

Research Article

Adjectives, Evaluation, and Authorial Stance in Academic Discourse: A Functional and Corpus-Informed Linguistic Analysis

Rafael Gómez-Martínez ¹

¹Department of Linguistics, University of Granada, Spain

Abstract



Received: 12 November 2025

Revised: 2 December 2025

Accepted: 20 December 2025

Published: 01 January 2026

Copyright: © 2026 Authors retain the copyright of their manuscripts, and all Open Access articles are disseminated under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CC-BY), which licenses unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original work is appropriately cited.

Evaluation and stance are central to academic discourse, shaping how knowledge is constructed, negotiated, and legitimized within disciplinary communities. Among the linguistic resources that realize evaluation, adjectives occupy a particularly complex and theoretically rich position, functioning at the intersection of grammar, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse. This article offers an extensive, theoretically grounded analysis of adjectives as carriers of evaluation and authorial stance in academic writing, drawing strictly on established linguistic scholarship in grammar, corpus linguistics, discourse analysis, and appraisal theory. Integrating insights from structuralist linguistics, functional grammar, corpus-based studies, and critical discourse analysis, the study examines how adjectives contribute to epistemological positioning, argumentation, and interpersonal meaning in scholarly texts. The article situates adjectives within broader systems of stance marking, alongside adverbs, evidentials, and metadiscursive devices, while emphasizing their unique capacity to encode gradability, subjectivity, and disciplinary norms. Methodologically, the study adopts a qualitative, text-based analytical framework informed by corpus findings reported in the literature, allowing for a nuanced interpretation of adjectival evaluation without reliance on numerical modeling. The results demonstrate that adjectives play a crucial role in shaping claims, signaling alignment or distance from prior research, and negotiating authority within academic communities. The discussion highlights theoretical implications for models of evaluation, addresses limitations inherent in text-based analyses, and outlines directions for future research, particularly in cross-linguistic and pedagogical contexts. Overall, the article argues that adjectives are not merely descriptive elements but fundamental resources for the construction of academic voice and epistemic responsibility.

Keywords: Academic discourse, adjectives, evaluation, authorial stance, appraisal, corpus linguistics

INTRODUCTION

Academic discourse is not a neutral medium for the transmission of facts; rather, it is a socially situated practice in which knowledge claims are advanced, evaluated, contested, and eventually institutionalized. Linguistic research over several decades has consistently demonstrated that scholarly writing is deeply infused with evaluative and interpersonal meanings, despite long-standing ideological assumptions about objectivity and impersonality in academic prose (Hyland, 1998; Hunston and Thompson, 2000). Within this context, the study of evaluation and stance has emerged as a central concern in discourse analysis, pragmatics, and applied linguistics, particularly with respect to how writers position themselves in relation to their claims, their readers, and the wider disciplinary community.

Among the linguistic resources that realize evaluation, adjectives have often been treated as secondary to more overt stance markers such as modal verbs, hedges, and stance adverbials. Traditional grammatical descriptions frequently frame adjectives as descriptive modifiers whose primary function is to attribute properties to nouns (Bloomfield, 1933; Bosque Muñoz, 1990). However, a growing body of research challenges this reductive view, demonstrating that adjectives play a crucial role in expressing subjectivity, evaluation, and epistemological stance, especially in academic discourse (Ferris, 1993; Dixon, 2004). Adjectives such as significant, important, problematic, or innovative do not merely describe entities; they encode judgments about relevance, value, and legitimacy, thereby shaping the argumentative structure of scholarly texts.

The importance of adjectives becomes even more evident when situated within broader theories of evaluation and stance. Functional and discourse-oriented approaches emphasize that evaluation is not an optional embellishment but a constitutive dimension of meaning-making in text (Hunston and Thompson, 2000; Martin, 2000). From this perspective, adjectives are integral components of appraisal systems, contributing to attitudinal meaning, graduation, and engagement. Corpus-based studies further reveal that evaluative adjectives are patterned in discipline-specific ways, reflecting epistemological norms and rhetorical expectations (Biber et al., 1999; Conrad and Biber, 2000). These findings underscore the need for a comprehensive theoretical account that integrates grammatical, semantic, and discourse-level analyses of adjectives.

Despite substantial advances in the study of stance and evaluation, significant gaps remain in the literature. Much research has focused on individual categories such as hedging devices or stance adverbials, often treating adjectives in a fragmented or ancillary manner. Moreover, while corpus linguistics has provided valuable quantitative insights into frequency and distribution, there is a need for deeper qualitative elaboration that situates adjectival evaluation within broader theoretical frameworks of meaning and interaction. Additionally, cross-linguistic and pedagogical dimensions of adjectival stance remain underexplored, particularly in relation to how non-native writers negotiate evaluative norms in academic writing (Hewings and Hewings, 2002; Fløttum et al., 2006). The present article seeks to address these gaps by offering an extensive, theoretically elaborated analysis of adjectives as resources for evaluation and authorial stance in academic discourse. Drawing strictly on established linguistic scholarship, the study synthesizes insights from structuralist linguistics, functional grammar, corpus-based analysis, appraisal theory, and critical linguistics. Rather than summarizing existing findings, the article engages in detailed theoretical discussion, examining how adjectives function at multiple levels of linguistic organization and how they contribute to the construction of academic voice. By doing so, it aims to advance our understanding of the subtle yet powerful role of adjectives in scholarly communication and to provide a foundation for future research in discourse analysis, applied linguistics, and academic writing pedagogy.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological orientation of this study is qualitative and theory-driven, grounded in close textual analysis informed by corpus-based findings reported in the literature. Rather than constructing an original corpus or engaging in statistical modeling, the study adopts a meta-analytical approach that synthesizes and interprets empirical observations from established research on academic discourse, evaluation, and adjectival usage. This approach is particularly appropriate given the article's aim of extensive theoretical elaboration and conceptual integration, as opposed to hypothesis testing or numerical generalization.

The analytical framework draws on several complementary traditions in linguistics. First, descriptive and structural accounts of adjectives provide the grammatical foundation for the analysis (Bloomfield, 1933; Dixon, 1982; Ferris, 1993). These works elucidate the syntactic positions, semantic properties, and classificatory challenges associated with

adjectives, establishing a baseline for understanding their linguistic behavior. Second, corpus-based grammar and discourse studies offer empirical insights into how adjectives function in actual language use, particularly in academic registers (Biber et al., 1999; Conrad and Biber, 2000). These studies inform the discussion of frequency, collocation, and distributional patterns without requiring the replication of quantitative methods.

Third, the study is informed by theories of evaluation and stance developed within discourse analysis and systemic functional linguistics. The concept of evaluation, as articulated by Hunston and Thompson (2000), provides a unifying lens for examining how adjectives encode values, judgments, and epistemic positions. Appraisal theory, particularly Martin's (2000) elaboration of attitudinal and gradational meaning, offers a nuanced framework for interpreting the interpersonal functions of adjectives. Finally, insights from critical linguistics and enunciation theory foreground the ideological and subjective dimensions of adjectival evaluation, emphasizing that linguistic choices are never neutral but always embedded in social relations and power structures (Fowler and Kress, 1979; Kerbrat-Orrechioni, 1980).

Analytically, the study proceeds through iterative close reading of exemplary patterns discussed in the literature, focusing on how adjectives contribute to argumentation, epistemological stance, and disciplinary positioning. Particular attention is paid to evaluative adjectives commonly found in academic discourse, such as those expressing importance, certainty, limitation, or novelty. These adjectives are analyzed in terms of their semantic orientation, pragmatic function, and interaction with other stance markers. By triangulating insights from multiple theoretical perspectives, the methodology enables a richly textured account of adjectival evaluation that transcends purely formal or frequency-based descriptions.

RESULTS

The theoretical and text-based analysis reveals that adjectives function as central resources for evaluation and stance in academic discourse, operating at the intersection of descriptive meaning and interpersonal positioning. One of the most salient findings emerging from the literature is that adjectives frequently encode epistemological judgments that shape how knowledge claims are presented and interpreted. Adjectives such as significant, robust, limited, or controversial serve to qualify propositions, signaling degrees of confidence, relevance, or acceptability within a disciplinary framework (Hyland, 1998; Dahl, 2008). These evaluative functions are not incidental but systematically patterned according to genre and discipline.

Corpus-based descriptions demonstrate that academic writing exhibits a high density of evaluative adjectives compared to other registers, particularly in sections where authors articulate research contributions, discuss results, or situate their work within existing scholarship (Biber et al., 1999). Importantly, these adjectives often co-occur with abstract nouns such as analysis, approach, evidence, or argument, forming collocational patterns that reinforce evaluative meaning. Such patterns suggest that adjectival evaluation is deeply embedded in the lexico-grammatical fabric of academic discourse, rather than being confined to overt expressions of opinion.

Another key result concerns the role of adjectives in constructing authorial stance through gradation and comparison. Many evaluative adjectives are inherently gradable, allowing writers to calibrate the strength of their claims with considerable precision. This gradability supports nuanced positioning, enabling authors to advance claims cautiously while maintaining credibility (Hyland, 1998). For example, the difference between describing a result as important versus crucial reflects a deliberate rhetorical choice that signals varying degrees of commitment. Such choices are central to the negotiation of authority and responsibility in scholarly writing.

The analysis also highlights the interaction between adjectives and other stance-marking devices. Adjectives rarely function in isolation; instead, they are embedded within complex structures involving adverbs, modal verbs, and evidential expressions. Conrad and Biber (2000) demonstrate that adjectival evaluation often co-occurs with stance

adverbials, creating layered expressions of attitude and certainty. This interaction underscores the need to view adjectives as part of a broader system of evaluation rather than as discrete elements.

From a discourse-analytic perspective, adjectives contribute to argumentation by framing entities and propositions in value-laden terms. Barton (1993) emphasizes that evaluative language plays a crucial role in academic argumentation, guiding readers toward preferred interpretations. Adjectives that characterize prior research as inadequate or influential implicitly position the current study in relation to existing knowledge, thereby constructing a narrative of progress or critique. These evaluative moves are essential to the rhetorical structure of research articles, even when they are presented in ostensibly objective language.

Cross-linguistic studies further suggest that while the evaluative function of adjectives is universal, the specific patterns of usage vary across languages and academic cultures (Fløttum et al., 2006; Lopez Ferrero and Oliver del Olmo, 2008). Such variation reflects differing norms regarding explicitness, subjectivity, and authorial presence, highlighting the culturally situated nature of adjectival stance.

DISCUSSION

The findings discussed above have significant theoretical implications for our understanding of evaluation, stance, and grammatical categorization in academic discourse. One of the most important implications is the challenge posed to traditional distinctions between descriptive and evaluative language. Adjectives, often categorized as descriptive modifiers in classical grammar, emerge as powerful vehicles of subjectivity and epistemological positioning. This observation aligns with broader critiques of structuralist models that prioritize form over function, suggesting instead that meaning must be understood in relation to discourse context and communicative purpose (Firth, 1957; Dixon, 2004).

From the perspective of appraisal theory, the analysis reinforces the view that adjectives are central to the realization of attitudinal meaning. Martin's (2000) framework highlights how adjectives encode affect, judgment, and appreciation, all of which are crucial in academic writing despite norms of impersonality. The subtlety of adjectival evaluation allows writers to balance the demands of objectivity with the need to persuade and align readers. This balance is particularly evident in the strategic use of seemingly neutral adjectives that nevertheless carry strong evaluative implications within a given disciplinary context.

The interaction between adjectives and other stance markers also invites reconsideration of how evaluative systems are modeled. Rather than treating adjectives, adverbs, and modal verbs as separate categories, the evidence points toward an integrated system of stance marking in which different grammatical resources work together to construct meaning (Conrad and Biber, 2000; Hyland, 2005). This integrated perspective has important methodological implications, suggesting that analyses focusing on single categories may overlook the cumulative and interactive nature of evaluation in discourse. At the same time, the study acknowledges several limitations inherent in its approach. The reliance on secondary corpus findings and qualitative interpretation means that the analysis cannot claim empirical generalizability in a statistical sense. Moreover, the focus on English-language scholarship may obscure important cross-linguistic differences that warrant further investigation. Future research could build on the theoretical insights developed here by conducting comparative corpus studies across languages and disciplines, as well as by exploring pedagogical applications for academic writing instruction.

Another important avenue for future research concerns the acquisition and use of evaluative adjectives by novice and non-native writers. Studies by Hewings and Hewings (2002) and Chavez (2008) indicate that learners often struggle with the pragmatic norms governing evaluation in academic writing, either overusing or underusing evaluative adjectives. A deeper understanding of adjectival stance could inform teaching practices

that help writers develop a more nuanced and discipline-appropriate academic voice. Finally, the critical dimension of adjectival evaluation deserves continued attention. Critical linguistics reminds us that evaluative choices are not merely stylistic but ideological, reflecting and reinforcing particular worldviews and power relations (Fowler and Kress, 1979). In academic discourse, adjectives contribute to the construction of legitimacy and authority, influencing whose knowledge is valued and whose is marginalized. Recognizing this dimension underscores the ethical responsibility inherent in scholarly communication.

CONCLUSION

This article has argued that adjectives are central, though often underappreciated, resources for evaluation and authorial stance in academic discourse. Drawing on a wide range of linguistic scholarship, the analysis has demonstrated that adjectives function far beyond simple description, encoding epistemological judgments, shaping argumentation, and mediating interpersonal relations within scholarly communities. Through their gradability, collocational patterns, and interaction with other stance markers, adjectives enable writers to negotiate credibility, align with or distance themselves from prior research, and position their contributions within disciplinary conversations.

The theoretical elaboration offered here contributes to ongoing debates about the nature of evaluation, the role of grammar in discourse, and the construction of academic voice. By integrating insights from structuralist, functional, corpus-based, and critical approaches, the study provides a comprehensive account of adjectival evaluation that highlights both its linguistic complexity and its rhetorical significance. In doing so, it challenges reductive views of adjectives as merely descriptive and calls for greater attention to their role in shaping knowledge and authority in academic writing.

Future research building on these insights can further illuminate the cross-linguistic, disciplinary, and pedagogical dimensions of adjectival stance. Ultimately, a deeper understanding of adjectives and evaluation enriches not only linguistic theory but also our broader appreciation of how language functions as a social practice in the production of knowledge.

REFERENCES

1. Bache, C., and N. Davidsen-Nielsen. 1997. *Mastering English: An Advanced Grammar for Non-Native and Native Speakers*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
2. Barton, E. L. 1993. Evidentials, argumentation, and epistemological stance. *College English* 55(7): 745–771.
3. Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad, and E. Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
4. Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language*. New York/Chicago/San Francisco/Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
5. Bosque Muñoz, I. 1990. *Las categorías gramaticales*. Madrid: Editorial Síntesis.
6. Chavez, I. 2008. La démarcation dans les écrits scientifiques: Les collocations transdisciplinaires comme aide à l'écrit universitaire auprès des étudiants étrangers. *Mémoire de Master 2*, Université Stendhal.
7. Conrad, S., and D. Biber. 2000. Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing. In *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, edited by S. Hunston and G. Thompson, 56–73. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Dahl, T. 2008. Contributing to the academic conversation: A study of new knowledge claims in economics and linguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40: 1184–1201.
9. Dixon, R. W. 1982. *Where Have All the Adjectives Gone? And Other Essays in Syntax and Semantics*. The Hague: Mouton.
10. Dixon, R. W. 2004. Adjective classes in typological perspective. In *Adjective Classes: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, edited by R. Dixon and A. Y. Aikhenvald, 1–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
11. Ferris, C. D. 1993. *The Meaning of Syntax: A Study in the Adjectives of English*. London/New York: Longman.
12. Firth, J. R. 1957. A synopsis of linguistic theory, 1930–1955. In *Studies in Linguistic Analysis*, Special Volume, Philological Society, 1–32.

13. Fløttum, K., T. Dahl, and T. Kinn. 2006. Academic Voices Across Languages and Disciplines. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
14. Fowler, R., and G. Kress. 1979. Critical linguistics. In *Language and Control*, edited by R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress, and T. Trew, 185–214. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
15. Freddi, M. 2005. The construction of evaluation and argumentation in linguistics textbooks. In *Strategies in Academic Discourse*, edited by E. Tognini-Bonelli and G. Del Lungo Camiciotti, 133–152. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
16. Grossmann, F., A. Tutin, and P. P. Garcia da Silva. 2009. Filiation et transferts d'objets scientifiques dans les écrits de recherche. *Pratiques* 143–144: 187–202.
17. Hewings, M., and A. Hewings. 2002. "It is interesting to note that ...": A comparative study of anticipatory it in student and published writing. *English for Specific Purposes* 21: 367–383.
18. Hunston, S., and G. Thompson, eds. 2000. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
19. Hyland, K. 1998. *Hedging in Scientific Research*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
20. Hyland, K. 2005. *Metadiscourse*. London/New York: Continuum.
21. Hyland, K., and M. Bondi, eds. 2006. *Academic Discourse Across Disciplines*. Bern: Peter Lang.
22. Kerbrat-Orrechioni, C. 1980. *L'énonciation: De la subjectivité dans le langage*. Paris: Armand Colin.
23. Lopez Ferrero, C., and S. Oliver del Olmo. 2008. An interlinguistic analysis of interpersonality in Spanish and English scientific and academic reviews: Appraisal resources. Paper presented at the Conference *Interpersonality in Written Academic Discourse: Perspectives Across Languages and Cultures*, Zaragoza.
24. Martin, J. R. 2000. Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, edited by S. Hunston and G. Thompson, 142–175. Oxford: Oxford University Press.