can gradually narrow L1–L2 gaps, enhance rhetorical competence, and contribute to raising the overall quality of academic discourse.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Institutional Review Board Statement. Not applicable. The study did not involve humans or animals.

Informed Consent Statement. Informed consent was waived because the research used pre-existing, publicly available, de-identified textual corpora (BAWE and MICUSP) with no interaction with human subjects and no collection of personal data.

REFERENCES

[1] **Siu B.W., Afzaal M., Aldayel, H.S.,** A corpus-based comparison of linguistic markers of stance and genre in the academic writing of novice and advanced engineering learners, Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11(1) (2024) 284. DOI: 10.1057/s41599-024-02757-4

[2] **Strauss S., Feiz P.,** Discourse Analysis: Putting Our Worlds into Words, Routledge, New York, 2013. DOI: 10.4324/9780203121559

[3] **Zheltova E.V.,** Faxo in Plautus Revisited: Causativity vs. Speaker's Stance, Philologia Classica, 17 (1) (2022) 77–84. DOI: 10.21638/spbu20.2022.106

[4] **Habibova K.,** Corpus linguistics and concordance: methodological approaches and new applications, Linguistic Researches, 1 (2025) 89–95. DOI: 10.59849/2664-5432.2025.1.89

[5] **Hyland K.,** Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing, 2nd ed., Bloomsbury Academic, London, 2019.

[6] **Hyland K.,** Writing with attitude: Conveying a stance in academic texts, Teaching Grammar To Speakers Of Other Languages, ed. by E. Hinkel, Routledge, New York, 2016, pp. 246–265. DOI: 10.4324/9781315695273

[7] **Martin J.R., White P.R.R.,** The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English, Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2005. DOI: 10.1057/9780230511910

[8] **Utkina T.I., Kostareva E.V.,** Features of Metadiscourse Use (Sphere of Economics, Students' Written Texts in English), Tomsk State University Journal of Philology, 74 (2021) 188–207. DOI: 10.17223/19986645/74/11

[9] **Hyland K., Jiang F.,** Change of Attitude? A Diachronic Study of Stance, Written Communication, 33 (3) (2016) 251–274. DOI: 10.1177/0741088316650399

[10] **Hyland K., Milton J.,** Qualification and certainty in L1 and L2 students' writing, Journal of Second Language Writing, 6 (2) (1997) 183–205. DOI: 10.1016/S1060-3743(97)90033-3

[11] **Nesi H., Gardner S.,** Genres across the Disciplines: Student writing in higher education, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. DOI: 10.1017/9781009030199

[12] **Römer-Barron U., Swales J.M.,** The Michigan Corpus of Upper-level Student Papers (MICUSP), Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9 (3) (2010) 249–249. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeap.2010.04.002

[13] **Pearson W.S., Abdollahzadeh E.,** Metadiscourse in academic writing: A systematic review, Lingua, 293 (2023) 103561. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2023.103561

[14] **Ädel A.,** Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 2006, pp. 69–97. DOI: 10.1075/scl.24

[15] **Mauranen A.,** Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.

[16] **Canagarajah S.,** Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations, Routledge, London, 2012. DOI: 10.4324/9780203073889

[17] **Vassileva I.,** Commitment and detachment in English and Bulgarian academic writing, English for Specific Purposes, 20 (1) (2001) 83–102. DOI: 10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00029-0

[18] **Dontcheva-Navratilova O.,** Cross-Cultural Variation in the Use of Hedges and Boosters in Academic Discourse, Prague Journal of English Studies, 5 (1) (2016) 163–184. DOI: 10.1515/pjes-2016-0009

[19] **Hinkel E.,** Hedging, Inflating, and Persuading in L2 Academic Writing, Applied Language Learning, 15 (1–2) (2005) 29–53.

[20] **Lee J.J., Subtirelu N.C.,** Metadiscourse and disciplinary identity in L2 writing, Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 20 (2015) 47–58.

[21] **Dahl T.,** Textual metadiscourse in research articles: A marker of national culture or of academic discipline?, Journal of Pragmatics, 36 (10) (2004) 1807–1825. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2004.05.004

[22] **Dugalich N.M., Han H.,** Certainty Stance Adverbs in Chinese Linguistic Academic Writing: A Corpus-based Study, RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics, 15 (1) (2024) 248–261. DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2024-15-1-248-261

[23] **Aull L.,** Linguistic Markers of Stance and Genre in Upper-Level Student Writing, Written Communication, 36 (2) (2022) 267–295. DOI: 10.1177/0741088318819472

[24] **Serova O.U.,** An automated study of translationese indicators in scientific paper translations, Terra Linguistica, 16 (1) (2025) 61–81. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.16105

[25] **Dalaf M.,** Exploring Iraqi EFL college students' idiomatic awareness and use, Journal of Ishraqat Tanmawya, 24 (2022) 1–18.

[26] **Chen S.,** A corpus-based study of stance markers in academic thesis writing by L2 undergraduates, Acta Psychologica, 259 (2025) 105333. DOI: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105333

[27] **Klochkova Ye.S.,** Evaluation strategies in open peer-review: Polarity of evaluation and representational variability, Terra Linguistica, 16 (2) (2025) 56–70. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.16204

[28] **Gurova E.A.,** Politeness markers venligst, gerne and please in the Danish language, Terra Linguistica, 15(4) (2024) 52–66. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.15404

[29] Əliyeva N., Heydərov R., Korpus dilçiliyinin təşkilində leksikoqrafiyanın rolu və vəzifələri [The role and tasks of lexicography in the organization of Corpus Linguistics], Ümummilli lider Heydər Əliyevin 100 illik yubileyinə və Beynəlxalq Ana dili gününə həsr olunmuş Azərbaycan dilinin İKT problemləri, İKT-nin Azərbaycan dili problemləri respublika elmi-praktiki konfransının materialları, 21–22 fevral 2023 [Materials of the Republican scientific-practical conference on ICT problems of the Azerbaijani language, problems of the Azerbaijani language of ICT, dedicated to the 100th anniversary of national leader Heydar Aliyev and the International Mother Language Day], Baku, 2023, pp. 200–204 .

[30] **Habibova K.A.,** Machine Metaphorics in Techno-Modern Texts, Terra Linguistica, 16 (4) (2025) 128–140. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.16408

[31] **Shubina E.L., Sedova A.V.,** Hedge Euphemisms as Tools of Economic Discourse, Nauchnyi dialog, 11 (2021) 183–200. DOI: 10.24224/2227-1295-2021-11-183-200

[32] **Boginskaya O.A.,** Functional categories of hedges: A diachronic study of Russian research article abstracts, Russian Journal of Linguistics, 26 (3) (2022) 645–667. DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-30017

[33] **Habibova K.A.,** The Specificity of Everyday Discourses, Proceedings of First International Volga Region Conference on Economics, Humanities and Sports (FICEHS 2019), Atlantis Press. 2020, pp. 335–340. DOI: 10.2991/aebmr.k.200114.079

[34] **Marinov Vranješ S., Varga M.,** Profiling the Use of Attitude Markers, Boosters and Hedges in Academic Written Production of International Student Mobility Participants, Journal of Language and Education, 11 (1) (2025) 116–130. DOI: 10.17323/jle.2025.22372

[35] **Batres-Prieto V., Abbas A.,** Self-mentions in design area disciplines: A corpus analysis, Heliyon, 11 (1) (2025) e41200. DOI: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e41200

[36] **Mammadli N., Habibova K.,** The interplay between academic communication and speech manipulation: A psychometric analysis, TPM – Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 32(S1) (2025) 29–37.

[37] **Hyland K.,** Disciplinary Identities: Individuality and Community in Academic Discourse, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. DOI: 10.1017/9781009406512

[38] **Swales J.M.,** Reflections on the concept of discourse community , ASp, 69 (2016) 7–19. DOI: 10.4000/asp.4774

[39] **Kulikova L.V.,** Language inclusion as a potential for interdisciplinary research and educational resource: multicultural experience, Terra Linguistica, 14 (2) (2023) 23–30. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.14203

[40] **Wharton S.,** Epistemological and interpersonal stance in a data description task: Findings from a discipline specific learner corpus, English Specific Purpose, 31 (4) (2012) 261–270.

[41] **Hyland K.,** Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing, Journal of Pragmatics, 34 (8) (2002) 1091–1112. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00035-8

[42] **Tang R., John S.,** The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun, English for Specific Purposes, 18 (1) (1999) 23–39. DOI: 10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00009-5

[43] **Ivanič R.,** Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1998. DOI: 10.1075/swll.5

[44] **Beliaeva L.N., Kamshilova O.N., Malakhovskaya M.L.,** Corpus technologies in research and education: analysing english noun phrases in scientific texts, Society. Communication. Education, 12 (4) (2021) 46–59. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.12404

[45] **Abusalim N., Zidouni S., Alghazo S., Rababah G., Rayyan M.,** Textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in political discourse: a case study, Cogent Arts & Humanities, 9 (1) (2022). DOI: 10.1080/23311983.2022.2124683

[46] **Choemue S., Bram B.,** Discourse markers in academic and non-academic writings of Thai EFL learners, Studies in English Language and Education, 8 (3) (2021) 1209–1226. DOI: 10.24815/siele.v8i3.20122

[47] **Haninda M.H., Bram B.,** Academic Writing of EFL Students' Undergraduate Theses: A Discourse Marker Analysis, ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 5 (1) (2022) 109–114. DOI: 10.34050/elsjish.v5i1.19719

[48] **Huseynova R., Aliyeva N., Habibova K., Heydarov R.,** The evolution of the English language in the internet and social media era, Brazilian Journal of Education, Technology and Society (BRAJETS), 17 (SE4) (2024) 299–314. DOI: 10.14571/brajets.v17.nse4.299-314

СПИСОК ИСТОЧНИКОВ

1. **Siu B.W., Afzaal M., Aldayel H.S.** A corpus-based comparison of linguistic markers of stance and genre in the academic writing of novice and advanced engineering learners // Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. 2024. Vol. 11. Art. no. 284. DOI: 10.1057/s41599-024-02757-4

2. **Strauss S., Feiz P.** Discourse Analysis: Putting Our Worlds into Words. New York: Routledge, 2013. 424 p. DOI: 10.4324/9780203121559

3. **Zheltova E.V.** Faxo in Plautus Revisited: Causativity vs. Speaker's Stance // Philologia Classica. 2022. Vol. 17, Iss. 1. P. 77–84. DOI: 10.21638/spbu20.2022.106

4. **Habibova K.** Corpus linguistics and concordance: methodological approaches and new applications // Linguistic Researches. 2025. Iss. 1. P. 89–95. DOI: 10.59849/2664-5432.2025.1.89

5. **Hyland K.** Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing. 2nd ed. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. 296 p.

6. **Hyland K.** Writing with attitude: Conveying a stance in academic texts. // Teaching Grammar To Speakers Of Other Languages / ed. by E. Hinkel. New York: Routledge, 2019. P. 246–265. DOI: 10.4324/9781315695273

7. **Martin J.R., White P.R.R.** The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 278 p. DOI: 10.1057/9780230511910

8. **Уткина Т.И., Костарева Е.В.** Особенности метадискурсивной организации академического письма на английском языке студентов-экономистов // Вестник Томского государственного университета. Филология. 2021. № 74. С. 188–207. DOI: 10.17223/19986645/74/11

9. **Hyland K., Jiang F.** Change of Attitude? A Diachronic Study of Stance // Written Communication. 2016. Vol. 33, Iss. 3. P. 251–274. DOI: 10.1177/0741088316650399

10. **Hyland K., Milton J.** Qualification and certainty in L1 and L2 students' writing. // Journal of Second Language Writing. 1997. Vol. 6, Iss. 2. P. 183–205. DOI: 10.1016/S1060-3743(97)90033-3

11. **Nesi H., Gardner S.** Genres across the disciplines: Student writing in higher education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 293 p. DOI: 10.1017/9781009030199

12. **Römer-Barron U., Swales J.M.** The Michigan Corpus of Upper-level Student Papers (MICUSP) // Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 2010. Vol. 9, Iss. 3. P. 249–249. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeap.2010.04.002

13. **Pearson W.S., Abdollahzadeh E.** Metadiscourse in academic writing: A systematic review // Lingua. 2023. Vol. 293. Art. no. 103561. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2023.103561

14. **Ädel A.** Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006. P. 69–97. DOI: 10.1075/scl.24

15. **Mauranen A.** Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 271 p.

16. **Canagarajah S.** Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations. London: Routledge, 2012. 216 p. DOI: 10.4324/9780203073889

17. **Vassileva I.** Commitment and detachment in English and Bulgarian academic writing // English for Specific Purposes. 2001. Vol. 20, Iss. 1. P. 83–102. DOI: 10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00029-0

18. **Dontcheva-Navratilova O.** Cross-Cultural Variation in the Use of Hedges and Boosters in Academic Discourse // Prague Journal of English Studies. 2016. Vol., 5, Iss. 1. Pp. 163–184. DOI: 10.1515/pjes-2016-0009

19. **Hinkel E.** Hedging, Inflating, and Persuading in L2 Academic Writing // Applied Language Learning. 2005. Vol. 15, Iss. 1–2. P. 29–53.

20. **Lee J.J., Subtirelu N.C.** Metadiscourse and disciplinary identity in L2 writing // Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 2015. Vol. 20. P. 47–58.

21. **Dahl T.** Textual metadiscourse in research articles: A marker of national culture or of academic discipline? // Journal of Pragmatics. 2004. Vol. 36, Iss. 10. P. 1807–1825. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2004.05.004

22. **Дугалич Н.М., Хань Х.** Наречия с семантикой уверенности в академическом письме китайцев-лингвистов: корпусное исследование // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика. 2024. Т. 15, № 1. С. 248–261. DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2024-15-1-248-261

23. **Aull L.** Linguistic Markers of Stance and Genre in Upper-Level Student Writing // Written Communication. 2022. Vol. 36, Iss. 2. P. 267–295. DOI: 10.1177/0741088318819472

24. **Серова О.У.** Автоматизированное исследование индикаторов переводческого языка на материале переводов научных статей // Terra Linguistica. 2025. Т. 16, № 1. С. 61–81. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.16105

25. **Dalaf M.** Exploring Iraqi EFL college students' idiomatic awareness and use // Journal of Ishraqat Tanmawya. 2022. Vol. 24. P. 1–18.

26. **Chen S.** A corpus-based study of stance markers in academic thesis writing by L2 undergraduates // Acta Psychologica. 2025. Vol. 259. Art. no. 105333. DOI: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105333

27. **Клочкова Е.С.** Стратегии оценки в открытой научной рецензии: полярность оценки и вариативность ее репрезентации // Terra Linguistica. 2025. Т. 16, № 2. С. 56–70. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.16204

28. **Гурова Е.А.** Маркеры вежливости venligst, gerne и please в датском языке // Terra Linguistica. 2024. Т. 15, № 4. С. 52–66. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.15404

29. **Əliyeva N., Heydərov R.** Korpus dilçiliyinin təşkilində leksikoqrafiyanın rolu və vəzifələri // Ümummilli lider Heydər Əliyevin 100 illik yubileyinə və Beynəlxalq Ana dili gününə həsr olunmuş Azərbaycan dilinin İKT problemləri, İKT-nin Azərbaycan dili problemləri respublika elmi-praktiki konfransının materialları. 21–22 fevral 2023. Baku, 2023. P. 200–204.

30. **Габибова К.А.** Машинная метафорика в техномодерных текстах // Terra Linguistica. 2025. Т. 16, № 4. С. 128–140. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.16408

31. **Шубина Э.Л., Седова А.В.** Хедж-эвфемизмы как инструменты экономического дискурса как инструменты экономического дискурса // Научный диалог. 2021. № 11. С. 183–200. DOI: 10.24224/2227-1295-2021-11-183-200

32. **Богинская О.А.** Функциональные категории хеджирования: диахронический анализ русскоязычных аннотаций // Russian Journal of Linguistics. 2022. Т. 26, № 3. С. 645–667. DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-30017

33. **Habibova K.A.** The Specificity of Everyday Discourses // Proceedings of First International Volga Region Conference on Economics, Humanities and Sports (FICEHS 2019). Atlantis Press, 2020. P. 335–340. DOI: 10.2991/aebmr.k.200114.079

34. **Marinov Vranješ S., Varga M.** Profiling the Use of Attitude Markers, Boosters and Hedges in Academic Written Production of International Student Mobility Participants // Journal of Language and Education. 2025. Vol. 11, No. 1. P. 116–130. DOI: 10.17323/jle.2025.22372

35. **Batres-Prieto V., Abbas A.** Self-mentions in design area disciplines: A corpus analysis. // Heliyon. 2025. Vol. 11(1). Article no. e41200. DOI: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e41200

36. **Mammadli N., Habibova K.** The interplay between academic communication and speech manipulation: A psychometric analysis // TPM – Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology. 2025. Vol. 32, Iss. S1. P. 29–37.

37. **Hyland K.** Disciplinary identities: Individuality and community in academic discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 236 p. DOI: 10.1017/9781009406512

38. **Swales J.M.** Reflections on the concept of discourse community // Asp. 2016. Vol. 69. Pp. 7–19. DOI: 10.4000/asp.4774

39. **Куликова Л.В.** Языковая инклюзия как потенциал междисциплинарных исследований и образовательный ресурс: мультикультурный опыт // Terra Linguistica. 2023. Т. 14, № 2. С. 23–30. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.14203

40. **Wharton S.** Epistemological and interpersonal stance in a data description task: Findings from a discipline specific learner corpus // English Specific Purpose. 2012. Vol. 31, Iss. 4. P. 261–270.

41. **Hyland K.** Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing // Journal of Pragmatics. 2002. Vol. 34, Iss. 8. P. 1091–1112. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00035-8

42. **Tang R., John S.** The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun // English for Specific Purposes. 1999. Vol. 18, Suppl. 1. P. 23–39. DOI: 10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00009-5

43. **Ivanič R.** Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1998. 373 p. DOI: 10.1075/swll.5

44. **Беляева Л.Н., Камшилова О.Н., Малаховская М.Л.** Корпусные технологии в исследовании и обучении: методика анализа именных групп в научном тексте // Общество. Коммуникация. Образование. 2021. Т. 12, № 4. С. 46–59. DOI: 10.18721/JHSS.12404

45. **Abusalim N., Zidouni S., Alghazo S., Rababah G., Rayyan M.** Textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in political discourse: a case study // Cogent Arts & Humanities. 2022. Vol. 9, Iss. 1. Art. no. 2124683. DOI: 10.1080/23311983.2022.2124683

46. **Choemue S., Bram B.** Discourse markers in academic and non-academic writings of Thai EFL learners // Studies in English Language and Education. 2021. Vol. 8, Iss. 3. P. 1209–1226. DOI: 10.24815/siele.v8i3.20122

47. **Haninda M.H., Bram B.** Academic Writing of EFL Students' Undergraduate Theses: A Discourse Marker Analysis // ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities. 2022. Vol. 5, Iss. 1. P. 109–114. DOI: 10.34050/elsjish.v5i1.19719

48. **Huseynova R., Aliyeva N., Habibova K., Heydarov R.** The evolution of the English language in the internet and social media era // Brazilian Journal of Education, Technology and Society (BRAJETS). 2024. Vol. 17, Iss. SE4. P. 299–314. DOI: 10.14571/brajets.v17.nse4.299-314

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHOR / СВЕДЕНИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

Dashdamirova Nigar
Нигяр Дашдамирова
E-mail: ndasdemirova@amu.edu.az
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9487-592X

Submitted: 02.12.2025; Approved: 20.02.2026; Accepted: 11.03.2026.
Поступила: 02.12.2025; Одобрена: 20.02.2026; Принята: 11.03.2026.