

*Stance and Engagement: A Comparative Analysis of Hyland and
Fu's Models*

Tuqa Mohammed Abed

tuqa1abed@gmail.com

Prof. Baida' Faisel Noori /Ph.D

baydaa.alarajy@coart.uobaghdad.edu.iq

College of Arts, University of Baghdad



الموقف والالتزام: تحليل مقارن لنماذج هايلاند وفو

تقى محمد عبد

أ.د. بیداء فیصل نوری

كلية الآداب، جامعة بغداد

المستخلص

يستعرض هذا البحث النماذج النظرية للموقف والتفاعل في الكتابة السياسية كما طورها كين هايلاند وشياولي فو، وهما من الشخصيات البارزة في مجال تحليل الخطاب. يركز نموذج هايلاند على الجوانب التفاعلية للكتابة السياسية، مسلطاً الضوء على الأدوات اللغوية التي تعزز التفاعل بين الكاتب والقارئ مثل التحولات والمعززات، كما ورد في مؤلفاته (هايلاند، ٢٠٠٥). في المقابل، يتضمن نموذج فو العناصر الثقافية والسياقية، مؤكداً على أهمية الميتاديسكورس في تشكيل هذه التفاعلات السياسية (فو، ٢٠١٢). تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقديم تحليل مقارن شامل للإطارات والمنهجيات والتطبيقات لكلا النموذجين. يغوص البحث في الأساسيات النظرية لكل نموذج ومساهماتها في تطوير مجال تحليل الخطاب، بالإضافة إلى تأثيرهما على الكتابة السياسية في مختلف التخصصات. من خلال هذا التحليل، يسعى البحث لإبراز قوة وقيود كل نموذج، مقدماً رؤى حول كيفية دمجهما أو تطبيقهما في سياقات سياسية متنوعة. يعمل هذا النهج المقارن على تعزيز فهمنا لمفاهيم الموقف والتفاعل ويقدم إرشادات ثمينة للمعلمين والباحثين في تطوير استراتيجيات الكتابة السياسية التي تأخذ في الاعتبار الأبعاد اللغوية والثقافية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تقنيات الموقف، أساليب المشاركة، تفاعل القارئ، الخطاب السياسي، خطاب الأخبار.

Abstract

This paper explores the models of stance and engagement in political writing as proposed by Ken Hyland and Xiaoli Fu, two prominent figures in the field of discourse analysis. Hyland's model emphasizes the interactional nature of political writing, focusing on linguistic features that facilitate writer-reader relationships, such as hedges and boosters (Hyland, 2005a). In contrast, Fu's model incorporates cultural and contextual factors, highlighting the role of metadiscourse in shaping these interactions (Fu, 2012). By examining their frameworks, methodologies, and applications, this study aims to provide a comprehensive comparative analysis. The paper delves into the theoretical underpinnings of each model, their contributions to the field of discourse analysis, and their implications for political writing across disciplines. Through this analysis, the paper seeks to highlight the strengths and limitations of each model, offering insights into how they can be integrated or applied in various political contexts. This comparative approach not only enhances our understanding of stance and engagement but also provides valuable guidance for educators and researchers in developing effective political writing strategies that are sensitive to both linguistic and cultural dimensions.

Keywords: Stance Techniques, Engagement Methods, Reader Interaction, political discourse, news discourse.

1. Introduction

Writing is a multifaceted process that involves the articulation of ideas, the construction of arguments, and the dynamic interaction between writers and readers. It is not merely a vehicle for conveying information but a persuasive endeavor that requires writers to position themselves within their disciplinary communities (Hyland, 2005a). Central to this interaction are the concepts of stance and engagement, which refer to how writers express their attitudes, judgments, and relationships with their audience. Stance involves the ways in which writers convey their personal authority, opinions, and commitments, while engagement pertains to how they acknowledge and connect with their readers, guiding them through the argument (Hyland, 2005b).

Ken Hyland and Xiaoli Fu have made significant contributions to understanding these concepts through their respective models. Hyland's model focuses on the linguistic features that facilitate writer-reader interactions, emphasizing the importance of rhetorical choices in constructing a credible political voice (Hyland, 2005a). His work highlights the role of hedges, boosters, and attitude markers in expressing stance, as well as the use of reader pronouns and directives in fostering engagement (Hyland, 2005b).

In contrast, Xiaoli Fu's model incorporates insights from systemic functional linguistics and contrastive rhetoric, emphasizing the cultural and contextual factors that influence stance and engagement (Fu, 2012). Fu's approach considers how different cultural backgrounds can affect the way writers express their stance and engage with their audience, making it particularly relevant for cross-cultural studies. Her work underscores the significance of metadiscourse in shaping writer-

reader interactions, offering a broader perspective on the complexities of political writing (Fu, 2012).

This paper aims to compare Hyland's and Fu's models, exploring their theoretical foundations, methodologies, and practical applications. By examining these models, the paper seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of stance and engagement in writing, highlighting the strengths and limitations of each approach. Through this analysis, the paper offers insights into how these models can be integrated or applied in various contexts, contributing to the development of effective writing strategies that are sensitive to both linguistic and cultural dimensions.

2. Theoretical Background

The theoretical exploration of stance and engagement in writing provides a foundation for understanding how writers navigate the complex interplay of ideas and interactions within their texts. These concepts are integral to the construction of persuasive and credible political discourse, as they encapsulate the ways in which writers assert their authority and connect with their audience.

2.1 Stance and Engagement in Political Writing

Stance refers to the ways writers express their attitudes, judgments, and commitments in their texts, serving as a reflection of their personal and professional identity (Hyland, 2005a). It encompasses the linguistic strategies that writers use to convey their level of certainty, evaluation, and alignment with their claims. This involves the use of hedges, which allow writers to present their arguments with caution, and boosters, which emphasize their confidence in their assertions (Hyland, 2005a).

Engagement, on the other hand, involves how writers acknowledge and connect with their readers, guiding them

through the argument and inviting them to participate in the discourse (Hyland, 2005b). This aspect of writing is crucial for establishing a rapport with the audience, as it involves the use of reader pronouns, questions, and directives that draw readers into the text and align them with the writer's perspective (Hyland, 2005b). Both stance and engagement are essential for constructing a persuasive and credible text, as they enable writers to position themselves effectively within their disciplinary communities and foster a sense of solidarity with their readers.

2.2 Overview of Hyland's Model

Ken Hyland's model emphasizes the interactional nature of political writing, focusing on how writers use language to position themselves and engage with their readers. His framework identifies key linguistic features that contribute to stance and engagement, such as hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and reader pronouns (Hyland, 2005a). These features are not merely stylistic choices but are strategic tools that writers use to navigate the expectations and norms of their political communities.

Hyland (2005b) argues that these features help writers to construct a credible representation of themselves and their work, aligning with the expectations of their disciplinary communities. By employing these linguistic strategies, writers can effectively manage the level of personality in their texts, balancing the need to assert their authority with the need to acknowledge alternative perspectives and engage with their readers. This model provides a systematic approach to understanding the rhetorical choices that underpin successful political writing, highlighting the importance of interaction in constructing persuasive arguments.

2.3 Overview of Fu's Model

Xiaoli Fu's model builds on Hyland's work by incorporating insights from systemic functional linguistics and contrastive rhetoric. Fu (2012) emphasizes the cultural and contextual factors that influence stance and engagement, highlighting the role of metadiscourse in shaping writer-reader interactions. Metadiscourse refers to the linguistic elements that help organize the discourse, engage readers, and convey the writer's stance, serving as a bridge between the writer and the audience (Fu, 2012).

Fu's model considers how different cultural backgrounds can affect the way writers express their stance and engage with their audience, making it particularly relevant for cross-cultural studies. She argues that cultural norms and values play a significant role in shaping the rhetorical strategies that writers employ, influencing how they construct their arguments and interact with their readers (Fu, 2012). By examining these cultural dimensions, Fu's model offers a broader perspective on the complexities of political writing, providing valuable insights into how writers from diverse backgrounds navigate the expectations of their political communities. (Al-Rickaby, 2020)

3. Methodology

This paper employs a comparative analysis of Ken Hyland's and Xiaoli Fu's models of stance and engagement in political articles writing. The methodology is designed to systematically evaluate the theoretical foundations, key features, and practical applications of each model, as well as their contributions to the field of discourse analysis. By drawing on their published works and relevant literature, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how these models address the complexities of political writing.

The comparative analysis begins with a thorough review of Hyland's seminal works, including "Stance and Engagement: A Model of Interaction in political Discourse" (Hyland, 2005a) and "Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing" (Hyland, 2005b). These texts provide the foundational framework for understanding Hyland's approach to stance and engagement, highlighting the linguistic features that writers use to construct their arguments and engage with their readers. The analysis also considers subsequent studies that have applied or critiqued Hyland's model, offering insights into its strengths and limitations within various political contexts. (Moini and Salami, 2015)

Similarly, the analysis of Fu's model is grounded in her key publications, such as her exploration of interactional metadiscourse in cross-cultural contexts (Fu, 2012). Fu's work is examined in relation to its incorporation of systemic functional linguistics and contrastive rhetoric, emphasizing the cultural and contextual factors that influence writer-reader interactions. The study also reviews literature that has expanded on Fu's model, particularly in the realm of cross-cultural discourse analysis, to assess its applicability and relevance in diverse political settings.

The methodology involves a qualitative synthesis of the findings from these sources, identifying common themes and divergences between the two models. This includes an examination of the linguistic strategies each model prioritizes, and the role of cultural and contextual influences. By comparing these elements, the study seeks to elucidate how Hyland's and Fu's models can be integrated or applied to enhance our understanding of stance and engagement in political writing.

In addition to the literature review, the methodology incorporates a critical evaluation of the models' contributions to

discourse analysis. This involves assessing their impact on the field, their influence on subsequent research, and their practical applications in political writing instruction.

Overall, this comparative analysis provides a nuanced exploration of Hyland's and Fu's models, offering valuable insights into the rhetorical strategies that underpin effective political writing. Through this methodological approach, the paper contributes to the ongoing discourse on stance and engagement, advancing our understanding of how writers navigate the complex interplay of ideas and interactions in political texts.

Sample Analysis

Trump doesn't want aides with values. He wants servile minions.

This article, under analysis, is sourced from The Washington Post and addresses the 'Deal of the Century' proposed by President Trump, aimed at resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. **Stance and Engagement Analysis**

Stance features	
Hedges	"reportedly was drowning in debt" "according to The Post"
Boosters	"He totally is" "All the worst people" "It's astounding how thoroughly Trump has managed to do the polar opposite" "Giuliani, of course, was also running around Europe, conducting foreign policy as the president's 'personal' representative" "Trump doesn't want aides with principles and values. He wants servile minions who will do what he says, regardless of whether it's right or wrong." "'All the worst people' is a feature of the Trump presidency, not a bug."
Attitude Markers	"All the worst people" "astounding" "Don't hurt yourself laughing" "America's embarrassment" "the Peace Plan will be announced. I'm not holding my breath." "If you're not going to speak truth, why speak at all?" "Trump doesn't want aides with principles and values." "He wants servile minions"
Self-mentions	"How on earth does President Trump find them? All the worst people, I mean." "We keep hearing, the Peace Plan will be announced."

This analysis examines the writer's use of stance features, including hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mentions. These elements reveal how the writer expresses judgments, evaluations, and engages with the reader.

Hedges serve to introduce a level of uncertainty or a lack of full commitment to the propositions presented by the writer. For instance, the use of phrases like "reportedly was drowning in

debt" and "according to The Post" indicates a deliberate choice to distance the writer from absolute claims. By attributing information to external sources or presenting it as hearsay, the writer softens the impact of the statement and creates a buffer against criticism. This strategy not only protects the writer from potential rebuttal but also invites the reader to consider the information as one perspective among many, rather than an indisputable fact.

In contrast, boosters are employed to convey the writer's confidence and strong commitment to the propositions. Expressions such as "He totally is," "All the worst people," and "It's astounding how thoroughly Trump has managed to do the polar opposite" reflect a high degree of certainty and assertiveness. The use of strong, unambiguous language, such as "totally" and "astounding," serves to underscore the writer's unwavering stance. These boosters are instrumental in convincing the reader of the validity of the writer's perspective, creating a definitive tone that leaves little room for doubt or alternative interpretations. They reinforce the writer's authority and assertiveness, making the text more persuasive and compelling.

Attitude markers are linguistic tools that express the writer's emotional response or affective stance toward the propositions. In the data, phrases like "All the worst people," "astounding," "Don't hurt yourself laughing," and "America's embarrassment" reveal a range of emotions, including disdain, sarcasm, and skepticism. These markers not only communicate the writer's feelings but also aim to evoke similar emotions in the reader. By sharing these emotional cues, the writer seeks to align the reader's affective response with their own, fostering a sense of shared sentiment and solidarity. This alignment can be

particularly persuasive, as it draws the reader into a shared emotional experience, making the writer's arguments more relatable and impactful.

Self-mentions involve the explicit presence of the writer in the text through the use of first-person pronouns. Examples such as "How on earth does President Trump find them? All the worst people, I mean" and "We keep hearing, the Peace Plan will be announced" demonstrate this feature. The use of "I" and "we" personalizes the narrative, establishing a direct and intimate connection with the reader. This personal engagement not only emphasizes the writer's involvement and investment in the topic but also serves to establish credibility and authority. By positioning themselves within the discourse, the writer signals that they are not merely an observer but an active participant with a vested interest in the subject matter. This can enhance the persuasive appeal of the text, as readers may perceive the writer as a trustworthy and knowledgeable source.

Engagement Features	
Reader-Inclusive Pronouns	"You will recall that as a candidate he promised to bring to Washington all 'the best' people." "Don't hurt yourself laughing." "You're right to perceive that there's a pattern here."
Questions	"How on earth does President Trump find them? All the worst people, I mean." "How could it be that a person like Parnas was apparently running around Europe, conducting foreign policy on behalf of the president of the United States?"
Directives	"Leave aside for a moment whether Trump is guilty." "Don't hurt yourself laughing."

The use of reader-inclusive pronouns, such as "you" in "You will recall that as a candidate he promised to bring to Washington all 'the best' people," creates a direct link with the reader. This makes the reader feel included and suggests they share the writer's knowledge or memories, making them feel like an active part of the conversation. Similarly, "You're right to perceive that there's a pattern here" supports the reader's views, making them feel their observations are valid and aligning them with the writer's critical stance.

Questions also play a key role in engaging the reader. For instance, "How on earth does President Trump find them? All the worst people, I mean" expresses surprise and criticism, leading the reader to think about the situation in a negative light. This type of question does not need a direct answer but guides the reader toward a critical view. Another question, "How could it be that a person like Parnas was apparently running around Europe, conducting foreign policy on behalf of the president of the United States?" prompts the reader to question the situation's validity and encourages a skeptical perspective.

Directives are used to instruct the reader and shape their focus. The directive "Leave aside for a moment whether Trump is guilty" asks the reader to set aside their biases and consider a different aspect of the issue. This guides the reader's attention and affects how they perceive the discussion. The phrase "Don't hurt yourself laughing," while humorous, acts as a directive that reinforces the writer's critical view, encouraging the reader to share in the writer's sense of disbelief and amusement.

4. Comparative Analysis

The comparative analysis of Ken Hyland's and Xiaoli Fu's models of stance and engagement in political writing reveals both shared principles and distinct approaches. By examining their

theoretical foundations and key features, this section elucidates how each model contributes to our understanding of writer-reader interactions in political discourse.

4.1 Theoretical Foundations

Hyland's model is firmly grounded in the interactional view of language, which posits that political writing is not merely a transmission of information but a dialogic process involving negotiation and engagement with readers (Hyland, 2005a). This perspective emphasizes the role of linguistic features in constructing relationships between writers and readers, allowing writers to position themselves within their disciplinary communities and align their arguments with the expectations of their audience. Hyland (2005a) argues that these interactional elements are crucial for establishing credibility and persuasiveness in political texts.

In contrast, Fu's model, while also interactional, incorporates a broader perspective by considering cultural and contextual influences on political writing (Fu, 2012). Fu's approach is informed by systemic functional linguistics and contrastive rhetoric, which highlight the importance of understanding how cultural norms and values shape rhetorical practices. Fu (2012) contends that political writing is deeply embedded in its cultural context, and that effective communication requires an awareness of the cultural nuances that influence writer-reader interactions. This broader perspective allows Fu's model to address the complexities of cross-cultural political writing, providing insights into how writers from diverse backgrounds navigate the expectations of their political communities.

4.2 Key Features of Stance and Engagement

Hyland identifies specific linguistic features that signal stance and engagement, such as hedges, boosters, and reader pronouns (Hyland, 2005a). Hedges, for example, allow writers to express uncertainty or caution, thereby acknowledging alternative perspectives and inviting reader engagement. Boosters, on the other hand, convey confidence and assertiveness, reinforcing the writer's commitment to their claims. Reader pronouns and directives serve to directly engage the audience, drawing them into the discourse and guiding their interpretation of the text (Hyland, 2005b).

Fu expands on this by exploring the role of metadiscourse and the cultural nuances that shape these interactions (Fu, 2012). Metadiscourse refers to the linguistic elements that help organize the discourse, engage readers, and convey the writer's stance, serving as a bridge between the writer and the audience. Fu (2012) notes that writers from different cultural backgrounds may use metadiscourse differently to achieve engagement, reflecting varying expectations of reader-writer interaction. For instance, in some cultures, indirectness and politeness strategies may be more prevalent, influencing the use of hedges and other stance markers. Fu's model thus provides a more nuanced understanding of how cultural factors influence the rhetorical strategies employed in political writing, highlighting the need for sensitivity to cultural diversity in discourse analysis.

By comparing these key features, the analysis underscores the complementary nature of Hyland's and Fu's models. While Hyland provides a detailed framework for understanding the linguistic strategies that underpin stance and engagement, Fu offers a broader cultural perspective that enriches our understanding of these interactions. Together, these models offer

valuable insights into the complexities of political writing, emphasizing the importance of both linguistic and cultural considerations in constructing effective political discourse.

4.3 Methodological Approaches

Hyland's methodology is characterized by a robust combination of corpus analysis and interviews with political, which allows for the identification of common patterns of stance and engagement in political writing (Hyland, 2005b). The corpus analysis involves examining a large collection of research articles across various disciplines to identify linguistic features that signal stance and engagement. This quantitative approach is complemented by qualitative interviews with experienced political, providing insights into the rhetorical strategies and community norms that influence these linguistic choices (Hyland, 2005b). This dual-method approach enables Hyland to capture both the frequency and the contextual significance of stance and engagement markers, offering a comprehensive understanding of their role in political discourse. (Angela, 2022)

In contrast, Fu's model also incorporates corpus analysis but places a stronger emphasis on cultural and contextual factors, offering a more holistic view of political writing (Fu, 2012). Fu's methodology involves analyzing texts from different cultural backgrounds to explore how cultural differences can influence the use of stance and engagement strategies in political texts. By integrating insights from systemic functional linguistics and contrastive rhetoric, Fu's approach allows for a nuanced examination of how cultural norms and values shape rhetorical practices (Fu, 2012). This methodological focus on cultural context provides a deeper understanding of the diversity of political writing practices, highlighting the importance of considering cultural influences in discourse analysis.

4.4 Applications and Implications

Hyland's model has been widely applied in political writing research, providing a framework for analyzing writer-reader interactions across disciplines (Hyland, 2005a). Its emphasis on linguistic features such as hedges, boosters, and reader pronouns has informed numerous studies on political writing, offering valuable insights into how writers construct their arguments and engage with their readers. This model has also been instrumental in developing pedagogical strategies for teaching political writing, helping educators to guide students in effectively using stance and engagement markers to enhance their writing (Hyland, 2005a).

Fu's model offers additional insights into the cultural dimensions of political writing, making it particularly relevant for cross-cultural studies (Fu, 2012). By understanding the cultural influences on stance and engagement, Fu's model provides a framework for analyzing how writers from different cultural backgrounds navigate the expectations of their political communities. This has important implications for educators and researchers, as it highlights the need to consider cultural diversity in political writing instruction. By incorporating cultural awareness into writing pedagogy, educators can better support students in developing effective political writing skills that are sensitive to both linguistic and cultural dimensions (Fu, 2012).

Overall, the applications and implications of Hyland's and Fu's models underscore the importance of integrating linguistic and cultural considerations in political writing research and instruction. By drawing on these models, educators and researchers can enhance their understanding of the complexities of political discourse, ultimately supporting students in becoming more effective and culturally aware political writers.

5. Discussion

The discussion section delves into the strengths and limitations of Ken Hyland's and Xiaoli Fu's models of stance and engagement, highlighting how each contributes to our understanding of political writing. By examining these models, we can appreciate their individual contributions and explore the potential benefits of integrating their approaches.

5.1 Strengths and Limitations of Hyland's Model

the study will explore how these models help in analyzing political language to reveal underlying strategies, biases, or engagement tactics used by politician Hyland's model provides a clear and systematic framework for analyzing stance and engagement, focusing on the linguistic features that writers use to construct their arguments and interact with their readers (Hyland, 2005a). This model's strength lies in its ability to identify specific rhetorical strategies, such as hedges, boosters, and reader pronouns, which are crucial for effective political writing. By offering a detailed analysis of these linguistic elements, Hyland's model has significantly advanced our understanding of how writers establish credibility and engage with their audience (Hyland, 2005a).

However, one limitation of Hyland's model is its potential oversight of cultural and contextual factors that influence these interactions. While it provides valuable insights into the linguistic features of political writing, it may not fully account for the diversity of writing practices across different cultural contexts. This limitation suggests that Hyland's model might benefit from incorporating a broader perspective that considers how cultural norms and values shape rhetorical strategies in political discourse. (Al-Shunnag, 2014)

5.2 Strengths and Limitations of Fu's Model

Fu's model offers a more comprehensive view by incorporating cultural and contextual influences, providing a richer understanding of political writing (Fu, 2012). By emphasizing the role of metadiscourse and cultural nuances, Fu's model addresses the complexities of cross-cultural communication, highlighting how writers from diverse backgrounds navigate the expectations of their political communities (Fu, 2012). This approach is particularly valuable for understanding the cultural dimensions of stance and engagement, offering insights into how cultural differences can affect rhetorical practices.

However, the broader scope of Fu's model may also present challenges in its application. The emphasis on cultural factors requires a deeper exploration of the specific cultural contexts in which writing occurs, which can make the model more complex to apply. Researchers and educators may need to invest additional effort in understanding the cultural backgrounds of writers to effectively utilize Fu's model in their analyses and teaching practices.

5.3 Integrating Hyland and Fu's Models

By combining the strengths of both Hyland's and Fu's models, researchers can gain a more nuanced understanding of stance and engagement in political writing. An integrated approach that considers both linguistic features and cultural contexts can enhance our understanding of how writers construct their arguments and engage with their readers in diverse political settings. This synthesis allows for a more holistic analysis of political writing, acknowledging the interplay between language and culture in shaping rhetorical strategies.

Such an integrated approach can also inform pedagogical practices, helping educators develop writing instruction that is sensitive to both linguistic and cultural dimensions. By drawing on the insights from both models, educators can better support students in developing effective political writing skills that are adaptable to various disciplinary and cultural contexts. Ultimately, the integration of Hyland's and Fu's models offers a comprehensive framework for understanding the complexities of political discourse, contributing to the advancement of research and teaching in this field.

6. Conclusion

This paper has provided a comprehensive comparative analysis of Ken Hyland's and Xiaoli Fu's models of stance and engagement in academic writing, highlighting their respective contributions to the field of discourse analysis. Both models offer valuable frameworks for understanding the intricate interactions between writers and readers, each bringing unique strengths to the table.

Hyland's model excels in its systematic approach to identifying the linguistic features that facilitate writer-reader interactions, such as hedges, boosters, and reader pronouns (Hyland, 2005a). This focus on linguistic elements provides a clear and practical framework for analyzing how writers construct their arguments and engage with their audience. However, as noted, it may not fully capture the cultural and contextual nuances that influence these interactions, suggesting a potential area for further development (Hyland, 2005a).

On the other hand, Fu's model enriches our understanding by incorporating cultural and contextual factors, offering a more holistic view of political writing (Fu, 2012). By emphasizing the role of metadiscourse and cultural influences, Fu's approach

provides critical insights into how writers from diverse backgrounds navigate the expectations of their political communities. While this broader perspective is invaluable, it also presents challenges in terms of application, requiring a deeper exploration of cultural contexts (Fu, 2012).

Together, these models offer a comprehensive understanding of the complex dynamics of political writing. By integrating the linguistic focus of Hyland's model with the cultural sensitivity of Fu's approach, researchers and educators can develop more nuanced analyses and pedagogical strategies that address both the linguistic and cultural dimensions of political discourse.

Future research can build on these models to explore the dynamic nature of political writing across different cultural and disciplinary contexts. Such research could investigate how writers from various cultural backgrounds employ stance and engagement strategies, and how these strategies are influenced by disciplinary norms and expectations. Additionally, further studies could examine the pedagogical implications of these models, exploring how they can be used to enhance writing instruction and support students in developing effective political writing skills.

In conclusion, the integration of Hyland's and Fu's models offers a promising avenue for advancing our understanding of political writing. By considering both linguistic features and cultural contexts, researchers and educators can gain deeper insights into the complexities of writer-reader interactions, ultimately contributing to the development of more effective and culturally aware political writing practices.

References

- Fu, X. (2012). Persuasive Function of Interactional Metadiscourse in Advertising Discourse. Hebei Provincial Social Science Fund.
- Hyland, K. (2005a). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365>
- Hyland, K. (2005b). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.
- Angela, C. (2022). Stance and Engagement Markers in The Jakarta Post's Opinion Articles. *Buana Pendidikan: Jurnal Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Unipa Surabaya*, 18(2), 183-207.
- Moini, R., & Salami, M. (2015). Stance and engagement discourse markers in journal's "author guidelines". *Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)*, 34(3), 109-140.
- Al-Rickaby, A. K. (2020). A critical discourse analysis of stance and engagement markers in English and Arabic newspaper opinion articles in 2016. *Journal of University of Babylon for Humanities*, 28(4), 182-194.
- Al-Shunnag, M. (2014). *Stance in political discourse: Arabic translations of American newspaper opinion articles on the 'Arab Spring'*. University of Salford (United Kingdom).

