

EVALUATIVE LANGUAGE AND APPRAISAL RESOURCES IN ACADEMIC BOOK REVIEWS: AN SFL GENRE-BASED STUDY

Umaira Kanwal

M. Phil Scholar, Dept of Applied Linguistics, GC University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Email: umaira.kanwal07@gmail.com

Tooba Asrar

M. Phil Scholar, Dept of Applied Linguistics, GC University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Email: toobaasrar222@gmail.com

Dr. Hafiz Muhammad Qasim (Corresponding author)

Assistant Professor, Dept of Applied Linguistics, GC University Faisalabad, Punjab,

Pakistan. Email: muhammadqasim@gcuf.edu.pk

Abstract

This study examines the evaluative language and appraisal resources used in book reviews in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. Based on the Appraisal Theory of Martin and White (2005) in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), ten (full-text) academic book reviews published in the last ten years and retrieved from Linguist List and Humanities and Social Sciences Communications are analyzed. To explore how reviewers build evaluative stances, interpersonally negotiate meaning, and situate themselves in the scholarly communities, the analysis concentrates on three key appraisal systems: Attitude (Affect, Judgment, Appreciation); Engagement; and Graduation. There was a total of 387 appraisal instances coded in the corpus. Results show that Attitude resources make up 50.9% of the total, and Judgment is the predominant subcategory (33.3%), followed by Appreciation (10.1%) and Affect (7.5%). Graduation Resources make up 31.8% of the cases, with Force amplification being most common at 17.8%. The resources of engagement account for 17.3%, with the heteroglossic moves being overwhelmingly dominant over the monoglossic assertions. There is also an observation and discussion of disciplinary tendencies between the reviews of applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. The research helps to develop an SFL-based genre analysis of academic book reviews and gives implications for teaching academic writing and training translators. This article centers on the concept of Appraisal Theory and explores the use of evaluative language in academic book reviews, as revealed through genre analysis. The concept of Appraisal Theory is the center of this article, which examines the use of evaluative language in academic book reviews through genre analysis.

Keywords: Appraisal Theory, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), Academic Book Reviews, Evaluative Language, Genre Analysis, Academic Discourse

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of study

Academic book reviews hold a special place and are an under-investigated genre in the world of academic genres. In contrast to research articles, which generally describe original empirical research, or theoretical essays, which present intellectual arguments, book reviews play an interpersonal role: to mediate between an intellectual product by the author and the targeted scholarly community, giving evaluative judgment, disciplinary orientation, and attitudinal positioning (Hyland, 2000; Motta-Roth, 1998). The purpose of the book review is, therefore, essentially evaluative, and this makes it an extremely fruitful place for discussion of stance, authority, and emotion in the context of disciplinary norms.

In the last 20 years, evaluation research in L2 writing has taken significant scholarly ground, primarily as a result of the Appraisal Theory of Martin and White (2005), based on Systemic Functional Linguistics. Martin and White (2005) offer a tri-partite framework of Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation in Appraisal Theory, a framework used for the systematic examination of evaluative connotations and negotiations in text produced by speakers and writers. Appraisal Theory is different from previous theories of evaluation, which emphasized only the lexical items that convey sentiment; it considers the wider spectrum of

interpersonal linguistic devices writers use to position themselves in relation to the propositions, individuals, and objects of value (White, 2003).

Although Appraisal Theory is very rich as an analytical tool, it has not been applied systematically to the academic book review genre to a large extent. Some studies have been conducted on the book review as a target genre but they have not been the subject of sustained focus, such as in the field of literary fiction (Liu & Zhang, 2022; Hussain & Raza, 2021), journalistic texts (White, 2003), translation studies (Mahmood & Afzal, 2022), the field of political interview discourse (Malik & Ahmed, 2024), and cross-gender academic writing (Ansari & Babaii, 2005).

1.2 Research Questions

This study aims to fill this gap by using the Appraisal Theory approach on a corpus of 10 book reviews in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. The study is guided by three research questions:

1. Which of the appraisal resources (Attitude, Engagement, Graduation) are more commonly used in academic book reviews for the field of applied linguistics and sociolinguistics?
2. What role do the Engagement resources play in the process of reviewers' evaluative stance with respect to the claims of an author they are reviewing?
3. What are the patterns of Graduation found in the corpus, and how do they perform rhetorically in the review genre?

1.3 Significance of the Study

This study has significance on a number of overlapping levels. From a theoretical point of view, it helps to build up the cumulative genre analysis literature from the SFL perspective by offering a systematic, full-text appraisal-based description of the academic book review genre in the fields of applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. The study contributes to the theory of Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation systems by showing how they work differently in the discourse of reviews, a genre that has very institutionalized evaluative conventions and is linguistically complex. Methodologically, the study presents a replicable analytical model that involves close manual coding and cross-text comparison by frequency, which can be applied to future research of other academic genres, similar to the research article discussion section, peer review report, and editorial commentary. The implications for pedagogic applications are immediate with regard to academic writing instruction, especially for graduate students who must write in an evaluative language appropriate for their genre. As writers learn this code of conventions for book reviews, it will help them respond to the constant negotiations between Appreciation, Engagement (which is strategically focused on heteroglossic voices), and Graduation (which is asymmetrically used to signify an unequal relationship between the critic and the book), they will be better able to navigate the competing demands of critical honesty and professional collegiality. In addition, the study has implications for translator education, as this pattern contributes in a major way to the interpersonal meaning that is most susceptible to loss of translation across languages, that which is conveyed by Engagement and Graduation patterns, not just attitudinal lexis, as argued by Mahmood & Afzal (2022).

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Underpinnings

The theoretical underpinning of this study is based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory, proposed by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), which states that language is a social semiotic system with the basic function of meaning-making in a social context. SFL argues that there are three overlapping metafunctions for language: ideational, textual, and interpersonal, with the latter being the most pertinent to evaluative language research. It rules social positions, social relations, and attitudinal positioning of the writers and readers (Martin

& Rose, 2007; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). In SFL, genre analysis has proved to be a fruitful approach for developing an understanding of the way evaluative meanings are produced by recurring social functions and textually identifiable structures (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993). Motta-Roth (1998) presented a four-move structure for the book review: positioning the book in its field, describing the structure of the book, summarizing the content of the book, and evaluating the book. The generic architecture is a rhetorical structure in which the appraisal resources studied in the present study are deployed. It is important to note that the present analysis does not systematically map appraisal resources onto these 4 moves, which will be undertaken in future research. Martin and White's (2005) Appraisal Theory is divided into three mutually related systems. The Attitude system includes: Affect (emotional response, feeling); Judgement (evaluation, judgment of people's behaviour according to social norms); Appreciation (evaluation, assessment of objects, processes, texts from an aesthetic, functional point of view). The Engagement system is used for dialogic positioning, which includes both monoglossic utterances (a single, uncontested voice) and heteroglossic utterances (other voices are acknowledged through attribution, concession and distancing). The Graduation system adjusts the evaluative force, that is, how strongly or less strongly it is present, and how clearly or less clearly the boundaries of the categories are differentiated (Martin & White, 2005).

Interestingly, the Appraisal framework is not completely free of intra-debates. The distinction between sub-categories has been questioned, such as between Affect and Appreciation in the reader-directed evaluative constructions, and between Force amplification and Focus sharpening in the intensified positive assessments (Ngo & Unsworth, 2015). The following overlaps were also found for the current coding process and are discussed in Section 3.5.

2.2 Survey of Literature

Using the framework of Martin and White (2005), Ansari and Babaii (2005) compared the frequencies of all three types of appraisal in a corpus of 60 book reviews written by native English speakers in the humanities field, concluding that male writers are more prolific than female writers with regard to all three types of appraisal. The percentages of usage were 69% for Attitude resources and 12.5% for Engagement. Female reviewers utilized significantly more Affect resources, and male reviewers twice as many Judgment resources. The study has revealed that male reviewers have more evaluative attitudes when it comes to critical expression, and female reviewers have more conservative or indirect critical expression. Qasim et al. (2020) explored appraisal and transitivity resources used in editorials of Pakistani English newspapers by evaluating and analyzing the ideological stance constructed in the results of the general elections of 2018 in Pakistan. The findings showed that the newspapers employ appraisal and transitivity resources to have a specific view. In the study of Pakistani newspaper editorials on the general elections of 2018, a hybrid Appraisal and Transitivity framework was used that revealed the different ways in which various newspapers constructed their divergent ideology through evaluative choices (Iqbal et al., 2020). The Express Tribune claimed that there was "fairness" in the electoral process, while The Nation highlighted "irregularities and rigging" in the electoral process by using negative language of Judgment and high force of Graduation, thus continuously normalizing the ideology of the publishing entity. Another, more recent, study examined the discourses of the ministers during the Indo-Pak military conflict in May 2025, and it found that Pakistani ministers used negative Judgment and Affect in their speeches to represent India as a 'cowardly aggressor', whereas Indian ministers used a monoglossic tone, emphasizing military precision, to justify state actions and strengthen the national identity, suggesting that evaluative language during diplomatic crises is 'weaponized' to justify state actions and reinforce national identity (Ahmad et al., 2025).

A study of Ha Jin's short fiction employed the UAM Corpus Tool version 6, which identified the dominant attitude of negative Affect with a rate of 55% amongst 7,211 words, with the most frequent attitude being coded as unhappiness, insecurity, and dissatisfaction (Liu & Zhang, 2022). In a comparative study, Urdu ghazals were revealed to be optimistic in the Urdu of Bhabha, and Ajami was revealed to be a deep despair in which the negative emotion values of the ghazals of Ajami were also higher than those of Urdu ghazals (Hussain & Raza, 2021). Appraisal analysis of H.M. Naqvi's Home Boy showed how the process of negative societal Judgment worked as a means to restructure the immigrant identity (Naqvi & Siddiqui, 2023). These literary and political works do not directly address the task of book review, but instead demonstrate the diversity of types of appraisal to which the book review could be applied, and provide methodological background for the present study.

Appraisal Theory in translation studies sheds light on some of how evaluative meaning is retained or lost when moving from one language to another. Research has shown that there is a significant loss of meaning in Saraiki short stories as compared to their English translations due to the subjectivity of the translator and incommensurable socio-cultural value systems (Mahmood & Afzal, 2022). International interviews of the three Pakistani politicians were examined via the UAM Corpus Tool, where negative Judgment was found in Khan's, Appreciation for image management in Bhutto's, and affection with high-force Graduation in Sharif's (Malik and Ahmed, 2024). The academic book review has been studied largely using the rhetorical move approach (Motta-Roth, 1998; Hyland, 2000). Reviewers in the humanities were generally more critical in their expression than hard science reviewers, according to Hyland (2000). Thompson and Hunston (2000) postulated that evaluation is a ubiquitous text feature that reflects the author's value system, regulates social interaction, and deals with propositional organization.

2.3 Research Gap

Even with this line of work, there is still a need to develop a systematic use of Appraisal Theory for academic book reviews in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. The previous genre-based research was mainly on rhetorical move structure (Motta-Roth, 1998) and the critical directness in the different disciplines (Hyland, 2000), but neglected to map the entire tri-partite appraisal profile of genre. The present author is not aware of any published study that has used the complete Appraisal framework (all three systems) as the focus of the primary genre in academic book reviews, specifically in these disciplines. The present study directly fills this gap.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

In this study, the author uses a qualitative-interpretive research design with an approach of corpus-assisted discourse analysis (Baker, 2006). The qualitative dimension is characterised by close reading and systematic coding of evaluative language, and the corpus-assisted dimension refers to the evidence of frequency to support the interpretation made in the qualitative dimension. The simultaneous use of the two methods is based on the principle of the so-called appraisal-based genre analysis, which has been used in the field of Second Language Writing (SLW) for years (Hood, 2010; Bednarek, 2008).

3.2 Data Collection

The Corpus comprises ten book reviews written by academics in the year range 2022–2025 and taken from two open-access publication venues. Linguist List is an open-access electronic publication of the language review phenomenon, which has been around for a long time and is one of the main sources of review discourse in the field of linguistics. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications (HSSC) is an open-access, peer-reviewed journal of Nature Publishing in the field of the humanities and social sciences. Both were chosen as they

provide different venue contexts, a discipline-specific linguistics review platform, and a wider interdisciplinary humanities journal, allowing for an initial look at both venue and disciplinary difference.

Full text of all 10 reviews accessed and read. The reviews in the first eight parts focus on applied linguistics (experimental syntax, teacher beliefs, multilingual assessment, multilingual motivation, intercultural citizenship, grammatical categories, general linguistics, and translation linguistics). Reviews 9-10 focus on the topics of sociolinguistics (migration and language identity; decolonizing linguistics). The names and institutional affiliations of the reviewers were verified from the published byline of each review: Review 1 — Alexander Holmberg (Northern Arizona University); Review 2 — Jose Manuel Pagán Rodríguez (University of Tulsa); Review 3 — Emily Cilliler (University of Pannonia); Review 4 — Maria Teresa Martinez-Garcia (University of Valladolid); Review 5 — Alisha Reaves (Towson University); Review 6 — Yulia Baturova (University College Dublin); Review 7 — Samira Hamzehei (University of Texas at Arlington); Review 8 — Zhengbing Liu (Wenzhou University of Technology); Review 9 — Elise Alberts (Leiden University); Review 10 — Monika Rohmer (University of Hildesheim).

3.3 Analytical Framework

The Appraisal Theory (Martin and White, 2005) was used to code each review for the following categories:

Attitude:

Refer to the expressions of emotion, desire, satisfaction, or personal response (e.g., "I really enjoyed," "it left me puzzled," "readers will find it easy")

In the strongest of cases, such a statement indicates that the author(s) at least made commendable efforts in the field of authorship or scholarly endeavor (e.g., "the authors succeed generally"; "the authors' efforts are commendable").

Appreciation: Evaluations of the book's textual, methodological, or scholarly features (e.g., "well-organized," "comprehensive coverage," "limited depth")

Engagement:

Monoglossia: Assertions with no dialogic qualification (e.g., "this is an invaluable resource," "the approach is groundbreaking")

Heteroglossia: Concession (e.g., "while the volume provides valuable insights, some chapters would benefit"), Distancing (e.g., "it could be argued"), Attribution (e.g., "as the authors argue")

Graduation:

Words that intensify the meaning of verbs and nouns (e.g., "comprehensive," "pioneering," "groundbreaking," "highly effective")

Examples of such downgraders include the words "somewhat narrow," "relatively limited," and "certain chapters."

Focus: sharpening (a true integration) or blurring (a kind of overview) of category membership.

3.4 Data Analysis Procedure

All coding was done manually by the researcher through multiple close readings of the entire text of the review. As in appraisal studies (Hood, 2010; Bednarek, 2008), the unit of analysis was the evaluative clause or clause complex that was identified based on lexical and grammatical features of evaluation. Each appraisal resource was coded separately in a single clause that included multiple appraisal resources. Raw frequencies were counted, and percentages were calculated. Some individual review appraisal profiles were built first, then some consolidated cross-corpus frequency tables, and then a comparative discussion of the tendencies of the two sub-corpora, applied linguistics and sociolinguistics.

3.5 Inter-Rater Reliability

A random 20% sample was chosen from the corpus (two complete reviews), and this was independently coded by a second trained researcher who is also familiar with the framework of Martin and White (2005) to increase the reliability. The interrater reliability was determined by the Cohen's kappa coefficient ($\kappa = .81$), and is considered within the limits of good agreement (Landis & Koch, 1977). Differences were found to focus on the Affect/Appreciation interface of reader-directed evaluative constructions and the Force amplification/Focus sharpening interface of intensified positive assessments as described in the framework (Ngo & Unsworth, 2015). All discrepant cases were discussed and referred to Martin and White's (2005) definitional criteria to solve the discrepancy. It is recognized that with a sample of ten reviews, a better reliability procedure would be for at least a 40-50% interrater agreement, and future replications are encouraged to follow this.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

All data used in this study are from openly accessible publications. No person was involved in data collection, and no personal identifiable information was collected or processed. All the texts and all the reviewers are cited using standard academic citation information. The study meets the ethical requirements of a textual and discourse analysis study completely.

4. Data Analysis and Findings

4.1 Overview of the Corpus

A total of 387 appraisal instances were coded using the full text of the manual coding in the three systems. The highest number of attitude resources comes in the category of Attitude and represents 197 instances (50.9%), followed by Graduation (123 instances, 31.8%) and Engagement (67 instances, 17.3%). In Attitude, Judgement comes in second with 39 instances (10.1%), and Affect comes in third with 29 instances (7.5%). The instances of heteroglossic moves are more numerous than the instances of monoglossic assertions within Engagement (47 instances (12.1%) compared with 20 instances (5.2%)). The three most common in Graduation are: Force amplification (69 instances, 17.8%), followed by Force attenuation (34 instances, 8.8%) and Focus (20 instances, 5.2%).

4.2 Individual Review Analysis

Review 1: *The Oxford Handbook of Experimental Syntax* — Reviewed by Alexander Holmberg (Linguist List, 2024)

The following review is of one of the largest volumes of experimental syntax edited by Jon Sprouse, which contains 18 chapters. Appreciation resources dominate (14 instances, 78% of Attitude), in which Holmberg assesses the volume as "a comprehensive compilation of chapters," and notes "authors largely succeed in achieving their goals," and characterizes the volume as "a large contribution to the field. The coverage is judged to be in-depth, the interdisciplinary nature is rated highly, and the presence of other languages (not mainstream) in Chapter 14 is noted as exemplary of "commitment to inclusivity. Negative Appreciation is restricted to two: "some chapters give too much emphasis on formal methods" and "some readers may not have much background in formal linguistics so may find it as a potential drawback. Judgment resources are positive (3 instances): The authors are successful in the interdisciplinary objectives. Affect is used in just one instance where the reader is directing. Engagement is heteroglossic in the main (5 instances), with the Appreciation's most direct concession structure softening the negative: "While some chapters may be challenging for beginners, the diversity of topics ensures the book caters to a broad spectrum. The review ends with a monoglossic verdict: the handbook is "a large contribution to the field. The word "amplify" is common in the genre of Graduation (7 times: comprehensive, in-depth, substantial, valuable, numerous).

Review 2: *The Beliefs and Experiences of World Language Teachers in the US* — Reviewed by Jose Manuel Pagán Rodríguez (Linguist List, 2024)

In this review of the qualitative empirical study by Pamela Wesely, there are 15 Attitude instances, of which the chief resource is Appreciation (9 instances, 60%). Positive Appreciation calls the book a "solid resource for its intended audience," "innovative and meaningful theoretical research," and "a great resource for those interested in case study research. Negative Appreciation says, "The book is not a detailed survey of the literature," and "It is a reference book as a research tool. Resources for judgment (3 positive instances) commend the "sociocultural perspective" as "the most innovative aspect". The word affect is used three times in constructions that imply the reader's direction: affect could stimulate discussion in a graduate class; affect is a window on a world language classroom in the U.S., a context ignored by researchers during the last few decades. Engagement is heteroglossic (4 instances), in that the limitation passage is marked by concession: "As stated above, the book does not attempt a deep examination of the literature; so, as a research tool, it serves primarily as a reference. The monoglossic conclusion of the review—*The Beliefs and Experiences of World Language Teachers in the US* fulfills its purpose as a solid resource, finally putting the final word.

Review 3: *The Assessment of Multilingual Learners* — Reviewed by Emily Cilliler (Linguist List, 2024)

This review is unique in that it has the highest number of instances of Affect, 24% of all instances of Attitude in this review, of any applied linguistics review. Positive Affect involves the reviewer saying 'I really enjoyed reading the lesson ideas' and describing what one of the chapters contained as 'impactful and can be replicated.' Negative Affect is mentioned in "I was left wanting more detail". This personal voice sets Review 3 apart from the more applied linguistics-type reviews. Positive appreciation resources (9 instances) consist of comments such as "a highly beneficial read for pre- and in-service teachers" and "a rich example of how theory and practice could be linked together" while negative appreciation resources (9 instances) come in the form of repetition (some points were repeated frequently) and uneven chapter quality (some chapters seemed to stand out more in their explanation). There are 4 occurrences of judgment—" editors and authors achieve their goal" and "Chapter 18 gave an eye-opening description" (positive) followed by a lack of judgment that "some chapters seemed to stand out more. Engagement is heteroglossic (5 examples), and there are moves to distance it from the notion of limitations: "It may have been a tradition that had an impact on several authors but it would be interesting to hear more.

Review 4: *Multilingual Selves and Motivations for Learning Languages other than English in Asian Contexts* — Reviewed by Maria Teresa Martinez-Garcia (Linguist List, 2024)

This review has the highest force amplification count (8) of all applied linguistics reviews, while the evaluative language is generally positive. Appreciation (12 times, 71% of Attitude) views the volume as "a pioneering contribution to SLA and multilingualism studies," "an invaluable resource," and "a foundational text. The instances of Negative Appreciation are three-fold of concession: "some chapters would benefit from the inclusion of longitudinal data," "certain chapters could benefit from stronger thematic integration," and one chapter "could more directly address" identity connections. Judgement resources (3 positive) evaluate the editors' methodological approach and adherence to the latest SLA research. Motivation of Asian learners is the focus of this volume; instead of English, as is typical of most SLA research, the engagement is heteroglossic, with a high percentage of Attribution moves (5 instances). Two monoglossic instances back this up: "Multilingual Selves is an invaluable resource" and "this volume will serve as a foundational text.

Review 5: *Intercultural Citizenship in Language Education* — Reviewed by Alisha Reaves (Linguist List, 2024)

The applied linguistics sub-corpus has the most direct negative critical stance, with 5 negative Appreciation instances and 2 negative Judgement instances in this review. The argument for ICit over intercultural competence alone is not convincing, Reaves ponders: "The argument for ICit as opposed to a focus on intercultural competence alone is less convincing, and the realities of globalization alone are not convincing enough to presume that social justice action should be a primary goal of every world language classroom. Negative Judgment is found in the critique of the theoretical assumptions: "This assumption is that students from minoritized groups have a greater concern for social justice than others do. Yet, in this important competitive advantage, Positive Appreciation (6 instances) states that the book will be "very useful" for "those world language teachers who wish to integrate social justice" and that chapters are "well aligned with one another. The vast majority of corpora are heteroglossic (5 instances) and the longest Distancing moves are in the corpus: "it is unclear how they arrive at the conclusion". The Balance of Force amplification and attenuation is the most equal, with 4 amplification and 4 attenuation in the corpus, in line with the truly mixed evaluative orientation of the review.

Review 6: *Grammatical Categories in Linguistics and Education* — Reviewed by Yulia Baturova (Linguist List, 2025)

Appreciation prevails (14 instances, 78% of Attitude) and Baturova views the volume as "well situated in the current discourse of language teaching" and offers a "variety of compelling discussions, approaches and methodologies. Two chapters are singled out for their high-force positive Appreciation: Chapter 5 is described as "serves as a detailed insight" and "serves as an inspiration to researchers and educators" and Chapter 10 is described as "a detailed yet accessible visualisation" and "a particularly interesting approach to evaluation". Negative Appreciation (3 instances) is specifically described as minor: "the only criticism that may be noticed is the overlap between consecutive chapters (present perfect and simple past tenses), which is not unexpected and therefore not a major criticism. This is an explicit downgrade that is a unique aspect of this review's Graduation profile. In the applied linguistics sub-corpus, the highest monoglossia occurs in the engagement (2 instances): the book is well situated in the current discourse, and all chapters provide varied and compelling insights.

Review 7: *The Study of Language* by George Yule, 8th edition — Reviewed by Samira Hamzehei (Linguist List, 2023)

The overall highest Appreciation-dominant profile (11 instances, 69% of Attitude) and the lowest negative Appreciation count (2 instances) are found in the review of Yule's popular introductory textbook. Hamzehei finds that the textbook is "a comprehensible and user-friendly introduction to the study of language," it is "well-organized in terms of content," and each chapter follows "a similar pattern which makes it effortless to read and understand. Affect resources (3) are reader-directed: "A suitable book for new readers," and "Easily read and understood," and readers interested in reading further are catered to through a reading list. Judgment (2 positive instances) looks at Yule's decisions to update the edition. There's very little criticism in the review: just "subtle changes and extra information in some chapters, compared to the 7th edition" — and that's formulated with a Force attenuation. The Study of Language is well-organized in terms of content (2 monoglossic instances at the end of the review) and provides a comprehensible and user-friendly introduction. The one with the most instances in the corpus, aside from Reviews 4 and 9, is, of course, Force amplification (8).

Review 8: *Linguistics for Translators* by Almana and House — Reviewed by Zhengbing Liu (HSSC, 2025)

This review has the most comprehensive appraisal profile and the greatest number of Attitude tokens (31) in the corpus. The book is written by Ali Almana and Juliane House; the review is written by Zhengbing Liu of Wenzhou University of Technology. The positive Appreciation resources are dominant (22 instances, 71% of Attitude): The work is "an in-depth exploration," with "comprehensive coverage of both linguistics and translation" and as "a valuable resource for translators. Negative Appreciation (9 occurrences) is the most frequent in the corpus, and systematically lists limitations: "limited depth of coverage of certain linguistic branches," "relatively narrow scope in terms of the range of languages covered," "lack of emphasis on modern technological tools" and failure to establish "deeper interdisciplinary connections." The nine negative Appreciation instances are mitigated by Force attenuation: each is altered by the use of "somewhat", "relatively", "surface-level" and "certain" limits. The Limitations section begins with the very typical concession that is used in the corpus: "This book is very good at presenting linguistic theories and applications, but it does have some limitations.

Resources of judgment (5 instances) showed both positive ones ("commendable efforts to include examples from several languages," "designed the book to feature a clear educational structure") and negative ones ("this book may seem to be somewhat outdated," "fails to take advantage of opportunities"). Affect (4 instances) is always reader-oriented and not personally expressed. In general, engagement is heteroglossic (6 instances), while Attribution is the most common move, and monoglossia occurs at three points: abstract judgment, and final endorsement in the conclusion: "this work is a valuable resource for translators.

Review 9: *Life in a New Language* — Reviewed by Elise Alberts (Linguist List, 2025)

This sociolinguistics review is the second highest Attitude count (22 instances) and the highest Affect count in the corpus (5 instances), with this subject area being more tolerant of affective engagement as it deals with the sociolinguistic and ethnographic subject matter. Positive Affect refers to the migrants' stories: "a refreshing and immersive glimpse into the lives of migrants," and negative Affect to the described experiences: "the amount of Othering, exclusion, discrimination, and racism is simply exhausting; migrants' stories are particularly harrowing. This type of Affect use, where it is directed at the content instead of at the reader, is unprecedented in the corpus. Appreciation includes positive characterizations ("rich and valuable account," "clear thematic coherence," "notable contribution" of the ethnographic approach), and negative assessments (as limitations) "much of the material appears to be based on in-depth interviews with a relatively limited inclusion of field notes," "a more explicit engagement with the ethnographic process could have further strengthened the book's methodological contribution," and "a separate methodological chapter might have clarified the collaborative process"). Judgment (4 instances) is an overall evaluation of the thematic coherence of the book, but with a critical observation that "the primary focus of the book is on migrants' accounts, not the social and institutional environments in which migrants' accounts develop. Engagement is heteroglossic (5 instances), two monoglossic instances with direct final assessments.

Review 10: *Decolonizing Linguistics* — Reviewed by Monika Rohmer (Linguist List, 2024)

This review is the most distinctive in the corpus in comparison to the applied linguistics reviews on several scores: It is the most frequently occurring word for Judgment (8 occurrences, 30% of Attitude), the most frequently occurring word for Affect (5 occurrences), and the most frequently occurring word for monoglossia in the entire corpus (5 occurrences). The reviewer's own voice dominates, as evidenced in the following comments: "I felicitate this justified critique and active application of decolonization," "For me, this approach is groundbreaking,"

and "I genuinely enjoyed Chapter 11," and "I am still reflecting on the Ticha Project. The applied linguistics reviews are completely lacking in this first-person Affect and Judgment orientation. Positive Judgment (5 instances) involves direct statements about the editorial methods (groundbreaking, invites a new self-conception in academia), while negative Judgment (3 instances) poses critical questions as to the centrality of English to decolonization discourse and the limits of the ability to stretch decolonization. Appreciation (14 instances): This volume is "a great toolbox for lecturers," fills a gap, and as the reviewer observes, has "chapters of varying length, depth and approach," but also "needs other supplementary reading to get one's decolonial approach." Monoglossic statements are sprinkled throughout the review body, not just at the end, such as "For him/her this method is revolutionary," "The range is the very essence of this volume," "Any reader will find it easy to start reading," and "Hudley, Mallinson, and Bucholtz fill a void. The major difference in terms of Engagement from all the other reviews in the corpus is that this is distributed throughout, as opposed to at the end of the review.

Selma University publishes "Comparative Analysis: Applied Linguistics vs. Sociolinguistics" twice a year. "Comparative Analysis: Applied Linguistics vs. Sociolinguistics" is published twice a year by Selma University.

Table 3 below shows a direct comparison between the mean appraisal resource frequencies across the two disciplinary sub-corpora. The applied linguistics sub-corpus (Reviews 1–8) contains eight reviews and the sociolinguistics sub-corpus (Reviews 9–10) contains two reviews. Since this is an imbalance, the comparison is intended as a preliminary descriptive observation only and there are no inferential statistics reported.

4.3 Frequency Analysis

Table 1: Individual Review Appraisal Profiles — Raw Counts

Review	Book	App+	App-	App Total	Jud+	Jud-	Jud Total	Aff+	Aff-	Aff Total	Att Total	Hetero	Mod	Forc+	Forc-	Focus	Grade Total
R1	Oxford Handbook Exp. Syntax	12	2	14	3	0	3	1	0	1	18	5	1	7	3	2	12
R2	World Language Teachers	7	2	9	3	0	3	3	0	3	15	4	1	6	2	2	10
R3	Assessment Multilingual	5	4	9	2	2	4	3	1	4	17	5	1	6	3	2	11
R4	Multilingual Selves	9	3	12	3	0	3	2	0	2	17	5	2	8	3	2	13
R5	Intercultural Citizenship	6	5	11	2	2	4	1	0	1	16	5	1	4	4	2	10

Review	Book	App+	App-	App Total	Jud+	Jud-	Jud Total	Aff+	Aff-	Aff Total	Att Total	Hetero	Mono	Force+	Force-	Focus	Grand Total
R6	Grammatical Categories	11	3	14	3	0	3	1	0	1	18	4	2	6	3	2	11
R7	Study of Language (Yule)	9	2	11	2	0	2	3	0	3	16	3	2	8	2	2	12
R8	Linguistics for Translators	13	9	22	3	2	5	2	2	4	31	6	3	9	6	2	17
R9	Life in a New Language	7	6	13	2	2	4	3	2	5	22	5	2	8	4	2	14
R10	Decolonizing Linguistics	9	5	14	5	3	8	3	2	5	27	5	5	7	4	2	13
Total		88	41	129	28	11	39	22	7	29	197	47	20	69	34	20	123

App+ = Positive Appreciation; *App-* = Negative Appreciation; *Jud+* = Positive Judgment; *Jud-* = Negative Judgment; *Aff+* = Positive Affect; *Aff-* = Negative Affect; *Hetero* = Heteroglossia; *Mono* = Monoglossia; *Force+* = Force Amplification; *Force-* = Force Attenuation

Table 2: Overall Corpus Frequency Distribution (N = 387 total coded instances)

Appraisal System	Sub-category	Raw Count	% of Grand Total
Attitude	Appreciation (total)	129	33.3%
	— Positive Appreciation	88	22.7%
	— Negative Appreciation	41	10.6%
	Judgment (total)	39	10.1%
	— Positive Judgment	28	7.2%
	— Negative Judgment	11	2.8%
	Affect (total)	29	7.5%
	— Positive Affect	22	5.7%
	— Negative Affect	7	1.8%
	Attitude Subtotal	197	50.9%
Engagement	Heteroglossia	47	12.1%
	Monoglossia	20	5.2%
	Engagement Subtotal	67	17.3%
Graduation	Force Amplification	69	17.8%

Appraisal System	Sub-category	Raw Count	% of Grand Total
	Force Attenuation	34	8.8%
	Focus	20	5.2%
	Graduation Subtotal	123	31.8%
GRAND TOTAL		387	100%

4.4 Comparative Analysis: Applied Linguistics vs. Sociolinguistics Reviews

Table 3 below presents a direct comparison of mean appraisal resource frequencies per review across the two disciplinary sub-corpora. The applied linguistics sub-corpus (Reviews 1–8) comprises eight reviews; the sociolinguistics sub-corpus (Reviews 9–10) comprises two reviews. Given this imbalance, the comparison is presented as a preliminary descriptive observation rather than a statistically testable claim, and no inferential statistics are reported.

Table 3: Mean Appraisal Frequencies Per Review by Disciplinary Sub-corpus

Appraisal Category	Applied Linguistics (R1–R8) Mean/review	Sociolinguistics (R9–R10) Mean/review
Appreciation (total)	12.75	13.50
Judgment (total)	3.37	6.00
Affect (total)	2.37	5.00
Total Attitude	18.50	24.50
Heteroglossia	4.62	5.00
Monoglossia	1.62	3.50
Force Amplification	7.00	7.50
Force Attenuation	3.25	4.00

The most prominent disciplinary tendencies are: higher Judgment mean in sociolinguistics (6.00 vs. 3.37), higher Affect mean in sociolinguistics (5.00 vs. 2.37) and higher Monoglossia mean in sociolinguistics (3.50 vs. 1.62). In these findings, it is revealed that the sociolinguistics reviews used in the corpus have more explicit authorial voice, personal emotional involvement and unhedged statements than applied linguistics reviews. These are, however, descriptive tendencies that need to be confirmed with more extensive research, as there are only two reviews in the field of sociolinguistics to consider.

4.5 Thematic Analysis: Appreciation-Dominant vs. Judgment-Prominent Reviews

Each of these reviews is categorized as either Appreciation-Dominant or Judgment-Prominent. All four of these reviews are in one of two categories: Appreciation-Dominant or Judgment-Prominent reviews. In the ten reviews, two general evaluative attitudes are evident. The Attitude instances in reviews 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 are mostly Appreciation-dominant, meaning that Appreciation makes up 70% or more of the Attitude instances, and there are few Judgment or Affect instances. This orientation is typical of reviews of volumes that have a more clearly methodological or pedagogical orientation. Reviews 3, 5, 9, and 10 have more mixed profiles - reviews 3 and 10 appear to be from reviewers who have been personally engaged with the content, whereas reviews 5 and 9 are likely to be from reviewers who have found their own theoretical assumptions challenged by the content of the reviewed work. Review 8 is the most balanced Appreciation-Judgment profile, due to the explicit strengths-limitations structure of this profile. This thematic variation further demonstrates that Appreciation dominance in book reviews is dependent on the type of book reviewed, the reviewer's disciplinary similarities to the book, and the voice of the individual reviewer.

4.6 Key Findings

The corpus analysis yields six main conclusions. Appreciation is the most prominent attitudinal resource (129 instances, 33.3% of all attitudinal instances coded), which confirms the product evaluation as the most prominent attitudinal function of the genre. Second, the most common attitudinal category is Judgment (39 instances), with positive Judgment (28 instances) significantly more common than negative Judgment (11 instances) and the norms of professional collegiality of the genre. Third, Affect is the least common attitudinal category (29 instances (7.5%)); it shows a preponderance of positive and reader-directed uses in applied linguistics reviews, and more of a personal expression in sociolinguistics reviews, especially in reviews 9 and 10. Fourth, in both Review 10 and applied linguistics reviews, the number of instances of heteroglossic engagement is higher than that of monoglossic assertions (47 instances, 12.1% vs 20 instances, 5.2%), although the latter is mainly found at the end of the review. Fifth, there is a systematic asymmetry in the data concerning the Force: Force amplification (69 instances, 17.8%) outnumbered by Force attenuation (34 instances, 8.8%), and the Force amplifiers tend to occur in positive evaluative contexts, while Force attenuators occur consistently in the negative evaluative contexts. Finally, Focus graduation is the least common sub-category, at 20 instances (5.2%), but is seen consistently across all ten reviews at about 2 instances per review, and plays a meaningful blurring role in passages of negative Appreciation.

5. Discussion

5.1 Appreciation as the Genre-Defining Attitudinal Resource

This dominance of Appreciation (33.3% of all coded instances; 65.5% of all Attitude instances) is directly related to the genre-constitutive function of the academic book review, namely its social purpose of evaluating a scholarly text-as-product, the domain of which is dominated by the Appreciation sub-system (Martin & White, 2005). Based on the results, the researchers found that the Attitude resources are the greatest in number in academic book review corpora, which was also found by Ansari and Babaii (2005), and the present study confirms this point by showing that the sub-category Appreciation is specifically predominant.

The positive-to-negative appreciation ratio of the corpus (88 positive to 41 negative instances) further proves that academic book reviews in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics are mostly appreciation evaluative texts, as it is argued by Hyland (2000) that the academic book reviewer is constrained by his profession to be a collegial evaluator. Review 8 (Linguistics for Translators) has the most negative Appreciation count (9), due to the explicit structure of strengths-limitations displayed in this review, but even in this case, all the negative instances are tempered by Force attenuation. In the case of Review 5 (Intercultural Citizenship in Language Education), the reviewer's person-to-person substantive disagreements with the underlying premises of the volume are balanced by the positive and negative elements of the review, giving the review the most even positive-negative Appreciation profile (6 positive, 5 negative).

5.2 Heteroglossia, Academic Objectivity, and Genre-Specific Engagement

The focus of this lesson is on genre-specific engagement, Academic Objectivity, and Heteroglossia. This lesson centers on Heteroglossia, Academic Objectivity, and Genre-Specific Engagement. In all of the ten reviews, a predominance of heteroglossic Engagement (47 occurrences, 70.1% of all Engagement occurrences) is reflective of a basic epistemological orientation in academic review discourse – the exercise of scholarly objectivity in dialogic balance. However, as Martin and White (2005) suggest, heteroglossic resources create the writer as not just one voice in a disciplinary conversation, but as an authoritative or pronouncing voice of unchallengeable truths. This is a pattern different from the Engagement preferences of the political discourse. The study by Ahmad et al. (2025) revealed that the Indian

ministers preferred to use monoglossic tone, whereas the editorial analysis carried out by Iqbal et al. (2020) showed that publications with strong ideological positions preferred to assert positions as self-evident in monoglossic tone. The present corpus has provided evidence that the communicative purpose of the discourse genre has a fundamental influence on Engagement choices (Hyland, 2005; Bhatia, 1993). The distribution of monoglossic assertions in the corpus is of theoretical importance. In applied linguistics reviews (R1-R8), monoglossia is focused on the conclusions, thus establishing a rhetorical structure in which the heteroglossic balance in the body is followed by a direct verdict at the end. Review 10, on the other hand, sprinkles 5 monoglossic instances throughout the text and at the end, a sign of Rohmer's ideological stance towards the decolonization agenda. This allows the confirmation that monoglossia in academic book reviews is evaluated in terms of certainty and ideology alignment, which aligns with the findings of Iqbal et al. (2020) that ideology commitment boosts monoglossic assertion.

5.3 Graduation Asymmetry and Community Maintenance

The asymmetry of graduation—with 69 instances of Force amplification in the data, compared to 34 instances of Force attenuation—reflects the dual social role of academic assessment found by Thompson and Hunston (2000): to create critical authority, and to foster collegial relations. Most importantly, the distribution is not random; Force amplifiers are always found together with positive evaluative contexts, and Force attenuators are always found together with negative Appreciation and negative Judgment. The finding is consistently asymmetric throughout all ten reviews; it is the most stable cross-corpus finding in the study.

The only exception to this where there are more instances of force amplification than of force attenuation is Review 5 (Intercultural Citizenship), which is a review that is truly mixed in evaluative orientation and materially critical in nature, with 4 instances of force amplification and 4 instances of force attenuation. Review 8, with its large number of attenuations (6 times), has a systematic use of the attenuators somewhat, relatively, and surface-level to tone down the negative Appreciation instances.

The lowest frequency subcategory, which is "performs a meaningful rhetorical function" (20 instances, 5.2% of all coded instances), is the one with the highest amount of meaning. Focus sharpening creates a sense of positive Appreciation by building the book up to be truly fulfilling of its scholarly goals. The reviewers' full endorsement is gently held back by focusing blurring ("a kind of overview," "serves as a reference," "a kind of starting point") that is consistently repeated in all 10 reviews, a face-saving tactic that takes the reviewer's endorsement off the table.

5.4 Disciplinary Tendencies and Epistemological Culture

The descriptive disciplinary comparison shows that the Judgment, Affect, and Monoglossia means in the field of sociolinguistics reviews are higher than the applied linguistics reviews. The most extreme case is Review 10 (Decolonizing Linguistics): 8 Judgment instances, the highest in the corpus, 5 Affect instances (with personally expressed emotion) and 5 monoglossic assertions, not only in Affect but throughout the whole text. In his first-person narration, reviewer Rohmer writes: "I felicitate this justified critique, I can only say that this approach is groundbreaking for me, I really liked Chapter 11. The level of first-person attitudinal expression found here is clearly not typical for the eight applied linguistics reviews, which clearly demonstrate a disciplinary norm difference in personal voice in applied linguistics reviews. This discovery echoes Naqvi and Siddiqui's (2023) proof that Appraisal resources found in social texts are not detached from the ideological frameworks in which they are produced, and Hyland's (2000) argument that disciplinary cultures influence the extent to which critical comments and personal voice are allowed in academic texts.

5.5 Theoretical Implications: Appraisal Patterns and Genre Conventionality

The six key findings are found consistently across all ten reviews, and therefore are believed to reflect genre-level conventions of book reviews in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics, rather than the individual choices of each reviewer. This consistency is striking, considering the variety of texts reviewed, the two outlets for the reviews, the spectrum of sub-topics reviewed, and the 10 different reviewers from different institutional settings.

This would generate a theoretically fruitful question about the Appraisal Theory/Swales' (1990) genre framework relationship. According to Swales, genre moves fall into three categories: obligatory, conventional, and optional moves are moves that would make the text unrecognizable in its generic context; conventional moves are moves that are considered standard for the genre, and optional moves will not affect the meaning of the text in its generic context. The current results indicate that some of the appraisal configurations described above – Appreciation dominance, heteroglossic predominance, monoglossic conclusion closure in applied linguistics reviews, and Force graduation asymmetry - might serve as genre-level inter-personal constraints for the producers of academic book reviews in these disciplines. This would indicate that appraisal-system constraints can be added to the genre-constitutive features, along with the propositional move structure (Martin & Rose, 2007; Hood, 2010; Bhatia, 1993; Hyland, 2005) as part of the genre theory. But there is not enough of a corpus of ten reviews to say that any pattern is obligatory in its technical Swalesean sense. The present study identifies this as a worthwhile hypothesis to be confirmed by a more extensive, interdisciplinary corpus of texts.

6. Conclusion

It has investigated evaluative language and appraisal resources used in 10 book reviews in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics using the entire text of each of the 10 book reviews, which resulted in the identification of 387 evaluative instances in total across the 3 appraisal systems, applied to the 10 book reviews. Six key findings are reported: (1) Appreciation dominates 33.3% of all instances; (2) Judgment is the secondary Attitude, with 10.1% of all instances; (3) Affect is mostly reader directed, with 7.5% of all instances; (4) heteroglossic Engagement is more common than monoglossia, accounting for 12.1% of instances versus 5.2% of instances; (5) there is little evidence of systematic and significant inter-attitude Force graduation asymmetry; and (6) evidence of preliminary tendencies toward higher Judgment, Affect and Monoglossia in sociolinguistics reviews.

The study has implications for genre pedagogy as follows: graduate students and early career researchers must be explicitly taught about the Engagement and Graduation systems of academic evaluation, not only Attitude, so that they can produce genre-appropriate review discourse. In respect of translator training, the findings validate that the patterns of Engagement and Graduation are the ones that have the most subtle interpersonal significance and hence are most susceptible to loss and/or flattening when translated (Mahmood & Afzal, 2022).

Some limitations are the small number of reviews ($n = 10$), the small number of reviews from a given discipline (8 reviews from one discipline and 2 reviews from a different discipline), and the lack of inferential statistical analysis. Future work should be based on a larger sample of texts, preferably with fifty or more reviews per disciplinary sub-group; automatic coding using the UAM Corpus Tool; 40–50% inter-rater reliability sampling; and systematic mapping of the appraisal resources onto the four-move genre structure of Motta-Roth (1998) as developed by Ansari and Babaii (2005).

7. References

- Ahmad, S., Khan, R., & Pasha, N. (2025). Evaluative language in Indo-Pak conflict ministerial speeches: An appraisal perspective. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 24(2), 115–138.
- Alberts, E. (2025). Review of *Life in a New Language*, by I. Piller et al. *Linguist List*, 36(2083).
- Almanna, A., & House, J. (2024). *Linguistics for translators*. Taylor and Francis.
- Ansari, S., & Babaii, E. (2005). Appraisal resources in book reviews: Cross-gender variations. *Written Communication*, 22(3), 243–268.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. Continuum.
- Baturova, Y. (2025). Review of *Grammatical Categories in Linguistics and Education*, edited by H. Härtl & K. Zaychenko. *Linguist List*, 36(2379).
- Bednarek, M. (2006). *Evaluation in media discourse: Analysis of a newspaper corpus*. Continuum.
- Bednarek, M. (2008). *Emotion talk across corpora*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.
- Cilliler, E. (2024). Review of *The Assessment of Multilingual Learners*, by K. Mahoney. *Linguist List*, 35(3399).
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Hamzehei, S. (2023). Review of *The Study of Language* (8th ed.), by G. Yule. *Linguist List*, 34(2139).
- Holmberg, A. (2024). Review of *The Oxford Handbook of Experimental Syntax*, edited by J. Sprouse. *Linguist List*, 35(481).
- Hood, S. (2010). *Appraising research: Evaluation in academic writing*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hussain, T., & Raza, M. (2021). Evaluating emotional language: Urdu poetry of Bhabha and Ajami. *Pakistan Journal of Language Studies*, 5(1), 89–107.
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum.
- Iqbal, A., Raza, S., & Mahmood, T. (2020). Appraisal-transitivity analysis of editorials on Pakistan's 2018 elections. *Discourse & Society*, 31(4), 367–389.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159–174.
- Liu, W., & Zhang, H. (2022). Attitudinal resources in *Winds and Clouds over a Funeral: An appraisal analysis*. *Lingua et Litterae*, 9(2), 44–62.
- Liu, Z. (2025). Book review: *Linguistics for Translators* by Ali Almanna and Juliane House. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, 1373. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05738-3>
- Mahmood, F., & Afzal, Z. (2022). Appraisal analysis of English translations of Saraiki short stories. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 20(3), 211–229.
- Malik, A., & Ahmed, J. (2024). Evaluative language in political interviews with Pakistani politicians. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 21(1), 78–99.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause* (2nd ed.). Continuum.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Martinez-Garcia, M. T. (2024). Review of *Multilingual Selves and Motivations for Learning Languages other than English in Asian Contexts*, edited by A. Hajar & S. A. Manan. *Linguist List*, 35(3400).

Motta-Roth, D. (1998). Rhetorical features and disciplinary cultures: A genre-based study of academic book reviews in linguistics, chemistry, and economics (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

Naqvi, R., & Siddiqui, A. (2023). Belonging and displacement in Naqvi's *Home Boy*: An appraisal perspective. *South Asian Literature and Culture*, 12(1), 55–74.

Ngo, T., & Unsworth, L. (2015). Reworking the appraisal framework in ESL research: Refining attitude resources. *Functional Linguistics*, 2(1), 1–24.

Pagán Rodríguez, J. M. (2024). Review of *The Beliefs and Experiences of World Language Teachers in the US*, by P. M. Wesely. *Linguist List*, 35(3219).

Qasim, H. M., Sibtain, M., & Nawaz, M. S. (2020). An appraisal-transitivity analysis of editorials on the results of general elections-2018 in Pakistan. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 8(2), 95-115.

Reaves, A. (2024). Review of *Intercultural Citizenship in Language Education*, edited by K. Kong & A. Spenader. *Linguist List*, 35(1658).

Rohmer, M. (2024). Review of *Decolonizing Linguistics*, by A. H. Charity Hudley, C. Mallinson, & M. Bucholtz. *Linguist List*, 35(3511).

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation: An introduction. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 1–27). Oxford University Press.

White, P. R. R. (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text*, 23(2), 259–284.

Yule, G. (2022). *The study of language* (8th ed.). Cambridge University Press.