

徐宏亮 / 著

作者立场标记语研究
学术语篇中的



A Corpus-Based Study of Authorial
S tance Markers in Academic
Research Discourse by
C hinese Advanced EFL Writers

合肥工业大学出版社

！



中國新詩歌研究

李元瑤主編

A Comprehensive Study of Modern
Chinese Poetry in English
Language Literature by
Chinese Advanced ESL Writers

2011年出版

A Corpus-Based Study of Authorial Stance Markers in Academic
Research Discourse by Chinese Advanced EFL Writers

学术语篇中的作者立场 标记语研究

徐宏亮 著

合肥工业大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

学术语篇中作者立场标记语研究/徐宏亮著. —合肥:合肥工业大学出版社, 2007. 5

ISBN 978 - 7 - 81093 - 596 - 8

I. 学… II. 徐… III. 术语—研究—英文 IV. H06

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2007)第 072906 号

学术语篇中作者立场标记语研究

徐宏亮 著

责任编辑 章 建

出 版	合肥工业大学出版社	版 次	2007 年 5 月第 1 版
地 址	合肥市屯溪路 193 号	印 次	2007 年 5 月第 1 次印刷
邮 编	230009	开 本	650×960 1/16
电 话	总编室:0551-2903038	印 张	24.5
	发行部:0551-2903198	字 数	290 千字
网 址	www.hfutpress.com.cn	发 行	全国新华书店
E-mail	press@hfutpress.com.cn	印 刷	安徽江淮印务有限责任公司

ISBN 978 - 7 - 81093 - 596 - 8

定价:48.00 元

如果有影响阅读的印装质量问题,请与出版社发行部联系调换



徐宏亮

1971 年生，南京大学外国语言学与应用语言学博士，阜阳师范学院教授。先后在省级以上学术期刊发表专业学术论文 20 余篇，主持和参与科研、教研项目 10 余项、参编教材 1 部。曾获安徽省教学成果三等奖。担任安徽省人事厅引智工作英语翻译、安徽省外国语言文学学会理事等。

Acknowledgements

The present book is revised on the basis of my PhD dissertation. It would not have been published without the encouragement and support of many people who deserve special acknowledgement.

First and foremost, I would like to express deepest gratitude to my supervisors Prof. Ting Yenren and Prof. Wen Qiufang, who by now must be getting tired of being thanked. Prof. Ting Yenren has always been ready to listen, to challenge my ideas, suggest new ways forward, and has offered masses of positive comments and encouragement which led to much-needed improvements in my work. His insightful suggestions have pointed me to exciting new research directions. Prof. Wen Qiufang has supported me immeasurably throughout the research and writing. She provided me with clear guidance and thought-provoking questions, enthusiastically cheering me along at crucial moments during the process. All my meetings with her were pleasant and productive. I thank Prof. Wen and Prof. Ting for all their support, patience, encouragement and practical help over those years of research and writing this thesis, and always.

I would like to record my debt of gratitude to the members of my thesis committee: Prof. Li Zhanzi, Prof. Xin Bin, Prof. Ma

Guanghui, Prof. Wang Haixiao and Prof. Chen Xinren, for their valuable insights and reflective comments at various stages in this research.

My friends and classmates Prof. Wang Lifei, Dr Wang Wenyu, Dr. Zhu Yeqiu, Dr. Chen Xuan, Dr. Bao Gui, and Dr. Guo Chunjie deserve particular mention for their generosity and help in the preparation of my research data. Special thanks also go to Prof. Yan Chensong for those valuable materials and encouragement I have received from him.

I have been fortunate to enjoy the camaraderie of my fellow PhD students; I am proud to have been a member of such a fine group of people. I especially want to recognize Dr Liang Maocheng, Dr Chen Hua, Dr Zhou Dandan, Dr Wang Yu, Dr Qi Yan, Dr Yu Jiang, Dr Chen Fang, Dr Li Changsheng, Dr Hu Xuewen, Dr Gao Chao, Dr Wang Haizhen, among others, who have encouraged me through the years and provided much-needed spiritual counsel and support.

A separate accolade is reserved for Prof. Wang Lifei, Prof. Wang Haixiao, Prof. Chen Xinren and Dr Hu Jian, who answered my numerous questions and always impressed me with their theoretical cogency and insight. I wish to express my gratitude to them for particularly helpful comments and suggestions.

I have no words with which to thank my wife Kang Jingqun. The writing of this thesis has been as much of an ordeal for her as it has for me, for which I beg her forgiveness. For making my life as easy as it could be, I thank her with my heart. I thank my parents for bringing me up and my son for being a good soul, and for all the things that have made me always proud of them.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	1
------------------------	---

0 Introduction

0.1 Motivation for the study	1
0.1.1 Inadequate use of authorial stance markers in Chinese EFL writings	1
0.1.2 Limited awareness of the social nature of academic research discourse	4
0.1.3 The importance of authorial stance markers and its relevance to publishing in English journals	7
0.1.4 Insufficient research on authorial stance markers in academic research texts in China	11
0.1.4.1 PhD dissertations	12
0.1.4.2 Scholarly journal articles	14
0.2 Significance of the present study	16
0.2.1 Theoretical significance	16
0.2.1.1 Contributing to the theory of interlanguage	16
0.2.1.2 Contributing to the research on evaluation	18
0.2.2 Practical significance	19
0.2.2.1 Contributing to the teaching of EAP	19

0.2.2.2 Promoting L2 writers' academic careers	20
0.3 Overview of the book	22

Chapter 1 Key Terms and Their Taxonomies and Realizations

.....	24
1.1 Key terms	24
1.1.1 The concepts of stance and stance markers	24
1.1.2 Concepts related to stance	29
1.2 Taxonomies of stance markers	50
1.2.1 Epistemic stance markers	50
1.2.2 Attitudinal stance markers	57
1.2.3 Style stance markers	60
1.3 Lexical realizations of stance	61
1.3.1 Lexical verbs as stance markers	62
1.3.2 Adverbs as stance markers	66
1.3.3 Adjectives as stance markers	70
1.3.4 Nouns as stance markers	72
1.3.5 Modal verbs as stance markers	73
1.4 Grammatical realizations of stance	76
1.5 Summary	79

Chapter 2 Studies on Stance Markers

2.1 Introduction	80
2.2 Empirical studies on stance markers	80
2.2.1 Studies on stance markers across word classes	81
2.2.1.1 Studies on stance markers; lexical verbs	82
2.2.1.2 Studies on stance markers; adverbs	82
2.2.1.3 Studies on stance markers; adjectives	84
2.2.1.4 Studies on stance markers; modals	85
2.2.2 Studies on stance across semantic categories	86

2. 2. 2. 1	Empirical studies on epistemic stance markers	86
2. 2. 2. 2	Empirical studies on attitudinal stance markers	87
2. 2. 2. 3	Empirical studies on style stance markers	88
2. 2. 3	Studies on stance markers across rhetorical sections	88
2. 3	Functional and pragmatical approaches to stance markers	93
2. 3. 1	The functional approach	94
2. 3. 2	The performative approach	100
2. 3. 3	The politeness approach	101
2. 4	Summary	103
Chapter 3	Towards a Framework of Authorial Stance	105
3. 1	Introduction	105
3. 2	Inadequacies of existing stance studies	105
3. 3	The framework of authorial stance used in the study	110
3. 3. 1	Defining the key terms	110
3. 3. 2	Features of the framework of authorial stance	115
3. 3. 3	Linguistic realization of authorial stance	118
3. 3. 3. 1	Grammatical realization of authorial stance	119
3. 3. 3. 2	Lexical realization of authorial stance	120
3. 3. 4	Functions of authorial stance markers	131
3. 3. 4. 1	The transactional function	132
3. 3. 4. 2	The interactional function	133
3. 4	Summary	136

Chapter 4 Research Design	138
4.1 Introduction	138
4.2 Research questions	139
4.3 Corpus preparation	139
4.3.1 Corpus linguistics setting	140
4.3.2 CARE: A Corpus of Academic Research English	141
4.3.2.1 Sources of CARE	142
4.3.2.2 Segmentation of files	146
4.3.2.3 Formatting of files	149
4.3.2.4 Representativeness and balance	149
4.3.2.5 Ethical considerations	150
4.4 Data analysis	151
4.4.1 Sources of potential authorial stance markers	152
4.4.2 Categorizing authorial stance markers	154
4.4.2.1 Criteria for identifying authorial stance markers	154
4.4.2.2 Epistemic modals vs. non-epistemic modals	162
4.4.2.3 Fuzzy cases	172
4.4.3 The Tagging Scheme	178
4.4.4 Procedures	179
4.5 Summary	180
Chapter 5 Distribution of Authorial Stance Markers	182
5.1 Overall distribution of authorial stance markers	182
5.2 Distribution of epistemic stance markers	185
5.2.1 Distribution of certainty stance markers	191
5.2.1.1 Overall patterns	191
5.2.1.2 Specific variations in distributional frequency	193
5.2.1.3 Variation in frequency of certainty stance markers	

within CARE-C and CARE-E	197
5. 2. 2 Distribution of hedging stance markers	199
5. 2. 2. 1 Overall patterns	199
5. 2. 2. 2 Specific variation in frequency of hedging stance markers	201
5. 2. 3 Distributions of evidentiality markers	231
5. 2. 4 Summary	234
5. 3 Distribution of attitudinal stance markers	236
5. 3. 1 Distribution of affect stance markers	238
5. 3. 1. 1 Affect stance markers; adverbs	238
5. 3. 1. 2 Affect stance markers; adjectives	239
5. 3. 1. 3 Affect stance markers; verbs, nouns, and multiword expressions	240
5. 3. 2 Distribution of evaluation stance markers	240
5. 3. 2. 1 Evaluation stance markers; adverbs	240
5. 3. 2. 2 Evaluation stance markers; adjectives	241
5. 3. 2. 3 Evaluation stance markers; verbs	242
5. 3. 2. 4 Evaluation stance markers; nouns	242
5. 3. 2. 5 Evaluation stance markers; modals	244
5. 3. 2. 6 Evaluation stance markers; multiword expressions	244
5. 4 Distribution of style-of-speaking stance markers	245
5. 5 Summary	247

Chapter 6 Intratextual Variation of Authorial Stance Marker Use

.....	250
6. 1 Overall distribution of stance markers in different sections of CARE-C and CARE-E	250
6. 2 Distribution of epistemic stance markers across sections	256
6. 2. 1 Distribution of epistemic hedging stance markers across rhetorical sections	261

6. 2. 2	Distribution of certainty stance markers across sections	272
6. 2. 3	Distribution of evidentiality markers across sections	274
6. 2. 4	Summary	275
6. 3	Distribution of attitudinal stance markers across sections	278
6. 4	Distribution of style-of-speaking stance markers across sections	282
6. 5	Summary	284

Chapter 7 The Multifunctionality of Authorial Stance Markers

		286
7. 1	Introduction	286
7. 2	The transactional functions of authorial stance markers	287
7. 2. 1	Intensifying an illocutionary force	288
7. 2. 2	Mitigating an illocutionary force	290
7. 3	The interactional functions of authorial stance markers	296
7. 3. 1	Achieving politeness	296
7. 3. 2	Exhibiting personal involvement	299
7. 3. 3	Avoiding unnecessary risks	301
7. 3. 4	Shunning possible responsibility for propositions	302
7. 4	Summary	303

Chapter 8 Findings, Implications and Limitations

8. 1	Introduction	305
8. 2	Major findings	305
8. 3	Implications	309
8. 3. 1	Theoretical implications	309

8.3.2	Pedagogical implications	312
8.4	Limitations	315
8.4.1	Methodological issues	315
8.4.2	Generalizability issues	317
8.5	Recommendations for future research	318
8.6	Summary	319
References		321
Appendix 1	List of authorial stance markers identified in the data	355
Appendix 2	PhD dissertations used in CARE-C	364
Appendix 3	Journal Articles used in CARE-E	365
Appendix 4	Specific variation in frequency of certainty stance markers within CARE-C and CARE-E	368
Appendix 5	Distributional variation of specific attitudinal stance markers	370
Appendix 6	Excerpts of CARE-C and CARE-E	371

Introduction

This study is to analyze evaluative discourse in the context of English academic writing, with special reference to the use of authorial stance markers by Chinese advanced learners of English at the doctoral level' and native or near-native English expert writers. There is a strong underlying pedagogic intention in this study to make the nature of evaluative discourse more apparent, accessible, and available for novice academic writers. The content of this study applies most immediately to English for Academic Purposes (Robinson, 1991), a subdivision of English for Specific Purposes (ESP). The objective is to reveal the ways in which academic knowledge is socially constructed in and through interpersonal discourse.

0.1 Motivation for the study

This section explains the factors which motivate the choice of the present research topic and the data upon which this study is based.

0.1.1 Inadequate use of authorial stance markers in Chinese EFL writings

The focus of this study is on the use of authorial stance markers by Chinese advanced learners of English. The interest grew out of my

own experience of teaching and researching in English academic discourse at tertiary level, and my first-hand recognition of the difficulties many college and university students experienced in academic English writing.

In their process of preparing English academic papers or doing research-related work, Chinese teachers and students in colleges and universities come across the persistently discouraging issue of how to show their evaluative stance toward, or critical opinions on, other researchers' findings. Teachers often find a lack of critical perspective in students' work, which seems to show that students are not equipped with the ability to question or evaluate knowledge. When they do show their stance towards other researchers or their findings, students may more often than not experience some difficulties in using evaluative linguistic resources appropriately and adequately in academic discourse. Some teachers may even find difficulty in assisting students to develop a critical stance in exploring and constructing knowledge. This apparent lack of critique in students' writing is sometimes accounted for in the literature in terms of naivety, unwillingness, or incapability. For instance, Groom (2000) suggests that many L2 student writers do not have a clear understanding of the nature and function of argument as an academic genre. They do not appreciate that they are expected to develop a position and mark their authorial stance in relation to a question, issue or field, or a position in relation to the contributions of other sources within a field. They are unaware of the fact that an adequate and appropriate use of evaluative stance markers is required in academic research texts. Alternatively, L2 writers may fail to attribute a proposition clearly to an author and thus be held to be responsible for a proposition that they actually do not agree with; they may be too dependent on source texts and fail to achieve a distinctive voice in their own text. Chinese EFL writers are sometimes found even unwilling or reluctant to express their

authorial stance and posit a critical view of a published author whom they regard as necessarily having greater insight or they may simply lack confidence that they have in fact understood the crucial aspects of what they have read.

To express authorial stance appropriately in English is a complex task for language learners, which is critical to successful academic writing. To be effective, writers need to make claims and assertions which academic readers judge to be warranted and which reflect appropriate social interactions. Statements must not indicate the extent of the writer's conviction in their truth, but also convey a suitable degree of deference and modesty to the audience (Coates, 1987; Stubbs, 1986).

Researchers have noted that advanced learners, even though they have mastered the basic rules of syntax and morphology, still experience difficulty in the adept use of rhetorical skills, especially the construction of authorial stance in their academic research discourse (Lorenz, 1998; Petch-Tyson, 1998). These skills allow the writers to use language flexibly to adopt positions, express points of view and signal allegiances (Stubbs, 1986). The problems of manipulating epistemic stance in academic discourse, for example, even persist for L2 writers at the postgraduate level where PhD supervisors are often required to counsel the need for appropriate degrees of qualification and confidence in expressing claims (Dudley-Evans, 1992: 47). Therefore, mastering English academic discourse is not restricted to mastering English vocabulary, syntax, morphology, and the genre schemata of the discipline in question. It is also crucial to master the rhetorical strategies and genre practices specific to English academic discourse. The ability to manage personal stance in academic discourse is important for researchers who want to express themselves and read academic texts in English.

Few studies so far are specifically directed to the use of authorial stance markers by Chinese EFL writers in their academic research