

A Cross-Linguistic Study of Stance Strategies in Abstracts of Linguistics Articles

Xiaoqi Xu

School of International Studies, Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou 310000, China

Abstract: Abstracts, serving as concise summaries of academic papers, directly influence readers' interest, impressions, and evaluations of the main text. Stance markers constitute essential metadiscourse resources for conveying the author's stance and commitment of proposal within academic discourse. However, previous research has shown insufficient attention to how advanced second language learners and native speakers construct author stance features in the linguistic domain, particularly in the context of abstracts in journal articles. Building upon this premise, this study examines English abstracts from both Chinese and international linguistics journals to comparatively analyze the differing strategies employed by Chinese and international linguists when using stance markers in abstract writing. The findings reveal that English abstracts published in international linguistics journals exhibit a greater quantity and variety of stance markers compared to those in Chinese linguistics journals, with hedges and self-mention notably more prevalent in the former. This paper further delves into the differences in the use of stance markers between Chinese and international linguists, taking cultural and educational backgrounds, linguistic structures, the demands of international communication, and authors' levels of confidence and language proficiency into consideration.

Keywords: Academic abstract, Stance, Metadiscourse.

1. Introduction

The abstract serves as a highly condensed representation of the academic papers, encompassing not only the role of guiding readers and facilitating retrieval and reference but also directly influencing readers' level of interest, impressions, and evaluations of the main text. The traditional viewpoint holds that the primary purpose of academic research papers is to explore external objective reality and convey objective facts. Consequently, the language used in these papers should remain objective, neutral, and free from personal emotions. However, in recent years, this perspective has encountered increasing challenges. Some scholars propose that the purpose of academic discourse extends to persuading readers to accept the author's viewpoints or research findings. Thus, it is inadequate to view academic discourse solely as a conduit for objective expression, as its evaluative and interactional features are of paramount significance. In this context, Hyland (2004; 2005a) proposed a model of metadiscourse which distinguishes interactive and interactional resources. Interactional metadiscourse concerns the author's strategic choices in managing the levels of personality within the text, encompassing the establishment of appropriate connections between content, arguments, and readers. The use of interactional metadiscourse reflects the degree of intimacy, reader engagement, as well as the expression of attitude and authorial commitment. Of particular importance, the linguistic means employed within interactional metadiscourse to convey the author's personal attitudes, emotions, and commitment are termed stance markers (Hyland, 2005a). These markers have become a pivotal rhetorical strategy for enhancing interaction within academic discourse.

2. Literature Review

In recent years, research concerning authors' stances in academic discourse has garnered substantial attention within the international linguistic community, yielding fruitful

research outcomes. Research in the realm of stance markers can be categorized into two primary directions. Firstly, it encompasses theoretical investigations concerning the definition and categorization of stance markers. Significantly contributing to this facet are the studies conducted by Hunston & Thompson (2000) as well as Hyland (2005a). Secondly, empirical research focuses on the practical application of stance markers within academic discourse.

Within the domain of empirical research, two pivotal dimensions are discernible. The first dimension involves an in-depth analysis of the use of stance markers within specific disciplines. These analyses encompass fields such as mathematics, medicine, civil engineering, and others (McGrath & Kuteeva, 2012; Crosthwaite et al., 2017; Gilmore & Millar, 2018). These investigations provide enhanced insights into the patterns of stance marker utilization in diverse disciplinary domains. The second dimension entails a comparative analysis of stance marker usage across various disciplines. For instance, Yang (2016) delved into the highlights of 240 journal articles spanning both the realms of soft disciplines and hard sciences. The research unveiled distinctive highlights preferences within various disciplines, which deviated from the conventional presumptions regarding the utilization of personal pronouns to assert claims in these domains. In a parallel vein, the inquiry by Hyland & Jiang (2018) entailed an exploration into the evolution of metadiscourse across diverse disciplines throughout the past half-century. Their investigation aimed to ascertain whether alterations had occurred, and if so, to what extent, in the employment of metadiscourse strategies. These analyses shed light on the nuances and similarities in communication patterns between authors and readers within distinct disciplinary contexts.

Empirical research on stance markers has also been concentrated on comparative studies within the context of second language (L2) and first language (L1) academic discourse writing. Such comparative investigations are conducted on two levels, namely, the examination of entire

articles and the analysis of various sections. Firstly, with respect to the scrutiny of complete texts, Yang (2013) conducted a comparative analysis of the distribution of hedges in scientific English papers and Chinese-to-English translated papers. The results indicated a tendency for Chinese authors to prefer non-lexical expressions, while English authors exhibited a predilection for the use of epistemic adjectives, nouns, and adverbs. Xu Fang (2015) categorized stance markers into epistemic stance markers, attitude markers, and author presence markers. In her comparative study, she juxtaposed these characteristics of L2 academic writers with those of native scholars. Her findings revealed a consistent trend among learners to exhibit a tendency of using fewer stance markers, including epistemic stance markers and first-person author presence markers. Lee & Lydia (2016) conducted a comparative analysis of the usage of stance markers in English paper writing among Chinese students and English native speakers. Their findings indicated a lower frequency of stance marker usage and limited vocabulary employed by Chinese students in comparison to native speakers. In addition to the scrutiny of entire texts, researchers have also focused on the examination of specific sections with regard to stance markers. For example, Wu Geqi (2010) analyzed the stance markers within the conclusion sections of English and Chinese journal articles, revealing significant disparities between the two languages. English articles demonstrated more direct utilization of self-mention and a higher frequency of attitude markers compared to Chinese articles. Regarding the employment of hedges, English authors inclined towards using those predominantly centered on credibility, while Chinese authors favored those predominantly focused on precision. Furthermore, Li Zhi & Cheng Xiaomin (2020) conducted a comparative analysis of stance markers in the abstract of core journal articles from both Chinese and international sources. Their findings unveiled commonalities and differences in stance marker usage between the two contexts. A shared characteristic was the frequent use of stance markers to convey authorial viewpoints. The frequency of usage followed a pattern, with hedges ranking highest, followed by boosters, self-mention, and finally, attitude markers.

However, in empirical research, there has been insufficient attention directed towards how proficient second language learners and native speakers in the field of linguistics construct authorial stance features, particularly concerning the abstract sections of journal articles. Nevertheless, the significance of abstracts cannot be underestimated. Within their limited extent, effectively expressing the author's stance and cultivating the author's scholarly identity in abstracts can facilitate garnering recognition within the academic community. This holds particularly true for Chinese scholars, for whom crafting well-structured English abstracts that adhere to international publication norms plays a pivotal role in elevating the international retrieval and citation rates of journal articles, thereby enhancing the global academic impact of Chinese journals.

Against this backdrop, this study adopts a combined approach of quantitative and qualitative analysis, focusing on the discipline of linguistics. It selects English abstracts from both Chinese and international core linguistic journals as its subject of investigation. Employing Hyland's (2005a) framework of stance markers, the study undertakes a comparative analysis of the distribution patterns of authorial

stance markers in English abstracts from the linguistic domain of China and international contexts, delving into their similarities and disparities. The objective of this research is to provide a fresh dimension to the study of stance markers and to offer valuable insights and guidance for Chinese journal authors, particularly those within the field of linguistics, when crafting English abstracts.

This paper aims to address the following research questions:

(1) What are the general characteristics and disparities in stance markers between English abstracts of linguistic journal papers from China and those from international linguistic journals? (2) What are the usage traits and distinctions in employing stance markers, encompassing hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention, in English abstracts of linguistic journal papers from both Chinese and international contexts?

(3) What factors influence or constrain the utilization of stance markers?

3. Research Design

3.1. The Data

The selection of source journals is based on two sources of information: the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) and the Chinese Social Sciences Citation Index (CSSCI). All selected journals are indexed in one of these influential citation indexes. The chosen Chinese journals are *Applied Linguistics*, *Contemporary Linguistics*, *Language Teaching and Linguistic Studies*, *Linguistic Sciences* and *Contemporary Rhetoric*. The selected English journals are *Journal of Phonetics*, *Phonology*, *Syntax*, *Journal of Semantics*, and *Pragmatics*. These two sets of journals are the leading academic journals in the field of linguistics in both Chinese and English languages, embodying the finest achievements in Chinese and international linguistic research, thereby ensuring the credibility and reliability of the data.

Within the aforementioned journals, we randomly selected 15 research papers' English abstracts published between 2017 and 2021 from each journal, totaling 150 abstracts. We excluded titles, author names, and keywords from the selected abstracts. Subsequently, two subcorpora were constructed: (i.e., English abstracts published in the Chinese journals) and the EAEL subcorpus (i.e., English abstracts published in the English journals). The total word counts for these two subcorpora are 12,999 and 12,019, respectively.

For this study, we utilized the stance marker word list provided by Hyland (2005b), comprising a total of 241 stance markers. With the assistance of the corpus retrieval software AntConc 3.5.9, searches were conducted within these two subcorpora. Following the retrieval process, an evaluation of the results was conducted, and index lines not meeting the criteria were manually removed. Given the varying sizes of the two subcorpora, standardization of word frequency per hundred thousand words was carried out to facilitate the observation of frequency disparities. The results were rounded to whole numbers using a standard rounding approach. Additionally, the Chi-square and Log Likelihood Calculator developed by Beijing Foreign Studies University was employed to perform chi-square tests, aiming to assess the statistical significance of differences in stance markers between the two corpora. A significance threshold of $P < 0.05$ was adopted to ascertain statistically significant variations.

3.2. Analytical Framework

Stance expresses a textual ‘voice’ or community recognized personality. It is an attitudinal dimension and includes features which refer to the ways writers present themselves and convey their judgements, opinions, and commitments. It is the ways that writers intrude to stamp their personal authority onto their arguments or step back and disguise their involvement (Hyland, 2005).

Stance markers are typically classified into four types: hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention. According to Hyland (2005b:52-53), hedges are linguistic devices that signal the author's intent to acknowledge alternative viewpoints, indicating a withholding of complete commitment to a proposition. By framing information as opinions rather than established facts, hedges accentuate the subjectivity of a position and open it to negotiation. For instance, terms like "possible" and "might" serve as illustrative examples of hedges. Conversely, boosters are lexical elements that enable writers to narrow down alternatives, preempt conflicting views, and assert confidence in their statements. They suggest that the writer acknowledges potential diversity in perspectives but intentionally narrows it down, presenting a singular and assured voice. Words such as "clearly" "obviously" and "demonstrate" exemplify boosters. Attitude markers convey the writer's emotional stance toward propositions, conveying sentiments like surprise, agreement,

significance, obligation, and frustration, among others. Self-mention involves the use of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives to convey propositional, affective, and interpersonal information (Hyland, 2001). Instances of self-mention encompass terms like "I", "me", "mine", "we" and "our".

4. Discussion of Results

4.1. Overall Distribution of Stance Markers

Table 1 presents the frequency and standardized frequency of four types of stance markers in the EAEJ and EACJ subcorpora. Overall, the EAEJ subcorpus exhibits a significantly higher frequency of stance marker compared to the EACJ subcorpus ($p < 0.001$), with notable differences in the usage of hedges and self-mention. A discernible pattern in the utilization of stance markers emerges across the two subcorpora. Arranged by frequency, the usage of stance markers follows the order from high to low: hedges, self-mentions, boosters, and attitude markers. This observation indicates that, in comparison to authors of Chinese linguistic journals, authors of international linguistic journals exhibit a greater tendency to employ stance markers to convey attitudes and commitment in academic writing. Moreover, the range of stance markers employed by the latter group is notably more diverse.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the use of stance markers by subcorpus

Stance	EACJ		EAEJ		χ^2	P value
	Observed frequency	Standardized frequency	Observed frequency	Standardized frequency		
Hedges	130	100	171	142	9.0336	0.002 * *
Boosters	101	78	99	82	0.1179	0.731
Attitude markers	18	14	30	25	-3.4682	0.062
Self-mention	61	47	133	111	32.1427	0.000 * * *
Total	309	238	433	360	32.1661	0.000 * * *

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

4.2. Use of Hedges across the Subcorpora

In the EAEJ subcorpus, the standardized frequency of hedges is 142, which is significantly higher than the 100 occurrences in the EACJ subcorpus ($p < 0.01$), and the variety of types used is more diverse. Hedges appearing in these two subcorpora can be categorized into four types: modal auxiliaries, epistemic verbs, epistemic adjectives and adverbs, as well as other structures such as "in general" and "in our view". Table 2 presents the top 10 frequently occurring hedges in the two subcorpora. Evidently, international journal authors, in comparison to their Chinese counterparts, employ epistemic verbs more extensively to express tentative stances. Among these verbs, "argue", "suggest" and "appear" hold a distinct preference, collectively accounting for 24.0% of all hedges. Notably, "argue" exhibits the highest usage frequency, constituting 11.7% of the total. The verb "argue" is commonly coupled with first-person pronouns like "we" and "I" in self-mentions (as in example (1)), possibly indicating that international English journal authors favor "argue" due to their propensity for self-mentions. Consequently, the major knowledge claim in the abstract was characterized as a personal viewpoint rather than a conclusion grounded in robust empirical substantiation.

Moreover, in terms of the use of modal verbs, while both

Chinese and international journal authors utilize modal verbs as a strategy for softening the assertiveness of a major knowledge claim, Chinese authors concentrate more heavily on employing "should" and "may," with comparatively fewer instances of "might." The limitation in utilizing a diverse array of modal expressions could be attributed to the early exposure of "should" and "may" in most English textbooks in China. As English is acquired as a second language, Chinese scholars may possess greater familiarity and confidence in employing these terms. This viewpoint aligns with Liang Maocheng's (2008) study on sequences of modal verbs in written English by Chinese university students.

(1) *We argue that multiple biases, such as naturalness bias, allophony bias and suprasegmental bias, are effective during phonotactic learning. (EAEJ)*

The proposition of academic claims often carries a degree of risk, as these assertions might diverge from existing literature or challenge readers' viewpoints. To navigate this challenge, authors employ the strategy of employing hedges in academic writing, aiming to create a discursive space for readers where interpretations can be disputed. Authors label their knowledge claims as provisional, intentionally avoiding overly affirmative statements, thereby presenting their academic writing with a suitable degree of caution and

commitment. Through this approach, authors demonstrate respect for potential divergent viewpoints held by readers while also mitigating the illocutionary force of a criticism, a face threatening act the illocutionary force of a criticism, a face threatening act (Myers, 1989) to fellow researchers within the same domain. The intention of this strategy is to enhance the sustainability and acceptance of authors' stances, arguments or assertions within their academic discourse community. By flexibly utilizing hedges in academic writing, authors not only convey their viewpoints but also seek to strike a balance between upholding academic integrity and maintaining the harmony of communication.

The reasons for the greater use of hedges among authors of international English journals compared to those of Chinese journals can be elucidated from three perspectives. Firstly, cultural backgrounds significantly influence scholars' writing styles. In Anglo-American academic tradition, scholars are encouraged to present diverse viewpoints and foster critical thinking. Consequently, employing hedges signals caution and tentativeness, reflecting respect for various possibilities and reducing the likelihood of being refuted by peers. Conversely, in the context of Chinese academic tradition, the emphasis lies in imparting experiences and honoring authority. Through the act of writing, authors are perceived to possess authority, credibility, and knowledge. As a result, Chinese

scholars might be less inclined to employ hedges to constrain their positions or qualify knowledge claims. Instead, they tend to utilize authoritative language to convey viewpoints, avoiding potential questioning or contradictions. Secondly, the linguistic structures and modes of expression diverge between languages, impacting the utilization of hedges. English is more flexible in expressing viewpoints, and allowing the incorporation of hedges could add flexibility to narratives. Conversely, Chinese expression tends to be more direct, leading to a relatively lower use of hedges. Scholars in English-speaking countries usually use English as their native language or are well-acquainted with it. Their heightened sensitivity to English grammar and expression allows them to naturally and easily apply hedges. On the other hand, Chinese scholars, whose native language is Chinese, may be influenced by the grammatical structure of the Chinese language. As a result, they might lean towards direct and concise expression, with less use of the rich variety of hedges in English. Moreover, the demands of academic communication play a pivotal role. In cross-cultural interactions, Chinese scholars may prioritize clarity and certainty of expression to circumvent challenges in linguistic comprehension. This tendency could lead to a reduced use of hedges in English writing, as they aim to evade potential ambiguity and polysemy.

Table 2. Top 10 hedges by frequency in two subcorpora

Rank	EACJ			EAEJ		
	Hedges	Observed frequency	Standardized frequency	Hedges	Observed frequency	Standardized frequency
1	should	11	8	argue	20	17
2	typical	11	8	may	15	12
3	mainly	10	8	possible	9	7
4	may	10	8	almost	8	7
5	certain	7	5	suggests	8	7
6	usually	7	5	appear	7	6
7	indicates	5	4	often	7	6
8	claim	4	3	might	7	6
9	frequently	4	3	certain	6	5
10	rather	4	3	suggest	6	5

4.3. Use of boosters across the subcorpora

The EACJ and EAEJ subcorpora did not exhibit a significant difference ($p = 0.731$). It indicates that there is not a substantial disparity in the use of boosters between international linguists and Chinese linguists when composing English abstracts.

In the exploration of disparities in the use of hedges across the two subcorpora, we propose a viewpoint that underscores the influence of cultural background. Chinese authors, shaped by their cultural context, appear to be inclined towards the use of more authoritative expression, which contributes to a comparatively lower frequency of hedges compared to their international English counterparts. This observation raises an intriguing question: If the intention is to infuse language with authority and convey a more certain author stance, it follows that the use of boosters, which enhance assertiveness, should be more prevalent, in contrast to the relatively intricate and indirect approach of employing fewer hedges. However, analyzing the data reveals that there is no statistically significant variance in the use of boosters across the two subcorpora. We posit that this might be attributed to a growing awareness among Chinese linguists engaged in international

academic discourse. These scholars are recognizing the preference of the international linguistic community for specific language norms, leading them to adjust their authorial stance towards a provisional and cautious disposition to align with these conventions. The question of why there is a reduction in the use of boosters while a corresponding increase in the use of hedges does not manifest could be closely linked to the English language proficiency of Chinese linguists.

Effective communication of an author's stance in writing necessitates the mastery of advanced language skills. This mastery entails not only a grasp of fundamental syntax structures and general vocabulary but also a profound understanding of intricate syntax, an extensive lexicon, and sophisticated rhetorical abilities. Such proficiency allows for the skillful utilization of metadiscourse resources embedded in language, including hedges and boosters, to convey the author's stance, attitude, and the degree of commitment to the proposal. Consequently, when compared to native language composition, academic texts written in a second language tend to exhibit fewer metadiscourse strategies. Given that English is studied and taught as a foreign language in China, it is plausible that many Chinese authors composing English

abstracts have not yet reached a sufficient level of English proficiency to adeptly apply the nuanced usage of hedges and boosters as native speakers do. While Chinese linguists endeavor to steer their authorial stance towards temporality and caution, their limited proficiency in English has led to moderate success solely in reducing the utilization of boosters. Nonetheless, challenges persist in enhancing the usage of hedges. This underscores the complexities inherent in conveying intricate authorial positions and attitudes in second language writing.

4.4. Use of attitude markers across the subcorpora

Attitude markers can be categorized into three major types, including attitude verbs, sentence adverbs, and evaluative adjectives. Table 1 demonstrates that there is no significant difference in the usage of attitude markers between the EAEJ and EACJ subcorpora ($p=0.062$). In abstract writing, both Chinese and international scholars exhibit a relatively diminished use of attitude verbs to express their stances, with only two instances retrieved from these two subcorpora. This frequency is considerably lower compared to the utilization of the other three stance markers, a finding that is consistent with the conclusions drawn by Hyland & Jiang (2016). Adjectives such as "important" and "interesting" are recurrent evaluative adjectives in both the EAEJ and EACJ subcorpora, although the disparity in usage frequency is not notably pronounced. Divergence in the utilization of attitude adverbs becomes evident between the two subcorpora, particularly noticeable within the EAEJ subcorpus where several attitude adverbs, such as "even" "importantly" and "strikingly" (as seen in examples (2), (3), (4)), are present, which are absent in the EACJ subcorpus. Noteworthy is the fact that "even" is the most frequently employed attitude adverb in the EAEJ subcorpus, constituting 30% of the total attitude markers used.

Academic discourse tends toward objectivity and minimizes personal tones in its textual composition. An overabundance of attitude markers could result in an undue subjectivization of academic papers. Chinese and international authors, when composing abstracts in English, tend to adopt a strategy of restrained use of attitude markers, to some extent averting personal subjectivity and emotional infiltration, thereby maintaining consistency with the requisites and features of scholarly writing. The frequency of emotional attitude markers in English abstracts of international journals surpasses that in Chinese journals, accentuating the divergent employment of attitude markers between Chinese and international scholars. This implies potential influences of diverse cultural backgrounds and writing conventions on attitude expression, and may to a certain extent reflect scholars' preferences for academic writing styles and varied strategies for expressing stances. Authors of foreign journals place greater significance on the role of attitude markers in delineating authorial stances, aiming to garner reader endorsement of arguments through emotional alignment. In contrast, Chinese journal authors might harbor concerns that excessive emotional tones could compromise the authority and rigor of their papers. Consequently, they incline toward minimizing the use of emotionally emphatic terms, favoring instead objective terminology to convey viewpoints.

(2) *The results suggest that paradigm uniformity bias plays a role in determining children's preferred production patterns,*

which favour non-alternating forms even after they have acquired adult-like knowledge of the patterns of alternations.

(3) *When challenging the system with related speakers, the results show that MZ twin pairs affect performance but, more importantly, that non-twin sibling pairs can deteriorate performance too.*

(4) *Several nurture aspects are highlighted as explanatory factors for the strikingly high similarity of a specific non-twin sibling pair.*

4.5. Use of self-mention across the subcorpora

Self-mention refers to linguistic markers involving first-person pronouns ("I", "we", "me", "my", "our", "mine", "us") and related designations like "the writer" or "the author". It is noteworthy that the use of "we" encompasses two distinct functions: inclusive "we", which includes both the author and the reader and signifies interaction between the author and the reader, lying outside the purview of self-mention; exclusive "we", on the other hand, pertains to self-mention and excludes the reader from the referent. As evidenced by Table 1, the EAEJ subcorpus displays a significantly higher frequency of self-mention compared to the EACJ subcorpus ($p < 0.001$). Across both subcorpora, "we", "I" and "our" are the most prominently employed self-mention, with "we" exhibiting the highest frequency of 42 times in the EACJ subcorpus and 80 times in the EAEJ subcorpus (as seen in example (5)).

It is indicated that authors of international journals tend to utilize self-mention more extensively when crafting English abstracts, thus establishing a distinct author identity and stance. Conversely, Chinese journal authors display limited use of self-mention, instead opting for indirect expressions such as "the (this) paper", "the (this) study", "the research" (as seen in example (6)), thereby concealing the research subject and sidestepping the articulation of personal identity and stance. Furthermore, self-mention is commonly paired with epistemic verbs such as "suggest" "argue" "present" and "show". The decreased use of self-mention indirectly impacts the frequency of epistemic verbs functioning as hedges, boosters, and attitude markers within abstracts.

The disparities in the usage of self-mention between international linguists and Chinese linguists may stem from cultural and educational backgrounds, familiarity with international academic writing paradigms, as well as author's stance and confidence levels. Firstly, China's education system emphasizes reverence for authority and humility in knowledge, values that significantly influence scholars. In Chinese culture, an excessive emphasis on personal viewpoints might be perceived as self-promotion. Consequently, Chinese scholars might refrain from overemphasizing their personal presence in English writing to avoid appearing immodest or self-centered. Conversely, in western cultures, asserting personal viewpoints and stances is encouraged. Secondly, Chinese scholars are accustomed to Chinese writing conventions that might differ from international academic writing paradigms. When transitioning to academic writing in English, the focus on subtle differences in language nuances and pragmatic features of communication might be insufficient, leading to unfamiliarity with typical practices of employing first-person pronouns, particularly when conveying one's viewpoints, research methodologies, and findings. This might lead them to favor more neutral expressions, sidestepping overt displays of personality and stances in academic writing. Lastly,

author's stance and confidence levels play a role in this phenomenon. The use of self-mention can expressly convey an author's stance, but simultaneously highlights subjective attitudes and bolsters the author's accountability for the research outcomes. Chinese scholars might incline towards maintaining a relatively neutral stance, particularly when they lack confidence in their English language expression. Excessive use of first-person pronouns might instigate concerns of excessive self-promotion, potentially compromising the objectivity of academic writing. Simultaneously, reducing the use of self-mention could be aimed at averting direct conflicts with readers and minimizing challenges to potentially differing reader perspectives. It reflects a lower academic self-assuredness among Chinese scholars and a reluctance to confront potential reader accountability risks.

In conclusion, the disparities in the usage of self-mention between Chinese and international linguists in English academic writing are the outcome of multiple interacting factors. The humility values of cultural and educational backgrounds, familiarity with international academic paradigms, and authorial confidence levels all contribute to shaping their writing preferences. This phenomenon underscores the influence of cultural diversity on modes of academic communication. The findings of this study also offer insights for academic English writing instruction: self-mention holds a pivotal role in academic writing, and when accurately employed in conjunction with epistemic verbs, it can indeed assist authors in further accentuating their stance, representing a significant facet in learners' acquisition of stance markers.

(5) Specifically, we argue that deviations of observations from theoretical predictions do not necessitate the rejection of the theoretical assumptions. (EAEJ)

(6) Finally, the paper points out that the research on the will, affect and attitude in the meaning of adverbs, as well as their relevance, should be intensified based on discourse relevance. (EACJ)

5. Conclusion

This study has unveiled notable cross-linguistic disparities in the utilization of stance markers. Firstly, as a general trend, English abstracts published in international linguistic journals employ a greater number and more diverse array of stance markers compared to those published in Chinese linguistic journals. When ordered by frequency, the hierarchy of stance markers is as follows: hedges, self-mention, boosters, and attitude markers. Secondly, within English abstracts published in international linguistic journals, hedges and self-mention exhibit significant prominence in contrast to their employment in English abstracts published in Chinese linguistic journals, whereas disparities in the use of boosters and attitude markers are less conspicuous. These disparities result from the confluence of various factors, encompassing cultural and educational backgrounds, linguistic structures and modes of expression, as well as author's language proficiency and confidence. Second language learners require a nuanced understanding of how to strike a balance in the application of hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention. Authors must skillfully emphasize their stances, attitudes, and commitment to persuade readers, while also

discerning the appropriate degree of personality engagement, thus maintaining the scientific objectivity of academic discourse.

References

- [1] Crosthwaite, Peter, Lisa Cheung, and Feng Kevin Jiang. "Writing with attitude: Stance expression in learner and professional dentistry research reports." *English for specific purposes* 46 (2017): 107-123.
- [2] Gilmore, Alexander, and Neil Millar. "The language of civil engineering research articles: A corpus-based approach." *English for Specific Purposes* 51 (2018): 1-17.
- [3] Hunston, Susan, and Geoffrey Thompson, eds. *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford University Press, UK, 2000.
- [4] Hyland, Ken. "Bringing in the reader: Addressee features in academic articles." *Written communication* 18.4 (2001): 549-574.
- [5] Hyland, Ken. *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- [6] Hyland, Ken. "Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse." *Discourse studies* 7.2 (2005a): 173-192.
- [7] Hyland, Ken. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum, 2005b.
- [8] Hyland, Ken, and Feng Kevin Jiang. "Change of attitude? A diachronic study of stance." *Written communication* 33.3 (2016): 251-274.
- [9] Hyland, Ken, and Feng Kevin Jiang. "'In this paper we suggest': Changing patterns of disciplinary metadiscourse." *English for Specific Purposes* 51 (2018): 18-30.
- [10] Lee, Joseph J., and Lydia Deakin. "Interactions in L1 and L2 undergraduate student writing: Interactional metadiscourse in successful and less-successful argumentative essays." *Journal of second language writing* 33 (2016): 21-34.
- [11] McGrath, Lisa, and Maria Kuteeva. "Stance and engagement in pure mathematics research articles: Linking discourse features to disciplinary practices." *English for Specific Purposes* 31.3 (2012): 161-173.
- [12] Myers, Greg. "The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles." *Applied linguistics* 10.1 (1989): 1-35.
- [13] Yang, Wenhsien. "Evaluative language and interactive discourse in journal article highlights." *English for Specific Purposes* 42 (2016): 89-103.
- [14] Yang, Yingli. "Exploring linguistic and cultural variations in the use of hedges in English and Chinese scientific discourse." *Journal of Pragmatics* 50.1 (2013): 23-36.
- [15] Li, Zhi, & Cheng, Xiaomin. "A Comparative Study of Stance Markers in English Abstracts of Chinese and Foreign Academic Journals." *Journal of Xi'an International Studies University*, 28.02 (2020): 6-10. doi:10.16362/j.cnki.cn61-1457/h.2020.02.002.
- [16] Liang, Maocheng. "A Study of Modal Sequences in English Writing of Chinese University Students." *Foreign Language Teaching and Research: Bimonthly of Foreign Languages*, 1 (2008): 51-58.
- [17] Wu, Geqi. "A Comparative Study of Authorial Stance Markers in the Conclusion Section of English-Chinese Research Papers." *Journal of Xi'an International Studies University*, 18.04 (2010): 46-50. doi:10.16362/j.cnki.cn61-1457/h.2010.04.013.
- [18] Xu, Fang. "A Study on Authorial Stance Markers in Second Language Academic Discourse." *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, 5 (2015): 1-7.