

Stance-taking linguistic markers in literary-analysis papers used by undergraduate students of a Philippine state university

Ryan Glenn C. Conda

Tokyo Metropolitan Ogasawara High School, Japan

Ateneo de Manila University, the Philippines

rye.glenn.conda@gmail.com

Abstract

Stance-taking is one aspect of academic-writing conventions that college students need to attend to in order to improve their scholarly writing. Stance includes the ways writers express their value judgments and attitudes to forward a proposition and be aligned with other authors in the field (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999; Du Bois, 2007). This study aims to describe the ways students establish their stance in their literary-analysis papers. While most researchers on stance-taking followed Hyland's (2005, 2010) framework, it cannot be denied that nuances appear in the ever-evolving dynamics of writing as a social act from authors. While Hyland's framework is heavily informed by a bulk of data involving advanced and published researchers only, the present study followed Aull and Lancaster's (2014) framework as this is informed by rather inclusive research data from amateur to advanced writers. The researcher examined the stance-taking linguistic markers used in the literary-analysis papers through the following: expressing commitment (use of hedges and boosters), reformulating and exemplifying (use of code glosses), and expressing concession and contrast (use of adversative or contrast connectors). Nine recorded interviews and 58 literary-analysis papers written by college students from a Philippine state university served as research data. Findings revealed that students used more boosters to express commitment to their claims, which would increase their authorial presence in the essays. Most of the time, the students used code glosses, boosters, and adversative or contrast markers to evidentialize their claims and refer to other authors in order to align themselves and eventually reveal their position on the topic(s) they discuss. The students, however, have limited understanding of the functions of stance-taking as they reasoned that these are only used to sound more convincing and persuasive. The study recommends the explicit instruction of linguistic markers of stance and their functions so that students can expand their rhetorical options for academic writing.

Keywords: Academic writing, authorial presence, linguistic markers, metadiscourse, stance markers

1. Introduction

Stance is defined as the “expression of attitudes, value judgments or assessments in addition to communicating propositional content” (Biber et al., 1999, p. 966). College writing, specifically, sets students to some writing expectations in their respective disciplines. These include being familiar with academic-writing features, particularly their interaction with their readers as they write their arguments; much so that stance-taking should be incorporated in college or at least in pre-university education because of the complexities of academic requirements, particularly in writing.

Several authors have described the complexities of academic writing in terms of purpose and audience or readers (Hogue, 2008; Swales & Feak, 2012). Furthermore, to write for academic purposes, writers must demonstrate an empowered critical and analytical thinking, so they can contribute to the discourse in their specialization, as in challenging traditional perspectives and offering alternative ones. This pushes writers to express their positions about certain ideas and actively argue those (Murray & Moore, 2006; Swales & Feak, 2012), thus the importance of having metalinguistic skills to establish stance.

Some recent studies have shown how other writing factors affect stance-building, for example, use of cohesive devices, use of metaphors, organization of ideas, and personal styles (Kirkham, 2011; McEntee-Atalianis, 2013; McNamara, 2013; Uccelli, Dobbs, & Scott, 2013). Only a few studies, however, have taken interest in the conception of English as a second language (ESL) students’ way of dealing with these academic-writing features, especially with how linguistic markers are used depending on their discourse functions (Chang, 2016; Lewin, 2005; Mojica, 2005). For example, Mojica’s (2005) study only covered the way commitment and detachment were shown by student-writers in their papers, which focused on the use of hedges and boosters as linguistic markers. In comparison with other researchers who covered metadiscourse use—or the way writers adjust to the needs of engaging the topic with the reader, reveal judgment and attitude about the topic, and organize the text as a coherent whole—studies have significantly covered hedges and boosters as active linguistic markers that show stance-taking capacities (cf. Çandarlı, Bayyurt, & Marti, 2015; Chan, 2015; Gillaerts & Van de Velde, 2010; Hyland, 2006, 2010; Khajavy, Assadpour, & Yousefi, 2012; Khedri, Chan, & Tan, 2013; Li & Wharton, 2012). This strong interest may be attributed to the expanse and impact of studies done and the metadiscourse framework postulated by Hyland (1998b, 2005, 2010).

1.1 Background of the Study

In the university where the researcher used to teach, college students generally write essays as a usual part of their coursework requirements. Students taking Bachelor of Arts in English served as research participants in the present study. Their academic-degree program helps them develop their ability to use ESL in different areas such as speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Writing has a special place in the academic journey of these students as writing different academic papers and reports, which require them to shape their own arguments, become even more common in their final years in the university, thus building their stance-taking ability which they may use even after graduation. In the same vein, Crosthwaite and Jiang (2017) comment that university students’ way of adjusting their arguments appropriately

and relevantly is essentially crucial, particularly in mastering academic-writing conventions. Maybe, this is why more academic papers are done during their final years in the university, and this is how students' individual stance becomes more refined. Therefore, it seems that the ability to take stance is a skill that students should be familiar with, especially in writing course essays. This would enable them to manifest their writer presence and adjust claims necessary to assert their contributions to whatever community they choose to serve in the near future (i.e., academic, professional, or corporate discourses). This is especially true in the sense that this collegiate program generally aims to produce graduates who aspire to be editors or editorial assistants, English language teachers, researchers, copyreaders or proofreaders, and the like. Rhetorical options are also explicitly taught in the department, but with much emphasis on transition markers and phrases that improve unity, coherence, and emphasis of ideas. This is evident in the English subjects 1 and 2. Research-writing subjects, however, are left to content-based idea development with a considerable level of supervision on English for Academic Purposes (EAP). This gives students an experience to write the way they see the writing styles on academic papers they read, without explicit discussions on stance markers in their writing classes.

While this study only included literary-analysis papers for data analysis, it may be pointed out that this writing experience can, to a certain extent, gauge students' ability to incorporate stance-taking skills. The possibility of including more writing tasks from other subjects had been a challenge because of the following scenarios: (1) most of the teachers have writing requirements to be done in groups of three to four students in order to compensate for the problematic teacher-student ratio; (2) other teachers would choose group or pair writing in order to manage their limited checking time; and (3) only the Literary Criticism class encouraged individual-writing tasks for the course essays.

Hyland (2005) set some pioneering studies about stance (and metadiscourse markers in general) and developed its earlier categories. For example, boosters and hedges are the most studied markers because of their functions, that is, to express certainty and uncertainty of ideas, respectively. Attitude markers and self-mentions are the two other sets, which show the affective attitude of writers as well as their self-reference through pronouns. Hyland's work on this classification, however, came from an intensive study and bulk of data from published writers. These professional writers have been well-published in peer-reviewed journals from different disciplines. That alone is indicative that if one attempts to study stance-taking based on how it is descriptively used in the collegiate level, Hyland's categories might not be that context-sensitive. However, the study of Aull and Lancaster (2014) offered a more inclusive approach by focusing on the periodic shift of using linguistic markers for stance. They included first-year level students, upper-level students, and professionals in their data gathering and found that more than epistemic and affective reasons through hedges, boosters, self-mentions, and attitude markers, they also used code glosses and adversative connectors. Additionally, self-mentions and attitude markers can be absorbed in hedge phrases and boosters, thus the configured classifications that complement and improve those of Hyland's (2005) framework and linguistic markers' classifications of stance. Aull and Lancaster stated that stance markers generally fulfill these functions: adjusting commitment as realized by hedges and boosters, reformulating and exemplifying as realized by code glosses, and expressing concession and contrast as realized by adversative connectors.

For easier reference, boosters are words or phrases that emphasize or directly express certainty of claims and statements. Phrases such as *beyond doubt*, *can completely*, *show(s)*, *undeniable(-ly)*, and the like belong to this category. Hedges are the opposite of boosters as they lessen writers' commitment over claims, thus expressing tentativeness and openness. *Possible(-ly)*, *suggest(s)*, *appear(s)*, *in my/our view*, *can*, and *in most cases* are considered hedges. Code glosses are phrases that signal writers' elaboration and explanation of claims. These words are considered code glosses: *much like*, *particularly*, *especially*, *for example*, *namely*, *which means*, and the like. Finally, adversative or concession connectors have been found to function as stance markers, too. Some examples of words and phrases from this category are *however*, *but*, *on the other hand*, *conversely*, and the like. Apparently, they signal writers' evaluation of contrasting ideas and, at some point, show some preference to one idea over the other as per writers' judgment and attitude. A great reminder tells that while these words are categorized and supplied in the matrix of stance markers, the context through which they are used matters significantly in order to tell if they really function as stance markers.

In the Philippine context, the most relevant study that covered stance-taking in academic writing is that of Mojica (2005). The study surveyed undergraduate students' way of showing commitment and detachment to their claims by using boosters and hedges. While the said study focused only on these two categories, the present study can complement and look at how other categories of stance markers contribute to the way stance-taking is realized in literary-analysis papers written for a Literary Criticism course. Furthermore, other recent studies involving academic writing of students were limited to the following topics: paragraph writing performance (Bacnotan, Imperio, & Viñas, 2008), the relationship between language exposure and errors in English essays (Masangya & Lozada, 2009), use of pronominal markers (Martin, 2011), grammatical difficulties (e.g., verb usage, noun forms, pronoun references, and the like) encountered in argumentative essays (Daban, Ebron, Grajales, Oraa, & Sanchez, 2013), errors as factors impacting essay scores (Gustilo & Magno, 2012), and significance of language exposure on writing self-efficacy and writing apprehension (Pariña & De Leon, 2013). This survey of previous research would show the lack of descriptive studies in terms of metadiscourse awareness in academic writing, specifically in stance-taking. The present study can help describe university students' stance-taking strategies and treat writing as socially situated and context-sensitive. Describing the students' use of stance markers can also reveal how they respond to the writing instructions given by the instructor for their course essays. Noting that the instructor explicitly encouraged in the writing prompt that the students must have their own insights and positions, one limitation that this study acknowledges is the fact that these students responded to present their own views and positions. In this classroom situation, it may be noted that the teacher acts as the main audience of the literary-analysis papers. Moreover, the teacher further instilled the value of scholarly dialogue by pointing out that the students must be in conversation with the 'masters' or other literary critics who are relevant to their textual choices.

1.2 Research Questions

This study sought to identify the stance-building linguistic markers used by undergraduate students in their literary-analysis papers. Particularly, it aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What linguistic markers do the students use in establishing their academic stance in their literary-analysis papers?
 - 1.1 hedges and boosters
 - 1.2 code glosses
 - 1.3 adversative or contrast connectors
2. What does the use of these linguistic markers reveal about the way the students establish their stance?

1.3 Theoretical Framework

This study recognizes that academic writing is both a linguistic and a social act; therefore, one must see academic writing not as an absolutely objective writing but a combination of objectivity and subjectivity. This is because of the components or factors comprising it: writer, reader, text, and arguments (Du Bois, 2007; Hyland, 2005, 2010). In a macroview, the constructivist theory of writing provides an umbrella term to view this social nature of writing (Reid, 1993). This further explains that social context and situation shape the writing processes in the same way that knowledge is socially constructed. Reid (1993) further elaborates that this movement in approaching writing processes led to the concept of discourse communities. A discourse community, in academic context, refers to the body of scholars or a group of people that influences the “intellectual climate,” which is reflective of their common goals, purposes, and shared histories (Hyland, 2006, p. 40). Reid (1993) also adds that any form of writing is a development from previous contexts and texts, which is why shared histories in a group of people matter in terms of getting into the discourse communities. This is where students often have a “constant struggle” as they have to be aware of the “social, cultural and rhetorical expectations” of the academic community (p. 11).

Knowing the writers’ position and aligning it to the scholars who have been in the field for a time is not an easy task for university students because they are at their phase of academic journey where they socialize with and immerse themselves into the norms and conventions in their respective disciplines. It should not be assumed that they can fully operate and respond favorably to these expectations right away; instead, it will take time for them to master stance-taking skills with the use of appropriate linguistic markers for their arguments. While Hyland (2005) gave a comprehensive categorization of linguistic markers for stance using a corpus that involved published and/or seasoned writers from several academic disciplines, Aull and Lancaster (2014) considered the inclusion of various writers’ stance-taking capabilities. This consideration covered those of university students, from incoming first-year to upper-level undergraduate students, and published academics. Such a move had implications as to how vast and socially-situated stance markers could be. Specifically, this gave birth to rather different and complementary categorizations, which are also reflective of

discourse acts that linguistic markers would achieve in texts. They are as follows: expressing commitment by using hedges and boosters, reformulating and exemplifying by utilizing code glosses, and expressing concession and contrast by employing adversative or contrast connectors. For example, if in Hyland's (2005, 2010) framework, *really* has been categorized as a booster, and while *can* is considered as a modal hedge and collocated with *certainly* (as in *can certainly*), it is still likely to function as a booster in a sentence that asserts the lexical meaning of the word *really*. This nuance is resolved in this framework as such cases appeared in the corpus of Aull and Lancaster (2014). Therefore, Aull and Lancaster (2014) also reiterate the concept of how words are used in texts in order to appropriately categorize them. Self-mentions in the form of pronouns like *I* and *my* are of common collocates to other words, as in *I think* and *in my view*. This led to a slight reorganization of having a subcategory called *self-mention hedges* because of the likelihood of the pronouns being used with a lexical hedge and other words. Code glosses were also added to be stance-building phrases because the authors found that these words also add fine-tuning to writers' intended claims. Code glosses make it appear that claims have even more important value as prescribed by the author, thus gaining special attention to elaboration and cautious explanation. One limitation that this framework has is that it covers for all academic-writing genres. To date, there is no known set of exclusive linguistic markers of stance for different genres, including literary-analysis papers. Instead, each discipline has tendencies to use one category over the other. For example, the humanities tend to use self-mentions and hedges, while the pure sciences tend to use less of those (Hyland, 2005; Maroko, 2013).

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

This study used both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The former was used to determine the stance-taking linguistic markers used by students in their literary-analysis papers, while the latter was considered to include and accommodate the description and in-depth interpretation of textual data, i.e., the literary-analysis papers (Creswell, 2014; Dawson, 2002; Lewin, 2005), and interview data.

More specifically, discourse analysis was used to determine the ways students establish their stance and their ways of choosing which linguistic markers best convey their stance. Discourse analysis may be deemed appropriate because it analyzes and looks at the pattern of language in different texts with respect to sociocultural contexts from which texts emerge. The inclusivity of context in analyzing the discourse competence of the students in the academic community was considered because they were viewed to be in the process of figuring out their academic stance. Paltridge (2006) emphasizes that people's ways to be visible or recognizable involve more than just language. He reiterates that language is always immersed in a situation as writers also negotiate their claims and/or propositions between the community and people in the social interaction.

2.2 Research Locale, Participants, and Study Corpus

The participants of this study were final-year college students taking Bachelor of Arts in English in a state university in Manila, the Philippines. The students were not grouped according to their language proficiency because there was no departmental profile for this. The students, upon admission to the program, just have to satisfy the 82% English grade from their high-school report cards and pass the university entrance exams. There are also no standardized tests such as International English Language Testing System (IELTS), Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) or any writing exams for EAP, which could profile the students upon admission to the university. The students just have to satisfy the requirements of their subject teachers until they write their undergraduate theses, which they will accomplish commonly in groups of three to four students depending on the thesis adviser. During the first semester of their final year, the students took the course Principles of Literary Criticism. The final requirement for this course was a literary-analysis paper of a text of their choice. The teacher provided the students with the list of approved literary texts to interpret and analyze. The students were also given the chance to select which literary theories they would like to use in analyzing the texts. The notable and specific instructions that the teacher provided was for the students to have their 'own positions and insights.' These instructions were written in bold letters. Other instructions reminded the students to substantiate their arguments from literary texts and theories. Furthermore, the instructor cautioned the students to process their dialogues well with other literary critics and authors, termed as 'masters,' so they would not lose sight of the theories they were using (see Appendix C). They could approach the teacher for possible consultations since the submitted paper by the end of the semester was considered final and would no longer be revised.

The collected 58 essays, as research corpus, totaled to 62,657 words. From the perspective of corpus linguistics, using a corpus in studying linguistic data can help give better descriptions of how a language is used by students. Historically, it helped in decentralizing the prescriptive use of a language in the classroom, which is the more traditional approach. With the use of available software for corpus linguistics, it is easier to monitor trends in using linguistic markers. However, limitations of the software can be complemented by the qualitative approach to data interpretation, such as discourse analysis (O'Keeffe & McCarthy, 2010).

2.3 Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected from the literary-analysis essays written by the students and from the interview. A total of 58 anonymized literary-analysis papers were collected upon the students' consent in order to conduct a linguistic analysis using AntConc version 3.4.1, a corpus-based concordancing application (Anthony, 2014). This was done to determine the frequency distribution of linguistic markers based on Aull and Lancaster's (2014) list of metadiscourse markers that build stance. The said application was used to run and analyze the collected essays from the students. The concordancing software helped track the frequency of a particular word present in the examined essays. The unit of analysis was limited to words and phrases denoting stance based on the categories of metadiscourse markers identified by

Aull and Lancaster (2014), which primarily focused on stance-building of different writers of varying academic-writing experiences (see Appendix A). The researcher had to qualify if the searched word was used appropriately as a stance marker before including it in the count. Two intercoders helped the researcher to finalize the stance-marker count using the frequency-percentage formula. The researcher then determined the most used and least used stance-building markers and examined how these stance markers were relevantly used by the students. For example, the analyzed word is *really*; the number of hits is shown in the AntConc software, but its use shows that the writer directly quoted a statement from a literary work. In this instance, the word is not counted as a stance marker because it is taken from a direct quote and does not show writer stance. One example of this states: “*But the poet asks in implication, ‘Should we really forget?’ This is what we can get upon initial reading, but, as we dig deeper, we shall then ask, ‘What is there to forget? Should we forget at all?’*” The author clearly imported a line from a literary work in order to build an argument. On the other hand, some writers used the word *really* to present their interpretation and argument of criticism. One sample states: “*The passage shows that the equality between men and women because just like men, women can also be dominant and can also be recognised like them. Therefore, sexuality and gender is really fluid.*” In this case, the researcher and the intercoders considered this as a valid booster.

Furthermore, a complementary interview, with most questions patterned from Chang’s (2016) study, was employed to elicit the students’ insights about their ways to establish stance. The interview was composed of three aspects: (a) questions about the students’ academic-writing background, (b) questions about their authorship in the literary-analysis papers, and (c) questions that elicit their insights on sample excerpts from the collected essays.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Linguistic Markers that Establish Stance

All 58 essays were run in the concordancing program, AntConc version 3.4.1, to determine the number of hits. After working with the intercoders to qualify the hits as valid stance markers, the figures in Table 1 were calculated to answer the first research question.

Table 1
Stance markers’ frequency table

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Boosters	955	45.03%
Adversative or Contrast Connectors	571	26.92%
Hedges	455	21.45%
Code Glosses	140	6.60%
Total Number of Stance Markers	2,121	100.00%

Table 1 shows the distribution of stance markers in their respective categories, revealing their frequency count and percentage against the total number of stance markers present in the collected essays. Data reveal that the students used more boosters than hedges (955 or 45.03% and 455 or 21.45%, respectively) in their literary-analysis papers. The results possibly mean that the students validate and emphasize their claims more than creating a tentative proposition about their topics. Furthermore, they seem to be more committed to their claims and statements. Some examples are as follows:

- (1) Based on Agueda's character, she is truly capable of making hasty decisions, ready for anything and can surpass the challenges ahead of her. On these lines we **can clearly** see how fearless Agueda is, which the society thinks of a woman doesn't have does characteristics.
- (2) This was **definitely** depicted in the part of the story where Fil was really excited to see the dancers and he was even thrilled to see their appearance when he arrived at Hamilton, "Some of the girls wore their black hair long. For a moment, the sight seemed too much for him who had but all forgotten how beautiful Philippine girls were. He wanted to look away, but their loveliness held him." (10).
- (3) It is **clear** how it illustrates how difficult it was to be a human exercising free will and eligibility to divine rights such as to be happy and to be satisfied since your society is controlled and manipulated by dogmas and ideologies which will always prevent you and discourage you from proceeding any further.

This tendency resembles the study of Hyland (1998a), where he explicated that more seasoned writers tend to hedge more than boost. In this case, the students, who are still considered novice, used more boosters than hedges. This point is somehow validated by the findings in Aull and Lancaster's (2014) study where they reported that using more boosters and committing further to claims were an exhibited tendency by first-year students as compared with higher-year students and published writers. Boosters are more commonly associated with the writers' manner of presentation where they could go "assertively... enthusiastically, or maybe indifferently" (Zhao, 2012, p. 207). Also, Hyland and Jiang (2016) aver that using boosters is an option to present oneself. Boosters could be a tool to explicitly intrude in the text, convey a personal stand, and invest confidence in the factual reliability of statements, as reflected in these excerpts:

- (4) Rizal also raised another statement in the second chapter that Padre Camorra stated, "the lack of energy noted in this country is due to the inhabitants drinking too much water (20)" **clearly** means that the friars/rich people don't drink much water because they have wines and beers.

- (5) The last dialogue is Dr. Lazaro's act of trying to suppress his aggressiveness in achieving his desire by acting upon his ego and turning this aggressiveness in a **more** subtle way, that is telling his son that there is no hurry in choosing his path.
- (6) "They believe their thorns are terrible weapons..." (p. 21), this line is **clearly** depicting females as weak and naive creatures who think they can defend themselves but they **actually** cannot.

The students may have been challenged by the instructions of their teacher to have their own position and insights. After all, most senior students who found their spot to self-expression would tend to persuade their audiences more, and such confidence shown in their essays could be manifested through the use of boosters. It may also be added that their frequent references to literary texts' phrases gave them more confidence to express their claims, thus the tendency to use more boosters. This move may have been grounded on the reminder the teacher provided in the writing prompt where the students were required to substantiate their claims by citing 'situations/events in the texts' (see Appendix C). This might also mean that while the students adhered to the instructions in the writing prompt, the after-effect of which was the increased usage of boosters.

Adversative or contrast markers came next with more than half the amount (955) of boosters present in the text, i.e., 571 valid counts or 26.92% of the total stance markers in the collected essays. Aull and Lancaster (2014) report that this tendency is present more likely among expert writers compared with beginning and advanced student writers. They posit that this can be attributed to multiple sources the expert writers need to consider when raising an argument. Considering Du Bois's (2007) stance triangle, it can be assumed that the student writers potentially calculated their positions and aligned themselves with sources that could strengthen their claims and eventually negated other authors', which run opposite to their viewpoints. This tendency is exhibited by high-graded student papers in the study by Lancaster (2014). He termed this move as "contract[ing the] discursive space" (p. 38).

Hedges followed on the third spot among the frequency counts. To reduce commitment to claims, the students employed 455 hedges in their papers, equaling to 21.45%. Hedging as a practice tends to "qualify statements as opinion rather than fact and reduce their force" (Itakura, 2012, p. 131). Students would have downplayed their propositions by settling into the opinion-based interpretations of literary texts they read before choosing to play on several literary theories' influences in the meaningfulness of short fiction. Literary-analysis paper is listed as a type of writing under the Humanities curricular division (VanderMey, Meyer, Van Rys, & Sebranek, 2012). Humanities or liberal arts are more into exploring the personal interpretation explicitly (Hyland, 2010; Maroko, 2013).

Lastly, code glosses were only 6.60% of the stance-taking linguistic markers found in the corpus. Clarifying meaning and/or further elaborating it through examples is a common practice among English-writing authors, as concluded in the study of Khajavy, Assadpour, & Yousefi (2012). In their study, it was found that English-writing authors more likely would use code glosses as compare with Persian-writing authors. They explicated that readership might have been the reason for such a result. In the present study, the students may have

assumed that the readership only directs to the instructor whose intention was to rate the analysis of a literary text. The students might have also considered such a readership to skip further exemplifying since it could be assumed that the instructor already knew the content of the short fiction and that it was easier to relate the meanings of their interpretation(s) to the content of literary pieces. While least used in this study, Zhang (2016) notes that code glosses have a special role in achieving writers' presence in academic essays by textually describing circumstances within their discussions, i.e., providing more vivid examples and illustrating complex ideas. Zhao and Llosa (2008) add that reiteration of a central point, by aligning one's argument with other authors', increases authorial presence. This reiteration resembles what Aull and Lancaster (2014) thought to be reformulation strategies where a writer elaborates a point. This elaboration also reorganizes the flow of ideas in the text, thus viewing stance markers as organizational markers, too (Uccelli et al., 2013). Some of these examples are discussed in the next section to highlight the manner of using code glosses.

Table 2
Stance-markers' frequency table featuring the subcategories of hedges

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Modal Hedges	267	12.59%
Approximative Hedges	111	5.23%
Evidential Hedges	71	3.35%
Self-mention Hedges	6	0.28%

Table 2 shows the more specific distribution of stance markers with emphasis on the subcategories of hedges, namely approximative, self-mention, evidential, and modal. As discussed earlier, Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse framework has been the most comprehensive and well-studied among the existing models in the literature. It has been used in a number of studies such as those of Gillaerts and Van de Velde (2010), Hyland (2010), and Khajavy et al. (2012). Interestingly, most of these studies examined the writings of published authors. Aull and Lancaster (2014) diverged from this model by realizing that in a continuum of beginner, advanced, and published writers, cases have been different, stating that self-mentions (such as the use of personal pronouns *I*, *we*, *our*) are collocates of hedges among younger academics. Also, lexical verbs such as *suggest*, *appear*, and *seem* can take the function of evidential hedges. This could mean that these lexical verbs, as provided by their lexico-grammatical form, explicitly forward and offer evidence as authors decrease their commitment. Lancaster (2014) even contrasted this discourse function with personalize, that is, evidentialize versus personalize; with evidentialized claims being more negotiating compared with personalized ones. Meanwhile, approximative hedges are used not to exact or fully submit claims to a hundred per cent, still making the claim negotiable with the readers. Some of its examples are *perhaps*, *somewhat*, and *presumably*. Modal hedges are an off-shoot of epistemic modals, which are the most common linguistic device to mark stance (Biber et al., 1999; Hyland, 1998b; Hyland & Jiang, 2016; Lancaster, 2014). In fact, even in

the present study, modal hedges comprised half of the identified hedges from the collected essays, with 267 counts or 12.59% of the stance markers identified. This only shows that the students downplayed claims and opinions to be more precise about what they would mean or play within the certainty-uncertainty continuum. After all, Literary Criticism merits interpretative meanings of literary texts. Some examples are qualitatively discussed in the next section.

Table 3 shows the most frequently used words in each category of stance markers. *Somewhat* is the most used approximative hedge in the corpus. In most cases, *somewhat* is employed to withdraw full certainty about a writer's claim. It is most often collocated with an adjective (*somewhat* + adjective) and is therefore used as an adverb.

- (7) D.H. Lawrence reaction to "I Am He That Aches with Love" is **somewhat** explosive, this is because of Whitman's construction of a narrator that embodies the uncomfortable universalization...
- (8) It is **somewhat** implied in the story that if women be given the chance to choose, like Josie, they will be corrupt.

Table 3
Most frequently used words among stance-marker categories

Category	Most Frequently Used Word(s)	Frequency	Percentage
Adversative or Contrast			
Connectors	but	287	13.53%
Modal Hedges	can	145	6.84%
Boosters	more	96	4.53%
Code Glosses	such as	34	1.60%
Evidential Hedges	seems	18	0.85%
Approximative Hedges	somewhat	11	0.52%
Self-mention Hedges	I believe	5	0.24%

The above two examples show that the writers already gave their judgments but were careful enough to frame them tentatively. Gearing toward uncertainty is the main discourse function of hedges, making a statement rather more approximated with the author's stance. In fact, it can be identified with Lewin's (2005) approximators, which is quite the contrary of expressing uncertainty. She wrote that approximators are words that "blur distinctions of quantity and frequency" (p. 165). Because their adjectives (*implied* and *explosive*) are qualified claims, the students may have neutralized them with *somewhat*.

Among the self-mention hedges, the most frequently-used phrase is *I believe*, which is a combination of the personal pronoun *I* and the non-factive verb *believe*. Non-factive verbs are categorized as a cognitive attitude or CGA according to Marín Arresse

(2015). In her study, she explained that CGAs are more often used in opinion columns for journalistic writing. In the present study, the use of CGAs in the literary-analysis papers may be acceptable because they also showcase the engagement of authors in relation to what they believe in. Other CGAs that go well with the personal pronoun *I* are *think* and *imagine*. *Believe* must have been the chosen word by the students because of its nondemanding way to present evidence immediately. It can be used at the beginning of an essay to provide an overview of the analyzed text, for example:

- (9) **I believe** the feminist theory best suits the award-winning novel, the *Little Prince* by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, because it helps the reader understand the cultural standards set by the people in a community.
- (10) **I believe** that this novel is a product of his natural love for our country. He used to write as a silent way to start a revolution against the colonizers.

The word *believe* seems to be naturally found in statements that are still broad. Apparently, the students used this in the beginning of their claims. Eventually, these broad statements were thoroughly explained in the succeeding parts of their essays. It can also be assumed that the phrase *I believe* signals a writer's move to own a claim before proceeding to his or her evidence later on in the essay.

Evidential hedges are equally interesting in terms of presenting the writers' stance because they require an immediate and obvious importation of evidence that must be situated within the reach of the claims. They naturally set the readers to expect subsequent claims shortly after the use of evidential hedges such as *evidently* and *seems*. The hedged claims normally feature the writer's evaluation of the topic at hand. For example:

- (11) Attributive adjectives are noticeable in the short story that it adds to the interpretation of the consciousness. Adjectives associated with her face are negative in terms: homely, very broad (forehead), unpleasant, masculine (look), broad and flat (nose), dilated (nostrils), big (jaws). **Evidently**, the female protagonist is having a sense of mental fragmentation for she has contradictory thoughts. She is suspicious to men because they only look to her full bloom, shapely, fine body.
- (12) The text has clearly demonstrated this at the beginning where it was stated in the short story that dancing is forbidden past 10 o'clock in the evening. The Feminist Theory is another attack on this paper that illustrates that women are seen as submissive and browbeaten by the society ruled by men (Brizee et al.). Virginia Woolf was one of the central figures of feminist criticism and author of *Three Guineas* (1938), focusing on the 'relations between male power and the professions' (Selden et al. 118). **Evidently**, writers

have used the female character to describe the more vulnerable side of humanity, but characterizing it through differentiating the two opposite genders: male and female.

- (13) The lamplighter **seems** to interest the prince for he said, “it may well be that this man is absurd [but] at least his work has some meaning.”
- (14) In a scene where Ibarra was shown to be wandering around Binondo Park, Ibarra noticed the metal he bent when he was still a child and finds out that it is still bent. For others, this scene is just a flashback of Ibarra’s memories. But as it appears to be, it is a symbolism of how progress and change has been extremely delayed. Rizal **seems** to have used this scene to imply that even after almost 300 hundred years of being conquered by the Spaniards at that time, nothing has much changed.

Examples 11 and 12 obviously present the writers’ ideas as hedged by the word *evidently* by referring to ideas of other authors, and such importation of ideas happens before their almost-conclusive statements. This may show that they are in line, well-positioned, and well-read about the topics they present. This potentially provides for their presence, but by the shadow of other authors’ ideas; in this case, a hedged stance because their commitment is merited and validated by what other authors say. Examples 13 and 14 specifically refer to the short fiction they read as evidence, where they directly import a circumstance whether by quoting or paraphrasing an event, respectively. The word *seems* could add flavor to the indication of evidence by coming in with a hedged statement, but with a solid evidence to present for reader persuasion.

The most frequently used words under modal hedges, boosters, code glosses, and adversative or concession markers are discussed in the next sections of this paper. The focus is on their linguistic markers’ impact to the sample excerpts, showcasing the respective discourse functions of these markers: expressing commitment, reformulating and exemplifying, and expressing concession or contrast.

3.2 Students’ Ways to Establish Stance

This section presents the ways students established their stance through a closer investigation of stance markers they used in their literary-analysis papers. The contexts of the statements are discussed together with what scholars have previously thought about stance-building. Afterward, their insights from the individual interviews are presented. This section specifically answers the second research question of the study.

3.2.1 Expressing Commitment: Use of Hedges and Boosters

Li and Wharton (2012) state that by tracking the use of metadiscourse, one can rediscover the needs of readers in terms of what to elaborate and clarify, and how the interaction should be undertaken. In the same vein, when one tracks his stance-taking ability as a writer, he or she can see what proposition needs to be asserted and what claims need to be negotiated further with the readers. Possibly, this allows for flexibly expressing commitment in the writers' statements.

In this study, boosters were used more than hedges by the undergraduate students in their literary-analysis papers. In most cases, if students have managed to stay for a while in the university and have experienced a number of academic papers to submit, the opposite is expected (Aull & Lancaster, 2014; Hyland, 2010; Lancaster, 2014). However, it is possible that the students in this study were challenged by their instructor to develop their own insights and positions in their papers, and there was no other way to increase their authorial presence in their analysis papers but to boost their claims and be more assertive. This is probably why the booster count went for almost a thousand words (955 counts) in only 58 essays. Three of the most used boosters are *more*, *very*, and *should*, with the first two considered as adverbs of intensifiers.

- (15) Because of the things that happened in the past, the Filipino people become **more** careful in choosing who will they vote to lead the country, the protection of the human rights and expression are greatly empowered and it also created a reason for the citizens of the country to be united as one.
- (16) Because of the tragedy happened to his family and also the political influence through father, Ricky became aware of the social problems happening around him and he was challenged by this [sic] circumstances to be **more** conscious and do something to change the situation through his own radical way.
- (17) In this phase, women tend to reject both imitation and protest, Showalter considers that both are signs of dependency, women show **more** independent attitudes, they realized the place of female experience in the process of art and literature.
- (18) Hemingway claimed that the old man, Santiago, was not based on "nobody in particular" his friend Gregorio Fuentes was **more** like Santiago, who was "gaunt and thin, had blue eyes, came from Canary Islands, and had a long, battle-scarred history as a fisherman."

The use of the word *more* has an interesting place in character profiling or the way the writers would like to describe or characterize the people in the stories they read, interpreted, and critiqued. It is also obvious that the students maximized using it to increase

their commitment to the adjectives they assigned to describe each character, whether it denotes a larger group as in examples 15 and 17, or a single character as in examples 16 and 18. Also, using a combination of an evidential marker and a booster makes the statements rather more persuasive. For example, in 17, the writer makes sure that her claim about the image of women is not a mere claim coming from a usual textual interpretation, but there is an importation of another author's point.

Very also follows the same use. Although organically it is used to intensify a qualifying adjective for claims (as in examples 19, 20, 21), it also works within statements that tend to evidentialize claims. This can be seen in examples 22, 23, and 24.

- (19) It teaches the readers what true happiness really means, and that decision making is **very** important as it would predict who you would be in the future.
- (20) The Gold in Makiling is a **very** remarkable novel for its theme connects the past and present, its combination of reality and fantasy which makes it one of a kind.
- (21) To me, the ending of this novel sent a **very** strong message.
- (22) Lines such as, "Do you think the friendship of me would be unalloy'd satisfaction?" and "Do you think I am trusty and faithful?" (Whitman. ll 5-6), when taken alone, appear **very** confrontational.
- (23) In the line, "Kaya nga. Di ba no'ng araw pa, sinasabi ko na sa inyo na mag-aral kayo? Kailangan sa taong gustong umasenso, may ambisyong mataas. Pag mababa'ng puntirya mo, mababa rin ang tama mo," shows how Imo, is **very** determined to reach a higher rank in the socioeconomic class by working hard to pursue his college degree.
- (24) **Very** powerful case indeed, and another one located in Chapter 7, where Simoun stated, "...our people should aim higher!...", "Stand out then, molding your own individuality; try to lay the foundations of the Filipino nation! They give you no hopes? Well and good! Hope only in yourselves and work. If they refuse to teach you their language then develop your own, understand it and make it more widely known."

The first three examples show the discourse function of *very* as a common intensifier for an evaluative stance, that is, the precise judgment of the author on the value of the theme, the fiction, and the appeal; whereas, the last three examples reveal that *very* has a flexible role by heightening the writers' claims if used together with an evidentializing move. It can be noted that *Lines such as*, *In the line*, and *where Simoun stated* signal a direct reference to

the content of the fiction read; correspondingly, the word *very* boosts and seals the validity of the claim. Through this strategy, the writers possibly demonstrated themselves to have used *very* as a worthy booster because pieces of evidence were presented right away. This kind of evidentiality can qualify as a reportative evidential expression (Marin Arrese, 2015). Reportative evidential expression usually points something out or refers to something factual as it presents the fact as a handful of evidence. In this case, statements or instances from the fictive writings were possibly imported by the writers as facts to assist in making their claims rather more believable and more persuasive to the readers. It may regard a different scenario if the writers do not indicate evidence, as it may look like a usual claim that is yet to be accepted.

The booster *should* is likewise noticeable in the collected essays. With its natural call for obligation, readers are signaled for possible persuasion because of its strong appeal of what is needed and what is not. This sense of urgency makes the writers' presence and stance even more felt, especially when partnered with strong verbs that evoke interpretative value.

- (25) Militarism favors patriarchy rather than femininity, but that kind of transition in shifting from being a traditional type of mother and wife, to a nationalist and feminist light of the family, is a manifestation of how women **should** re-conceptualize motherhood in times of war.
- (26) As a conclusion, women **should** have equal treatment with men because women feel just as men feel, and it is narrow-minded for men to think that women are supposed to stay at home, do the house chores and take care of the kids because they can do more and use their abilities to develop themselves aside from doing the things that the society pronounced necessary for their sex and Latorena effectively showed her readers two images of a woman in the short story.
- (27) Dr. Jose Rizal knew that Spain has some good intention for the Philippines like to unite its people; however, he also knew that the Filipinos were drowning in ignorance before political issues and social issues which **should** not be neglected.

In these cases, *should* is potentially used to amplify the writers' advocacy or call for something to be done. Several social movements such as feminism, peace and order, heroism, social justice, and the like are normally delivered with this modal. As the researcher observed, *should* occurred more likely at the end of the essays as the writers concluded and put their arguments to rest. Perhaps, it is because the latter parts of the essays bear the function to restate and carry the moving part for readers to act (e.g., to invest fully on believing in the writers' claims or to bear the same advocacy the writers uphold).

As much as boosters are well-used by students to strengthen propositions, hedges are also employed. Most of these hedges are modal. Signifying modality, these hedges are naturally high-frequency even in other studies like those of Hyland (1996, 1998a), Maroko (2013), and Vázquez and Giner (2008). All these studies referred to modality as something that shapes the social condition of writers where they put things into a continuum to fluidly state something between possibility to impossibility, certainty to uncertainty, and full commitment to lack thereof. Therefore, modal hedges are writing essentials to be precise or to blur precision. In the case of the present study, modal hedges *can* and *may* are the most frequently used, as shown in these excerpts:

- (28) Using Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, we **can** say that *The Old Man and the Sea* is the “Other” which Hemingway used to reflect himself in searching for himself through his depression.
- (29) It **can** be seen in the novel that Victor basically indulged himself in the things that women can offer to him in the relationship (such as their supportiveness for his endeavors, their sexuality, and so on), then left them hanging out to dry afterwards... It **can** also be seen in the novel that some men, like Victor, tried to run around and claim the world for themselves, so to speak, and basically treat women like things to be put aside and not treated seriously.
- (30) In the novel, you **can** see an actual oppression and rebellion and digging deeper into reading, you’ll see an abstract power struggle of a loving wife and mother with a woman who wants to stand up for equality.
- (31) In the latter part of the story, foregrounded scenes was still observed however, I **can** infer that the foregrounding of death due to its often inclusion in the text does not necessarily mean death itself.

In the preceding examples, *can* takes a flexible role to be partnered with different points of view: from the first-person plural *we* to the agentless passive *it*. Also, it matches with the second-person pronoun *you* and the first-person pronoun *I*; both of which do not intervene with its function to open a tentative characterization to form their literary analysis. Thematic development is also aided by the word *can* to make the claims appear personally relevant to the writers and to show that the writers’ stance is merely one among the several interpretations one can draw from the short fiction. This possibly means that in exploring the chosen themes of the literary fiction, the writers diversified their points of view, and while asserting their own views, they left an open avenue for other potential interpretations. Maroko (2013) characterizes the humanities discourse as more inclined to the use of personal pronouns, which is relatively true in this study. While agentless passives are more evident in the scientific discourse, they appear in literary analyses as shown in example 29. This kind of strategy creates a discursive space between the writer and the literary text under study, with

the writer having enough distance both from the reader and the text as if withdrawing any personal influence from textual interpretation, and with meaning as if it is directly emanating from the text. Lancaster (2014) termed this as part of dialogic contraction, where modal hedges have a big part in its realization. He even included *may*, *could*, and *might* to have this property and function. Some examples include:

- (32) Therefore, as the narrated is privileged in the binary, we have come to believe that the narrator is the narrated. This **may** answer why the ego of the narrator is his dominant psyche: he tries to isolate himself from reality by directing pain to other people, possibly removing himself from his body.
- (33) By close reading it **could** be noticed that there is inequity in gender ever since. In the story, it was shown that female characters have more participation in house choirs than in offices and politics which makes them to participate less in the society.
- (34) At surface reading, we **might** get the simple binary opposition of the narrator/narrated where the former is privileged.

The above examples carry the same function of the modal hedge *can*. Truth, in the eyes of the writers, is suggestive to be theirs alone, thus creating a sense of writers' stance property. This separates the readers' point of view, who could also elicit their own perspective allowing for some truth negotiation. There is a lesser commitment, and the author looks less aggressive. Although it projects vagueness, this does not mean that it is a bad writing; Myers (1996) advocates this as "strategic vagueness" in academic writing (p. 6). This also allows for negotiability of meanings. Although there is no direct formula for this, writers are urged to be familiar with this according to their context and discipline. It can be argued that such vagueness may have been opened and accommodated in the Literary Criticism class because of the nature of the course. The student writers may have used the hedges appropriately in forwarding provisional interpretations in their essays. They used hedges for varied purposes such as discussion of character development, thematic interpretation, or situational analysis as shown in the above excerpts.

During the interviews, the students were asked if they used similarly discussed words in their papers. For example, in explaining their use of the word *can* (and other similar words), Student D noted that:

I used them so that I don't sound imposing or I might suggest that there is a possibility that one or the other might be a fact. It might be possible that it could be true I don't want to [*be*] self-factual and imposing if other people find it not really true, I don't want to sound unreliable to other people. (Student D)

Five out of nine students revealed that they used similar words in expressing uncertainties, comparing possibilities, and providing options. The other four students cited their limited-to-no use of *can* and other similar words because they believed that writers should be knowledgeable about what they discuss and should appear confident to share strong opinions. Perhaps, they thought that hedging decreases the appeal of strong opinions and their knowledgeable ability as writers. In the words of Student C, he wanted to appear as a 'decisive' writer, thus limiting the use of such words for formality purposes. He even noted the kind of preference he had for the use of *could* over *can*, both of which acting as hedges:

The underlined word matters but if I'm going to conform to the standard of using formal terms instead, I feel like it could be better if you use the word "could" instead of "can" in the paper, instead of saying that "the line from the story can be inferred" it could be written as well as "the line from the story could be inferred" rather because not surely as far as I know, in modals "would" and "could" sounds more formal than "can" and "will" itself. (Student C)

This possibly shows that most of the students used hedges to provide for the same discourse functions as Hyland (2005, 2010) stated, although almost half of them reported they limited their use of hedges. These functions help express uncertainty, tentativeness, and possibilities of claims.

When boosters were discussed, the students revealed they have a strong inclination to using the similar words of *should*, which is a booster. Seven students said that they used the similar words of *should*, while the two other said they did not use such words. When asked whether *should* is a good thing to use in their statements, Student E claimed:

For an academic paper, I believe it's a good thing because you're expressing your opinion and you're being firm. [*A writer*]...should be firm to his opinion. (Student E)

On the other hand, Student I said he did not use the similar words of *should* because he found it 'somewhat bossy,' which contradicts his belief that a writer should appear 'well-read' and that it can be attained even without sounding bossy in the paper. Student G had a different reason, however, for not using such words like *should*:

Personally, I do believe it's not healthy to use imperatives cause you will sound more like, not rude, *parang mayabang* [*like proud*]. You will sound like *mayabang* [*proud*] and like you are not welcoming others' opinion. Cause again, your claims will, of course, be different from the readers themselves. (Student G)

Overall, the students' common tendency for using boosters than hedges reflects their belief that they should sound firm, decisive, and someone who makes a point. It may be noted that it is primarily because they want to sound confident, knowledgeable, and familiar to the

topic, as well as to provide strong opinions as reasons for using more words such as *should*, which is a booster. This validates the studies conducted by Hyland (2005, 2010) and Aull and Lancaster (2014), where they found that seasoned and published writers tend to hedge more to avoid overgeneralization and demonstrate caution in their claims. Knowing that the present study only included undergraduate students, it can be assumed that these students are novice writers yet in their discipline. This is especially true for the reasons that the subject they took was an introduction to the Principles of Literary Criticism and that a semester of writing assignments could not make them legitimate critics yet in the discipline. These conditions can be a manifestation of what Hyland (2000) said that recognizing hedges and boosters is “crucial to the acquisition of a rhetorical competence in any discipline” (p. 193). Furthermore, the tendency to use boosters might be an after-effect of their response to the writing prompt. It can be noted that the students were reminded to have their ‘own positions and insights’ (see Appendix C). While the students believe that using boosters marks their confidence, they could also increase the level of their firmness and reliability as writers who express claim by choosing these words. Doing so could probably let the teacher, as a reader, view their own insights.

3.2.2 Reformulating and Exemplifying: Use of Code Glosses

Academic writing requires clear statements for easier understanding, and to do this, writers employ certain strategies. Zhang (2016) describes code glosses as those linguistic devices that supplement more information to precisely understand other elements in a text. Initially, they are used in explaining or defining particular details or in “describing text circumstances” (p. 209). When properly used in literary-analysis papers and other genres, code glosses can help in presenting analyses, topics, and idea interpretations. In a study comparing Persian and English texts, Khajavy et al. (2012) identified code glosses to be more commonly found in English texts for sociological studies. Some of the discourse functions they fulfilled include clarifying meanings and restating complex information. In Aull and Lancaster’s (2014) words, code glosses help exemplify broad concepts and propositions, as well as reformulate them for easier understanding. Some adverbial phrases are considered code glosses such as *namely*, *especially*, *in particular*, *for example*, *such as*, *in other words*, and *which means*.

The present study also found the most frequently used code glosses: *such as*, *indeed*, and *especially*. *Such as* recorded 34 counts or 1.60% of the total stance markers in the collected essays. In fact, *such as* is the most prevalent code gloss as an exemplifier. It is followed by the exemplifiers *especially* and *specifically*, respectively.

- (35) According to Eagleton, Marxist theorist, Ideology refers not to formulated doctrines but to all those systems of representation **such as** aesthetic, religious, judicial and others which shape the individual’s mental picture of lived experience.
- (36) Through its vivid description of scenarios **such as** “That fall, Chicago was sandman’s town, sleepy valley, drowsy gray, slumberous mistiness,” “a hideous shape among perfect footmarks”

and “The memory, distinctly recalled, was a rock on his breast.” gave the story a different color and expression which is not our usual perception and description about our environment, feelings and situation.

- (37) Through the use of conative function that is best observed in imperatives **such as** “Let’s talk about something nice,” “Now you listen to me,” “Now, let me teach you how to keep afloat” and “Turn that Thing off!” These are just some examples from the story that were used in conversations between Fil and Tony.
- (38) There are a lot more lessons that we could learn from this novel using Marxism and New Historicism lens if given another chance, and possibly, one could learn a lot more if other lenses were involved, **such as** Structuralism, Feminism, Formalism, Psychoanalytic, and others.

In its natural form, *such as* signals a succeeding enumeration to offer examples from a previously mentioned proposition, such as those in the above examples; but also notice that the writers directly quoted from the literary texts. This possibly shows that the writers also used code glosses to promote evidentiality and to make their claims factually motivated. This may also mean that they did not only use boosters within these evidentializing situations but also with the enumeration of a number of evidence through code glosses, as observed in examples 36 and 37.

- (39) This paper analyses Joaquin’s short story entitled, “The Summer Solstice” and uses the theory: Feminist Theory, **specifically** of Simone de Beauvoir in her book, *The Second Sex*, where she strongly stated that women are capable of choice as men, and thus can freely decide to elevate themselves (The Same Sex, 1949).
- (40) But by these words from Rizal, it convinces Filipinos that we are also human beings! We have rights! Those friars or Spanish people have no right to insult and belittle us in any way! They don’t own us! **Specifically** from Chapter 11, Rizal showed another magnificent message, a point of view of Padre Fernandez, stating, “Why should we be in continuous tension with the people (Filipinos), when after all, we are the few and they are the many, when we need them and they do not need us” (115).
- (41) But throughout time, **especially** in the period of 1965-1990, the immigrant community became more diverse due to the immigration of highly educated professionals and scholars.

- (42) Having restrictions with women, men can freely express themselves whenever and wherever they want, most **especially** if they are in a high stature.

Epecially and *specifically* were also frequently used as exemplifiers in this study. Unlike *such as*, they have the tendency to be used as tools to single out and give emphasis to a specific clarifying statement or phrase, that is, *specifically* to *Simone de Beauvoir* (example 39) and *Chapter 11* (example 40), and *especially* to *period of 1965-1990* (example 41) and *high stature* (example 42). Each of these exemplifiers directs the readers to just one example.

- (43) Moreover, he is ashamed to accept the truth. “Gahaman” [*Greed*] was used to describe men who, **indeed**, seek power because of their feeling of inferiority. The description of Victor as someone who is insubstantial to temptations and the repeated use of “Umiibig na naman si Victor” [*Victor is in love again*] in the story only signifies his absence of authority, resulting to his continuous submission to his different women, who are displaying superiority over him.
- (44) Agreeing with Leo Burnett that “On the Beach at Night Alone” is a “hint of Theory of Everything” (1), it **indeed** tells that there is a special bond among the universe, nature, and humans.

The word *indeed* justifies the role of a reformulator where it frequently follows an earlier descriptive statement. For example, in 43, *indeed* reformulates the presence of *Gahaman* [*Greed*] by extending its meaning to what the men were seeking. In 44, *indeed* also reformulates the agreement of the writer to the statement of Leo Burnett. In a way, it also promotes evidentiality by referring to the textual content of both the literary pieces and other sources, respectively.

During the individual interviews, the students generally agreed on the functions of the word *especially* in the excerpts as a word that specifies, clarifies, elaborates, and gives direction. All the nine students reported that they used it and other similar words in their papers. Some students even added that they used synonymous words as well, for example, *in particular* and *specifically*. Student E even mentioned that such use makes it appear he is a firm writer:

I definitely use word “especially” cause for my literary criticism [paper], I have to give emphasis on certain details cause there were some underlined messages there so I have to pinpoint what I’m talking about and the word “especially” really help[s] a lot. (Student E)

He referred to it as a marker of emphasis. This was affirmed by two other students in their respective interviews. The students believed that practices of emphasis would increase their presence as well-read writers. Given that all students confirmed that they used similar words of *especially*, this potentially means that glossing is a common practice among the

undergraduate students. This also affirms their earlier statements and beliefs that writers should be well-read and well-researched, enough to cite examples for more definite details when needed. Their thoughts on *especially* to be a word that directs the readers to the text and presents concrete arguments resemble that of Uccelli et al.'s (2013) concept of stance markers as organizational markers within the text. In the same way, this affirms the study of Hyland (2007), which reported that glossing makes for a reader-friendly and coherent text, enough to display writer presence extending to readers' expectations and viewpoints.

Another code gloss presented in one of the excerpts during the interviews was *indeed*. This gloss functions as a reformulator, which means that writers tend to clarify a specific term or elaborate on a certain concept or claim by explaining it thoroughly in the subsequent clauses. Seven students said that they used it in their papers as well as similar words that would denote its meaning. At least three of them deliberately explained that *indeed* builds up a stronger author presence by showing a strong conviction and sounding credible enough about what they discuss:

I usually use “indeed” and for me it is a strong word because whenever I encounter the word “indeed” it sounds like there is a conviction on whatever the writer’s talking about. (Student A)

...It sounds firm that the word “indeed” it sounds like he’s really convinced with what he wrote or what he found out across the poem... whenever I analyze a poem it does help that you use the word indeed cause it sounds like you really understood what you read. (Student E)

This increased authorial presence springs from the fact that the writers were knowledgeable enough about their topic and totally knew what they shared about the concepts. Zhang (2016) mentions that code glosses help in describing text circumstances, and this may include the instance that writers direct readers to whatever possible meaning they would like the latter to get persuaded to. This can be placed under the categorical use of code glosses, which is to “expand” or widen the reader’s understanding as the writer reformulates, re-elaborates, or re-explains a concept (Hyland, 2007, p. 274). This is because writers have their own way of saying something in general, and when they think something is still vague for that explanation, they tend to elaborate further. This move to clarify earns the writers’ power for conviction and knowledge-sharing. It can be inferred that these reasons the students forwarded can be related to the kind of author they wanted to be: firm, decisive, authoritative (i.e., strong presence in the text), and deeply versed. Again, these tendencies to evidentialize claims and refer to ‘situations/events in the texts’ could be from their responses to the writing prompt, which encouraged them to write as if they are in the process of ‘dialogue with the masters.’ The ‘masters’ in this case refer to the literary critics and authors they read to develop the literary-analysis papers. Additionally, this evidentializing of claims is possible if they reformulate their sentences and direct their arguments to the substance of the literary texts and critical papers, thus the use of specifying and focusing words—or code glosses. The usage of code glosses then has complemented the use of boosters earlier, which are also obviously used to refer to the content of literary texts in order to become more

reliable to the readers, such as the teacher. This is especially true when the teacher assured the students, through the writing prompt, that their papers may not be studied in the literary circles and that they do not have to worry because ‘We - YOU and **I as reader of your paper** - will always be in conversation’ (emphasis by the teacher, see Appendix C). The use of the pronoun *I* here could have denoted the presence of the teacher as the primary reader-critic of the literary-analysis papers.

3.2.3 Expressing Concession and Contrast: Use of Adversative or Contrast Connectors

Unlike boosters and code glosses, which writers used to present evidence, concession or contrast connectors were mostly found in the broad parts of interpreting the story meaning and themes. Words such as *but*, *however*, *while*, and *although* were the most commonly used concession or contrast connectors in the collected essays. To show concession, the writers employed these connectors to add elements other than the usual expectations, as in:

- (45) This proves that the Committee does not only want to control external factors like physical distinctions and colors **but** also internal factors such as natural emotions.
- (46) This symbolism does not just show how powerful and impossible it was to overcome the system back then, **but** it also shows how necessary it is to have a stronger force to bend these inhuman forces.

Expressing concession works well when *but* is a collocate of *also* in the above statements. Reading the statements of the writers, it can be noted that there is already a given qualification to elements such as *physical distinctions* (example 45) and in the case of *how powerful and impossible* (example 46). After the signaling words *but also*, additional details (*internal factors*, *how necessary*) are given much emphasis because of concession. In other words, the said signal words work like the word *additionally*, only that greater focus is given to the succeeding clause after *but also*. *Additionally*, however, may appeal that the previous thought and the current ones are of same or equal value for the writers. Doing such a concession strategy, the writers were possibly or almost negotiating with the readers what they thought to appeal more. Eventually, this potentially merits their authorial presence and stance when the readers subtly realize this.

- (47) Sanang showcases the Platonic Ideal character where she is the source of inspiration for the hero. **While** Nanong Balabal portrays the Innocent one for being pure and good man, he is also the everyman in the story, a normal person who is a supporting figure.

- (48) During that time, it was mentioned earlier that this piece was written in 1928. That was during the American occupation here in the Philippines. Meaning the man can possibly be a soldier. **While**, on the other hand, I also have concluded that the woman also came from a wealthy family.

In the case of *while* as a concession marker, *also* becomes helpful as well to note that the writers have something to add in the statements, that is, insights they own. The *while*-clause appears to carry something that is already established with the readers as an acceptable thought, and the *also*-clause shows something additional to the content of the *while*-clause. This is especially true in example 47. However, example 48 shows a different approach. *While* is explicitly showing a different stance by the writer, topped with the personal pronoun *I* and the transitional words *on the other hand*. This makes an obvious stance delivered by the writer because of the word combination. This possibly creates a strong writer presence.

- (49) This diversion of the man's pain by the narrator is through the guide of his ego. **However**, Dobie stated that the ego "is not directly approachable. We come closest to knowing it when it is relaxed by hypnosis, sleep, or unintentional slips of the tongue" (Dobie, 57). At surface reading, we might get the simple binary opposition of the narrator/narrated where the former is privileged.
- (50) The situation is that the two characters are in a repeated phase in their life and that phase will be altered by the news of the arrival of the dancers from the Philippines. **However**, I agree with Bernad's interpretation of the last part of the story where he said, "Is this perhaps an allegory of the expatriate's fate? Antonio, the unimaginative ex-porter, preoccupied with his own pain, has nothing to look forward to but a painful death. Filemon, more imaginative, finds all his dreams vanish into a blank tape" (801).
- (51) **However**, it may also be perceived that Whitman was once in constant conflict in seeking his identity and responsibilities. Thus, his poem served as enlightenment for the people who do not desire to know what separates them from the chaos of the world, and the interconnectedness between nature and mankind...
- (52) At first reading, one might assume that the narrator in the poems is the authority on the life of the individual he is observing, let alone the one who truly understands the individual. **However**, a Psychoanalyst reading will allow one to discover that the narrator is only trying to justify the individual's situation and frustrations.

All the uses of *however* here submit to the idea of the connectors' function to express concessive effects. This possibly means that there is an earlier expectation set to the readers (as in examples 49, 50, and 51); that is, there are previous statements that tell how the readers might expect about *man's pain, repeated phase in their life, and the narrator...is the authority*. These statements are countered in the next clauses signaled by *however*. Aull and Lancaster (2014) figured another thing when they said that *however*, in their study, was used primarily by their participants as contrast markers instead. This means that connectors are merely used to present two opposing statements and not counter an earlier established statement or reader expectation. This rings true in the following statements:

- (53) In the latter part of the story, foregrounded scenes was still observed **however**, I can infer that the foregrounding of death due to its often inclusion in the text does not necessarily mean death itself.
- (54) Though this book is known for as a retelling of the story of Cupid and Psyche, this **however**, does not mainly focus on the well-known Greek Mythology characters, but to Orual and her journey to find happiness and freedom.

Although Aull and Lancaster (2014) said that these two uses are relative, the nuance lies on setting readers' expectations. In the present study, concessive uses are favored as equally as contrast functions. It may be observed that the concessive function is used to show the writers' position with or against other authors' ideas. The contrast function, on the other hand, is used more to present general inferences or ideas by the writers without immediate citations from other authors' work. Therefore, following Lancaster's (2014) "objective/subjective distinction," the concessive function is used to evidentialize, while the contrast function is employed to personalize (p. 43).

During the interviews, *still* was the last adversative or contrast connector the students discussed. They further explained how they used it in their essays, whenever applicable. Eight of these students said that they used *still* and other similar words in their papers. They commonly characterized the functions of these words to convey writers' certainty, emphasize and express a firm decision, and express an inquiry and argumentation in order to change a reader's point of view. Although they cited varied reasons for using these words, it cannot be denied that these students hold the idea that writers should present both supporting and opposing ideas in building reliability in their discipline.

I mean with academic writing, sometimes, you have to, for example with the literary criticism, so we were supposed to argue with this master someone who has written criticism regarding the book that we chose and we were supposed to say whether or not we agree with them or not, we were supposed to choose a side but I did not choose a side because I both agree and disagree with that master that I chose. (Student F)

In this case, Student F strongly affirmed that as students, they were likely to argue with some masters or literary critics who have written about the fiction they read for the analysis paper. Apparently, the teacher's instruction encouraged them to explicitly state their ideas and positions in alignment or opposition to other scholars'. This possibly manifests their idea to evaluate, align, and position their insights with or against these 'masters' (Du Bois, 2007). This situation might have prompted them to use as much adversative or contrast connectors as they could.

The students stated different reasons for using the adversative or contrast markers; most of them explained that they used these markers to emphasize a stronger author presence. Adversative relations of words mark something "contrary to expectation" (Weißner, 2008, p. 30). In Aull and Lancaster's (2014) words, such show a "counterexpectancy" expression (p. 168). Student C particularly noted how his use of contrast connectors was driven by his aim to persuade the readers. He even forwarded his preference to use other words than *still* in his paper. He said he would better use *however* and *even though* for formality purposes.

While these contrast connectors appeared somewhat strong or prevalent in this study as revealed by the students who used them, the findings by Aull and Lancaster (2014) would demonstrate otherwise; they noted that the use of adversative connectors is common among advanced academic writers, notably the published academics. The undergraduate student writers are still considered novice writers here, given their limited practice of academic writing in their discipline. Perhaps, what prompted them to use more contrast markers was the attention they gave to argue with other seasoned authors in their respective analysis papers, provided that it is one of the requirements asked by their instructor.

For the most part, the students' tendency to use hedges, boosters, code glosses, and adversative connectors may seem to correspond to how they wanted to appear as well-read, firm, confident, and decisive writers. Their inclination to use boosters than hedges might be driven by their desire to increase their authorial presence; they would want to show the strong points or unique insights of their essays primarily through presenting as much evidence by citing parts of the literary works and arguing for or against other authors' ideas. The reasons they discussed for using stance-taking linguistic markers in their papers also partly demonstrate that they were quite aware of the functions of these markers in making them appear and sound like writers of their own texts. However, there was no deliberate mention of the metadiscourse terms in the interviews. The students mentioned the words such as *tone*, *appearing strong as an author*, *strong opinions*, and *appropriate words* to mean metadiscourse functions. They likewise agreed that all the words they used as linguistic markers in their papers helped them establish their writer position.

Overall, the students would tend to use linguistic markers of stance to assist in forwarding evidence for the readers. This was observed in the use of boosters and code glosses. Boosters were mainly used to describe characters and to persuade the readers. Boosters were also employed to import evidence of lines and parts of the literary fiction. Hedges, on the other hand, were mostly used to develop themes and explore multiple viewpoints where the stories can be possibly interpreted. Hedges were also strategically used to promote the writers' perspective while welcoming other potential options for interpretations. Code glosses were likewise utilized to refer to some lines and parts of the fictive writings they read, that is, to evidentialize. Aside from this, code glosses were used to enumerate examples

and make claims that were limited to a specific situation or period. Adversative or contrast markers manifested two equal functions: (1) concession or making a claim more appealing than others by proposing the favored claim as something beyond the usual expectations of readers, and (2) contrast or negating other ideas of the same value. Such an inclination could be influenced by the students' assumption that writers should be interactive enough to accommodate supporting and opposing ideas in their papers. Because they believed that opposing ideas could enrich their discussions, the students would tend to use adversative or contrast connectors to emphasize which side they would take as writers. The presence of negating and offering contrasting ideas against the author or possible textual interpretations might have been stirred by the reminder in the writing prompt. The students were encouraged to have their "own positions and insights" and be in dialogue with the literary authors and critics. This move might have opened the possibility for the students to keep their own interpretation and stance, may it be against other established authors and critics. It is in these situations when students probably have to use adversative and contrast markers to keep their stand and appear reliable and firm to their claims.

4. Conclusion

As stance markers generally track authorial presence in terms of manner of presentation, the study used the framework by Aull and Lancaster (2014), which argues that stance-taking can be realized by expressing commitment, reformulating and exemplifying, and expressing concession or contrast. Respectively, these stance-taking strategies can be manifested through the use of hedges and boosters to adjust writer commitment, code glosses to reformulate and exemplify statements, and connectors to express concession or contrast. In the present study, the students used a total of 2,121 stance markers in the 58 collected essays. They used more boosters than hedges, which means they possibly asserted their commitment to propositions more than taking tentative, uncertain stances. This is probably because of the value they put into the instructions given by their Literary Criticism course facilitator, which was to show their position and claim, where boosters could amplify their authorial presence (Aull & Lancaster, 2014; Hyland, 2010; Zhao, 2012; Zhao & Llosa, 2008). They also used adversative or contrast markers, which means they took on an adversative stance against what other authors said about the literary text, or positioned themselves with one author against another. It possibly resembles the strategy shown in Du Bois's (2007) stance triangle, where the writers evaluate, position, and align their claims with or against other authors. It potentially provides for the "us vs them dichotomy" that shows authors' evaluation over a specific theme or topic (Gales, 2011, p. 42). By doing this, the student writers showed their legitimate place in the scholarly conversation. Lastly, the students used code glosses in order to exemplify and elaborate their opinions relevant to other writers' points and to organize ideas according to their own understanding (Aull & Lancaster, 2014; Uccelli et al., 2013).

Interview data revealed the students' belief that hedges and/or boosters operate as words that convey strong, weak, or neutral authorial presence (Hyland, 1998a, 2010; Maroko, 2013; Vázquez & Giner, 2008). Five students found such a function to be typical as they also used other similar words for the same purpose. However, the students reported

that they employed more boosters than hedges. Still, both boosters and hedges, which denote authorial presence by manner of presentation, were observed in the essays (Hyland & Jiang, 2016). This writing practice may be attributed to the kind of writer they wanted to portray, i.e., well-read, decisive, and authoritative. They explained that this is essential to appear more persuasive. The high frequency of boosters among the stance markers in the analyzed essays would entail that boosters helped the student writers signify their authorial presence, present evaluative character profiling, evidentialize claims, and show urgency so that the readers would be persuaded to agree with their ideas and analyses (Lancaster, 2014; Marín Arrese, 2015).

As regards the use of code gloss (exemplifier), the students commonly identified the word as specifiers, but they also recognized its functions to present concrete arguments or keen perspectives, relate ideas to personal ones, and give direction to the essay. Likewise, the students viewed these moves as ways to let the readers realize their presence. Reformulation, another function of code glossing, was also seen as a strategy for emphasizing. This makes the writer's presence appear strong. Such an idea is inevitable because reformulation presents two opposing sides yet makes one idea more valuable, therefore creating a writer who forwards certain judgment by elaboration and explanation. Surprisingly, all the students admitted that they used code glosses in their papers to appear well-read or to portray the kind of writer who is knowledgeable about a certain topic.

Contrast markers were deemed to have varied discourse functions based on the interview findings. Using concession or contrast markers is common among expert writers according to Aull and Lancaster (2014), but the students admittedly used them to appear more confident and more persuasive, and to demonstrate a stronger writer presence. The results of the present study run parallel with those of other studies where there is great acknowledgment on the use of hedges, boosters, and code glosses as markers of authorial presence (Aull & Lancaster, 2014; Hyland, 2005, 2007; Hyland & Jiang, 2016; Jalilifar & Shooshtari, 2011; Li & Wharton, 2012). Furthermore, this validates other research findings, which found that novice writers tend to boost more as compared with their seasoned counterparts. Published and more experienced writers tend to be cautious with their claims; thus, they hedge more in their statements (Aull & Lancaster, 2014; Hyland, 1998a, 2005; Lancaster, 2014).

The linguistic markers possibly helped the students establish their writer presence and stance by providing pieces of evidence through the use boosters, code glosses, and adversative or contrast connectors. These markers were used to profile characters and make the interpretation of story themes more convincing. Meanwhile, hedges were utilized to interpret texts in multiple viewpoints, thus expressing tentativeness in doing so. The students seemed to use these linguistic markers to increase their authorial presence because they were urged by their instructor to develop their own insights and positions and shape their arguments. Also, these students concurred that the use of these linguistic markers would denote if an academic writer is well-read, decisive, firm, and well-informed; thus, familiarity with the topic is a priority when writing literary analyses. It is also worthy of mention that the students' general tendency to use boosters, code glosses, and adversative and/or contrast connectors and the usual move to evidentialize their claims by reference to literary-text contents and literary critics' work might have been grounded on their responses to the writing prompt. It was discussed earlier that the instructions provided by the teacher reminded them

to: (1) have their own insights and positions, (2) substantiate their claims by citing situations and events from the literary texts, and (3) be in the process of dialogue with the ‘masters’ or literary critics and authors. The teacher also assured that their essays would stand as a conversation with readers, including the teacher.

The essential place of stance in academic writing springs from the need of writers to be aware of their perceived readers and to guide the latter by interacting, elaborating, and clarifying the arguments in the text (Hyland, 2010; Hyland & Tse, 2004; Li & Wharton, 2012). This means that students should not only practice taking stance, but they should also learn to use appropriate linguistic markers to achieve such a purpose.

Therefore, this study may call for an explicit instruction of using stance markers, so students can practice academic writing by properly utilizing these markers that provide better rhetorical options. In this way, they develop certain metadiscourse skills so that they can decide when to hedge, to what extent they shall boost statements, how to use code glosses to pertain to specific details, how reformulation helps their readers grasp seemingly difficult concepts, and how adversative connectors better express concession to emphasize their position as writers of the text.

Additionally, ESL teachers can empower their students’ writing skills and show that academic writing encompasses the mere presentation of facts and relevant ideas along with their stance. For one, the writing prompt was followed by the students and clearly gave directions to how the students should frame their arguments and present their evidence. In this study, the explicit instruction for students to have their *own positions and insights* possibly encouraged them to increase their authorial presence. Consequently, such eagerness to emphasize ideas and be more confident and persuasive possibly drove them to use boosters, code glosses, and concession or contrastive markers in this light. In the same vein, hedges were used to make their interpretations and claims open for negotiation of meanings as the discipline is still grounded on creating interpretative meanings (Gillaerts & Van de Velde, 2010; Hyland, 1998a, 2010; Jalilifar & Shoostari, 2011). Talking about stance markers deliberately and applying the appropriateness of their functions in academic essays are viewed to influence the writing quality positively (Lancaster, 2014).

This study only described the stance-taking practices of undergraduate students in their Literary Criticism class. To progress the inquiry and scholarly discussions on the use of stance markers, especially in state universities, other factors may be considered. First, knowing that this study featured literary-analysis papers of students who were not grouped according to their writing proficiency, other researchers can possibly investigate if writing proficiency is a factor that can influence how the students use hedges, boosters, adversative or contrast connectors, and code glosses in their papers. Second, a longitudinal study involving one batch of university students in a similar Literature course could be done. This can help in describing how Literature students change their preferences of using stance markers overtime. It may help track their trajectories in stance-building practices, especially that university education exposes students to their respective discipline-specific writing conventions—specifically as regards utilizing appropriate research methods, writing data interpretation, and shaping academic arguments. Lastly, comparative studies about stance-taking capacities of students within the Humanities track (e.g., theater arts, Philippine studies, philosophy, cultural studies, and the like) may help describe and appropriate the way students signify

their stance. Other factors such as gender, students' grades in writing exams, writing styles and beliefs, and practices by novice writers may also be examined as influences on stance-taking abilities and performance.

References

- Anthony, L. (2014). AntConc (Version 3.4.1) [computer software]. Available from <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/>
- Aull, L.L., & Lancaster, Z. (2014). Linguistic markers of stance in early and advanced academic writing: A corpus-based comparison. *Written Communication, 31*(2), 151-183. doi: 10.1177/0741088314527055
- Bacnotan, J.M.B., Imperio, R.V.A., & Viñas, L.B. (2008). *Performance of ABE Sophomores in Paragraph Writing* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Manila.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. England: Pearson Education.
- 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.
- Chan, T.H. (2015). A corpus-based study of the expression of stance in dissertation acknowledgments. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 20*, 176-191.
- Chang, P. (2016). EFL doctoral students' conceptions of authorial stance in academic research writing: An exploratory study. *RELC Journal, 47*(2), 175-192.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Crosthwaite, P., & Jiang, K. (2017). Does EAP affect written L2 academic stance? A longitudinal learner corpus study. *System, 69*, 92-107.
- Daban, R.S., Ebron, A.V., Grajales, R.J.T., Oraa, J.P., & Sanchez, A.P. (2013). *Argumentative Writing Performance of the Third Year Bachelor of Arts in English Students Based on the Data Implications for the Enrichment of Writing Instruction* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Manila.
- Dawson, C. (2002). *Practical research methods*. Oxford: How To Books Ltd.

-
- Du Bois, J.W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 139-182). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gales, T. (2011). Identifying interpersonal stance in threatening discourse: An appraisal analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 13(1), 27-46.
- Gillaerts, P., & Van de Velde, F. (2010). Interactional metadiscourse in research article abstracts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9, 128-139.
- Gustilo, L. & Magno, C. (2012). Learners' errors and their evaluation: The case of Filipino ESL writers. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 8, 96-113.
- Hogue, A. (2008). *First steps in academic writing* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Hyland, K. (1996). Nurturing hedges in the ESP curriculum. *System*, 24(4), 477-490.
- Hyland, K. (1998a). Boosting, hedging, and the negotiation of academic knowledge. *TEXT*, 18(3), 349-382.
- Hyland, K. (1998b). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(4), 437-455.
- Hyland, K. (2000). Hedges, boosters and lexical invisibility: Noticing academic texts. *Language Awareness*, 9(4), 179-197. doi: 10.1080/09658410008667145
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192. doi: 10.1177/1461445605050365
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hyland, K. (2007). Applying a gloss: Exemplifying and reformulating in academic discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 266-285.
- Hyland, K. (2010). Metadiscourse: Mapping interactions in academic writing. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9(2), 125-143.
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (2016). Change of attitude? A diachronic study of stance. *Written Communication*, 33(3), 251-274.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004) Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177.
- Itakura, H. (2012). Hedging praise in English and Japanese book reviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 45, 131-148.

- Jalilifar, A.R., & Shooshtari, Z.G. (2011). Metadiscourse awareness and ESAP comprehension. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 41*(2), 53-74.
- Khajavy, G.M., Assadpour, S.F., & Yousefi, A. (2012). A comparative analysis of interactive metadiscourse features in discussion section of research articles written in English and Persian. *International Journal of Linguistics, 4*(2), 147-159.
- Khedri, M., Chan, S.H., & Tan, B.H. (2013). Cross-disciplinary and cross-linguistic perspectives on metadiscourse in academic writing. *Southern African Linguistics & Applied Language Studies, 31*(1), 129-138.
- Kirkham, S. (2011). Personal style and epistemic stance in classroom discussion. *Language and Literature, 20*(3), 201-217.
- Lancaster, Z. (2014). Exploring valued patterns of stance in upper-level student writing in the disciplines. *Written Communication, 31*(1), 27-57.
- Lewin, B.A. (2005). Hedging: An exploratory study of authors' and readers' identification of 'toning down' in scientific texts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4*, 163-178.
- Li, T., & Wharton, S. (2012). Metadiscourse repertoire of L1 Mandarin undergraduates writing in English: A cross-contextual, cross-disciplinary study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*, 345-356.
- Marín Arrese, J.I. (2015). Epistemicity and stance: A cross linguistic study of epistemic stance strategies in journalistic discourse in English and Spanish. *Discourse Studies, 17*(2), 210-225.
- Maroko, G.M. (2013). Learning about author positioning in written academic discourse. *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 47-60.
- Martin, I.P. (2011). Representations of self in reflection essays of Philippine university students. *Reflection on English Language Teaching, 10* (1), 55-66.
- Masangya, E.M., & Lozada, L. (2009). An investigation on the relationship between the language exposures and errors in English essays of high school students. *Philippine ESL Journal, 2*, 31-50. Retrieved from <http://www.philippine-esljournal.com/Volume-2-em.php>
- McEntee-Atalianis, L.J. (2013). Stance and metaphor: Mapping changing representations of (organizational) identity. *Discourse & Communication, 7*(3), 319-340.

-
- McNamara, D.S. (2013). The epistemic stance between the author and reader: A driving force in the cohesion of text and writing. *Discourse Studies*, 15(5), 579-595.
- Mojica, L. (2005). Filipino authors' way of showing detachment/commitment in their English academic papers. In D. Dayag, & J.S. Quakenbush (Eds.), *Linguistics and language education in the Philippines and beyond: A festschrift in honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista* (pp. 511-525). Manila: Linguistics Society of the Philippines.
- Murray, R., & Moore, S. (2006). *The handbook of academic writing: A fresh approach*. England: McGraw Hill Open University Press.
- Myers, (1996). Strategic vagueness in academic writing. In E. Ventola, & A. Mauranen (Eds.), *Academic writing: Intercultural and textual issues* (pp. 3-18). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- O'Keeffe A., & McCarthy, M. (2010). Historical perspective: What are corpora and how they have evolved? In A. O'Keeffe, & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics* (pp. 3-13). London/NewYork: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Parina, J.C.M, & De Leon, K. (2013). The significance of language exposure with writing self-efficacy and writing apprehension of Filipino ESL writers. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 10, 232-244.
- Reid, J. (1993). *The teaching of ESL writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Swales, J.M., & Feak, C.B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Uccelli, P., Dobbs, C.L., & Scott, J. (2013). Mastering academic language: Organization and stance in the persuasive writing of high school students. *Written Communication*, 30(1), 36-62.
- VanderMey, R., Meyer, V., Van Rys, J., & Sebranek, P. (2012). *The college writer: A guide to thinking, writing, and researching* (4th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Vázquez, I., & Giner, D. (2008). Beyond mood and modality - Epistemic modality markers as hedges in research articles: A cross-disciplinary study. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 21, 171-190.
- Weißner, E. (2008). *Sentence Connectors in English Academic Writing- An Empirical Comparison of Research Articles by German and Native English Writers*
-

(Unpublished master's thesis). Technische Universität Chemnitz, Chemnitz.

Zhang, M. (2016). A multidimensional analysis of metadiscourse markers across written registers. *Discourse Studies*, 18(2), 204-222.

Zhao, C.G. (2012). Measuring authorial voice strength in L2 argumentative writing: The development and validation of an analytic rubric. *Language Testing*, 30(2), 201-230.

Zhao, C.G., & Llosa, L. (2008). Voice in high-stakes L1 academic writing assessment: Implications for L2 writing instruction. *Assessing Writing*, 13, 153-170.

Appendix A

List of metadiscourse markers that build stance (Adapted from Aull & Lancaster, 2014)

<p>1a. Hedges Approximative hedges</p> <p>about almost apparent/ly approximately around broadly certain amount certain extent certain level doubt that doubtful essentially fairly frequently generally in most cases in most instances in this view largely likely mainly maybe mostly often on the whole perhaps plausible plausibly possibility possible possibly presumably probable/y quite rather typical/lly</p>	<p>uncertain/ly unclear/ly unlike/ly usually</p> <p>Self-mention hedges</p> <p>from my experience/ perspective from our perspective I believe I imagine I think in my experience/ view/opinion in our view to my knowledge</p> <p>Evidential verb hedges</p> <p>appear(s)(ed)(ing) evidently indicate(s)(ed)(ing) indication(s) indicative indicator seem(s)(ed)(ing) seemingly suggest(s)(ed) tend(s)(ed)</p> <p>Modal hedges</p> <p>can could may might</p>	<p>Modal hedges</p> <p>can could may might</p> <p>1b. Boosters</p> <p>actually always beyond doubt can accurately can actually can barely can certainly can clearly can completely can definitely can directly can easily can greatly can hardly can honestly can only can readily can really can scarcely can significantly can simply can successfully can truly certain(ly) clear(ly) conclusively decidedly definite(ly) demonstrate(s)(ed) incontrovertibly</p>
---	--	--

Appendix A continued...

<p>doubtless establish(es)(ed) evident extremely find finds found incontestable incontestably incontrovertible incontrovertibly indeed indisputable indisputable know known knows more most must never no doubt of course ought realize realizes really should show showed shows sure surely true truly undeniable undeniably</p>	<p>undoubtedly very without doubt</p> <p>2. Code glosses</p> <p>an example as a matter of fact defined as e.g. especially for example for instance I mean i.e. in fact in other words in particular indeed known as likewise more accurately much like namely one example particularly put another way specifically such as that is to say that means this means to put it.../put *ly which is to say which means , say, . Like</p>	<p>3. Adversative/contrast connectors</p> <p>alternatively although at the same time but by contrast conversely however in contrast on the other hand nevertheless nonetheless rather still though whereas while yet</p>
---	--	---

Appendix B***Interview questions (Modified and patterned from Chang [2016])*****Phase I: Participants' Academic Background and Academic Writing Experiences**

1. How long have you taken academic-writing classes?
2. How many years of academic-writing experience do you have?
3. Where do you commonly use these learned or acquired academic-writing skills?

Phase II: General Conceptions Related to Authorial Stance

1. What should an effective academic argument look like?
2. What is the purpose of making an academic argument?
3. How do you sound (as an author) in your academic paper?
4. Do you sound almost the same or different in other academic papers?
5. What kind of words do you use to sound such?

Phase III: Text Reading and Judgment

1. How do you find the argument here?
2. What can you say about the boldfaced word(s)?
3. How do they affect some interpretation to readers like you?
4. Will it be different if we take the word out of the sentence or phrase?
5. Do you use similar types of words when you write? If yes, for what purpose?
6. Explain how you do such in your paper, say in your literary-analysis paper.

Appendix C

Guidelines for the major/final paper in Literary Criticism 2017-2018

1. 3-5 pages , proper margins, 12 font size, Times New Roman, double-spaced.
2. Acknowledge your citations, sources, and references. Use the MLA format.
3. Give an appropriate and a “focused” title.
4. Make sure you do READ the literary piece. Do a close reading of the work/s even if you’re not using a formalist approach as your mode of reading/interpretation.
5. Make clear the framework you’re using, i.e., the theory/ies that you will use in reading/interpreting the text/s.
6. Make it clear: What does your paper argue? Make sure this is not only introduced but developed and concluded. Substantiate your arguments with texts from your literary text/s and theories.
7. Have a dialogue/conversation with (a) ‘master/s’ (Research a lot; refer to the journals I will be posting plus books on Literature/Literary Criticism.) who have already critiqued the literary piece/s you’re working on. Be clear with your arguments. Substantiate them with quotations from and situations/events in the texts. Cite quotations in the original language used.
(If after a real hard work of research, nobody seems to have studied your text, no worries. We - YOU and I as reader of your paper- will always be in conversation.)
8. Do not lose sight of the theory/ies you’re using and of your chosen literary piece/s in the process of your dialogue with the ‘masters’ and in the development of your paper. **Have your own position and insights.**
9. Research still more: understand the context of your chosen literary piece/s to help you read/interpret/find or give meaning to your text/s better.
10. Make sure you write a paper with an **Introduction**, a **Body** (You may put subtitles/ subtopics as you develop body of your paper if they help you to be more focused and be clearer. Otherwise, you can just write fluidly.), and a **Conclusion**.
11. Should the chosen text/s be in the Filipino language, the paper may be written either in the English or the Filipino language.
12. Edit your work.
13. **Due date: October 9 (ABE 4-4); Oct 10 (ABE 4-1); Oct 13 (ABE 4-2) 2017 or earlier + only HARD COPY is allowed – just staple the pages. No need for cover paper and folder.**

IMPORTANT NOTE: Plagiarism in any form will mean automatically FAILURE for the COURSE, **not** only a grade of zero for the paper.

Acknowledgments

The writer is extremely grateful for the assistance extended by the reviewers of this research article. The following people are also instrumental in the completion of this paper: Ms. Maria Concepcion B. Montenegro, Dr. Marianne Rachel G. Perfecto, Mr. Michael Ian Benedict P. Estipona, Ms. Frances Paola D. Perez, Mr. Edward G. Estrera, and Ms. Carmencita E. Caridad. The writer will be forever indebted for their valuable insights and support. Lastly, the writer is also sincerely grateful to Dr. Veronico N. Tarrayo, for the encouragement and for providing essential language edits to the paper.