



P-ISSN 2355-2794
E-ISSN 2461-0275

A Corpus-Based Study of Authorial Presence in the Academic Writing of Indonesian Higher Education EFL Learners

Suhandoko^{1*}
Dian Riesti Ningrum²
Ali Mustofa³

¹Department of English Literature, Faculty of Adab and Humanity, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel, Surabaya 60294, INDONESIA

²Department of English Literature, Faculty of Cultural Science, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya 60286, INDONESIA

³Department of Islamic Educational Management, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel, Surabaya 60237, INDONESIA

Abstract

Using appropriate stance markers is essential to enhance argumentation. However, scholars have consistently reported that linguistic, cultural, and instructional factors make developing persuasive skills in L2 writing instruction challenging. This quantitative study employed a corpus-based methodology to investigate the use of stance markers in the academic writing of Indonesian EFL learners to establish persuasive arguments. The dataset comprises academic essays from 59 learners who were part of their academic writing coursework. The stance markers were identified using AntConc software and analyzed following Hyland's (2019) stance framework. The research revealed learners' reliance on transitions to create a logical structure in their text, while the use of boosters slightly surpasses the use of hedges, reflecting their growing understanding of the need to balance certainty with caution in academic writing. The high frequency of markers for disagreement and doubt indicates their ability to engage effectively with alternative viewpoints. The findings of this study challenge the stigma that Asian EFL learners are less assertive in expressing their arguments and challenging opposing views because they adhere to their cultural communicative norms. However, we found the limited use of markers indicating subjectivity and evaluation, which points to a potential gap in pedagogical approaches and suggests the need for more targeted instruction to bridge culturally appropriate communication norms and academic writing conventions.

* Corresponding author, email: suhandoko@uinsa.ac.id

Citation in APA style: Suhandoko, Ningrum, D. R., & Mustofa, A. (2025). A corpus-based study of authorial presence in the academic writing of Indonesian higher education EFL learners. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 12(3), 1248-1265.

Received July 30, 2024; Revised September 13, 2024; Accepted August 7, 2025; Published Online September 30, 2025

<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v12i3.39813>

Copyright © 2025 by Authors, published by *Studies in English Language and Education*. This is an open-access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Keywords: Academic writing, corpus analysis, education for sustainability, Indonesian EFL learners, stance markers.

1. INTRODUCTION

Studies highlight the role of stance markers in shaping persuasive writing (Chen, 2020; Liu et al., 2022). However, scholars have consistently reported that developing persuasive skills in L2 writing instruction is challenging due to linguistic, cultural, and instructional factors (Hyland & Tse, 2004; Nursanti et al., 2023). While academia is highly emphasized to exercise their linguistic strategies to enhance authority and credibility, L2 writers' cultural norms that favor indirectness and politeness in communication may hinder their ability to argue assertively, resulting in blunt writing (Hashemi & Hosseini, 2019; Sirijanchuen & Gampper, 2018; Yoon, 2021). In the instructional contexts, limited exposure to authentic English outside the classroom and traditional writing instruction have also contributed to restricted lexical proficiency and hindered critical thinking (Warschauer, 2017). Despite the abundance of research on stance markers in academic writing, few studies have been conducted using corpus analysis to map how EFL learners use stance markers to shape persuasive writing.

Defined as the way “writers present themselves and convey their judgements, opinions and commitments” (Hyland, 2009, p. 74), stance markers in L2 writing are highly related to cultural and linguistic factors that shape communication styles. Cultural norms of politeness and an emphasis on harmony in the discourse of non-native English speakers can lead to indirectness when expressing different views, affecting how EFL learners critique various arguments (Chen, 2020). In the Indonesian context, the language is linguistically characterized by complex verb affixation, which may have influenced the choice and positioning of English stance markers within academic discourse (Hidayat et al., 2023). Departing from these issues, scholars have consistently reported that EFL learners tend to combine English linguistic features and their L1 sociopragmatic norms. Such cross-linguistic transfer could lead to overuse, underuse, or even misuse of stance markers, potentially affecting the argument's effectiveness.

Studies on the use of stance markers in academic writing demonstrate distinct patterns between L1-L2 English writers and novice-expert writers. L1 writers tend to use hedges and boosters in a more balanced way; in contrast, L2 writers tend to underuse hedges, a typical feature of the ability to create ‘open dialogic space’ for alternative interpretations or criticism (Babaii et al., 2016; Farahani, 2020). The overuse of boosters has made L2 writers' writing appear overly assertive and potentially weakened their argument (Alkhathlan, 2019; Kobayashi, 2016). Similarly, novice writers, regardless of whether they are L1 or L2 writers, frequently struggle with balancing their arguments with either overly assertive or excessive cautious hedging compared to expert writers who exhibit greater flexibility of stance markers by using hedges to introduce caution, boosters to assert argument, and self-mentions to assert authorial presence (Almakrob, 2023; Barbara et al., 2024; Peacock, 2015). These findings suggest that providing explicit instruction on the strategic use of stance markers is essential for helping L2 and novice writers improve their academic writing (Lee & Park, 2023).

Using appropriate stance markers is essential to enhance argumentation. However, linguistic, cultural, and rhetorical factors demand a deeper understanding of their strategic use (Hyland & Tse, 2004). While pedagogical principles emphasize the importance of stance markers (Biber & Gray, 2016; Lancaster, 2014), few researchers have empirically investigated their functions, variations, and impacts on persuasive discourse within specific contexts, especially in the Indonesian higher education EFL context. The present study highlights the need for thorough corpus-based analyses to reveal the patterns and functions of stance marker use in the academic writing of Indonesian higher education EFL learners. By utilizing learner corpora, we examine the variations and functions of stance markers in the academic writing of Indonesian EFL learners. This approach enables us to analyze an extensive collection of texts, which may help us understand the complexity of stance markers (Liu et al., 2022). This study addresses the lack of empirical research in this context, seeking to enrich writing pedagogy and improve academic

writing skills among Indonesian EFL learners in higher education. Accordingly, it asks: What are the patterns and functions of stance markers in the academic writing of Indonesian higher education EFL learners?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Stance Markers and Their Relevance to Argumentation

Hyland and Jiang (2016) emphasize the significance of ‘authorial investment’ in academic writing in the sense that writers should actively participate, express their positions, and address potential limitations, going beyond merely presenting facts (Biber & Gray, 2016). Hyland’s (2019) metadiscourse model outlines two key types of stance markers: interactive and interactional, with the first being concerned with how text is presented in a structured and cohesive manner and the latter focusing on engaging with readers by creating voice and dialogic space. Interactive discourse markers include transitions (e.g., however, in addition), frame markers (e.g., first, to sum up), endophoric markers (e.g., as mentioned before), evidential (e.g., according to), and code glosses (e.g., namely). Interactive discourse markers include hedges (e.g., perhaps), boosters (e.g., clearly), attitude markers (e.g., surprisingly), self-mention (e.g., I), and engagement markers (e.g., note). Swales (1990) argues that recognizing a writer’s stance helps readers navigate complex texts and critically evaluate biases and motives.

Hyland (2019) highlights that stance markers in academic writing are essential in several ways. They allow writers to express certainty or agreement (e.g., clearly), show disagreement or doubt (e.g., however), highlight importance (e.g., significantly), create coherence (e.g., furthermore), and convey subjectivity or evaluation (e.g., surprising). Moreover, stance markers help writers balance their certainty with caution, using hedging to moderate their claims while maintaining a smooth and coherent flow in the text. While traditional notions value objectivity, Hyland and Jiang (2019) advocate for a more inclusive scholarly view that embraces diverse perspectives and voices. This aligns with Hyland (2005), who observed that writers in soft disciplines tend to use explicit stances, while those in hard disciplines are more reserved in expressing their views on research findings, avoiding subjective evaluation. However, the increasing frequency of stance in recent publications on hard disciplines reflects an adaptation to diverse audiences and academic recognition (Hyland & Jiang, 2019).

Cultural and sociolinguistic factors may have contributed to the observed differences in the use of stance markers. Liu et al. (2022) found that EFL Chinese learners prefer modal verbs as a hedging strategy, whereas native English speakers use stance adverbs to convey their confidence. However, different findings were found in the studies of Liu and Liu (2019) and Sabzevar et al. (2019), who found that L2 writers tend to use confident and generalization markers, making their statements appear exaggerated. In contrast, native English writers tend to prioritize caution when expressing their claims. Yang’s (2020) investigation on lexical features used by PhD and undergraduate candidates in 3MT presentations found that while both strategically use lexical choices to engage the audience, PhD candidates rely on personal perspective using the pronoun I, owing to their expertise. In contrast, undergraduates tend to present their research as a collective effort, as indicated by the frequent use of “we,” reflecting their roles within a research team. Although we may diminish the authorial tone, Qiu and Jiang (2021) contend that it can engage readers by fostering a shared understanding.

2.2 Corpus Analysis on Stance Markers Use

Corpus analysis has enriched our knowledge of how academics use language to convey their stances in their writing. Contrastive studies on stance across languages and genres reveal significant insights into authorial presence. Deng and He (2023) found that English writers use more stance markers in research articles than Chinese writers, reflecting cultural influences. Blanco’s (2016) analysis reveals that English writers utilize predicative roles to make evaluations

more explicit, whereas Spanish writers rely on adjectives within noun phrases to convey shared negative judgments. [Shen and Tao's \(2021\)](#) study found that opinion columns use attitude markers and the first-person singular to convey credibility, whereas medical articles prioritize the first-person plural to foster research community engagement. Studies on metadiscourse and genre, as exemplified by [Hyland \(2010\)](#), reveal the role of genre in shaping discourse strategies. Hyland examined writers' strategies to establish reader-writer proximity and the different uses of hedges and attitude markers in research and popular science genres. Corpus-based pedagogy on stance in academic writing highlights essential aspects of authorial stance development. [Lancaster's \(2014\)](#) study highlights the importance of adopting a novice academic stance by incorporating heteroglossic elements, as it is deemed more effective in conveying their ideas to readers, which explicitly positions the readers as more authoritative. [Chang's \(2012\)](#) research highlights the effectiveness of corpus tools in enhancing writing performance, with a focus on discourse-based examples. This further emphasizes the need to teach stance expressions and incorporate corpus tools into writing pedagogy to increase exposure to authentic examples.

2.3 Stance Markers in L2/Novice Writers' Writing

Studies have consistently reported that L2/novice writers frequently struggle with using stance markers effectively in academic writing. These studies have observed an overreliance on boosters and an underuse of hedges, which can create the impression of an overly assertive argument ([Babaii et al., 2015](#); [Farahani, 2020](#)). [Alkhathlan \(2019\)](#) found that Saudi EFL writers relied more on interactive markers, such as transitions, than on interactional markers, like hedges and boosters, making their writing, despite being well-structured, appear more formulaic and superficial. Similarly, novice writers, especially from Arabic and Asian cultures, have been reported to depend heavily on modal verbs and attitude markers but struggle to use them appropriately, leading to weaker argumentative structure and even awkward or overly strong expressions of certainty or evaluation ([Jomaa & Alia, 2019](#); [Peacock, 2015](#)). Cultural factors also play a role, with writers from linguistic backgrounds such as Arabic or Asian cultures showing distinct preferences in rhetorical engagement. This can include the overuse of self-mentions or rhetorical questions to engage readers ([Almakrob, 2023](#); [Hamdan & Ahmad, 2023](#)). These findings highlight the need for more targeted instruction on stance marker usage to help L2 and novice writers convey the appropriate levels of certainty, engage their audience more effectively, and align with disciplinary conventions in academic writing ([Babaii et al., 2015](#); [Peacock, 2015](#)).

Studies that provide interventions to enhance L2 learners' argumentation skills and authorial presence have consistently found a positive impact in raising learners' awareness of stance in academic writing. [Zhang and Zhang \(2023a\)](#) highlight that such instruction significantly enhances learners' skills to employ dialogically expansive techniques effectively and include external voices. [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#) emphasize the transformative effect of explicit stance instruction on the shifts in writing preferences toward assertive stances, reflecting a significant change in learners' awareness of their authorial presence in their writing. Reinforcing these findings, [Zhang and Zhang \(2023b\)](#) argue that learners can benefit from explicit instruction by exhibiting more dynamic stances. Considering these factors, L2 writing teachers are encouraged to incorporate a top-down teaching approach that includes stance markers in their instruction, specifically through engagement with a stance corpus ([Chang, 2012](#)). This approach recognizes disciplinary differences in academic writing instruction and emphasizes the importance of being explicit about stance expectations in writing assessments ([Lancaster, 2016](#)).

3. METHODS

3.1 The Data Source

Quantitative design was employed to identify the frequency of stance markers in learners' writing. To analyze the stance markers within learners' writing, we compiled a corpus of learners'

academic essays. The essays were a part of their academic writing coursework. Learners were required to write an essay of 2,500-3,000 words on a topic of their interest, such as bullying in educational institutions, extracurricular activities in higher education, or gender equality, which the teacher must first approve. Upon the teacher's approval, learners were given 72 hours to complete their writing at home. In order to ensure originality and prevent the use of artificial intelligence tools, the essays were checked using Turnitin for plagiarism and GPTZero for AI-generated content. Essays were included in the analysis only if they met the criteria of having a similarity index below 20% and an AI detection score below 20%.

3.2 Data Collection

Of the 62 essays submitted, 59 met these requirements and were used for analysis. The final compilation reached a total of 158,201 tokens. After that, the essays were converted into a single plain text (.txt) file and cleaned of unnecessary content, including tables, figures, and bibliographies. A corpus compilation software named AntConc was used to manage the data (Anthony, 2004). The software automatically identifies stance markers based on the keywords provided for searching and provides the context of the stance markers. To ensure data validity, after AntConc completed the search, we carefully reviewed the data to ensure that only words indicating stance were included in the analysis.

Meanwhile, words that resembled the search keywords but did not express a stance, such as those found in word-for-word quotations, were excluded from the analysis. To ensure data reliability, we enlisted an independent rater to identify stance markers using the same framework and software. The results indicated a reliability coefficient of 89%, suggesting that the data found were consistent (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). Nevertheless, we and the rater discussed the inconsistencies in the data, identified, and updated the scheme and keywords for searching.

3.3 Data Analysis

To analyze stance markers within the corpus, we employed Hyland's (2019) stance model, which provides a comprehensive taxonomy for examining how writers express their attitudes in academic writing. This model has been widely used in corpus-based studies on stance markers (see Deng & He, 2023), highlighting its applicability. Specifically, for interactional markers, we excluded self-mentions, as their function is clear: they serve as markers of subjectivity. Once all stance markers were identified, they were categorized by type to observe the patterns in how these stance markers are distributed in learners' academic writing. These stance markers were then further analyzed to examine how they function in constructing learners' arguments in their writing.

4. RESULTS

4.1 The Patterns of Stance Markers in Indonesian Higher Education EFL Learners' Academic Writing

Table 1 shows the distribution of learners' use of interactive and interactional markers in their academic writing. The table shows learners' reliance on interactive (64.2%) over interactional markers (35.8%) in their writing. Transitions dominate at 34.6%, reflecting learners' preference for organizing and connecting their ideas to ensure clarity and coherence. Furthermore, the evidential and frame markers are at 26.8% and 2.8% respectively. In contrast, interactional markers, such as boosters, hedges, and attitude markers, are used at 17.2%, 14.5, and 4.1%, respectively. This imbalance suggests that learners prioritize structural clarity over interpersonal engagement. Such a tendency may indicate limited awareness of how interactional markers can enhance persuasiveness and reader involvement.

Table 1. Patterns of stance markers in learners' academic writing.

Category of stance	Indicating words or phrases with frequencies	f	%
<i>Interactive</i>			
Transitions	however (195), on the other hand (4), in addition to (37), furthermore (34), moreover (30), while (17), nevertheless (9), in contrast (6), additionally (6), on the contrary (2)	340	34.6
Evidential	state (158), demonstrate (4), argue (41), explain (36), mention (20), find (5)	264	26.8
Frame markers	finally (21), lastly (5), secondly (1)	28	2.8
<i>Interactional</i>			
Hedges	could (42), likely (36), possible/possibly (36), suggest (12), might (10), probably (8), perhaps (3)	143	14.5
Boosters	significant(ly) (60), certainly (44), essential(ly) (32), clearly (21), undoubtedly (6), absolutely (6)	169	17.2
Attitude markers	vital (13), unfortunately (11), particularly (6), worthy of (4), concerns (2), surprisingly (2), promising (2)	40	4.1

The following subsections provide a closer look at each category of stance identified in learners' writing. These sections highlight how different stance markers function to shape meaning and rhetorical effect in their academic texts. Some examples from the corpus are also provided to show how these markers reflect learners' stance in their academic writing.

4.1.1 Transitions

Our observation reveals that learners rely heavily on interactive stance markers, particularly transitions, to organize their ideas. Markers like 'however', 'on the other hand', 'furthermore', and 'in addition to' reflect a strong emphasis on maintaining logical flow in their writing. The frequent use of these markers demonstrates learner's awareness of maintaining cohesion between ideas as shown in Examples (1), (2), and (3).

- (1) **However**, one thing that stands out more is the difference in social class from people who come to Borobudur Temple.
- (2) **On the other hand**, men are trusted to do all things related to the world of work and have a high career.
- (3) **In addition to** the acceptance of soft masculinity by fans of K-pop Idols, marketing techniques that incorporate merchandise, such as photo cards, are often a powerful tool in selling beauty cosmetics in South Korea.

In these instances, learners use transitions to guide readers through contrasting points and additional information. In Example (1), 'however' introduces a contrast between what has been previously discussed and a new point regarding social class differences at Borobudur Temple. Example (2) uses 'on the other hand' to juxtapose gender roles, showing the perceived role of men in the professional world. The use of 'in addition to' in Example (3) adds information on marketing techniques in the context of K-pop idols, expanding on the earlier view about fan acceptance of soft masculinity. Transitions serve to help readers follow the flow of the text. However, while this approach ensures coherence, it highlights learners' overreliance on such formulaic expressions. While the writing may be well-organized, the overuse of transitions can create the impression that the writing lacks the depth expected at higher levels of academic discourse.

4.1.2 Evidential

The evidential markers found in the learners' writing frequently take the form of reporting verbs. These verbs, such as 'state', 'argue', and 'mention' are common in the learner's writing, aiming to present information or to attribute to other authors, a notable feature of academic writing. The following instances illustrate how these markers are realized in the learner's writing.

- (4) Yanti et al. (2018) **state** that the advantages of early marriage are avoiding free sex behavior and reaching old age, and no longer having small children.
- (5) Riggio (2016) **argues** that one of the abilities of charismatic people is being able to communicate so that they are able to attract attention.
- (6) Jones (2004, p. 8) **mentions** that a gap year is a period of time, typically between three and 24 months, during which a person takes a break from school, the workplace, or training, resulting in a longer career trajectory.

The learners' use of reporting verbs demonstrates their attempt to use external sources to support their claims. In Example (4), the verb 'state' is appropriately used when citing Yanti et al. to indicate factual information regarding the advantages of early marriage. Similarly, in Example (5), the learner uses 'argue' to acknowledge Riggio's view about the charismatic trait. However, our closer observation reveals that while learners use reporting verbs, their selection seems to be arbitrary and random, as seen in Example (6). The learner uses 'mention' to introduce Jones's definition of 'gap year'. The verb 'mention' serves to give short information, which is not appropriate to provide a key definition; rather, verbs like 'define' and 'explain' would be more appropriate. This analysis suggests that while learners are aware of the need to include evidential markers to indicate their stance toward external sources, their selection of the verbs does not align with the rhetorical purpose of their citations, leading to confusion and weak arguments.

4.1.3 Frame markers

Our observation on the learner's writing shows that frame markers play a significant role in signalling text organization and the sequence of argumentation in a text. These markers, such as 'firstly', 'next', 'finally', and 'in conclusion', help readers follow the writer's intended structure and anticipate the development of ideas in an argument. However, compared to transition markers, frame markers tend to be used less frequently and mostly in predictable positions, such as in the beginning or at the end of paragraphs, as in the samples below.

- (7) **Finally**, external factors that also contribute to efforts to increase the self-confidence of a person with mental illness are group norms.
- (8) **Lastly**, students can develop and explore their abilities or passions to increase their personal growth and build self-reflection to face lectures.

In these examples, both 'finally' and 'lastly' are used to mark the final point in a sequence. Example (7) uses 'finally' to signal the last external factor that contributes to a person's self-confidence. Similarly, Example (8) uses 'lastly' to wrap up a discussion on how students can develop personal growth and self-reflection. The examples show that learners are relatively confident using frame markers to signal conclusions but may not be using them consistently to signal progression throughout the text, as shown by the lower frequency of these markers. The lower frequency of markers, like 'lastly' and 'secondly', suggests that learners may prefer alternative cohesive devices to organize their ideas and structure their writing. The frequent use of transition markers such as 'however' and 'furthermore', and the relatively low use of 'firstly', 'secondly', or 'lastly' indicates learners' rhetorical strategy to guide their readers through their arguments without explicitly marking each stage of idea progression with frame markers. This choice suggests that learners focus on establishing logical connections between ideas rather than explicitly marking each stage of their argument. Transitions serve not only for connecting ideas and signaling relationships but also offer greater flexibility because they are not limited to outlining the argument structure.

4.1.4 Boosters

The study observed that learners frequently use boosters more compared to other interactional markers in their writing. Learners' reliance on boosters demonstrates their strategy

to mask uncertainty or to assert their arguments. The following examples illustrate how learners use boosters in their writing.

- (9) A person can **significantly** improve and achieve their skills outside the scope of education to explore themselves for the better.
- (10) Then, if the intelligence and potential abilities possessed by someone who is good looking are not considered, then this is **certainly** not pleasant and detrimental for someone who experiences it.
- (11) After pursuing a foreign language course well, language skills can develop, which will be **undoubtedly** helpful in college and career life.

In these examples, learners use boosters such as ‘significantly’, ‘certainly’, and ‘undoubtedly’ to assert their claims. In Example (9), ‘significantly’ is used to emphasize the extent of improvement one can achieve through self-exploration, highlighting the learner’s acknowledgment of the positive outcomes of personal growth. Similarly, in Example (10), the use of ‘certainly’ emphasizes the learner’s assertiveness on the negative consequences of ignoring someone’s intelligence based solely on physical appearance. In Example (11), ‘undoubtedly’ is used to reinforce the learner’s belief in the benefits of foreign language skills for future success. It is worth noting that when used appropriately, boosters can lend writers a sense of authority and demonstrate their confidence in the validity of their assertions. However, overuse of boosters can create the impression that the writing is overly assertive and exaggerated, compromising the overall accuracy and balance of the arguments.

4.1.5 Hedging

Our study found that learners used hedging to soften their claims. Common hedges in the corpus include ‘could’, ‘likely’, ‘might’, and ‘possible/possibly’. Learner’s use of hedging indicates their awareness of the need to be cautious with their arguments and others’ rather than absolute certainty. The followings are examples of the use of hedging in the learner’s writing.

- (12) This **could** be the reason that young marriage does not always guarantee the welfare of the child will be much better with his new family.
- (13) They are also more **likely** to enjoy their time and are familiar with courses that allow them to exercise their minds and initiatives independently as well as incorporate their own theories and concepts.
- (14) For people who believe in witch doctors, this **might** not be too threatening for him or her because they have a witch doctor who will protect them if they are attacked by other magic users.

The use of hedging in learners’ writing reflects their awareness of the need to balance assertiveness while leaving room for alternative viewpoints. For instance, in Example (12), the use of ‘could’ shows the learner’s acknowledgment of the possibility of different consequences for young marriages. Similarly, Example (13) ‘likely’ reflects the learner’s understanding that student preferences involve probabilities rather than certainties, and Example (14) ‘might’ offer flexibility by suggesting that belief in witch doctors may or may not mitigate fear, depending on the individual’s perspective. As novice writers, learners might find it challenging to balance hedging and boosting their arguments. Their frequent use of boosters and less hedging, which indicates confidence, may indicate a tendency to present ideas more assertively, likely due to instruction highlighting the importance of presenting convincing and assertive arguments. However, without sufficient hedging, their arguments may appear overly formulaic, as they do not fully engage with the debates on the topic.

4.1.6 Attitude markers

Our observation reveals that learners actively use attitude markers to express their evaluations toward the ideas presented. These markers appear in various form, such as adjectives, adverbs, and phrases conveying approval or concern. The prevalent use of attitude markers is demonstrated in the following examples.

- (15) **Unfortunately**, when faced with a situation that makes it impossible to care for their pets, some people choose to surrender them to shelters.
- (16) Therefore, it is **vital** for someone to not only have academic intelligence but also develop these three abilities in order to achieve the desired success in life.
- (17) Not **surprisingly**, billions of dollars are spent yearly on appearance-enhancing products.

The varying frequencies of attitude markers demonstrate how learners have strategically incorporated evaluative language in their writing. These markers allow them to express personal evaluation without reducing the overall objectivity of their arguments. In Example (15), ‘unfortunately’ allows the learner to frame the issue of pet surrender as regrettable practice. In Example (16), ‘vital’ strengthens the argument by emphasizing the necessity of the abilities being discussed, showing that learners can assertively prioritize specific ideas without relying purely on objective reporting. The use of attitude markers like ‘particularly’, ‘worthy of’, and ‘concerns’ demonstrates learners’ ability to maintain a more objective tone while still signaling their evaluative stance. This approach reflects learners developing the rhetorical skill of incorporating subjective evaluation in a manner that does not overpower the factual basis of their arguments. For instance, in Example (17), the use of ‘not surprisingly’ expresses a subtle evaluation while maintaining the focus on the fact that large amounts of money are spent on appearance-related products. However, the less frequent use of attitude markers in learners’ writing suggests that they prioritize maintaining a neutral tone instead of a subjective one.

4.2 Functions of Stance Markers in Indonesian Higher Education EFL Learners’ Academic Writing

Table 2 illustrates how stance markers are used to support and convey arguments effectively. The table indicates that conveying disagreement and doubt is the most frequently occurring function of learners’ use of stance markers, accounting for 30.3% of the total markers. This demonstrates learners’ thoughtful effort to engage with alternative arguments, highlighting their high stance-taking in their argumentation. Furthermore, the expression of certainty and agreement, accounting for 9.6%, indicates that learners use linguistic features to emphasize their assertiveness. Additionally, the use of markers for highlighting importance and emphasis (14.4%) and creating a coherent flow (21.8%) indicates the learners’ meticulous effort to engage readers and maintain logical coherence in their writing. However, the limited use of markers indicating subjectivity and evaluation (5.6%) suggests the need for targeted instruction.

Table 2. Functions of stance markers in learners’ academic writing.

Functions of stance markers	Indicating words or phrases with frequencies	f	%
Expressing certainty and agreement	certainly (44), undoubtedly (6), clearly (21), absolutely (6),	77	9.6
Conveying disagreement and doubt	however (195), nevertheless (9), on the contrary (2), unfortunately (11), in contrast (6), concerns (2), while (17)	242	30.3
Highlighting importance and emphasis	significant(ly) (60), particularly (6), essential(ly) (32), vital (13), worthy of (4)	115	14.4
Indicating subjectivity and evaluation	surprisingly (2), promising (2), argue (41)	45	5.6

Table 2 continued...

Balancing certainty with hedging	could (42), might (10), likely (36), suggest (12), perhaps (3), probably (8), possible/possibly (36)	147	18.4
Creating a coherent flow	on the other hand (40), secondly (1), moreover (30), finally (21), additionally (6), in addition to (37), lastly (5), furthermore (34)	174	21.8

The following subsections discuss each functional category of stance in detail. This analysis highlights how learners employ stance markers to construct argumentation and achieve rhetorical purposes in their academic writing. Some examples from the corpus are also provided to show how these markers function in a text.

4.2.1 *Expressing certainty and agreement*

Our analysis found that learners frequently use expressions of certainty and agreement to assert their claims. These markers allow them to convey their arguments with a sense of assurance. Words, such as ‘undoubtedly’, ‘certainly’, and ‘clearly’, best describe learners’ use of markers expressing certainty and agreement to convey their belief in the validity of their claims.

- (18) For children who witness their parents’ divorce, this is **undoubtedly** an excessive event to accept.
- (19) The relationship of trust between children and parents is **essential** because it can significantly impact a child’s future development.
- (20) Frequently, they also do not mind or feel burdened if they need to spend more money to get an advanced and proper education, which will **undoubtedly** have higher tuition fees when compared to public school or universities.
- (21) In parenting, a good child-parent relationship is essential for the child to develop into a well-adjusted adolescent.

In Example (18), the learner’s confidence in the claim that witnessing parents’ divorce is overwhelming for children is certainly established, emphasizing the learner’s belief in the gravity of the situation. The phrase ‘absolutely essential’ in Example (19) unequivocally highlights the learner’s view that a strong relationship of trust between children and parents profoundly impacts children’s future development. In Example (20), ‘undoubtedly’ in this context reinforces the idea that studying at prestigious institutions abroad will lead to higher tuition fees, emphasizing the learner’s opinion in the financial implications of pursuing a quality education. ‘Clearly’ in Example (21) emphasizes that a good child-parent relationship is essential for the child’s positive growth, demonstrating the learner’s agreement with the necessity of this relationship in parenting. The moderate use of markers indicating certainty and agreement shows that learners are establishing assertive stances on important issues. These markers, although somewhat mechanical due to the frequent repetition of certain words, emphasize the learner’s strong belief in the validity of their arguments and encourage readers to align with their views by minimizing doubt.

4.2.2 *Highlighting importance and emphasis*

Our observation shows that learners frequently use markers highlighting importance and emphasis to draw readers’ attention to the arguments. These markers help them signal which parts of their arguments deserve readers’ special attention. The expressions, such as ‘significantly’, ‘clearly’, and ‘more importantly’, best describe how these markers strategically make their ideas more noticeable.

- (22) The percentage of female MPs also varies **significantly** across the world’s regions.
- (23) This proves that many Muslims use witchcraft and go to witch doctors for help in solving problems that are **clearly** forbidden by religion.
- (24) However, **more importantly**, the best environment for teaching and educating children is at home.

- (25) Time and affection are **essential** for children.

The term ‘significantly’ in Example (22) implies a significant variation in the percentage of female MPs across regions, emphasizing the importance of understanding the disparities and their potential impact on global representation and political dynamics. The use of ‘clearly’ in Example (23) does more than acknowledge the contradiction between witchcraft and religious teachings. It asserts its undeniable nature, bringing attention to the gravity of the behavior and its implications to religious beliefs. In Example (24), ‘more importantly’ directs attention and establishes an argument structure, emphasizing a nurturing home environment while noting other relevant factors. In Example (25), the marker ‘essential’ not only signifies importance but also emphasizes the fundamental nature of time and affection required in childhood development. In terms of effectiveness, these markers could draw the reader’s attention to key points in the argument. However, a closer look reveals that learners may be using emphasis markers somewhat mechanically, much like their frequent use of certainty markers, without fully integrating the critical analysis that usually accompanies strong claims. Learners’ overreliance on certainty markers might unintentionally close off dialogic space, providing less room for readers to engage with their arguments critically.

4.2.3 *Conveying disagreement and doubt*

Our observation reveals relatively abundant instances of markers that convey disagreement and doubt. The use of these markers demonstrates the learner’s engagement with alternative arguments while maintaining their own stance. Words, such as ‘while’, ‘however’, and ‘nevertheless’, are strategically used to introduce contrast or partial disagreement.

- (26) **While** adolescents may commit heinous acts when they are young, rehabilitation is **still** possible because adolescents are still elevating their identity and social status.
- (27) **However**, all the intelligence that he has is hidden by appearance so that most people think that he only has looks.
- (28) **Nevertheless**, not all subjects in every school are tested.
- (29) **Unfortunately**, the number of shelters is still not large enough compared to the number of cats on the streets that have been overpopulated.

‘While’ and ‘still’ in Example (26) indicate that the learner acknowledges the skepticism but asserts the possibility of rehabilitation for adolescents who commit heinous acts. In Example (27), ‘however’ functions as a marker conveying disagreement and introduces a contrasting view to the previous statement, suggesting that despite being intelligent, an individual’s appearance may lead others to underestimate him. The term ‘nevertheless’ in Example (28) indicates a counter to the initial statement about the National Examination being a graduation benchmark. Additionally, ‘not all’ introduces an element of doubt, suggesting that the examination’s scope may not be as comprehensive as initially implied. In Example (29), ‘unfortunately’ serves to convey doubts, by introducing a sense of negative evaluation and suggesting that the current state of affairs is not desirable. The use of markers, such as ‘however’, ‘nevertheless’, and ‘while’ reflects learners’ awareness of the importance of addressing counterarguments. This is a positive step, as engaging potential opposing arguments is essential in academic writing.

4.2.4 *Balancing certainty with hedging*

Our analysis reveals that learners strategically balance assertiveness with cautions. The use of these markers allows them to present their claims assertively while remaining open to alternative perspectives. The following instances demonstrate learners’ rhetorical strategy of balancing certainty with hedging.

- (30) Delivering boundaries to young children **might** be a challenge, but setting a line between one another is important.
- (31) So far, it is **possible** for those who are not materially able to think that success is only owned by those who are rich, because their perception of success requires money.
- (32) FWB relationship often connotate with sex, so this **could be** another reason why most of the young-adult choose this kind of relationship rather than be casual couple.
- (33) Another study found that children raised in matriarchal families get a better education and are less **likely** to get sick than children raised in a patriarchal family.
- (34) Parental attitudes toward interactive technology **suggest** that they believe their value lies primarily in entertainment, rather than in its educational potential.
- (35) Although **perhaps** the factors and signs are rarely seen, in fact this needs to be very carefully considered by every parent and people around them.

In the examples above, learners use hedging to strike a balance between assertiveness and caution. For example, ‘might’ in Example (30) expresses uncertainty about the challenges of delivering rules and boundaries to children while maintaining social relationships. In Example (31), ‘possible’ introduces doubts about the idea that success solely belongs to the rich, suggesting that while such perception exists, the learner acknowledges other factors. In Example (32) ‘could be’ indicates that the emerging trend for ‘friends with benefit’ relationships is associated with having sex despite the doubts presented in the statement. In Example (33) ‘likely’ indicates a degree of probability of children being raised in matriarchal families being less prone to illness while acknowledging exceptions or variations. In Example (34) ‘suggest’ is used to soften the assertion about parental attitudes toward technology. While the assertion implies a tendency, it does not present it as an absolute fact, allowing for some doubt in the interpretation. ‘Perhaps’ in Example (35) introduces doubt about the visibility of certain factors, allowing learners to express ideas with caution and consider alternative viewpoints. The use of hedging in learners’ writing reflects their awareness of the need to approach claims cautiously, a key feature in advanced academic writing. By softening their assertions, learners strategically signal their recognition of alternative perspectives. However, problems arise when hedging is used in a formulaic manner, as evidenced by the repetitive use of modal verbs rather than a more varied range of hedging strategies.

4.2.5 Creating a coherent flow

Stance markers that contribute to creating a coherent flow were prevalent in learners’ writing. Words, such as ‘furthermore’, ‘moreover’, and ‘in addition to’, are commonly used to signal addition or transition between ideas. The following examples show the markers used to create coherence in learners’ writing.

- (36) **Furthermore**, a gap year can gain significant improvement in personal skills.
- (37) **Moreover**, a parent who is so busy with his work that his children do not have a good time communicating with their parents.
- (38) **In addition to** academic performance, sleep deprivation also has an impact on the psychological condition of students.
- (39) **On the contrary**, children that have generally received more trust than they should be, can also easily adapt to some behavior change in their daily lives.

The examples above contain markers that contribute to creating a coherent flow. In examples (36) and (37), ‘moreover’ and ‘furthermore’ signal additional information or supporting evidence, reinforcing the earlier statements. They show a clear progression in discussing personal

skills and parent-child communication. The use of ‘in addition to’ in Example (38) aims to introduce another aspect related to sleep deprivation, indicating that the learner is expanding the discussion to cover psychological effects. In Example (39) ‘on the contrary’ introduces contrasting ideas, showing that the text presents alternating perspectives. In academic writing, stance markers serve not only to create a logical structure of the text but also to add depth and complexity to the argument. When learners rely heavily on transitions like ‘moreover’, ‘furthermore’, and ‘on the contrary’, they miss the opportunity to make their writing more engaging. Using markers like ‘additionally’ or ‘besides’ as an alternative to ‘moreover’ to indicate an extension of an argument or using markers like ‘alternatively’ or ‘conversely’ rather than ‘on the contrary’ to present contrasting ideas allows them to avoid redundancy and create more sophisticated transitions that add complexity to their arguments. This strategic variation not only improves the writing flow but also enhances its persuasiveness by demonstrating more thoughtful engagement with the topic.

4.2.6 *Indicating subjectivity and evaluation*

We observed several instances of markers indicating subjectivity and evaluation in learners’ writing. These markers allow them to move beyond simply presenting facts by adding their own judgement and stance. Words, such as, ‘promising’ and ‘not surprisingly’, best describe how learners evaluate situations based on their perspectives, as illustrated in the following examples.

(40) Through the annual fashion event held by Indonesia, namely ‘Jakarta Fashion Week’, Indonesia opened up quite **promising** cooperation opportunities for the development of the fashion industry.

(41) **Not surprisingly**, billions of dollars are spent yearly on appearance-enhancing products.

In Example (40), ‘promising’ suggests the learner’s positive evaluation, conveying that the learner sees the cooperation opportunities resulting from Jakarta Fashion Week as having significant potential for growth. This indicates the learner’s personal evaluation of the event’s impact, emphasizing the learner’s positive attitude toward its role in developing the fashion industry in Indonesia. Furthermore, the phrase ‘not surprisingly’ in Example (41) establishes the assumption that billions of dollars have been spent on appearance-enhancing products, indicating a subjective evaluation of the situation. The use of markers indicating subjectivity and evaluation is essential to allow learners to incorporate their attitudes, evaluations, and judgments into the text, thereby influencing how the reader interprets the information presented.

5. DISCUSSION

In academic writing, stance markers are essential for helping writers convey their attitudes, evaluations, and commitment to the arguments (Hyland, 2005). These rhetorical devices allow writers to position themselves about their arguments and engage with their readers. For EFL learners, using appropriate stance markers can be particularly challenging, as it requires both language mastery and an understanding of rhetorical conventions. Research shows that while even advanced EFL learners use stance markers, their usage patterns often differ from those of native speakers, which can sometimes compromise with clarity, persuasion, and reader engagement (Hashemi & Hosseini, 2019; Sirijanchuen & Gampper, 2018; Yoon, 2021). In this section, we examine our findings on the use of stance markers in the academic writing of Indonesian undergraduate EFL learners. We focus on the types and frequency of stance markers to examine patterns in their usage and how these markers help learners effectively assert their arguments in writing.

Overall, our study on learners’ use of stance markers reflects their growing ability to take a stance in academic writing. We observed that learners demonstrate a strong preference for

interactive markers, particularly during transitions. This practice highlights their understanding of the need to maintain coherent flow in academic writing, a key aspect of effective discourse (Hyland, 2005). While this reliance on transitions helps maintain structural clarity, it also suggests a formulaic approach to argumentation, emphasizing the logical flow rather than engaging critically with the content. This observation aligns with previous research, such as Huh and Lee (2016) and Alkhathlan (2019), which noted that novice writers frequently adopt a mechanical approach to writing that prioritizes coherence over critical engagement with the content. Although learners have attempted to diversify their transition with alternatives like 'in addition to' and 'furthermore' instead of frame markers like 'first' and 'second' to create smooth connections between ideas, we argue that they could benefit from exploring more linguistic strategies to avoid redundancy and bring more sophistication to their writing. This reflects the need for learners to go beyond basic coherence strategies and engage with more complex forms of argument structuring, which would better showcase their critical engagement with their topics (Biber & Gray, 2016; Hyland, 2005).

The prevalence of markers conveying disagreement and doubt, such as 'however', 'in contrast', and 'nevertheless', raises questions about the influence of cultural norms of non-native speakers of English that prioritize harmonious communication (Hashemi & Hosseini, 2019; Nursanti et al., 2023). In the study, the use of markers indicating disagreement and doubt demonstrates learners' skills in handling disagreement subtly and balancing cohesion and distance while presenting opposing viewpoints. We assume that while L2 writers of English are often criticized for using less personal stance-taking, Indonesian sociocultural values that emphasize group cohesion and respect for diverse opinions may encourage learners to demonstrate openness to alternative perspectives, and it reflects learners' strategic alignment between standard academic conventions and local customs, reflecting a 'glocal' rhetorical strategy.

This is further evidenced by the use of interactional markers, such as hedging and boosters, reflecting learners' understanding of the need to balance assertiveness and caution. The prevalence of boosters (17.2%) suggests that learners are aware of expressing certainty and highlighting the importance of their arguments; however, they may not fully understand the importance of balancing certainty with hedging, as indicated by the slightly lower use of hedging (14.5%). In advanced academic writing, maintaining a balance between certainty and remaining open to a dialogic space is essential for presenting well-supported claims while demonstrating intellectual humility and critical engagement with the topic (Aull, 2019). However, in our study, in contrast to common findings that highlight a significant imbalance between the use of hedges and boosters in novice writing (see Barbara et al., 2024; Çandarlı et al., 2015; Kobayashi, 2016; Xu, 2024), we reveal learners' efforts to strike a balance between the two. While boosters still slightly outweigh hedges, learners' use of hedging, especially modal verbs, reflects their attempt to navigate their cultural norms of indirectness (*sungkan*) and politeness (*unggah-ungguh*) in communication (Nursanti et al., 2023). This growing shift from boosters to hedges suggests that learners are gradually adopting more sophisticated stance-taking strategies, moving toward a more expert level of academic writing. However, we argue that learners would benefit from using diverse hedging strategies beyond modal verbs to bring more sophistication to their arguments.

Despite the prevalence of hedging and boosters in the learners' writing, the limited use of attitude markers indicating subjectivity, combined with a somewhat arbitrary selection of reporting verbs for personal evaluations, suggests a hesitance to engage more critically with the topics. This hesitance may reflect a preference for maintaining objectivity and neutrality, likely due to instructional emphasis and cultural norms that discourage overt personal stance-taking. Although scholarly discussions traditionally prioritize objectivity, it does not imply that these markers must be discouraged, particularly in writing instructions. On the contrary, these markers can be powerful tools for conveying personal evaluations within appropriate contexts (Deng & He, 2023; Hyland, 2005). Additionally, different cultures and academic discipline conventions might also affect the use of explicit markers of subjectivity. In some contexts, it might even be considered unnecessary or discouraged to use covert personal evaluation to avoid subjectivity (Almakrob, 2023; Hashemi & Hosseini, 2019; Xu, 2024). Indonesian sociocultural norms, which highly value politeness and respect for authority (Nursanti et al., 2023), may discourage learners

from overtly expressing their evaluations of information. These cultural expectations often prioritize indirectness and deference to authoritative sources, leading them to assert their judgment over information hesitantly. This echoes what [Tang and John \(1999\)](#) argue: “Students feel insecure about the validity of their claims, seeing themselves to be at the lowest rungs of the academic ladder” (p. 34). This concern necessitates extensive research into how teachers can effectively guide their learners in striking a balance between assertiveness and caution, while also reconciling Asian cultural norms that favor indirectness with academic conventions that equally emphasize the importance of personal evaluations and respect for diverse viewpoints. Therefore, it is fitting to conclude this discussion by quoting [Deng and He \(2023\)](#), who state that “academic writing is rooted in social reality” (p. 9), emphasizing the indispensable role of cultural norms in knowledge construction.

6. CONCLUSION

The study reveals an overreliance on interactive markers, particularly transitions, in the academic writing of Indonesian higher education EFL learners. While contributing to text coherence, this practice has led to formulaic writing, suggesting a need for more diverse linguistic strategies to enhance learners’ engagement with the topic. We also observed learners’ attempts to engage critically with knowledge production, as evidenced by their use of transitions indicating disagreement and doubt. This practice challenges the perception that Asian learners are reluctant to present differing viewpoints, particularly those presented by authoritative sources. Nevertheless, learners could benefit more from a stronger focus on markers that not only structure the text but also foster critical connections between ideas within the text, such as using more hedges. Our study found a relative balance between hedging and boosters in learners’ writing, reflecting their growing understanding of the need to balance between assertiveness and caution in advanced academic writing. Nevertheless, the overuse of boosters, combined with the mechanical use of hedging, highlights the necessity for more targeted instruction on diversifying linguistic strategies and effectively balancing certainty with caution. We also found limited use of attitude markers indicating subjectivity, combined with a somewhat arbitrary selection of reporting verbs for personal evaluations, suggesting the need for pedagogical intervention to bridge cultural norms that favor indirectness with academic conventions that equally emphasize the importance of personal evaluations and respect for different viewpoints.

In light of these findings, there is a need for more targeted instruction to diversify stance markers in learners’ academic writing. This can be achieved by emphasizing explicit instruction of stance markers. Teachers can design activities that allow learners to experiment with using diverse stance markers during the writing process. Teachers can point learners to specific parts of their writing and discuss the possibilities for incorporating more stance markers to add sophistication and depth to their writing. Teachers can also design culturally sensitive instruction that acknowledges Indonesian norms of politeness and indirectness by explicitly introducing varied forms of hedging beyond modal verbs to develop learners’ diverse linguistic strategies in argumentation, thereby bridging the expectations of global academic conventions with cultural norms in their writing. While these insights are valuable, the study is based on a relatively small sample of learner corpus, which limits its ability to fully portray Indonesian EFL learners’ academic writing as a whole. Future research should adopt a more comprehensive approach by collecting data from a broader range of regions and institutions nationwide. A larger, more diverse sample would provide a more accurate and representative analysis of academic writing practices among Indonesian higher education EFL learners, offering deeper insights into learners’ writing strategies and their perceptions of academic writing across cultures.

REFERENCES

- Alkhatlan, M. (2019). Metadiscourse in academic writing: An investigation of Saudi EFL students' research articles. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 7(5), 220-225. <https://doi.org/10.13189/lls.2019.070505>
- Almakrob, A. Y. (2023). How do Arab writers interact with their readers? An analysis of the use of metadiscourse markers. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(6), 1591-1600. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1306.29>
- Anthony, L. (2004). AntConc: A learner and classroom friendly, multi-platform corpus analysis toolkit. In L. Anthony, S. Fujita, & Y. Harada (Eds.), *Proceedings of IWLeL 2004: An Interactive Workshop on Language e-Learning* (pp. 7-13). Waseda University.
- Aull, L. (2019). Linguistic markers of stance and genre in upper-level student writing. *Written Communication*, 36(2), 267-295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088318819472>
- Babaii, E., Atai, M. R., & Mohammadi, V. (2015). Stance in English research articles: Two disciplines of the same science. *Tell*, 9(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2015.53730>
- Babaii, E., Atai, M. R., & Mohammadi, V. (2016). Tracing metadiscursive stance over time and across disciplines: A comparative study of English research articles. *Issues in Language Teaching (ILT)*, 5(1), 83-106. <https://doi.org/10.22054/ilt.2016.7727>
- Barbara, S. W. Y., Afzaal, M., & Aldayel, H. S. (2024). 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), 284. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02757-4>
- Biber, D., & Gray, B. (2016). *Grammatical complexity in academic English: Linguistic change in writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blanco, M. P. (2016). The construction of attitudinal stance: A corpus-based contrastive study of negative evaluative adjectives in English and Spanish opinion discourse. *Languages in Contrast*, 16(1), 31-53. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.16.1.02per>
- Çandarlı, D., Bayyurt, Y., & Marti, L. (2015). Authorial presence in L1 and L2 novice academic writing: Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspectives. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20, 192-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.10.001>
- Chang, P. (2012). Using a stance corpus to learn about effective authorial stance-taking: A textlinguistic approach. *ReCALL*, 24(2), 209-236. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344012000079>
- Chen, R. (2020). Single author self-reference: Identity construction and pragmatic competence. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 45, Article 100856. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JEAP.2020.100856>
- Deng, L., & He, P. (2023). "We may conclude that:" A corpus-based study of stance-taking in conclusion sections of RAs across cultures and disciplines. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1175144. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1175144>
- Farahani, M. V. (2020). Metadiscourse in academic written and spoken English: A comparative corpus-based inquiry. *Research in Language*, 18(3), 319-341. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1731-7533.18.3.05>
- Hamdan, N. N., & Ahmad, U. K. (2023). Asserting authorial identity through stance and voice: Expert vs. novice scientific writers. *Arab World English Journal*, 14(2), 360-377. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no2.25>
- Hashemi, M. R., & Hosseini, H. (2019). Stance and culture: A comparative study of English and Persian authorial stance in applied linguistics research articles. *Advanced Education*, 6(12), 21-27. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.123284>
- Hidayat, R., Sukri, S., & Burhanuddin, B. (2023). Nasalization [N-] in Indonesian: Generative morphology perspective. *Path of Science*, 9(4), 4001-4009. <https://pathofscience.org/index.php/ps/article/view/2312/0>
- Huh, M.-H., & Lee, I. (2016). On the use of metadiscourse in EFL undergraduate student writing. *English Teaching*, 71(3), 99-120. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.71.3.201609.99>

- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365>
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2010). Constructing proximity: Relating to readers in popular and professional science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(2), 116-127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.003>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Bloomsbury.
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. K. (2016). Change of attitude? A diachronic study of stance. *Written Communication*, 33(3), 251-274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088316650399>
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. K. (2019). Points of reference: Changing patterns of academic citation. *Applied Linguistics*, 40(1), 64-85. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx012>
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/APPLIN/25.2.156>
- Jomaa, N. J., & Alia, M. M. (2019). Functional analyses of metadiscourse markers in L2 students' academic writing. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 10(1), 361-381. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no1.30>
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(3), 269-292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.08.003>
- Kobayashi, Y. (2016). Investigating metadiscourse markers in Asian Englishes: A corpus-based approach. *Language in Focus*, 2(1), 19-35. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lifijal-2016-0002>
- Lancaster, Z. (2014). Exploring valued patterns of stance in upper-level student writing in the disciplines. *Written Communication*, 31(1), 27-57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088313515170>
- Lancaster, Z. (2016). Expressing stance in undergraduate writing: Discipline-specific and general qualities. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 16-30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.05.006>
- Lee, S., & Park, H. I. (2023). Changing patterns of interactive metadiscourse in English teaching articles. *English Teaching*, 78(2), 83-102. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.78.2.202206.83>
- Liu, Y., Hu, X., & Liu, J. (2022). A corpus-based study on Chinese and American students' rhetorical moves and stance features in dissertation abstracts. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 1004744. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1004744>
- Liu, Y., & Liu, J. (2019). A corpus-based comparative study of generality in Chinese EFL students' and international scholars' stance in academic writing. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 42(3), 386-399. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cjal-2019-0023>
- Nursanti, E., Andriyanti, E., & Wijaya, I. A. (2023). (Im)politeness employed by multilingual Indonesian EFL learners in argumentative conversations. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 10(2), 1000-1021. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i2.26033>
- Peacock, M. (2015). Stance adverbials in research writing. *Iberica*, 29, 35-62. <https://www.revistaiberica.org/index.php/iberica/article/view/248>
- Qiu, X., & Jiang, F. K. (2021). Stance and engagement in 3MT presentations: How students communicate disciplinary knowledge to a wide audience. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 51, Article 100976. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.100976>
- Sabzevar, A., Haghverdi, H., & Biriya, R. (2019). A corpus-based analysis of epistemic stance adverbs in essays written by native English speakers and Iranian EFL learners. *The Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 12(25), 32-52. <https://doi.org/10.30495/jal.2020.674922>
- Shen, Q., & Tao, Y. (2021). Stance markers in English medical research articles and newspaper opinion columns: A comparative corpus-based study. *PLoS ONE*, 16(3), Article e0247981. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247981>
- Sirijanchuen, N., & Gampper, C. (2018). Academic citations within rhetorical move structures in ELT research article introductions written by Thai and international scholars. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 11(2), 1-20. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/learn/article/view/161504>

- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The “I” in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(Suppl. 1), S23-S39. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906\(99\)00009-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906(99)00009-5)
- Warschauer, M. (2017). The pitfalls and potential of multimodal composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 38, 86-87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.10.005>
- Xu, X. (2024). A cross-linguistic study of stance strategies in abstracts of linguistics articles. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 13(1), 120-125. <https://doi.org/10.54097/64kery15>
- Yang, W. (2020). A keyword analysis of stance and engagement in three-minute thesis (3MT) presentations. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 20(2), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2020-2002-01>
- Yoon, H.-J. (2021). Interactions in EFL argumentative writing: Effects of topic, L1 background, and L2 proficiency on interactional metadiscourse. *Reading and Writing*, 34(3), 705-725. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-020-10085-7>
- Zhang, L., & Zhang, L. J. (2023a). Development and validation of the questionnaire on EFL students’ perceptions of authorial stance in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 14(5), 1219-1251. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2021-0003>
- Zhang, L., & Zhang, L. J. (2023b). Improving EFL students’ stance-taking in academic writing with SFL-based instruction: A qualitative inquiry. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231164758>
- Zhang, L., Zhang, L. J., & Xu, T. S. (2023). Effects of teacher explicit instruction in stance-taking on students’ perceptions of stance and on their academic writing beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1140050. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1140050>